

ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
February 1, 2023
Zoom Meeting from 10-11 AM
<https://virginiatech.zoom.us/j/86096067549>

Members Present: Keith Goyne, Robin Panneton, Susan Sumner, Michel Pleimling, Kimberly Smith, Keith Thompson (chair)

Members Absent: none

Guests: Rebecca Moreau, Associate Director for Academic Integrity

Recorder: Tracy Sebring, Office Manager, College of Engineering Academic Affairs

Keith Thompson (Chair) called the meeting to order at 10:02 AM.

I. Items to review and vote upon

A. None.

II. Review and approve agenda

A. Motion carried and agenda approved.

III. Notifications

A. None.

IV. Old Business

A. None.

V. New Business

A. Discussion of Resolution to Allow Administrative Resolution of First Time Honor Code Cases

Introduced Rebecca Moreau – Assoc. Dir. Of Academic Integrity to discuss Policy 6000. Acknowledged Keith Goynes comments on the document to improve the language.

Discussion of students coming to a resolution with their instructor vs. going to the honor panel included clarifying the appeal process. Either way the student would get one appeal. From an administrative decision they can only disagree. It is rare for a student to disagree with the instructor/student resolution recommendation

Discussion of need for faculty education: Rebecca stated that they encourage faculty to call the office of academic integrity to discuss. They will sit in on discussions with student if requested. There are faculty liaisons to provide support in COE and COS. Rebecca shared that they have hired a new director that will have faculty education duties.

Keith G. pointed out that 3.2b discusses flexibility. Robin stated her concern that it's up to faculty and that it should be more standard across the university.

Question: Will this proposal reduce the workload of the panel? Rebecca stated that the hope is that ½ would be resolved by instructor/student and that would significantly reduce the workload.

Keith T. – If student accepts responsibility but disagrees with sanction, could they get worse sanction from panel or would be less than/equal to the recommendation? Rebecca stated that while there could be exceptions it would most likely be less than/equal to. She said that most students only object to the harshest sanction.

Michel – What is definition of an egregious offense? That would be something of a more contextual magnitude – ex. Forging, using TA access for cheating - This should be more clearly stated in the policy. Who is defining egregious? That would be the Director, Office of Academic Integrity.

Kim – requested to discuss the students right to bring an advocate. It was clarified that this is a support person not involved in the panel and cannot participate, and that person has to have a valid Hokie ID (usually an advisor). This is in the honor code manual, but not in policy – discussion about whether it should be in policy ensued. Seems that advocate might not be the correct word.

B. Discussion related to “W” Grade Policy (time permitting)

1. Overview of data collected by Keith Thompson: Keith T. shared the data that he has collected so far on the CW's and how using them affects students in various ways. First plan to look at 2015/16 cohort because they would not have been significantly impacted by the pandemic.

Question for group – What other data should be pulled? How to approach? Group agreed that they should wait and make a well-informed decision.

Thoughts on gathering the data: Utilizing the CMDA program to partner? Michel agreed that it would be a good capstone project but would have to be in Fall 2023. Rachel Holloway has a data person that might be able to help (Kayla Patterson, but Rachel would have to agree). Pay an intern.

Discussion on how upcoming changes to academic relief (no single drops) might make this a higher priority need. Stated that new policy is not a mandate, but a recommendation so we will have to see how it plays out with the committee.

Decision to meet after Spring break to discuss what everyone is hearing and for a touch point for the group.

VI. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 10:56 AM.