

AJC FACULTY SENATE MEETING, APRIL 4, 2025

Below is a summary of the biannual meeting of the Academic Judiciary Committee. In addition to running through the numbers (covered in #2), the major portion of our meeting focused on discussing a proposal to modify the current process for students who are appealing the “responsible” outcome of an academic dishonesty hearing, from two levels of appeals to a one (covered in #1). There was a unanimous agreement that this proposal should be moved forward. Members will work together to put together a formal proposal before bringing it to the Senate and other invested committees.

In attendance-

Neta Dean - AJC Chair

Wanda Moore – University Academic Integrity Officer

Ben Martin

Leslie Marino

Jingrui Cheng

Matt Reuter

Kristine Lucenko

Marie Huffman

Faith Matranga

Sam Dodd

Andrew Flescher

Brady Nelson

Julie Huang

David Rubenstein

Christine Gilbert

Sharon Nachman

1. PROPOSAL TO MODIFY APPEALS PROCESS

A. OVERVIEW OF THE STANDARD OF EVIDENCE – used at hearings

“The standard of evidence used by the hearing board is "clear and convincing."

Students may be found responsible on the basis of direct evidence, circumstantial evidence, or a combination of the two. This may include, for example, any of the following: a dramatic change in writing style; possession of accessible notes, devices (i.e. mobile phones, clickers, calculators, translators, etc.), or similarly prohibited material during an exam; observed communication between students during an exam; or unusual similarity among exams, papers, assignments, projects, or other work, including similarity with online resources.

At the conclusion of the hearing, the board will make a decision of finding the student "responsible" or "not responsible" for violating academic integrity. All decisions will be made by majority of the members present. The individual votes and tally are not divulged”.

https://www.stonybrook.edu/commcms/academic_integrity/policies_procedures/index.php

APPEAL OF COMMITTEE ACTION PROCESS: after the student receives an outcome from the academic judiciary committee (from a hearing or a review of multiple offense)

FIRST LEVEL OF APPEAL

PROCESS “Decisions made by the Academic Judiciary Committee can be appealed by submitting a detailed statement (either as e-mail text or an attachment) to academic_appeals@stonybrook.edu. In situations where the student is in the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences (CEAS), the appeal will be forwarded for consideration to the CEAS Office of the Dean. **Appeals are only considered based on new evidence not available at the time of the hearing and/or errors in procedure.** Appeals must be submitted within seven (7) business days of the original hearing committee's decision. Instructions for appeals and specific deadlines are included in the email with the decision by the hearing committee.”

https://www.stonybrook.edu/commcms/academic_integrity/policies_procedures/index.php

- ALL CEAS APPEALS ARE SUBMITTED TO THE CEAS DEAN
- ALL OTHER APPEALS ARE SUBMITTED TO ASSOCIATE PROVOST DESIGNEE – at this time, the designee is Anastasia Zannettis- Assistant Dean for Academic Engagement – Division of Undergraduate Education

SECOND (and final) LEVEL OF APPEAL:

An Academic Judiciary appeal that is denied on the first appeal review may be appealed to the Senior Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education (Rachelle Germana or designee)- **only when new documentation not available at the time of the hearing or evidence of procedural error is provided.** Appeal requests should include the original request, as well as the new documentation and/or evidence of procedural error, and must be submitted within seven (7) business days of the communication of the decision from the first appeal. Appeals should be addressed to: Senior Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, at academic_appeals@stonybrook.edu. **The appeal decision of the Senior Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education (or designee) is final.**

B. Discussion for proposal - One level of appeal

- There is often (or in most cases), the same basis for appeal with same documentation. The second appeal reviewer is reviewing the same information submitted in first level (recording of hearing, hearing file and the judiciary overview). Rarely has there been a

case overturned or submitted for “re-hearing” at final level when the basis for appeal and information is the same as the initially submitted case.

- During peer -review conducted in 2023 with other NE region Institutions’ Academic Integrity administratorswe were asked the purpose/reason for two-level for review. Most judiciary programs have one-level *“why are there 2 levels of appeals”? “sounds repetitious. Especially if students are submitting the same thing to the next level and appealing on the same basis”*

1. Questions for discussion-Should we consider a one-level review for all standard appeals (with exception due to unusual circumstances or cases involving expulsions). **Should there be a limitation on deadline for review ?** With the understanding of exceptions due to special circumstances,. At times, an appeal’s review process including final appeal has taken 2-3 months for completion. **We propose that the appeal process have a mandatory two week limit**

APPEALS Spring/Summer 2024

- **2 CEAS Appeals Submitted at first level** - First level outcome: (2) Denied. Two students submitted a final level of appeal (Associate Provost) . Final Appeal outcome: One permitted a “re-hearing” at the final level. One denied at final level.
- **7 non-CEAS Appeals Submitted at first level** - First level outcome: (6) Denied Appeals. One student permitted a “re-hearing”. Final Appeal outcome: One student submitted a final level of appeal (overturned). Five students: did not submit a final appeal.

