

Community College *of* Philadelphia

AGENDA
Institution-Wide Committee
Monday,
June 6, 2022
1:00 pm

ZOOM meeting

- I. Call to Order**
- II. Attendance**
- III. Approval of Minutes**
 - a. Minutes of March 28, 2022**
- IV. Old Business**
- V. New Business**
 - a. Memorandum No. 14 Standards for Distance Education Courses**
(recommended by Technology Coordinating Committee)
 - b. Academic Integrity Policy** (recommended by Student Affairs Committee)
- VI. Information**
- VII. Adjournment**

Institution Wide Committee

Monday March 28, 2022 2:30pm

Zoom Meeting

I. Call to Order - The meeting was called to order at 2:32 p.m. by Sam Hirsch.

II. Attendance

Federation Voting Delegates: Sean Sauer (Co-Chair), Stan Walling, Jacquelyn Bryant, Karima Bouchenafa (joined during the discussion of the Academic Integrity Policy); *Federation Alternates:* Elisa King (joined during the discussion of the Academic Integrity Policy, Cynthia Paul

Administration Voting Delegates: Sam Hirsch (Co-chair), Carol de Fries (Secretary), Dave Thomas; *Administration Voting Alternate:* Vijay Sonty; *Administration Alternates:* Vishal Shah, Leila Lawrence

Student Voting Delegate: Ahmad Mitchell

Guests: Richard Kopp, Nikki Sarpolis, Sandy Harrill

III. Approval of minutes – The minutes from Monday, February 28, 2022 meeting were presented. Stan Walling moved to approve the minutes, and Cynthia Paul seconded the motion. The meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

IV. Old Business – No items were discussed.

V. New Business – Dr. Hirsch introduced the first of two policies for the IWC to consider.

a. Academic Integrity Policy

Richard Kopp, Nikki Sarpolis, and Sandy Harrill represented the Student Affairs Committee on the presentation of this revised policy to the IWC. Richard Kopp opened the presentation of the new Academic Integrity Policy noting that the Student Affairs Committee has been working on a revised policy for the last year (20-21) with a few changes made at the beginning of this year (21-22) so that the College can get this new revised policy moving forward through our review and recommendation process.

Sandy Harrill was on the Committee when the first set of changes were made and noted that the goals of the revision were to: establish a separate policy for this kind of violation so that it is not lumped into a separate judicial review process automatically; to provide more discretion to faculty to handle issues first; and to give more clarity to the process.

Dr. Cynthia Paul asked about an issue she encounters in Foundational Math around academic integrity, which includes students using calculators during tests when they are not allowed. She wanted to make sure that the policy's use of "unauthorized electronic equipment during exams" covers this kind of issue with the broader description in the policy. Sandy Harrill noted that other programs such as Nursing have had students using other kinds of electronic equipment, so the committee felt it best to use the broader terminology. It would be incumbent on faculty to have the delineations of what is authorized and what is unauthorized on their syllabi.

Dave Thomas brought up a specific issue he has encountered recently with a student who was accused of plagiarism on a class assignment by the faculty member. The student wanted to know what their appeal process would be for appealing an accusation around an assignment. The current policy only discusses appealing the final grade and the faculty member was indicating that the student should drop the class because they will be failed for the academic integrity violation. The discussion centered on providing more clarity about a process for appeals to the student prior to final grade being issued. There was much discussion on providing faculty more discretion in determining whether the initial issue is a violation of academic integrity or possibly something that the faculty member can address with the student directly.

Stan Walling emphasized that many initial issues that he has encountered with students over the years can be addressed among the faculty member and the student. Many issues he has encountered revolve around the student misunderstanding of plagiarism. Sandy and Nikki noted that most faculty on the Committee agreed that they have a good sense of when these issues are willful and intended versus misunderstandings. Faculty want a policy that allows them to work out these lower level issues first before it must go to a judicial review formalized process. There was also consensus that there needs to be more specific language about what a student's path can be as well and that there needs to be an avenue for appeal prior to final grade being issued.

