Agenda

I. Student Code of Conduct review (guest, Jeri Cabot)

II. Honor Code Sanctions review
   a. meeting scheduled with Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Standards, 3/27

III. Other committee duties
   a. Review of nominations for Alexander Chambliss Connelly Award: April meeting
   b. review of attendance policy in re: athletic-related absences
   c. review of Student Code of Conduct revisions

IV. Other items for discussion?

V. Adjournment

VI. Next meeting: Thursday, April 12, 11:00am
Agenda

1. Report on Honor Code revision proposal

   Allison met with the Academic committee on the 3rd and they were pleased with the proposal. Student member was especially pleased with the update. Retention of conduct information even when X is removed so that if law schools, medical schools, or government jobs can consult the records (within 7 years or however long they are held) as a matter of recordkeeping.

   Despite approval from Academic Standards this year, this proposal technically dies in committee because it ends with each academic year. Allison will revive it next academic year and hopefully get it back through Academic Standards and then to faculty senate because of Parliamentary Procedure.

2. Nominations for Alexander Chambliss Connelly Award
   a. SALA award ceremony on April 18 at 4 pm in the Stern Ballroom
   b. need a committee representative

   Allison cannot attend, so Ana will attend in Allison’s place to award the ACC award.

   Award nominations – It is worth asking the question of how we can get students involved in the selection process because they know more about the campus community than we do.

   We have gotten it down to 2 candidates and are awaiting Brandon’s rankings. If there is still a tie, we will consult Dean Cabot about awarding 2 students.

3. Review of student code of conduct draft

   Under “Other Violations” section:
7. No student shall sell or attempt to sell or benefit financially from any class materials provided by any instructor or guest lecturer in any course of study offered at the College of Charleston, without the permission of the instructor of record.

Under “Procedures” section

Question about administrative resolution – faculty members may not be ok with this procedure with regard to Honor Code violations. Does this have to go before faculty senate and/or does this affect updates to the FAM at all?

4. Other business
   a. Attendance policy

The committee has not changed their position with regard to the conversation about changes to the attendance policy, but welcome information as to what, if anything, has been discussed within other committees or divisions of the College.
I. Code of Conduct
   a. Administration has accepted language updates on student code of conduct
      i. Updates remove legal language regarding appeals and ensure consistency between undergraduate and graduate student handbooks.

II. Honor Code Review
   a. Review is ongoing
      i. Extensive discussion of xx-grade designation, especially whether it should be included as a possible sanction for Class 2 (serious) violations and whether it should be removed automatically after a set period of time, after completion of education, or via petition.
         1. Xx-grade might be valuable for instances where academic dishonesty is detected but student still demonstrates competency in skills of the class in other settings (e.g. student uses an unauthorized calculator on homework problem sets or Google Translate in a composition, but passes in-class exams without academic dishonesty.)
            a. In this instance, Honor board might institute xx-transcript designation as sanction for academic dishonesty, but faculty member would still assign grade based on class performance. This is different than xx-F sanction, which is assigned by Dean of Students.
         2. Removal of xx-designator from transcript. Options are
            a. Removal automatically after a set period of time
            b. Removal after completion of education on ethics and academic honesty (current program is about 10 hours, online learning, costs $100—seminar developed by former Deans of Students, with emphasis on ethical decision-making. Plagiarism/cheating is part of a
broader discussion within this seminar).

3. XX-Grade in major/minor required courses.
   a. Should this count as completing the requirement for the major? Or should student have to complete requirement in another way?
      i. If xx- drops automatically after education or a period of time, major requirement might still be considered completed—but what about a senior student in a capstone class?
      ii. If xx- must be removed via petition, can major requirement be considered completed before xx-is removed?
      iii. Further discussion of this and the removal seems to be indicated

