|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Present | Excused | Absent |
| Anne Angstrom | X |  |  |
| Karen Buonocore | x |  |  |
| Marius Coman | X |  |  |
| Camille Drake-Brassfield |  | x |  |
| Ann Eastman | x |  |  |
| Susan Holland | X |  |  |
| William Kelvin | X |  |  |
| Brenda Knight |  | x |  |
| Jay Koepke |  | x |  |
| Qin Liu |  | x |  |
| David Logan | X |  |  |
| Karen Maguire | X |  |  |
| Martin McClinton | X |  |  |
| Tommy Mann |  | x |  |
| Thomas Mohundro |  | x |  |
| Kristi Moran |  | x |  |
| Mary Myers | x |  |  |
| April Palmer | x |  |  |
| Yadab Paudel | X |  |  |
| Jessica Slisher |  | x |  |
| Les Sutter | x |  |  |
| Melanie Ulrich | x |  |  |
| Tejendrasinh Vala | x |  |  |
| William Van Glabek | X |  |  |
| Vera Verga | X |  |  |
| Valentin Zalessov | X |  |  |

**Academic Standards Committee Meeting**

**All Campuses via Zoom**

**March 1, 2024**

**2:00 – 3:30 pm**

Meeting called to order at 2:02 pm by Bill Van Glabek.

Approve meeting minutes from February 2, 2024.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Meeting Summary for Academic Standards Committee**  Mar 01, 2024 01:45 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada) ID: 856 4997 5993  **Top of Form**  **Quick recap**  The team discussed updating their academic integrity policy, the placement of the policy on the website, the issue of academic dishonesty on websites where students can upload and share course materials, the need to review and potentially revise the policy, amending program manuals for students in health professions to direct to the student handbook for matters of academic dishonesty, and collecting feedback from students on a certain topic.  **Next steps**  Martin will create a version of the document with the year 2023-2024 and share it with the committee.  William Van will meet with Dr. Palmer to discuss new wording for the academic integrity policy.  Committee members will review the academic integrity policy and suggest any changes or additions.  Susan will discuss with Tommy about aligning program handbooks with the academic integrity policy.  Tejendrasinh will consider gathering student feedback on the academic integrity policy.  **Summary**  **Academic Integrity Policy Update**  The team discussed updating their academic integrity policy, particularly focusing on the second page about academic standards. Vera noted that this section was not changed last year and needs to be updated with new links to the latest documents. Martin proposed creating a version of the document for the upcoming academic year (2023-2024) and the team agreed, as there were no significant updates in the previous year. The discussion also suggested that future versions should be created ahead of time to ensure they are always up-to-date.  **Academic Integrity Policy Revision**  The team discussed the faculty handbook and the academic integrity policy. Martin expressed surprise about the placement of the policy on the website, suggesting it should be more accessible. The team agreed to consider making changes to the policy, including adjusting the wording and possibly addressing issues related to students uploading their work to course hero and other similar websites. Vera suggested that the policy should explicitly state that uploading and distributing coursework to these websites is considered cheating. The team decided to review the policy and make necessary edits before the next meeting.  **Academic Dishonesty on Course Material Sharing Websites**  There was a discussion about the issue of academic dishonesty on websites where students can upload and share course materials. Vera highlighted the problem of super users uploading and sharing course content, which could potentially violate academic policy. William Van noted that the only tool available to detect such activities is Turnitin, but it does not support other languages and does not focus on AI. The team agreed that it is up to the professor to identify any potential academic dishonesty, as there are no other supported tools available. There was also mention of other platforms like Chig and Doc Student, but their functionality and reliability were not confirmed.  **Academic Integrity Policy Review**  The team discussed the need to review and potentially revise an academic integrity policy. They debated the definition of academic accomplishment and whether to include examples related to technology. The team decided not to submit the policy to the Faculty Senate yet, but rather to review it thoroughly and possibly add new, more relevant examples or definitions. The next meeting was set to discuss changes and additions to the policy.  **Consistency in Student Handbooks and Cybersecurity Concerns**  Martin proposed the idea of amending program manuals for students in health professions to direct to the student handbook for matters of academic dishonesty. He emphasized the importance of consistency and avoiding contradictions in documents. Susan agreed, noting that their nursing handbook already refers to the academic integrity policy. William Van suggested the same approach for other handbooks, and Martin recommended faculty members to address any policy discrepancies. There was also a discussion about the cybersecurity students and cheating, but no clear resolution was provided.  **Student Feedback Experiment Proposed**  Tejendrasinh proposed collecting feedback from students on a certain topic and conducting an experiment. He was uncertain about the confidentiality of this process but decided to proceed with the idea. William Van agreed, emphasizing the need to address the topic before the spring break and into the semester. Mary and Yadab expressed their gratitude for the discussion.  Bottom of Form  *AI-generated content* | |
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