

3-25-2010

## Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Thursday, March 25, 2010

Arts & Sciences Faculty  
*Rollins College*

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_fac](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac)

 Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Faculty, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Thursday, March 25, 2010" (2010). *College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes*. Paper 30.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_fac/30](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac/30)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences Minutes at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact [wzhang@rollins.edu](mailto:wzhang@rollins.edu).

**Approved Minutes**  
**Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting**  
**Thursday, March 25, 2010**  
**12:30 – 1:45pm**  
**Galloway Room**

Joshua Almond, Anna Alon, Mark Anderson, Pedro Bernal, Sharon Carnahan, Roger Casey, Jennifer Cavanaugh, Julian Chambliss, Daniel Chong, Denise Cummings, Alice Davidson, Don Davison, Joan Davison, Kimberly Dennis, Lewis Duncan, Hoyt Edge, Larry Eng-Wilmot, Marc Fetscherin, Richard Foglesong, Lynda Glennon, Yudit Greenberg, Mike Gunter, Fiona Harper, Paul Harris, Karen Hater, Scott Hewit, Alicia Homrich, Gordie Howell, Jill Jones, Laurie Joyner, Madeline Kovarik, Carol Lauer, Barry Levis, Richard Lewin, Susan Libby, Lee Lines, Julia Maskivker, Cecilia McInnis-Bowers, Margaret McLaren, Bob Moore, Thom Moore, Ryan Musgave-Bonomo, Rachel Newcomb, Marvin Newman, David Noe, Alan Nordstrom, Kathryn Norsworthy, Socky O’Sullivan, Thomas Ouellette, Alberto Prieto-Calixto, Paul Reich, David Richard, Charlie Rock, Dawn Roe, Scott Rubarth, Maria Ruiz, Judy Schmalstig, Eric Shultz, Bob Sherry, John Sinclair, Jim Small, Eric Smaw, Cynthia Synder, Paul Stephenson, Claire Strom, Kathryn Sutherland, Bill Svitavsky, Lisa Tillmann, Gio Valiante, Rick Vitray, Yusheng Yao, Jay Yellen, Wenxian Zhang

Guests: Sharon Agee

Present:

- I. Call to Order – the meeting was called to order at 12:36 pm.
- II. Approval of Minutes – the minutes of the February 16, 2010 and February 25, 2010 meeting are approved as corrected.
- III. Reports
  - A. Report from the Dean of Student Affairs – Hater presents her spring semester report. Hater thanks Foglesong for inviting her and also thanks Student Life particularly Bill Boles for their hard work and accomplishment. Hater notes she only has five minutes for speaking and five minutes for questions and therefore will emphasize the major points. Hater addresses housing and explains last year three fraternities were placed on probation, Chi Psi, ATO and X club. She elaborates Chi Psi and X Club did a great job and were restored, but ATO was removed from housing and this opened Mowbray and Strong Hall for other residential groups. Four groups made proposals for housing (two for language, one for sustainability, and one for interfaith housing). Sustainability will be housed in Mowbray and languages in Strong. Hater also notes that during the evaluation process two other groups were

