

## **Committee on Academic Policy (CAP): Meeting Minutes**

Monday, November 25, 2024, 2:00pm; Mid-Century Room

Meeting #11 AY 2024-2025

Attendees: J. Dudle (CEAE, CAP Chair and EDC Representative), N. Farny (BBT, CAP secretary, B term), A. Gericke (Dean of Undergraduate Studies ad interim), D. Heilman (CBC, UOAC representative; via zoom), M. Leatherman (student representative), L. Roberts (BBT), S. Wodin-Schwartz (MME), F. Zoutendyk (MME)

Absent: S. Miles (Registrar), B Antupit (student representative)

The meeting was called to order at 2:03 pm.

Minutes from 11/4/24 and 11/18/24 (meetings 9 and 10) were discussed and approved.

An email communication to students prior to A term from the Dean of Students Office regarding the academic honesty policy included an example violation of academic dishonesty related to the use of AI tools. The email dated 8/2/2024 stated: “Specifically, please make yourself familiar with the [Academic Integrity website](#) for policies surrounding academic honesty, including plagiarism, cheating, facilitation, and fabrication. Specifically, use of AI tools without the explicit permission of your professor is considered a violation of our policies.”

CAP received correspondence from faculty concerned about this example of academic dishonesty. Dean Perlow, in a conversation with Dean Gericke, described the “AI communication” to students as an example for the existing policy, not a change to the approved academic integrity policy. Dean Perlow confirmed that any change to the academic dishonesty policy would be approved by CAP. CAP discussed the purview of various offices and committees over the interpretation and communication of the academic honesty policy, and whether and how the academic honesty policy intersects with other campus policies. The Dean of Students Office message to students says that the Student Code of Conduct (which references the academic honesty policy) is revised each year. CAP members found multiple websites and/or posted guidance documents where examples of academic dishonesty were provided, and the provided examples varied from each other and from the academic honesty policy. CAP members noted that unclear wording and multiple versions of academic dishonesty examples introduce a source of confusion for students and faculty.

WPI does not have an institutional-level policy for AI use. Many universities are establishing institutional policies. CAP previously discussed this and related issues, noting that policies about AI currently lie with individual faculty. It is up to individual faculty members to communicate their AI policies to students in their syllabi. Ideas of mechanisms to help faculty craft or adopt policies for their syllabi were discussed. Mechanisms for discussing the future of AI use at WPI, including a potential Community Summit on AI in D-term, were discussed.

CAP will continue this discussion at a future meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 2:51 pm