

Honor Code Task Force

Question 5: What would be a general outline for a modified honor code system at CSU?

Task Force Input:

1. Graduate students should be involved
 - a. Need to be educated
 - b. Need to understand implications for their teaching role
2. Grading penalty
 - a. Decision should stay with the Instructor.
 - b. Honor Council hearing panel could make recommendation to Instructor
 - c. Allow variation for mitigating circumstances
3. Retain Instructors' option of referring cases to another hearing body
4. Keep the requirement of Instructors for reporting and for central record keeping
5. Going before a panel should be optional
 - a. Keep both student and Instructor's option to go to a hearing
6. Don't mandate un-proctored exams
7. Hearing panels:
 - a. Have them University-wide (not for each College)
 - b. Keep them at an odd number
 - c. Keep them small for scheduling purposes (3 or 5)
 - i. Non-voting chair (instructor or CRSCS)
 - d. Composition should mirror our current Appeals Board
 - e. Composition options:
 - i. 2 students, 2 instructors¹ + instructor chair
 - ii. 3 students, 2 instructors
 - iii. 2 undergrads, 2 Instructors, 1 grad student who has taught
 - f. If students aren't majority of panels, use other techniques to promote student ownership and responsibility of student culture of integrity.
 - g. Allow hearings to take place with a quorum if one person doesn't show up (i.e. Panel of 5 could proceed with 4 if necessary)
 - h. Use "Instructors" instead of "faculty" so AP's who teach are eligible for panels
 - i. Use CRSCS person as "advisor"
 - i. Possibility with a vote in the case of a tie.

¹ Instructor is meant to include faculty and Administrative Professionals who have instructional responsibilities.