Faculty Senate
Academic Standards Committee
2007-08 Year-End Report

Submitted by Louis Marvick
April 28, 2008

Committee Members
Maureen Cronin, Anne Keniston, Frank Lucash, John Mahaffy, Louis Marvick (Chair), Barbara Millis, Pat Ragains, Banmali Rawat, Jill Wallace, Peter Weisberg

Annual Charges
1. Review existing policies at UNR that relate to fostering a "culture of completion" (including disqualification policy, drop policy and grade replacement policy) with a view to reducing student attrition rates and reducing the mean time required for students to obtain a degree. Develop a midterm progress reporting tool. Review similar policies at peer institutions. Develop recommendations for change if necessary.

2. Start a faculty-wide conversation about ensuring that faculty follow ethical rules on academic integrity. Develop a faculty honor code.

3. Review the recommendations of the 2006-2007 Academic Standards Committee concerning student academic dishonesty. Determine which of those recommendations have been implemented and which have not. Develop an implementation plan for the recommendations that have not been implemented.

Standing Charges
1. Appoint a member to the Regents' Academic Adviser Award Committee.

2. Appoint a liaison to the Core Curriculum Board.

3. Appoint a member to the Academic Advising Advisory Board.

Detailed Committee Activity (for each annual and standing charge)
1. Maureen Cronin was elected to the three advisory roles listed under **Standing Charges**.

2. A detailed account of the committee's work on its **annual charges**, including research and findings, actions taken, and recommendations with full explanations of rationale, begins on p. 5 (below). For convenience, a **concise list of the committee's final recommendations** precedes the detailed account.

Concise List of Recommendations

[Pertaining to Charge 1:]
1. The existing catalog language regarding the **policy for dropping a course** should be changed to state that students who wish to withdraw from individual classes must obtain their instructor's signature on a form stating that they have discussed their intention to withdraw with the instructor.

2. The existing catalog language regarding the **grade replacement policy** should be changed as follows:
    2a. Students may repeat a course anytime before graduation, instead of only during the next semester a course is offered.
    2b. Students may not repeat a course for which a grade of C or better is earned (except where specific degree programs require higher grades).
    2c. Repeating a course withdrawn from does not count as a grade replacement attempt.
    2d. The number of allowable grade replacement attempts should be increased to 4 courses.
    2e. Only one grade replacement attempt should be allowed per course, although more are permissible with approval from the Dean/Chair and academic advisor. Repeating a course more than once requires a plan for improvement, drafted and signed by both student and advisor, which may include tutoring and other forms of academic support.

3. Regarding **probation, disqualification, suspension and dismissal**, the committee recommends as follows:
    3a. Students under academic warning and probation should avail themselves of progressively more advisement and assistance as a condition of continued enrollment. This should take the form of a written agreement specifying the assistance the student will obtain (e.g., help with study skills, tutoring in specific subjects). The contract would be developed and signed by the student and his/her academic advisor, then signed by the student's department chair and the dean. UNR Admissions and Records would receive a copy of the contract. Course registration would be blocked until approval of the contract.
    3b. Students not raising their GPA above the threshold for disqualification after two semesters should be suspended from UNR and not readmitted until they can present a record of 15 semester credits of transferable credit at a community college or other accredited institution, with a minimum GPA of 2.5.

4. Regarding **midterm progress reporting**, the committee recommended that faculty teaching lower-division courses be strongly encouraged to use the midterm grade reporting functionality in CAIS, or some other means, to report grades of C-, D and F to students prior to the drop date. A general e-mail should be sent to alert faculty to the existence of this tool.

[Pertaining to Charge 2:]

5. The Nevada Faculty Alliance should be involved in future discussions with the Faculty Senate about the formulation of a code of ethical conduct for faculty at UNR.

6. The "faculty-wide discussion" should not begin with a campus-wide survey of all faculty, but be conducted within the Colleges. As a first step towards this, the matter should be brought before the Academic Leadership Council.

[Pertaining to Charge 3:]
7. Regarding **methods of addressing academic dishonesty** by students (reporting and sanctions):

   7a. The OSC web site should put online the standard format of the letter to be sent to students, or several different sample letters; and should include a link for faculty which would include all the information faculty need to report, verify, and learn about penalties for academic dishonesty.

   7b. The curriculum of the voluntary course in ethical decision-making for students currently being offered through the Office of Student Conduct (see pp. 31-32 below) should be evaluated by the committee. The committee should work with Sally Morgan, bearing in mind our specific curricular recommendations of several years ago, to design a course that fits both her and our needs.

   7c. The committee should propose specific language to be added to the conduct code related to retaking of courses. The Graduate School should be made aware of and take steps to implement our committee's earlier recommendations regarding the Q course and implement this policy as soon as the grade has been approved for use. The committee should discuss whether, with these changes, the current policy is adequate. If there are other issues not addressed by the current policy or by our other recommendations, the committee should identify them and make specific recommendations for Graduate Council consideration.

   7d. A mechanism should be developed for noting on the student's transcript actions taken regarding academic dishonesty that does not involve a specific course (e.g., research projects, TA work, etc.). The permanence of this notation should be treated in the same way as the Q grade for in-class dishonesty. The Graduate Council should look into this issue and make sure that a consistent policy is in place.

   7e. The Office of Student Conduct should put in place a mechanism for notifying the home department of students involved in incidents of academic dishonesty.

   7f. Sally Morgan should be asked to follow up with the Provost to ensure that changes recommended by the committee in the past (regarding the development of sanctioning guidelines to guide faculty in the academic sanction area) are in fact implemented into the Code.

8. Regarding **ways of discouraging academic dishonesty** among students:

   8a. The committee should discuss the importance of having the Provost's or President's office address publicly the issue of academic dishonesty, and of establishing how the administration will promote the importance of the issue.

   8b. As regards the modality of conducting faculty workshops, face-to-face workshops should be scheduled regularly and online options be made available.

8c. As regards faculty and student websites on academic dishonesty issues and resources, UNR's webpage should be revised to include links to other web pages (as indicated in Appendix A, p. 35 below).

9. Regarding **policy clarity** and **future directions**:

9a. Based on the help and facilities available to Sally Morgan, a definite timetable should be set up to ensure the implementation of the committee's earlier recommendation that the University Code of Conduct and Policies should, in separate sections, lay out explicitly the nature of possible academic and administrative sanctions, and distinguish these two types of sanctions clearly.

9b. Policy language should include the instruction that the committee should revisit the policy three years after it was enacted to determine how well or ill it has functioned.

Detailed Account of the Committee's Work
The Academic Standards Committee of 2007-2008 met twice as a full committee in the fall semester and arranged for each of its three annual charges to be addressed by a subcommittee. The subcommittees and their charges were as follows:

Subcommittee 1 (Maureen Cronin, Pat Ragains, Peter Weisberg [Chair]); **Charge 1**. Review existing policies at UNR that relate to fostering a "culture of completion" (including disqualification policy, drop policy and grade replacement policy) with a view to reducing student attrition rates and reducing the mean time required for students to obtain a degree. Develop a midterm progress reporting tool. Review similar policies at peer institutions. Develop recommendations for change if necessary.

Subcommittee 2 (Frank Lucash, John Mahaffy [Chair], Jill Wallace); **Charge 2**. Start a faculty-wide conversation about ensuring that faculty follow ethical rules on academic integrity. Develop a faculty honor code.

Subcommittee 3 (Ann Keniston [Chair], Barbara Millis, Banmali Rawat); **Charge 3**. Review the recommendations of the 2006-2007 Academic Standards Committee concerning student academic dishonesty. Determine which of those recommendations have been implemented and which have not. Develop an implementation plan for the recommendations that have not been implemented.

The full committee met once in the spring semester to discuss the subcommittees' reports and vote on their recommendations. Those reports are given in **Appendix A** (pp. 14-38 below). The full committee's discussion of the recommendations is synopsized in the minutes of the meeting of April 1, 2008. Minutes of all three meetings are given in **Appendix B** (pp. 39-44 below).

The result of the Academic Standards Committee's efforts for the 2007-2008 academic year can be summarized as follows:

I. Charge 1. UNR policies relating to the "culture of completion" were compared with policies at eight peer institutions. In order to bring our policies more closely into line with those that have worked well elsewhere, it will be necessary **(a)** to reduce ambiguity in current policy; **(b)** to provide students with greater flexibility to make use of available academic assistance and to mitigate the impact of past mistakes; **(c)** to ensure that students on the verge of failure receive more structured advising; and **(d)** to bring greater clarity to the disqualification process, such that students on a trajectory of failure, who are unable or unwilling to improve their academic record, are prevented from "digging a deep hole" (academically speaking) from which it would be difficult for them ever to emerge.

The following **recommendations** were approved by the full committee at its meeting of April 1:

• The existing catalog language regarding the **policy for dropping a course** should be changed to state that **instructor permission is required to drop between the second and eighth weeks**. The purpose of this change is to compel dialogue between student and instructor regarding this important decision, so that the student makes the best choice with full knowledge of current standing in, and chances of success for a given course. Specific language is suggested on p. 16 below; the committee's recommendation, however, goes to the principle rather than the specific language used.

• The existing catalog language regarding the **grade replacement policy** should be changed to reflect five proposed policy changes; namely:

1. Students may repeat a course anytime before graduation, instead of only during the next semester a course is offered.

2. Students may not repeat a course for which a grade of C or better is earned (except where specific degree programs require higher grades; honors courses may also be excepted).

3. The catalog should **state explicitly that repeating a course withdrawn from does not count as a grade replacement attempt**.

4. Increase the number of allowable grade replacement attempts to 4 courses (15 credits).

5. Allow only one grade replacement attempt per course, although more are permissible with approval from the Dean/Chair and academic advisor. Repeating a course more than once requires a **plan for improvement**, drafted and signed by both student and advisor, which may include tutoring and other forms of academic support.

Again, specific language is suggested on pp. 16-17 below; the committee's recommendations, however, go to the principles rather than the specific language used. A full account of the rationale for the proposed changes will be found in Appendix A (Report of Subcommittee 1).

