|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Present | Excused | Absent |
| Anne Angstrom | X |  |  |
| Karen Buonocore |  |  | X |
| Michael Chiacchiero |  |  | X |
| Marius Coman | X |  |  |
| Camille Drake-Brassfield | X |  |  |
| Ann Eastman |  | x |  |
| Susan Holland | X |  |  |
| William Kelvin | X |  |  |
| Brenda Knight |  |  | X |
| Jay Koepke |  |  | X |
| Qin Liu | x |  | X |
| David Logan | X |  |  |
| Karen Maguire | X |  |  |
| Martin McClinton | X |  |  |
| Tommy Mann | X |  |  |
| Thomas Mohundro | X |  |  |
| Kristi Moran | x |  |  |
| Mary Myers |  | x |  |
| Yadab Paudel | X |  |  |
| Jessica Slisher |  |  | X |
| Les Sutter | x |  |  |
| Melanie Ulrich |  |  | x |
| Tejendrasinh Vala | x |  | X |
| William Van Glabek | X |  |  |
| Vera Verga | X |  |  |
| Valentin Zalessov | X |  |  |

**Academic Standards Committee Meeting**

**All Campuses via Zoom**

**November 3, 2023**

**2:00 – 3:30 pm**

Meeting called to order at 2:03 pm by Bill Van Glabek.

Approve meeting minutes from November 3, 2023.

**Discussion Items**

**New Business**

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| |  | | --- | | **Meeting Summary for Academic Standards Committee** | | |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| **Overview** | |
|  |  |
| Rozalind discussed updates from a committee and emphasized the importance of accurate notes. Martin presented a flow chart of the academic integrity process and expressed the need for it to be in a college operating procedure format for board approval. The team discussed issues with the current flow chart and the need to update it. Martin also discussed the challenges of writing the language of a new law, including revisions due to feedback and changes in titles and deadlines. The team agreed on the need for a majority of faculty on the board and the importance of having the most updated version of the college operating procedure. The conversation ended with a discussion on the complexity of the flow chart and the challenges in dealing with layers, as well as the issue of cheating in academia and subsequent punishments. | |
|  |  |
|  | |
|  | |
| **Full Recap** | |
|  |  |
|  | |
|  |  |
| **Updating Academic Integrity Process Flow Chart** | |
| Rozalind shared updates from a committee and emphasized the need for accurate notes until a decision is finalized. Martin presented a flow chart of the academic integrity process and expressed the need for it to be in a college operating procedure format for board approval. The team discussed issues with the current flow chart, particularly regarding timelines, and the need to update it. Martin also discussed the challenges he faced in writing the language of a new law, including revisions due to feedback and changes in titles and deadlines. The team agreed on the need for a majority of faculty on the board and the importance of having the most updated version of the college operating procedure. The conversation ended with a discussion on the complexity of the flow chart and the challenges in dealing with layers, as well as the issue of cheating in academia and subsequent punishments. | |
|  |  |
| **Streamlining Student Misconduct Procedures** | |
| Martin, Vera, and the team discussed the need for a clear and streamlined process for handling cases of student misconduct and academic dishonesty. Martin is working on a document to address this, which will be sent to Vera, Melanie, and Bill for review. The document will also need to be presented to the Faculty Senate. The team also discussed the possibility of establishing an Academic Integrity Board, which would include faculty members and representatives from student affairs. Additionally, the team acknowledged the need to align the code of conduct with the academic integrity policy. The document is being worked on and will be presented soon for further review and implementation. | |
|  |  |
| **AI Policy in Academic Integrity** | |
| William expressed the need for a policy on academic integrity to include a statement on artificial intelligence (AI) use. He highlighted potential issues like infringement of intellectual property and magnification of biases with AI. Rozalind agreed with William's concerns and discussed recent rulings on AI-related copyright infringement. It was agreed that further discussions on this topic would be necessary. Rozalind also shared her insights on the use of AI in education, the challenges in maintaining academic integrity, and the potential for a college-wide AI policy. She also discussed the issue of faculty resolving issues informally, the difficulty of tracking repeated misuse of tools like AI, and the challenges in the academic misconduct process. Rozalind emphasized the need for a clear policy on AI use in class and following the academic misconduct process when students violate it. | |
|  |  |
| **AI Detector Transition to Paid Product** | |
| Rozalind informed the team that the AI detector, previously used as a free preview, is being turned into a paid product. This unexpected cost has left them unsure about how to proceed, especially considering the reliability of such tools. The team also discussed the potential ethical concerns of using student data with free AI detectors. The discussion ended with Rozalind emphasizing the need to clarify policies around AI use in syllabi and seeking input on alternative solutions. | |
|  |  |
| **Integrating AI Ethically: Tools and Considerations** | |
| Martin, Rozalind, and William discussed the integration of AI into their classes and the ethical considerations surrounding it. They explored tools like Draftback, a Chrome extension that records the creation of a Google Doc, to prevent student misuse of AI. Rozalind introduced the concepts of 'preventative tools' and 'restorative' measures for both faculty and students. They acknowledged the demand for AI skills in the job market and the importance of teaching students both coding and critical thinking skills. The team also touched on the 'hallucination' problem with AI and the possibility of it decreasing as AI becomes more specialized. Furthermore, Rozalind highlighted the rapid advancements in AI technology and urged others to experiment with AI tools like Chat GPT, which can now handle multimodal conversations and access data from 2021. | |
|  |  |
| **AI Policy Development and Impact on Learning** | |
| There were concerns raised about the development of a specific policy for AI due to its rapid changes and potential obsolescence. Rozalind suggested involving other departments to rethink ways to reduce student motivation to cheat using AI and hosting AI open forums for students. The group discussed the impact of AI on academic learning and teaching, including the challenges of maintaining academic integrity and the need to adapt pedagogy to incorporate AI tools. There was also a discussion about the use of AI tools in academic work and the need for clear policies. The conversation ended with an exercise to demonstrate the limitations of AI tools and a discussion on its potential impact on the workforce. | |
|  |  |
| **Exploring AI's Potential in Education** | |
| Rozalind discusses the potential of AI tools to support both faculty and students, with some saying they can be a great leveler just like machines were for the physical body. He also mentions an interesting study with a large consulting firm, Boston Consulting Group, which found that groups that were allowed to use AI with or without training performed just as well as high-performing groups with no training. Students in the AR forums are also using AI to help them study, not just to shortcut writing and cheapen the process. | |
|  |  |
|  |  |