

ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE

Tuesday, January 20, 2026
2:30p.m. | UC Council Room

Present: Borum, Chapin, Couch, Garrett, Han, Karlin, Leatherman, Leonard, Newman, Wood
Zoom: Gershwin, Endres
Absent: Mannello, Roberts

Call to Order 2:30pm

Approval of the Agenda approved without objection

Approval of the November 24, 2025, meeting minutes approved without objection

Announcements/Chair's Report:

There will be two Senate motions on behalf of APC today:

1. Proposal to Adjust Full-Time and Part-Time Enrollment in Graduate Programs
2. S/U Grading Policy

Reports from Councils:

Graduate Council (Cieminski) – No report. The Graduate Council will be meeting on the 29th.

Liberal Arts Council (Wood) – Muller is on sabbatical and Wood is the new LAC chair. The LAC has a one-time exception request for an ASL student that was granted. Several LAC courses are at the LAC workflow stage and will be reviewed at the February 3rd meeting.

Professional Education Council (Paytoe Gbayee) – No report. However, PEC encountered issues related to the new workflow revamp and associated deadlines, resulting in lost syllabi requirements for course deactivations. When deactivations move forward, they create problems for impacted courses.

Undergraduate Council (Karlin) – The Undergraduate Council approved 6 inter-disciplinary proposals and voted on an automatic approval process for this program. The council started discussing the Development of the Work-to-Learn Portfolio Framework.

Student Government Association (Baxter) – No report

Special Reports:

Special Order:

New Business:

1. Thomas Endres, Academic Appeal Chair to present and discuss the following two requests:
 - APC to revise the Academic Appeal Procedure in Board Policy Manual 2-1-201
 - APC to revise the Academic Appeal committee membership in Board Policy Manual 2-1-201
 - Endres suggested that revisions be made to existing language rather than start over entirely.

- All decisions are based on the three stated criteria:
 - Arbitrary
 - Capricious
 - Violation of University policy
 - The Board found it difficult to determine if an appeal should move forward based on those requirements.
- Remove the “DSPAC” acronyms throughout the document.
- **Section 2-1-203(4): Student’s Right to Academic Counsel**
 - The language does not specify who may serve as academic counsel.
 - Clarification is needed on whether the Dean may serve in this role.
 - The process for how a student selects academic counsel is unclear and should be defined.
 - Students should be informed at the beginning of the appeal process that the academic counsel may not serve as a witness.
- **Section 2-1-204(1) Appeal based on Action by a Faculty Member**
 - The document does not specify where materials are submitted or stored (e.g., electronic submission) and clarification is needed regarding the use of student Bear Mail.
- **Section 2-1-204(4) Request for Academic Appeals Board Hearing**
 - Language addressing situations in which a student is dissatisfied with the decision needs clarification.
 - The chronological procedure could be moved to the bylaws
 - Two separate processes should exist for undergraduate and graduate students.
 - The role of the SGA representative requires clarification because no student has been assigned to cases in the past
 - Decisions made during non-contractual times are problematic.
- **Section 2-1-204(6) Preparation for the Formal hearing**
 - (a) Language should be improved to clarify that information is submitted to the chair, who then distributes it to the relevant parties.
- **Section 2-1-204(7) Hearing Procedure**
 - (f) The definition of quorum differs for deliberation versus decision-making and should be clarified.
 - Endres noted that if three or more panel members vote to move a case forward, it proceeds, however he questioned whether this should instead require a majority vote.
- The committee agreed that the document does not appear to be student and faculty friendly.
 - The committee can work on a process that is more student and faculty friendly.
- Questions were raised regarding whether the language is primarily driven by legal requirements.
 - Gershwin and Newman will contact General Counsel English to determine whether the language is legally required.
- Adding a preamble summarizing the process and establishing guardrails was suggested.

