

# BFC Student Affairs Committee 2023-2024

## Meeting Minutes

### Meeting 01 (09/13/2023; 4:00 pm to 5:00 pm)

**Attendees:** Catherine Sherwood-Laughlin (co-Chair), William Ramos (co-Chair), David Taylor, Lamar Hylton, Jane Grogg, John Moreland, Kathy Adams Riester, Cooper Tinsley, Chelsea Brinda, Libby Spotts, and Maurice Shirley

#### Agenda

1. **Welcome and Introductions**
  - a. Around the Zoom room with introductions
2. **Approval of the 9/13/2023 Agenda**
  - a. Review of agenda – No additions/changes
3. **Review of the Purpose of the SAC**
  - a. Catherine and Bill noted that the purpose and mission for the group was noted at the top of the agenda sent out to all.
4. **Review 2023-2024 Assignments:** Assignments below were introduced and discussed.
5. **Assignment for Fall 2023:**

A. **Request the BFC SAC to review and submit changes to the BFC for Disciplinary Procedures** for the [IUB Campus – A. Academic Misconduct](#)

#### Discussion:

- The committee reviewed the request from the BFC (Lana), Kathy and Libby provided information about the process of review to acceptance of the changes. Libby reminded us that this is still a campus held regulation. Libby also provided context to each of the bulleted items in the original request.
- The SAC supported the idea that a sub-committee be formed to take the first pass on edits/changes then report back to the whole group at our next meeting for more discussion and consensus.
- **ACTION ITEM:** Catherine and Bill will send an email to the committee asking for volunteers to serve on the sub-committee.
- **ACTION ITEM:** Libby will provide a clean copy and a copy for editing in this shared SAC Teams folder.

Bullet #'s and Context from Libby:

- **Establishing a clear distinction between which campus offices have the responsibility to hear graduate and undergraduate cases.**
- **Moving the graduate level cases from the VPFAA Office to the Dean of the Graduate School and VP of Graduate Education and Health Sciences Office.**
  - Libby: The process is not streamlined in respect to how graduate cases go through the process and where they should be placed.
- **Reviewing the number of appeals, taking into specific consideration the length of time it can take a student to complete all appeal options.**
  - Libby: Reviewing number of appeals – currently 3 appeals at department/school level. 3 appeals at campus level as well. Do the number of appeals serve a purpose, is it harming the student in the process, slows things down and takes months. Needed?
- **Reviewing the size of the campus board of review for each case. Specifically considering the time and coordination to establish a board and how that may contribute to delays in the process for the student.**

- Libby: Current board numbers are larger than others for campus review boards. Some require 5 panelists, others 3. Do we want it to be consistent across procedures for fair review and easy of convening?
- **Establish a process for summer.**
  - Libby: A policy does not exist, needs to be created.
- **Explore if student members could extend beyond the groups identified in the procedures if trained appropriately.**
  - Libby: Expand the pool from which trained student representatives can be selected to sit in on cases where needed. These would be those with no conflict of interest. This expansion could also be important as we develop a summer policy. Cooper posed the question – if we expand what student groups can serve – who will select them? This will be considered during the review.

## B. Request to review Academic Misconduct Code, ACA-33 (see email below).

- This is a code from the UFC. Our committee had a discussion around recommendations on the suggested edits which will be shared with the BFC executive committee.
- **Discussion:** Consider the revisions to the Academic Misconduct Code, ACA-33;
  - Agreement regarding changing “Dishonesty” to “Misconduct” in the document
  - Agreement to delete the 3 listed items that serve as examples. Concern is that this is what people will focus on as the only items that matter.
  - Several people express that it would be helpful to add wording around student misrepresenting resources and a concern over noting legitimate resources such as writing tutorial services fit here.
  - Bill has a concern over the word “presumed”. If we’re going to make presumptions, can we ensure that what was presumed is really being communicated to all students in an effective manner.
- **ACTION ITEM:** Catherine and Bill will send an email to Terri Greenslade, [tgreensl@indiana.edu](mailto:tgreensl@indiana.edu); Nathan Hendershott, [nahender@indiana.edu](mailto:nahender@indiana.edu); Andrea Need, [aneed@indiana.edu](mailto:aneed@indiana.edu); and Sarah Negggers, [sneegggers@indiana.edu](mailto:sneegggers@indiana.edu) indicating the SAC supported the change in terms from “dishonesty” to “misconduct”, and the SAC concerns related to the following paragraph which indicates that students cannot use campus supported resources to assist the with course assignments (e.g., Writing Tutorial Services) and the term “presumed” leaves grey areas for both instructors and students regarding what can and cannot be used related to external assistance.