• Regarding **probation, disqualification, suspension and dismissal**, the committee made two substantive recommendations:

1. Students under academic warning and probation should avail themselves of **progressively more advisement and assistance as a condition of continued enrollment**. We recommend this take the form of a **contract**, specifying the assistance the student will obtain (e.g., help with study skills, tutoring in specific subjects). The contract would be developed and signed by the student and his/her academic advisor, then signed by the student's department chair and the dean. UNR Admissions and Records would receive a copy of the contract. **Course registration would be blocked until approval of the contract.**

2. Students not raising their GPA above the threshold for disqualification after two semesters should be suspended from UNR and not readmitted until they can present a **record of 15 semester hours of transferable credit at a community college or other accredited institution, with a minimum GPA of 2.5.** [This is a reworking of the subcommittee's recommendations (3) and (4) given on page 16 below. The subcommittee's other recommendations in this category were not voted on. Again, specific changes to the catalog language is suggested on pages 12-15 below; the committee's recommendation, however, goes to the principle rather than the specific language used.]

• Regarding **midterm progress reporting**, the committee recommended that faculty teaching lower-division courses be **strongly encouraged to use the midterm grade reporting functionality in CAIS to report grades of C-, D and F to students** prior to the drop date. A general e-mail should be sent to alert faculty to the existence of this tool.

II. Charge 2. As a first step towards "starting a faculty-wide conversation about ensuring that faculty follow ethical rules on academic integrity," the chair of Subcommittee 2 addressed the Faculty Senate at its meeting of February 21. He described a number of policies and codes of ethical conduct in place elsewhere, and asked the Senate to advise the committee on how best to start such a conversation. Possibilities might include distributing a survey to UNR faculty; convening discussion forums; presenting a summary of the issue to College faculty meetings or to the Academic Leadership Council; or publishing a PowerPoint presentation on the UNR website and inviting comments. From the lively discussion that followed it appeared that there was **no consensus in the Faculty Senate that a faculty code of ethics was desirable.** Approval was expressed for the AAUP's Statement on Professional Ethics, which is both succinct and relatively comprehensive; but it was pointed out that that is a statement of principle rather than a code of conduct. Given the lack of a definite mandate from the Faculty Senate for proceeding with this charge, the committee concluded that **the Faculty Senate needs to take responsibility for the discussion,** which may mean **engaging the college deans to lead it within their respective colleges.**

At its April 1 meeting the full committee approved the following recommendations:

1. The **Nevada Faculty Alliance should be involved** in future discussions with the Faculty Senate about the formulation of a code of ethical conduct for faculty at UNR.

2. The "faculty-wide discussion" **should not begin with a campus-wide survey of all faculty, but be conducted within the Colleges.** As a first step towards this, the matter should be brought before the **Academic Leadership Council.**

Given this situation, the committee was **unable to proceed with the part of its charge requiring it to "develop a faculty honor code."** The committee also felt that the implementation of a training program conforming to NIH and NSF criteria (see minutes of ASC meeting of November 21 in Appendix B, pp. 40-41 below), although related to

the development of a general faculty code of ethics, is probably best left to be pursued as a separate issue, and on its own timetable, through Dr. Brenner's office.

III. Charge 3. The subcommittee reviewed the recommendations of last year's committee and determined which of them had, and which had not, been implemented. A condensed version follows; the full account is given in the subcommittee's report (Appendix A, pp. 30-38 below). In addition, the following **new recommendations** were approved by the full committee on April 1 and in a follow-up e-mail.

• Regarding **methods of addressing academic dishonesty** by students:

Reporting

1. The **purchase** of a streamlined, web-based reporting system, that would allow instructors to inform the Office of Student Conduct easily of cases of academic dishonesty, **should be expedited**.
[**Earlier recommendation not yet implemented.**]

2. The OSC web site should **put online the standard format of the letter to be sent to students,** or several different sample letters; and should **include a link for faculty** which would include all the **information faculty need to report, verify, and learn about penalties for academic dishonesty**.
[**New recommendation.]**

3. The time frame for faculty to report an incident of academic dishonesty should be **extended to 15 working days**.
[**Implemented as of Fall 2007.**]

Sanctions

1. Students should receive a "Q" for courses in which there has been significant academic dishonesty, indicating that this has occurred. For purposes of the student's grade point average, a Q is treated as an F. Upon successful **completion of a non-credit course on academic dishonesty**, its social costs, and methods for avoiding it, the **Q would be changed to the grade determined by the original instructor**, for a non-egregious first time offender.
[**Earlier recommendation not yet implemented.** Nevada has a uniform system of higher education; therefore a new grade of Q would have to be approved by the Faculty Senates of every unit of the system, and by the Board of Regents.]

2. Sally Morgan is currently teaching a **voluntary course in ethical decision-making for students** (see pp. 31-32 below). We **recommend evaluating the curriculum of Sally Morgan's course and then working with her**, bearing in mind our specific curricular recommendations of several years ago, **to design a course that fits both her and our needs**. We may need funding for an assistant to help her teach this course

depending on the need, or we may need to make at least part of the course available on the web.
[**New recommendation.**]

3. If a student retakes a course with an existing poor grade received due to academic dishonesty, the **original grade should not be removed from the transcript**.
[**Implemented.** Both grades now stay on the transcript, although it is not indicated that the first grade is the result of academic dishonesty.]

4. While the limit of an academic sanction assigned by the instructor is an F in the course, **instructors** should have the right to **request additional sanctions** as part of the judicial process of determining additional administrative sanctions (such as the right to refuse re-admission to the course section taught by them).
[**Earlier recommendation not yet implemented.** Specific language must be proposed; see next recommendation.]

5. The Academic Standards Committee should **propose specific language** to be added to the conduct code related to retaking of courses. The Graduate School should be made aware of and take steps to implement our committee's recommendations regarding the Q course and implement this policy when the transcript system is updated. The whole Academic Standards Committee should **discuss whether**, with these changes, the **current policy is adequate**. If there are other issues not addressed by the current policy or by our other recommendations, the committee should **identify them and make specific recommendations** for Graduate Council consideration.
[**New recommendation.**]

6. A mechanism should be developed for **noting** on the student's transcript actions taken regarding **academic dishonesty that does not involve a specific course** (e.g., research projects, TA work, etc.). The permanence of this notation should be treated in the same way as the Q grade for in-class dishonesty.
[**Earlier recommendation not yet implemented.** The Q grade requires system-wide approval; see recommendation 1 above.]

7. The **Graduate Council should look into the issue** described in (6.) above, and be sure that a consistent policy is in place.
[**New recommendation.**]

8. A student's **home department** should be **informed of incidents of academic dishonesty**.
[**Earlier recommendation not yet discussed or implemented.**]

9. The **Office of Student Conduct** should **put in place a mechanism for making the notification** recommended in (8.) above.
[**New recommendation.**]

10. UNR should develop sanctioning guidelines and case studies to guide faculty in the academic sanction area.
[**Earlier recommendation partially implemented.** Some of the policy changes we recommended have been put into the Code of Conduct. Other recommended changes have not been made. The recommendations may have been sent to the Provost; see following recommendation.]

11. We recommend asking Sally Morgan to follow up with the Provost to **ensure that any recommended changes not yet made be implemented into the Code.**
[**New recommendation.**]

• Regarding **ways of discouraging academic dishonesty** among students:

Visibility

Many of the committee's earlier recommendations have been addressed by Sally Morgan and the Office of Student Conduct (formerly Student Judicial, Mediation and Advocacy Services). Measures towards **implementation of earlier recommendations** include the offering of workshops for faculty/graduate students on an as-requested basis; a half-hour briefing from Sally during the annual required three-day training for new graduate teaching assistants; and the adding of information and links concerning ways of defining, recognizing and avoiding academic dishonesty to the Office of Student Conduct's website. The committee made the following **new recommendations**:

1. The Academic Standards Committee should **discuss the importance of having the Provost's or President's office address the issue of academic dishonesty**, and of establishing how the administration will promote the importance of the issue.

2. As regards the modality of conducting faculty workshops, **face-to-face workshops should be scheduled regularly and online options be made available.**

3. As regards faculty and student websites on academic dishonesty issues and resources, **UNR's webpage should be revised to include links to other web pages** as indicated in Appendix A, pp. 35 below).

The full committee did not act upon the subcommittee's other recommendations as to increasing the *visibility* of the issue of academic dishonesty among students (see Appendix A, pp. 33-37 below). As a point of information, however, Jill Wallace, the manager of WebCampus Support and a member of the committee, stressed that **WebCampus would like to be closely involved with the Office of Student Conduct in any future efforts to design an on-line course for students** concerning academic dishonesty.

Detection

1. UNR should buy a license to Turnitin.com adequate to cover faculty wishing to use it.

[**Earlier recommendation not implemented.** The price for a campus license for Turnitin was prohibitive at $15,000. A similar "plagiarism prevention service" called SafeAssign is integrated with Blackboard Learning System, which is UNR's system for WebCampus. Consequently, there is no additional cost for SafeAssign. Jill Wallace is currently offering training workshops on the use of SafeAssign and will coordinate its implementation with Sally Morgan.]

• Regarding **policy clarity** and **future directions**:

1. The University **Code of Conduct and Policies** (section IV, "Academic Standards") **should** in separate sections **lay out explicitly the nature of possible academic and administrative sanctions**, and distinguish these two types of sanctions clearly. [**Earlier recommendation not implemented.** Sally Morgan did not receive a copy of last year's Academic Standards Committee report until March of this year and was unaware of this recommendation. At present there is no provision for administrative sanctions since the Q grade has not yet been adopted. However, the catalog states that "A student may also be subject to discipline for academic dishonesty pursuant to the provisions of Board of Regents Code, Title 2, Chapter 6." Last year's committee recommended a method for removing the Q grade but it seems not to have gone beyond the Provost's Office. At present, Sally Morgan must inform Admissions and Records in cases where an F was given for academic dishonesty; otherwise, there is nothing to prevent a student from retaking the course for a better grade.]

