2024 AJC Committee Meeting REPORT Oct 10, 2024 1PM (via Zoom)

In attendance:
Neta Dean
Wanda Moore
Leslie Marino
Julie Huang
Christine Gilbert
Andrew Fleischer
Sam Dodd
Brady Nelson
Marie Hoffman
Kristine Lucenko

1.   Review of hearing statistics

ACADEMIC JUDICIARY REPORT   (FALL 2022- Sp 2024)

Note on process:
We continue with all VIRTUAL hearings
Notes on the numbers: these include CEAS (merged 2020)
2.
3.

	F 2022	SP 2023	F 2023	SP 2024
REPORTED ACCUSATIONS	277	128	102	85
APPEALING	53	33	2	20
NOT APPEALING	224	95	91	65
FOUND RESPONSIBLE	44	24	9	11
FOUND NOT RESPONSIBLE	9	9	2	5
AI cases	NR	NR	21	9

2. Policy updates (2024)

a. **NO ATTORNEYS ALLOWED AT HEARING-** In accordance with other SUNY academic integrity policy, we have stipulated no attorneys may attend hearing as witnesses. UPDATED ONLINE "A student accused of violating academic integrity will be given an opportunity to address the hearing board. The student may bring an advisor or witness. In no such case shall the advisor be an attorney. An advisor may not speak on behalf of a student nor do they have privilege of the floor. The Academic Judiciary Office must be notified of the intention to bring advisors or witnesses no later than two working days prior to the hearing.

3. **Topics discussed**

a. Turnitin plagiarism detection/privacy controversy - Matt brought up the requirement of FERPA as being the reason Turnitin is now restrictive. A work around may be some other internal platform that would allow students work to be compared within the university. Matt said he would discuss with CELT whether or not this is a possibility

b. There is a consensus among computer scientists that AI detection systems are unreliable. Therefore, accusations that rely solely on AI detection numbers are weak. *Should a statement about AI policy be mandatory in course syllabus? i.e.*

"As more written work is being examined by AI detection software, which can be inaccurate, students should safeguard themselves by keeping time stamped versions of all written work as irrefutable evidence of their workflow." Some ideas (a) to ask the Curriculum committee to ask that some statement be included in course syllabus (b) some framework be provided by Provost (c) use a recent draft document that was disseminated by the Graduate school and that contained an assortment of different that could be tailored to individual instructor's preference of AI usage in course

c. Are there any program-specific policy/procedures that deviate from those outlined on AJ webpage that require updates? None noted

d. Multiple levels of student appeals- Consider changing? One issue that is different @ SBU vs other SUNY is level at which students can appeal post hearing. We have "1st appeal to Associate Provost designee, but if denied, a 2nd (final) appeal to Vice Provost . This policy should be re-examined. There was an agreement that a single level of appeal is sufficient. There was also a suggestion that the Associate Provost Designee use a defined rubric to triage appeals that lack new data or evidence of procedural error.