III. Attendance Policy
   a. Request from Provost McGee to consider language of attendance policy
   b. Current attendance policy states that faculty members are expected to make “reasonable accommodations” for students who are excused absent from class as a result of representing College (e.g., athletic events, presentations at conferences, etc.) with respect to exams and class assignments.
   c. Policy does not explicitly state that reasonable accommodations should be extended to these excused absences with respect to a WA grade.
      i. Possible that faculty members with very strict WA policies might effectively bar student athletes or others from completing major or minor requirements if faculty member is only one who regularly teaches the course
   d. Discussion in committee re whether explicit statement is required in the attendance policy about “reasonable accommodations” for excused absences when calculating or assigning a WA grade. Committee has diverse responses to WA grade; some use it while others don’t see a need.
e. Discussion should continue in future meetings whether we need to update the language of the policy.

IV. Campus Climate
a. Request from Rebecca Shumway (History) and Black Students’ Union regarding statement from faculty senate over the racist Halloween costume incident in late October. President McConnell already made a statement condemning this event. Jeri Cabot confirmed that a conduct investigation is in progress, but results will not be made public.
b. Campus Climate survey was performed a few years ago (reports available in MyCharleston) but limited recommendations have been implemented.
c. Discussion over the extent to which Student Affairs and Athletics has responsibility for campus climate; general agreement that campus climate is the responsibility of the Faculty Senate and the Office of Institutional Diversity. We may wish to approach Faculty Senate to encourage them to revisit reports and recommendations and move forward on implementing more changes.

V. Student Members
a. Two student members have been nominated. We still seek nomination of one more resident female student to serve on the committee. Please forward names to Jeri Cabot so that we can include the student members in future meetings.

VI. Committee Chair
a. Sarah Hatteberg will be on maternity leave next semester. She may be able to attend meetings via Skype but cannot continue as chair.
b. Allison Sterrett-Krause volunteered to step into the chair role for next semester.
c. Election will be via email. Additional nominations and self-nominations are welcome.

VII. Other Items for Discussion

VIII. Adjournment
Faculty Senate Student Affairs and Athletics Committee  
Minutes, Meeting 10/10/2017, 8:00am  
Conference Room, Department of Sociology and Anthropology  

I. Welcome to the Committee  
- Members present: Sarah Hatteberg-Smith (Sociology, committee chair), Oleg Smirnov (Math), Ana Oprisan (Physics), Brandon Lewter (Library, via Skype), Allison Sterrett-Krause (Classics)  

II. Selecting Student Members  
- Committee makeup includes two resident student members and one non-resident student member.  
- Jeri Cabot has made suggestions for two student members, a resident male and a commuter female; we need to solicit additional an additional resident student willing to serve on the committee.  
- Student members are invited to be present at meetings. Last year’s committee failed to appoint student members.  

III. Who’s Who Award  
- Nomination to Who’s Who Among American College Students has traditionally been the purview of SAAC.  
- Dean Jeri Cabot received notice in 2017 that Who’s Who organization is not going to make the award this year while they reconsider their mission.  

IV. Alexander Chambliss Connelly Award  
- Award recognizes a graduating senior who has made selfless contributions to the College of Charleston community  
- Committee typically splits nomination packets into two groups; half of the committee reads one group, half the other group; chair reads both. Discussion of applicants’ merits in committee results in a single award.  
  - In previous years a rubric has been used, but last year a limited number of nominations were received, and qualitative ranking by committee members recognized a few top candidates. If the number of nominations increases, it might be desirable to use the rubric for ranking purposes.  
- Nominations will be sought for this award in spring. Communication will be via Yammer and faculty announcements to classes; Jeri Cabot will also make an announcement to student body and/or faculty as a whole via email to ensure that we reach a wide group of potential nominees.
• Nomination packets and all SAAC committee documents will be available to committee members via Dropbox to preserve student privacy and reduce email attachments.

V. Student Grievances
• One function of the committee is to hear grievances from undergraduates against faculty members. These grievances are only on non-academic matters. Last year the committee did not have to convene for a grievance; we hope for a similar record this year.
• Lack of clarity whether this committee also convenes for grievances of undergraduate students against College staff members. SHS will investigate whether this falls under our responsibilities.

