SAC DRAFT Meeting Minutes 04/16/2024

Attendees

2023-24 Co-chairs

Bill Ramos, Public Health, wramos@iu.edu

Catherine Sherwood-Laughlin, Public Health, csherwoo@iu.edu

Members: * in attendance

*Dacia Charlesworth, Kelley School of Business

Kristine Eaton, Indiana Institute for Disability and Community

*Jane Ann Grogg, Optometry

John Moreland, Libraries

Alain Barker, Music

*Richard Hardy, Biology

Christi Walton, Kelley School of Business

Maurice Shirley, Education

Deeta Ganapathy, IU Student Government Representative

- *Chelsea Brinda GPSG Representative
- *Jeff Rutherford, Graduate Education

David Daleke, VP Graduate Education (Ex officio)

- *Lamar Hylton, VP for Student Life (Ex officio)
- *Libby Spotts, Office of Student Conduct (Ex officio)
- *Anna Krause, Office of Student Conduct (Ex officio)
- *Janett Thomas, Office of Student Conduct (Ex officio)
- *Kathy Adams Riester, Associate Vice Provost and Dean of Students (Ex officio)

Agenda

Welcome

- 1. Approval of Agenda
 - a. Motion to Approve- Dacia Charlesworth
 - b. 2^{nd-} Chelsea Brinda
 - Vote: Approved by all voting members in attendance None opposed No abstentions
- 2. Approval of February 20, 2024, Meeting Minutes
 - a. Motion to Approve- Dacia Charlesworth
 - b. 2nd Chelsea Brinda
 - c. Vote: Approved by all voting members in attendance None opposed No abstentions
- 3. Bill and Catherine wanted to thank the SAC for their hard work and dedication to addressing the Tasks the SAC was assigned for the 23-24 AY.
- 4. Email and supporting documents from Jack Tyndall Former Speaker of the Student Body Congress and, <u>Aaliyah</u> Raji the President of Indiana University Student Government
 - a. Delivery of CEA 1027 Email to BFC and SAC
 - b. CEA 1027
 - c. <u>Letter to the BFC</u>

Discussion: Kathy mentioned that we need consistent representation on this committee. Bill and Catherine will communicate with the BFC and IUSG to discuss consistent representation.

- 5. BFC 1st and 2nd Reading Recap (Bill Ramos)
 - a. 2024 March/April SAC Updates: Bill Ramos presented the changes previously voted on by our group at the BFC meeting, as a 1st reading, on Tuesday, March 19th. There was discussion around the title of the office that oversees graduate academic misconduct cases should be Office of the Vice Provost of the Graduate School

and not Office of the Vice Provost of the Graduate School and Health Sciences. The SAC committee was sent the revised redline version in an email on March 20, 2024, for a vote to use the revised office title by March 22, 2024, at 5 pm. The results of the vote were to accept the change from the Office of the Vice Provost of the Graduate School and Health Sciences to Office of the Vice Provost of the Graduate School. This change was presented at the 2nd reading of the SAC recommendations at the BFC meeting on April 2, 2024, and was passed. The next steps are to ensure this change is consistent throughout the IUB Student Code of Conduct and communicated with all academic units on the IUB campus. During the March 19th BFC meeting, Bill also presented the SAC approved changes related to the number of faculty and students that comprise the hearing board. The SAC recommendation was to change the number of faculty from 3 to 2, and the number of students from 2 to 1, leading to a hearing board committee comprised of 3 members. The BFC was overwhelmingly (culminating with an unofficial vote at Bill's request) opposed to changing the Faculty/Student numbers for hearing boards.

<u>Discussion</u>: Jane said it may be difficult to change the board from 5 to 3. A few others spoke up at the BFC meeting and shared their concerns about the reduction in the number serving on the board. Further discussions at the BFC meeting were focused on the need for faculty to step up and serve on these boards if the consensus is to have 5 members.

Kathy suggested gathering input from faculty that serve on 3-person hearing boards- their experiences and outcomes with 3 members. Consistency is important across all boards.

Libby discussed the outcomes for each type of board and the number of people on the boards. The Academic Review Boards are the largest of the boards.

This item will be on the SAC 24-24 AY agenda as an action item carried over from the 23-24 AY.

