

4-16-2007

Student Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2007-02-16

University of Dayton. Student Academic Policies Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Student Academic Policies Committee, "Student Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2007-02-16" (2007). *All Committee Minutes*. Paper 148.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/148

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate Committees at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu.

Student Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate

Minutes from the meeting of February 16, 2007

Approved 4/16/07

Present: Dale Courte, Russell Hardie, Erik Elam, Tom Eggemeier, George DeMarco, Carl Chen

Review of the current draft of the Honor Code proposal continued.

The possibility of adding a “three strikes” rule, under which third-time offenders were expelled from the university, was discussed. George DeMarco and Wade Lockett had discussed this with Legal Affairs to determine if it was possible, and it appears there are no legal problems with such a rule. It was noted, however, that strict procedure would have to be defined in order to prevent problems in implementation.

There was discussion as to whether the Honor Code should address behavioral issues. Members agreed the code should pertain only issues of academic integrity, and that existing policies and procedures for behavioral problems were working.

It was noted that text needed to be added to the code to specifically address the various forms of electronic plagiarism that have become common in recent years.

Members felt the appeals procedure needed some more work. For one, if in fact the “three strikes” rule were approved, there would need to be procedure defined to appeal an expulsion apart from the one to appeal a simple decision. In addition, it was pointed out that, as stated in the current draft, appeals would go to the unit Deans, who were in essence by-passed in the original process. It was pointed out that it was unusual for a university-level body, such as the proposed honor board, to forward appeals back to the units. The possibility of the Provost hearing appeals was discussed briefly.

A decision was made to have members contact their Deans to set up meetings to get their perspective on the proposed code and their feelings about how it would impact current policies and procedures. Russel Hardie, Dale Courte, Carl Chen and George DeMarco volunteered to handle this for their respective units.

Meeting was then adjourned.