2. We recommend that a **definite timetable** be set for the implementation of the committee's earlier recommendation (1. above), based on the help and facilities available to Sally Morgan.
[**New recommendation.**]

3. A more comprehensive and consistent **set of guidelines for disciplinary action** in both the academic and administrative sanction area **should continue to be developed and implemented**. These should involve progressively more severe disciplinary actions based on the degree of academic dishonesty.
[**Earlier recommendation; status uncertain.**]

4. We recommend that new **policy language should include the instruction that the Academic Standards Committee should revisit the policy three years after it was enacted** and determine how well or ill it has functioned. This recommendation arises from our cognizance of the fact that the policy on disqualification currently in place originated with the Academic Standards Committee six years ago and has not been revisited until now.
[**New recommendation.**]

***

At meetings with the chair of the committee on April 8th and 15th, the **Executive Board suggested emendations** to a number of the committee's recommendations. The chair submitted these proposed changes to the members for vote; the results were as follows:

1. Under Charge 1, we recommended that "instructor permission [be] required to drop a course" (p. 2 of the Year-End Report sent to you earlier). The Board foresees cases where faculty members might refuse to give their permission; if so, this would deprive the student of his or her right to drop. They recommended changing the language of our proposed change (p. 10, line 7 of Year-End Report) as follows: "Students who wish to withdraw from individual classes [. . .] must obtain their **instructor's signature on a form stating that they have discussed their intention to withdraw with the instructor. Signed forms** are due . . ." VOTE: **9 yes, 0 no**

2. Under Charge 1, we recommended "increasing the number of allowable grade replacement attempts to 4 courses (15 credits)" (p. 2 of Report). The Board recommended dropping the specification as to credits, and keeping only the specification as to courses (so: ". . . **attempts to 4 courses.**"). VOTE: **9 yes, 0 no**

3. Regarding probation, DQ etc. (pp. 2-3 of Report), the Board objected to the use of the term "contract" in our recommendation. The word has legal implications which might be avoided by substituting the words "**written agreement**." VOTE: **9 yes, 0 no**

4. Under Charge 1, number 2 (p. 3 of Report), the phrase "present a record of 15 semester hours" should be changed to "**a record of 15 credits.**" VOTE: **9 yes, 0 no**

5. Also under Charge 1, we recommended that faculty "be strongly encouraged to use the midterm grade reporting functionality in CAIS to report grades . . ." (p. 3 of Report). The Board recommended that this be expanded to allow for other ways of reporting the midterm grade to students; so: ". . . the midterm grade reporting functionality in CAIS, **or some other means**, to report grades . . ." VOTE: **8 yes, 1 no**

6. Under Charge 3 ("Reporting," p. 4 of Report), we recommended "extending the time frame for faculty to report an incident of academic dishonesty to 15 working days." The Board recommending adding the words "**from the time the faculty member discovers the incident**" to the end of the sentence. VOTE: **7 yes, 2 no**

7. Under "Sanctions" (pp. 4-5 of Report), the Board suggested that we might recommend an alternative to the still-non-existent "Q" grade ("a way of solving the problem locally"). This might be done by using a **variant of the F grade, perhaps F with an asterisk (F*)** to indicate an F given for academic dishonesty. This could be included in New Recommendation 5 (p. 5 of Report) VOTE: **5 yes, 3 no, 1 abstention**

In view of this result, the **wording of recommended changes 1 through 4 was modified** to incorporate the Board's suggestions; **they appear in this modified form in the Concise List of Recommendations** (p. 2-4 above). The committee approved recommended change 8 by such a decisive margin that it too, has been submitted to the Senate in its altered form. Recommendations 6 and 7, however, elicited considerable controversy within the committee; for this reason, the chair has decided to leave them in the form in which the committee originally approved them, i.e. without incorporating the

Board's recommended changes.

Appendix A: Reports of the Three Subcommittees

Subcommittee One Report

Draft Report of the "Culture of Completion" Subcommittee
- submitted to the Academic Standards Committee, April 1, 2008
- prepared by Maureen Cronin, Pat Ragains, Peter Weisberg

I. BACKGROUND:

Subcommittee One of the Academic Standards committee was charged with reviewing existing policies at UNR that relate to fostering a "culture of completion," with the goal of reducing student attrition rates and reducing the mean time required for students to obtain a UNR degree. This subcommittee was tasked with addressing (1) the UNR drop policy; (2) the UNR grade replacement policy; (3) the UNR dismissal, suspension and disqualification policy; and (4) development of a mid-term progress reporting tool. With respect to each of these tasks, the subcommittee was directed to "review existing policies at UNR and their impact on students; review similar policies and their impact at peer institutions; and develop recommendations for change, if necessary."

The subcommittee has addressed these tasks and presents its findings herein. The three-member subcommittee reached consensus on all findings presented. Our report is organized according to the four specific tasks outlined above. For each task, we provide the current UNR catalog language, followed by our proposed catalog language incorporating any recommended changes. This is followed by a short section summarizing our changes and providing a brief rationale.

We have compared UNR current policies with those of the eight peer institutions named in the 2002 UNR strategic plan: University of Arizona, UC-Davis, CU-Boulder, Colorado State University, Iowa State University, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, University of Utah, and Washington State University. We have used the results of this comparison to formulate recommendations for change that will bring UNR more in line with its peer institutions.

In formulating our recommendations, we gave primary consideration to:

(1) Reducing ambiguity in current policy, such that students have a clearer understanding of what constitutes academic success;

(2) Providing students with greater flexibility, where feasible, to make use of available academic assistance and to mitigate the impacts of past mistakes;

(3) Ensuring that students on the verge of failure receive more structured advising, so that no one "falls through the cracks;" and,

(4) Bringing greater clarity to the disqualification process such that students on a trajectory of failure, who are unable or unwilling to improve their academic record, are prevented from "digging a deep hole" (academically speaking) from which it would be difficult for them to eventually recover.

Some of our recommendations were presented to the Academic Affairs / Student Services Council (by M. Cronin, P. Ragains, 3-6-08). There was much positive feedback, but advisors expressed concern about lack of resources available for mandatory advisement of probationary students. Those resources would include additional advisement staff and increased access to academic support. We also strongly recommend improved resources for monitoring student success. We understand that resources to implement the recommended changes may not currently be available. However, questions of appropriate resource allocation at the University level are beyond the scope of this subcommittee.

An associate dean wanted the catalog to include guidance on removing students who fail to progress from major programs. We recommend that <u>next year's charges</u> include the development of <u>a university level definition of academic success</u> with a description of options/consequences for students who fail to progress. Colleges and/or major programs would then be free to develop narrower definitions of academic success if they choose to do so.

II. DROP POLICY

Existing:

Dropping a Course: Students are responsible for managing their own enrollment. Instructors are not responsible for dropping students from classes but may do so during the first week of instruction for non-attendance. Students may drop courses via ePAWS during the first eight weeks of the semester. If a course is dropped between the sixth day of classes and the end of the eighth week of classes, a grade of "W" appears on a student's transcript. Students who withdraw from the university after the eighth week of classes, and who are passing all of their classes, receive grades of "W" on their transcripts. Students who withdraw after the eighth week, and who are not passing all of their classes, receive grades of "F."

Students are not permitted to drop individual courses or change courses from grade to audit during the ninth week through the end of the semester. Under extenuating circumstances, including illness, accident or similar medical emergency or other hardship, students have the option of either requesting an incomplete grade in one or more courses, or withdrawing from the university. In both cases, students must follow the rules listed in sections of the catalog regarding these policies.

No student may drop a course to avoid discipline for academic dishonesty or a violation of the academic standards policy. If a course is dropped before discipline is imposed, any "W" may be changed to an "F". A student is not eligible to apply for grade replacement, academic renewal or improper withdrawal for the semester in which the offense occurred.

"W" signifies that a course has been dropped or that a student has withdrawn from the university with passing grades. The grade of "W" is not included in the grade-point average. After the first eight weeks of the semester, an "F" is given to students who are failing when they withdraw from the university.

Proposed:
Dropping a Course: Students are responsible for managing their own enrollment. Instructors are not responsible for dropping students from classes but may do so during the first week of instruction for non-attendance. Students may drop courses via ePAWS during the first ten days of the semester. If a course is dropped between the sixth day of classes and the end of the eighth week of classes, a grade of "W" will appear on the student's transcript. Students who wish to withdraw from individual classes between the 11th day of the semester through the eighth week of classes, must obtain their instructor's permission to do so. Signed "Permission to Drop" forms are due in the Office of Admissions and Records by five p.m. on the last day to drop. Students who withdraw from the university after the eighth week of classes, and who are passing all of their classes, receive grades of "W" on their transcripts. Students who withdraw after the eighth week, and who are not passing all of their classes, receive grades of "F."

Rationale:
The substantive change we are recommending is that instructor permission is required to drop between the 2nd and 8th weeks. The purpose of this change is to compel dialogue between student and instructor regarding this important decision, so that the student makes the best choice with full knowledge of current standing in, and chances of success for a given course. Three of our eight peer institutions require instructor permission to drop a course.

III. GRADE REPLACEMENT POLICY

Existing:

Grade Replacement Policy: Students may repeat a maximum of 12 lower-division credits (100-200 level) to replace original University of Nevada, Reno grades. The course(s) must be repeated and completed at the University during the next regular semester in which the course is offered and the student is enrolled. The most recent grade earned in the course will be used in the grade-point calculation. Students who wish to utilize the repeat adjustment policy must file an application in the Office of Admissions and Records. Students may not apply for grade replacement for courses in which they received a sanction for academic dishonesty.

Proposed:

Grade Replacement Policy: Students may repeat a maximum of 15 undergraduate credits (100-499) to replace original University of Nevada, Reno grades.
1. The course(s) must be repeated and completed at the University before the posting of an undergraduate degree. Students earning a second or subsequent undergraduate degree may replace grades for undergraduate courses taken after the posting of the last undergraduate degree but prior to the posting of the second or subsequent degree.
2. Students may use the grade replacement policy once per course. However, with the approval of their academic advisor, department chair, and dean, students may submit an application to the Office of Admissions and Records to exercise their

grade replacement rights for the same course twice. The application must be approved prior to the second attempt. Appeals must be accompanied by a plan for improvement developed with the student's advisor. Plans for improvement may require students to access tutoring and other forms of academic support.

