|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 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 |
| 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 Sullivan | X |  |  |
| Valentin Zalessov | X |  |  |

**Academic Standards Committee Meeting**

**All Campuses via Zoom**

**February 7, 2025**

**2:00 – 3:30 pm**

Meeting called to order at 1:57 pm by Bill Van Glabek.

**Meeting Summary for FSW Academic Standards Meeting**

**Quick recap**

The team discussed the potential use of Pressbooks as a platform for updating and presenting the faculty handbook, with a focus on improving its visual appeal and interactivity. They also deliberated on the grading system, the issue of academic misconduct, and the need for clear guidelines and consistency in grading policies. Lastly, they touched upon the academic grading system, the use of plus and minus grades, and the potential impact on transfer students and prerequisites.

**Next steps**

Christy to gather information about grading systems from several in-state and out-of-state institutions, including FGCU, and report back at the March meeting.

William to research more on the grading scale, particularly the 89.99 cutoff system.

Academic Standards Committee to discuss the topic of plus/minus grading system at the March meeting.

William to bring up the issue of consistent grading scales (e.g., 89.99 cutoff) to Faculty Senate.

Academic Standards Committee to review and discuss the timeline for reporting academic misconduct at the March meeting.

**Summary**

Exploring Pressbooks for Faculty Handbook

In the meeting, Rozalind introduced the idea of using Pressbooks, a digital publishing platform, to update and present the faculty handbook in a more visually appealing and interactive format. She demonstrated how to use the platform and mentioned that it could be used for tracking revisions and adding multiple authors at no extra cost. William and Tejendrasinh expressed interest in exploring this option further. Rozalind also mentioned the possibility of using Rise, another platform, but noted that it would require paid licenses and more restrictions on editing. The team agreed to consider these options and possibly involve Rozalind in the process.

**Faculty Handbook Updates and PressBooks**

The meeting discussed the proposed changes to the Faculty Handbook, specifically regarding the recording of class lectures and publishing. The committee agreed to update the Handbook to align with the House Bill, which includes obtaining written consent from the lecturer before publishing any recordings. The committee also discussed the use of PressBooks as a platform for the Faculty Handbook, with most members expressing positive views. The decision was made to adopt PressBooks for this purpose. Lastly, the committee chair was asked to represent the group's perspective on academic standards during an upcoming event.

**Addressing Academic Dishonesty Timelines**

The discussion revolved around the appropriate timeframe for identifying potential academic dishonesty in online assessments. Dr. raised concerns about the delay in reviewing assignments due to other commitments, which could lead to discrepancies in identifying cheating. The team agreed that the clock starts ticking once an issue is brought to the student's attention. Tejendrasinh suggested making the policy clear on the syllabus, stating that any academic dishonesty found at any time during the semester would be subject to disciplinary actions. The team also discussed the importance of consistency in grading and the need to address patterns of cheating over time.

**Grading Scale Consistency and Confusion**

The discussion revolved around the grading system and its potential inconsistencies. Dr. expressed concern about the grading scale, particularly the range between 89 and 90, which he felt could lead to confusion and potential grievances. He suggested that the grading scale should be consistent, with 89.9 being an A and 89.7 being a B. Yadab shared his own approach, where 85% is an A and 84.9% is a B. Dr. also pointed out that not all syllabi in the math department follow this consistent grading scale, which could lead to confusion.

**Addressing Academic Misconduct Concerns**

The meeting focused on the issue of academic misconduct and the need for faculty to be vigilant in identifying and reporting such instances. Dr. Moran expressed concern about a loophole that students were exploiting, which could lead to more problems if not addressed. William agreed to research what other schools in the area were doing about this issue. April clarified the timeline for reporting academic misconduct, stating that it could be reported at any time after an incident has been discovered, but ideally as soon as possible. She also emphasized the importance of evidence in supporting the preponderance of evidence standard. Dr. Moran appreciated the clarification and agreed to be more proactive in reporting instances of academic misconduct.

**Grading Policies and Consistency Discussion**

The meeting revolved around the discussion of grading policies and the importance of consistency in grading. The team agreed on the need for clear guidelines and ranges for grading, with the suggestion that these should be updated and reinforced in the syllabus. They also discussed the potential for students to exploit loopholes in the grading system, and the importance of having a consistent grading policy to avoid confusion and disputes. The team also discussed the need for a more detailed faculty handbook to address these issues.

**Academic Grading System and Dual Enrollment**

In the meeting, the group discussed the academic grading system, specifically the use of plus and minus grades. They considered the potential benefits and drawbacks of adopting a plus and minus system, with some members arguing that it could lead to more fairness in grading and others expressing concerns about the potential impact on transfer students and prerequisites. The group decided to investigate the issue further, with Christy tasked with gathering information on local institutions and William to research the grading scale. The group also discussed the dual enrollment program, noting that the State had raised the cut scores for admission, leading to a decrease in the number of students enrolled. The conversation ended with a motion to end the meeting.