

August 28, 2003

Present: Scott Thede (chair), Aaron Dziubinskyj, Rebecca Schindler, Rebecca Upton, A.J. Feeny-Ruiz (student member), Bruce Serlin, Andrew Hayes, Toby Butler (Student Member), Kelley Hall (Academic Affairs), and Marnie McInnes (Academic Affairs)

1. The meeting convened ca. 4:05 pm.
2. We introduced new members.
3. We chose a secretary for the semester (Rebecca Schindler)

4. We chose two 'rotating' chairs for the Academic Integrity Committee. They will be Scott Thede and Bruce Serlin.
 - a. We decided to hold a training session early this semester on the academic integrity policy and how to run the hearings. Marnie will find a date for this session.
 - b. At the next faculty meeting, Scott will make a call for volunteers to serve on the committee.
 - c. Aaron, Rebecca U., Rebecca S., and Andrew also agreed to serve on the Community Conduct Committee.

5. Scott noted that we will not hold the meeting that is currently scheduled for fall break. If necessary, we will reschedule.

6. We confirmed that the co-Chair for SLAAC this semester is Aaron Dziubinskyj

7. We discussed possible agenda items for this semester:
 - a. A follow-up on the book lists. Later in the meeting Kelley and A.J. said they thought the system worked well for students and faculty but we need to get feedback from the bookstores. We tentatively agreed it would also be a good idea to hold a joint forum with student congress on the book list issue.
 - b. Follow-up with the issue of whether a student is allowed to withdraw from a course while an academic dishonesty charge is pending.
 - c. Follow-up with convincing more faculty to submit mid-term grades. Kelley would like to address this issue at a faculty meeting in conjunction with other comments about advising.
 - d. A.J. informed us that Student Congress would be meeting this Sunday and that he would probably have more agenda items for our next meeting. He expects that student parking, especially near the academic quad, will be an issue this year.
 - e. Marnie brought up SLAAC's role, in the formation of the new Harassment Policy and any relation between that policy and the Sexual Misconduct Policy in the student handbook. Kelley clarified that the new Harassment policy is from, the office of Human Resources and covers faculty, staff, and students. SLAAC was consulted on an earlier draft of the policy.
 - i. Related to the Sexual Misconduct Policy, AJ asked why students are not allowed to have an attorney at Sexual Misconduct Hearings. Marnie explained that the procedures are internal to DePauw and that they work well, they are not criminal or civil hearings.
 - ii. Aaron mentioned that an Electronic Fair Use Policy is also in the works and SLAAC may be called on to review that.
 - f. Bruce asked if the students thought the new policy charging students extra to study off-campus would cause any problems. A.J. and Toby both expected complaints from the student body.

8. The meeting adjourned at 4:45 pm.

Submitted by Rebecca Schindler

September 25, 2003

Present: Scott Thede (chair), Rebecca Schindler, Andrew Hayes, Rebecca Upton, Kelley Hall, Aaron Dziubinskyj, Toby Butler, James Lincoln

1. There were no previous minutes to approve because we did not take any at the last meeting.
2. Kelley will send an e-mail appealing to the faculty to submit their mid-term grades on time. Grades are due October 13. Scott will follow this up with a reminder at the next faculty meeting (on October 13). Perhaps the registrar's office can supply some stats at that point on how many faculty have submitted their grades.
3. We discussed the best way for SLAAC to liaison with students regarding their concerns. Rather than holding a joint SLAAC-Student Congress open forum, we decided that it would be better for the student representatives on SLAAC to hold their own forum with Student Congress.
4. We looked at the list of preliminary student concerns supplied to Scott by the student representatives. We tried to determine which of the issues SLAAC needs to address.

The two main issues that SLAAC may look into are:

- a. Fees for study abroad
- b. Printing costs

On both of these issues Toby said that students were not concerned with the added costs per se but with equity. Should students studying off-campus but staying in the US be covering the costs of students going to Australia. Likewise with the printing, some classes require a lot more printing (i.e., readings from Blackboard).

Rebecca U. asked whether students were also concerned about the costs of off-campus Winter Term study. Toby did not think this was a concern.

Rebecca S. noted that even if students are required to print their readings from the Web, this is less expensive than having course packs made.

We decided that the other items on the list were not SLAAC issues and the students should go through the appropriate campus offices.

