



FACULTY MEETING MINUTES
March 7, 2018
Heritage Commons, Samuel Read Hall Building

The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m.

Speaker Cantor noted a change to the order of business for the meeting to allow 15 minutes for the Academic Deans to clarify information from President Birx's March report.

I. Approval of Minutes

The draft Minutes of the December 6, 2017 Faculty meeting were approved as written.

II. Old Business

None

III. New Business

A. Resolutions of Standing Committees

The General Education Committee approved a revised course description for IS 1111 First Year Seminar (see General Education Committee Report, Appendix H).

- B. MOTION:** To approve the BS in Criminal Justice degree. (Submitted and presented by Francis Williams, Program Coordinator, Criminal Justice Department.)
(The proposed BS in Criminal Justice degree is attached as Appendix A; the complete New Program Proposal was sent with the Agenda as a separate document.)

The motion was moved and seconded. Dr. Francis M. Williams, Program Coordinator, Criminal Justice Department, Justice and Security Cluster, spoke to the motion.

Dr. Williams explained that Criminal Justice faculty are proposing to create a new degree option for a Bachelor of Science (BS) in Criminal Justice, to change the existing BA degree to Criminology, and also change both programs to 4-credit courses. They hope that the new curriculum will increase retention and aid majors in completing their degree in a timely manner. With the course revisions to 4 credits, more high impact learning experiences are incorporated.

Having both BA and BS degree options would allow students greater flexibility to tailor their degree options to meet their varied interests and job opportunities in the field of criminal justice and to increase opportunities for double majoring with other BS programs.

In the current program, students can earn the BA in Criminal Justice with 39 credits in the major plus 6 language credits, for a total of 45 credits. Some faculty expressed concerns with the possibility of fewer students taking language courses if this program change is approved. While acknowledging that this may be the case, Criminal Justice faculty realize that language skills are essential and will encourage students to take language courses.

Speaker Cantor noted that the Curriculum Committee and the faculty Steering Committee recently agreed with her proposal that all votes for new programs will be conducted by written ballot. That will be the procedure moving forward.

The motion to approve the BS degree in Criminal Justice was passed by ballot vote with 48 in favor and 11 opposed.

Discussion and Clarification

The Academic Deans answered questions and discussed concerns related to information included in President Birx's March report regarding the Provost's Council, the timeframe and selection process for establishing Cluster leadership and release time.

It was clarified that the terms "Provost's Council" and "Deans' Council" are synonymous.

In his monthly report, President Birx shared his preliminary thoughts regarding establishing the Cluster leadership team and its relationship to both work plan development and promotion and tenure. The Deans noted that President Birx is sharing these thoughts as a framework for continued discussion. The Deans also noted that we are currently negotiating a union contract that includes provisions for promotion and tenure, which they can't speak to in more detail until the contract is finalized.

With respect to release time, President Birx does not want to increase this next year. Clusters may have up to the equivalent of one full-time faculty to perform administrative duties for programs. There has to be transparency in how we use release time and there must be an ability for the Cluster to use release time in the best way for their needs. If there are extenuating circumstances, faculty are encouraged to contact their Dean to discuss.

Faculty expressed concern with the tight deadline to establish Cluster leaders by March 16th. There is some flexibility with this deadline; however, the first meeting of the Provost's Council will be scheduled for early April. Therefore, representatives should be chosen by the Clusters no later than April 1st. It was noted that release time for those faculty members assuming Cluster leadership duties also impacts scheduling, which is currently underway. Faculty commented that it may be difficult for someone to accept a Cluster leadership position since the new Provost has not been selected. The Deans suggested that a Cluster leader could have a very limited term initially and then reconsider once the new Provost is in place.

Faculty expressed concerns that without a job description and clarity with respect to release time, it is difficult to ask someone to be a Cluster leader. The Deans noted that this is an evolving position and the Clusters will have some flexibility in how they determine their leadership

model. Each Cluster will need to name a person to serve as a representative to the Provost's Council. Clusters will also need individuals to be responsible for performing administrative and operational duties. Some faculty expressed the belief that the Provost's Council is a 'top down' governance model and stated that they are uncomfortable with this. They also expressed concerns about workload. The Deans commented that the Provost's Council is a framework for working in a strategic, cross-cluster way; the Provost's Council is not intended to a 'top down' model.

Faculty were invited to join President Birx and the Academic Deans on Friday, March 9th, from 3:30-5:00 PM in the Newfound Room in Prospect Hall, to continue discussions regarding the Provost Council, the Cluster Leaders, release time, and the URI Process. Faculty were encouraged to attend.

- C. **MOTION:** 1) To approve an update to the Withdrawal Period Policy by adding the proposed language; 2) To approve a new Academic Integrity Policy. (Submitted and presented by Dr. Emma Wright, Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee.)
(The proposed language is attached as Appendix B.)

Motions 1) and 2) were moved and seconded. Dr. Emma Wright, Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee, spoke to the motions.

With regard to Motion 1, Dr. Wright explained that, according to the current Academic Integrity Policy, a student under an academic integrity violation investigation should continue attending the course related to the investigation. If a student is found responsible for an academic integrity violation, all available penalties relate to a grade in the course. If the academic integrity violation investigation time period falls within the withdrawal period, a student can withdraw from the course, thus rendering potential penalties ineffectual. To remedy this, a proposed change to the Academic Integrity Policy would state that "students with pending academic integrity cases may not withdraw from a course." Therefore, a corresponding change to the current Withdrawal Period Policy is warranted.

Discussion ensued with respect to whether or not a student should be able to withdraw from a course during an academic integrity violation investigation and what is in the student's best interest. The comment was made that an investigation continues whether or not a student withdraws from the course and we shouldn't want to keep students in a course just to give them a grade of "F" if found guilty. There are consequences to the student for withdrawing in terms of the cost for the course and lost credits. It was noted that the current process is unfair, as a student involved in an investigation in week 3 of a course could withdraw, while a student in week 13, for example, could not. It was questioned if an academic integrity violation investigation could be added as an exception for late withdrawal; could this be added as another reason to be able to withdraw? Dr. David Zehr, Student Academic Advocate, noted that he approves late withdrawals on a case-by-case basis and is willing to work with students. It was also noted that financial aid may be impacted based on when a student withdraws from a course.