3. Course withdrawals do not count as attempts for the purposes of this policy.
4. Students may not repeat a course for which a grade of "C" or better was earned unless the specific course requirements for the student's major or minor program require a higher grade.
5. Students may not replace a grade after they have taken and passed a course for which the original course was a prerequisite.
6. Students are strongly encouraged to repeat coursework for grade replacement within three semesters because course offerings do change.
7. The most recent grade earned in the course will be used in the grade-point calculation.
8. Students who wish to utilize the grade replacement policy must file an application in the Office of Admissions and Records. Both attempts at the course will be included on the transcript. After the grade replacement application has been processed, the first grade earned will be replaced with an "R".
9. Except when applying to replace a grade a second time, an application for grade replacement may be filed after completing the course for the second time but before a degree is posted. See (1) above for information on grade replacement for second or subsequent undergraduate degrees.
10. Students may not apply for grade replacement for courses in which they received a sanction for academic dishonesty.

Rationale:

Our proposed catalog language reflects the following policy changes:

1. **Allow students to repeat a course anytime before graduation, instead of during the next semester a course is offered**. This would provide students with greater flexibility and so foster a culture of completion. This policy revision would bring UNR more in line with its peer institutions. It would also reduce the workload on Registration and Records personnel, since many exceptions to the current policy have to be made. However, it should be specified that students cannot repeat a course for which they have already taken and passed a more advanced course, for which the course in question is a prerequisite.

2. **Students may not repeat a course for which a grade of C or better is earned** (except where specific degree programs require higher grades). This would bring UNR more in line with its peer institutions, and limits grade replacement to its true purpose of helping those students who most need it.

3. **Make explicit that repeating a course withdrawal does not count as a grade replacement attempt**. This provides students with greater flexibility.

4. **Increase the number of allowable grade replacement attempts to 4 courses (15 credits)**. This represents an increased number of credits over existing policy, and will provide students with greater flexibility.

5. **Allow only one grade replacement attempt per course**, although more are permissible with approval from the Dean/Chair and academic advisor. Repeating a course more than once requires a **plan for improvement**, drafted and signed by both student and advisor, which may include tutoring and other forms of academic support.

Proposed changes provide students with greater flexibility, and bring UNR more in line with its peer institutions. However, other changes (maximum grade limit, single replacement per course) would limit grade replacement to its true purpose of helping those students who most need it.

IV. PROBATION, DISQUALIFICATION, SUSPENSION AND DISMISSAL

Probation

Existing:

ACADEMIC PROBATION

Undergraduate students are placed on academic probation when the student's cumulative University of Nevada GPA is below the Warning threshold as defined by credits.

A student who has earned:

- **0-29 credits** and has a cumulative University of Nevada GPA of less than a 1.6.
- **30-59 credits** and has a cumulative University of Nevada GPA of less than a 1.8.
- **60 or more credits** and has a cumulative University of Nevada GPA of less than 1.9.

Students who are placed on Academic Probation will receive a letter notifying them of their academic status, which will include a recommendation to contact their advisor and other academic support services.

Release from University Probation: Undergraduate students are removed from Probation when their University of Nevada cumulative GPA meets the Academic Warning status.

Program Probation: A school or college may place a student on Probation whenever satisfactory progress toward degree objectives is not maintained. The credit load of a student on Probation is determined in consultation with the assigned advisor and, when necessary, the dean of the appropriate school or college.

Release from Program Probation: The school or college defines release from program probation.

Proposed:

ACADEMIC PROBATION

Undergraduate students are placed on academic probation as a warning that their academic progress is not satisfactory and that they must take immediate action to improve their academic performance. Students are placed on academic probation when their cumulative University of Nevada GPA is below the Warning threshold as defined by credits.

A student who has earned:

- **0-29 credits** and has a cumulative University of Nevada GPA of less than a 1.6.
- **30-59 credits** and has a cumulative University of Nevada GPA of less than a 1.8.
- **60 or more credits** and has a cumulative University of Nevada GPA of less than 1.9.

Students who are placed on Academic Probation will receive a letter notifying them of their academic status and should immediately seek assistance from their advisor, instructors, and academic support programs such as The Math Center, The Writing Center, and the Academic Skills Center. During the registration period following the student's notification of probationary status, a registration hold will be placed on the student's record. Students must meet with their advisor to create a plan for development. Plans for development must include specific, measurable goals and activities. The plans must be approved by the student's advisor and department chair. A copy of the plan for development must be forwarded to the Office of Admissions and Records. Completion of the plan for development is a condition of continued enrollment.

Release from University Probation: Undergraduate students are removed from Probation when their University of Nevada cumulative GPA meets the Academic Warning status.

Program Probation: A school or college may place a student on Probation whenever satisfactory progress toward degree objectives is not maintained. The credit load of a student on Probation is determined in consultation with the assigned advisor and, when necessary, the dean of the appropriate school or college.

Release from Program Probation: The school or college defines release from program probation.

Existing:

DISQUALIFICATION

Students who are on Probation for one semester and fail to raise their cumulative University of Nevada GPA above the Academic Probation threshold will be placed on Academic Disqualification.

Students will receive a letter notifying them of their academic status. Disqualification removes students from their academic program/major. During the registration period following a student's notification of disqualification, Admissions and Records will place a registration hold on the student's records. The student will be required to meet with an advisor, obtain a signed registration advisement sheet, and register for classes in person at the Admissions and Records counter. Disqualified students may not enroll in more than six credits or two courses per instructional term and may be restricted from certain classes.

Release from University Disqualification: Upon achieving a cumulative University of Nevada GPA above the Probationary threshold (see above), students will be released from Disqualified status, placed on Academic Warning, and allowed to enroll full-time. Students will be reinstated in their previous majors subject to the requirements of the current University of Nevada Catalog. The requirements for re-acceptance to specific programs and majors are always subject to both general University and specific program standards.

Proposed

DISQUALIFICATION

Students who are on Probation for one semester and fail to raise their cumulative University of Nevada GPA above the Academic Probation threshold will be placed on Academic Disqualification.

Students will receive a letter notifying them of their academic status. Disqualification removes students from their academic program/major. During the registration period following a student's notification of disqualification, a registration hold will be placed on the student's record. Students must meet with their advisor to create a plan for development. Plans for development must include specific, measurable goals and activities. The plans must be approved by the student's advisor and department chair. A copy of the plan for development must be forwarded to the Office of Admissions and Records. Completion of the plan for development is a condition of continued enrollment.

Disqualified students may not manage their own enrollment. They must obtain a signed registration advisement sheet from their advisor identifying not more than 12 credits of appropriate coursework per semester and must register in person at the Office of Admissions and Records.

At the end of two semesters, disqualified students must raise their GPA above the threshold for disqualification. Students who fail to do so will be suspended from the University for two years.

Release from University Disqualification: Upon achieving a cumulative University of Nevada GPA above the Probationary threshold (see above), students will be released from Disqualified status, placed on Academic Warning, and allowed to enroll full-time.

Students will be reinstated in their previous majors subject to the requirements of the current University general catalog. The requirements for re-acceptance to specific programs and majors are always subject to both general University and specific program standards.

SUSPENSION

Disqualified students who fail to raise their GPA above the threshold for disqualification after two semesters, will be suspended from the University for two years. Academic suspension is placed on the student's academic record. The official transcript of a student who has been suspended includes a "not in good standing" notation.

After two years, suspended students who wish to return must present a record of 15 semester hours of transferable credit at a community college or other accredited institution with a minimum GPA of 2.5.

Previously suspended students who are readmitted must develop a plan for improvement with their academic advisor and maintain a cumulative GPA of 2.0 or higher as a condition of continued enrollment. Readmitted students who do not maintain these standards will be dismissed from the university.

DISMISSAL

Academic dismissal is placed on the student's academic record as a permanent notation. The official transcript of a student who has been dismissed includes a "not in good standing" notation.

Following dismissal from the University of Nevada, Reno, a student may appeal to be readmitted after five years. The Special Admissions Board will review each appeal on a case by case basis.

SUMMARY AND RATIONALE: Proposed Changes Regarding Probation, Disqualification, Suspension and Dismissal

There is little evidence that UNR's current Probation/ Disqualification policy helps students return to good standing, re-enter their degree program and graduate. While under disqualified status, some students continue taking classes for several semesters. Many leave the university, and fewer than 10% eventually graduate.

Students do not benefit from remaining on disqualified status for an indefinite number of semesters. It is not an appropriate use of university resources or faculty's time and effort to allow disqualified students to remain at the university semester after semester.

We have received recommendations from Student Services staff that probationary & disqualified students should receive more frequent, structured advisement (perhaps

following an established protocol to ensure points about the student's circumstances are discussed).

The Academic Standards subcommittee has drafted the following policy recommendation. We stress that this is a draft, for which we welcome discussion and suggestions:

1.   Students under academic warning and probation should avail themselves of progressively more advisement and assistance as a condition of continued enrollment. We recommend this take the form of a contract, specifying the assistance the student will obtain (e.g., help with study skills, tutoring in specific subjects). The contract would be developed and signed by the student and his/her academic advisor, then signed by the student's department chair and Dean. UNR Admissions & Records would receive a copy of the contract. Course registration would be blocked until approval of the contract.

2.   Disqualified students would avail themselves of appropriate advisement and assistance as a condition of continued enrollment, specified in a contract, in the same form as described in #1 above.

3.   Students not raising their GPA above the threshold for disqualification after two semesters, should be suspended from UNR for two years.

4.   Before being readmitted to the university, such students must present a record of 15 semester hours of transferable credit at a community college or other accredited institution, with a minimum GPA of 2.5.

5.   Previously suspended students who are readmitted should receive advisement and assistance for at least two semesters (guided by a contract as described in #1 above) and maintain a cumulative GPA of 2.0 or higher as a condition of continued enrollment.

6.   Readmitted students who do not maintain these standards should be dismissed from the university.

7.   Following dismissal from UNR as described in #6 above, a student may be readmitted, if approved by the Special Admissions Board.

   Summary comments

A.   We believe the above recommended policies on academic warning, probation, disqualification, suspension and dismissal would best support a "culture of completion" at UNR.

B.   Regular & required contact with one's academic advisor and utilizing contracts to direct the student's improvement would provide better support for UNR students under academic warning, probation, and disqualification.

C.   UNR may wish to consider developing a structured program to readmit students who have been dismissed (see #6 above), along the lines of Colorado State University's "Academic Fresh Start." Colorado State's program is described at http://admissions.colostate.edu/Returning/FreshStart.aspx .

V. MIDTERM PROGRESS REPORTING

Faculty teaching lower-division courses are strongly encouraged to use the midterm grade reporting functionality in CAIS to report grades of C-, D, F to students prior to the drop date. Midterm grade reports should include the basis on which midterm grades have been calculated (assignments included in calculation, percentage of total grade).

The purpose of midterm grades is to provide the student and advisor with a timely warning that the student's performance to that point in the course may be lower than desirable. Students who receive midterm grade reports are strongly encouraged to discuss their academic performance with the course instructor and their advisor.

Rationale: Instructors currently have access to the CAIS reporting tool for efficiently alerting students who have low grades. It is probable that few instructors make use of this tool. It is likely that academic success would be fostered if students on a trajectory potentially leading to failure were alerted by mid-semester. Therefore, while the subcommittee did not reach consensus as to whether midterm progress reporting should be made mandatory for instructors, it did reach consensus that instructors should receive strong encouragement to utilize existing tools to notify students with a grade of less than a C.

APPENDICES: Comparisons of UNR policy with that of peer institutions

Appendix 1. Drop Policy

Institution	No Record	Drop: When, How	Record/Grade	Limit
UNR	2nd Thursday	Through the 8th week	W	None
UC, Davis	20th day	Until final exam w/dean's permission. Available in exceptional circumstances. $3 fee.		Students are expected to graduate in 4 years. Minimum progress rules require students to average 13 passed units per quarter over their career. Students who are out of compliance are not in good standing and risk disqualification. Must petition to be part-time.
U of A	1st 4 weeks	5-8th week w/Change of Schedule Form w/instructor's signature. After 8th week Chg. Form w/instructor & dean's signature.	W passing E not passing	None
U of Colorado	3rd Wed.	Through 6th week w/instructor's signature. Must be passing the class. After the 6th week in exceptional circumstances w/dean's permission.	W	None
Colorado State	3rd week	Through 8th week.	W except Core Math & English courses for students with 60+ credits then a W turns to an F.	None. Students must complete Core English and math courses in their first 60 credits. Students out of compliance must enroll in the appropriate courses and may not drop.
Iowa State	5th day	Through 10th week on Schedule Change Form w/signature of instructor and advisor. A fee is assessed. After the 10th week in very exceptional circumstances (clearly beyond the student's control).	X	5 drops allowed for students who entered as freshmen, excluding courses dropped in the 1st term.
U of Nebraska, Lincoln	6th day	Through 12th week.	W	
Washington State, Pullman	30th day	5th -9th week. A fee is assessed. After the 9th week in exceptional circumstances; except for 2 uncontested withdrawals per UG.	W	UG 1998-2004: 6 UG 2004 forward: 4

Appendix 2. Grade Replacement Policy

Peer Institution	Timing	Allowable Number Attempts	W/Ds count?	Max Grade Cutoff	Other Criteria	How Indicated on Transcript	How Counted in GPA
UNR current policy	Lower-division courses only. Next regular semester the course is offered.	Max. 12 credits	Unspecified	None	Lower-division courses only; Not allowable if low grade because of academic dishonesty	Both course grades recorded	Replacement (most recent grade counts)
Univ Arizona	Before graduation	Once per course. Max. 3 courses (10 cr)	Yes	Can only repeat C, D, E, W	N/A	Both course grades recorded	Replacement (most recent grade counts)
UC Davis	Unspecified (both undergraduate and graduate students permitted to repeat courses)	Once per course (additional times with approval of Dean). Max. 16 units	Unspecified	Can only repeat D, F, NP	Departments can restrict repeats if student has already received C- or better in a course for which that course was prerequisite	Both course grades recorded	Replacement (most recent grade counts)
UC Boulder	Before graduation	Once per course. 10 credit hours (undergrad); 1 course (grad)	Unspecified	D+ or lower (C+ or lower for grads)	Not allowable if low grade because of academic dishonesty	Both course grades recorded	Replacement (most recent grade counts)
CSU	Before graduation. Must be requested before end of W/D period.	Once per course (10 credit hours, 3 courses)	Unspecified	None	"academic fresh start policy", once per student, allowed after 5 yrs elapsed! Not allowable if low grade because of academic dishonesty	Both course grades recorded	Replacement (most recent grade counts)
Iowa State	Before graduation, but recommend within 3 semesters	Up to 15 credits	Unspecified	None		Both course grades recorded	Replacement (most recent grade counts)
Univ Nebraska - Lincoln	Before graduation	Once per course	Unspecified	C or better not allowable	N/A	Both course grades recorded	Replacement (most recent grade counts)
Univ Utah	Before graduation	Once per course	No	None	N/A	Both course grades recorded	Replacement (most recent grade counts)
Washington State	Before graduation	Once per course	Yes	C or better not allowable	N/A	Both course grades recorded	Replacement (most recent grade counts)

Appendix 3. Probation, Disqualification, Suspension and Dismissal Policies at Peer Institutions
This is a lengthy document that the subcommittee will provide upon request.

Subcommittee Two Report
John Mahaffy, Jill Wallace, Frank Lukash

Charge to Subcommittee

The charge to subcommittee 2 is to recommend starting a faculty-wide conversation about ensuring that faculty follow ethical rules on academic integrity. A supplement to the charge was implied by Mark Brenner's meeting with the ACS at which he discussed training programs in the "responsible conduct of research at NIH and NSF."

Subcommittee Progress

The subcommittee first reviewed some examples of statements and codes of ethics produced by other institutions, including one by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). Following consideration of how UNR faculty might be engaged in a discussion on this topic, including both the pertinent questions and the methodology to be employed, we agreed that we wanted more guidance from the Faculty Senate.

John Mahaffy represented the subcommittee at the February 21 meeting of the Faculty Senate. The discussion focused on the following document prepared by the subcommittee and distributed to senators prior to the meeting.

Academic Standards Committee, Sub-Committee on Faculty Ethics (discussion topic)

The Faculty Senate charged the Committee to: "Start a faculty-wide conversation about ensuring faculty follow ethical rules on academic integrity." One of the subcommittees working on this is focused on academic dishonesty and a faculty code of ethics. We want input and guidance from the faculty senate on how to proceed with initiating a faculty cnversation on this topic.

<u>What we have now.</u>

The *Nevada System of Higher Education Code* (6.2.2. Standards of Conduct) addresses a variety of specific issues that could be interpreted to fall within the "ethics" rubric. One clearly does: "Acts of academic dishonesty, including but not limited to cheating, plagiarism falsifying research data or results, or assisting others to do the same."

<u>What some others do</u>.

We found a number of other institutions and associations with more comprehensive and specific guidelines regarding faculty ethical behavior. Below is a very brief synopsis of each, including a Web link to the full statement.

American Association of University Professors, Committee on Professional Ethics

Adopted in 1987, this Statement on Professional Ethics is both a succinct and relatively comprehensive set of guidelines addressing faculty behavior regarding: their discipline, as teachers, as colleagues, as members of an institution re: academic freedom and as members of their community.

http://aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/statementonprofessionalethics.htm

Arizona State University

This faculty code of ethics was adopted in 1986 and includes a number of areas of responsibility. Each area includes descriptions of Ethical Standards and Types of Unacceptable Conduct. The areas are: Responsibilities to Teaching and Students, Responsibilities to Scholarship, Responsibilities to the University, Responsibilities to Colleagues and Responsibilities to the Community. http://asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd204-01.html

Saddleback College

The Faculty Cole of Ethics and Professional Standards document also uses categories (Students, Colleagues, Disciplines, College and Community). Within each category, an ethical principle is described, followed by specifically stated standards of conduct.

http://www.saddleback.edu/gov/senate/acsen/acsen/ethics.html

We are asking the Faculty Senate to advise us on:

How to start a faculty conversation regarding the need for a faculty code of ethics and, if one is needed, what it should include? Possibilities include:

1. Survey UNR faculty
2. Convene discussion forums
3. Offer to present a summary of the issue to College faculty meetings, chairs, or ?
4. publish a PowerPoint presentation on the UNR web site and invite comments
5. Others

Discussion of this topic at the Faculty Senate meeting was lively, however there appeared to be no consensus that a faculty code of ethics was desirable. In the end, there was some sentiment for the AAUP statement (see document above), particularly as UNR already has a relationship with AAUP. We did not receive the clear guidance we sought, but Steve Rock said that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee would discuss this further.

Subsequently, Steve suggested that the "faculty conversation" might occur more appropriately at the college level, rather than the campus level and discussed the idea of placing the issue on the agenda of the Academic Leadership Council (ALC) with Jannet Vreeland and Bill Follette. They agreed that input from the Deans is important; Steve and I are scheduled to meet with the ALC at their April 8 meeting.

The Faculty Senate discussion raised the idea that UNR is an AAUP institution and, as such, may already subscribe to the AAUP's statement on faculty ethics. As we tried to gain a better understanding of UNR's relationship to the AAUP, we posed the question to Glenn Miller, president of the UNR chapter of the Nevada Faculty Alliance and received this response.

