

MEMORANDUM

Date: October 9, 2015

TO: Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies

From: Undergraduate Honor System Constitution Revision Committee

SUBJECT: Undergraduate Honor Code Policy Revisions

We worked to obtain feedback from the Commission on Student Affairs and Faculty Senate. This document highlights the changes that were made to the Honor Code Manual and Policy based on the feedback that we received, primarily from the Faculty Senate. These changes provide greater clarity and flow to the document while maintaining its original intent.

1. Several minor grammatical, wording, and organization recommendations were made and are in the red-line copy of the Honor Code Manual. However, these recommendations do not substantively change the content so they are not highlighted here.
2. The Honor Code Manual was slightly reorganized, while maintaining all of the original information, to make the document easier to read.
3. We agreed that a student can have the * removed from his or her transcript immediately after completing the Academic Integrity Education Program. The previous version required the * to remain on for a semester. This addresses a concern that was raised during the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies meeting.
4. We added a phrase indicating that if the student has graduated or is not present on campus that we would attempt to contact them in order to provide them with the incident report.
5. We added a phrase that says, "If the student who is accused of academic misconduct does not reside on or near campus, accommodations will be offered (i.e. teleconference and/or video conference) to give the student an opportunity to participate in the hearing.
6. There were concerns about faculty members having support and assistance with preparing for hearings. Hence, we added the following statements:
 - a. A faculty member and/or student who is participating in a hearing is encouraged to consult with the Undergraduate Honor System Personnel. Case facilitators and other Undergraduate Honor System personnel are available to explain the honor system policies and procedures, discuss how the hearing panels work, and assist with preparation for a hearing.
 - b. Faculty and students who are scheduled to appear before a hearing panel will be offered the opportunity to participate in a pre-hearing meeting with a member of the Undergraduate Honor System personnel prior to the hearing panel date. While participation in pre-hearing meetings is not required, it is strongly encouraged.
7. We agreed to revise the definition of multiple submission in order to make it easier to read. I have listed below the old definition and the revised definition:

Invent the Future

- a. Old: The submission of substantial portions of the same work (including oral reports) for credit more than once without authorization from the instructor of the class for which the student submits the work, or attempts thereof
 - b. New: Includes the submission for credit-without authorization of the instructor receiving the work- of substantial portions of any work (including oral reports) previously submitted for credit at any academic institution, or attempts thereof.
8. Some faculty were concerned that they may want to use the Faculty-Student Resolution Process, but not meet with the student. We agreed to clarify the language by adding the following statement in the document:
 - a. A case of alleged academic misconduct can be resolved through the Faculty-Student Resolution Process without the faculty member and student meeting together. In situations where the student and/or faculty member are unable to meet or do not wish to meet, a faculty member can complete the Honor Code Violation Report Form and send it along with supporting documentation directly to the Undergraduate Honor System. A member of the Undergraduate Honor System's personnel will then meet with the student to discuss the allegations of academic misconduct and the faculty member's recommended sanction(s). The student will then have an opportunity to select one of the options described in step 5 of this section.
9. The document was not clear that panels would not proceed unless at least one faculty member was present. Hence, we clarified this by adding the information that is highlighted in yellow:
 - a. The Director of the Office of Undergraduate Academic Integrity may permit a hearing panel to consist of fewer than five voting members in extenuating circumstances as long as at least one faculty panel member is present and there remains a voting majority for the student members on the panel.
10. The document was not clear that the UHS would not drop or dismiss a case prior to a panel hearing without consulting with the faculty member. We added the following sentence in yellow regarding cases that an investigation may reveal there is insufficient information for the case to proceed:
 - a. If the recommendation [from the case investigator] concludes that there is insufficient information to support the allegation, the Director will contact the faculty member to seek additional information. After consulting with the faculty member, if the Director of the Office of Undergraduate Academic Integrity determines that there is not sufficient information to support the allegation, the Undergraduate Honor System creates an event file and the charges are dropped.
11. The students did not want to be called Vice-Chairs. They requested that their names be Honor Council Delegates. We made this change.
12. The Faculty Senate recommended that minor revisions to the Honor Code Manual be reviewed and approved by the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies. Therefore, we inserted language that allows minor changes to be made if approved by the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies.