**Honor System Task Force Subcommittee Report**

This subcommittee was asked to review both the Educational Policy Committee/Committee on Student Conduct report (2011) and the executive summary of the 2002 Chancellor’s Task Force. The Subcommittee consisted of Todd Austell (faculty, Chemistry), Travis Riley (undergraduate student), Kiran Bhardwaj (graduate student, Philosophy), and Melinda Manning (staff, Dean of Students and adjunct faculty). The subcommittee was asked to come up with some recommendations that might be feasible to implement this term. Unfortunately, Travis Riley was unable to join in the discussion.

The group noted that many of the recommendations from both reports, particularly the 2002 report had either already been implemented or were in process. The subcommittee selected several recommendations to forward to the whole group:

1. From the EPC/COSC report: “Have department/unit Chairs nominate two people each year who would be available for occasional service to the Honor System and the UHB (where HC appeals are heard); one of the two nominees could serve as the Honor System representative at the unit level, available to provide guidance and answers for other faculty.”

We feel that this is a worthy recommendation for multiple reasons. One, it would help replenish the severely depleted pool of faculty members available for UHBs. Two, it may help with faculty “buy in” to the system. We could provide training for these individuals so that they will be able to answer questions at the departmental level and debunk some of the myths in regards to the Honor System.

The Business school is already in the process of appointing such a liaison. In addition, we are aware of several departments that already have an informal liaison in place.

An additional idea that Kiran had for this was to allow instructors to “check a box” when they are submitting a case to ask the AG reviewing the case to also have a “faculty expert” review the charge decision. This could be both beneficial for the AG in particular cases (computer science comes to mind) and also could help with faculty buy in. The liasons might be able to be used as some of the “experts”.

2. From both reports: “Establish the Informal Faculty-Student Session as an alternative route for academic integrity cases” (2002 report) and “Adopt a student-faculty resolution option that would enable an accusing faculty member and an accused student to arrive at a mutually agreeable penalty in certain cases of academic or non-academic misconduct. A range of acceptable alternative resolutions would also need to be defined and affirmed by the Honor System, and the alleged infractions and outcomes would still need to be reported to the Honor System for the broad purpose of insuring equity across units.”

We feel that this recommendation would accomplish several goals. One, it would reduce the Honor System caseload. Two, it may increase faculty confidence in the Honor System by giving instructors more control over the process. Three, it may help regulate a practice that already appears to be occurring. It would be critical to require instructors to consult with the Honor System before they embark on such a session with a student to determine if the student has been found guilty in any prior academic misconduct cases. We feel that the informal session should not be used for these cases. Lastly, there is already a template that was used briefly around 2003-2004.

There are two important things to note. In order to establish the informal session, would we have to remove the usual sanction? This is based on the assumption that instructors cannot issue a suspension. Two, in order for these informal sessions to work we should use the “liaisons” as established in recommendation 1 to help spread the word on this new option and in order to adequately educate faculty on how to use it.

3. From the 2002 report: “Add to the range of normative sanctions for academic integrity the “XF” grade (“failure due to academic dishonesty”). Institute an honor/integrity course requirement that would allow the “X” to be removed but would retain the “F” on the student’s transcript.”

We realize that this goal may be overly ambitious to achieve by the end of this semester, but we feel this is one that should be pursued. We believe that by instituting the “XF” grade, it would send a strong signal to employers and graduate schools. It would be distinguish between poor performance and cheating. We know that in many of these cases, the student would receive an F anyway for poor performance. We also support the creation of an ethics/integrity class that students could enroll in to remove the “X” from their grade.

Lastly-we also believe that either the task force or COSC should examine lowering the standard of proof. This was a recommendation made in both reports, and seems timely in wake of the recently lowered standard of proof in harassment/assault cases.
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