Committee on Excellence in Teaching (CET) Meeting
December 10, 2012

Present: Wendy Binder, Vanessa Newell for Beth Serlin (Fall 2012), Ani Shabazian, Damon Willick, Zahra Nourani.

Excused: Laurel Franzen, Anna Harrison,

Meeting commenced at 2:10 pm.

Travel Grants:

- Committee members agreed that submissions received thus far are not ones that can be funded according to the grant criteria.

Fritz Burns Distinguished Teaching Award:

- Sue Scheibler (Committee on Committees) supports CET proposal to form a CET subcommittee for the Burns selection. The subcommittee will consist of all tenured CET members plus additional tenured faculty member for the colleges/schools that are not yet represented. These additional members will be selected in coordination between Sue Scheibler and Wendy Binder, trying to include some members from the former Burns committee.

Walsh Grants:

- Deadline set for January 25. Documents will be same as last year with appropriate updates.
- Online submissions will once again be made available and summary scores will be distributed to committee members ahead of selection meeting.

CET Bylaws:

- The committee members present unanimously agreed to reduce the number of faculty on the committee from 8 to 6 members.
- Also unanimously agreed on a reduction in the number of members required for a quorum from 5 to 4.
- Members agreed that language should be inserted regarding attendance requirements would be beneficial to the mission of the committee. If a member misses more than three (3) consecutive meetings, then the committee chair will meet with him/her to reassess commitment to the CET. Wendy will make a suggestion about wording based on an example provided by Ani at a future meeting.
- CCET, currently a CET subcommittee will most likely sunset at the end of the academic year. Therefore, it will be crucial for the CET to take a more active role in the efforts of that committee. Once the CCET has recommended forms and procedures for the peer evaluation process, the maintenance of these documents will then be the charge of the CTE and any possible major revisions will be up to the CET. Wendy will discuss this transition with Kevin Wetmore and John Parrish.
Honor Code Suggestions:

- In order to have a successful Honor Code, it will need for it to be a part of the culture and identity of the university. Methods to do so may include:
  - A ceremony before school starts – orientation? Where students (possibly also faculty) sign the code.
  - Make sure students have a voice in the forming and application of the code.
- With every student signing the same honor code, the ambiguity between intentional and non-intentional dishonesty should become void. Any such distinction should be eliminated from the code.
- The “Honors Council” or “Judicial Board” (aka. J-Board), made up mostly of students, to be formed as a third party should be involved to decide on severity of each case and punishment in kind with the offense.
- Clear instructions for faculty to be provided (checklist so that appropriate passages can be included in syllabus) on situations that may encourage academic dishonesty, such as group work.
- A separate entity (i.e. Dean of Students) to receive all reports of academic dishonesty – regardless of outcome – as a method of keeping all such information in one place for future reference.
- The decision about sanctions and interpretations should be taken on the academic side, not the student affairs side.
- Rough timeline of proposed steps following an alleged incident of academic dishonesty:
  - Faculty member to determine if the individual has indeed broken the honor code.
  - Professor to report incident to Honors Council or Dean of the school. This can be followed by the faculty making a decision to give a 0 on an assignment or to just report the incident if no grade is associated with the infraction.
  - The Honors Council or Dean to inform the student of the charges in a formal manner.
  - The Honors Council or Dean to also inform the record-keeping third party (i.e. Dean of Students).
  - If faculty member determines honor code violation warrants failure of the class, will report an F at the end of the semester with an In Progress (IP) reported on students’ transcript while the Honors Council deliberates on the final consequence.
- Severe consequences such as expulsion or suspension need to be part of the honor code and should be used if appropriate.
- Possibly customize PROWL to include an area to specify if an F is due to academic dishonesty or a true F in order to determine IP on transcript.
- The complaint will need to be completely redacted in the event that an academic dishonesty report is overthrown.

Next meeting will be held 11-12:15 pm on Tuesday, January 22.

Action items:

- Each committee member to research the following areas of the Honor Code and to draft the related section. The committee will edit the drafts in the next meeting.
- Damon – Honor Code signing (ceremony, making it a portion of orientation, etc.)
- Ani – The Honor Council or J-Board
- Dorothea – Role of faculty
• Wendy – repeat offenders

Meeting concluded at 4:10 pm.