**Academic Affairs Committee**

Monday April 27, 2015, 3:30-5:10 pm Frost Commons

*Attending: David Zehr, Stephanie Halter, Jen Green, Christin Chenard, Jason Cordeira, Roger Blake,* *Sam Miller,* *Deb Tobine,*

*Absent: Jim Hundreiser, registrar, Jamie Hannon, Kerry Yurewicz,* *Kelly Swindelhurst*

Agenda

1. No additions or corrections needed to 4/20 minutes.
2. Academic Integrity:
   1. Christian Robison proposal: Christian highlighted some of the issues he sees with the Academic Integrity (AI) policy on campus today, based on his experience as a panel member for the past 3 years and as chair of Computer Science: faculty not following the AI policy, process is cumbersome and bureaucratic, too severe of punishments/too punitive (default punishment is Academic Failure of the course) and the process is not swift. Christian shared a flow chart for case processing of AI violations that visualized the proposal that he is suggesting (see attached), which is that an additional step be created at the department level that would allow for cases of AI violations to be resolved through resolution between the faculty, student and chair of the department. If the student admitted guilt, and agreed with the faculty that an appropriate sanction is the failure of the assignment that there would be no need for an AI panel to hear the case. We could create a one page form that the chair would send on to AA office, keeper of the database of AI offenders, which details the agreement between the student and faculty member (see example provided in attachment). Cases which faculty thought were particularly egregious, involved second offenders or the student did not admit guilt/agree to sanction of failure for the assignment would be resolved through the academic integrity hearing panel. David Zehr raised the concern of how do we assure fairness and consistency across campus? Some felt the current policy is not being consistently applied across campus and that this would likely be an improvement to developing a fair policy that would be consistently applied across campus in hopes of reducing AI violations. AAC would also need to make sure that a process is in place so that the people serving on the AAC did not know until after deliberation whether or not the student was a repeat offender.
3. Discussion of BA/BS issue brought forth by Robin DeRosa for Interdisciplinary Studies. Here is the email I received from Robin DeRosa on this issue (in italics):

*The Interdisciplinary Studies Council is hoping that the AAC could consider an issue that we have struggled with over the last few years, which we don't feel that we are able to solve on our own.  Students in the I.S. major are able to select a BA or a BS degree.  The only substantive difference between these two choices seems to be that the BA requires a Foreign Language while the BS does not.  Sometimes, a student's program makes it clear which path they will choose (for example, a student mixing History and English might select a BA, while a student mixing Business, Chemistry, and Health might choose a BS).  But students often ask us during advising what the definitions of each degree category are, and what the criteria are for deciding which to select.  Sometimes, we run into challenging cases, for example:*

* *a student whose degree is all focused in arts and humanities requests a BS to avoid a language.  Is this ok?*
* *a student with a very arts focused program requests a BS because he thinks it will help him get into grad school in a different subject that is more science-oriented.  Is this ok?*
* *A student who combines disciplines which all award the BS decides to select a BA because she has taken Spanish and so why not? Is this ok?*

*We are not looking for the AAC to answer these questions, but to consider creating a definitions for the BA and BS degrees that would guide the ISC when we come across thorny cases such as these.  If it is true that the* only *difference between a BA and a BS at PSU is the language question-- and therefore students could choose either for any program simply based on their desire to include or exclude a language--it would help for us to see that clearly stated as well.*

*Would you check with the AAC and see if you would be willing to take up this issue and hash it out a bit?  If not, please let us know if you think this is something you would like to empower the ISC to handle on a case-by-case basis based solely on our own internal criteria (which seems to us like not a great plan).*

The AAC decided to take this to the steering committee to see if it is a curriculum committee issue more so than AAC.

1. No new business.

**Future meeting dates:**

**Friday 5/29** 9-12 Probation Contracts Mary Lyons 001 and Tentative Academic Integrity Panels at 1:00, 2:00 and 3:00 pm location TBD

**Tuesday June 9th** 9-12 Severance Appeals Mary Lyons 001 and Tentative Academic Integrity Panels at 1:00, 2:00 and 3:00 pm

**Next year meeting dates: location tbd (hopefully Frost)**

**Fall 2015**

9/21 3:30-5:15

9/25 2:30-3:30

10/19 3:30-5:15

10/23 2:30-3:30

11/16 3:30-5:15

**Spring 2016**

2/15 3:30-5:15

2/26 2:30-3:30

3/21 3:30-5:15

3/25 2:30-3:30

4/18 3:30-5:15

4/22 2:30-3:30