

Minutes
Senate Scholastic Standards Committee
February 13, 2006
(approved Feb. 27, 2006)

In Attendance: Moiseff, Chidester, DeWolf, Dimauro, Goodstein, Gramling, Rodin, Sidney, Wagner, Jason Stephens (Guest)

1. The 1/30/06 minutes were approved
2. The committee was advised that the motion concerning removing the transfer credit restriction for minors would be presented as a 'recommendation to the provost' since minors exist under the authority of the provost, not through a Senate bylaw.
3. The committee was informed that we will be working with Dr. Margaret Lamb, Director, Individualized & Interdisciplinary Studies, to come up with recommendations for procedures to review and approve INTD courses.
4. Our subcommittee presented a comprehensive definition of academic integrity that would be suitable for inclusion in the Student Code of Conduct. Wagner will fine-tune the document based on any feedback he receives from the committee.
5. The subcommittee also presented their first draft for "Processes for resolving academic misconduct". The proposed policy shifts the responsibility for dealing with misconduct from the current process that relies on individual faculty 'hearing officers' to a process that has great reliance on student involvement in the judicial process. One side-effect of the prominent role of students would be that students would have a greater ownership of the code and following the code would be part of the expectation of being a member of the student community. Enforcement of the code would be in the hands of an "Academic Integrity Panel" comprising students (and possibly faculty and administrative representatives) that worked together with the existing Judicial Affairs Office.

The process begins when a faculty member informs a student that they are being charged with misconduct. The faculty member may come to an agreement directly with the student concerning the violation and sanction. Alternatively, the faculty member may refer the case to the Academic Integrity Panel. The student may also appeal to the AIP if they do not want to engage in, or accept the result of the direct negotiation.

Faculty members that feel that a violation warrants a transcript notation of misconduct must refer the misconduct case, with their recommendation for a notation, to the AIP for determining whether such a notation is appropriate. A transcript notation sanction may also originate at the AIP as part of their deliberations.

Cathy Cocks, Director of Judicial Affairs, will attend our next meeting to help us consider these processes.