

Academic Standards Committee (ASC) Minutes		March 15, 2019 (in lieu of the February 22 meeting)	
		1:40 pm	
		BAC 206	
Meeting called by: Ian Wischmeier, Chair	Academic Standards Committee	Type of meeting:	ASC
Facilitators:	Ian Wischmeier	Note taker:	Daniella Watson
<p>Attendees: Daniella Watson, Dan Stoffel, Ian Wischmeier, John Georgas, John Masserini, Kevin Gemoets, Kyle Winfree, Michael Kallsen, Mohamed Mohamed, Pam Anastassiou, Terry Crites and Victoria Pickett.</p> <p>Participated by phone: Amanda Cornelius, Jamie Smith, Luke Plonsky, Nicole Hampton, Patty Horn and Samantha Callahan.</p> <p>Excused by email: Glenn Hansen, Kathy Savage, Margaret Dunfee, Pamela Powell, Ronni Marks, Rosalicia Cordova, and Tarang Jain.</p> <p>Guests: Chelsea Bergner (University Advising) representing Glenn Hansen.</p>			
<i>Call to Order</i>			
Agenda Item: 1	Call To Order	Presenter:	Ian Wischmeier
<p>Ian Wischmeier called the meeting to order at 1:40 p.m. He asked everyone present and the members on the phone to introduce themselves. He introduced Kevin Gemoets, Assistant Dean of Student Affairs, replacing Cindy Anderson. Also attending was Chelsea Bergner, from University Advising, on behalf of Glenn Hansen.</p>			
<i>ASC Business</i>			
Agenda Item: 2	Approval of Minutes	Presenter:	Ian Wischmeier
<p>Ian asked if everyone had any feedback on the January 25 minutes. No feedback. Minutes approved.</p>			
Agenda Item: 3	Academic Integrity Policy 100601	Presenter:	John Masserini
<p>John Masserini received feedback from some ASC members on the Academic Integrity Policy 100601. He amended it with the recommendations that were suggested. More questions were brought up and a few grammatical errors to edit.</p> <p>Page 3: should the student, faculty member....does not specifically list Chair/Director. Should we add in Chair/Director doesn't have to be there for the hearing to move forward? John Masserini will clean up for consistency.</p> <p>Page 3: Previous Violations: The AD and the Chair can identify the previous violations but it doesn't say where they will look for those. Should they maintain their own records?</p> <p>No, they are all in Sales Force. They have to be official violations that have been recorded properly through Sales Force. Violations have to be recorded properly.</p> <p>Page 4: under Facilitation: remove "both" and add "all involved".</p>			

Page 5: Under General Procedures: delete #'s 9, 10 and 11 and add 1, 2 & 3.

Page 6: Under Initial Meeting: get rid of "effectively".

Page 6: question on #3 regarding the request within 3 business days. Is it the students who need to request to notify in 3 days or for the meeting? For the meeting. Is there a time line on that meeting? No. but it needs to be done in a timely manner.

Page 7: Under Decision: Associate Dean: remove "they" and add "Dean".

Page 8: Training: a student has a history of prior and/or repeated academic integrity violations: Is it the AD's or the chair/director who can refer at this point. No, only the Associate Dean.

Page 8: Jurisdiction:

- #2 – Recommendation to the Provost or the Provost's designee that the student be suspended from their College, major, or program of study
- #3 – Recommendation to the Provost or the Provost's designee that the student be removed from their program of study;

Suggestion: that the second item be augmented to include all the same items from the first; i.e. the second item should read:

- Recommendation to the Provost or the Provost's designee that the student be removed from their College, major, or program of study.

Under Hearing Procedure:

Would like to have more students on the hearing board. It currently has 8 students. Every college has one student some may have more. We can do it by college: 2-3 students per college and colleges themselves can decide. It makes it difficult with one student who may have a very high workload and may not be able to commit. The students will be rotated. Everyone who is part of the hearing board does not necessarily hear all cases.

Notification: VPAA to notify all parties: John will extract some of the process and have it as procedures rather than part of the policy and that will be part of the Hearing Board training.

Page. 10: question on the 10 business days from the date of the hearing. It's post-hearing board timeline.

Page. 10 #4: it says Chair/Director: John Masserini will revise.

Page 4: Board members shall hear all cases before them *de novo* (from the beginning) NO. Faculty need to do a better job communicating to the students on the policy.

Course sanctions of that "F" John will clean it up as a specific sanction.

Board Members may solicit outside advice: should be pre-hearing.

Page 10: 5.5: A comment: it says that a student has the right to present his or her case but it does not address whether the faculty have the right to present their case. John Masserini said that is an error. It should be noted as well.

