

## Motion to Amend the Faculty Handbook (section 5.2)

### Rationale:

Faculty interactions with the honor system are complex, and more clarification would be helpful in specific areas. In particular, the following updates will be useful:

1. An update of the proper link for the Honor Constitution and a reminder that honor advisors are available for faculty to consult (5.2)
2. An explicit statement that faculty should let students know what actions are allowed or forbidden in their courses. The previous language only included writing assignments, but many honor code violations occur on exams, homework, or other non-written assignments. The new language clarifies that faculty should provide expectations for all assignments. The new language also highlights the importance of explaining the rules in each course regarding collaboration, since there is wide variance between classes, leading to the possibility for confusion. (5.2.2)
3. The motion proposes a policy that prohibits automatic test proctoring systems, but does allow for “Zoom proctoring” of remote tests. Given the inequities and privacy concerns with automated proctoring systems, this policy is designed to encourage faculty to take an active role in student assessment rather than outsourcing this aspect of our job. (5.2.2)
4. The motion clarifies for faculty the process of grading our students when an honor case has been reported. The contents of the motion codify and clarify existing policy and practice for the situations when a case is in progress, a student is found responsible, and when a student is found not responsible. The policy more explicitly reiterates faculty prerogatives in grading while still granting students the rights outlined in the Honor Constitution.

The motion does not intend to create any additional contractual obligations on the part of the faculty, but rather clarifies expectations in these areas.

### Items of clarification:

- a. There is an abundance of evidence (e.g., Roig, 2001) showing that faculty don't always agree on definitions of plagiarism and that students aren't always aware of these expectations. Our syllabi are expected to contain the rules of the road for our courses now, and this amendment enumerates specific ways that faculty already describe assignments.

- b. This document does not require a separate set of requirements to be listed for every assignment, **merely an expectation that students have the rules of the road for their classes explained in writing in whatever form the faculty deems appropriate.**
- c. Current policy requires faculty to report honor violations they believe to occur (Honor Constitution, p.10). This revision clarifies that faculty are expected to report only when they wish to allege to the Honor Council that a violation has taken place. Nothing in this policy prevents a faculty member from opting not to report a behavior to the Honor Council if there is to be no punishment for that behavior.

DRAFT

Motion:

The UFC moves that the changes described below be made to the faculty handbook. The changes affect section 5.2, which describes the honor system, student-faculty interactions under the honor code, faculty actions related to the honor code, faculty responses to suspected violations of the honor code, and grading in the context of an honor report.

DRAFT

1. **David Rettinger (dretting)**  
January 14, 2022 at 3:00:00 PM  
Update link
2. **David Rettinger (dretting)**  
April 1, 2022 at 9:09:00 AM  
Pronoun change
3. **David Rettinger (dretting)**  
April 1, 2022 at 9:09:00 AM  
See rationale, point 2
4. **David Rettinger (dretting)**  
April 1, 2022 at 9:11:00 AM  
See rationale, point 3
5. **David Rettinger (dretting)**  
January 26, 2022 at 2:11:00 PM  
Moved to 5.2.4, not truly deleted
6. **David Rettinger (dretting)**  
April 1, 2022 at 9:21:00 AM  
Deleted in anticipation of a constitutional reorganization
7. **David Rettinger (dretting)**  
March 18, 2022 at 10:46:00 AM  
Paraphrased from the Honor Constitution III.I.B p24 and added to point out that mere suspicion is not sufficient, but rather that an allegation to the Honor Council is required
8. **David Rettinger (dretting)**  
March 18, 2022 at 10:30:00 AM  
Added to highlight the fact that dismissal isn't the first step or even a likely one.

## The Honor Code

### 5.2 THE HONOR CODE

1 The Honor Code and Honor Constitution are found in [Appendix B](#). Each faculty member agrees to accept and abide by the Honor System when accepting ~~his or her~~their original faculty appointment. It is the responsibility of all faculty members to stay familiar with the principles and operating procedures of the Honor System and to support it. [Faculty honor advisors and procedural advisors are available to support faculty and answer questions. A directory can be found in Appendix B \(Honor Constitution\).](#)

5.2.1 Student-Faculty Interactions and Honor Code Each student upon entering the University signs a pledge to observe the Honor System. Therefore, the work of all students is predicated on the Honor System, and the faculty member in his or her relationship with students is expected to act within this framework. All statements about academic matters made to a faculty member are covered by the Honor Code.

3 5.2.2- Faculty Actions Related to the Honor Code Faculty members should make clear in [writing](#) their [assignments-expectations with regard to sources, paraphrasing, and citation for all class activities](#). Faculty should also explain the extent ~~to and manner in~~ which they consider help from (or collaboration with) others to be legitimate. It is expected that faculty members will conduct ~~tests and examinations~~all assessments according to the expectations of the Honor System. Faculty members need not remain in the classroom during tests and examinations; they must indicate to the students where they may be found if needed, and they may return to the classroom briefly for consultation.

4 Faculty may [proctor online assessments using video meetings, but may not require students to use automated proctoring services except as required by outside accrediting bodies.](#)

5.2.3 Faculty Response to Suspected Violations of the Honor Code Violations of the Honor Code are not to be condoned or ignored by faculty; however, neither are they to be dealt with by unilateral faculty action (such as by simply lowering the student's grade). ~~Assignments under review by the Honor Council should not be assigned a grade until a final verdict has been determined. In cases where an honor accusation is outstanding on the day final grades are due, the Honor Council will request a 'G' grade on the faculty member's behalf. Faculty will be notified in all instances when this act occurs. All alleged suspected Honor Code violations are to be reported to and handled by the Honor Council, assuring due process and fairness.—Before alleging an honor code violation, A~~ faculty member who has reason to suspect a violation ~~of the Honor System Code~~ should consult the Honor Constitution (~~Appendix B~~) for [definitions of the honor offenses, investigation processes, and reporting procedures and other important information](#). [If a faculty member investigates a suspected violation and it is apparent that no honor violation has in fact occurred, no disciplinary action may be taken.](#) All alleged Honor Code violations are to be reported to and handled by the Honor Council, assuring due process and fairness. Willful failure to support and abide by the Honor Code may serve as a basis for [grievance and disciplinary procedures up to and including](#) termination of a faculty member for cause.

6

7

8

5.2.4 Grading in the Context of an Honor Report Assignments under review by the Honor Council should not be assigned a grade until a final finding has been determined. In cases where an honor report is outstanding on the day final grades are due, the Honor Council will request a 'G' grade on the faculty member's behalf. Faculty will be notified in all instances when this request occurs. In cases where a student is found responsible for an honor code violation but not sanctioned loss of credit in the course, faculty should grade the assignment in light of the Honor Council finding. In cases where a student is found not responsible for an Honor Code violation, faculty should grade the assignment according to the grading policy outlined in the course syllabus. Faculty may not sanction students for Honor Code violations. Grading decisions are the prerogative of faculty and disputes about grades in the context of an Honor case will be resolved by the grade dispute policy outlined in the Academic Catalog.

DRAFT