

Academic Regulation 15: Academic Misconduct

Summary of Feedback from Faculty

- Language raises questions/needs clarification (12)
- Proposal takes authority away from instructor (10)
- Overall, acceptable (8)
- Seems too bureaucratic (5)
- Concerned the department head is removed from the process (2)
- What about faculty appeal? (2)

Language raises questions/needs clarification

“I would like to see the committee carefully JUSTIFY the proposed changes with data about how the previous policy is flawed, and HOW the proposed changes will remedy the current flaws.

I mean specifics, not vague generalizations about streamlining this and student due process that. How are students' due process rights being violated now? How many students? How often? What exactly are the concerns to be addressed with the new policy?”

Proposal takes authority away from instructor

“... any policy that removes the instructor's ability to control sanctions on academic dishonesty is unacceptable.”

“The proposed changes put all the same burdens on the professor (reporting/documentation/meeting with the student) but takes away all of their power to respond to the offense. This will discourage professors from taking any action and academic dishonesty will become even more prevalent than it already is.”

Overall, acceptable

“I like that the academic misconduct will be reviewed at a level outside of the class instructor. First this removes the instructor, who might be biased or whose professional/personal feeling could be a factor. Also, that this looks at a student's record to see if academic dishonesty has occurred before (information an instructor would not necessarily know).”

Seems too bureaucratic

“The proposed version makes the entire process more cumbersome, which is a disincentive for the instructor to initiate proceedings.”

“I do not find the policy efficient. There is paperwork involved. Being asked to scan or copy forms takes time. I would prefer an online reporting system.”

Concerned the department head is removed from the process

“The new policy is vague about the role of the academic department head. This person should be a specific step in the process as he/she typically has a great deal of specific and contextual information relevant to many cases of academic misconduct (e.g., department standards around course requirements).”

What about faculty appeal?

“I'm curious what recourse faculty have in the event they disagree with the CHO's findings and/or penalty.”