|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 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 |  |  |  |
| 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**

**January 5, 2024**

**2:00 – 3:30 pm**

Meeting called to order at 2:03 pm by Bill Van Glabek.

Approve meeting minutes from December 1, 2023.

**Meeting Summary for Academic Standards Committee**

Jan 05, 2024 01:43 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada) ID: 856 4997 5993

**Top of Form**

**Quick recap**

William reviewed the minutes from the previous meeting, the Integrity Board and its structure, an appeals form, an academic integrity form, an updated academic integrity policy, a student conduct process and consequences, revisions to the academic conduct policy, the composition of the Academic Integrity Board, the student complaint handling process, the responsibility of aiding in academic misconduct, issues related to academic dishonesty during exams, and the need to revise and finalize documentation.

**Summary**

**Appeals Form Discussion and Review**

The meeting began with William reviewing the minutes from the previous meeting. Vera clarified that they were not present at the previous meeting. The team then moved on to discuss an appeals form that had been previously reviewed and approved by Dr. Bilski and Dr. Mcinton. Vera and Melanie had provided some input on the form. The form was discussed in detail, with William noting that it matched the discussion from the previous meeting. There were no concerns or comments about the Integrity Board.

**Integrity Board Structure and Form Discussion**

The structure and role of the Integrity Board was discussed, which consists of one faculty from the school, one from another school, a staff member from student affairs or administration, and a student. A campus administrator, who is not a voting member, acts as the secretary for the meetings. The board's decisions can be appealed, but once the VPA gets involved, the decision is final. There was also a discussion about a form related to academic integrity, which was not yet ready for publication due to pending approvals. The form seemed to be similar to the content discussed in a previous meeting.

**Academic Integrity Policy Review**

Martin presented an updated academic integrity policy and procedures to the team for review before it was sent to the Faculty Senate. The team discussed the need to align with state statute and the process for appealing to the VPA. An omission in the document was identified and planned to be addressed. There was a discussion about the absence of an acceptance of responsibility form in their process, originally developed by student affairs, with Vera expressing concern. It was suggested that a form already in use by Fgc. U. could be used instead of recreating it. However, there was uncertainty about the existence of this form and whether April, involved in the development of the form, was present at the meeting.

**Academic Misconduct Consequences Discussed**

Martin, Dr., Vera, and William discussed the student conduct process and the consequences for academic misconduct. They agreed that severe offenses should result in expulsion, with Vera emphasizing the need for strict actions against academic misconduct. Martin clarified the role of the student code of conduct in handling expulsion and the need for faculty to be kept separate from this process. The team also discussed revisions to the academic conduct policy, focusing on student report writing and its consequences. Martin emphasized the importance of faculty reporting and requested William to forward the final version of the document to the Faculty Senate. No further action items or decisions were stated.

**Academic Integrity Board Composition and Policy Revision**

The team discussed the composition of the Academic Integrity Board, emphasizing the importance of fair representation. The board was agreed to include two full-time faculty members, one from the school, and one staff member. April was assigned to train faculty members for the board. The team also discussed the student complaint handling process, with Martin expressing confidence in faculty willingness to serve and the need for training. A revised policy was agreed to be reviewed, with Karen noting the need to correct some typos. The team also discussed the responsibility of an individual who aids another in cheating at a university. They agreed to modify the language in the relevant document to hold such individuals equally responsible and considered the possibility of applying this rule to non-student helpers.

**Exam Integrity and Student Management**

The team discussed issues related to academic dishonesty during exams, particularly concerning students leaving the exam room. They agreed that while students should be allowed to leave the room if necessary, their test should be marked as completed and submitted for grading. They also considered using different versions of exams to prevent students from looking up answers online. The team also touched upon the challenges of managing students with medical conditions who need to take breaks during exams. The possible use of online proctoring services was discussed as a potential solution to some of these issues.

**Academic Integrity Policy Review**

Martin, Melanie, William, Dr. McClinton, and other team members discussed the academic integrity policy. Martin clarified that the first paragraph remained unchanged and the timeframes were still 10 business days, adjusted to 7 after legal advice. There was some confusion due to an outdated document sent to William, who agreed to forward the final version to the committee. The team also reviewed steps for handling policy violation appeals and discussed issues such as student withdrawal and academic misconduct. They agreed that the last report to the academic dean should be sent via their FSW email no later than 7 business days after responding to the faculty. The conversation concluded with a discussion on the challenges of cheating in mini semesters and the reporting process.

**Documentation Revision and Faculty Communication**

The team discussed the need to revise and finalize documentation, including addressing potential conflicts of interest. Martin noted that reading documents out loud can help catch missing words. The team also discussed the importance of keeping a faculty member informed throughout the process. William outlined the next steps, which included sending the revised document to committee members, presenting it to the Faculty Senate, and discussing forms, student responsibility, and appeals at the next meeting. The team agreed to prepare a draft for discussion at the next meeting to ensure enough time for feedback and revision before the February meeting.

**Next steps**

Martin will update the academic integrity policy and procedures document and send it to William. William will discuss with the committee about moving the document forward to the Faculty Senate. Martin will revise the COC based on the discussed changes. Martin will send the revised document to William for review by the committee. William will distribute the revised document to the committee and request feedback. William will ensure that April is present at the next meeting to discuss the forms and training. Karen will communicate with Dr. Palmer about the need for the student responsibility and appeals form for the February meeting.
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