**Academic Affairs Committee**

**Minutes for Meeting No.6**

**Wednesday, December 6, 2023**

**6:00 P.M.**

**Founders Suite (conference side), Bone Student Center**

**Roll Call**:

Present: Holland, Nikolaou, Pancrazio, Seifert, Su-Russell, Werner-Powell, Blair, Bonilla, Monk, Smith

Absent: Gonzalez, *Hurd*

Welcome to Bonilla and Su Powell.

---------

No public comment

--------

Approval of minutes, Smith and Pancrazio, passes.

**Policy 4.1.5 Final Exams**

Pancrazio – Should we restructure to say in 2nd paragraph “Shall not be given during success week, the week before final examinations....”

Nikolaou – We haven’t defined success week in the policy at that point, so it should not be first.

Discussion moved on.

Werner-Powell motions to aprove, second by Smith

Passes.

**Revised Code of Conduct Discussion**

Guests include Janice Blair, Jen Stevenson, Donald Reed, and Roy Magnuson.

Nikolaou: We created a timeline at Exec’s request. Since it was last put forward, Janice and Roy were consulted and new language was written. If we approve new language, the new language will be on the floor. If not, the item on the floor will be the language proposed at the last Senate meeting.

Janice, on definitions – code shouldn’t be unwieldy or too long. It should be accessible for students. We worked on trying to pare down the definition. Janice has no strong opinion on whether the definition is necessary or not, so long as it is understandable.

Monk – asks for clarification on what approving this language in committee means.

Nikolaou – clarifies that it would change the language sent to the floor; if not approved, the language as proposed at last senate will be up for approval of the whole Senate.

Pancrazio – asks what specific lines are changed. Asks Janice for comments on lines 13 and 16.

Some confusion on what page to look at ensues.

Janice – We worked to pair it down, eliminated some language.

Pancrazio – Any changes to Page 8, 13 A?

Janice – requested to use GAI or GenAI for clarity with the term AI (Academic Integrity).

Pancrazio – Is Jancie fine with 13 A?

Janice – SSCR does not approve of eliminating “possessing” but that doesn’t make sense with GenAI included. They added a sentence that allows both to exist.

Pancrazio – One of the issues was that AI is acceptable in some classes, so if this is a standalone statement, does that mean unauthorized possession?

Janice – SSCR wants the instructor to determine if AI is permissible or not. This would indicate that.

Pancrazio – Line 15?

Janice – Formatting will be improved later. I am not the best to address the line 15 change, that should be Roy Magneson.

Nikolaou – Let’s focus on A first. Discusses possession.

Janice – We state “unauthorized” explicitly.

------

Nikolaou – Let's move to C. Before, there was one long sentence with what plagiarism included and a reference to intellectual property. GenAI is not considered protected intellectual property, but it is still considered plagiarism if not attributed properly.

Blair – asks about logical reasoning of “is not protected property” and “therefore, it is plagiarism.”

Pancrazio – suggests removing the sentence (“GenAI is not protected...”).

Janice – Legal specifically added that clause. For the SCCR office, the proposed language for the last iteration, they accept “plagiarism also included GenAI etc.”

Magnuson – Courts cannot prove that GenAI can be copywrite.

Blair – Can we remove it from plagiarism all together? And just classify it as a tool?

Stevenson – but if they are allowed but didn’t cite, that is plagiarism. It has to be attributed. If we removed it completely, it would change how SSCR can address it.

Pancrazio – suggests returning to the previous iteration where the sentences are flipped to this order: [GenAI is covered under plagiarism / It is not intellectual property].

Janice – the flipping was our suggestion to be more readable to students.

Pancrazio – It links the two in an unintended way.

Janice – Is okay with it simply being removed.

Stevenson – Agrees, it is more direct and clear to students.

Magnuson – Only concern is it can inadvertently produce copywritten material.

Confusion ensues; it remains plagiarism.

Janice – SSCR is completely referral based. They do not review student work unless a faculty member reviewed it, determined it was a violation, and then referred it to SSCR.

Nikolaou – Should we stop it at “AI system.”?

Pancrazio – supports

Powell – Option 2, two sentences proposed after meeting with Janice and Roy. Seifert agrees.

Reed – What if we change therefore to, however?

Seifert – We should keep it as it is.

Pancrazio – why don’t we just throw it out the way it is, the senate will see something we haven’t anticipated, we can fix it later as reviews continue.

Powell – moves to approve changes included on timeline.

Nikolaou – reads through changes on timeline.

Monk – clarifies student’s stance opposing any changes made during this time.

Seifert – seconds Powell's motion.

All aye, save Smith and Blair who abstain. It passes and we recommend the new language in the timeline.

Janice – SSCR is already addressing cases involving AI, the current, unchanged versions of the Code of Conduct is not in need of changing from SSCR perspective.

Nikolaou – just updating for clarity.

Janice – we are allowed to address it without a specific language pertaining to AI because any means of assistance must be authorized by the instructor regardless.

Nikolaou thanks guests for coming guests depart.

**Policy 4.1.18 Credit Earned Through Transfer Examination and Prior Learning**

Nikolaou – This policy was seen by previous Academic Affairs. The Registrar sent it back. On page 5 they asked to remove Item 1 regarding CLEP.

Pancrazio – It is difficult to administer. If one person in a certain language process is not on campus at the right time, they cannot take it.

Nikolaou – These are guidelines, not policy. We can wait until Amy Hurd can be here to tell us more.

**Reinstatement Report**

Pancrazio – Moves we send it back because we get aggregate numbers. In the past, Pancrazio has asked to see numbers that are disaggregated. We are bleeding millions regarding the first year of students. The suggestion has never been discussed outside of the committee. I am convinced we will keep losing students if we don’t help students have a successful first semester, specifically Academically. Who goes on Academic Probation and what are their majors? Students need to be able to find their best fit and find Academic Success. Students may not have the tools to work out of Academic Problems. We need the right statistics and need to make a presentation to the Senate. The bulk of students who go on probation are FTICs.

Smith seconds the motion.

Nikolaou – agrees and points out the vagueness of points 3 and 5 of the report.

Powell – We aren’t addressing the learning curve caused by virtual learning in high school during the pandemic time.

Pancrazio – People don’t go to office hours anymore.

Nikolaou – We are sending it back. We can ask for a presentation to the full Senate.

Motion to adjourn, Nikolaou and Blair.