placed on probation – Rock and TKE. Hater then addresses fraternities and explains Rollins suspended ATO for four years due to college and national violations at their graffiti party. Phi Delta Theta was placed on the most serious form of probation by its national organization and requires a major review if it wishes to keep charter its charter. Rollins placed Phi Delta Theta on organizational probation so it cannot participate in any events this semester. Hater announces a new sorority, Delta Zeta. Hater then discusses judicial hearings and states at this point there are 7 suspensions and 2 dismissals due to violations of college policies; last year at this time there were about 20 dismissals and suspensions. She also notes alcohol violations are down about 9% and illegal substance abuse violations are down about 19%. Newman asks if at a subsequent time the faculty could be informed about the specifics of fraternity suspensions because judging by the penalties they might be very serious; he suggests this says something about us as a community and therefore faculty need to understand the details. Hater responds ATO and Phi Delta Theta violated national organization risk management standards. Hater explains Phi Delta Theta must complete a membership review and must look at each member and decide if they should be a member of the organization. Additionally, Rollins is to report to the national organization any individual or group violation. Rollins placed the organization on probation and if it does hold any events then it is in violation. Carnahan mentions a parent of a first year student who expressed concern about cocaine, amphetamines and ruffies; the mother's question was "what are you doing." Carnahan asks what happens when a parent calls with drug use questions. Hater states when there is a report about drug use, DoSA acts on it; if parents are concerned about their own child's use the DoSA tries to work through counseling and health services. Hater continues if reports or complaints come from a student in the residence hall about other students then DoSA tries to substantiate and gain a second report or confirming information. Hater explains if sufficient information exists to believe the reports are credible then she authorizes a room search with residence life, campus safety and the Winter Park Police Department. If drugs are found then the student is arrested. Hater concludes dismissals almost exclusively are due to students selling an illegal substance. J. Davison expresses concern whether the college's response to Phi Delta Theta is sufficient given the national organization's action. She elaborates that she wonders about the College's liability for Phi Delta Theta's actions. Hater emphasizes the fraternity is not permitted to have activities and is closely monitored.

B. Report from the Provost – Casey addresses the email regarding the great colleges to work for survey from the Chronicle. He reminds the faculty that last year Rollins ranked in the top 10 colleges and the survey has major national ramifications with respect to hiring. He encourages faculty members to complete the survey. Casey also explains the importance of the percentage of faculty who give to the college and notes Robin and his desire to move the number above 37%. Casey announces Robin and he issue a challenge to give

in which they will make additional contributions for each additional percentage point of faculty giving.

C. Report on the Provost Search – Jones reports for Miller and reminds the faculty the charge is to deliver no more than 4 candidates to the president at least one of whom is from an underrepresented group. She encourages the faculty to continue to send comments regarding what they desire in a provost. She explains the committee currently is completing one-hour video phone interviews with 14 strong and diverse candidates; the intent is to bring a smaller group to campus for intense contact to meet with people. A. Ilan asks what the search committee wants in a provost and what it is looking for, and whether the college should evaluate whether it even needs a provost. Jones answers that as the committee deals with candidates and explains the structure to people she finds that Rollins is a very complex institution and in fact a provost has an enormous amount to do at Rollins. A. Ilan again asks for specific qualities which are important. Jones responds the college wants a chief academic officer who also can handle budget and strategic planning concerns and QEP concerns. Foglesong asks if the committee will receive e-mail from faculty wishing to express what should be emphasized, and Jones encourages such e-mail. Bernal says it is important to hire someone who can bring some coherence to the structure we have and to the Holt/A&S relationship. He also notes that candidates have different backgrounds and the committee is looking for people associated with liberal arts institutions sometime in career. O’Sullivan asks whether faculty will be able to vote on the acceptability of the candidates and Jones says yes. J Davison voices concern about the plan to bring candidates during final exam week or possibly even after graduation. Jones states the committee is working as quickly as possible.

- IV. Consent Agenda – Proposed AHC revisions – Foglesong asks to change the order of business and move the committee reports to the end of the meeting. He states he wishes to get to new business because of the need to address the issue of a quorum and the motion to rescind. Foglesong then says it is difficult to move through the AHC document. He explains the EC adopted the process of the consent agenda to do so in an orderly and fair way. He elaborates the technique is commonly used in government where the body can vote the whole block or can move through the document with individual amendments. Foglesong notes anyone can pull an amendment from the agenda to vote up or down on that point individually. Small offers the background that the revisions respond to the practice of the honor code and knowledge of what works and does not work. Small notes some issues are legal and some are clarifications. Small moves to place the revisions on the floor: “I move to accept revision of the honor code.” DDavison seconds. Foglesong reminds the faculty that two documents were distributed explaining the revisions (See Attachment 1). Foglesong then asks the faculty which points they might wish

