**DRAFT**

**Senate Rules and Elections Committee**

**Feb. 25, 2015**

**Minutes**

 **Wood (Chair), Brown, Grossman, Mazur, McGillis, Jones, Tagavi**

**1. Changes to Senate Rules Proposed by SGA**

Subsequent to its Dec 4, 2014 meeting, the SREC received clarifying information from the SGA concerning its intent on suggested revision to SR 6.3 and SR 6.4. The SREC discussed the effectuation of SGA intent and prepared the following updating of proposed revisions to SR 6.3 and SR 6.4 for submission to the Senate Council for consideration along with other revisions forwarded pursuant to the SREC Dec. 4, 2014 meeting.

### 6.3.1 Plagiarism

[…]

When students submit work purporting to be their own, but which in any way borrows ideas, organization, wording or ~~anything else~~ content from another source without appropriate acknowledgment of the fact, the students are guilty of plagiarism.

Plagiarism includes reproducing someone else's work (including, but not limited to, a published article, book, a website, computer code, or a paper from a friend) without clear attribution, whether it be published article, chapter of a book, a paper from a friend or some file, or whatever. Plagiarism also includes the practice of employing or allowing another person to alter or revise the work which a student submits as his/her own, whoever that other person may be. Students may discuss assignments among themselves or with an instructor or tutor, but when the actual work is done, it must be done by the student, and the student alone.

[…]

**6.4.0**

1. "Notice" shall be ~~is~~ sent ~~given~~ to a student in writing by both regular mail and email to the student's addresses as they ~~it~~ appear~~s~~ in the Registrar's records. The University is not responsible for a student's failure to maintain current addresses in the Registrar's records.~~:~~ Instructors also are encouraged to give notice to the student in person when feasible.
	1. ~~in person, with a witness or a signed receipt by the student; or~~
	2. ~~in writing by regular mail to the student's address as it appears in the Registrar's records. The University is not responsible for a student's failure to maintain a current address in the Registrar's records.~~

Any notice of a finding or penalty shall include the name and ID number of the student, the college in which the student is enrolled, the course and section in which the offense occurred, the date and nature of the offense, the penalty that is being imposed or recommended, and any right that the student may have to appeal the finding or penalty.

### 6.4.1 Jurisdiction

1. If an instructor is not a faculty employee (for example, the instructor is a teaching assistant), then the ~~faculty employee~~ Instructor of Record who is ultimately responsible for signing the grade reports for the course shall normally assume the role of the instructor. However, with the agreement of the responsible ~~faculty employee~~ Instructor of Record, the chair may decide either to allow the actual instructor to retain this role or to ask and shall participate in all UAB meetings as far as possible another employee who is directly involved with the course (for example, a course coordinator) to assume this role. In any case, the actual instructor should retain an important consultative role.

### 6.4.3 Initial Determination

1. **By the Instructor and Chair**

**Allegation; Opportunity of Student to Respond**. The instructor and chair shall review the evidence of an academic offense, and the instructor shall decide whether the evidence warrants an allegation of an academic offense. If so, the student shall be notified of the allegation and invited to meet with the instructor and chair to discuss the allegation and to state his or her case. Within 10 days after the evidence is received, the instructor and chair must make a reasonable effort to schedule the meeting. The instructor and chair shall set a deadline for the student to respond to the invitation to the meeting, but the deadline shall be no fewer than 7 days after the invitation is issued. The instructor and chair must make a reasonable effort to schedule a meeting with the student as soon as possible after the evidence is received.

 **2. Change to SR 1.4.4.2 Concerning Senate Elections**

The SREC continued its discussion from the Oct. 4, 2014 meeting, concerning procedures by which the various colleges conduct their election of senators. Of specific concern was to ensure the opportunity of every faculty member to be a candidate in a college senatorial election, e.g., that college administrative action (or inaction) did not cause elimination from candidacy of a faculty member who is otherwise eligible and willing. The SREC approved adding the following sentence to SR 1.4.4.2

The respective faculties of each college (including the Graduate School and Libraries as equivalent to colleges; GR VII.A.1) represented in the Senate shall conduct elections for vacancies in the second semester of the academic year, with the representatives elected taking office on August 16 of the following academic year. The election shall be conducted by secret ballot by a procedure approved by the College faculty. This election process will ensure that all eligible faculty have the opportunity to be nominated or self-nominate.

**3. Update on Draft Faculty Disciplinary Policy**

Wood updated the SREC on the status and implications of current interactions among persons involved in the drafting of the faculty disciplinary policy. No matter what the language is decided, the SREC will need to assist in necessary revision to Section 7 of the *University Senate Rules.*

**4. SACPT and Senate Rules**

Wood related to the SREC her action on its behalf to respond to an inquiry from the Chair of the SACPT, concerning the scope of charge to the SACPT. Wood clarified to the SACPT Chair that under the *University Senate Rules*, the SACPT addresses issues of privilege, academic freedom and procedure concerning individual reappointment, promotion or tenure cases. The SACPT does not evaluate the substantive qualifications of the individual complainant in such cases.

Submitted by D. Jones, SREC Secretary