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

**April 4, 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**

Apr 04, 2025 11:00 AM Pacific Time (US and Canada) ID: 846 9452 9217

**Quick recap**

The team discussed the challenges of detecting AI-generated content in student work and the limitations of technological solutions, emphasizing the need for pedagogical and cultural changes. They also explored the importance of direct evidence in proving academic misconduct, the use of learning technology and tools, and the need for better education on academic integrity. Lastly, they discussed the rapid evolution of AI and its potential impact on education, including the challenges of verifying student identities and the increasing reliance on AI in high schools.

**Next steps**

William Van to work with Anna or April to develop a document with suggested syllabus statements for faculty to consider including before submitting their syllabi for the fall semester.

Anna to lead a 90-minute session on AI and academic integrity at the June conference, pending approval from Martin.

Anna to meet with Dr. Jester and Dr. Harris to discuss whether AI has been considered in the context of learning assessments.

William Van to follow up on organizing professional development or summer series on AI and academic integrity through the Center for Teaching and Learning.

William Van to revisit and share previous Academic Standards Committee discussions on plus/minus grading from past meeting minutes.

Faculty members to contact William Van if interested in helping edit the faculty handbook in Pressbooks.

Tejendrasinh to submit an IT request to review camera recordings from the Proctorio testing room for a potential cheating incident.

**Summary**

AI Detectors: Ineffective and Biased

In the meeting, William Van welcomed everyone and discussed the topic of artificial intelligence and academic misconduct. Anna, who was invited to the meeting, shared her insights on AI detectors, stating that they don't work effectively due to high rates of false positives and negatives. She also mentioned that the tools are prone to bias, disproportionately flagging students whose first language is not English, students who are neurodivergent, and students who speak a non-standard version of English. As a result, the college has not been able to find an AI detection solution to provide to faculty.

**Addressing AI-Generated Content in Student Work**

Anna discusses the challenges of detecting AI-generated content in student work and the college's approach to addressing this issue. She emphasizes that technological solutions are limited, and the focus should be on pedagogical and cultural changes. Anna presents some tools provided by the college that can help track students' work processes, but acknowledges they are not perfect solutions. She suggests creating assignments that students don't want to use AI for, rather than trying to make AI-proof assignments. The discussion also touches on updating syllabi, conducting oral exams, and adapting strategies for different course modalities. Anna encourages faculty to seek help in developing appropriate strategies for their disciplines and modalities. The conversation concludes with a debate on how to gather evidence of AI use and the challenges of proving it compared to traditional plagiarism.

**Addressing AI-Generated Work in Assessments**

In the meeting, Miguel and William Kelvin discussed the importance of direct evidence in proving academic misconduct. They agreed that circumstantial evidence, such as a student's inability to explain the content of a document, could be used to support a case. William Kelvin expressed concern about the reliability of process documentation as a means of detecting AI-generated work, as AI could potentially mimic such processes. Anna suggested that students might be more willing to copy and paste from Chat GPT than to build an AI agent to mimic a process document. William Van raised the issue of how assessments are checked for AI-generated work, and Anna agreed to discuss this with Dr. Jester and Dr. Harris. The conversation ended with a consensus that the issue of AI-generated work is far-reaching and requires a coordinated effort to address.

**AI Usage in Academic Settings**

Anna discussed the use of learning technology and tools like Google Docs and Grammarly in classes. She mentioned a new tool that will allow students to interact with AI and suggested that instructors could use it to intervene with individual students who may be misusing AI. Mary shared her approach of requiring students to meet with her individually if their assignments were more complex than the topics covered in class. Susan suggested using a class charter and authenticity agreement to deter cheating. William Van proposed an open forum for discussing practices and experiences in the fall. Vera suggested creating a document to share with faculty before they finalize their syllabi, including statements about AI usage.

**Academic Integrity Education and Reporting Process**

The team discussed the need for better education on academic integrity, particularly regarding the 10-day reporting timeline. They also considered the possibility of a summer series on this topic. The importance of faculty understanding the reporting process was emphasized, with a suggestion to include more faculty in the discussion. The team also discussed the limitations of technology in proving academic dishonesty, with a focus on the difference between plagiarism and AI checks. The idea of using web-based techniques to gather evidence was also explored.

**Addressing AI Challenges in Education**

The team discussed the challenges of AI in education, particularly Chat GPT, and its potential to undermine academic integrity. They agreed that it's crucial to invest time in the beginning of courses to prevent cheating and ensure students understand the value of their work. The team also discussed the need for professional development to address these issues. They decided to continue exploring solutions and will follow up with relevant parties.

**AI's Impact on Education and Identity**

The team discussed the rapid evolution of AI and its potential impact on education. They highlighted the challenges of verifying student identities, particularly in online exams, and the need for strict ID verification processes. The team also discussed the increasing reliance on AI in high schools and its potential to influence students' attitudes towards authenticity and knowledge acquisition. The conversation ended with a concern about the potential misuse of AI in obtaining false degrees and licenses.

**Faculty Handbook and Proctorio Concerns**

In the meeting, William Van discussed the faculty handbook and the need for editing. He also mentioned an agenda item for September and a greeting scenario brought up by Christy Moran. The committee decided to consider the greeting scenario a mute issue. Tejendrasinh raised a concern about a student potentially cheating in a proctorio exam, and the committee suggested reaching out to the proctorio team for assistance. The conversation ended with William Van thanking everyone for their efforts and looking forward to work in the next year.