

Honor Code Task Force:

Question 3; What other approaches might be appropriate for CSU?

Input

Each department (or College) could have an Academic Integrity representative.<sup>1</sup> At some other schools such a model is being used, with that person's responsibilities ranging from just being an information resource to taking an active role in meeting with the instructor and accused student, facilitating the student/instructor meeting, investigating, and/ or recommending the Grading Penalty. Such a system would potentially address the "weaknesses" of our current system in these ways:

1. Makes academic integrity (AI) more a "faculty" matter as opposed to "administrative".
2. May help students have a more knowledgeable resources in their department
3. They could be a "champion" for AI; an ambassador.
4. We should find out from schools doing this;
  - a. Training
  - b. Jurisdiction
  - c. When does the conduct office get involved
5. This could reduce inconsistencies and our ability to be proactive as opposed to reactive.
6. Is it feasible?
  - a. Enough volunteers
  - b. Incentive system
  - c. Support system
7. Should there be a representative in each department or each college?
  - a. Hybrid = several departments within like disciplines team up, share a person.
8. It would be important to have support from above: department, college, University admin.

Should we have a rubric to reduce inconsistency in grading penalties?

1. It would be hard to have one that works for multiple disciplines. We should just acknowledge that there are differences among disciplines (ie. sciences vs. liberal arts)
2. Departments with a track record of multiple incidents should consider a rubric.
3. Some courses have a coordinator/director that provides consistency in sections of that course (CO150, Chem., Life 102, etc.)
4. Guidelines may be better than a rule/rubric (Faculty flexibility is important to maintain.)

---

<sup>1</sup> The proposed "Academic Support Coordinator (ASC) position at CSU is probably a good place to refer students for AI information once they are trained. As an AP position, it wouldn't be appropriate as a faculty resource.

5. We could encourage departments to consider policies such as Computer Science's or the course coordinator/director model as "best/better" practices.

Weaknesses of our current system can be viewed as [Awareness + Application] X [Student concerns + Faculty concerns]

There are concerns about AI in online courses, so educational/prevention options need to be for both residential and online students.

Doing an annual report and publicizing it is an easily implemented suggestion

To faculty & instructors —this could be a great discussion item at a Faculty Council meeting

To ASCSU

To larger student organizations such as SLICE and Greeks

Encourage Greeks to make AI part of their chapter standards.

Annual AI Awards – students, faculty, groups – for being champions and models for AI