Faculty Senate, Tuesday, December 8, 2020, 5:00 PM
Via Zoom

Voting results are in red.

1. The meeting was called to order at 5:00 PM.

2. The November 10, 2020, minutes were approved by unanimous consent.

3. Announcements and Information

   Speaker of the Faculty Simon Lewis noted that, technically, senate meetings continue to be out of order because the by-laws do not contain a provision for meeting and voting online. Having tried a few times to arrange a brief, in-person Senate meeting to approve a change to the by-laws that would validate votes taken online, Speaker Lewis said that he may try one more time, the Friday before spring semester starts Jan 8. Otherwise, we may have to wait until we’re back in person in the fall of 2021 to ratify the votes taken at online meetings during the pandemic.

   He reminded faculty that grades are due by 5 pm Wednesday 12/16; the deadline for sustainability literacy course proposals has been extended until 12/21.

4. Reports

   a. Speaker of the Faculty Simon Lewis thanked everyone for their dedication in getting through a difficult semester, with special acknowledgment to those whose family obligations made things even tougher. He noted that there had been occasions when false rumors threatened to sour the atmosphere, but he has perceived the general mood on the virtual campus to be positive. The College has continued to offer not only the basics of instruction and mentoring but also a variety of co- and extra-curricular offerings for students. Despite the fact that spring semester will be much the same in terms of COVID protocols, he hopes now that we have a clearer sense of the crisis having an end, as the days begin to get longer, our spirits will rise.

   b. Provost Suzanne Austin echoed Speaker Lewis’s thanks to everyone for their hard work throughout the semester. She expressed concern for our students, saying she worries that some of them have fallen into habits that we don’t want to encourage. She wants us to think of the spring semester as a transition to a new normal.

   Academic Affairs, schools, and departments are making coordinated efforts to “close the gap” on spring registrations. Many students and parents may still be waiting, though, to make a decision on spring enrollment. Ultimately, she believes most of our students will be back in the spring. Meanwhile, projections for fall 2021 enrollment are strong, with
applications up 6% for residents, 50% for nonresidents from a year ago. Virtual admissions events have been well-attended.

With thanks to Mark Del Mastro and others who served on a subcommittee, Provost Austin reported that there will be some guidance coming out in the next couple of days about attendance policies for the spring. The new language will reflect our effort to make spring 2020 a transitional one.

Following up on the memo sent jointly by herself and Speaker Lewis, Provost Austin reported that while the PS/NS (pass/fail) option was not renewed for the fall semester, in spring 2021 students will have the option to select one course as PS/NS.

The School of the Arts’ Dean search is underway. Professor Mary Beth Heston is chairing the committee. With Godfrey Gibbison’s departure, Provost Austin will launch an internal search for Dean of the Graduate School, with the committee to be chaired by EHHP Dean Fran Welch. Provost Austin said she would like to have someone in place by March 1. She has asked HSS Dean Gibbs Knotts to serve as Interim Dean until then.

The Provost’s Office is working on a faculty survey as part of regular evaluation of deans. Faculty were last surveyed about deans’ performance in 2017, so there is precedent. Provost Austin said that she would like the process to include deans preparing written responses to major themes that emerge from the survey results, followed by school-wide meetings to discuss those themes. This process would generate plans to address issues raised in the surveys.

“Shells” for courses in OAKS will be ready within days. She would like faculty to post a syllabus (in some form, possibly a draft or basic syllabus) one week before the beginning of classes.

c. Chief Diversity Officer Renard Harris gave a Presentation on the Diversity EDU program. The self-paced program takes about three hours to complete (divided into three modules). He said the goal is universal participation among faculty and staff, but he is not sure how to “enforce” compliance. He would like input from faculty on how to do that.

Senator Irina Gigova (HSS) noted that adjunct faculty are already overburdened, and she asked if it would be possible to pay them to complete the program. Dr. Harris responded that they had not considered that. Senator Gigova asked if departments might be able to pay adjuncts out of their own funds, and Dr. Harris replied that he assumes that would be up to deans and chairs.

Senator Ashley Pagnotta (Physics and Astronomy) asked if it is possible to get statistics on compliance by department, in which case it might be possible to create competition among departments. Dr. Harris said he is sure that’s possible.
Senator Fran Scudese (Adjunct Rep, Teacher Education) reported that she has completed the program and found it informative and valuable.

