

Proposed Academic Honesty Process Changes

The SGA Code of Laws language concerning academic dishonesty will remain unchanged with the exception of the procedural changes that are explained below. The procedural changes describe the insertion of a new step between the reporting and hearing stages of the process. Incidents of possible academic dishonesty will now be reported electronically on the Provost's website and the current Hearing process will remain the same.

Academic Honesty Committee

The current SGA Code of Laws states that the University Academic Honesty Committee consists of: a faculty Chairperson appointed by the President, student representatives, and faculty representatives. The Code states that, in order for the Committee to hold a hearing, two students (one graduate student and one undergraduate student) and two to three faculty members and the Chair must be present. The Chair may form a quorum, but he or she only votes in the event of a tie.

Procedure:

If a faculty member detects an alleged incident of academic dishonesty, he or she must make a reasonable attempt to meet with the student and indicate the possibility of reporting the incident. The instructor must assume the student is innocent and allow the student to attend class and take exams.

A faculty member may report the incident to the Office of the Provost using an electronic form located on the Provost's website. The Office of the Provost will then assign the case to one of the faculty on the Academic Honesty Committee who then becomes the facilitator. The facilitator should have no direct connection with the School or College of the accused student or the department that administers the course in question. Once the form is submitted, the Office of the Provost will notify the student via email that they have been accused of academic dishonesty within fifteen (15) working days of the detection of the alleged violation, and of their rights. The charging party and the instructor in charge of the course in which the alleged violation occurred will also be notified of the student's rights, the procedures involved, and the names of known witnesses. The Office of the Provost will have a period of five (5) business days to begin scheduling an appointment with the student, facilitator, and instructor.

1. If the student does not agree to an appointment with the facilitator and the instructor within the identified time frame, the case will be referred to the Academic Honesty Committee for a decision. If the student forgoes the meeting with the facilitator, he or she maintains the right to meet with the Academic Honesty Committee.
2. The instructor may request to bypass the facilitated meeting and refer the case directly to a hearing of the Academic Honesty Committee.
3. If the student meets with the facilitator and instructor, they will engage in a discussion of the incident and, ideally, agree on an appropriate sanction. Witnesses will not be present. If no agreement on a sanction can be reached during the meeting with the appointed facilitator, the case will go before the Academic Honesty Committee.

If the case progresses from a facilitated meeting to a hearing of the Academic Honesty Committee, the facilitator originally assigned to the case will recuse himself or herself from the hearing.

Records:

The Office of the Provost is responsible for keeping records of all occurrences. Records should be kept for a period of six (6) years. All incidents and sanctions will be recorded in case of repeat occurrences. If a student has previously been accused of academic dishonesty and either proven guilty by the Committee or sanctioned by a Committee member during an informal meeting for academic dishonesty, then their case

will automatically go before the Academic Honesty Committee. Previous offenses cannot be used as evidence against the accused party, but should be a factor in sanctioning by the Committee.

All offenses resulting in sanctions will be reported to the Office of the Provost, the Dean of the college or school in which the student is registered, and the Dean, Department Head and Instructor in charge of the course in which the violation occurred.

In response to the comments and concerns of faculty, the following additions and changes have been made to the proposal issued at the August 2010 Faculty Senate Meeting:

Additions:

The proposed process will be evaluated 3 years after implementation. Any complaints or suggestions concerning the process can be sent to the Office of the Provost.

Changes to the Proposed Procedure:

The Academic Honesty Committee will review the recommended sanctions agreed upon during the facilitated meetings and forward the Committee's recommendation to the Office of the Provost. The Provost shall receive and consider the report of the Committee and shall determine the action to be taken. When the decision of the Provost differs from the Committee's recommendation, the Committee chair shall be consulted before the charged student is officially notified.

Both the student and the faculty member have the right to bypass the facilitated meeting and go directly to the hearing stage of the process.

Academic Honesty Committee members are not required to serve as facilitators.

It is currently preferred that the same grouping of the Academic Honesty Committee hears linked cases. If a professor accuses multiple students and the cases are linked, the same facilitator will be assigned to each case. Note that the professor can choose to bypass the facilitated meeting and refer the case directly to the Academic Honesty Committee in this situation as well.