

# FINAL: Meeting 04 (12/06/2023; 4:00 pm to 5:00 pm)

## Attendees

### 2023-24 Co-chairs

Bill Ramos, Public Health, [wramos@iu.edu](mailto:wramos@iu.edu)

\*Catherine Sherwood-Laughlin, Public Health, [csherwoo@iu.edu](mailto: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

\*Cooper Tinsley, 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, Student Conduct (Ex officio)

Kathy Adams Riester, Associate Vice Provost and Dean of Students (Ex officio)

## Agenda:

### Welcome and Introductions

1. Approval of the 12/06/2023 Agenda Kristy motion, 2<sup>nd</sup> Chelsea, approved
2. Approval of October 18, 2023, Meeting Minutes Kristy motion, 2<sup>nd</sup> Chelsea, approved
3. Approval of the November 08, 2023, Meeting Minutes: Kristy motion, 2<sup>nd</sup> Chelsea, approved
4. Review the timeline for first and second readings at BFC Spring 2024 meetings
5. Committee review of Academic Misconduct policy areas
  - a. Recap of November 16<sup>th</sup> meeting- Bill Ramos, Catherine Sherwood-Laughlin, Libby Spotts, Janett and Anna Krause (Catherine and Libby)
  - b. Discussion of changes to student representation on board, email and documents in Notes (Cooper)
6. Spring 2024 Meeting Dates (as of 12/5: Tuesdays 12p-1:30p; Thursdays 10a-12p; Fridays 2-3:30)
7. Other items

## Timeline to present Policy Changes at BFC Meetings:

### Proposed First and Second Reading Dates at BFC Spring 2024 Meetings

Goal (per recommendation of the BFC Executive Committee): SAC would need to submit a copy 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

### Discussion:

Suggested revised timeline:

First reading- February 13, 2024 -ok in Lana's BFC agenda notes

Second reading-March 5, 2024 or March 19, 2024 (Provost State of the Campus Address-30 mins)

Catherine will follow up with Lana

### Review of Academic Misconduct Policy 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.**

### Current Language:

Current language in the Code: "The Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs or Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education convenes Campus Review Boards to hear two types of appeals for graduate and professional, and undergraduate students, respectively: first, a limited appeal by the student that a serious procedural error deprived the student of a full and fair opportunity to present their response to the misconduct charge; and second, an appeal by the student asserting that a university-wide sanction imposed by the Dean of Students and / or Designee is arbitrary or disproportionate."

### Revised Language:

"The Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs, or their designee, or Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, **or their designee**, convenes Campus Review Boards to hear two types of appeals for graduate and professional, and undergraduate students, respectively: first, a limited appeal by the student that a serious procedural error deprived the student of a full and fair opportunity to present their response to the misconduct charge; and second, an appeal by the student asserting that a university-wide sanction imposed by the Dean of Students and / or Designee is arbitrary or disproportionate."

### Discussion:

Who is authorized to convene this group, that office is responsible, overall office has authority- can keep it in house or designate out- consistent in other areas of the Code. Can address conflicts of interest.

Correct title of the Office: Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Health Sciences

This type of appeal is academic misconduct only

VPGEHS- willing/able to fulfill the role as the designated office to facilitate the academic cases

Designee gives room to meet the needs of the case

Does one office get more authority than another?

Graduate Education seems to be the office to handle academic misconduct

Helpful to know that VPFAA is aware of the case, may be other issues/concerns

**Libby- will check with Judah to determine if he has thoughts about VPFAA is aware of cases- as the first office or working in collaboration with Graduate Education if they become the first office to get the case.**

Will make a decision in January 2024.

- **Reviewing the number of appeals, taking into specific consideration the length of time it can take a student to complete all appeal options.**

Current Language:

Current language in the Code:

### **If Student Wishes to Appeal Faculty Decision/s**

A student may request a review of the faculty member's decision within 7 business days after receiving a faculty member's written report sent by the Dean of Students, by submitting a request in writing to the Academic Dean of the school or unit within which the offense occurred.

A student may appeal a faculty member's decision on the basis of preponderance of the evidence not being met, alleged bias, due process error, or arbitrary/disproportionate outcome. The student's written appeal must include evidence supporting their reason for appeal. The Academic Dean reviews submitted appeals and can reject any appeal that does not allege lack of preponderance of the evidence, bias, due process error, or arbitrary/disproportionate outcome.

Academic Dean notifies Dean of Students that appeal received

Academic Dean discusses matter with both student and faculty member, either separately or together, at their discretion

If no resolution within 7 business days of concluding individual meetings with student and faculty member, case is considered by unit hearing board

### **If Student Wishes to Appeal Dean of Students Sanction to Campus Review Board**

Scope: disproportionate sanction

Decision: uphold/overturn/modify

Student submits written request for appeal within 7 business days of receipt of Dean of Students decision to Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs or Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education

Campus Review Board considers whether sanction is warranted - may uphold or impose lesser sanction

Decision is final

### **Discussion:**

3 appeals across the entire process- at each level- 2 at the academic unit level, and 1 at campus appeals board

Decision, then 1<sup>st</sup> appeal- re-hearing of the case, 2<sup>nd</sup> appeal- review- procedures followed (rarely used)

Is it necessary to have 3 levels of appeals?

Lag time in the summer

Document in Teams folder- "Tinsley Act"- new procedures to address students not available during the summer for hearings

Do we like the new problem we created or like the problem we have

Timeline, multiple phases in the process

Model 1: Could do the entire process in the academic unit, campus representation at the unit level and part of the hearing process- scope of the academic unit level increases- responsible and sanction, academic unit asks- should the student be separated from the campus? Concerns about consistency across units?

Model 2: Entire process is conducted through the Student Conduct Office- is the faculty finding appropriate? 2 appeals, then done; content expertise and conduct office staff making decisions,

Shifted the student standard process to referring 1<sup>st</sup> time offenses to the AI seminar, instead of requiring them to meet with Conduct staff first. No record, don't create a record. Very few appeal the first offense. Discussions with students by Conduct staff- can help lead to referring them to other campus resources-would lose this if referring to students to AI on 1<sup>st</sup> offense. Learning outcomes from the AI seminar collected.

**Need more data before removing this process.**