Dean Shah recommended that we have a standardized form for any academic issue that is reported as this is important for Middle States. In addition, he recommended that the word "Final" be removed from the policy so that an appeal can be filed for any grade that is given as a result of an academic integrity issue. He asked that the Committee also make sure that the policy covers academic integrity issues beyond plagiarism or unauthorized use of electronic equipment. For example, some individuals hire others to do their work. He recommended that a 4th bullet be added to the faculty responsibility list to include, "Faculty should help students learn the importance of academic honesty in the learning process. Students must be told that the faculty and the institution does not tolerate academic dishonesty of any type. A statement clarifying the application of academic integrity criteria to the course should be included in the syllabi."

Ahmad Mitchell commented that he wanted students to have the ability to express concern about an academic integrity issue beyond just the faculty member. He asked if violations can be reported to the Board. However, Stan Walling indicated that reporting any issue immediately to the Board would be too cumbersome. Most issues can be dealt directly with a student. Beyond that it should be brought to the Department Chair and Dean. Jacquelyn Bryant noted that the policy states "should report" and she believes that the policy should use the term, "must report..." She agreed that the first step is for a faculty and student to work out the issue first, but once the violation is moving forward the issue "must" be reported. It was also agreed that the policy should be clear that a student has a right to appeal during the semester rather than waiting for a final grade.

Sam Hirsch asked that the Student Affairs Committee take the feedback provided today from the IWC and update the policy and bring it back for the April IWC meeting. He indicated that the IWC feedback is to make sure the policy is clearer for students and what steps they can or should do. That it is clear we agree that a balance is needed between giving the faculty member the ability to work out an issue with a student first, but if there is a determination that a violation occurred then the process needs to be clearer and include an option for an appeal during the semester rather than waiting for a final grade to be issued. If there is no resolution, then the issue must be reported to the department head next.

A recommendation was also made that once the new revised policy is approved that Student Affairs do a better job of making this a more prominent part of the Student Handbook. It currently is very difficult to find. Sam Hirsch thanked Richard, Sandy and Nikki for their work and asked that they bring it back to IWC in April.

b. Authentication in Distance Education Policy

Sam Hirsch presented the policy in the absence of Dean Karen Rege of Online Learning and Media Services. Dean Rege could not make today's meeting. Sam Hirsch noted that the College is required under the Federal Higher Education Act to have processes and systems in place to ensure that a person taking an online course is actually taking it and completing it; the policy presented today reflects those systems and procedures the College has in place to verify a student's identity and to codify these processes and mechanisms. It was noted that the policy is recommended by the Technology Committee, which reviewed it prior to it coming to IWC. The policy is also a Middle States requirement. By establishing this policy, we are helping with our Middle States self-study and accreditation review.

The policy helps address concerns about authentication and potential abuse with regards to fraudulent financial aid or Title IV filings. This concern has been heightened due to the increasing number of students who had to take online courses during COVID and the adjustment to more online courses and online exams. The College partnered with third party proctoring services so that faculty had the option to have online exams be electronically proctored. It was noted to faculty on the committee that faculty can speak to their Chair about the need to access the third-party proctoring services. Dean Vishal Shah asked CIO Vijay Sonty if there is more data and information available about how well third-party proctoring works due to faculty skepticism about online proctoring. It was noted Online Learning will be doing an assessment of the third party proctoring we used and to determine how many faculty are using it. This service is still a work in progress.

Jacquelyn Bryant made a motion to recommend the policy move forward as presented; Stan Walling seconded the motion. There was no opposition and no abstentions. The new policy as presented was recommended by all voting members of the IWC to move forward to the President.

VI. Information – No other items were discussed.

VII. Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Community College *of* Philadelphia

SIGN-IN SHEET

Institution-Wide Committee

Monday, March 28, 2022

2:30 p.m.

