

FS Prop. No.: 07-17/18
Title: A Proposal Substantively Revising the Student Academic Code of Conduct
Date Submitted: August 28, 2017

Sponsor(s): Sassenfeld (Eng), Corran (DACC)

Proposed Committee: _____

Assigned Committee: _____

Prior Approvals: The project to revamp the Academic Misconduct Policy has spanned several provost's task forces, some working jointly with ASNMSU task forces. Each working group consisted of representative of faculty, students, academic administration, university legal counsel and executive administration.

The attached proposed Rules 5.10 and 5.11, are collectively referred to as the Student Academic Code of Conduct, were assigned on April 6, 2017 by the AAG to be reviewed by the ADAC, ADC, ASNMSU, CC President's Council and the VP SAEM. The feedback received through the summer was addressed and edits incorporated into the drafts being presented to the Faculty Senate for consideration.

Rationale: One change, aimed at enhancing due process, is that internal communications between faculty, department head and other academic administrators will be able to flow freely as matters of alleged academic misconduct progress. Contested matters will be heard by neutral third party hearing panel members. Similar to the Faculty Grievance Review Board, a pool of faculty, administrators and students will be created (called the Student Academic Conduct Board) from which hearing panel members will be selected.

Some other changes relate to types of sanction and appeals: Level I sanctions are for first offenses and less serious offenses. They are implemented in coordination with an Academic Conduct Officer and subject to one level of appeal. Level II sanctions are for repeat offenses or more serious offenses, including first offenses by graduate students. Notation of academic misconduct on the academic transcript is now also expressly included as a Level II sanction. A Level II sanction may be contested by the student by requesting a hearing (with the 3 member hearing panel), and for Level II Sanctions, the student may seek a final review by the EVPP or designee. Another substantive revision is that either party (student or faculty) may seek a final review. Also, the use of warnings is acknowledged, and must be documented, which should prevent repeat offenders from avoiding sanctions.

Proposal: Through this bill, the Senate Sponsor(s) submit for review by the Faculty Senate: Attachment 1 (Rule 5.10 - Academic Integrity), Attachment 2 (Rule 5.11 - Procedures to Respond to Allegations of Student Academic Misconduct, Attachment 3 (Appendix- Flowchart), Attachment 4 (Appendix-- Examples of Academic Misconduct), and Attachment 5 (Academic Misconduct Report Form).