- Members thought it is important to clarify the basis for an appeal and how they should require a justifiable reason.
- Consider mirroring language from the Faculty Welfare Committee tenure appeal process.
- Endres suggested a single committee that includes undergraduate and graduate faculty, as well as undergraduate and graduate students.
- Leatherman suggests committee members review the document and return with feedback and suggestions.
- Kudos were extended to the current Academic Appeals Board for the work completed so far.

Note: Based on my notes and the drafted policies, this has been ongoing since 2024, See [Academic Appeal Procedure_COD 2-26-25 .docx](#)

Continued Business:

1. Policy Recommendations of the Artificial Intelligence (AI) Task Force

- See **AI APC Policy folder** for all related documents: [AI Policies](#)
- **APC Responsibilities:**
 - a. Review most recent AI Syllabus Guidelines on Student Use of AI
Review policy draft: [11-24-25 APC Revised AI Proposed Policy .docx](#)
 - b. Review Undergrad/Graduate catalogs re: Student Code of Conduct/plagiarism policy to ensure it is aligned with AI policy and AI taskforce recommendations.
- **Review UNCO Student Code of Conduct:** [UNCO Student-Code-of-Conduct.pdf](#)
P. 6 states: “unauthorized use of Artificial Intelligence (AI). The use or attempted use of written content, images, tables, references, music or musical scores, or data generated by artificial intelligence (AI) tools that are not permitted by the instructor or University Official.”
- **Review UNCO Graduate Catalog Plagiarism- AI Policy** for AI additions/edits: [GRADUATE CATALOG 2025-2026: Plagiarism - Generative Artificial Intelligence Policy](#)
- **Review UNCO Plagiarism- Student Policies and Procedures** for AI additions/edits: [UNCO Plagiarism- Student Policies and Procedures.docx](#)
- **Reminder** – all the documents the AI taskforce recommendations and toolkits are in the AI policy SharePoint
 - Leatherman questioned whether “clear, accessible language” applies to the entire syllabus and suggested simpler wording.
 - Paytoe Gbayee noted the importance of clarity regarding scope, given her role in reviewing multiple syllabi.

- Leonard shared how design tech professors received a lot of backlash in their student evaluations for talking about AI in their courses and requested feedback on how faculty can approach this topic.
 - Newman shared that unless there is a curriculum requirement regarding the use of AI, it is the faculty's decision.
 - Guidelines could be offered on how to introduce AI to students
 - Faculty are recommended to teach AI in their courses, and some members feel that it is overstepping their tenure.
 - It was stated that if AI is not addressed in the classroom, it does not prepare students for the real world.
- Gershwin shared it is important to go off the robust kit the AI Taskforce provided and how units should have language regarding AI.
- Leatherman had concerns on how curriculum committee will determine if the AI syllabus statement aligns with the unit's position on AI.
 - It was shared that it would be the units responsibility to make sure those align.
- The use of "AI" and "GenAI" in the proposal will need to be clarified
 - "GenAI" will be used for "Generative Artificial Intelligence"
- Insert "is student-friendly, accessible, and" before "clearly:"
- **MOTION:** Paytoe Gbayee moves to approve the proposed AI policy, seconded by Cieminski.
- **VOTE:** Motion approved unanimously
- The proposal will be sent to Codification for review and the committee will move forward with the language linked to the student code of conduct and undergraduate and graduate catalogs.

Goal: Complete all AI work (syllabi statement and university policy reviews) by March 2026

Unfinished Business:

1. Request: Revise Academic Standing Language from "*Academic Probation*" to "*Academic Standing Warning*"
 - APC Motioned and approved to change "*Academic Probation*" to "*Academic Warning.*" On 10/7/25
 - APC Sent tracked/suggested changes to Codification 10/7/25
 - Codification reviewed and suggested changes to the academic standing language. See [Academic Standing Change-COD 10-8-25.docx](#)
 - T. Gershwin will meet with Stephanie Torrez early Spring 2026, AVP for the Division of Student Academic Success

Comments to the Good of the Order

Adjournment 3:45pm

Tracy Gershwin
Chair

