

**Academic Policy Council
Minutes
November 21, 2006**

Attendees: Anita Spring (chair), Jack Mecholsky, Donna Duckworth, Carol Murphy
Saeed Khan, Ken Gerhardt, David Bloomquist, Janie Fouke
Guests: Kim Tanzer, Andy McCollough, Bernie Machen

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 AM and the minutes of October 18 were approved.

Honor Code

Kim Tanzer reviewed the conduct code committee charge and subcommittee structure. There are sub committees for definitions, academic violations and conduct violations and each subcommittee is comprised of faculty, students and staff. The goal of the conduct code committee is to revise regulations. The Academic Policy Council will provide Kim Tanzer with final recommendations regarding violations to the honor code by use of new technology.

The APC I expressed concern that the conduct code does not explicitly include the words “electronic” or “Internet”. The council discussed holding a series of awareness forums to educate students and faculty about plagiarism and cheating. The conduct code committee hopes to have recommendations completed by the end of the year so that the recommendations can be widely distributed to the faculty before going to the Board of Trustees in the spring. Dr. Fouke proposed implementing a year long program to inform faculty and students about the conduct code. Ideas for the program are to have each college host a discussion, have the Faculty Development office host a Conversation about the code and to include information in the Gator Times e-mail for all students.

General Education Council’s Gordon Rule

Andy McCollough presented the General Education Council’s Gordon Rule recommendations. The issue surfaced one year ago when the general education council heard concerns from faculty regarding the ability for students to communicate in writing and how to articulate that concern in the curriculum. The last revision of the UCC resulted in the general education composition requiring three hours of writing with the understanding that the Gordon Rule requirement would dictate how many words a student must write. Currently the Gordon Rule classes are issued one grade, which evaluates the student’s writing ability. The recommendation is to evaluate the writing with a grade of S/U and also give an overall course letter grade (C or better).

Anita Spring expressed some concern that if a student is otherwise doing well the faculty member may check S when grading even if the writing is insufficient. The S and U grades for Gordon Rule may or may not be reflected on the student’s transcript.

The Graduate Education Council is unsure whether or not the college representatives on the council have passed the recommendations on to their faculty members. Dr. McCollough noted that Gordon Rule courses are designated as such by the faculty member teaching the course.

Anita Spring will summarize the APC's comments and send to Andy McCollough. Comments from the APC include:

- Grade reporting structure
- Informing students
- Who grades the course work (Professor or TA?)
- What if courses are taken elsewhere?

Strategic Work Plan

Dr. Machen spoke with the APC about the Strategic Work Plan and plans for revisions. The Strategic Work Plan was created in response to the Board of Trustees request. The APC will create an annual document outlining what was and what was not accomplished that year from the strategic plan and will meet with Dr. Machen in March or April to review. Dr. Machen hopes this document will also outline priorities. It was noted that the work plan should address how the University is addressing social problems.

Minus grades

Carol Murphy discussed the Senate minus grades presentation with the APC and reviewed questions that Senators asked during the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at: 11:03 AM