

Meeting 06 (02/20/2024)

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 (note- is replacing Katie Ruffner)

*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)

*Janett Thomas, Student Conduct (Ex officio)

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

Agenda

Welcome and Introductions

Approval of the 2/20/2024 Agenda

Approval of 1/16/24 Meeting Minutes

Review meeting notes- [Academic Misconduct policy areas](#)

Announcements:

- New dates for first and second readings at BFC Spring 2024 meetings: First reading- March 19, 2024, Second reading-April 2, 2024
- Spring 2024 Meeting Dates- Calendar invites and Zoom links sent: Next meeting date is Tuesday, April 16, 12-1 pm.

a. Review [Action Items Revisions Document](#)

Vote on Action items #1 & #2 (VP Office Change), #4 (Number of Hearing Board Committee Members)

SAC members in attendance approved the change to Action Item #1- changing the name of the office to facilitate the graduate level academic misconduct cases from the Office of the Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs to the Office of the Vice Provost of Graduate Studies.

Libby shared the pros and cons of having 3 faculty vs. 2 faculty, and 2 students vs. 1 student on the hearing board committee. A discussion focused on the availability of faculty and students to serve on the board- it is a challenge. Further discussion focused on having a board that provides more perspectives by having 3 faculty and 2 students to make decisions. It was expressed that the 1 student could be stressful for that one student being the voice for the student perspective. Having 2 students would allow another perspective. A motion was made to change the composition of the hearing board from 3 to 2 faculty, and 2 to 1 student. A vote was taken among the voting members of the SAC committee on the motion and it was passed with one member voting against the motion.

b. Discuss Action Item #3 and Finalize Draft Language (Number of Appeals) [Review document](#) by Libby, Anna, and Janett

A conversation, led by Libby and Janett, about the number of appeals was shared through the review of possible scenarios related to appeals and the process. The discussion prompted further questions and conversations by the SAC and it was decided to continue this discussion at the next meeting.

c. Discuss Action Item # 6 and Finalize Draft Language (Student Members Extend Beyond Current Groups) (Deeta)- Deeta was not in attendance; therefore, the discussion will be moved to the next SAC meeting.

d. Discuss Action Item #5 (Summer Policy) - discussion postponed to next SAC meeting

e. Discussion of changes to University Policy ACA-33, email and documents in Notes. (Cooper/Katie/Deeta)- Discussion is postponed to next SAC meeting

f. Fostering Student/Faculty Connections (email from Nicky Belle in Notes) - discussion postponed to next SAC meeting

g. Other items

Tasks- Bill and Catherine will develop the redline document and the PPT slides to be presented at the BFC meetings for the 1st and 2nd readings. They will update the SAC on the outcomes of both meetings via email and will be reflected in the meeting minutes.

SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA INFORMATION

DISCUSSION OF CHANGES TO UNIVERSITY POLICY ACA-33, EMAIL AND DOCUMENTS BELOW. (COOPER/KATIE)

Changes to University Policy ACA-33

From: Tinsley, Cooper <coottins@iu.edu>

Sent: Sunday, November 12, 2023 8:00 AM

To: Ramos, William Dominic <wramos@indiana.edu>; Sherwood-Laughlin, Catherine M.

[<csherwoo@indiana.edu>](mailto:csherwoo@indiana.edu)

Subject: Code and ACA-33 Revisions and Recommendations
Catherine and Bill,

Good morning! Late last month, I met with Terri Greenslade, Nathan Hendershott, Andrea Need, and Sarah Neggers to discuss the letter they sent our way in which they expressed their concerns with recent changes to University policy ACA-33 and the Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct (attached). We had a great conversation and I wanted to share our thoughts (summarized below) with both of you in hopes that we could discuss it as a committee at our next SAC meeting. Let me know if this is something we would be able to do.

1. Regarding topic 2, we discussed various strategies to alleviate some of the confusion and ambiguity concerning cheating and the use of university resources:
 - a. Add subsections that (1) recommend some broad resources that faculty should consider when writing their syllabus and (2) encourage students to ask the professor about a resource not stated in the syllabus or other course governing document
 - b. Go outside the code to provide a list of recommended resources specific to the Bloomington campus to be shared via the start of semester faculty memo and/or included on the syllabus template. We also discussed sharing these guidelines with VPFAA.
 - c. Work with UITS to develop a canvas tool that allows faculty to select from suggested resources allowed in their course or specific assignments
2. We agree that it is necessary to define research misconduct in the Code and from our initial assessment it seems that the most consistent approach would be to utilize the ORI's definition. We also discussed how we might disseminate this information better to students participating in research.