5. New Business

a. Approval of degree candidates (December): approved by unanimous consent.

b. Curriculum Committee (Nenad Radakovic, Chair)

1) PSYC: Course change:


2) GLAT: Program change:


3) REAL: Program and course change

https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:171/form Approved by online vote.

4) CPLT: Deactivating minor and two courses:


5) FINC: Course changes:


c. **Senator Jonathan Neufeld (Philosophy)**: Motion to reconstitute the ad hoc REI (Race, Equity, and Inclusion) Committee in order to bring a formal proposal for the REI curriculum requirement through Curriculog and the Faculty Curriculum Committee. The motion was seconded by Senator Merissa Ferrara (Communication). The members of the committee are as follows:

Anthony Greene (African American Studies) and Morgan Koerner (German), co-chairs; Julia McReynolds-Perez (Sociology), research subcommittee chair; Charissa Owens (Office of Institutional Diversity), Kristen Monet Graham (ICAN Curriculum Chair), Ghazi Abuhakema (Asian and Arabic Studies), Kristi Brian (Women’s and Gender Studies), Nenad Radakovic (Teacher Education), Jason Vance (Biology), Chris Korey (Biology), Lanie Joiner (Honors College), James Malm (Finance), David Hansen (Entrepreneurship), Judy Millesen (Public Administration), Meg Goettsches (African Studies), Mark Del Mastro (Associate Provost), and Mary Bergstrom (Registrar).
The motion passed by online vote.

d. Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty-Administration Manual (Merissa Ferrara, Chair): Motion to delete from the By-Laws item c (implementation) under Section 3.B.20 (Advisory Committee on First-Year Experience). Revision

Senator Ferrara explained that this is essentially a “housekeeping” change; the provision being deleted is obsolete. The motion passed by online vote.

e. Senator Chris Warnick (HSS): Motion to form an ad hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness and Mentoring to serve through Fall 2022, with the following charge:

- Identify and implement more effective approaches for gathering formative and summative student feedback that better informs teaching effectiveness and promotes students’ metacognitive engagement with their own learning;

- Develop guidelines for faculty end-of-course self-reflection that draw on formative and summative feedback from students and that can be used to demonstrate growth in annual reviews and major reviews;

- Incorporate a fourth evaluation category into the Faculty Administration Manual that rewards and incentivizes outstanding faculty advising and mentoring;

- Create an effective professional development infrastructure to support these project goals.

Rationale and Proposed Timeline

Senator Warnick reviewed the rationale and goals (see attachment). The motion was seconded by Senator Gretchen McLaine (Theatre and Dance).

Citing the second goal, which includes “self-reflection” and demonstrating growth in performance reviews, Senator Irina Gigova (HSS) expressed concern about creating more work for faculty. She asked whether that item was just something for the committee to consider or something they must endorse.

Senator Warnick replied that it’s something that other schools have done, but he can see how it could become busywork. He said it would be up to the committee to decide on the exact guidelines, but the group making this proposal wants there to be follow-up on evaluations.

Senator Gigova asked if faculty will be able to weigh in on these discussions with the committee --- for instance, through a survey.
Senator Warnick replied that the committee would do focus-group surveys with students and faculty and have conversations with department chairs and the tenure and promotion committee. He said this effort should be ground up, not top-down.

Senator Jessica Streit (Art and Architectural History) said she worries about mandatory “reflection,” especially when it is part of tenure-and-promotion process. It can easily become performative, she said. She is also concerned about the prospect of another merit category for tenure and promotion. While she and her department are wary about adding those requirements, they are in favor of revising the evaluations provided by students to try to mitigate bias against women and people of color. Senator Warnick responded that his group imagined that the “reflection piece” would not be an add-on but, rather, something to support faculty. Senator Streit said that in her experience with faculty reviews, “optional” usually becomes mandatory in practice.

Associate Provost Deanna Caveny reminded the Senate that the administrative portion of the Faculty-Administration Manual, which includes evaluation policies, is controlled by the Provost. The Provost’s Office has, in the past, sought feedback from relevant faculty committees, chairs and deans. But essentially for items in the administrative section in the manual, the Provost would have the final say.

