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

**December 1, 2023**

**2:00 – 3:30 pm**

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

Approve meeting minutes from November 3, 2023.

**Discussion Items**

**New Business**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Quick recap**  The team discussed the use of AI for meeting summaries, concerns about AI's ability to correctly identify individuals, end of the semester and beginning of the next one, and inclusion of April Palmer in future academic standards meetings. They also discussed reports and actions, academic violations by students, and the importance of training faculty in their roles on the Student Conduct Board and Academic Integrity Board. The team agreed on the importance of training faculty, revising the COP, and the need for more training and uniformity in the use of AI tools.  **Summary**  AI, Meeting Summaries, Name Changes, Semester End  The team discussed the use of AI for meeting summaries, with William sharing his experience of using it for the meeting minutes. There were some concerns about the AI's ability to correctly identify individuals, prompting a discussion about name changes. Melanie and Qin requested changes to their meeting attendance status. The team also touched on the end of the semester and the beginning of the next one, but no specific decisions or next steps were outlined.  **Academic Standards Committee Meeting**  The committee discussed a number of issues. Martin suggested including April Palmer in all future academic standards meetings and proposed a new agenda item to discuss reports and actions. He also requested Brandon to consider having April permanently on the committee. William agreed to invite April but there were uncertainties regarding the number of administrators allowed. Martin reported that the Senate had approved a flow chart in February but there were issues with its language. He had been working with Dr. Bilsky, Dr. Palmer, and Melanie to revise it and they had developed an academic dishonesty policy to be presented to the Board of Trustees. Melanie agreed with Martin's assessment and suggested the committee should review and provide input on the new document.  **Academic Misconduct Procedure and Appeal Process**  Martin discussed the procedure for addressing academic violations by students, which includes informing the student about their wrongdoing and potential sanctions. He highlighted the important role of faculty in reporting violations and the timelines involved. Martin also mentioned the possibility of the student asking for an advisor, although he acknowledged the vagueness of this rule due to legal allowances. He emphasized that students found responsible for misconduct must respond to the faculty member via email before starting a formal appeal. Martin also discussed the process of handling academic misconduct reports within their college, outlining that students found responsible for misconduct can request a late withdrawal or late drop. He acknowledged the need to update the document to ensure its clarity and accuracy. Martin and Karen discussed the importance of following legal guidelines and academic timelines. They also talked about the process of handling student appeals, particularly in cases of academic misconduct. Martin explained that the appeal process involves the Academic Integrity Board, which consists of two full-time faculty members, one from the school where the accusation originated and another from a different school, a student trained to participate in student conduct hearings, and a case administrator who acts as a secretary. The board, which convenes on a last-night basis, can decide whether to change the student's record. However, the final decision can be appealed to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.  **Reporting and Training on Student Appeals and Integrity**  Martin, Dr. Bilsky, and April discussed creating a report outlining the student appeals process, emphasizing that final decision-making authority would rest with a committee. The report would be kept separate from the legal aspect and not attached to a student's transcript to avoid implications of double jeopardy. April explained the function of Maxine, their case management system for handling conduct and academic integrity violations. She clarified that when a faculty or administrator files a report, it becomes a matter of record that can affect a student's transfer or application to other institutions. However, honesty about such violations in admissions clearance forms typically does not negatively affect a student's chances of admission. The team agreed on the importance of training faculty in their roles on the Student Conduct Board and Academic Integrity Board, with William suggesting using the committee as a test group for training. Melanie recommended updating the link to the page on academic integrity and misconduct, which Martin agreed to do. The team also discussed improving access to the forms.  **COP Revision, Academic Misconduct, and Consistency Updates**  Karen stressed the need to revise the COP in conjunction with ongoing efforts and highlighted a potential issue with the appeal procedure's 10-day time frame. Martin noted no significant changes were planned for the academic misconduct policy. April and Karen discussed the need for updates to ensure consistency among documents, an idea that Martin agreed on. They also discussed the interconnection between the academic catalog and the code of conduct. April reported about 45 academic misconduct reports since August, many of which were resolved informally, and emphasized the importance of faculty senator or committee approval before proceeding with changes.  **AI Misuse and Academic Integrity Concerns**  April voiced her concerns about the misuse of AI tools by students and emphasized the need for more training and uniformity in their use. She highlighted the importance of faculty utilizing these forms to identify patterns of academic dishonesty. The team discussed the complexities of handling academic dishonesty incidents, the importance of factual reporting, and the role of accountability for students who engage in egregious academic dishonesty. No clear decisions or next steps were made, but plans were discussed to engage faculty in discussions about helping students understand the difference between plagiarism and cheating.  **Academic Integrity and AI Policy Discussion**  William informed the committee about his intention to present some gathered information in the next meeting for a comprehensive review. The team discussed the issue of academic integrity, particularly plagiarism, and agreed to tackle it in the future. Karen shared that her department has developed a policy on AI use, which was approved and will be included in the syllabus. The team also expressed concerns about the potential misuse of AI and agreed on the need to differentiate between acceptable and unacceptable uses. Towards the end of the meeting, William and Karen agreed to share a document with the committee, outlining expectations from instructors and violations. The meeting was adjourned by Melanie.  **Next steps**  Martin will share the updated academic dishonesty policy document with the committee for review and feedback. Martin will update the document to correct typos and clarify certain points. April will train students to participate in behavioral misconduct hearings.  The committee will consider the feedback loop idea for reporting and meetings.  Martin will distribute the presentation and discuss it with the committee.  Martin will consider updating the faculty page link to the academic integrity and misconduct page. The committee will discuss the possibility of being a test subject for the training.  Martin will coordinate with April to update the COP in conjunction with the process changes.  April will provide specifics and logistics on academic misconduct reports in January.  Karen will share the academic integrity policy with William and the committee. | | |
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