Good question. I don't believe that any academic institution is a formal member of the AAUP, since the AAUP is an organization of faculty, with chapters at individual institutions and state conferences of several chapters. The NFA is the AAUP organization in Nevada, with chapters at several of the NSHE schools in Nevada. As a member of the NFA, I am also a member of the AAUP. The AAUP national meeting was held at UNR last summer, and UNR was the host chapter. For clarity, I went to the AAUP website www.aaup.org and found the following:

The AAUP is a network of faculty and academic professionals, organized into campus-based chapters and state conferences and backed up by national and field staff. The AAUP's strength and promise is in our members.

On campus, AAUP chapters advocate for faculty rights and interests at an institutional level. Some serve as collective bargaining agents. See a directory of AAUP chapter Web sites.

A state conference is formed when several chapters in a state decide to work together to advance AAUP policies and goals. Through a state conference, existing chapters are able to have more influence statewide and new chapters find the support and guidance they need closer to home. Contact your state conference.

You can become more involved by becoming a member of the AAUP, making a financial contribution, starting a chapter on your campus, lobbying your state or federal legislators, or attending an AAUP meeting or conference.

So, I would agree with your final sentence- UNR is not a member of the AAUP, but the UNR NFA Chapter is the AAUP affiliate on the UNR campus.

Finally, the idea of having a code of ethics is good, and we would very much like to participate with the Faculty Senate in this process. Please keep us (me) informed as this process moves forward. I do feel that the AAUP Code of Ethics has some important thoughts in it for the beginning discussion on a UNR Code of Ethics.

Finally, I cc'd this to Jim Richardson and Frank Hartigan and they can add comments if mine are not complete.

Status and Recommendation

As may be surmised from the above description of the subcommittee's activity, this process is still very much in play. Consequently, we are not ready to make a specific recommendation about a starting a faculty conversation about faculty ethical behavior. Our general conclusion is that the Faculty Senate needs to take responsibility for the discussion, which may mean engaging the college deans to lead it within their respective colleges. The April 8 ALC meeting should help inform decisions about how to proceed. The message from Glenn Miller suggesting that the Nevada Faculty Alliance would like to work with the Faculty Senate on this likely is welcome news, but adds to the complexity and timeline to work out both the nature and strategy of the faculty conversations. As there appears to be interest in this topic from several perspectives and no real urgency to reach a decision, we recommend allowing the process to proceed.

The training issues raised by Mark Brenner, although related to a faculty code of ethics, seems to us to be enough of a separate issue that it should continue to be pursued through his office and on its own timetable. We believe Dr. Brenner indicated that such training needs to conform to NIH and NSF criteria and will need to occur regardless of what UNR decides to do regarding a faculty code of ethics.

Subcommittee Three Report

Below are our committee's original 2006 recommendations about academic dishonesty penalties and prevention, followed by an update of what has been implemented to date (in italics) and our subcommittee's recommendations (in boldface).

Methods for Addressing Academic Dishonesty

(Subcommittee Three, pt. 1, report prepared by Anne Keniston)

Reporting
• A streamlined, web-based reporting system should be put into place that would allow instructors to inform the Office of Student Judicial Affairs easily of cases of academic dishonesty.

This hasn't been implemented yet. The Office of Student Conduct (formerly the OJSA) has purchased "Odyssey," a judicial database that allows for web based reporting and tracking of

reports. Someone in IT is trying to get this in place by the end of the semester. Sally is working on setting up a way to report AD on line, where one copy is sent to Sally on the web and a letter is generated to the student at the same time.

Recommendation: We recommend suggesting that this purchase be expedited; in the meantime, we suggest that OSC put on line the standard format of the letter to be sent to students or several different sample letters.

We also suggest that OSC web site include a link for faculty which would include all the information faculty need to report AD, verify AD, and learn about penalties for AD and that would include information about syllabus language, classroom strategies for preventing and making students aware of AD, etc.

• The time frame for faculty to report on incident of academic dishonesty should be extended to 15 working days

Done as of Fall 2007

Sanctions
• The campus should adopt a policy successful pioneered at the State University of New York – Stony Brook: Students should receive a "Q" for courses in which there has been significant academic dishonesty indicating that this has occurred. For purposes of the student's grade point average, a Q is treated as an F. Upon successful completion of a non-credit course on academic dishonesty, its social costs, and methods for avoiding it, the Q would be changed to the grade determined by the original instructor, for a non-egregious first time offender. These sanctions are in addition to any other disciplinary and academic sanctions provided through normal processes. In the case of egregious offences or in the case of a repeat offences the potential for deletion of the Q grade from a student's record would not normally be possible.

This hasn't been done yet because the CIS transcript system won't allow it; no piecemeal changes or corrections can be made to the system. The university is attempting to get a new system, which should be presented to the regents soon.

As for the "Q course," Sally currently is teaching a voluntary course in ethical decision making for students; this is taught to small groups recommended by profs who know about it. Many don't know about this course and it could be better publicized. Sally proposed adding info about the course to the AD web site, perhaps in a new section of information for faculty. Sally clarified that the course she is teaching is different in parameters from the "Q course"; AD is currently defined during orientation, and her course does not focus on the definitions of AD but on student decision making more generally..

Recommendation: We recommend evaluating the curriculum of Sally Morgan's course and then working with her, along with our specific curricular recommendations of several years ago to design a course that fits both her and our needs. We may need funding for an

assistant to help her teach this course depending on the need or we may need to make at least part of the course on the web.

• If a student retakes a course with an existing poor grade received due to academic dishonesty, the original grade should not be removed from the transcript.

This has been fixed. (It was only ever the case that this option of "repeat adjustment" was available for courses at the 100/200 level). Now both grades stay on the transcript, although it is not indicated that the first grade is the result of AD.

• While the limit of an academic sanction assigned by the instructor is an F in the course, as part of judicial review, instructors themselves should have the right to request additional sanctions as part of the judicial process of determining additional administrative sanctions (such as the right to refuse re-admission to the course section taught by them).

Sally suggests that we propose language for the policy specifying, for example, that students can retake courses with the same instructor only at that instructor's discretion. She also said that other administrative sanctions (regarding graduate committee membership, etc.) should be specified in the policy language. Our committee needs to propose this language.

Marsha Read of the Graduate Council says that much AD among graduate students is course-related (ie, even comps and theses have course numbers) so the penalties are consistent with those for other courses. Students committing AD are showing evidence of "failure to progress" and thus are eligible for dismissal from programs. (This may only be the case if the student fails the course.) If they are suspended from a program, the program can allow the student to apply or be reinstated after a specified period, or the student can apply to another program. There is no written policy clarifying that faculty can refuse to serve on graduate committees following AD, but this has occurred in several cases; at that point, students are eligible to reconfigure their committees but the reason for this reconfiguration is not specified on the transcript.

Recommendation: We should propose specific language to be added to the conduct code related to retaking of courses. The Graduate School should become aware of and take steps to implement our committee's recommendations regarding the Q course and implement this policy when the transcript system is updated. The whole Academic Standards Committee should discuss whether with these changes the current policy is adequate. If there are other issues not addressed by the current policy or by our other recommendations, the committee should identify them and make specific recommendations for Graduate Council consideration.

• A mechanism should be developed for noting on the student's transcript actions taken regarding academic dishonesty that do not involve a specific course (e.g., research projects; TA work; etc). The permanence of this notation should be

treated the same as the Q grade for in class dishonesty.

This does not exist because of the problem with the transcript system outlined above. Sally also wondered whether the transcript was the right place for this notation to occur. For eg, if the AD involves TA work, perhaps it should be indicated elsewhere.

Recommendation: We recommend that the Graduate Council look into this issue and be sure that a consistent policy is in place.

• A student's home department should be informed of incidents of academic dishonesty, so that advisors and other key parties will be informed of the student's situation.

This has not been discussed or implemented, though it can be done if we clarify the mechanism for this.

Recommendation: We recommend asking that Sally's office put in place a mechanism for this notification.

• UNR should develop sanctioning guidelines and case studies to guide faculty in the academic sanction area. Normally, the minimum penalty should be at least a grade of "F" on the assignment; in many cases, a grade of "F" in the course should be the appropriate penalty. We recommended offering a 1 or 2 step grade reduction for the entire course in addition to the current choices. It should be a very exceptional situation in which students would be permitted to rewrite plagiarized essays, retake exams on which cheating has occurred, or withdraw without penalty from courses in which an accusation of academic dishonesty has been made.

Some of the policy changes we recommended have been put into the code of conduct (e.g., the 1-2 grade reduction in the course grade). Other recommended changes have not been made. The change recommendations may have been sent to the provost.

Recommendation: We recommend that we ask Sally to follow up with the provost to ensure that any recommended changes not yet made be implemented into the code.

Discouragement of Academic Dishonesty

(Subcommittee Three, pt. 2, report prepared by Barbara Millis

and Katy Schleef, Excellence in Teaching Program.)

Visibility
• The President and/or Provost should make clear to the University community the importance of the issue of academic dishonesty to the integrity of the University.

Barbara planned to discuss with Jannet Vreeland at a meeting on March 10 but Jannet canceled the meeting.

Sally Morgan emphasized the importance of having the Provost's or President's office address the issue of academic dishonesty, and of establishing <u>how</u> the administration will promote the importance of the issue. She suggested that the AS committee actually propose specific plans to facilitate the process. Examples: poster campaign, letter from the President to all new faculty, having the faculty routinely sign an honor code addressing academic dishonesty.

Recommendation: These topics should be discussed by the entire committee.

Education and Resources
• A faculty workshop designed to help discourage academic dishonesty should be created and made available to faculty on a voluntary basis. The procedures to be followed in such cases should be included in this training. Faculty should learn about proactive strategies to prevent academic dishonesty (e.g., creating multiple tests, Turnitin.com), not just the methods to address it once it has occurred.

Sally Morgan currently presents workshops for faculty/graduate students on an as-requested basis. This past fall, two one-hour workshops addressing academic dishonesty were presented September 7 and 14. The decision was made by the Provost's office to hold these workshops separately from new faculty orientation rather than trying to fit the content into the orientation in August. Sally has also done workshops at the request of Marsha Read. The Excellence in Teaching Program had planned to offer workshops on this topic once a semester and to bring in James Hammond, University of Arkansas, a national recognized expert on preventing plagiarism, to offer workshops.