Page 11: Under Extension of Time: remove "Associate Dean" replace with "VPAA".

A: **Outcomes of Meeting:** Faculty & Student: Choice of either a faculty and student or faculty, Chair and student:

- Remove those clauses entirely to be consistent. All meetings everywhere starts with faculty and student, faculty, student and chair. It aligns with the grade appeal process.
- John Masserini will revise that section.

Question on Office of Student Life under the Student Code of Conduct (Section F.1). May have been an error. John Masserini will look at the Code of Conduct and clean up that section. He will also look at where the Student Code of Conduct language is intersecting with Academic Integrity and clean that, as well.

- All Academic issues go to the Provost, Office.
- Code of Conduct go to Student Life.

Question: can a student appeal for Academic Integrity and Grade Appeal? No, sanctions should not happen until Academic Integrity process has happened.

Ian asked if anyone on the phone had any comments. No comments.

There was no quorum in today's meeting, so voting was not allowed. Ian asked if we should do an email vote or do we want to send those edits out. It was decided to wait till the March 29 meeting to vote.

John Masserini will make all the edits discussed in the meeting and will send a revised copy to the ASC members for review. We will vote on it at our next meeting on March 29.

Agenda Item: 4	Academic Integrity training working group updates	Presenter	John Masserini
----------------	---	-----------	----------------

John announced that Betsy Buford had an Academic Integrity Training Team Kickoff Meeting on Thursday, March 14 in the BAC 206.

There are three (3) modules:

1. Modules for Students.
2. Modules for Faculty.
3. Modules for training for Hearing Board.

Modules will live on the Academic Integrity Website.

- It will linked in the policy.
- The Hearing Board will have their own website under the VPAA with the resources.
- Faculty will be able to link into it.
- It will linked to BB Learn.
- Can be added to the handbooks for the programs.
- It will be accessible for faculty to give to students; put in the syllabus, use it as your first day of classes.

Some Project Overview from the Academic Integrity Training Team Kickoff Meeting were:

1. Discuss Draft Learning Outcomes
 - a. Hearing Board Online Certification.
 - b. Student-Facing Online Tutorial.

c. Faculty-Facing Online Tutorial.

2. Identify Committees and Components for Development Process.

3. Identify Key Stakeholders.

a. Who else should be included?

b. Who should review materials before we finalize/build these trainings?

4. Create Project Timeline/Workflow.

a. Identify committees and leadership.

b. Set general project timelines.

c. Select next meeting time and set tentative agenda.

Please contact Betsy.Buford@nau.edu if you have questions or would like to participate in the training.

Hearing Board:

After completing this online workshop, Hearing Board members will be able to:

1. Identify and describe NAU's Academic Integrity and other associated policies related to Academic Integrity Hearings.
2. Identify and describe the key procedures, personnel, and possible outcomes/next steps leading up to the hearing process.
3. Identify and describe the key procedures, personnel and possible outcomes/next steps comprising the hearing process.
4. Accurately apply "burden of proof" criteria as outlined in the Academic Integrity policy to case studies.
5. Identify potential circumstances in which Title 9 and/or policies related to Equity and Access may influence the proceedings and/or consideration of certain types of documentation.

More information on Proposed Learning Outcomes, from Betsy, can be found on the ASC Website.

Agenda Item: 5	First Year Attendance Policy 10037 and Student Institutional Excuses Policy 100226	Presenter:	John Masserini
Time ran out to discuss the <i>First Year Attendance Policy 10037</i> and <i>Student Institutional Excuses Policy 100226</i> . John said that there are a few attendance policies and some of them are from a long time ago and some do not make sense. Why not combine them all together and compose one for 2019. John asked for volunteers to review both Policies and will discuss at the next ASC meeting, on Friday, March 29. Michael Kallsen, Nicole Hampton and Kevin Gemoets volunteered. John Masserini thanked them.			
Daniella Watson to schedule their first meeting for Thursday, March 28.			
Agenda Item: 6	Announcements		Ian Wischmeier
Ian announced that at the March 29 ASC meeting we will be voting on a New Chair and Vice Chair.			
Agenda Item: 7	Good To Order	Presenter:	Ian Wischmeier
Nothing for Good to Order.			
Agenda Item: 8	Adjournment	Presenter:	Ian Wischmeier
Motion to adjourn the meeting. Approved. Meeting adjourned at 2:55pm. Ian thanked everyone for coming and those on the phone. He reminded everyone that we will be voting on a New Chair and Vice Chair at the March 29 meeting.			

