

FINAL: Meeting 02 (10/18/2023; 1:30 pm to 2:30 pm)

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

*Cooper Tinsley, IU Student Government Representative

*Chelsea Brinda GPSG Representative

*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

1. Welcome and any new Introductions (Bill & Catherine)
2. Approval of 10/18/2023 Agenda (Bill) Motion approved Alain Barker 2nd Rich Hardy, all approved
3. Approval of 9/13/2023 Meeting minutes (Bill - find in TEAMS) Motion approved Cooper Tinsley, 2nd Maurice Shirley, all in favor
4. Update: Academic Misconduct Policy Review – Sub-Committee (Libby & Catherine)
5. Undergraduate Request- Daniela Moloci, Senior studying Political Science and Spanish, IUSA- Co-Director of Academic Affairs (Catherine & Bill)

Continued discussion from the BFC to have the SAC 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 SAC Sub-Committee met on October 10, 2023, and the meeting minutes are available here: [10 10 2023 SAC Sub Committee Meeting Minutes DRAFT Academic Misconduct Review.docx](#)

[Academic Misconduct Policy Review](#)

- **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.**

Discussion:

David Daleke gave some background on past revisions and this proposal to bring the graduate school back into the review case systems. He stated that it is up to BFC if this is what is wanted. He expressed that the Graduate school is a neutral body. School's decision on what outcomes would be for students in the past. David can see there is a Graduate School role in addition to what the Schools/College do in the process.

Libby explained the current policy including appeal- stating that the average number of appeals is around 40 undergrads/year and about 3-5 graduates/year. Often repeat offenses. The students appeal because of the sanction. No national benchmark exists. We now give 7 business days to submit an appeal.

Discussion Points/Questions the SAC needs consider at next meeting:

Moving the hearings/cases to the Graduate School is in alignment with undergraduate process.

Moving hearings/cases to the Graduate School keeps the employment of SAAs separated from the academic misconduct- removes the conflict of interest from VPFAA.

More information is needed from Judah Cohen about making this change to graduate school oversight. In line with undergraduate process.

Do we want to talk about decentralizing the process and putting back in the schools instead of the Dean of Students office for sanctioning?

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

Discussion:

There are currently 3 opportunities for the students to appeal, and most appeals are to reconsider the sanction.

- **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.**

Discussion:

Academic Misconduct panels include 5 people, other panels are 3 people. In an academic year, there are typically ~12 students and ~22 faculty who are trained and available for the panel.

Discussion Points/Questions for SAC:

Do we want to change academic panels?

Could we make the appointment for for student and faculty panelists a calendar year instead of an academic year to help avoid the issues with transitions between academic years?

- **Establish a process for summer.**

Discussion:

Currently, there is not a policy or procedures for summer hearing- needs to be developed

Libby noted that there really is no break in the schedule of the 3 sessions (fall, spring, summer). Christy and Judah may have a template about policy change.

Discussion Points/Questions SAC needs to consider:

To recruit students over the summer, becoming a panelist could serve as a practicum or field experience.

Research other degree programs that are active in summer (want students to have a practical experience serving on the hearing boards). Counseling students as well as education. Law? Libby supports acknowledging students' time on the board and would like more discussions about where funding or other incentives like credit hours, or serve as High Impact Experience, that could be used to recruit students.

Action Item:

Cooper will touch base with student leaders/volunteer board members to get their thoughts about this SAC discussion related to student involvement on the boards.

- **Explore if student members could extend beyond the groups identified in the procedures if trained appropriately.**

Discussion:

Cooper recommended that if there is a need to replace a student on a board, the request to get a replacement should go back to GPSG or IUSG to make the recommendations and not a VP office. He would like to see a more formal communication to the student body president for the campus.

Timelines for student government and hearing cases seems to be a challenge with having enough students to sit.

Libby asked if the IUSG is interested in changing the constitution to have emergency student appointees to full campus obligations or give permission for other offices (e.g., VPFAA) to appoint a student.

Perhaps IUSG is asked first and if not available then other options can be explored.

Kathy mentioned that students trained through RPS (e.g., RAs) might be a good pool of students to recruit.

Discussion Points/Questions SAC needs to consider:

Can a statement be added to the student codes to broaden who can sit in on these as long as there is no conflict of interest to help get them filled when needed?

Action Item:

Libby will meet with Cooper to review the current process for clarification.

Undergraduate Request:

Undergraduate Student, Daniela Moloci, Senior studying Political Science and Spanish, IUSA- Co-Director of Academic Affairs, contacted Bill and Catherine about making undergraduate courses, specifically the course descriptions and requirements more transparent and available before students register for courses. She was referred to BFC President, Colin Johnson, to discuss this further and take this to the BFC Executive Meeting for discussion.

Additional Resources:

[Link](#) to Course Description Notes/Ideas from Daniela

[Link](#) to GPSG Resolution on Access to Course Information

Link to Sub-Committee Meeting Notes:

[10 10 2023 SAC Sub Committee Meeting Minutes DRAFT Academic Misconduct Review.docx](#)

Tasks/Action Items:

Libby will meet with Cooper to discuss students on review boards

Cooper will touch base with student leaders/volunteer board members to get their thoughts about this SAC discussion related to student involvement on the boards.