Meeting on Zoom Platform

NAME PRINT	SIGNATURE PLEASE
1. Karima Bouchenafa, Federation	Present via Zoom Voting ((joined during the discussion of the Academic Integrity Policy)
2. Stan Walling, Federation	Present via Zoom Voting
3. Jacqueline Bryant, Federation	Present Via Zoom Voting
4. Sean Sauer, Federation	Present Via Zoom Voting
5. Elisa King, Federation (A)	Present via Zoom as alternate (joined during the discussion of the Academic Integrity Policy)
6. Dr. Cynthia Paul, Federation (A)_	Present Via Zoom as alternate (voting alternate while Academic Integrity Policy considered)
7. Raquel Wheelings, Federation (A)	Not present
8. Samuel Hirsch, Administration, Co-Chair	Present Via Zoom, Voting
9. Carol de Fries, Administration, Secretary	Present via Zoom, Voting
10. Leila Lawrence, Administration (A)	Present via Zoom as alternate
11. Vijay Sonty, Administration (A)	Present via Zoom as alternate, Voting
12. Jacob Eapen, Administration	Not present
13. Dave Thomas, Administration	Present via Zoom, Voting
14. Vishal Shah, Administration (A)	Present via Zoom as alternate
15. Lisa Hutcherson, Administration (A)	Not present
16. Ahmad Mitchell, Student Representative	Present Via Zoom, Voting
17. Jawaad Benson, Student Representative (A)	Not present
18. Justice Passe, Student Representative (A)	Not Present
19. Richard Kopp, Nikki Sarpolis, Sandy	Guests

Community College *of* Philadelphia

Harrill	
---------	--

Administration Voting Representatives: Sam Hirsch, Carol de Fries, Dave Thomas

Administration Voting Alternate: Vijay Sonty

Administration Alternates: Leila Lawrence, Vishal Shah

Federation Voting Representatives: Karima Bouchenafa, Stan Walling, Jaqueline Bryant, Sean Sauer

Federation Voting Alternates: Dr. Cynthia Paul

Federation Representative Alternate: Elisa King

Student Voting Representative: Ahmad Mitchell

Guests: Richard Kopp, Nikki Sarpolis, Sandy Harrill

Memorandum No. 14 Standards for Distance Education Courses

Date of Issue: November 29, 2001

Revised Date: April 20, 2022

This document provides a uniform standard for distance education courses. Distance education courses are defined as those courses where the faculty member may be in a different physical location than the students. This encompasses online and hybrid courses. The goal of these standards is to promote high-quality distance education courses.

Types of Online Learning

Online learning at Community College of Philadelphia is offered in the following formats:

Fully Online

Fully online courses are available in two ways:

- *Asynchronous online* – Courses are conducted entirely via the Internet using the College’s LMS and do not require any face-to-face interaction on campus. These courses have no scheduled lecture time. However, there may be some classes which require in-person testing.
- *Synchronous online* – Online classes meet virtually via video conferencing and are scheduled on a regularly occurring day/time throughout the semester. These courses have a scheduled lecture time and there may be some classes which require in-person testing.

Hybrid

Hybrid courses are delivered in a wider variety of formats and combine elements of face-to-face with online components. Most hybrid courses generally have 50% regularly scheduled face-to-face meeting times on campus and 50% online with either unscheduled time or scheduled time for video-conferenced meetings.

Hosting

Online courses shall be hosted on an approved College platform (e.g. Zoom), or within the College’s approved LMS.

Online Course Design

Syllabus

When an instructor is assigned a fully online, synchronous online, or hybrid course by the department head, they will place a version of their current course syllabus on a publicly available College website. Course information contained in the syllabus must be consistent with departmentally approved course documents. Departments offering online courses may choose to post generic course syllabi on the publicly available website for the use of prospective students.

Materials

The choice of instructional materials shall be made by the instructor(s) teaching a course or as otherwise approved by the applicable Department. All materials and learning objects should be accessible by students with disabilities. All materials should be made available online that can be done so practically, legally, and in accordance with academic standards.

Communication/Interaction

In accordance with Federal regulations 34 C.F.R. §600.2 of the Higher Education Act (HEA), regular and substantive interaction between instructor and student shall occur in fully online and hybrid courses as in traditional courses. Online interaction, using communication methods and media appropriate to the course, shall be integral elements of the course. Instructors shall maintain regular online communications with students on a schedule made known to their students.

