Minutes
Educational Affairs Committee
May 1, 1991

The committee met at 11:30 a.m. in the Dean's Conference Room in the College of Business Administration. Members present included: Karen Kuers, Peter Dress, Sharan Merriam, Betty Whitten, Daniel DerVartanian, Stan Longman, Delmer Dunn, Ileana Arias, and Bruce Shutt. David Radcliffe was absent. Wayne Antenen, Director, Division of Developmental Studies was present during the discussion on academic assistance. William Bracewell, Director, Office of Student Judicial Programs, and Dwight Douglas, Vice President for Student Affairs were present during the discussion on student dishonesty.

The panel reviewed once again the proposal on academic assistance. After reviewing the changes made at last meeting, it was moved, seconded, and approved sending the proposal to the University Council.

Dr. Dress introduced the discussion on student academic honesty. He indicated that a major concern was the procedure for considering cases of academic honesty was the same as the one used for conduct and ethical cases that do not have an academic component.

Dr. Douglas indicated one problem was creating a climate in which faculty became more of a partner in enforcing academic honesty. Mr. Bracewell stated that when courts first became involved in reviewing University decisions, a separation was made between conduct and academic questions like grade appeals because the former were governed by more strict due-process requirements. Cheating has been handled by courts as a conduct rather than as an academic evaluation. Mr. Bracewell also indicated that more faculty involvement was needed in the issue of academic honesty. He also reported that at other universities faculty were involved along with students in considering academic dishonesty cases.

Vice President Douglas suggested that one way to deal with the concerns of the committee would be to ask Vice President Prokasy to designate a member of his staff to work with faculty who had inquiries on academic honesty. Dr. Douglas also suggested that the same person might assist in facilitating practices by faculty that would enhance academic honesty (e.g. using different tests rather than the same test over several years). The University should also strengthen the brochures that communicate University problems in this area.

In discussing the issue the committee concluded that the best course of action would be to request that the Office of Student Affairs devise a process for considering academic dishonesty cases that would address the concerns expressed in the original report. The committee authorized the chair to write Dr. Douglas. The committee would like for the proposal to contain the following provisions: 1) faculty should be equally involved with students in determining if a student is innocent or guilty; 2) there should be only one line for considering an appeal; 3) the procedures should specify under what circumstances the student accused and the faculty member bringing the charge may and should be represented by legal counsel; 4) the procedures should specify the status of the faculty member bringing the charge e.g., whether she or he is a plaintiff or witness; and 5) the appropriate penalty for students who are found guilty.

Dr. Douglas suggested that the committee keep the Student Affairs Committee informed of its deliberations on this matter.

The committee next discussed the action of the Council that disapproved the committee proposal on department drops. Dr. Shutt indicated that information would be gathered and the proposal presented again at a later date.

The committee will meet next at 11:00 a.m. on May 7, 1991 in the same place if it is available. The minutes of April 25 will be considered at the next meeting. The committee adjourned at 12:50 p.m.