With regard to Motion 2, Dr. Wright explained that the proposed changes to the Academic Integrity Policy seek to improve an academic integrity violation investigation process which is often slow and cumbersome. The proposed policy:

- Allows faculty to handle smaller violations at the discipline/department level;
- Has faculty submit cases online (like a CARE form);
- Allows students the opportunity to request a panel be convened to dispute an outcome;
- Has all cases reviewed for consistency; and
- Emphasizes that the student can consult with the Academic Student Advocate.

These proposed changes would make it easier for faculty and students to navigate the process, make it easier to complete an investigation quickly, and reduce the number of academic integrity panels required.

Faculty discussed the need for ensuring consistency among disciplines/department in imposing the same penalty for the same violation. It was suggested that a list of penalties for certain violations could be developed to help ensure consistency. It was noted that the composition of panels is not the same for every case and so there may be some inconsistency.

The comment was made that panels provide assurance for a student that an objective group of people is making the determination; it removes any subjectivity of the professor in the process and provides equity for all students across all disciplines. It was noted that a professor always has an opportunity to meet with the student and can be an advocate for their student with the panel if they so choose.

After consideration, on behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee, Dr. Wright withdrew Motion 1, To approve an update to the Withdrawal Period Policy by adding the proposed language. The Committee will give further consideration to this issue and bring forth any recommendation to the faculty at a future meeting.

As Motion 1) was withdrawn, Motion 2), To approve a new Academic Integrity Policy, was amended to remove the proposed wording to be included at the end of the current Withdrawal Period Policy, “Note: students with pending academic integrity cases may not withdraw from a course.’

The motion to approve a new Academic Integrity Policy passed by voice vote.

- D. **MOTION:** To replace the graduate Academic Standing policy (p. 206 of the 2017-2018 Academic Catalog) with the proposed new policy. (Submitted by the Graduate Council and the Academic Affairs Committee; presented by Eric Hoffman.) *(The proposed language is attached as Appendix C).*

Note: This motion was withdrawn from the Agenda prior to the meeting.

- E. MOTION:** To charge the Steering Committee to form a 3-5 member taskforce that will: collaborate with the Bridge Planning Group to create an experimental pass/no-pass course called Introduction to the Cluster Experience (ICE); provide faculty oversight of the course; report to the faculty in the fall about the successes and challenges of the program; and in concert with the Bridge Planning Group, make any recommendations concerning creating the course as a permanent offering. (Submitted by the faculty representatives to the Summer Bridge Program Work Group; presented by Scott Coykendall.)
(The motion with rationale is attached as Appendix D.)

The motion was moved and seconded. Mr. Jason Moran, Dean of Enrollment Management, spoke to the motion.

He explained that this proposal relates to focusing the Bridge Program on retention, persistence and graduation. Faculty are being invited to develop and teach five 1-credit toolkit courses that can be delivered in a five-day period before Panther Days. These toolkit courses will be considered at the April meeting of the Curriculum Committee. In addition to the Toolkit courses, a 1-credit-bearing, pass/no pass course will provide the desired amount of academic rigor that he believes is necessary for a successful “bridge” program.

The motion passed by voice vote.

National School Walkout – March 14, 2018

Ms. Janet Currier, Student Body President, stated that the student body, faculty and staff are invited to come together on March 14th for a campus-wide walkout as part of the National School Walkout taking place that day. The walkout will be held 10:00 – 10:17 a.m. on the Alumni Green in front of the Hartman Union Building. The Student Government is asking for faculty support by not penalizing students who may leave class early or arrive late to class as a result of participating in this event. Faculty expressed their support by applauding.

IV. Reports

A. President

The report was distributed via email from the President’s Office on March 5, 2018.

B. Academic Deans

The report was distributed via email from the Academic Affairs Office on March 6, 2018.

C. Principal Policy Making Committees

Committee reports from Academic Technology and Online Education, Curriculum Committee, Faculty Welfare, General Education, and Graduate Council are attached to these Minutes as Appendices E-I.

The meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

APPENDIX A:

New Program Proposal

Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice (BSCJ)

II. General Information

- Institution Name: Plymouth State University
- Date of Proposal: March 2018
- Degree and Program Name: B.S. in Criminal Justice
- Name of Proposing Department: Criminal Justice Department
- 2010 CIP code and CIP title <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/Default.aspx?y=55>
 - 43.0104 Criminal Justice/Safety Studies.
- Proposed Date of Program Implementation (effective term/year): Fall, 2018
- Primary Contact Person: Dr. Francis M. Williams, Program Coordinator, Criminal Justice Department, Justice and Security Cluster
fmwilliams@plymouth.edu

I. Executive Summary: BS in Criminal Justice

Introduction:

The Criminal Justice program is a thriving academic program at Plymouth State University with, in the fall of 2017, 310 majors working towards a Bachelor of Arts (BA) in Criminal Justice and 20 minors. Our program is fairly streamlined and students can earn the BA in Criminal Justice with 39 credits in the major plus 6 language credits, for a total of 45 credits. The Criminal Justice faculty are proposing to create a new degree option for a Bachelor of Science (BS) in Criminal Justice and change our existing BA degree to Criminology, while also changing both programs to 4 credit courses. The impetus for the new BS program is to allow our students the opportunity to double major with other BS programs within the 120 credits. Currently, if a BA student wants to double major with a BS program (e.g. Psychology and Law, Biology, Business) they would have to earn a dual degree and the student would need to earn 150 credits to earn both degrees. Having a BA and BS degree options would allow our students greater flexibility to tailor their degree options to meet their varied interests and job opportunities in the field of criminal justice and increase opportunities for double majoring with other BS programs (e.g. Business, Accounting, Biology, Chemistry, and Computer Science). For example, students with a dual degree in Business/Accounting and Criminal Justice might work as an Officer for the IRS or FBI or a student who majors in Biology and Criminal Justice might work as a Fish and Game Officer. In line with the University's priority to be cost-conscious and provide affordable options for students, allowing students the option of either a BA or a BS would enable them to tailor the program to reach their specific goals within the 120 credits of a typical undergraduate degree without having to take out an additional year of student loans. Nationally, criminal justice programs are more likely to offer a BS, with some programs offering BA degrees and a few offering both degrees. However, it's more typical for a BA program to be in Criminology rather than CJ or for it to be a joint Criminology/CJ program. This change also moves the program to

be more in line with other, similar, social science programs at the university, such as Psychology, which offers both a BA and a BS.