5. Marnie was going to talk about the Academic Integrity Policy, but she was not present. Kelly mentioned that there may be some confusion in the policy (something caught during proofreading), but she could not remember exactly what the problem was.

Submitted by Rebecca S.

October 9, 2003

Present: Scott Thede, Aaron Dziubinskyj, James Lincoln, Cindy Babington, Bruce Serlin, Rebecca Schindler, A.J. Feeny-Ruiz, Toby Butler, Rebecca Upton, and Marnie McInnes

1. The minutes from the last meeting were approved.
2. Announcements : None.
3. Student Congress Forums: Toby has arranged two forums, Wednesday Oct. 15 6-7 pm and Thursday Oct. 16 4-5 pm. He will also put post-it notes in the HUB for students to express any concerns. Tob will try to advertise the forums on WGRE.

4. Academic Integrity Policy:

Marnie has noted that there may be some problems in the time-line for Grade Grievances:

1. there is no time limit for departments to respond to a student with a grade grievance. Marnie suggests changing the policy to say that the department will respond within two weeks.
2. Also students have two weeks to appeal a grade grievance decision from the URC, while in academic integrity and CCC cases students only have three days. Marnie suggested that it would be good to bring the three policies in line with each other. A discussion followed on how much time was appropriate for an appeal. The issue is that the board needs to know if there is going to be an appeal. Marnie is going to work on language for the policy that would reflect this and circulate a draft of the proposed changes.

Scott is going to work on language for the Academic Integrity Policy on whether a student can withdraw from a class while an integrity case is still pending.

5. SLAAC's next meeting is scheduled during fall break. We decided to meet next on November 13 (the following meeting in the schedule). However, SLAAC may meet sooner if something comes up in the student forums that we need to address.

6. Copyright Issue, Coursepacks, and the Printing Budget for students

After our previous meeting, Scott felt this was an issue that SLAAC would want to discuss further, and the committee agrees. From the student perspective the University's policy on copyright is dramatically increasing the costs of course materials; from the faculty perspective it is hindering their ability to provide certain materials to their students. Using Blackboard is not a long-term solution and it is affecting the printing budget.

The committee raised a number of questions:

- How was the decision on our policy made?
- How do we compare with other schools in the GLCA and in Indiana?
- What are our options (aside from the Copyright Clearance Center and Blackboard)?
- Were we previously in violation of the copyright law?

We decided that as a first step we should investigate the policies of other GLCA schools.

Minutes submitted by Rebecca S.

November 13, 2003

Present: Scott Thede, Andrew Hayes, Rebecca Schindler, Bruce Serlin, Marnie McInnes, Aaron Dziubinskyj

Approve minutes from last meeting. Minutes were approved.

Discussion of Academic Integrity policy

Proposed change to withdrawal policy: we will read this and discuss it later.

Questions from Marnie

- penalties for second violations: is there any difference between academic integrity policy and settlement form on the role of URC in second offense? No. But Marnie will change the language on the settlement form to read "usually suspension or dismissal,..." (instead of "including suspension or dismissal").

- creating a series of guidelines for URC chairs on 'typical' sanctions for second offenses.

Committees need to know what the limits of their power are.

- Grade changes: can a URC change the student's grade retroactively (from the prior class)? As stated the URC has the right to do that but the members of SLAAC feel that this is not necessarily appropriate.

- Implications of suspension: The URC does not have access to transcript or financial aid information (this can come out in the appeals process), thus the committee does not know what the implications of suspension are. Do we want to leave it this way?

- Grades for mid-semester suspension: for courses not involved in the offense the normal grade is W. Can the committee impose a penalty of 'Fs' for all courses in a suspended semester?

SLAAC feels that this would not be appropriate.

- Confidentiality: We cannot insure 'tight' confidentiality in second offenses since other members of the university will have to know (e.g., the registrar) when a student withdraws mid-semester.

Adjustment to grade grievance policy

Discussion of student issues raised in forums

Recycling: SLAAC feels that concerned students should talk to physical plant about this and we will consider later on if a faculty committee needs to get involved.

Bookstore comments: Not clear what SLAAC can do about this.

Discussion of copyright issues

Look at other GLCA policies: we will review this for next time.

Invite Dennis Trinkle and Rick Provine to comment

Plan out further discussions.