Sincerely,

Cooper Tinsley

Molecular Life Sciences, B.S.

Indiana University '26

Co-Director of Academic Affairs, IUSG

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

Sent: Tuesday, December 5, 2023 11:27 AM

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

Cc: Hardy, Richard William [<rwahardy@indiana.edu>](mailto:rwahardy@indiana.edu); 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); Tinsley, Cooper [<cottins@iu.edu>](mailto:cottins@iu.edu)

Subject: FW: Changes to the Code and ACA-33 - Revised document

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*.

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,

Terri Greenslade

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

[Document Attached to Email from Terri on 12 4 2023](#) (Also below)

November 6, 2023

Revised Recommendations for Revisions to the *Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities* and ACA-33

Topic 1: Academic Misconduct

Recommendation #1:

Revise *Code* II.B.3 as follows:

“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.”

Recommendation #2:

Revise ACA-33 C.6 as follows:

“6. 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.”

Rationale (*Code*)

- i. All academic misconduct is significant. The addition of “significant” 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.
- ii. The addition of “significant” undermines our institution’s values, and the values IU promotes to its students (see Indiana Promise re: academic integrity).
- iii. The addition of “significant” 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.
- iv. The addition of “significant” 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.
- v. The addition of “significant” 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.
- vi. The addition of “significant” 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.
- vii. Faculty can still determine the weight of the academic sanction in their own class. This is the way to address varying degrees of misconduct.
- viii. The existing Code language uses the term “dishonesty”. The correct term is “academic misconduct.”

Rationale (ACA-33)

- i. The rationales listed above apply to the following changes proposed to ACA-33: “and report ~~significant dishonesty~~ **the misconduct** to the student affairs officer of the campus”
- ii. The existing language in ACA-33 lists some, but not all, types of misconduct (which does not make sense) and includes evaluation of ‘intent’ to reporting plagiarism, despite the importance of educating students about plagiarism and the inability for faculty to determine intentionality.
- iii. It is worth noting that people may not have been aware of the changes to ACA-33 because in the Report to the UFC on Revisions to ACA-33, Code of Academic Ethics from the UFC Policy Review Committee (November 29, 2022) there is no mention of a change. (p. 29):

“Old text (6C, 23) The teacher makes every effort to foster honest academic conduct. 23. The teacher has a responsibility to foster the intellectual honesty of students. This obligation is particularly serious in connection with examinations and class exercises. Should a teacher determine that cheating or intentional plagiarism has occurred, the teacher should take appropriate action with respect to grades and report the dishonesty to the student affairs officer of the campus.

Changes: None”

- iv. Replace ‘should’ with “will” because should is hortatory. This is a requirement, and “will” is used in the analogous section of the Code.
- v. It is also worth noting that ACA-72, sections of which were transferred into ACA-33, states that: “The necessity to report every case of cheating, whether or not further action is desirable, arises particularly because of the possibility that this is not the student’s first offense, or that other offenses may follow it. Equity also demands that a uniform reporting practice be enforced; otherwise, some students will be penalized while others guilty of the same actions will go free.”

Topic 2: Cheating

Recommendation #3: Revise *Code II.B.4.a* as follows:

“**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 that the faculty member has not authorized** on any exam, assignment, or academic-related activities. **Assistance or materials** ~~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. ~~subject to the following:~~

- ~~a. On exams, term papers, and graded assignments, external assistance is presumed to be unauthorized unless the instructor or syllabus gives permission.~~
 - a. Faculty should include **authorized resources in their syllabus/course materials/assignment instructions.** (see [ACA-33: Academic Appointee Responsibilities and Conduct C.5.e](#)).
 - ~~b. On ungraded academic related activities, students may use external assistance unless the instructor or syllabus prohibits their use.~~
 - b. Students should communicate with their faculty members if they are unsure about whether a resource is authorized.