Assessment of Students

Online courses shall include online tests and/or practice quizzes, projects, or other forms of assessment as appropriate. Provision for the integrity of the assessment should be part of the course design. This can include multiple measures of learning outcomes assessment, varied approaches to assessment of learning, as well as technological solutions such as online test proctoring.

Support

The following forms of support shall be available for online and hybrid courses:

For Students:

- Technical support for students via phone, e-mail, or online chat by the Office of Online Learning and/or software vendor where available. This will not include general computer support.
- Course support for students via phone, e-mail, or online methods by instructors.
- Academic support through online tutoring, advising, library resources, etc.
- An online tutorial or other documentation for use of the LMS.

For Faculty:

- Access to technology for faculty to manage courses while on-campus.
- Training to teach online. Specifically, training includes best practices in online pedagogy, instructional technology, and compliance with relevant laws such as those related to copyright, students with disabilities, and use of the LMS.
- Instructors of online courses who require additional necessary software directly related to their courses shall be provided a copy for use at home. (This applies only to software that students are required to have purchased and not to proprietary development software.)
- Library resources and services in electronic format.

Faculty Training

When an instructor desires to teach a fully online, synchronous online, or hybrid course, faculty must demonstrate proficiency in online course design and delivery consistent with departmentally approved requirements. Training is available for online strategies and the currently approved LMS.

Fully Online and Hybrid Course Approval Process

For a course to be developed in a fully online or hybrid format, the following procedures will be followed:

1. The appropriate department head (representing the department/program) recommends courses for development in an online or hybrid format, as well as the instructors who will participate in the process.
2. Faculty meets with Online Learning to discuss preliminary design.
3. Faculty builds the course.
4. When the course development process is complete, the instructor and the Office of Online Learning conduct a final review and approval based on:
 - Compliance with relevant laws such as copyright laws and the Americans with Disabilities Act.
 - A quality assessment of the course using Quality Matters or other nationally recognized course design standards.
 - Compliance with the provisions of other College policies and procedures.
5. The Office of Online Learning forwards a recommendation for approval to the appropriate department head. The department reviews and approves the course, and forwards it to the dean. Upon approval by the dean, the course may be offered.

Course Design Quality Assurance

The Office of Online Learning currently utilizes the *Quality Matters Higher Education Rubric* as part of the online and hybrid course development process and periodic review of courses. In addition, a periodic review of all existing online courses takes place at regular intervals.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

Academic integrity emphasizes fairness and honesty in academic study and communication and is a shared commitment and responsibility of students, faculty, and administrators.

The faculty and staff of Community College of Philadelphia are dedicated to helping students learn about academic integrity and to develop their abilities to engage in academic study fairly and honestly. These abilities include respecting others' work through correct citations, learning to quote, paraphrase, and summarize accurately and appropriately, and taking responsibility for doing your own work rather than cheating on a test or assignment or deceiving a professor to get more time on an assignment. For academic support, students are encouraged to use the [Learning Lab](#) and [Library Services](#) to their advantage. These services are free and very helpful resources. Please visit the [Virtual Student Resource Center](#) website for more information.

STUDENTS RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- i. The student has the responsibility to familiarize themselves with and comply with College and class policies on academic integrity, and to seek clarification if needed.
- ii. The student has the right to be informed of any alleged violations and possible sanctions concerning academic integrity and to receive due process (fair treatment) concerning those allegations.

VIOLATIONS OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Violations of academic integrity can include, but are not limited to, cheating and plagiarism. Cheating is an intentional effort to deceive or gain an unfair advantage in completing academic work. Plagiarism is the act of using the work of another person and passing it off as your own. Any violation may lead to disciplinary action. Here are common examples of academic integrity violations, including but not limited to:

- i. copying original ideas, images, words or design elements and using them without proper citation or permission of the author.

- ii. unauthorized collaboration on an assignment.
- iii. deceiving the instructor to get more time for an assignment or examination.
- iv. using unauthorized electronic devices or software during an examination.
- v. allowing other students to copy exam responses or homework assignment answers so that they can pass it off as their own work.
- vi. stealing an exam and selling it to fellow students.
- vii. substantial and deliberate plagiarism on a project or paper.
- viii. having a substitute take an exam.
- ix. [self-plagiarism](#) (the presentation of your own previously published work as original; like plagiarism, self-plagiarism is unethical; learn more [here](#)).