- 6. Process for sharing communication on changes/updates.
 - a. Per Danielle DeSawal:
 - i. SAC develops an email that the BFC will send to all faculty and academic units via the BFC Office email listserv.
 - ii. Ask for assistance from Libby to ensure the language is accurate. Libby's team is on stand-by to update the website and will review the communication to academic units. By August, all students who needed to be notified have been, and updated letter templates will be ready by August 1st.
 - iii. Consult with David Daleke to decide what to include in communication about when to anticipate changes.
- 7. 2023-2024 SAC Accomplishments (see above)
- 8. 2024-2025 SAC Tasks related to Academic Misconduct:
 - a. Reviewing the number of appeals, taking into specific consideration the length of time it can take a student to complete all appeal options.
 - b. 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.
 - c. Establish a process for summer.
 - d. Explore if student members could extend beyond the groups identified in the procedures if trained appropriately.
- 9. 2024-2025 SAC Additional Tasks not charged by the BFC Executive Committee in August 2023:
 - a. Discussion of changes to University Policy ACA-33, email and documents in Notes. (Cooper/Katie/Deeta)
 - b. Fostering Student/Faculty Connections (email from Nicky Belle in Notes)
 - c. Email from Terri Greenslade and colleagues (December 2023): Dear Members of the Student Affairs Committee of the BFC, Earlier this semester, Nathan Hendershott, Andrea Need, Sarah Neggers and I met with Cooper Tinsley, student member of the Student Affairs Committee, who had suggestions regarding the recommendations we forwarded to your group for consideration on October 5. Our discussion included the following: Concerns from a student perspective about the proposed changes to the definition of 'cheating.' Specifically, Cooper felt that the definition proposed would discourage students from utilizing University/campus approved resources such as Writing Tutorial Services, the Math Learning Center, the Student Academic Center, etc. During our meeting, we discussed ways of addressing this concern and we

believe that a multi-pronged approach is appropriate; namely, the *Code* would indicate a responsibility shared by faculty and students to clarify authorized/unauthorized resources. In addition, it was recommended that CITL prepare a list of resources specific to the Bloomington Campus that faculty should consider when preparing their syllabi that could be included on the syllabus template (or suggested language for syllabi that could be shared in the OVPFAA Start-of-Semester memo). Another suggestion was to work with UITS to develop a Canvas tool that would allow faculty to select from suggested resources that could be authorized in their courses or on specific assignments. A recommended definition of 'Research misconduct' that could be incorporated in the *Code*. (see attachment with recommended edits). Attached to this message is a revised document (dated November 6, 2023) that is the result of our conversation, which we submit to your committee for renewed consideration during the spring semester. We are grateful for the opportunity for continued dialogue on this important topic. Please do not hesitate to contact us if we can provide additional information in this regard. Wishing you the best for a successful conclusion to the fall semester

<u>Discussion:</u> Libby said these discrepancies have been rectified and the word "significant" has been removed from the language. Not sure if a resolution for the definition of cheating has not been resolved but will be addressed at the UFC.

d. Terri A. Greenslade, Ph.D. | Assistant Dean for Undergraduate Education and Director, Office of Undergraduate Retention and Achievement Indiana University |College of Arts + Sciences |Owen Hall| 812.855.1647

Email from Terri Greenslade (March 2024): I see that the agenda for the BFC meeting on April 2 has been released and that item #8 on the agenda is a continued discussion and second reading of changes to the *Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct*. In reviewing the document attached for that item, I noticed that most of the changes are related to the change in graduate appeals from VPFAA to VPGE. I am writing to point out that there is a longstanding error in the Title of Part Two of the Academic Misconduct Procedures that I am hoping that can be corrected since this seems like an opportune time to do so. In the document, the proposed title of this section is *Limited Appeal of the Finding to the Vice Provost for Graduate Education or Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education*. The information below that heading, however, does not describe the procedures for appealing to the VPGE or VPUE (this is actually what is described in Part Three). Part Two outlines the procedures for appeal to the academic unit (dean of the school in which the alleged offense occurred). In the 2009 version of the Procedures, which I believe was the last printed copy of the *Code*, the title for this section was "Appealing the Finding of Misconduct and/or the Academic Sanction." If the desire is to make the title of this section more consistent with Part Three of the document, it seems that something such as "Appeal of the Faculty Member's Finding or Sanction to the Academic Unit."

<u>Discussion:</u> Libby will correct this on the website (will work with Taylor). This is a friendly amendment and a clerical error to correct, does not need a vote to make this change from the SAC since this is a simple header correction on the website.