Sally thinks the best approach to faculty workshops would be to design an on-line course on WebCT, similar to what is now being done for the sexual harassment training. The faculty could access this at any time and receive a certification after successfully completing the course. Such a course would incorporate real-life case examples from different disciplines, and would have built-in assessment features to assure that the content was understood and assimilated. The subcommittee noted that online courses that are not well designed are unpopular with faculty and seen as obstacles, not education.

GRAD 701, the annual required three-day training for new teaching assistants, has included a half-hour briefing from Sally (see "GRAD 701 Academic Standards handout"). This includes information on charging students with violations of the Academic Standards Policy, options for sanctions, and tips to discourage academic dishonesty.

Recommendation: Face-to-face workshops should be scheduled regularly and online options be made available on a voluntary basis.

• Faculty and student Web sites on academic dishonesty issues, resources, and an online tutorial defining plagiarism and how to avoid it, should be established.

UNR's Office of Student Conduct (formerly Student Judicial, Mediation and Advocacy Services) has information on their website at: http://www.unr.edu/sjmas/, regarding academic standards for students

Resources outside the UNR website include:

A comprehensive website on detecting and preventing academic dishonesty/plagiarism can be found on SUNY Stonybrook's website at: http://www.sunysb.edu/uaa/academicjudiciary/policies.shtml

The Center for Academic Integrity at Clemson University has a comprehensive website that includes educational materials: http://www.academicintegrity.org/index.php

Indiana University's plagiarism webpage contains examples of acceptable and unacceptable paraphrases: http://www.indiana.edu/~wts/pamphlets/plagiarism.shtml

A number of tutorials on academic dishonesty are available on-line; one example is from Acadia University: http://library.acadiau.ca/tutorials/plagiarism/

Recommendation: Re-do the web page including links to other web pages for students as well as faculty.

• New faculty orientation should thoroughly address these issues.

See section on faculty workshops, above. This past fall the decision was made to offer academic dishonesty workshop separately from new faculty orientation, to ease time constraints.

Recommendation: Academic honesty needs to be referenced and faculty given handouts with links to new web page.

• Students should be made aware of the University policies on academic dishonesty and the resources available to understand and avoid it in a pamphlet to be handed out at new-student orientation.

Sally indicated that currently new student orientation gives students the option of meeting with her, but does not have a required academic dishonesty component, other than providing students with the printed policy.

Millenium scholar orientation has included a meeting with Barbara King and Sally Morgan, so all Millenium scholars hear a presentation on academic dishonesty. According to Sally, this has accounted for roughly 75% of the new student population in recent years. Sally thinks this may be part of the reason for the recent drop in the number of academic dishonestly cases.

Because of the fact that new students are bombarded with so much information at once, Sally thinks that an on-line student course on academic dishonesty would be a good idea. New students would be given a window of time in which to complete the course on their own.

Another important means of making students aware of this issue are faculty presentations during class time. Sally emphasized how powerful this can be for two reasons: faculty can tailor the content to their discipline, and students potentially hear about academic dishonesty multiple times and from multiple sources.

Recommendation: Webpage could include tips for instructors, study skills for students, more online resources, and optional online course for students to supplement Sally Morgan's face-to-face one. Students might also be informed about academic dishonesty issues on a routine basis in English 101 or 102.

• Faculty should be made aware of the current University policies on academic dishonesty (e.g., the need to report cases of dishonesty to SJA).

See faculty workshops, new faculty orientation sections above.

• The university should make available standard language for course syllabi concerning the definition of academic dishonesty/plagiarism and the academic and disciplinary sanctions that will be imposed should it occur. We suggest that SJA be tasked with generating that language.

A search of the UNR website on "academic dishonesty" returned the pdf file http://www.unr.edu/catalog/uccc/SAMPLE%20of%20Academic%20Dishonesty%20Statements.pdf (see "AD Sample Statements") which contains sample academic dishonesty statements; however the link to this page from the University Courses & Curriculum Committee forms page, http://www.unr.edu/catalog/UCCC/forms.htm, is broken. Sally reviewed this document and indicated that it has some excellent content, but needs updating (this may be why it's no longer linked to UCCC's webpage). Consistent with the recommendation that Sally's office generate the language, Sally recommends bringing any such sample statements to her for review.

The ETP publication "Syllabus Toolbox" contains examples of syllabus statements regarding academic dishonesty.

Recommendation: Post the Toolbox and update the syllabus section.

• Additional resources should be provided to SJA and other units tasked with the additional prevention, training and enforcement activities envisioned in this report in order to enable practical application of the increased campus importance being placed on dealing effectively with academic dishonesty.

It sounds as though additional resources haven't been provided as yet, in part because the plan has not yet been made operational, i.e., projects prioritized and an action plan delineated for each. Sally emphasized the need for the AS committee to prioritize proposed changes and new

initiatives, especially those with a budget. For example, she would need assistance (perhaps a graduate assistant) in order to offer the workshops/interventions that would be required of students in order to remove a Q grade, if that system was put into place. She would need an instructional designer to help set up WebCT courses on AD for faculty and students.

Detection
• The campus should buy a license to Turnitin.com adequate to cover faculty wishing to use it. The nature and of this software program will be described in more detail in the main body of the report, but in brief it allows faculty to require that papers submitted for courses be submitted to a web portal and screened for possible plagiarism.

According to Jill Wallace, the price for a campus license for Turnitin was prohibitive - $15,000. SafeAssign is a similar "plagiarism prevention service" that is integrated with Blackboard Learning System, which is UNR's system for WebCampus. Consequently, there is no additional cost for SafeAssign. Jill is currently offering training workshop on SafeAssign – one was offered in February, and one is scheduled for April 7. Jill indicated that some departments have purchased their own licenses for Turnitin.

Note: SafeAssign is the program of choice at SUNY Stonybrook; their website referenced above delineates advantages of SafeAssign over Turnitin.

Recommendation: Faculty should be made aware of SafeAssign.

Policy Clarity and Future Directions

(Subcommittee Three, pt. 3**,** report prepared by Banmali Rawat)

- We recommend that the University Code of Conduct and Policies (section IV, "Academic Standards") should in separate sections lay out explicitly the nature of possible academic and administrative sanctions, and distinguish these two types of sanctions clearly.

Sally Morgan never received the 2007 report of ASC until yesterday (March 10, 2008) when I e-mailed one to her. Academic Sanctions are already in the Catalog 2007-08. At present there is no provision for administrative sanctions as there is no ability to add Q grade in the current transcript system. However the catalog definitely reads "A student may also be subject to discipline for academic dishonesty pursuant to the provisions of Board of Regents Code, Title 2, Chapter 6. *Due to these reasons this has not been completely implemented yet.*

The 2006 ASC had already recommended the method to remove Q grade but according to Sally Morgan, it never went beyond Provost's Office. She suggests that the transcript should say that Q is due to Academic Dishonesty.

Recommendations: We should emphasize this in the current year's report and set some time table for implementation based on the help and facilities available to Sally.

- Beyond our specific recommendations in this area, a more comprehensive and consistent set of guidelines for disciplinary action in both the academic and administrative sanction area should continue to be developed and implemented. These should involve progressively more severe disciplinary actions based on the degree of academic dishonesty. In the administrative sanction area, repeated instances should be treated very seriously.

This will continue in future. Once both the sanctions are in place, the feedback from dishonesty cases , pertinent sanctions and impact of the related workshops will be helpful in developing further sanctions in both the categories.

Recommendations: The ASC can recommend some more severe sanctions based on the previous experience or should wait for the firs phase implementation of both the sanctions until next year.

- We recommend that a future committee draft an honor code for the University

My understanding is that some subcommittee is already doing this work.

Appendix B: Minutes of the Academic Standards Committee meetings, 2007-2008

Minutes of the meeting of October 12, 2007

Rawat Banmali, Maureen Cronin, Frank Lucash, John Mahaffy, Louis Marvick (Chair), Barbara Millis, Patrick Ragains, Peter Weisberg

Standing Charges
Maureen Cronin kindly volunteered to be the Committee's liaison to the Core Curriculum Board, the Academic Advising Advisory Board, and the Regents' Academic Advisor Award Committee.

Proposed Charges
1. We began the "faculty-wide conversation about ensuring that faculty follow ethical rules on academic integrity." Stephen Rock confirmed by telephone that the charge pertains to the conduct of faculty, not students. The following points were raised in discussion: Was it necessary or desirable to formulate a more explicit code of conduct for faculty than already exists? Was not such a code already spelled out in the contractual terms of faculty employment and in the University Code of Conduct? What was meant by the charge's reference to "academic and administrative sanctions" for faculty? How could such sanctions be anything but administrative? Did not the peer review process already in place (and, sometimes, professional licensing boards) serve to ensure the "academic integrity" of faculty members? How rigid a code of conduct was contemplated? Were faculty campus-wide likely to welcome a solicitation of their views on this subject? In contrast to the skeptical tenor of this response to the charge, it was also suggested that, if a range of sanctions for academic dishonesty is to be put in place, the guidelines for faculty conduct ought to be correspondingly detailed and explicit.

Barbara Millis volunteered to see what sorts of honor codes for faculty exist at other institutions. John Mahaffy volunteered to look at the existing language of the NSHE Code.

2. Maureen Cronin explained the context of the second charge. At present there is no limit to the length of time a student can remain on disqualified status at UNR. If a student is allowed to enroll for six credits despite being disqualified, should he or she be required to show improvement in that semester (and if so, how much) or be allowed to take more classes in subsequent semesters until a mathematical point of irremediable failure is reached? Should a mathematical standard be strictly applied or should academic advisors have some discretion in individual cases? If the latter, would not a question of liability arise? At present there is no consistent oversight of students on probation and no automatic intervention in cases of disqualified students who continue to enroll.

Frank Lucash volunteered to look at the relevant language in the UNR General Catalog. Maureen Cronin volunteered to look at how other institutions handle the problem. She also distributed a "Draft Proposal to Revise Grade Replacement Policy" for the Committee to examine and respond to at its next meeting.