1. Using or providing unauthorized external assistance or materials on any exam, assignment, or academic-related activities. This prohibition includes the use of tutors, editing services, commercial term-paper providers, books, notes, calculators, online and electronic resources, artificial intelligence, and wireless communication devices. External assistance is presumed to be unauthorized unless the instructor or syllabus gives permission.

- Libby: Procedures for this request to change text in ACA-33: Since the code is a University policy, the proposed changes will need to make their way to UFC. Danielle asked that any proposed changes be sent to her, Collin and Cate – they will move it over to UFC. I’ve also given Dr. Julie Payne Kirchmeyer, the Vice President for Student Success, a heads up so she can assist with getting items over to UFC.

## C. Other items

- Catherine asked if the meeting minutes from the 2022-2023 SAC can be added to our SAC 2023-2024 Teams Folder.
- **ACTION ITEM:** David will ask Lana about this request.

## Supplemental Information:

### BFC SAC Charge to Revise IUB Campus A-Student Academic Misconduct Sections

**From:** Bloomington Faculty Council Office <[bfcoff@indiana.edu](mailto:bfcoff@indiana.edu)>

Sent: Tuesday, September 5, 2023 9:35 AM

**To:** Ramos, William Dominic <[wramos@indiana.edu](mailto:wramos@indiana.edu)>; Sherwood-Laughlin, Catherine M. <[csherwoo@indiana.edu](mailto:csherwoo@indiana.edu)>

**Cc:** DeSawal, Danielle Marie <[ddesawal@indiana.edu](mailto:ddesawal@indiana.edu)>

**Subject:** BFC SAC charge

Bill and Catherine,

Based on conversations with the VPFAA, OVPUE, and the VP for Student Life, it is necessary for us to make changes to the procedures related to academic misconduct this year. As a result, we are charging the SAC with this task for the fall 2023 semester. The following outlines what needs to be addressed.

1. Request the BFC SAC to review and submit changes to the BFC for Disciplinary Procedures for the [IUB Campus – A. Academic Misconduct](#), as well as additional areas in the procedures that may reference the academic misconduct process which would be impacted by a change in A. Academic Misconduct. The review should address the following areas:
  - Establishing a clear distinction between which campus offices have the responsibility to hear graduate and undergraduate cases.
  - Moving the graduate level cases from the VPFAA Office to the Dean of the Graduate School and VP of Graduate Education and Health Sciences Office.
  - Reviewing the number of appeals, taking into specific consideration the length of time it can take a student to complete all appeal options.
  - Reviewing the size of the campus board of review for each case. Specifically considering the time and coordination to establish a board and how that may contribute to delays in the process for the student.
  - Establish a process for summer.
  - Explore if student members could extend beyond the groups identified in the procedures if trained appropriately.

Goal: SAC would need to submit a copy at the end of the Fall semester to be on the January 2024 BFC Agenda for a first reading. It would be wise for us to schedule the second reading two meetings after the first reading to allow the SAC to meet and address comments from the first reading. This would then allow the campus time to update the processes and implement for Fall 2024. Suggested BFC Meeting Dates: January 16, 2024, First Reading; February 13, 2024, Second Reading OR January 30, 2024, First Reading; March 5, 2024, Second Reading).

Dr. Kathy Adams Riester and Libby Spotts will work with SAC to review and provide the suggestions for the new procedures. A similar process was used to update the academic misconduct policy. This was highly effective.

### Email from Terri Greenslade to SAC re: ACA-33

**From:** Greenslade, Terri A <[tgreensl@indiana.edu](mailto:tgreensl@indiana.edu)>

Sent: Tuesday, September 12, 2023 9:56 AM

**To:** SAC Committee **Cc:** Hendershott, Nathan J <[nahender@iu.edu](mailto:nahender@iu.edu)>; Need, Andrea <[aneed@indiana.edu](mailto:aneed@indiana.edu)>; Neggers, Sarah <[sneggers@indiana.edu](mailto:sneggers@indiana.edu)>; Winterman, Brian Joseph <[bwinterm@indiana.edu](mailto:bwinterm@indiana.edu)>

**Subject:** Concerns with Policy Changes

Dear Colleagues,

We are writing for two reasons:

First, we ask that faculty and administrative offices charged with overseeing policies and the *Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct (Code)* be informed of proposed and approved changes at the BFC or UFC so that we can adequately prepare to assist faculty and students. We learned of changes to the *Code* and ACA-33 when we accessed the website for the *Code* last month.

Second, to request that the BFC review several policies that were recently changed. Below we provide specific feedback on some of the most concerning changes to ACA-33 and the *Code*. We also offer suggested revisions to those changes for you to consider.

