

**Graduate Academic Council
2005 – 2006**

Minutes of the Council meeting of April 3, 2006
Approved by the Council on April 28, 2006

In attendance: D. Byrd, E. Redkey, F. Bolton (staff), J. Bartow (staff), L. Kranich, L.-A. McNutt, M. Pryse, O. Ongiti, S. Chinnam, S. Friedman, S. Levine & S. Maloney

GAC members unable to attend: G. Burke & M. Rodriguez

1. Minutes of the GAC meeting of 3/24/06 were considered and approved without amendment (8-0-0).
2. Dean's Report – M. Pryse
 - Dean Pryse reported that stipends for funded Fall 2006 incoming doctoral students will be uniformly increased by \$1000 each, due to access to a small pool of SUNY funds.
 - Graduate student support funding modeling discussions are underway with graduate program directors.
3. Standards of Academic Integrity

Dean Pryse introduced the proposal to amend campus policy entitled “Standards of Academic Integrity.” She provided a background summary for the project, one that was initiated following review of the 2004-05 Student Opinion Survey results. A task force was formed, which she co-chaired with Undergraduate Dean Sue Faerman, to (1) assess the campus environment pertaining to the topic, (2) investigate strategies for addressing the topic, (3) review current policies & recommend changes and (4) consider the establishment of an Honor Code or alternate mechanism for attending to the issues of academic integrity.

The work of the Task Force involved extensive research and has resulted in a proposal to move away from a strictly punitive model, more toward one that attends to education about matters of academic integrity. The summary of Task Force recommendations to the Provost, not an item for governance action, was shared with Council members for informational purposes.

A Task Force proposed revision to “Standards of Academic Integrity” (campus policy) is a matter that has been forwarded to governance (UAC & GAC) for consideration and action. She summarized the proposed changes:

- New introductory text has been inserted, stressing the University as a community of scholars and replacing existing administrative jargon. This new section is intended to convey a sense that Academic Integrity strengthens our community of learning.
- There are no proposed substantive changes to the “Examples of Academic Dishonesty.”
- There are proposed changes to “Penalties & Procedures,” including the elimination of faculty warnings and the opportunity to re-write submitted work. It is viewed that these are inherent faculty prerogatives and need not be defined within the policy. Faculty members do play a key role in determinations about breaches of academic integrity and should continue to impose course based sanctions, file reports of such and consider further judicial referral action.
- The opportunity for making academic integrity judicial referrals is proposed for broadening to include deans, in recognition that breaches of academic integrity are not necessarily limited to be within specific courses, i.e., program exams.

The Council discussed various matters related to the proposal, including what constitutes an “honor code,” limited role for ombudspersons in AI matters, the importance of AI education & orientation, especially for foreign students as a cultural matter, and the reporting of faculty imposed sanctions.

Prof. McNutt suggested that the “Examples” language defining multiple submissions should be amended and clarified to address “second or subsequent” submittals to instructors of the latter courses, not the original instructors. On behalf of the authors, Dean Pryse accepted such a friendly amendment.

The proposal, as amended, was approved by a Council vote of 9-0-1.