3. The Committee inferred that the third proposed charge—to develop "a more comprehensive and consistent set of guidelines for disciplinary action in both the academic and administrative sanction area"—must refer to the conduct of students, not faculty. Before undertaking this charge we must find out exactly what the Committee recommended in its report to the Faculty Senate of last year. Louis Marvick volunteered to do this.

Minutes of the meeting of November 21, 2007

Maureen Cronin, Anne Keniston, Frank Lucash, Louis Marvick (Chair), Barbara Millis, Pat Ragains, Jill Wallace, Peter Weisberg

Guests: Mark Brenner, Bill Follette

1. The minutes of the October 12 meeting were approved.

2. Charge #1. Dr. Mark Brenner described the implications for UNR of the recently mandated training programs in the Responsible Conduct of Research at NIH and NSF. We can anticipate that we will be required to institute such a program at UNR (at least for labs receiving funding from NSF) and may wish to take this opportunity to define eventual content and applicability more precisely. The requirement poses a number of questions:

- Who would be required to participate in such a training program (graduate students, post-docs, junior faculty, senior faculty)? Should participation be required of everyone or only of participants in research projects receiving funding from NSF?

- At what level would the program be administered (the colleges, the departments)?

- How subject-specific should the content of the training program be?

- Who will attest to satisfactory completion of the training program (the principal investigator, the chair, the institution)?

- How much time should the training program take (an hour's workshop, a one-credit course)?

- What is the most effective way to engage faculty in a discussion of these questions?

A number of points emerged from our discussion:

- It is clearly desirable for the training program(s) to be as discipline-specific as possible, since the "fuzzy areas" connected with the responsible conduct of research are often tied to matters having a peculiar importance within one discipline but not within another (e.g., questions arising from multiple authorship).

- A valuable resource exists in the department-specific guidelines for the responsible conduct of research assembled by the Graduate School of the University of Minnesota (http://www.grad.umn.edu/ethics/).

- The Misconduct Policy at UNR is currently being redrafted by Dr. Brenner. This could provide the occasion for soliciting faculty input—at, say, a forum organized to discuss one item of possible misconduct.

- We assume that most cases of misconduct are not deliberate. Our intent in beginning this discussion is not to "set traps" but to "smooth the road" by identifying possible problems of which researchers may not be aware.

In view of the great differences among disciplines, the committee decided to proceed as follows:

- Ask the Academic Leadership Council to advise us in defining the extent of our committee's involvement in framing elements of the new code.

- Equipped with that understanding, submit a set of questions about the possible content of a future training program to the deans of the colleges at one of their monthly meetings.

- Ask the deans to raise these questions with the department chairs of their colleges, who in turn will raise them with the faculty of their departments; and to convey the results to us, so that we may begin to identify the kinds of problems that arise in connection with the responsible conduct of research in specific disciplines.

3. Charge #2. Dr. Follette told the committee about the "issues of retention and enrollment" before the Faculty Senate. Many students drop out of UNR as a result of being unaware of deadlines for dropping and adding courses or because those deadlines fall before they know if they are passing or failing a course. A change in the add/drop policy is contemplated; there should be a faculty debate about this. The matter is relevant to the second of our committee's charges (to recommend how long students can remain on Disqualified Status) inasmuch as it, too, has to do with "fostering a culture of completion" at UNR. We agreed to consider the matter and to forward our recommendations as to wording or principle to Dr. Follette, Chair Elect of the Faculty Senate Executive Board. Any recommendations should be tied to specific data.

4. The meeting adjourned without further discussion of our charges.

The subcommittees' charges were conveyed in a letter from the committee chair on December 28, 2007. It read in part:

It turns out that not all of the Faculty Senate's charges were communicated to the Academic Standards Committee last fall. In addition to the three we received there were three more:
  Review the drop policy.
  Review the grade replacement policy.
  Develop a mid-term progress reporting tool.

Clearly, these three are related to the second of the charges we were given in September, namely to review the current disqualification policy. All four are aspects of the "culture of completion."

We need to form subcommittees to work in three areas.

Subcommittee 1: The charges relating to a "culture of completion." The Executive Board would like us to review existing policies at UNR and their impact on students; review similar policies and their impact at peer institutions; and develop recommendations for change, if necessary. After the committee as a whole has accepted the subcommittee's recommendations we will present them for feedback to the Advising Advisory Board, the UCCC, the Core Board, and the AA/SSC, modify them as appropriate, and submit them to the Faculty Senate.

Subcommittee 2: The first of our original charges, which asks us to initiate a faculty-wide discussion on academic dishonesty and develop a faculty honor code. This subcommittee should develop the leads we started to follow last term and aim to produce something we can show (or submit) to departments university-wide. This might include a PowerPoint presentation comparing faculty honor codes at (say) five peer institutions; or a list of proposed suggestions for a faculty honor code at UNR; or a questionnaire addressing the discipline-specific problems involved with the development of such a code for humanities and science departments. The subcommittee could recommend a way to implement what it develops (i.e., an e-mail survey? a presentation to Chairs and faculty by invitation? a posting on the Faculty Senate website?).

Subcommittee 3: The third of our original charges, which is tied to this committee's previous recommendations concerning student Academic Dishonesty that have yet to be fully implemented. The subcommittee should review the Annual Report of the 2005-2006 Academic Standards Committee; determine which of the committee's recommendations have been implemented and which have not; develop an implementation plan for the recommendations that have not been implemented; seek the Senate's approval of the implementation plan; and (with the mandate of the full committee) help bring about the implementation of those changes for the Fall of 2008. To accomplish this, the subcommittee will have to consult with the Executive Board and Sally Morgan about problems of implementation and language.

Minutes of the meeting of April 1, 2008

Rawat Banmali, Maureen Cronin, Linda Kuchenbecker (*ex officio*), Frank Lucash, John Mahaffy, Louis Marvick (Chair), Jill Wallace, Peter Weisberg

1. Peter Weisberg presented the report and recommendations of Subcommittee 1, charged with revising and clarifying UNR policy regarding the "culture of completion" (drop policy, grade replacement and disqualification/probation). UNR's policies were compared with those of eight peer institutions. To bring UNR's policies more in line with theirs, the subcommittee recommended measures intended to reduce ambiguity in current policy; provide students with greater flexibility to make use of available academic assistance; ensure that students on the verge of failure receive more structured advising; and bring greater clarity to the advisement process so

as to remove the possibility that failing students may continue to enroll in new courses indefinitely.

The subcommittee's report and recommendations are found in Appendix A of the Year End Report to the Faculty Senate of the Academic Standards Committee 2007-2008 (attached). The committee approved all the recommendations of Subcommittee 1 unanimously with the exception of the recommendation that the catalog language be changed to state that "students may not repeat a course for which a grade of C or better is earned [etc.]"; one committee member abstained from that vote (6 yes, 1 abstention).

Before we voted, Peter Weisberg stressed that the committee's vote should be understood to pertain to the principle of each proposed change, rather than to the specific new catalog language worked out by the subcommittee.

There was much discussion of the subcommittee's recommendation that "students under academic warning and probation should avail themselves of progressively more advisement and assistance as a condition of enrollment," and that this contact and supervision should "take the form of a contract." The committee recognized that the proposed change would be likely to place a burden on academic advisers and on the Writing Center, and that a new form (or forms) would have to be created. Nevertheless, in view of President Glick's emphasis on fostering a "culture of completion" and increasing enrollment (by retention as well as recruitment, presumably), the committee voted unanimously in favor of this recommendation.

2. John Mahaffy presented the report and recommendations of Subcommittee 2, charged with starting a faculty-wide conversation about ensuring that faculty follow ethical rules on academic integrity. The subcommittee's report is found in Appendix A of the Year End Report to the Faculty Senate of the Academic Standards Committee 2007-2008 (attached). John described the mixed reaction to the charge at the Faculty Senate meeting of February 21. The committee concurred with the subcommittee's finding that, in view of this mixed response, "we are not ready to make a specific recommendation about starting a faculty conversation about faculty ethical behavior." We endorsed the subcommittee's conclusion that "the Faculty Senate needs to take responsibility for the discussion," perhaps in collaboration with the Nevada Faculty Alliance, and that the Academic Leadership Council should take up the matter.

3. Banmali Rawat presented the report and recommendations of Subcommittee 3, charged with determining which of last year's committee's recommendations concerning student academic dishonesty had been implemented and which had not. The subcommittee's findings are found in Appendix A of the Year End Report to the Faculty Senate of the Academic Standards Committee 2007-2008 (attached). Much of the delay in implementation seems to be due to the fact that Sally Morgan of the Office of Student Conduct did not receive the 2006-2007 committee's report until March 10 of this year. Jill Wallace stressed her eagerness to work with Sally Morgan and another expert to design an on-line course on academic dishonesty that could be conducted through WebCampus. She also gave the committee the welcome news that, by using the "plagiarism prevention service" offered by SafeAssign instead of Turnitin, UNR can save some $15,000 in permission fees.

4. Since several committee members could not stay for the whole meeting we agreed to vote on the remaining recommendations of Subcommittee 3 by email. The following ballot was sent to the full committee on April 2 and the votes tallied on April 4; the 10 members responding voted unanimously to approve the recommendations.

• *From Ann Keniston's section, "Methods of Addressing Academic Dishonesty":*
'The time frame for faculty to report an incident of academic dishonesty should be extended [from "two weeks"] to "15 working days."' _____

• *From Banmali Rawat's section, "Policy Clarity and Future Directions":*
[In connection with the method recommended by the Academic Standards Committee in 2006 for removing the grade of Q, a recommendation which was never acted upon]: 'We should emphasize this [lack of follow-through] in the current year's report and set some time table for implementation based on [. . .] help and facilities.' _____

• *Policy language formulated by (or formulated on the recommendation of) the Academic Standards Committee should include an instruction that it be revisited by the same committee "in three years." [This measure would prevent policies which turn out not to work in practice from remaining in place indefinitely.]* _____

5. The meeting was adjourned at about 10 a.m.

(All minutes submitted by Louis Marvick)