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Student Academic Policies Committee

Minutes

Wednesday, September 28, 2011

10:00 am

KL 205

Present: Anloague, P., Doyle, G., Krane, C., Lau, T., McCombe, J.
Absent: Grewal, J., Mari, A., Parsons, H., Tsiribas, D., Webb, K.

Discussion on the form to report an academic “dishonesty” incident was continued. The following decisions were made.

1. It was more appropriate to call the form “Academic Incident Report” rather than “Academic Dishonesty Report.”
2. Date of the incident should be on the form
3. Each of the seven areas of dishonesty cited in the Academic Honor Code should be listed.
4. A space for Appeal to the Chair: Signature and results should be included.
5. A space for Appeal to the Department Review Committee: Signature and results should be included.
6. A space for Appeal to the Dean’s Office: Signature and results should be included.
7. A space for Appeal to the Provost’s Office: Signature and results should be included.

Eliminate the paragraph that details the appeal process and just refer the student to the honor code, section V.

The form will be modified and emailed to the SAPC for further comments.

The possibility of a separate “Appeals Form” was mentioned.

It was noted that the Honor Code specifically states: “All honor code violations require that a dean be notified of the violation . . .” If the faculty follow the Honor Code, and students do not change some of their practices, the deans’ offices are likely to be inundated by forms. Perhaps the First Year Experience courses should include detailed information on dishonesty and the consequence to the student.

It was suggested that the Senate consider “honesty” problems associated with on-line courses, e.g. what percentage of a grade can be determined by on-line testing?