|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 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 |
| Miguel Rivera | x |  |  |
| Qin Liu | x |  |  |
| David Luther | 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**

**March 7, 2025**

**2:00 – 3:30 pm**

Meeting called to order at 2:00 pm by Bill Van Glabek.

**Meeting Summary for FSW Academic Standards Meeting**

Mar 07, 2025 10:58 AM Pacific Time (US and Canada) ID: 846 9452 9217

**Quick recap**

The team discussed the importance of maintaining high-quality education, the need for a living faculty handbook, and the potential use of Zoom Rooms for meetings. They also explored the college's assurance argument, the potential implementation of a plus-minus grading system, and the challenges of detecting and preventing AI-generated content in academic work. Lastly, they considered the use of AI tools like Claude and the need for better solutions to combat AI plagiarism.

**Next steps**

Bill to follow up with Dr. Jester regarding AI detection tools and alternatives to Turn It In.

William to invite Dr. Jester to the next meeting to discuss AI detection options.

William to contact Academic Technology department regarding current AI detection capabilities and potential alternatives. Committee members to prepare examples of how their work relates to the college's mission for potential HLC discussions. Committee members to review relevant sections of the HLC assurance argument before the upcoming visit. Martin to ensure Wi-Fi availability in HLC meeting rooms and communicate room locations to committee members. William to keep the topic of grading scales and plus/minus grades on the agenda for the next meeting. Committee members to consider volunteering to help transfer the faculty handbook to Pressbooks format.

**Summary**

**Grading Scales, AI, and HLC Discussion**

In the meeting, William summarized the minutes from the previous discussion, including the topics of grading scales, artificial intelligence, and filters. They also discussed the need for a quorum, which was achieved with 11 participants present. William then shifted the discussion towards the role of HLC, mentioning the contribution of Dr. Harris. Martin shared an email, and William proposed to share it with the group. No specific decisions, alignments, or action items were mentioned. The conversation ended with a recognition of the participants' presence.

**Academic Standards and Quality Assurance**

In the meeting, Martin discussed the assurance argument, focusing on the institution's mission, integrity, and academic standards. He emphasized the importance of the Academic Standards Committee's involvement in setting standards and supporting teachers. Bill and William shared their thoughts on maintaining high-quality education and the need for fairness in policy implementation. They also discussed the importance of the faculty handbook, noting the need for it to be a living document rather than a static policy.

**Discussing Press Books and Zoom Rooms**

The team discussed the need to review and update the press books constantly. They also considered the use of Zoom Rooms for meetings, with Vera suggesting individual Zoom meetings for committee discussions. Martin noted the meetings with different groups varied, including President's Cabinet and open forums. He also mentioned the possibility of meeting with the Governance Committees. William raised concerns about the availability and quality of Wi-Fi in the Zoom Rooms, and he suggested verifying this information.

**In-Person Meetings and Assurance Arguments**

Martin discussed the upcoming in-person meetings and the potential for using additional rooms on each campus. He also emphasized the importance of considering the mission of the college in various aspects of faculty work. He promised to share certain questions and examples related to the college's assurance argument, but noted that these might not reveal much about the questions asked based on the assurance arguments.

**College Assurance Argument Discussion**

Martin discusses the content generated by an AI tool called Claude regarding the college's assurance argument. He highlights key points about the institution's academic integrity, including systematic policy review, consistent standards across delivery modes, and transparent expectations for faculty and students. Martin emphasizes the importance of using Simple Syllabus, which allowed for quick submission of syllabi in various modalities when requested. He also notes the committee's involvement in developing academic integrity frameworks and procedures for handling misconduct and appeals.

**Upcoming Period and Faculty Handbook Update**

Martin discussed the upcoming two-week period, which will see the issuance of terms and information. He also mentioned the creation of podcasts to explain the assurance arguments. Anne emphasized the collaborative nature of the committee's work over the years. Lastly, William proposed the idea of shifting the faculty handbook to Pressbooks for ease of updates and asked for volunteers for the task.

**FSW Plus-Minus Grading System Discussion**

The Academic Standards Committee discusses the potential implementation of a plus-minus grading system at FSW. Martin and Bill argue against the change, citing increased workload and student complaints. Vera suggests it could benefit transfer students, but William points out that transfer credits often don't include grades. The committee notes that Florida universities use plus-minus grading, but most state colleges don't. Bill believes there isn't enough faculty support for the change. The discussion concludes with Martin emphasizing the importance of transparency in grading policies rather than adopting a new system.

**Detecting AI-Generated Content in Academic Work**

The team discussed the challenges of detecting and preventing AI-generated content in academic work. Bill shared his experience of using AI detectors like Grammarly and Quillbot to identify AI-generated content in his students' work, but expressed concern about the lack of tools provided by the college to combat AI plagiarism. Martin suggested that the team should be aware of the tools available and figure out where their use is appropriate. The team also discussed the limitations of AI detectors, with Vera mentioning that some tools flag English second language learners as AI-generated content. The team agreed to follow up with Dr. Jester and academic technologies to explore better solutions for detecting AI-generated content.