Program Description, objectives and student learning outcomes:

The mission statement of the criminal justice program is: “The Criminal Justice Department at Plymouth State University aims to serve students interested in pursuing careers in the criminal justice field, as well as continuing their education at the graduate level including law school. The Department also serves criminal justice agencies in the North Country and Lakes Region of New Hampshire by providing service and research support. Students within the Criminal Justice major are exposed to a well-rounded education that is interdisciplinary in nature. Students are supported in developing skills in a variety of areas including, but not limited to, problem solving techniques, communication and writing skills, computing skills, and foreign language proficiency. They are also encouraged to adopt an appreciation for ethical and professional behavior in the field. Furthermore, students are provided opportunities and challenges to aid in the development of an independent sense of self, with a tolerance toward others and the ability to work in diverse cultures.” Consistent with the general mission of Plymouth State University, the Criminal Justice Department seeks to produce well-rounded graduates who are well-equipped to both continue their education and enter the work force. In addition, the department serves the surrounding community, not only by producing high quality graduates well prepared to enter their field, but also by partnering with local and regional agencies to provide academic and research support. The creation of the BS option will help us achieve these goals, especially goal # 1, 2, and 3.

As part of its five-year plan, the Criminal Justice Department has set 6 goals:

1. Improve undergraduate retention and graduation rates;
2. Increase student involvement in high impact learning activities;
3. Develop an esprit de corps among criminal justice majors to foster bonds among majors while in attendance at Plymouth State University to facilitate professional contacts among criminal justice alumni;
4. Connect with alumni and collect/store contact information of alumnae for the purpose of sharing their stories, tracking their success, and expanding the network of working professionals in the field that current students have access to;
5. Encourage healthy behaviors among students (alcohol, drugs, etc.);
6. Reexamine the potential for a future Master of Science in Criminal Justice.

The BS in CJ would require the following courses: CJ1XXX Criminal Justice in Action, CJ10XX Emerging Technology in CJ (TECO/WRCO), CJ2XXX Criminal Law, CJ/SO2XXX Crime and Criminals, CJ2XXX Corrections, CJ20XX Criminal Procedure, CJ3XXX Law Enforcement Environment, CJ3XXX Research Methods for CJ, CJ3XXX Data Analysis for CJ (QRCO/TECO), CJ/PY3XXX Society Ethics & the Law (INCO), 1 3/4000 level elective from pick list (AN3600, CJ3XXX Criminal Investigations, CJ 3025 Forensic Science, CJ3040(DICO), CJ34XX Homeland Security, CJ3510(DICO/GACO), CJ3710, IS4360(INCO/DICO), PO3630, SO3080, SO3180, SO3370(DICO), SO3380, CJ3015, CJ3600) and as a capstone experience students complete a 3 credit internship or practicum with a co-requisite of a 1 credit career preparation course.

Student learning objectives include:

- demonstrate an understanding of criminal justice processes, terminology, and history,
- articulate an understanding of the link between criminological theory, research methodology, and criminal justice policy,
- formulate and appraise your moral, ethical, cognitive, and personal development in relation to the field of criminal justice,
- demonstrate computing, verbal, and written communication skills,
- describe and evaluate the principles of scientific methodology so that you may become informed consumers of criminal justice research, and
- develop an esprit de corps among criminal justice majors while in attendance at Plymouth State University to facilitate contacts among criminal justice professionals and alumni.

Supporting data. The existing BA program with over 300 majors in fall 2017 and about 100-125 new first year students each fall attests to the demand for a criminal justice degree.

Available resources will be the same that are used in the current CJ BA program. No new resources are required.

Evaluation will occur in a manner consistent with the evaluation of the current CJ BA program, which includes a graduating senior survey and a pre-post assessment following the introductory course to the major. A copy of our 5-year program review is available upon request.

Long term implications. We do not anticipate any long-term implications in terms of changes in enrollment. It is hoped that the new curriculum will increase retention and aid majors in completing their degree in a timely manner. We will likely see an increase in double majoring, increasing the interdisciplinary development of our majors, while continuing to provide the existing BA options that our students are currently utilizing. With the course revisions to 4 credits, more high impact learning experiences were built into the course revisions and opportunities to connect with practitioners in the field including our alumni.

APPENDIX B:

MOTION:

- 1) To approve an update to the Withdrawal Period Policy by adding the proposed language;
- 2) To approve a new Academic Integrity Policy.

RATIONALE: 1) According to the current Academic Integrity Policy, a student under an academic integrity violation investigation should continue attending the course related to the investigation. If a student is found responsible for an academic integrity violation, all available penalties relate to a grade in the course. If the academic integrity violation investigation time period falls within the withdrawal period, a student can withdraw from the course, thus rendering potential penalties ineffectual. To remedy this, the proposed Academic Integrity Policy claims “students with pending academic integrity cases may not withdraw from a course.” Thus, an update to the current Withdrawal Period Policy to include “students with pending academic integrity cases may not withdraw from a course” serves both the current Academic Integrity Policy and the proposed policy.

2) The proposed Academic Integrity Policy will streamline the academic integrity violation process. The proposed policy

- Allows faculty to handle smaller violations at the discipline/department level,
- Has faculty submit cases online (like a CARE form),
- Allows students the opportunity to request a panel be convened to dispute an outcome,
- Has all cases reviewed for consistency, and
- Emphasizes that the student can consult with the Academic Student Advocate.