VI. Honor Code Review
• One of two major projects for the committee this year; begun by previous committee last year (SHS and ASK are returning members).
• Periodic review of Honor Code language and sanctions; last update about a decade ago.
• Review prompted by College Honor Board, who had concerns about the stringency of the XXF sanction and lack of flexibility in current penalty system for students found responsible for academic dishonesty.
  o XXF is awarded for either Class 1 or Class 2 sanctions currently; XX designation can be removed from transcript by petition after 2 years. Nearly all students successfully petition for removal.
  o Concern also related to changing assignment structures in CofC classrooms; many instructors include numerous homework assignments, staged projects, etc. in final grade (rather than two exams and a term paper as in previous decades). Honor Board wonders if XXF is too stringent a sanction for inappropriate collaboration on a homework problem set or similar dishonesty.
• Committee last year followed a research process including conversation with current Honor Board Chair and members of the academic leadership team, research into peer institutions’ Honor systems and sanctions, and spirited discussion. 2016-2017 SAAC proposed a revision of Honor Code sanctions (3-page proposal and supporting documentation can be found in committee Dropbox).
  o Recommendations include
    ▪ Expand sanctions for class 2 violations to allow for notation of academic dishonesty without course failure (XX-Grade, e.g., XXB-, XXC+)
- Automatic second-offense sanction increase, to move second incidents up by one level of severity (from class 3 to class 2, for example) rather than automatically making any second offense class 1.
- Add qualitative descriptors to each violations class, such that faculty and students can more easily distinguish between sanction levels (Class 1: Severe, Class 2: Serious, Class 3: Minor).
- Suggest a range of appropriate sanctions for each class, to allow for greater flexibility.

**Future actions**
- Committee members this year are asked to review the current proposal. Although we do not wish to start from scratch on the proposal, it is still very much a work in progress and can be amended as the current committee believes to be appropriate.
  - In particular, please consider possible ramifications of updated policy as it might be applied, e.g.:
    - Will the policy function effectively for both traditional face-to-face and online courses?
    - What is the position of ethically questionable activities such as students selling notes via course-preparation websites? Do these rise to the level of academic dishonesty?
    - Should XX-Grade be removed automatically from transcript? Last year’s committee discussed this but did not make a formal recommendation on the matter.
    - If a student receives XX-Grade in a course for the major, minor, or general education, is the requirement considered satisfied?
  - Please provide a list of elements of the proposal that you like, don’t like, or believe to be missing, so that proposal can be amended as necessary.
- After committee discusses proposal this semester, it needs to be vetted by chairs, Deans, and departments before being forwarded to other committees and Faculty Senate in this academic year.
  - Important that we are able to anticipate possible objections so that we can answer those—preferably before F.S. receives proposal.
• Committee members asked brief questions related to proposed extended sanctions for Class 2 ("serious") violations, especially the value of the proposed XX-Grade. We will discuss in more detail at next meeting.

VI. Updates to Student Grievance Policy within Student Code of Conduct
• Jeri Cabot has updated language of student grievance policy to sound less legalistic. Language updates reflect current practice.
  o Proposed changes can be viewed in tracked copies via Dropbox.
• As Dean of Students, Jeri Cabot can make changes to Student Code of Conduct/Student Handbook unilaterally, but requests that SAAC vet language to ensure that it is clear and reasonable.
  o Complication of language change is that student grievance policies also appear in FAM and elsewhere, so changes in Student Code of Conduct need to appear in those documents as well to avoid complication or miscommunication.
  o SAAC will function largely as a liaison between Dean Cabot and relevant Faculty Senate committees such as By-laws.

VIII. Other Items for Discussion
• Future Meetings
  • SAAC will meet again on November 7, 2017, at 8:00 in the Conference Room of the Sociology and Anthropology Department.
  • Meeting’s goals will be discussion of current proposal for Honor Code revision and discussion of proposed Student Code of Conduct changes.

Meeting adjourned, 9:12 am.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Allison Sterrett-Krause