

College of Arts and Sciences

Faculty Meeting Minutes

December 2, 1998

Call to Order at 3:30 p.m.

Deep regrets from the college community were extended to Nancy Curran. A moment of silence was observed.

The minutes for the October 7 and November 4 meetings were approved.

The President is out of town, and will be taking a leave till the end of January.

Dean's Report

Thanks to participants in the November 7th admissions open house; the event was a success and will be held again, on April 10th.

Faculty phoning dates--

February 9-11: early action / scholarships.

March: Neely and Trustee scholarships.

April: General phoning.

Faculty are encouraged to sign up to help with this effort.

The Academic Council and chairs are exploring expanding our joint degree programs. We are considering joint law and MAT programs at the College, and possible science options with OHSU or OGI.

As a consequence of last month's faculty vote on the developmental review cycle, Associates scheduled for a fourth year review this year will now have a two year delay. Developmental reviews for professors have been canceled. Chairs no longer write separate letters since they sit on the developmental review committee.

The College's family leave policy, about which we have been notified, does not

contain possible future modifications under discussion at Academic Council affecting new parents.

Tomorrow's FAT Lunch has been canceled because of the General Education Forum.

The Dean acknowledged two students who have helped develop the proposed modification of the Academic Integrity Policies and Procedures under debate today. Ashley Schmitt from the Honor Board, and Erin Bailey, VP of SAAB. They have also helped developed entries for Lewis and Clark applications for inclusion in the *Templeton Guide to Colleges*.

Committee Reports

Admissions, Awards and Academic Standing

Kurt Fosso: For graduation, Latin Honors will be based on the GPA calculated through fall semester, with an asterisk indicating that the receipt is contingent. Final awards of Latin Honors will be based on the students full academic record.

The alternatives were not attractive:

1. Do not include Latin Honors in the graduation program.
2. Calculate senior grades earlier than other grades.
3. Use mid-term grade estimates for seniors.

Since final honors will be based on the full 4 years, it will be possible to receive Latin Honors at graduation and later have them revoked, or not be listed and later have them awarded. These occasions should be rare, however.

The committee discussed possible reasons for this year's low matriculation rate:

1. Increase in California state tuition grants.
2. Asian economic problems.
3. The departure of the financial aid director.
4. Non competitive financial aid environment.

The good news is that applications are back up to the levels we saw two years ago. In addition, the drop in tuition revenue from the first year students is less than feared. Finally, there are more parking spots!

Recommendations from the committee for improving recruitment:

1. Update/improve the College web page.
2. Department web pages need to be individualized.
3. College should hire a web czar.
4. Committee will be examining first year advising. (Retention between 1st and 2nd year is up.)

Dean Atkinson: Last year, a proposal was considered and rejected to add two web positions. The Law school hired their own web guru last year. Based on the continuing concern, the Executive Council has authorized the dean as an interim temp to upgrade our web-site on a short term basis. A full time hire in college relations looks likely.

Elliot Young: Can departments deviate from the cookie cutter format in web design?

Dean Atkinson: The same template and certain conventions will be required, but creativity is encouraged.

Mike Sexton: 11 % of applicants last year made their first contact over web.

Evan Williams: It took a year for the college to link the Environmental Studies Home Page to the main college page.

Dean Atkinson: Searchability/interactivity clearly need to be addressed first. A place to post complaints about the web site will be announced.

Curriculum Committee

Bill Randall: The general education forum will be held tomorrow. One item not to be discussed tomorrow, community service as a requirement for graduation, has been addressed by the curriculum committee. The committee is proposing to insert a paragraph in the catalogue indicating that community service is a common part of the Lewis and Clark experience.

Evan Williams: The forum will be held in Stamm. The forum format will allow each proposer only a few minutes; the main object is to have as complete a discussion as possible. Afterwards, the task force group will try and produce a summary directed to the curriculum committee. The forum is community wide, and is not intended just for faculty.

The proposal by Susan Hubbuch sent out was missing two pages.

Steve Hunt: What is Curriculum Committee time line for reporting on general education?

Bill Randall: The committee hopes to get a report to the faculty by February meeting; by March at latest.

Janet Davidson: The forum time doesn't work for some faculty who are teaching.

Rachel Wheeler: Can we have a straw poll on faculty preferences after the forum?

Bill Randall: The object of forum is simply to present possibilities. It is the Task Force's job to determine appropriate follow-up.

Committee on Promotion and Tenure

No report.

New Business

Kurt Fosso moved the following resolution for the AAAS committee. No second was necessary.