This new policy should

- Make it easier for faculty and students to navigate the process,
- Make it easier to complete an investigation quickly,
- Reduce the number of academic integrity panels required.

Additionally, the language suggests a change in faculty and student priorities with respect to academic integrity panels. The policy claims that a panel, when requested, will be convened within a week, and thus all interested parties should prioritize the panel in their schedules. As this new policy should reduce the need for academic integrity panels, the Academic Affairs Committee is prepared to offer their regularly scheduled meetings as a secondary option when necessary.

PROPOSALS: 1) The current Withdrawal Period Policy begins on page 36 of the 2017-2018 catalog and is stated below.

Students may withdraw from full-semester courses any time after the end of the drop period (the seventh calendar day of the semester) until the 10th Friday after the first day of classes. Students may withdraw from internships, practica, individual enrollment courses, independent study, second-half, Performance Study, fourth-quarter, and auditioned courses from the 10th Friday after the first day of classes until the 14th Friday after the first day of classes. The instructor must sign the course withdrawal form. Students must submit the course withdrawal form to the Registrar after it has been signed

by the instructor. A grade of W (withdrawal) will be recorded on the transcript. Withdrawal (W) grades do not contribute to a student's grade point average.

Late Withdrawal: After the withdrawal period has ended, students may petition for withdrawal from a course only under extenuating circumstances such as, but not limited to, the following:

1. documented learning disability for which evidence has been produced after the withdrawal period has ended;
2. documented medical circumstances arising after the withdrawal period has ended;
3. care of family during an emergency arising after the withdrawal period has ended;
4. military duty, where activation has occurred after the withdrawal period has ended;
5. jury duty; or
6. transfer credit which is verified only after the withdrawal period has ended.

The petition is to be presented to the academic student advocate and must include a letter explaining the extenuating circumstances, whatever documentation is available, and a course withdrawal form signed by the instructor, indicating a grade of W is to be assigned.

The Academic Affairs Committee proposes the following to be included at the end of the current policy:

Note: students with pending academic integrity cases may not withdraw from a course.

2) The current Academic Integrity Policy begins on page 28 of the 2017-2018 academic catalog. The proposed policy follows.

Academic Integrity DRAFT Policy

Academic integrity is the foundation of the pursuit of knowledge. All members of the academic community are expected to be dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge in an honest, responsible, respectful, and ethical manner. Every violation of academic integrity is an affront to the academic community. Violations of academic integrity make fair evaluation impossible and cast doubt upon the seriousness with which students accept the responsibility of acquiring an education.

Members of the academic community are expected to report all instances of those violations which come to their attention. Both faculty and administration consider it their duty, as guardians of academic standards and intellectual honesty, to enforce the following policy by identifying, investigating, and bringing to a resolution all cases of violation of academic integrity. Students are urged to consider that it is the toleration of violations of academic integrity, and not the reporting of it that is dishonorable.

1. Definitions

A. What is a Violation of Academic Integrity?

A violation of academic integrity includes any act which portrays a member of the academic community as having acquired knowledge through legitimate study or research which, in fact, has been stolen. Violation of academic integrity includes also any act which gains one member of the academic community an unfair advantage over another. This includes any act hindering the academic accomplishment of another.

Examples of violations of academic integrity include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Providing or using unauthorized books, notes, or other sources of information during an examination.
2. Submitting another person's work as one's own, that is, plagiarism. This includes, for example: copying during examinations; purchasing papers or taking them from Internet resources; copying papers, reports, laboratory results, or computer work; quoting or paraphrasing library or Internet sources without proper citations.
3. Doing work for which another person will receive credit. This includes, for example, allowing one's examination answers, reports, laboratory results, or computer work to be submitted by another person as his or her own work.
4. Falsifying, through forgery or other alteration, academic documents such as transcripts, registration materials, withdrawal forms, or grade reports.
5. Reading, removing, or copying, without authorization, or stealing any academic document, exam, or academic record maintained by any member of the faculty or administration.
6. Using unauthorized assistance in the laboratory, at the computer terminal, or on field placement.
7. Stealing, copying, or destroying another person's computer program or file, deliberately preventing or depriving another's access to the University computer system or resources, or impeding the system's performance.
8. Stealing, or removing without authorization, books or periodicals from the library, or mutilating library materials.
9. Falsifying or fabricating data or results of research or field work.
10. Lying in connection with an academic integrity investigation.

B. Who are Involved in Academic Integrity Cases?

1. *Complainant*: The Complainant is the individual who makes the discovery of an alleged violation and initiates proceedings as described in the list of required actions by the Complainant.
2. *Examiner*: The Examiner is a designated academic colleague (e.g., Department Chair, Program Coordinator, or Cluster Coordinator) who reviews allegations with the Complainant to determine if the evidence is sufficient for taking prescribed actions.
3. *Student(s)*: The student(s) is the individual(s) alleged to have violated the Academic Integrity policy.
4. *Academic Student Advocate*: The Academic Student Advocate is an independent campus resource who can advise both the Complainant and student on specific policy matters. The office of the Academic Student Advocate receives and maintains all electronic records from the beginning to the end of an inquiry.

5. *Academic Integrity Appeals Panel*: The Academic Integrity Appeals Panel is a body comprised of faculty and students. The Panel hears appeals regarding findings of responsibility and sanctioning.

2. What Steps Are Taken When a Violation of Academic Integrity Is Suspected?

In cases where a violation of academic integrity in course work is suspected, or in other cases of suspected violations, the individual making the discovery, the Complainant, must initiate proceedings as prescribed in the list of required actions.