Senator Ashley Pagnotta (Physics and Astronomy) asked, if a fourth pillar of evaluation (advising and mentoring) were to be added, will we get more pages for our tenure-and-promotion narrative? Senator Warnick replied that that would be determined by Academic Affairs. Associate Provost Caveny added that some of these measures would affect departments differently from one another, so her office would work with departments accordingly.

Professor Vince Benigni (Guest, Communication) suggested that we put the burden for supplying advising data on advisees rather than on faculty. He added that the College does not place enough importance on service as it is, and perhaps service and mentoring could be combined rather than creating a fourth “prong” of evaluation. Senator Warnick said that advising “shows up” in reviews under both teaching and service, so he hopes the committee would work on clarifying that.

Senator Brian Bossak (Heath and Human Performance) said that he sees this as a complicated question; there are benefits of this initiative, but he shares concerns expressed by others about where such well-intentioned proposals might lead.

Senator Warnick expressed hope that this proposal will spark discussion about course-instructor evaluations, but he also hopes that we can gather information about perceptions of teaching. The proposers want this committee to help us as an institution define what effective teaching is.
The proposal passed by online vote (26 yes, 14 no, 4 abstain).

f. Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid (Meta Van Sickle, Chair): Proposal to revise the policy on X XF Transcript Notation (Academic Dishonesty) Presentation / Proposed Revision The proposal was withdrawn by the committee.

6. Constituents’ General Concerns

Senator Tom Carroll (EHHP) asked how members of the ad hoc REI Committee were chosen. Speaker Lewis replied that he and several others put the committee together in October 2019. Senator Carroll asked if there were a way for others to get involved in those conversations. Speaker Lewis said that the idea was to have representation across schools on the committee so that they could solicit input from across campus before a curricular proposal comes back to the Senate.

Senator Ashley Pagnotta (Physics and Astronomy) asked how the ad hoc Teaching Effectiveness and Mentoring would be chosen. Speaker Lewis replied that the selection would go through the Committee on Nominations and Elections, who will try to get as wide a range of faculty as possible.

Speaker Lewis thanked Katy Flynn, who is leaving the College after serving as Faculty Secretariat and Administrative Assistant in the Provost’s Office for the past year. He also acknowledged Dean Valerie Morris, Dean Jeri Cabot, Dean Godfrey Gibbison, Professor Elaine Worzala, and Professor Chris Starr, all of whom are retiring or leaving the College this December.

7. The meeting adjourned at 6:18.
DIVERSITY EDU
FACULTY / STAFF
ACCESS DIVERSITY EDU

• Cougar ED
• Cofcmyabsorb.com
• My Courses
• Faculty and Staff: Personal Skills for a Diverse Campus
- CofC’s Commitment and what it means to you
- Defining Diversity
- Engaging Comfortable with Difference
- Examining Assumptions
- Searching for Similarities
- Anticipating Impact
- Microaggressions and their impact
- Skills for senders of microaggressions
- Skills for recipients of microaggressions
- Skills for bystanders to microaggressions

STUDENT MODULE
• Module 1 Engagement with Diversity
  • *defining diversity
  • *addressing diversity resistance
  • *engaging comfortably with difference
  • *managing assumptions
  • *searching for similarities

• Module 2 Communication for Inclusion
  • *anticipating impact
  • *keeping up with evolving identity terms
  • *the value and variability of self-identification
  • *micro-aggressions and their impact

• Module 3 The Influence of Unconscious Bias
  • *recognize how unconscious bias influence choices and decisions
  • *myths and stereotypes about people of color, women, people with disabilities, and people with minority sexual orientations and gender identities
• FACULTY MODULE

• 180 Minutes (approximately)
• 3 Modules
• Resources (for additional materials)
• Closed Caption (Navigation Bar)
• Pause
• Resume
• Table of Contents
• Interaction
COMMITMENT TO COMPLETING THE MODULE
Committee and other invited guests with expertise in a discipline, department, or program relevant to a particular course proposal.

(4) The Committee shall forward all recommendations to the Faculty Senate.

(5) In consultation with the Faculty Secretariat, the Committee shall maintain an archive of all materials submitted to it.

(6) Requirements for a public process of course proposal review shall not interfere with the right of the Committee to enter into executive session.

d. Appeals: No changes in the General Education Program shall be presented to the Faculty Senate without the Committee’s action. Any decision of the Committee on General Education can be appealed to the Faculty Senate.

e. Effective on the date on which this committee is established, no change to the General Education Program shall be approved without consideration by this committee.