RESOLUTION

BE IT RESOLVED that the document on Academic Integrity Policies and Procedures be modified to state that all cases of alleged academic dishonesty be adjudicated by the College Honor Board (per items 1-4 below), to amend the reporting process (item 5), and to clarify the document's terminology (item 6), in the following ways:

1. 4.4: **amend** the sentence "To hear cases referred from individual faculty members, students or staff (including alleged violations of provisions regarding the responsible use of academic technology)" to read: "To hearall cases of alleged academic dishonesty including alleged violations of provisions regarding the responsible use of academic technology)."

2. 4.5: **omit** the paragraph that begins, "To hear appeals from students...."

3. 5.3-4: **omit** the phrase "The opportunity to" and the following paragraph that begins, "Either the student or the faculty member may request a hearing...."

4. 6.2: in the last two sentences of the paragraph **omit** the phrase "to request a hearing, or" and the phrase "requesting a hearing or."

5. 5.3: before the phrase "the Registrar, Dean of Students, and Dean of College," **add** the phrase "the Honor Board chair, who will forward the report form in a timely manner to."

6. 1.3, 3.4: **replace** the term "misconduct" with the term "dishonesty." Make the same replacement in the heading "Principles Governing Adjudication of Alleged Academic Misconduct" on p. 3, and in the respective headings atop pp. 4 and 5.

Once approved, these changes will take effect immediately."

Minor revisions to the motion have been made to the one that was previously circulated . The proposed changes are in procedure not policy.

The following points emerged in discussion.

The proposal was initiated by last year's Honor Board, and supported by the Board this year. Both the SAAB and the student council unanimously support the changes.

Why the proposed changes?

- The Honor Board can reinforce the same educational function provided by the professor's sanction.

- Going to the Honor Board uncovers the possibility of similar behavior in other classes.
- The purpose is not to terrorize students but to establish a uniform culture of academic integrity. The policy change improves fairness. All students are held accountable at both the class level and college level.
- The process appropriately expands student and community involvement; it becomes less of a private matter between faculty and student.
- Appearing before the Honor Board will not ruin the student's life. The information is placed in a disciplinary file separate from the student's academic file. If action is taken by the board not requiring a response by the Dean of Students (e.g. suspension or expulsion) the disciplinary file will be destroyed at graduation. Disciplinary records of students whose sanctions are imposed through formal action of the Dean of Students or designate (probation, deferred suspension, suspension) will be maintained for five years. Disciplinary files will be maintained permanently in the event of dismissal (expulsion). Graduate schools do not automatically receive disciplinary files.
- The Honor Board has dealt with other cases; they can provide third party input on cases that may seem gray to a faculty member.
- Faculty should not be making these decisions in isolation.

What is meant by the threshold requirement that "all alleged cases have to be reported"? What if a student simply doesn't understand plagiarism? The answer: "any sanctionable offense". Since the faculty member typically does the alleging, the faculty member can judge whether the action is a "violation of academic integrity" or "cluelessness." For the latter, no grade sanction for a violation of academic integrity would be applied, and no reporting would be necessary.

What if a student alleges cheating, but is not willing to testify or provide other evidence? Must this allegation be reported by the faculty member? No. If the student cannot be persuaded to provide evidence, the case cannot be adjudicated. Hence the Honor Board should not be notified.

Two moves in last two years have reduced faculty autonomy: changes in the grievance and the academic integrity procedures. Both are appeals processes. Is this another level? Faculty are not being allowed the opportunity to resolve classroom affairs independently. Does this alter control over grades? Yes, but only in rare instances. Currently, if the Honor Board rules against a faculty member, the Dean could change the grade. (This has not yet happened). By requiring reporting, the chances may be raised that the Board would indeed rule against a faculty member.

But, the student already has the option of bringing a case directly to the Honor Board.

Can information about a student's past record be obtained to help a faculty member evaluate whether or not to allege a violation of academic integrity? Yes; either Michael Ford or any member of the Honor Board can provide that information.

What if a student testifies but seeks confidentiality. If the case goes to the Honor Board, will this be compromised? Yes; but this is true now.

Is forgery academic dishonesty? Of grade records or other academic documents, yes. Non-academic forgery is not. But it is still a violation of the Code of Conduct.

The original academic integrity policy did not require students to report violations, as is common at other schools. Are we close to moving down that road? SAAB is supportive, but the students felt that the general culture is not yet ready for students turning in fellow students.

Curtis Johnson called the question and was seconded. Debate was closed by a voice vote.

The motion passed by a voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Eban Goodstein

Created by: eban@lclark.edu

Updated: 12-02-98