Present: **Bolin, Flowers, Franti, LaCost, McCollough, Prochaska-Cue, Rapkin, Schubert, Shea, Stock**

Absent: **Fech, Konecky, Lindquist**

Date: **Wednesday, February 10, 2010**

Location: **420 University Terrace**

Note: These are not verbatim minutes. They are a summary of the discussions at the Executive Committee meeting as corrected by those participating.

1.0   Call to Order
Prochaska-Cue called the meeting to order at 3:07 p.m.

2.0   Announcements
No announcements were made.

3.0   Minutes of 2/3/10
No additional changes were made to the minutes.

4.0   Unfinished Business
4.1   BRRRC Document
Prochaska-Cue asked if the Executive Committee agreed with the rest of the changes that were proposed by the BRRRC. The Executive Committee agreed. Flowers moved that the corrected draft of the Procedures to be Invoked for Significant Budget Reallocation and Reductions be presented to the Senate for approval. The motion was seconded by Stock. The motion was approved.

Prochaska-Cue reported that she will also send a copy of the document to the BRRRC for the members to see the additions being proposed by the Executive Committee. She noted that the Faculty Senate and ASUN will need to approve the document and the Academic Planning Committee will need to adopt it before it becomes effective.

The Executive Committee agreed to send a copy of the proposed changes to the Chancellor prior to the Senate meeting.

4.2 Academic Honesty Committee Report

To see more detailed discussion of this agenda item, go to the appendix at the end of the minutes.
The report from the Academic Dishonesty Committee (AHC) was received. Flowers, a member of this committee, explained that there were two main policy issues

recommended by this report. The first was two specific wording changes to Section 4.2 of the Student Code of Conduct (the section dealing with academic dishonesty). These were an addition to section 4.2a section 3 that clarified the scope of materials considered as academic work and intellectual property for which copying or misrepresenting as one's own original work would be considered to be plagiarism, and an addition of a new section (8) that dealt with impermissible collaboration. The second recommendation was to create an Academic Integrity Structure for promotion of academic integrity on campus. This would involve establishing a faculty leadership team to be called the Academic Integrity Team, comprised a faculty members who would work with both the Dean of Graduate Studies and the Dean of Students to promote academic integrity and work on additional policies and modifications of policies that impact academic honesty and integrity. Examples of possible future policy and procedures are contained in the report.

Flowers moved to initiate the process of amending the Student Code of Conduct to incorporate the language recommended by the AHC report: Specifically, to add the following sentence to section 4.2a3 concerning Plagiarism: "Materials covered by this prohibition include, but are not limited to, text, video, audio, images, photographs, websites, electronic and online materials, and other intellectual property." Also, to add a new section 4.2a8 that would read as follows:

"Impermissible Collaboration: Collaborating on any academic exercise, work, speech, test or examination unless expressly authorized by the faculty member. It is the obligation of the student to know whether collaboration is permitted."

 "Flowers withdrew his motion to modify section 4.2 of the Student Conduct with the committee changes. He then moved to initiate the process of amending section 4.2 of the Student Conduct to include the wording change in section 4.2a section 3 suggested by the committee (omitting the addition of the new section 8). McCollough seconded the motion. The motion was approved."

4.3   ARRC Special Committee Report
The Executive Committee agreed to postpone discussion of the report until the chair of the special hearing committee can meet with the Executive Committee to answer questions.

5.0   New Business
5.1   Class Times for East and City Campus
Agenda item postponed due to lack of time.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, February 17 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and David Rapkin, Secretary.

Detailed Discussion of Section 4.2 – Academic Honesty Committee Report

4.2   Academic Honesty Committee Report

Flowers noted that the Academic Honesty Committee (AHC) was formed nearly two years ago but due to scheduling conflicts was not able to meet regularly. He stated that Dean Hecker handles most cases dealing with violations of the Student Code of Conduct. Flowers pointed out that at most other institutions a committee exists with representation from both undergraduate and graduate students who address violation issues. He stated that the early work of this committee was to review how other institutions deal with academic dishonesty and it was found that most institutions have a broader way of dealing with violations of the Code.

Flowers reported that the AHC reviewed the Student Code of Conduct and it was decided that the AHC should take on the limited role of modifying section 4.2 of the Code. Specifically the idea is to have changes to the broader unit to deal with honesty and integrity issues at both the graduate and undergraduate level.

Flowers stated that the AHC is suggesting that the Judicial Board be expanded to create an Academic Integrity Team which would discuss issues of academic honesty and the Student Conduct Code. The Team would address modifying policies and could also create an information repository for faculty members on existing policies relating to academic honesty. Instructional modules that can be shown in classes regarding academic honesty could also be created and made available to the faculty by the Team.

Flowers stated that there have been some suggestions from faculty members to simplify the process of reporting incidents of academic dishonesty. He noted that the Team could work on this process and possibly modify it. He stated that currently a report of academic dishonesty goes to both the chair of a department and to Dean Hecker. McCollough pointed out that most instructors deal with cases of academic dishonesty on their own. Flowers stated that the Code specifically states that any cases of academic dishonesty which result in the lowering of a grade needs to be reported, but this is not uniformly followed.

