

Community College *of* Philadelphia

MEETING MINUTES
Institution-Wide Committee
Monday, October 28, 2013
2:30 p.m.
Isadore A. Shrager Boardroom

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Pascal Scoles.

II. Attendance

Delegates

Faculty: Ed Baker, Sue Ellen Liebman, Bridget McFadden, Pascal Scoles

Administration: Mary Anne Celenza, Tom Hawk, Samuel Hirsch, Sharon Thompson

Students: Luiggi Cavanna, Erika Laurence, Jason Mays, Aneury Rodriguez

Alternates

Faculty: John Braxton

Administration: Ron Jackson

Students: Alex Valachovic

Guests Present

Steve Jones, Osvil Acosta-Morales

III. Approval of Minutes

Discussion ensued on the style of the Minutes and whether detailed conversation including the names of the committee members should be included. It was determined that the committee would follow precedent and include summary statements of the proceedings. The minutes of September 23, 2013 were approved unanimously. (Hirsch/Baker)

IV. Old Business

There were no items for old business.

V. New Business

(a) Student Code of Conduct

Ron Jackson and Osvil Acosta-Morales presented the portion of the Student Code of Conduct before the committee. They reiterated that this is not a revision of the entire Code, just the portion that references Academic Integrity. Major changes to the Code include making the language consistent with Policy and Procedure #3 and a revision to the process for handling suspected violations. This process allows matters of academic integrity to be handled separately from the process for other disciplinary matters. A separate Academic Integrity Hearing Committee is created (distinct from the Judicial Hearing Committee). Violations will continue to be reported on the Behavioral Reporting Form. This allows the College to track violations across discipline areas. Concerns were raised about the faculty "obligation" to report suspected violations. Ron Jackson reviewed the current process and explained that an individual faculty member can not determine whether there has been a violation of College policy. Ron Jackson explained

that this obligation puts the College in compliance with students' right to due process. Without mandatory reporting, the faculty is potentially making judgments on violation of College policy without a clear process.

The new Academic Integrity Hearing Committee will review the documentation and make a recommendation based on their findings. This process parallels the existing Judicial hearing process. Faculty, department heads and Deans will be advised of the committee's findings. Faculty members will continue to maintain control of the classroom grading process. It was explained that academic integrity is both a classroom matter and a matter of College policy. Violations will not necessarily go to committee. If the student agrees with the allegation, the Judicial Affairs Officer can issue a decision directly. The student would need to agree in writing. This process does not obviate the responsibility of the faculty to communicate with their students. Students can use the Reporting Form to report violations by other students. It is accessed through MyCCP. This change was initiated by a long standing concern that disciplinary matters were intertwined with matters of academic integrity. This creates a separate and parallel process with a trained committee.

Concern was raised about whether the language changes were reviewed by the Sub Committee and whether they had an opportunity to comment or were just informed. Ron Jackson clarified that the Code was on the agenda for the Sub Committee and the committee did not object to its going forward. Members did not see the revised document. He explained that the only section that was changed from the committee's initial review was that there is now only one Judicial Hearing Officer. The original draft included a new position, Academic Integrity Officer, which is now eliminated.

Concern was also raised about the process of appointment to the Academic Integrity Hearing Committee. It was pointed out that the process of direct appointment by the Vice President for Academic Affairs is different than for the Judicial Hearing Committee. It was explained that the intent was to have a process whereby the Committee could move quickly to respond to reported incidents. Right now we have a back log.

Motion: To return the Student Code of Conduct to the Sub-Committee on Academic Support for editorial considerations, review of faculty "obligation" in the process, and appointment of membership on the Academic Integrity Hearing Committee. (Mays/Baker)
The motion passed, 10 affirmative votes and two no votes, no abstentions.

VI. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 PM.