A. Required Actions by the Complainant

1. Any alleged violation of academic integrity should be examined by at least two people. In the case of a violation of academic integrity associated with a class, these people shall include the instructor (Complainant) and an Examiner. In other cases, the people shall include whoever is making the complaint and whoever is in charge of the area of complaint. In the case of stealing, removing, or mutilating library materials, in conjunction with a course, the library shall notify the course instructor of the violation. The course instructor shall pursue the complaint. Library personnel may be asked to appear as witnesses.
2. Any supporting evidence shall be gathered and verified as thoroughly as possible. The examination shall be thorough enough to establish with reasonable confidence whether a violation of academic integrity occurred, who the parties involved are, and that allegations can be justly made and are supportable. The examination shall proceed as quickly as possible and should be completed within seven days.
3. If the Complainant and Examiner determine through the review of evidence that the alleged behavior is not a violation of the Academic Integrity Policy, no further actions are taken.
4. If the Complainant and Examiner determine through the review of evidence that the alleged behavior violates the Academic Integrity Policy, the student, or students, shall meet with the Complainant and be made aware of any accusations and be given a copy of this policy. This shall be done in a nonthreatening manner. The student shall be provided with the evidence and given the chance to respond to the allegation. The Complainant must inform the student that she/he may consult with the Academic Student Advocate before any further actions are taken. The Academic Student Advocate is an independent resource who can assist the student with policy questions and who will review findings and outcomes to assure fairness and consistency in application of the Academic Integrity Policy.
5. The Complainant must file an online Academic Integrity reporting form with the office of the Academic Student Advocate ([link](#)). The form describes the allegation, confirms that an Examiner has reviewed the evidence, reports all evidence pertaining to the allegation, and recommends sanctions (see **Sanctions Options** below).
6. After presenting the allegation to the student the Complainant shall, within seven days, arrange a resolution meeting with the student. The purpose of the resolution meeting is to discuss sanctions for the academic integrity violation. If the student accepts responsibility for violating the policy and accepts the Complainant's proposed sanctions, the matter is

resolved, pending final independent review by the Academic Student Advocate. If the student does not agree with the Complainant's allegation or does not agree with the proposed sanctions, the student may request an independent appeal hearing before an Academic Integrity Appeals Panel. If the Student fails to communicate with the Complainant and/or attend the resolution meeting, the case will be decided per the judgment of the Complainant's and Examiner's review of evidence.

B. Required Actions by the Student

1. Honor any requests by the Complainant for evidence concerning any alleged violations of academic integrity. This is the first and best opportunity for the student to present ameliorating evidence and/or arguments of innocence.
2. Continue to attend the course until notified otherwise. Note: students with pending academic integrity cases may not withdraw from a course.
3. Read and review the Academic Integrity Policy. The student is encouraged to contact the Academic Student Advocate with any questions regarding the policy. The Academic Student Advocate will advise the student of their rights and responsibilities and provide guidance for further actions. If requested, the Academic Student Advocate will accompany the student to any subsequent meeting(s).
4. Respond to requests from the Complainant to schedule and attend an Academic Integrity resolution meeting.

C. Academic Integrity Resolution Meeting Outcomes

There are three possible outcomes from the resolution meeting between the Complainant and the student:

1. A determination of an unintentional violation is made. This may be the outcome wherein it is determined that the alleged violation resulted from poor academic practice resulting from a lack of sufficient knowledge/training. In such cases the student and Complainant shall work together to give the student the opportunity to learn the correct academic practice. As with all grades, instructors will evaluate the assignment in question and may account for the violation in their evaluation
2. A judgment of an intentional violation of the Academic Integrity Policy is sustained. Based on the evidence, the Complainant will recommend a sanction (see **Sanction Options** below). If the student accepts responsibility for this outcome and the recommended sanction, the matter is officially resolved pending independent review by the Academic Student Advocate.
3. A judgment of an intentional violation of the Academic Integrity Policy is sustained, but the student disagrees with the finding and/or recommended sanction. In such cases, a student may ask for an appeal hearing before an independent Academic Integrity Panel.

D. Role of the Academic Student Advocate

All cases are reviewed for consistency in sanctioning by the Academic Student Advocate. If the ASA determines that the outcome of a case is consistent with past outcomes for violations of a

similar nature, no further action is taken and the matter is officially resolved. If the ASA determines that an outcome deviates significantly from past outcomes for violations of a similar nature, the ASA will work with the Complainant to resolve the discrepancy. If the ASA and Complainant are unable to resolve the discrepancy, the case will automatically be referred to the Academic Integrity Appeals Panel.

3. Academic Integrity Appeals Panel

A. Composition of the Academic Integrity Appeals Panel

The Office of the Academic Student Advocate will convene the Academic Integrity Appeals Panel. The Academic Integrity Appeals Panel will consist of:

- A designated Chair who shall be a faculty member recruited from the membership of the Academic Affairs Committee.
- Two PSU faculty members recruited from a faculty pool.
- Two student members

B. What Happens At an Academic Integrity Appeals Panel Hearing?

1. At the student's request, a hearing before an independent Academic Integrity Panel will be scheduled within seven days of the resolution meeting described above. The appeal may be directed at the Complainant's allegation, the recommended sanction, or both. The Complainant, student, panel members, and witnesses shall be notified of the hearing date. The Complainant and student are required to attend the hearing.
2. The student should continue to attend the course until a decision is rendered at the appeal hearing.
3. The student may consult with the Academic Student Advocate regarding the appeal and may request the presence of the Academic Student Advocate at the appeal hearing.
4. The Panel will hear the statements of the Complainant, student, and witnesses. Based on those statements and the evidence behind the allegation, the Panel will decide on the merit of the appeal.
5. If the appeal is denied, the student must comply with all requirements of the original finding and sanction as determined by the Complainant.
6. If the appeal is granted, the Panel may rescind a finding of responsibility for a violation or may impose a different sanction.

4. Sanctions

A. Determining an Appropriate Sanction

The appropriateness of a sanction should, using the Complainant's best professional judgment, reflect the severity and extent of the violation. Complainants are expected to exercise fairness and consistency in determining sanctions. The Complainant may consult with the Academic Student Advocate to seek guidance about sanctions, but nonetheless should consider the following questions in making a decision:

1. Does the violation entail a minor portion or a significant portion of an assessment?
2. Does the violation reflect carelessness/lack of knowledge or does it reflect a calculated and deliberate attempt to gain an unfair advantage?
3. Does the violation involve any external constituencies?
4. Does the violation entail any behaviors that would warrant investigation by other campus offices (e.g., Student Conduct Office, University Police-- if a violation of academic integrity involves damage to University property or otherwise violates the law, legal or disciplinary action may also be taken)?