to pull. Harris pulls 1; Levis pulls 2; DDavison withdraws 5; Strom notes a friendly amendment to change the language in 9 from him/her to them; Carnahan pulls 16. Foglesong seeks discussion on the motion to accept the revisions accept for 1, 2, and 16. Small calls the question and DDavison seconds. The faculty vote to call the question and then vote to pass the motion. DDavison moves and McLaren seconds number 1. Harris states his issues are the amendment makes things more complicated in that faculty members are expected to separate first and non- first year students, and the rationale to increase compliance is not convincing because compliance typically declines when a procedure is more difficult. Casey suggests an amendment so that only the second half of the amendment is accepted. Such an amendment would eliminate the differentiation between first year and other students but maintain the ability of students to abbreviate the pledge with their faculty members' permission. The amendment to the amendment is seconded. DDavison acknowledges the students on AHC and their hard work and explains the process is not unlike health care in US; he elaborates there was a two and a half year in depth review of the policy and process which led to these amendments. The amendments moved through SGA's bicameral process and then into the SLC. He notes any change by the faculty must also go back to SGA. DDavison says with regard to amendment 1 there is a great deal of faculty inconsistency in requiring the written code with some permitting AHC, some requiring the first three words and some requiring the entire code. He elaborates that this amendment was not brought by AHC but by students who do not deal with the honor code. They want this change because students want consistency. Further it is noted this issue is not something which AHC adjudicates but it was something which students brought because some faculty members fail papers if the honor code pledge is incorrect. Vitray states "when I submit a paper or deliver a talk I do not write a pledge but put my name on the work and understand my name is the pledge it is my work." He suggests students need the pledge so they know what they are stating. He explains sometimes he asks students to write the whole pledge and sometimes he just asks them to sign their name but he reinforce what the signature represents. Vitray then asks what punishment exists for faculty members who do not enforce the pledge. Libby states it might be possible to have a shorter code with fewer commas, but the existing code with all its commas is a learning experience. Goj opposes students shortening the pledge because they shorten everything else, but the learning process demands integrity and time, and faculty should support and enforce these objectives. Carnahan says her social science colleagues understand the pledge works on many levels as it raises the student's awareness of actions. She argues "writing on my honor obviates the whole thing." Duncan expresses his support to write the whole pledge. TMoore says at Rollins there is a need to reinforce the pledge because it is not engrained in the faculty or student traditions or culture. Strom calls the question and Glennon seconds. The faculty votes to call the question but defeats the amendment to the amendment. Lauer moves to table to time specific, Glennon seconds and the motion to table amendment 1 passes.

V. Old Business – no old business

VI. New Business

A. Announcement of Motion to Rescind- McLaren states “I will move to rescind #4 passed by a vote of 19 to 18 during the faculty meeting on Tuesday Feb. 16th, 2010: ‘4) Shall the available points for assessment be: 1-3 for teaching, 1-3 for service, and 1-3 for scholarship? The Dean of the Faculty will review each faculty FSAR and rate the faculty member within the categories of Meets Expectations, Exceeds Expectations, or Below Expectations based upon the points for assessment. Exceeds Expectations will be awarded for 8-9 total points, Meets Expectations for 6-7 total points and Below Expectations for 3-5 points. The FSC will review each faculty member; evaluation will be based on the FSAR and professional judgment considerations identified by the department chair. The FSC will reach agreement with the Dean on all faculty evaluated.’ I am rescinding not due to the content as I agree with the content but am rescinding because of the question about a quorum when the motion passed and specifically whether a quorum existed.” Foglesong responds do not decide a priori about a quorum but rather once a quorum is established it is assumed it is maintained unless the pres recognizes otherwise or if someone else recognizes and calls for a quorum count. Foglesong continues he concedes advance notice on the motion to rescind even though it was not sent out with the agenda, but he declares the motion out of order because the policy with which it deals already is in effect. Levis moves to appeal the ruling the motion to rescind is out of order, and Libby seconds. Lauer brings a point of information as she believes the motion cannot be discussed unless the faculty hears what Roberts’ Rules state. She reads “when something has been done as a result of the vote on that main motion that is impossible to undo...unexecuted part of order can be rescinded” so given that part of the order is not carried out then it can be rescinded. Foglesong states he declared the motion out of order and the question is to overrule his ruling. Duncan asks if impossible to rescind if the policy is in place and Foglesong answers the policy is in place as FSC is at work and that is the issue: whether impossible or not to rescind. Jones says this body, like all bodies, exists to expedite a democratic process and to make decisions and to feel as if all have been heard. She suggests it is necessary to rescind in order to discuss an important issue. Almond says he understands the question of impossibility or possibility linked to FSC’s deliberation but asks whether they have made decisions. Sinclair says the committee currently is working on criteria but will soon start decisions and a delay makes this an impossible task. PStephenson confirms that if the process is delayed then a decision becomes impossible. Glennon calls questions on whether to overrule the decision that it is impossible to rescind. She is seconded, the faculty vote to call the question and vote to overrule Foglesong’s decision. The faculty moves to consideration of the motion to rescind. Rock suggests that the minutes of the special faculty