- d. ~~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.”~~

Rationale:

- i. The subsections make the policy more confusing. Adding the subsections creates different presumptions based on different types of assignment and the source of the assistance. As edited, it is clear that if assistance is unauthorized, it can't be used.
- ii. The added language places shared responsibility on faculty and students with respect to the use specific resources and is consistent with the recommended change in ACA-33 below. This addition should not discourage students from using university/unit resources such as Writing Tutorial Services, the Math Learning Center, the Student Academic Center, PASS program, etc., but would allow faculty to make individual determinations about resources such as Grammarly, ChatGPT, etc. This language also prevents faculty from having to provide exhaustive lists of specific university resources and evolving technology.

Recommendation #4: Revise ACA-33 C.5.e as follows:

“5.e. Clearly state the **resources that are authorized for exams, assignments, or academic-related activities and whether and the** extent to which study aids or assistance from other students or allowed in class preparation and assignments.”

Rationale

- i. To align with the proposed revisions to the section on Cheating in the *Code*.

Topic 3: Research Misconduct

Recommendation #5: Clarify Code II.B.4.g as follows:

“**Research Misconduct:** A student working on a research project ~~covered by ACA-30, Research Misconduct [link], must not engage in conduct that would violate ACA-30.”~~ **must not fabricate, falsify, or plagiarize in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting results. A student must not deliberately interfere or cause harm to the research activity of others. (see [ACA-30](#))**

The inclusion of Research Misconduct as a category of academic misconduct is welcome, but it is not clear what was intended by the language that describes ‘Research Misconduct’ Is it possible to add a brief description of ‘Research Misconduct’ in more student-friendly language which is similar to the definitions of other types of academic misconduct?

The addition of a specific definition of research misconduct provides clear information about what actions are considered to be research misconduct and refers faculty and students to the appropriate University policy for additional information.

Respectfully submitted:

Terri Greenslade

Assistant Dean for Undergraduate Education and
Director of Undergraduate Retention and Achievement
College of Arts and Sciences

Nathan Hendershott
Senior Associate Director of Undergraduate Retention and Achievement
College of Arts and Sciences

Andrea Need
Director of Undergraduate Academic Affairs
Senior Lecturer
O'Neill School of Public and Environmental Affairs

Sarah Neggers
Director of Graduate Academic Affairs
College of Arts and Sciences

FOSTERING STUDENT/FACULTY CONNECTIONS

Emails to Bill and Catherine:

From: Belle, Nicky <nbelle@indiana.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 3:34 PM
To: Ramos, William Dominic <wramos@indiana.edu>; Sherwood-Laughlin, Catherine M. <csherwoo@indiana.edu>
Subject: BFC Student Affairs Committee

Hi Bill and Catherine,

I work with student engagement in the Student Involvement & Leadership Center, and a big piece of my job is to build out a Second Year Experience program. I've spent a lot of time looking at NSSE data, and we spend a lot of time speaking with second-year students, and we continue to see and hear that the frequency and quality of interactions between students and faculty are declining over their time at IU. I think this is something that we've all seen.

So as our office is thinking about ways to improve that interaction – and it may be that students now need to learn the ways to interact with others, particularly adults – I wanted to check in with the BFC to see if this is something you all are talking about and to see what ways our office can best support your efforts.

I'd love to find an opportunity to talk more about this with you.

Thanks!

Nicky

Nicky Belle, Ph.D.

Associate Director

Student Involvement & Leadership Center

From: Belle, Nicky <nbelle@indiana.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, November 8, 2023 2:53 PM

To: Ramos, William Dominic <wramos@indiana.edu>; Sherwood-Laughlin, Catherine M. <csherwoo@indiana.edu>

Subject: RE: BFC Student Affairs Committee

Hi again,

Dabbling in the data again today.

If we want to address the quality of interaction with academic advisors and work on improving that, where does that work begin? Is that something that is managed by each of the individual schools? Aside from UD, I don't think there is a central place where academic advisors are connected, right?

Nicky

Nicky Belle, Ph.D.

Discussion- revisit when to invite Nicky to our meeting:

Bill followed up with Nicky and invited him to attend our January meeting and passed along the SAC concern that in the email from Nicky on 11/1/23, the comment "*the ways to interact with others, particularly adults*". The concern was that perhaps we don't currently see our students as adults as well?

Notes

Tasks