**Senate Rules and Elections Committee**

**April 25, 2014**

**Jones (Chair), Grossman, Pienkowski, Wood**

**1. Diploma for Doctor of Public Health**

The SREC briefly continued discussion of the situation that the current diploma for the Doctor of Public Health displays

“Student name”

“Doctor of Public Health”

“Doctor of Public Health”

Dr. Holsinger asks that the University Senate approve that the diploma be changed to show the correct display of the Major Name. The CIP established by the KY Council of Postsecondary Education when it approved this doctoral degree was 51.2201. The CIP title of the disciplinary field for this CIP number is “Public Health, General.” Jones and Wood confirmed for the SREC that what probably happened was that when the above degree was originally created, the paperwork incorrectly entered “Doctor of Public Health” as the Major Name, instead of “Public Health.” The solution to be relayed to Dr. Holsinger is that the college should submit a program change proposal with the Major Name being changed from “Doctor of Public Health” to “Public Health.”

“Student name”

“Doctor of Public Health”

“Public Health”

**2. Governing Regulation XI and the University Appeals Board**

The SREC met with Richard Greissman and Marcy Deaton to discuss the origin of the change to the wording in GR XI in 2006 that introduced “original jurisdiction” and solutions to the problems that the new wording had created. The problems were heightened by an official interpretation rendered by General Counsel Bill Thro in response to a request submitted by the SREC for clarification of issues.

Thro interpreted that the 2006 changes to GR XI have the effect to substantively remove the UAB from the controlling academic policy architecture of the University Senate Rules. In his opinion, the UAB is not bound by limitations (upper or lower) that the Senate has established for academic offenses of cheating and plagiarism. In addition, he opines that the UAB is no longer bound by the Senate Rules that place student grades under the “good faith judgment” of the course instructor. The SREC members expressed alarm that the University (Faculty) Senate has apparently lost control of academic policies on student academic offense and ultimate determination of student grades.

The SREC discussed with Richard Greissman and Marcy Deaton what revision in GR XI would be needed to restore the University Senate’s control over the UAB to the nature of academic control that the University Senate possessed from 1970 until 2005. The needed revisions were drafted and will be further circulated among the SREC for final editing and submission to the Senate Council for inclusion in the SC 4/28/2104 agenda.

**3. Student Submission of Work Student Previously Submitted**

The SREC discussed whether an academic offense has occurred when a student submits for a course assignment work that the student previously submitted for a different course, or even for the same course taken in a previous semester. The SREC interpreted that such a situation does not constitute plagiarism. However, the Instructor can impose a penalty on the grade for the assignment as ‘failure to follow course assignment instructions’ if the Instructor has specifically stated in the syllabus that it is not allowed for a student to submit the same work in that present course the student has submitted in a different course or in a previous offering of the same course.