

# Minutes

Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee  
February 11, 2021 3:00—5:00 p.m.

In Attendance: Voting Members: Wendy Cook, Eric Foch, Lori Braunstein, Taralynn Petrites, Andy Piacsek, Josh Welsh, Ke Zhong,  
Ex-Officio: David Douglas, Gail Mackin, Rose Spodobalski-Brower, Michael Pease, Rachel Medalia  
Guests: Kelsey Haney, Glenn Petrites (ASL interpreter), Christy Camarata (ASL Interpreter)

(This week's notetaker is Mike Pease)

1. After a quorum was present, Josh Welsh called the meeting to order
2. Motion to approve the Jan 28, 2021 minutes was made by Eric F., and were seconded by Wend Cook  
4:10 pm Minutes approved unanimously
3. Discussion of Academic Appeals Committee led by David Douglas, reporting discussion from FSEC on 3/08. This involved the future location of the Academic Appeals Committee. Not enough information is present at this point to add much, and the FSAAC does not have a charge on which to act.

Last week, Josh reported FSAAC progress to the Senate.

#### 4. Old Business

The committee continued working on the language for policy 5-90-80 regarding Disruptive Behavior in academic settings.

##### i. Finalize Behavior Committee Placement

Two options were presented: Academic Appeals committee or having the Office of Student Success make the determination. The former was preferred and pursued.

If the Academic Appeals committee is used, should student members participate? Discussion centered on how to protect students from retaliation while maintaining their ability to provide input. A compromise of having students serve on the committee but in a non-voting role was offered and gain support.

Students would have to be trained in FERPA.

How to ensure these appeals can be heard in a timely manner is paramount. This will need to be considered in subsequent decision and in procedure.

No formal motion was made, but the group agreed in principle to work on a policy in which the Board of Academic Appeals review the cases. Student representatives would participate, but not vote. The modifications to the policy were based on this operational premise.

Discussion occurred over whether chairs or program directors are making recommendations or determinations. It was determined they are making determinations of course exclusion or course expulsion. Whether to have this decision reviewed by the dean's office was considered. But, because of the need for expedient decisions, was rejected.

Department chairs or program directors will, in consultation with the faculty member, make a determination for course exclusion or course expulsion. It is assumed the decision maker would consult the dean but it is not a strict procedural requirement.

Removal from a Program would start with a recommendation from the chair or program director. It would then go to the Dean's office. Since these are less time-sensitive issues, an extra step seems warranted, and then Academic Appeal committee for original jurisdiction. Should program removal be reserved for repeat offenses or can one egregious event justify removal?

Should faculty have the right to appeal decisions made by the department chair, assuming that decision is made in consultation with the dean? Scenarios were analyzed. Faculty appeals will go to the dean. This decision can then go to the Board of Academic Appeals Standing Academic Council.

## ii. Procedures

Should each department develop their own set of standards of behavior--for inclusion in the catalog? This should most likely be placed in the student code of conduct.

The notion of placing this in the catalog was removed. Within the catalog there are some basic expectations of conduct, involving alcohol, drug use, etc. So there is a place for it, but the catalog is perhaps not the best place.

Board of Academic Appeals Standing Academic Council wording was modified to reflect the changes in policy. Committee decisions require a subset of the committee comprised of at least 3 faculty members unaffiliated with the departments in question, and non-voting student members of the committee, and a non-voting representative from student success. It was suggested the Academic Appeals procedures be followed, but it was thought their procedures are time consuming and not appropriate here.

Josh had originally proposed ending discussion at 4:30 so that we can move forward with two items of new business. The decision was made to not pursue this strategy and instead to focus on procedures as this is fresh in everyone's head.

5. Adjournment

Meeting Adjourned at 4:59pm

**Next Meeting:**  
**Feb 25, 2021**