All findings of responsibility will result in a record of violation. Additional sanctions beyond that are classified as Level 1 or Level 2. In most cases when students are found to be responsible for violating the Academic Integrity Policy, whether by admission or by evidence examined by the Complainant, and where the incident occurs in connection with a specific course, the Complainant shall impose one of the following Level 1 sanctions:

- Resubmission of an assessment with no grade penalty
- Resubmission of an assessment with a grade reduction penalty
- Lowered grade or grade of failure for an assessment
- Record of violation only (in cases where a violation of academic integrity occurs apart from a particular course or where it has a minor or tenuous impact on a course, the penalty may be simply having a record of conviction. A record of conviction is a serious consequence of a first offense).

If the Complainant judges an intentional violation to be egregious (e.g., extensive plagiarism; falsification of research data; forgery of a supervisor's signature), a recommendation for imposing a Level 2 sanction may be offered. A recommendation for imposing a Level 2 sanction will automatically require that the Complainant and student appear before the Academic Integrity Appeals Panel, which will determine the sanction.

Level 2 sanctions are:

- Failure for the course
- Suspension from PSU for a semester or for one academic year
- Expulsion from PSU

B. Second Offense

Upon receiving an Academic Integrity Incident Report Form, the Academic Student Advocate will review prior records to determine if the violation is a first, second, or third offense. If it is determined that a violation is a second offense, the matter is automatically brought for consideration to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, or designee, who will determine a sanction. The second conviction for violating academic integrity will normally result either in suspension from PSU for one semester or for one academic year, or expulsion. Also, if the second offense occurs within a particular course, an F will be posted on the transcript as the final grade for that course.

C. Third Offense

A third violation of the Academic Integrity Policy will result in an automatic and immediate expulsion from Plymouth State University. A student will be withdrawn from all courses.

5. Records

If the student has a formal resolution meeting with a Complainant and is found not responsible for an academic integrity violation, no official records shall be kept. Whenever students have been found in violation of the Academic Integrity Policy, a record of the conviction shall be retained permanently by the Office of the Academic Student Advocate. The Academic Student Advocate, all faculty and principal administrators with legitimate need to know, and the student in question shall have the privilege of access to the record. The Academic Student Advocate shall retain all evidence related to the case until three years after the student has left the University. A record of the conviction shall be reportable to the appropriate academic affairs administrator if the student is convicted of a subsequent violation of the Academic Integrity Policy and to any outside agencies legally requesting this information until the student graduates or five years after the finding.

APPENDIX C:

MOTION: To replace the graduate Academic Standing policy (p. 206 of the 2017-2018 Academic Catalog) with the proposed new policy.

Graduate Academic Standing Policy

Academic Standing: An admitted graduate student is in good academic standing when the following conditions are present:

The student has an academic program grade point average (GPA) of 3.0 or higher •
The student has no more than one grade of incomplete (IC)

An admitted graduate student is not in good academic standing if either of these conditions is present:

The student has an academic program grade point average (GPA) below 3.0
The student has two or more incompletes (IC)

Academic Probation:

Students are in academic probation if their credits and their academic program GPA falls in these ranges:

< = 10 credits 2.66 – 2.99
< = 11 – 20 credits 2.75 – 2.99
> = 21 credits 2.85 – 2.99

Students and their advisors are notified if they are not in good academic standing, and they must develop a corrective plan with their advisor. Students have one calendar year or two consecutive terms to raise their GPA to at least a 3.0. Students may not enroll in more than six credits if they are not in good academic standing. Students with more than one incomplete will be prevented from registering for additional classes until all but one incomplete is resolved.

If the student does not achieve good academic standing within the time frame, dismissal from the degree program will occur. If the student wishes to appeal the dismissal, he or she should do so by submitting an appeal request to the Academic Affairs Committee. After dismissal, should the student want to continue, he or she must reapply and be accepted into the program.

Academic Severance (or Dismissal):

Students are dismissed from their degree program if their credits and their academic program GPA falls in these ranges:

< = 10 credits < = 2.65
< = 11 – 20 credits < = 2.74

> = 21 credits < = 2.84

If the student is dismissed and wishes to appeal the dismissal, he or she should do so by submitting an appeal request to the Academic Affairs Committee. After dismissal, should the student want to continue, he or she must reapply and be accepted into the program.

*Please note that academic standing may impact financial aid status and veterans' and eligible dependents' receipt of GI Bill benefits.

* Other degree programs may have more stringent policies for maintaining academic standing in their degree program. See individual department program descriptions for further information.

Approved by Graduate Council January 2018

Presented jointly with the Academic Affairs Committee to Full Faculty March 2018

APPENDIX D:

MOTION: To charge the Steering Committee to form a 3-5 member taskforce that will: collaborate with the Bridge Planning Group to create an experimental pass/no-pass course called Introduction to the Cluster Experience (ICE); provide faculty oversight of the course; report to the faculty in the fall about the successes and challenges of the program; and in concert with the Bridge Planning Group, make any recommendations concerning creating the course as a permanent offering.

Elaboration/Clarification of the motion:

The committee would pick-up from prior faculty work with this group with the objective to request in a May/last meeting of the semester curriculum committee meeting to approve the experimental course.

The Dean of Admissions (Jason Moran) supports this motion. He values its function to provide faculty and staff with in collaborative experience that will serve students; and staff would have the chance to be involved in the process of developing course curriculum (which noted he would consider to be professional development for the staff involved).

Meetings should be 2 hours each of March, April, and May

Visions already formed from the Bridge Planning Group (which included faculty members Scott Coykendall and Kelly Swindlehurst):

- The course should be 1-credit, pass/no-pass
- The course should run for five days, in the week before the first class meetings of the fall semester – (Aug. 19 to Aug 23).
- Faculty should teach the course and be compensated 1-credit of pay.
- The course should work in concert with toolkit courses offered so as to offer up-to 2 credits for the entering students in the program.
- Ideally 75 students will be recruited into the program; up to five faculty members would teach in the program.

