

AUC Academic Policies Subcommittee

Meeting Minutes

11/18/25, 3:30 p.m.

Miller Oval/Hybrid

PRESENT:

Soumitra Basu, Matthew Burke, Brady Chen, Justin Conner (Co–Chair), Lynn D’Agostino, Lena Ficco (Co–Chair), Robert Hynes, Guy Karlebach, Amy Kendrick, Eileen Kirk, William McGurl, Aisling O’Connor (Vice Chair), Andrea Olmstead, Ozge Ozay, Lindsay Parisi, Connie Strittmatter, Collin Syfert, Samuel Tobin.

ABSENT: Mathangi Krishnamurthy, Lori Leonard, Michaela Parris (Secretary), Tim St. John.

GUESTS: Becky Copper Glenz, Barbara Cormier, Jacalyn Kremer, Patricia Marshall, Paul Weizer, Stacey Luster, Nadimpalli Mahadev, Deresa Webb, Marie (+1 267-***-**66)

Meeting convened at 3:33 p.m.

Motion to Approve the Minutes: Andrea Olmstead

Second: Aisling O’Connor

Discussion: None

Vote: Approved 14-0-0 (For-Against-Abstain)

Motion to Consider AUC 012: Eileen Kirk

Second: Aisling O’Connor

Paul Weizer spoke to the proposal which is part of a package with AUC 011. AUC 011 creates a 4+1 program in History, but this proposal is not for consideration by this committee. AUC 012 proposes to require students to have a GPA of 3.0 in their junior year in order to enter the 4 + 1 program and take their first graduate course (HIST 7450). They need a 3.0 in this first course to take subsequent graduate courses in their senior year.

Discussion:

- If a student does not get a 3.0 in the first graduate course, can they use it towards the graduate program? They would be subject to the graduate program rules and it would not shorten the path to the graduate 4+1 program.
- Are the 3 courses counted in both the undergraduate and graduate programs? Yes, but the program is not being considered in this program, only the GPA requirement.

- Is there a university wide 4 + 1 policy? No, there is a university policy regarding the GPA undergraduates need to take graduate classes. The GPA is higher than 3.0. This policy lowers the GPA required to take the 4+1 graduate classes in history to 3.0 to encourage motivated students to consider this option.
- Are there pre-requisites for the first graduate course (HIST 7450)? No, this history course takes the place of a similar undergraduate course and has no pre-requisites (apart from Jr, status and GPA > 3.0 for 4+1 program entry) ● Clarification (Becky Copper Glenz): Policies regarding 4 + 1 programs are unique and depend on the needs of individual departments.
- Is there a state-wide mandate on graduate programs? Yes, and this 4+1 program meets these.

Vote: Approved 17-0-0

Motion to Consider AUC 007: Aisling O'Connor

Second: Eileen Kirk

Jacalyn Kremer spoke to the proposal which aims to update the academic integrity policy. The last update to the policy was in 2007, when there was of course no AI around. The proposal is the product of a 3 year project. The current (2007) policy includes:

1. No mention of AI.
2. No definition of academic integrity.
3. Language that is not student friendly.
4. Academic integrity is not a shared responsibility
5. Current procedures are housed in Student Affairs.
6. No central repository in place for recording violations.

Changes proposed in the new policy include:

1. Use of AI is explicitly addressed.
2. Definitions are provided and the importance of academic integrity is stated.
3. Student friendly language used.
4. Academic integrity is a shared / FSU community responsibility
5. Procedure housed in Academic Affairs (AA).
6. Central repository in place for recording violations in AA.

Academic integrity procedures will move from Student Affairs to Academic Affairs as they are an academic matter related to curricula and learning. It is hoped that students will get on board and that academic integrity will become a peer responsibility. The goal is a more student centered, equitable and fair policy. There are 3 issues that need to be approved. 1. Revised

Academic Integrity Policy

2. Revised Academic Integrity Procedures

3. Creation of an MSCA Academic Integrity Review Board

Discussion:

- What happens if students agree to the violation and sanctions; is the case closed? Is it sent to the central repository? Letter must be sent to the central file, but no hearing takes place. Chair of the Academic Integrity Review Board (Chair of AIRB) reviews and is placed in a central repository.
- Matthew Burke (Student Affairs): This new policy has the full support of Student Affairs and Tim St. John has been involved. Now Student Affairs can function as an advocate for the student in such matters.
- What is the process if the student does not sign the letter? If a student does not sign, the sanctions hold.
- Can students sign the letter to say they accept the sanctions, but do not admit to violation? No, this is not an option and not helpful for the central repository.
- What is the sequence of the process / where do emails/dynamic forms go? Faculty – Student – Faculty & Chair of AIRB.
- Barbara Cormier (Registrar): If the student accepts the violation and sanction does the Chair of AIRB have to be involved? Once a student signs, the form goes to the Chair of AIRB. General discussion on sequence; should the Chair of AIRB be notified at the same time as the student. This may be important if they don't sign. Dynamic form can be set up to process even if a student does not sign.
- Friendly amendment proposed by Lena Ficco: The faculty member will send the notification letter to the student **and the Chair of the Academic Integrity Review Board.**
- What is the purpose of the student signature? The student must make a decision on how they wish to proceed. They are given 3 options; (a) they can admit violation & accept sanction, (b) they can request a hearing and (c) they can admit the violation & appeal sanction. If they don't sign the sanction will apply.
- Patricia Marshall (Provost): What is the timeframe? i.e. sign in X days or sanction will be applied.
- Friendly amendment proposed: If a student does not respond to a violation letter in 72 hours, sanction will be applied.
- Who can make accusations apart from faculty members? Students can report to each other. The proposed policy does not define the accuser, rather mentions that if the accuser is not a faculty member the Chair of AIRB manages the violation / notifies the student.
- Discussion centered on accusers being members of the FSU community i.e. have a FSU email address.
- Friendly amendment proposed: Accusers other than faculty must be members of the

FSU community and submit details of violation to the Chair of the Academic Integrity Review Board.

- Is reporting mandatory? No, it is left to the discretion of the faculty member. However, faculty are encouraged to report so that details can be sent to the central repository which allows for violation patterns to be monitored.
- How much individualization is there for faculty in dynamic form used for reporting? 1st three paragraphs allow for customization, but student rights are not editable.
- Can faculty refer to “clear expectations” in places other than syllabus e.g. other course documents? Policy refers to syllabus only but could be included as a friendly amendment (see #4 below).
- Should a definition for academic integrity violation be added to the glossary? Such behaviors are outlined, and “academic integrity” is defined so this is not necessary.
- Can violations be reported to external groups? If a professor is writing a letter of recommendation, the professor can request reports of academic integrity from the Chair, but they are only available if the student signs a release. Professors may decline to write letters on behalf of students for whom they have academic integrity concerns. Violations will be released if required by court order.

Friendly Amendments:

1. The faculty member will send the notification letter to the student and the Chair of the Academic Integrity Review Board.
2. If a student does not respond to/sign the violation letter in 72 hours, sanction will be applied.
3. Accusers other than faculty must be members of the FSU community and submit details of violation to the Chair of the Academic Integrity Review Board.
4. Change: “Promoting academic integrity through clear expectations on syllabi for all aspects of the course, including homework, collaborative assignments, research papers, and exams” to “Promoting academic integrity through clear expectations on syllabi **or other course documents**” for all aspects of the course, including homework, collaborative assignments, research papers, and exams.

Motion to Approve AUC 007 with 4 Friendly Amendments: Aisling O’Connor

Second: Andrea Olmstead

Vote: Approved 16-0-0

Pat Marshall thanked Connie Strittmatter, Jacalyn Kremer, Tim St. John and others who put a lot of time and effort into the creation of this proposal

Items from the Floor: None

Motion to Adjourn: Aisling O’Connor

Second: Connie Strittmatter

Meeting concluded at 4:49 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Aisling O’Connor