

CODIFICATION COMMITTEE
Carter Board Room, 4th Floor Carter Hall
Wednesday, October 9, 2019
MINUTES

Present: Berg, Fitzpatrick, Joy, Satriana, Schuttler, Welsh

Absent:

Guests: Brian Luedloff, Anne Toewe

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:03pm.

Approval of the October 9, 2019 Agenda

The October 9, 2019 agenda was approved without objection.

Approval of the September 25, 2019 meeting minutes

The September 25, 2019 meeting minutes were approved without objection

Chair's Report/Announcements

Brian Luedloff (Academic Appeals Board Chair) and Anne Toewe (APC Chair) are visiting to contribute to Academic Appeals Policy discussion.

Unfinished Business

- Academic Appeals Policy – Satriana
 - Luedloff originally presented questions to Provost Wacker and Alison Merrill in 2015; there are many areas of the policy that need clarification and/or revision.
 - One specific concern about the APC draft sent to Codification is the elimination of the preliminary evaluation hearing. Appeals would go to a full board hearing automatically.
 - Approximately 2/3 of matters that go to preliminary hearing do not advance to the full board.
 - Having appeals go straight to the full board would not be an efficient use of limited time and resources.
 - Initial review helps determine what needs to go to a full hearing.
 - Prima facie evidence must be established to proceed with a hearing.
 - Preliminary evaluation does not duplicate department process; department process precedes preliminary AAB review.
 - Language is needed to describe under what circumstances a designee can be appointed in the absence of a chair/director to serve in their capacity so as not to delay the appeal procedure.
 - Language is needed to specify that grade changes can be made at the department level *only* if the faculty member is no longer employed by UNC; or *by the Registrar* as a result of the Hearing Panel's decision.
 - Replace the 'calendar day' language to comparable/equivalent 'working day' language as defined in the BPM.
 - Replace the reference of 'conference' with 'communication' so as not to give the impression that it must be a face-to-face meeting; for instance, consideration should be made for online students.
 - Extension of deadlines may be requested at any stage of the AAP but must be requested

before the deadline has passed.

- Replace the reference to ‘remedies’ in 2-1-204(1)(b)(i) with “or may recommend a resolution to the parties”.
- The intent of the AAP is to address disputes regarding final course grades or termination from a program, not to address disputes regarding individual course assignments; this should be specified in the outset.
 - If discrimination is the basis of the complaint, then students should report the incident through the Dean of Students [website](#). Complaints of discrimination are handled through the Discrimination Complaint Procedures (DCP) of the University, not via the AAP.

Schuttler – We’ll stop today at 2-1-204(3). Anne and Brian, please return for our meeting in two weeks if you are available.

- Senate Action 1153: Article 8
- Senate Action 1113: Evaluation, Promotion, Tenure
- Senate Action 1143: Part 12 Faculty Grievance – Satriana
- 3-6-125 Discrimination Complaint Procedures – Satriana
- Review Add’l Senate Actions/Board Policy Manual and University Regulations Updates

New Business

Adjournment

- The meeting adjourned at 3:15pm.

Mary Schuttler
Chair

Betsy Kienitz
Recording Secretary