JUDICIAL PROCEDURES

The judicial process for issues involving academic integrity follows the standard judicial process detailed in Article IV of the [Student Code of Conduct](#).

ACADEMIC PENALTIES/DISCIPLINARY SANCTIONS

Academic penalties and disciplinary sanctions are progressive. In other words, students who violate the Student Code of Conduct on separate occasions are subject to more severe sanctions with each repeated offense, whether or not the violations are similar in nature.

Any one or more of the following academic penalties or disciplinary sanctions may be imposed upon any student found to have committed an academic integrity violation (*sanctions ii-vi may be imposed by the Judicial Board/Judicial Affairs Officer):

- i. Academic Sanctions – the faculty member may impose an academic penalty as articulated in the class syllabus. These penalties may vary based on the number or severity of the violation(s). Examples of these

- penalties include, but are not limited to, receiving no credit for an assignment or failing the class.
- ii. Warning – Judicial Affairs may issue a verbal or written warning to the student that they are violating or have violated institutional regulations.
 - iii. Probation – Probation lasts for a designated period of time and includes the probability of more severe disciplinary sanctions if the student is found to be violating any institutional regulation(s) during the probationary period.
 - iv. Discretionary Sanctions – Work assignments, service to the College or other related discretionary assignments (such assignments must have the prior approval of the Judicial Affairs Officer).
 - v. College Suspension – Separation of the student from the College for a designated period of time, after which the student may apply for readmission to the College. The College will then decide on the conditions for readmission.
 - vi. College Expulsion – Permanent separation of the student from the College. Expulsion requires the approval of the College President.

APPEALS PROCEDURE

The appeals procedure for issues involving academic integrity follows the standard appeals process detailed in Article IV of the [Student Code of Conduct](#).

FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- i. It is the responsibility of faculty to know and execute College policies regarding academic integrity in a fair, timely, and diligent manner.
- ii. It is the responsibility of faculty to inform students of class expectations and assessment guidelines in a timely manner and to include these expectations and assessment guidelines on their class syllabi.
- iii. It is the right and responsibility of faculty to participate in a fair and equitable process concerning any allegations of violations of academic integrity.

- iv. It is the responsibility of faculty to include a link to the academic integrity policy and a statement clarifying the application of academic integrity criteria to the course in the syllabi. Faculty should help students understand the importance of academic honesty in the learning process relevant to course content. Faculty are encouraged to review the policy at the beginning of the course and reiterate the policy throughout assignments within the course.

REPORTING

When a faculty member believes that a student is deliberately violating the academic integrity policy, it is their responsibility to do the following:

- i. document evidence of suspected wrongdoing and keep records of relevant communications with the student.
- ii. contact the student concerning the suspected violation. Remind student about the consequences of violations with the student as outlined in the course syllabus. Allow the student time to respond.
- iii. seek to resolve the matter informally with the student (if appropriate). Faculty may choose to notify their department head and/or the Judicial Affairs Officer about any academic integrity violation, with no sanctions requested.
- iv. if there is no informal resolution, submit documented evidence to the Dean of Students office (via the [Behavioral Reporting Form](#)). Severe academic integrity violations should always be submitted. Examples of severe violations include stealing an exam, extensive and deliberate plagiarism or repeated acts of plagiarism, or unauthorized use of a device during a test or exam.
- v. inform the student that the alleged violation has been reported to the College.

Other than College expulsion, disciplinary sanctions shall **not** be made part of the student's permanent academic record, but shall become part of the confidential disciplinary record. Cases involving the imposition of sanctions other than College

suspension or expulsion shall be expunged from the student's confidential disciplinary record five (5) years from graduation or last date of attendance.

The sanctions above may also be imposed upon student groups or organizations. In addition, student groups or organizations may be deactivated and lose all privileges for academic integrity violations, including College recognition for a specified period of time and/or have their charter revoked.

REVISED DRAFT 04-27-22