1. Academic ~~Dishonesty~~ **Misconduct** Reporting

a. For ACA-33:

- i. Academic appointees have a responsibility to foster the intellectual honesty of students, especially in connection with examinations and other graded exercises. Should an appointee determine that ~~cheating, fabrication of data or information, or intentional plagiarism~~ **academic misconduct** has occurred, the instructor ~~should~~ **will** take appropriate action with respect to grades, and report ~~significant dishonesty~~ **the misconduct** to the student affairs officer of the campus.

1. For *Code* (II: Responsibilities B.3):

If an instructor determines that academic misconduct has occurred, the instructor will take appropriate action with respect to grades, and report ~~significant dishonesty~~ **the misconduct** to the student affairs officer of the campus.

a. Rationale

- ii. All academic misconduct is significant. The change limits IU's ability to hold students accountable to important academic standards. To say otherwise is to say that IU accepts a student committing academic misconduct repeatedly—even in every course they take—without holding the student responsible, without requiring the student receive training, and without IU eventually taking action.
- iii. The change undermines our institution's values and the values IU promotes to its students (see Indiana Promise re: academic integrity).
- iv. The change places too much discretion with faculty, potentially resulting in one instructor reporting misconduct which another instructor does not report. This will result in confusion and will create inequities among students because what one faculty member considers significant another may not. This could also lead to unintentional bias.
- v. The change increases the likelihood of procedural error. The way this section is written suggests that faculty can take action with respect to grades (impose an academic sanction) and should report significant dishonesty. There will be faculty who interpret this to mean that they can sanction without reporting when they deem the misconduct to be insignificant, which violates students' right to due process.
- vi. The change allows for student pressure to influence an instructor's reporting decision. Faculty need support. They need to be able to point to the policy and say they are required to report. This is especially important for Associate Instructors.
- vii. The change hurts students. Students need the training provided through the Academic Integrity Seminar and meeting with Student Conduct to grow and accept responsibility for their actions (See Indiana Promise re: responsibility). Students do not benefit when IU allows academic misconduct to go unaddressed.
- viii. Faculty can still decide the weight of their OWN sanction in class. This is the way to address varying degrees of misconduct.
- ix. The existing language in ACA-33 lists some, but not all, types of misconduct and adds evaluation of 'intent' to reporting plagiarism, despite the importance of educating students about plagiarism and the inability for faculty to determine intentionality.
- x. The existing Code language uses the term 'dishonesty'. The correct term is "academic misconduct."

2. Internal versus External Assistance
  - a. Revise definition of Cheating as follows:

II.B.4.a: Cheating: Cheating is using, providing, or attempting to use or provide unauthorized assistance, materials, information, or study aids in any form. Cheating is prohibited. Cheating includes, but is not limited to:

1. Using or providing unauthorized external assistance or materials on any exam, assignment, or academic-related activities. This prohibition includes the use of tutors, editing services, commercial term-paper providers, books, notes, calculators, online and electronic resources, artificial intelligence, and wireless communication devices. **External assistance is presumed to be unauthorized unless the instructor or syllabus gives permission.**, subject to the following:

- ~~b. On exams, term papers, and graded assignments, external assistance is presumed to be unauthorized unless the instructor or syllabus gives permission.~~
2. ~~On ungraded academic related activities, students may use external assistance unless the instructor or syllabus prohibits their use.~~
3. ~~Campus or unit centers that assist students with computing, writing, research, mathematics, or other academic skills are not considered external, and may be used unless the instructor or syllabus prohibits their use.~~
- b. Rationale:
  - i. The subsections make the policy more confusing. As edited, it is clear that if assistance is unauthorized, it can't be used. Adding the subsections creates different presumptions based on different types of assignment and the source of the assistance.

Thank you in advance for your consideration. If you have questions about this request or the suggested revisions, please do not hesitate to contact any of the signers below.

Sincerely,

Terri Greenslade, Assistant Dean for Undergraduate Education and, Director of Undergraduate Retention and Achievement, College of Arts and Sciences, [tgreensl@indiana.edu](mailto:tgreensl@indiana.edu)

Nathan Hendershott, Senior Associate Director of Undergraduate Retention and Achievement, College of Arts and Sciences, [nahender@indiana.edu](mailto:nahender@indiana.edu)

Andrea Need, Director of Undergraduate Academic Affairs, Senior Lecturer, O'Neill School of Public and Environmental Affairs, [aneed@indiana.edu](mailto:aneed@indiana.edu)

Sarah Negggers, Director of Graduate Academic Affairs, College of Arts and Sciences, [sneggers@indiana.edu](mailto:sneggers@indiana.edu)