20. Advisory Committee on First-Year Experience

a. Composition: Seven regular faculty members, at least three of whom shall be teaching in the First-Year Experience program (i.e., teaching either a First-Year Seminar or a Learning Communities Course) during the relevant academic year or have taught in the First-Year Experience program during the preceding academic year. Preferably, each academic school should be represented on the committee. The committee shall have one voting student member selected by the Student Government Association. The Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience (or other administrator designated by the Provost), the Assistant Vice President for New Student Programs (or other administrator designated by the Provost), the Dean of Students, and the Director of the First-Year Experience program are ex officio, non-voting members.

b. Duties:

(1) In consultation with the relevant administrators, to support and advise the First-Year Experience program on all matters relevant to the program, including program development, budget requests, and other issues germane to program support;

(2) In consultation with the Director of the First-Year Experience program, to review and assess the First-Year Experience
program and to make non-binding recommendations for revisions to the program;

(3) To request and review proposals for First-Year Experience courses (sections of FYSM 101 and Learning Communities); and

(4) To assist the Director of the First-Year Experience program in recruiting students for First-Year Experience courses and to recruit and plan the training for new First-Year Experience faculty and peer facilitators for Learning Communities.

e. Implementation: The Advisory Committee on the First-Year Experience shall be constituted only if the Provost and the Speaker of the Faculty certify in a written notice addressed to the members of the Faculty Senate that a coordinated, comprehensive, and unified First-Year Experience program has received the necessary approvals and shall be implemented in a timely fashion. Such written notice shall be supplied no later than August 15, 2009, or the ratification for which Art. VI, Section 1 provides shall be null and void and this committee description shall be removed from the Faculty By-Laws.

21. Adjunct Oversight Committee

a. Composition: Five faculty members, including one each from the Faculty Welfare Committee and the Faculty Compensation Committee, together with three elected faculty members, two of whom are regular faculty, and one of whom is an adjunct faculty member (as described in Article V, section 1.B). In addition, an ex-officio non-voting sixth member will be designated by the Provost.

b. Duties:

(1) Receive and analyze reports: from the Office of Institutional Research on the number of adjuncts employed by the College, the number of credit hours delivered by adjunct faculty, adjunct faculty members’ rank and status (part-time or full-time), and adjunct faculty compensation; and from the Provost’s office on College policies for adjunct faculty.

(2) Solicit additional information on adjunct practices in use in schools, departments, and programs. To obtain this information, the committee may analyze published documents (e.g., department websites or handbooks), interview deans and chairs, conduct surveys of adjunct faculty, and/or do additional research.

(3) Receive and response to information from the Provost’s office and/or senior leadership regarding future plans for the College
In 2013, a group of faculty and Associate Provosts formed a working group that participated in a pre-conference workshop at the AAC&U annual conference. That experience and additional discussions led to a proposal for a Center for Academic Innovation and Faculty Engagement (CAiFE) to cultivate an institutional climate that values, rewards, sustains and renews excellence in teaching, learning, scholarship, and campus leadership. The Center’s initiatives would facilitate innovation and creativity in all aspects of an academic life. Overall progress towards a Center has not yet come to fruition, however groups of faculty continue to meet to discuss how best to implement certain aspects of that original plan. One area that has generated consistent energy focuses on the development of a better approach to supporting and evaluating teaching effectiveness. Since early 2019, a group of faculty from across departments and schools has met informally to discuss experiences with and concerns about current evaluation practices (including but not limited to course-instructor evaluations) and to share methods other institutions use to evaluate teaching effectiveness. We believe our current approaches could be improved substantially by exploring promising practices as established in the literature and through review of other institutional revision processes. With the approval of our new strategic plan, we believe now is an optimal time to begin a college-wide effort to build on current practices used to evaluate teaching effectiveness at the College. This effort aligns with all three of the new pillars and resonates with our cross-cutting commitment to fostering a culture of innovation that encourages and enables innovation and continuous improvement in how faculty, staff and students teach, learn and lead.