McCollough stated that she does not think that all incidents of academic dishonesty need to be reported. Stock reported that he has not had a lot of problems with this in his classes. He pointed out that there can be incidents of plagiarism that would be difficult to describe in a report.

Flowers stated that the reporting of incidents of academic dishonesty is important because it can help identify students who are repeat offenders who need some intervention. He noted that both Dean Hecker and Interim SVCAA Weissinger are concerned with this issue.

Flowers stated that there is a suggestion in the report of creating a subset of the Judicial Board that will deal with honor code violations. He stated that this group would be knowledgeable about the honor code and would meet more often than the Judicial Board.

Flowers noted that the idea of an XF grade was discussed but the AHC was split about it. He suggested that the Team could be given this idea for further consideration. He stated that he is not sure whether a lot of people would be in favor of this grade.

Flowers reported that the actionable item of the report would be to modify Section 4.2 of the Student Code of Conduct.

Flowers stated that the idea of having a team rather than a center is due to the fact that the Regents Bylaws have a specific definition for center. He pointed out that there should be more than just an undergraduate dean of students to deal with student violations and one way to do this is to have a team.

McCollough asked if an appeal process is set up if a student's grade is lowered because she/he cheated and the instructor filed a report. Flowers stated yes. He noted that a report can identify a problem student or a cheating ring but usually appeals for cases of academic dishonesty are not handled by a department appeals committee. McCollough asked if it is foreseeable that the department appeals committee could be replaced. Flowers stated that this could possibly happen in the future.

McCollough asked how much autonomy an instructor has with students and academic dishonesty. Flowers stated that instructors would still have autonomy but reminded the committee that any cases of cheating that lower a grade need to be reported. He suggested that the Team could help develop a better policy on this and could make the faculty more aware of the policy and the Student Code of Conduct. Stock stated that he does not recall any chair ever informing the faculty about the Code. Flowers pointed out that it is on the university's website (http://stuafs.unl.edu/ja/code/).

Franti asked for clarification on the word collaboration that is used in the proposed changes to the Code. Flowers stated that it refers to students working together as a group. Franti asked if this would restrict a student from getting help from another student in a course. Flowers stated that an instructor could stipulate this in a course syllabus. He pointed out that some instructors encourage group participation but make it explicit the times when students have to do work on their own. He noted that it should be obvious where limits are for collaboration, but it is up to the student to find out what they can and cannot do for courses.

McCollough stated that it would be nice to make students attend a class about academic dishonesty if they are caught cheating. Flowers stated that this is a sanction that can be used, but currently there is no structure in place to do this. He noted that this could be something else the Team could consider.

Stock stated that the root of his concern with the proposed changes is that they do not address the difference between collaboration and plagiarism. He stated that a faculty member should reserve the right to lower a grade if a student turns in a paper late or plagiarizes.

Schubert pointed out that there may be legitimate reasons why a student cannot attend a class to take an exam. He noted that there is a difference between a student pretending to have an excuse for not taking an exam and one that has a legitimate excuse and they should not be punished in the same way. He stated that he does not think it is applicable to have prescribed set of what students can and cannot do for a class. He stated that he has problems with the draft of the codification of sanctions. Flowers pointed out that having a prescribed set of what is and is not allowed is to help students, not to restrict faculty decisions in any way. He stated that the codification of sanctions is meant to help guide the Judicial Board when it makes decisions.

Rapkin pointed out that collaboration can vary greatly by disciplines. He pointed out that language that is specific can be dangerous and suggested that a core set defining violations should be created. Flowers suggested that the Team could develop something like this. Rapkin noted that collaboration has a core meaning that isn't necessarily negative. He asked if is incumbent on the instructor to specify what they mean. Flowers stated that the instructor would need to be specific with what is and is not permissible, although he stated that he could see problems with this.

Shea stated that instructors could say that students cannot collaborate on assignments or quizzes unless allowed by the instructor. He pointed out that there could be a general policy but nothing too specific so everyone could establish what is allowed for their course. Stock stated that we do not want to be overly prescriptive.

Flowers noted that the Committee wanted revisions to the suggested changes in section 8. He made the motion for the Committee to accept the modifications to the Code of Conduct so it can be passed on to the appropriate groups.

Schubert stated that the phrase unpermissable collaboration needs to be removed from the document. He noted that this is a collaborative environment and that constraints should not be put on students. Stock stated that he agreed to a certain extent. He noted that getting together behind his back to collaborate might be a concern but not if it is just about class discussion. Schubert asked if students collaborate to find a solution to a problem in class, if that is necessarily wrong. He noted that they are in the process of gaining knowledge by doing this. Shea stated that collaboration can be used in various ways and it can be defined differently in departments and within courses.

The Committee worked on further refining the purposed revisions to the Student Code of Conduct.

Flowers withdrew his original motion. He moved to begin the process of amending section 4.2 of the Student Code of Conduct to address the concerns of the Executive Committee. McCollough seconded the motion. The motion was approved.