

**INSTRUCTION COUNCIL
MINUTES
May 2, 2014
204 Whitehurst**

Present: Celeste Campbell, Bruce Crauder, Bob Davis, Cheryl Devuyt, Bavette Miller, Shiretta Ownbey, Chris Ross, Raman Singh, Jean Van Delinder, Mark Weiser, Sarah Gordon, Susan Johnson, Rae Ann Kruse, Steve Damron, and Brenda Masters.

1. Academic Integrity Policy – Rae Ann Kruse

Dr. Crauder noted that some of the suggestions have moved efforts toward what we hoped the process would be, more educational and clear cut. Moving to take some of the level of discretion off faculty and put in the hands of the Academic Integrity process, have also been positive. Dr. Crauder asked Dr. Kruse if there was a history of problematic issues and what areas of the policy need improvement and Dr. Kruse noted that the interpretation of “minor violations” has been unclear and problematic. The policy reads that level one violations are minor violations but there is not a definition of what a minor violation constituted; therefore, it was up to the committee to determine that violation. This resulted in confusion whether the violation should be considered level one or level two and the committee turned to the faculty’s syllabus to determine the sanction. Dr. Kruse suggests including wording in the policy to refer a percentage of the assignments to determine the level of sanction. This would provide a bases for determining level I and II sanctions. Dr. Masters noted that there are concerns with faculty assigning an F! on assignments which account for a very small percentage of the grade and in some cases only 2% of the total grade for the class. It was asked if the terminology “discovery period”, in section 2.02, should be removed. Perhaps a statement should replace the terminology to read “once an instructor identifies the alleged violation he/she has _____ days to report the alleged violation”. There were also concerns about the definition for the “discovery period” in regards to degree revocation after a violation is discovered after graduation. It was decided to keep the “discovery period” terminology and to revise the first sentence in procedures to read: “Within five school days of discovering an alleged violation, but no more than 30 calendar days after the submission due date, the instructor prepares an Academic Integrity Inquiry Form (including a list of possible Academic Integrity Facilitators) and gives or emails the form to the student.” 1.03b.1 - Dr. Ross asked to have the following statement added: “Standards set by instructors in their classes should be consistent with the guidelines provided within the policy.” 1.03 – add 1.03e – Syllabus needs to be consistent with the policy. Members asked that section 2.04 and 2.05 be reversed. A suggestion was also made to remove the wording “assign” in the second sentence in 2.05 to “recommend”. 2.05a and 2.05b the wording “awards a” should be removed. “The instructor should assign level I or level II sanctions for alleged violations of academic integrity.” It was also suggested to alter the wording in 2.04b.10 from “copying from another student during an examination with or without his/her knowledge” to “copying from another student during an examination”.

2. Modifications to University Academic Regulation 3.4: General Education Requirements – Celeste Campbell

Dr. Campbell noted that this subject is being brought back for discussion to address the proposed recommendations from the General Education Task Force. Dr. Masters wanted members to consider the seriousness of these two items and to contemplate what effect, large or small, would this change have on degree plans. Dr. Masters asked members to consider if the changes would be positive in providing better transferability between the colleges. Please consider these issues as degree sheets are being developed.

Adjourn: 11:00 a.m.