Current Evaluation System
We see several concerns as deserving attention. Our current evaluation system relies on a standardized instrument that is administered once at the end of a course. The current instrument does not provide formative feedback about teaching throughout the term, which would enable the instructor to respond productively to student concerns, but rather catalogs after the fact how the student experienced the course. In addition, a large body of work has shown that this type of evaluation, without attention to bias, can have differential impacts on women faculty and faculty of color as well as on those who teach “controversial” or “non-traditional” courses (such as those in area, identity-focused, and cultural studies), and as compared to white and male faculty and those teaching uncontroversial and/or more traditional courses. Peer reviews of classroom teaching are used in some but not all departments and they use a variety of approaches, often occurring only just before a faculty member undergoes a significant review (e.g., third-year, T&P). Finally, our current tenure and promotion process does not fully capture other aspects of faculty-student interactions, such as advising and mentoring, that the College holds up as essential parts of the education we provide.

Other Models
Several institutions have created more formative systems and with attention to concerns around bias, such as University of Oregon, the University of Southern California, and Elon University. Their approaches can serve as starting points for discussion and models that can be adapted and tested on our campus.
Ad-hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness and Mentoring 2020-2022

Project Goals

- Identify and implement more effective approaches for gathering formative and summative student feedback that better informs teaching effectiveness and promotes students’ metacognitive engagement with their own learning
- Develop guidelines for faculty end-of-course self-reflection that draw on formative and summative feedback from students and that can be used to demonstrate growth in annual reviews and major reviews
- Incorporate a fourth evaluation category into the Faculty Administration Manual that rewards and incentivizes outstanding faculty advising and mentoring
- Create an effective professional development infrastructure to support these project goals

Project Timeline

- Fall 2020
  - Create Senate-sponsored Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness and Mentoring
- Spring 2021
  - Invite all chairs and program directors for discussion of the process and project goals
  - Organize Focus Groups to gather student and faculty input
  - Collect student feedback methods currently used by faculty across campus
  - Document current advising/mentoring/coaching practices
  - Announce opportunities for participation in fall 2021 pilot
- Summer 2021
  - Analyze student and faculty focus group data
  - Develop pilot student feedback material
  - Develop faculty self-reflection parameters and potential models
  - Develop forms of evidence for effective advising/coaching/mentoring
  - Recruit faculty to participate in the fall 2021 pilot
  - Plan fall 2021 faculty development on self-reflection and learning from student feedback
- Fall 2021
  - Pilot new feedback model in selected classes across all schools
  - Offer professional development on faculty self-reflection and learning from student feedback
- Spring 2022
  - Continued pilot of student and faculty feedback model
  - Ad-hoc committee and participating faculty analyze pilot data
  - Pilot implementation of faculty self-reflections and revised instruments in annual reviews
- Fall 2022
  - Revised language for FAM proposed to Senate and all the required approval steps
XXF Policy Change Proposal
Need:

• The current policy needs three changes:
  • Clarity about what happens when a student has more than one offense
  • Addition of a sanction option in cases where a “low stakes” offense has occurred.
  • Clarifying the meaning of XXF
Clarity of what happens upon a repeat offense

• **Progressive movement between the Classes**
  • A second Class 2 violation becomes a Class 1
  • A second Class 3 violation becomes a Class 2

• Currently all second violations of any class are placed in Class 1
Adding a new sanction for a subset of violations

• Carving out a subset within Class 2 offenses for violations linked to “low stakes” assignments. A new sanction is proposed for such cases:
  • A mandatory online integrity seminar in lieu of the XXF
  • Why add this option:
    • Faculty are assigning more low-stakes, developmental assignments
    • “Keep It Small, Keep It Frequent” James Lang, Small Teaching (2016)
    • An admission of guilt should factor into the sanctioning
    • Take advantage of the opportunities to educate vs punish
Clarifying what an XXF means

Clarifying that the XXF sanction is not a grade but a status indicator (XX) plus a grade (F)
Reviewed and supported by:

- Mark Del Mastro and Mary Bergstrom
- Deans
- FCAS committee

- Three committee members completed the Integrity Seminar and noted both its usefulness and effect
- Effect studies about the Integrity Seminar were reviewed
Academic Dishonesty and the Operation of the XXF - Transcript Notation Due to Finding of Responsibility for Academic Dishonesty

1. Faculty input – When a faculty member determines a student has committed academic dishonesty, they will fill out the appropriate Honor Code Report form. The faculty member has the option of designating whether they believe that the offense warrants the status indicator and grade of XXF.