Rationale for the motion:

As mentioned in a prior communication from the director of admissions, last year's program was a success for what it was intended to address which were concerns linked to summer melt. Specifically, the outcome was 29 new first-year student participants and 28 remained enrolled past R+30.

The Bridge Group has reported other, unintended, results which point to where the program should focus on its next iteration: academic success and retention. Of the 28 who did not “melt” over the summer (the focus of the program), 26 enrolled in the Spring which suggests good retention; their fall GPA's were 50% at a 3.0 or higher (with some nearly at 4.0) which is good, although the bottom half of performances were low.

In effort to scale up this program -

1. The director of admission and members of the Bridge Planning Group went to the Curriculum Committee (CC) on Feb 23 to seek advice and guidance on the credit-based curricular portion for the future bridge program. At the conclusion of the meeting, the agreed direction was –
 - a. Inviting/asking faculty to develop and teach five or so excellent (1-credit) toolkit courses that can be delivered in a five-day period. Ideally, it would be great to have one toolkit course from each Cluster and the toolkit courses will also help to recruit students into programs.
 - b. While IS 1750 ST: Intro to Design Thinking served as the curricular credit-based vehicle last year and CC's initial recommendation was to use IAC, this meeting revised the suggestion in favor of just the toolkit for now and to develop for next summer an IAC-like course while running a non-credit bearing, faculty advised, experience; and over the next year create a more appropriate second credit-bearing course for the following year (2019).
2. Since the Feb 23 meeting with the Curriculum Committee, the director has consulted with the faculty and staff members of the Bridge Planning Group and concluded that it would be better to have a 1-credit-bearing pass/no pass course overseen by faculty available for this summer (2018). It will remain truthful to the contours of last summer's iteration that affected 1-section of 29 students, as we scale-up this summer's iteration to five sections in anticipation of offering this to (approx. 75 students). A 1-credit-bearing pass/no pass course along with a 1-credit toolkit course per participating student would provide the desired amount of academic rigor prior research shows is necessary for a successful "bridge" program.

APPENDIX E:

Academic Technology and Online Education Committee (ATOEC) Report March 2018

Submitted By: Lynn V. Johnson, Chair

Meeting Date: February 13, 2018

Action Items:

Technology for Enhanced Learning Spaces Proposal: Laptops with SPSS/Laptop Cart - HHP (for new space in renovated Field House in PE Center)- Approved to Go Forward into Budgeting process.

Discussion Items: (Description and short summary of discussion)

- a. Update: EduNav : Connected with MSB and signed contract with EduNav; will come to campus in the Fall (NB: SSC/EAB is for faculty and staff only)
- b. ATOEC Bylaws: Function : a working group to address functions and purpose of ATOEC was formed
- c. ATEOC's University Academic Technology Decisions:
 - 2) What happens after ATOEC approves Enhanced Learning Spaces Proposal? Should ATOEC have a role in prioritizing those proposals that are approved? What should the next step be?
 - 3) Additional discussion centered around having multiples avenues to get academic technology purchasing approval. Currently, some are asked to go through ATOEC Enhanced Learning Spaces proposal process, others are not. .
 - 4) What role should ATOEC have in reviewing Cluster projects that include requests for academic technology? Should the different groups talk to each other in order to minimize duplication or double dipping?
 - 5) Lynn Johnson will further investigate how/where the decisions are made as it relates to academic technology.
- a. TIP Proposal Process Revision Discussion:
 - Spent \$18,000 of our \$25,000 so considering timeline. Suggested split between Fall and Spring instead of rolling acceptance and consideration of applications.
- 6) Based on discussion of pros and cons of maintaining current process it was decided to maintain current process

TIP Proposal Actions: (Proposal Description/Vote): No proposals submitted

APPENDIX F:

Curriculum Committee Report March 2018

Toolkit and Project Courses: The committee continues to accept proposals for experimental Toolkit and Project Courses.

Meeting Times and Deadlines

Curriculum Committee meetings this academic year will be as follows at the specified location:

- March 16th HUB Student Senate Room
 - Deadline: March 5th by 11:59:59pm
- April 20th HUB Student Senate Room
 - Deadline: April 9th by 11:59:59pm
- May 18th HUB Student Senate Room
 - Deadline: May 7th 11:59:59pm

The committee conducts voting twice a month. Any proposals requiring discussion will be on the agenda of the first committee meeting after the proposal is submitted. Below is a list of each month's second proposal deadline:

- April 23rd by 11:59:59pm

The committee will be voting electronically on all proposals. Only those proposals requiring discussion (as determined by committee members) will be voted on in-person at committee meetings.

Updates to Forms and Procedures Documents: The committee is working to revise curriculum forms and related documentation to align with current administrative structures and account for new opportunities in course offerings.

If you are unsure how to proceed, contact psu-curriculum-chair@plymouth.edu with your questions.

Reminder

Transitioning to Four-Credit Model The committee welcomes proposals for program changes to the four-credit model. The committee has developed the following guidelines for departments as they prepare proposals:

- The overall degree requirements must remain at 120
- The requirement for a *minimum* of 15 free elective credits remains in effect
- The degree program should not increase in size (number of required credits.)

The information below was sent in an email from the Curriculum Committee Chair on January 31st.

Curriculum Procedures:

- Procedures: Please submit one electronic file (PDF) to psu-curriculum-chair@plymouth.edu for each proposal with all of the following included/attached:
 - Complete Curriculum Proposal Form;
 - All required votes and signatures;
 - Email communications from librarians and ITS;
 - Email communications with other departments/programs if required;
 - Syllabus and other supporting documentation if required. Syllabi must meet the requirements indicated on the syllabus checklist.
 - The syllabus checklist is available at the link below. *Be sure to use the newest ADA and Academic Integrity statements in your syllabi.* The checklist has not yet been updated to the newest statements because of recent changes for the Spring 2018 semester:
<https://www.plymouth.edu/committee/faculty/files/2010/08/PSU-Syllabus-checklist-Appvd-06Feb2012.pdf>

All of the above must be submitted in a single PDF with an identifying file name.