APPEALS Fall 2024

- **4 CEAS Appeals Submitted at first level** - First level outcome: (4) Denied. Two students submitted a final level of appeal (Associate Provost) . Final Appeal outcome: (2) cases pending decision of final review
- **1 non-CEAS Appeals Submitted at first level** - First level outcome: (1) Denied. None submitted final level outcome

Status of Fall cases as of today:

(3) cases closed

(1) case pending - currently under final review

(1) case pending - student permitted to submit 2023 appeal for final review – currently under final review

Ex: University at Buffalo one -level. The Director does not serve as hearing officer therefore is the reviewer of appeals “ Upon thorough consideration of the committee’s findings and recommendations, the Director of the Office of Academic Integrity will render a final decision. The final decision and sanction(s) imposed shall be submitted in writing from the Office of Academic Integrity to the student via email to the student’s UBIT address within 10 academic days* of receiving the Admissions Integrity Committee’s statement of recommendations. **The decision of the Director of the Office of Academic Integrity is final, and no further appeal is available**”. <https://catalogs.buffalo.edu/content.php?catoid=11&navoid=571#academic-integrity>

EX: University of Rochester – one level of appeal
<https://www.rochester.edu/college/honesty/policy/index.html#XIV>

2.AJC UPDATES

A. UPDATE TO WEBSITE: In coordination with the AJC, CELT has put up a great web page for guidelines to faculty about evaluation of AI-flagged papers. Please have a look

- next steps for AI-flagged paper flowchart : <https://stonybrook.edu/celt/innovative-technology/AI/ai-flagged-eval-process.php>

-where to find additional resources on artificial intelligence and learning. Please insert the following link to CELT:

additional resources on artificial intelligence and learning. <https://stonybrook.edu/celt/innovative-technology/AI/index.php?accordion=content-d19e525>

-Academic Judiciary Process Flowchart on the side bars of the Faculty FAQ's and the Student FAQ's

B. AJC Member update

- We continue to have strong faculty, staff and student involvement - this includes our Senate-appointed members and our ad hoc volunteer members. We have faculty and staff representation from many departments. We conduct outreach at the beginning of every academic year to department chairs (and receive favorable responses) Student membership numbers are strong. However we conduct outreach for student members every academic year due to graduating members. We use student volunteer platforms for student outreach
- Our current members also play an active role in outreach to peers/ department colleagues
- Our current task is to conduct more outreach for CEAS faculty. Our outreach practice for CEAS is to reach out to Jenn in CEAS for faculty referrals. Jenn refers CEAS faculty & staff for MEC, CSE, or ISE. Then there are faculty who can participate in all CEAS cases.
- Training/academic judiciary overview: We provide any new members with the recorded training (from Fall 2024)
- Our AJC Faculty Chair - Neta Dean is very involved/accessible throughout the entire judiciary process. Neta had an AJC- University Senate committee/ members meeting in Fall 2024. There is an upcoming Spring 2025 meeting - scheduled in April.

C.PENDING HEARINGS/MULTIPLE OFFENSE REVIEWS/JUDICIARY APPEALS

There are no outstanding Fall 2024 pending hearings

We have MULTIPLE OFFENSE reviews scheduled at the end of each semester. FALL REVIEW: Dec 16, 2024 - the committee reviewed (4) cases

JUDICIARY APPEALS FALL TO PRESENT= 5

(3) cases closed

(1) case pending - currently under final review (YC)

(1) case pending - student permitted to submit 2023 appeal for final review (AH)

D. Q COURSE SPRING 2025 (UG & GRAD)

We have our weekly online classes Wednesdays 1-2pm. We have our campus partners scheduled for weekly presentations

We have an alternate independent course for students no longer attending SBU or approved for alternate and must satisfy sanction/requirement

C. OTHER ACTIVITIES (WANDA MOORE AND AJ)

AJC DATABASE -

GA responsible for ongoing updates to database

- FALL 2024 Data information to be submitted before April 4th meeting

FALL 2024

Reported Accusations	80	
Requested Hearings	9	
Found Responsible	6	
Found Not Responsible	3	

STUDENT CORRESPONDENCE UPDATES -SASC Approved/Ashley

Update to the initial email sent to students - to include SASC information

- Student Accessibility Support Center (SASC) For disability related accommodations for the academic judiciary process, please contact SASC. SASC will work with the student and Academic Judiciary on determining reasonable accommodations

Stony Brook Union Suite 107
Stony Brook NY 11794-3216

Office: 631.632.6748

Email: sasc@stonybrook.edu

<https://www.stonybrook.edu/commcms/studentaffairs/sasc/about/index.php>

- GA made updates to all outgoing email correspondences to students - to adhere to "accessibility in communications" - SASC/Ashley approved
- Flowchart - easy read for judiciary process
- https://www.stonybrook.edu/commcms/academic_integrity/judiciary-process.php

ACADEMIC JUDICIARY PARTNERSHIPS /COLLABORATION PROJECTS

- **Project Collaborator** - IITG/OER Impact Grants "*AI & Academic Integrity Community of Practice*" Proposal **MARCH 2025**
- **Panelist**- Webinar for New Integrity Administrators. **JUNE 2025**

We were invited to participate on panel for new integrity administrators

- **Committee Member**: NE ICAI International Center for Academic Integrity - North East Region **MONTHLY**

We participate in monthly virtual meetings with members from the Academic Integrity offices from the following institutions (peer reviews of policies & procedures, consultation follow up, trends & best practices).

- University at Buffalo
- Le Moyne College
- EF Academy
- UMass Boston
- Adelphi University
- UC Santa Cruz
- Syracuse University
- Bentley University
- Union College
- Columbia University
- University of Rochester
- Georgetown University
- Binghamton University
- UC Santa Cruz
- Lafayette College

- Stony Brook University
- The Ohio State
- New York University

Partnerships with Student Support Services - Ongoing .

We continue to work in partnership with the University's student support services on cases involving shared students. Personal information about the student is not shared/exchanged - only coordinating the delivery of judiciary outcomes where student support services assist with supporting the student with "what happens next" - after the student receives outcome from academic judiciary