2. Schedule of Sanctions for Violations of Academic Honesty

A. Class 1. The most serious breaches of academic honesty fall into this category, as well as all second Class 2 offenses. Class 1 violations must be found to involve significant premeditation; conspiracy and/or intent to deceive. See listing of examples at the end of this policy.
Sanction options:

- XXF and suspension
- XXF and expulsion

B. Class 2. This Class includes serious acts that are found to involve deliberate failure to comply with assignment directions; some conspiracy and/or intent to deceive, as well as all second Class 3 offenses. Additionally, factors such as the weight of the assignment, the nature of the deception, and/or student admission of responsibility may be considered.
See listing of examples at the end of this policy.
Sanction options:

- Online Integrity Seminar
- XXF
- XXF and disciplinary probation and/or other educational sanctions
- XXF and some form of suspension

C. Class 3. This class includes violations due to student confusion; ignorance and or miscommunication or incomplete communication between the faculty member or his/her designee and the class. See listing of examples at the end of this policy. The faculty member sets the sanction. Faculty can also initiate a Class 3 Report without a prior assessment by an Honor Board or the Office of the Dean of Students.
3. Class 1 and 2 Violations  A. If the Honor Board or the dean of students or their designee sanctions a student with a status indicator and grade of XXF, and this sanction is not appealed by the student, the dean of students and the faculty member notify the Registrar to place a grade of XXF for the applicable course on the student’s academic record. The grade XXF shall be recorded on the student’s transcript with the notation “failure due to academic dishonesty.”

B. Student appeals of the XXF grade follow the procedure for all other appeals of academic dishonesty sanctions, as outlined in the Student Handbook. If the Appellate Authority denies the right to another hearing, or another hearing is granted and the decision is to uphold the XXF grade sanction, the dean of students and the faculty member notify the Registrar to assign the XXF grade to the student’s academic record.

C. If grades are due but an academic dishonesty hearing is still in progress, a grade of ‘I’ shall be applied to the course until the hearing process is complete.

D. An XXF grade shall maintain a quality point value of 0.0. The grade “XXF” shall be treated in the same way as an “F” for the purposes of Grade Point Average, course repeatability, and determination of academic standing.

E. The XXF must stay on the transcript for at least two years from the date student is found in violation of a Class 1 Violation or Class 2 Violations where the assignment is of significant weight.

F. In cases of a Class 2 violation, the Honor Board or the dean of students or their designee will have the authority to assign a required online integrity seminar where the infraction of academic integrity occurred on an assignment of limited scope or grade weight, such as a homework assignment, low-stakes writing assignment, other formative-type assessments, and/or there is record of an admission of responsibility. The time required to complete this seminar is between 5 to 10 hours. Students will be afforded the opportunity to complete an online integrity seminar within 30 days from notification by a deadline designated by the Honor Board with the acknowledgement of the faculty member. Faculty will have sole authority over the assessment and grading of the assignment(s) under review. Should a case be reported close to the end of term, the faculty member will assign an Incomplete.

After receiving notice that the online seminar has been completed satisfactorily, faculty will calculate and assign the final course grade according to their usual practices. If the online seminar is not completed by the designated deadline; the Office of the Dean of Students will direct the Registrar to attach the XXF designation plus grade. The XX designator and the notation of “academic dishonesty” will remain on the student transcript for minimum of one year in such cases.

After a period of one year from notification, the student (or alumnus/alumna) may petition the Honor Board for removal of the XX and notation, the F remains. (Information on responsibility for violations of the Honor Code will be maintained in the student’s conduct record per the normal practices of the Office of the Dean of Students.) Procedures for the petition will be the same as those outlined for the petition of removal of the XXF grade.
Students are responsible for the fee affiliated with the online integrity seminar. See https://integrityseminar.org/faqs/ for the current rate. The fee does not cover the cost of all required materials. The Office of the Dean of Students will make available an application for need-based assistance and provide alternative payment options for qualifying students.