- Policies:
 - Because of the sheer volume of curriculum proposals expected in February, the committee cannot consider proposals submitted after the deadline or that do not have all required components.
 - Clarifications and minor changes to proposals are acceptable during the approval process.
 - When a department/program/cluster has one or more items on the agenda, a representative should plan to attend the committee meeting. If a proposal passes by online vote, attendance will not be necessary.
- Proposal Forms: The most recent Curriculum Change and New Course Proposal forms, approved in August 2015, are available at the following link: <https://campus.plymouth.edu/faculty-governance/committees-and-appointed-groups/curriculum-committee/> as is the updated Experimental Course Proposal form. The newest forms will be available at the link above as they are ready. Please use this link to retrieve the most current forms instead of using older ones you may have saved elsewhere.
- Questions: If you are unsure how to proceed with curriculum changes, contact psu-curriculum-chair@plymouth.edu with your questions.

APPENDIX G:

Faculty Welfare Committee Report

March 2018

Submitted by: Lisa Doner, Chair

The Faculty Welfare Committee most recently met on Feb 9, 2018.

The Faculty Welfare Committee, between Sept 2017 and Feb 2018, has had discussions with AAUP representatives, the Academic Deans, the Faculty Steering Committee and Faculty Speaker, regarding our duties and perceived mission under the emerging Cluster framework at PSU. Much of the discussion to date has focused on Promotion and Tenure, but we are also seeking feedback on Intellectual Property topics and proposed changes to that bylaw language.

The information we have gathered indicates that there are conflicting ideas across these groups about the future duties of the Faculty Welfare Committee. According to current Faculty Bylaws, adopted 12/2/2015 (reference Bylaws of the Trustees, The Faculty Welfare Committee), the Faculty Welfare Committee's function is:

- (1) To represent the interests of the faculty as a group of professional persons. The Committee will advocate for the welfare of the faculty and will make recommendations to the faculty and/or administration on matters affecting the welfare of the faculty, including but not limited to: academic freedom; promotion and tenure; compensation and benefits; workload; personnel policies; professional ethics; and "quality of life" issues related to working conditions.*
- (2) To serve as a point of contact and consult with other groups, constituencies, and/or administrators when they formulate, revise, or propose policies affecting faculty welfare.*

Because we first and foremost serve faculty needs, the Faculty Welfare Committee has arranged to meet with all of the Cluster leaders during our March 9, 2018 meeting in order to reassess the overall faculty vision for this committee's future role. We ask that each cluster member provide feedback to their designated cluster leader prior to that meeting.

Respectfully submitted, February 22, 2018

Lisa Doner, Chair Faculty Welfare Committee

APPENDIX H:

General Education Committee Report March 2018

Submitted by: Wendy Palmquist, Chair

The General Education Committee met February 12 and 26, 2018. Since catalog deadline was approaching, we had many proposals to review. After looking at several at our meeting the 12th that were simply renewing the General Education status of courses moving from 3 credits to 4 credits, we determined that if the change did not diminish the General Education content those courses did not need to come for renewal; they would be checked when Sunset Renewals return. That was announced to the Faculty.

In response to the General Education forum in December we determined that we wanted to seek student input on General Education, in particular on the plan to establish themes in sets of Gen Ed courses. There is a group of four experimental courses that are sharing a theme this semester. We looked at theming at Santa Clara University, which has a Pathways program as part of their Gen Ed, and are looking at other such ideas. We have decided to work on questions to ask and how to get student input, with the plan for a student forum or such in April.

The Committee clarified questions that arose over Directions expectations in majors that already had waivers for a Direction. The waivers hold, and the Directions total credits drop, as is reflected in the 2018-2019 catalog drafts now being generated. It was also determined that the Four Habits of Mind Outcomes would also appear in the new catalog section on General Education, along with the updated requirements for the distribution of Gen Ed courses, particularly Directions.

The committee did receive a large number of courses newly asking for or changing Gen Ed status, often due to the department changing their programs to predominantly four credit courses. The committee voted electronically on these courses, and those that did not attain a majority of positive votes were invited to come to our meeting and answer questions that had emerged, which did lead to more positive results.

We also received from the First Year Seminar Fellows the request for a change in the course description for the First Year Seminar, a description that recognizes the recent changes in the emphasis of the course as it becomes a key player in engaging new students with our new efforts. The course description currently reads **“Introduces students to the concepts of general education and the academic community and to the skills educated people use to generate and address important questions. Using critical thinking skills and basic tools of gathering and evaluating information, students and the instructor together engage in a meaningful exploration of a specific “Question.” The “Question” varies across sections of the course. Required of all first year students, admitted beginning Fall 2004, during their first semester at Plymouth State University. Elective for transfer students entering with 24 or more credits. Falls and Springs.”**

The proposed description, which was approved by the Committee, reads **“Introduces students to the General Education program's four habits of mind as well as project-based learning. Using critical thinking, design thinking, and information literacy skills, students and the instructor together engage in the development of a project that addresses some aspect of a wicked problem. The wicked problem varies across sections of the course. Required of all first year students during their first semester at Plymouth State University. Elective for transfer students entering with 24 or more credits. Falls and Springs.”**

The Committee also discussed whether our students who take a semester abroad can take a course abroad for our DICO requirement. Since our requirement reads “US society,” we agreed to stick to the current process, established a number of years ago, that courses taken abroad cannot be counted.

Wendy Palmquist
Chair, General Education Committee

APPENDIX I:

Graduate Council March 2018

The Graduate Council held its sixth meeting of the year on February 26, 2018 in Frost Commons. The minutes from our January 22nd meeting were accepted without the need for correction.

Jen Boutin, from admissions, request input regarding a policy for international transcripts. A policy does exist and admissions will be updating the website to clarify the vendor that students should be using to specify equivalencies. She shared with us that graduate application, which had not been working properly since November, was finally back to full functionality.

Dean Mears engaged in a discussion with the council regarding their concerns about graduate programming. A variety of issues were discussed.

Respectfully submitted to the faculty,
Linda L. Carrier, Ed.D.
Graduate Council Chair