meeting emphasize the quandary about how to measure teaching and the lack of a good measurement but that people at the top and bottom are signaled out. Rubarth states he has no problem with the policy in the original amendment but rather the decision by 19 faculty members to pass the policy. Lines says it was obvious to everyone there was no quorum. Newman calls the question, Glennon seconds and the motion passes. JDavison states based upon the original memo from McLaren "If rescinded this proposal can go to the Executive committee for discussion and a vote." Lauer disputes that the proposal now can go to the EC.

B. Kurt Wells, President of the Alumni Association greets the faculty and notes how pleased he is to see faculty members. He mentions he chatted with Dr.Griffin this morning and had a nice time with the Davison last evening. Wells invites all faculty members to all reunion activities encourages them to attend the luncheon barbeque and particularly the grove party. He emphasizes alumni want to see faculty.

VII. Adjournment at 1:47pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Davison, PhD

## **Attachment 1**

### **ACADEMIC HONOR CODE**

#### **The Philosophy of the Academic Honor Code**

Integrity and honor are central to the Rollins College mission to educate its students for responsible citizenship and ethical leadership. Rollins College requires adherence to a code of behavior that is essential for building an academic community committed to excellence and scholarship with integrity and honor. Students, faculty, staff, and administration share the responsibility for building and sustaining this community.

Each student matriculating into Rollins College must become familiar with the Academic Honor System. The College requires that students be able and willing to accept the rights and responsibilities of honorable conduct, both as a matter of personal integrity and as a commitment to the values to which the College community commits itself. It is the responsibility of instructors to set clear guidelines for authorized and unauthorized aid in their courses. It is the responsibility of students to honor those guidelines and to obtain additional clarification if and when questions arise about possible violations of the Honor Code.

## **The Honor Pledge and Reaffirmation**

Membership in the student body of Rollins College carries with it an obligation, and requires a commitment, to act with honor in all things. The student commitment to uphold the values of honor - honesty, trust, respect, fairness, and responsibility - particularly manifests itself in two public aspects of student life. First, as part of the admission process to the College, students agree to commit themselves to the Honor Code. Then, as part of the matriculation process during Orientation, students sign a more detailed pledge to uphold the Honor Code and to conduct themselves honorably in all their activities, both academic and social, as a Rollins student. A student signature on the following pledge is a binding commitment by the student that lasts for his or her entire tenure at Rollins College:

The development of the virtues of Honor and Integrity are integral to a Rollins College education and to membership in the Rollins College community. Therefore, I, a student of Rollins College, pledge to show my commitment to these virtues by abstaining from any lying, cheating, or plagiarism in my academic endeavors and by behaving responsibly, respectfully and honorably in my social life and in my relationships with others.