G. After two years, a student may petition the Honor Board to exchange the XXF for an F. The petition must be in written form and provide the reason for removal of the XXF. Additionally, the petitioner must appear before the Honor Board to explain the request (appearance may be through electronic means if necessary). If the student petitions and a majority of the Honor Board agree to remove the XXF, the Honor Board outlines conditions under which the XXF is removed. The conditions may include giving testimony of dishonesty during freshman orientation or other organized Honor Board events, and/or performing specific tasks aimed at increasing the education of the violator and/or campus on the value of academic integrity. When these conditions are met, the XXF is removed entirely from the transcript, leaving no past evidence of the XXF. A grade of F is recorded in its place.

H. If a petition to change an XXF grade to an F has been made and denied, another petition may not be made for another year from the date of denial. This stipulation applies after graduation as well.

I. If the student is/has been found responsible of an additional violation of academic honesty, the XXF remains permanent. The student may not petition for an F in exchange for the XXF in these cases.

J. A student who has received an XXF in a course and needs to pass the course for a requirement may retake the course. If the student passes the course, the requirement is met, but the original course grade will remain as an XXF unless the XX is removed by an accepted petition for removal.

4. Class 3 Violations

A. When a faculty member suspects an Honor Code violation is more of a result of student confusion, ignorance or miscommunication, they should arrange a conference with the student as soon as possible to discuss the matter.

B. Together, the faculty member and student review all materials.
C. The faculty member designs a response that is discussed with the student, e.g., zero on the assignment, written warning, resubmission of the work, research on relevant topic, etc.

D. The faculty member and student commit the outcome to a form provided by the Dean of Students.

E. A written record of the educational response with the signatures of both the faculty member and the student is forwarded to the Dean of Students. The record will remain in the Dean of Students office.

F. The record of the educational response for this violation will be introduced in subsequent hearings during the sanctioning phase should the same student be found in violation of the Honor Code at a later point in time.

G. The student has the right to contest the allegation and request that the matter be forwarded immediately to the Dean of Students for adjudication under the procedures outlined in the Student Handbook.

5. Changes to the operation of the XXF grade as a sanction option within the Honor System must go through the Faculty Committee on Academic Standards and the Faculty Senate.

6. Examples of violations for Classes 1-3. The lists below are not meant to be comprehensive but illustrative of the types of acts that generally will be before the Honor Board and faculty members.

A. Examples of Class 1 violations:
   All second offences of Class 2 violations, cheating on a test which involves significant premeditation and conspiracy of effort, taking a test for someone else, or permitting someone else to take a test or course in one’s place, intentional plagiarizing, where the majority of the submitted work was written or created by another, obtaining, stealing, or buying all or a significant part of an unadministered exam, selling, or giving away all or a significant part of an unadministered test, bribing, or attempting to bribe any other person to obtain an unadministered test or any information about the test, buying, or otherwise acquiring, another’s course paper and resubmitting it as one’s own work, whether altered or not entering a building, office, or computer for the purpose of changing a grade in a grade book, on a test, or on other work for which a grade is given, changing, altering, or being an accessory to changing and/or altering a grade in a grade book, on a test, on a “Change of Grade” form, or other official academic college record which relates to grades, and entering a building, office, or computer for the purpose of obtaining an un-administered test.
B. Examples of Class 2 violations:

All second offenses of Class 3 violations

cheating on an exam which involves some premeditation,
copying from another’s test or allowing another student to copy from your test, where some plans were made for such collaboration,
intentional plagiarizing, where a moderate portion of the submitted work was written or created by another,
unauthorized reuse of previously graded work,
intentionally failing to cite information from the correct source,
intentionally listing sources in a bibliography/work cited page that were not used in the paper,
copying, or allowing one to copy, homework assignments that are to be submitted for credit, when unauthorized,
intentionally opening an officially sealed envelope containing an exam, test or other class-related material,
unauthorized and intentional collaboration on an assignment, and
unauthorized and intentional use or possession of a study aid.

C. Examples of Class 2 violations of involving low-stakes assignments

Unauthorized collaboration on homework
Unauthorized use on an online tool to complete a low-stakes quiz/assignment
Plagiarism in a reading response paper
Plagiarism in a discussion thread or blog
Unauthorized collaboration on a pre-lab quiz

D. Examples of Class 3 violations:

record of same offense made on other similar assignments and no feedback provided by the faculty member prior to allegation,
reusing and/or building upon coursework already submitted for another class without permission of the professor,
unintentionally failing to cite information from the correct source,
unintentional violation of the class rules on collaboration, and
unintentional possession of a study aid.