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

**February 2, 2024**

**2:00 – 3:30 pm**

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

Approve meeting minutes from January 5, 2024.

**Meeting Summary for Academic Standards Committee**

Feb 02, 2024 01:44 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada) ID: 856 4997 5993

**Top of Form**

**Quick recap**

The team discussed the need for clarity and consistency in their documents, particularly in student disciplinary processes and academic integrity violations. They also debated the issue of student grades and the process of grade appeals, highlighting potential legal risks. The team approved the minutes from the previous meeting and discussed a training proposal by Dr. April Palmer.

**Summary**

**Document Overhaul for Clarity and Consistency**

The team led by Ann Eastman, Martin McClinton, Karen Maguire, Dr. Dr Kristi Moran, and William Van Glabek discussed the need to overhaul their documents to improve clarity and consistency. They considered replacing certain verbs with more definitive ones to avoid confusion in their student disciplinary processes. The team agreed to review all documents to ensure the appropriate language is used throughout. They also discussed the need to improve the parallelism in a set of statements about academic integrity violations, suggesting that each example should be defined for clarity, and that the focus should be on violating academic integrity policy. The team noted that the examples were not written in a parallel manner and needed rephrasing by someone with good English skills.

**Grade Appeals and Academic Integrity**

The team discussed the issue of student grades and the process of grade appeals. They debated whether a student found not guilty of a reported violation should have their grade changed. The conversation ended without a clear resolution on the matter. They also discussed the process of handling grade appeals and academic integrity violations. The team agreed that if a student is found not responsible for an academic integrity violation, it should not count towards multiple violations. However, they also highlighted the potential legal risks a faculty member might face if they do not change the student's grade.

**Faculty Training and Student Rights**

Martin and Vera discussed the need for improved faculty training, particularly in certain aspects. William suggested reaching out to Melanie Ulrich and Vera to refine document wording and placement. April then presented a training she previously conducted for faculty serving on hearing boards, emphasizing the importance of the process and the preponderance standard. She proposed spending an hour and a half to two hours on a Friday afternoon for the training. April also discussed student rights and responsibilities, particularly in the context of academic integrity processes. She outlined the standard of proof, the role of the board, and the purpose of the hearing process. Furthermore, she emphasized the importance of asking good questions and the role of the facilitator in ensuring a fair and equitable process. April also proposed training faculty members twice a year and expressed her desire to have the training completed by fall.

**Document Date Inconsistencies and Streamlining Process**

Susan Holland raised a concern about the inconsistency in the dates mentioned in the document. Martin McClinton and Karen Maguire responded that the dates were set by law and couldn't be changed, although some dates might be shorter due to legal requirements. Melanie Ulrich emphasized the need for streamlining the process without increasing the duration, as faculty was dissatisfied with the length of the process. William Van Glabek proposed reaching out to those interested in working on the document. The group also approved the minutes from the previous meeting. Finally, William Van Glabek mentioned a training proposal by Dr. April Palmer, which would be face-to-face or via Zoom at the start of the semester.

**Next steps**

Review and revise the language used in the academic integrity policy examples to ensure clarity and parallelism.

Review and revise the document regarding the grade appeal process, with a focus on clarifying the roles and responsibilities of the faculty and the committee.

April will provide a training session on the academic integrity process once it is approved by the Senate.
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