Senate Council
April 20, 2015

Snippet from SC Minutes February 23, 2015

3. Committee Reports
a. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) - Greg Graf, Chair
i. College of Health Sciences Proposed Student Appeals Policy

The Chair asked Guest Greg Graf, chair of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), to explain the proposal, which he did. Guest Randa Remer (Health Sciences assistant dean for admissions and student affairs) also was present and participated in the discussion.

There were a number of questions from SC members. Although SC members largely understood the impetus for the proposal, there were some major concerns, which are summarized below.

- As written, students may not understand that the proposed policy is merely a documentation of internal college procedures. Students could think that the Health Sciences (HS) policy supersedes the University-wide appeals process, which is outlined in the *Senate Rules* (*SR*).

- Currently, the *SR* presumes that any appeals processes that are separate from the processes outlined in the *SR* are those in colleges that have an academic honor code, but HS does not have an honor code. If the HS appeals policy were to be approved, it would require a change to the *SR*, too. Another option would be for HS to create an honor code, which would then allow a college-level appeals process.

- As written, the policy facilitates a student‘s ability to appeal all the way to the University Appeals Board (UAB), but there is no similar process for a faculty member who wants to uphold a penalty.

- If the appeals language is not clear on the appeals process, or if it conflicts with other, related University-wide rules, a student may have grounds to claim violations of their due process.

- The proposal needs to be edited to be clear that a faculty member is not obligated to change a student’s grade based on colleagues’ comments or a committee’s determination – only the instructor of record and the UAB can change a grade and a faculty member’s autonomy should not be undermined.

The Chair said that the **motion** from the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) was that the SC recommends Senate approval of the proposed new College of Health Sciences Student Appeals Policy. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required.

Porter **moved** to table the proposal and Christ **seconded**. Both Porter and Christ **accepted** Grossman’s **friendly amendment** to have the proposal tabled until the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) can review and comment upon the proposal. McCormick asked that the review and comments take the form of assisting HS to move forward, not merely a “yes” or “no” response from the SREC.

In response to a comment from Grossman, Remer explained that it was unlikely that HS faculty would want to create an honor code.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.