This pledge is reinforced every time a student submits work for academic credit. All first year students shall add the following handwritten signed statement to their papers, quizzes, tests, lab reports, etc., "On my honor, I have not given, nor received, nor witnessed any unauthorized assistance on this work."

Second through fourth year students can abbreviate the pledge with their faculty member's permission to read, "On my honor . . ." followed by the student's signature.

Material submitted electronically should contain the pledge; submission implies signing the pledge.

## **Definitions of Academic Honor Code Violations**

Students are expected to conduct themselves with complete honesty in all academic work and campus activities. Violations of the Academic Honor Code include, but are not limited to the following:

Definitions:

**PLAGIARISM.** Offering the words, facts, or ideas of another person as your own in any academic exercise.

**CHEATING.** Using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in an academic exercise. This includes sharing knowledge of previously administered or current tests. The keeping of tests, papers, and other assignments belonging to former students is prohibited. Use of external assistance (e.g., books, notes, calculators, conversations with others) in completing an "in class" or "take home" examination, unless specifically authorized by the instructor, is prohibited.

**UNAUTHORIZED COLLABORATION.** Collaboration, without specific authorization by the instructor, on homework assignments, lab reports, exam preparations, research projects, take home exams, essays, or other work for which you will receive academic credit.

**SUBMISSION OF WORK PREPARED FOR ANOTHER COURSE.** Resubmitting previous work, in whole or in part, for a current assignment without the consent of the current instructor(s). **FABRICATION.** Misrepresenting, mishandling, or falsifying information in an academic exercise. For example, creating false information for a bibliography, inventing data for a laboratory assignment, or representing a quotation from a secondary source (such as a book review or a textbook) as if it were a primary source.

**FACILITATING ACADEMIC DISHONESTY.** Helping another student commit an act of academic dishonesty.

**VIOLATION OF TESTING CONDITIONS.** Looking at other students' answers, allowing other students to look at your test, and working past allotted time are just a few examples where test conditions may be considered to be violated.

**LYING.** Lying is the making of a statement that one knows to be false with the intent to deceive. It includes actions such as (a) lying to faculty, administrators, or staff

(c) lying to a member of the Honor Council.

**FAILURE TO REPORT AN HONOR CODE VIOLATION.** Failure to report occurs when a student has knowledge of or is witness to an act in violation of the

Academic Honor Code and does not report it within ten class days.

### **Reporting a Violation**

Because academic integrity is fundamental to the pursuit of knowledge and truth and is the heart of the academic life of Rollins College, it is the responsibility of all members of the College community to practice it and to report apparent violations. All students, faculty, and staff are required to report violations in writing to the Academic Honor Council for disposition. Referrals will be made through the Dean of the Faculty's office.

If a faculty member has reason to believe that a violation of the Academic Honor Code has occurred, he/she may have an initial meeting with the student to determine if a violation has occurred. If the faculty member believes that a violation has occurred he/she is required to report it. This initial meeting is to clarify if a violation has occurred and not to determine if a known violation is to be reported.

If a student has reason to believe that a violation of academic integrity has occurred, he/she is required to report it to the Academic Honor Council. The student that has witnessed a violation can, but is not required to, encourage the student suspected of the violation to self-report. If the student refuses to self-report, then the student that witnessed the violation must report it to the Academic Honor Council.

Staff members that believe they have witnessed a violation must refer the case to the Honor Council for disposition.

Complaints must be made in writing and filed through the Office of the Dean of the Faculty. These complaints are then forwarded to the Academic Honor Council. Allegations must be submitted in writing within ten days of the discovery of the alleged violation. Complaints against graduating seniors must be submitted by the date senior grades are due to allow time for an investigation before graduation. The complaint should indicate all relevant details, including names of witnesses and must be signed. Submissions may also be made online.

### **Disposition of Cases**

Reports of violations may be resolved through Self-Referral, or by informal or formal Resolution through the Academic Honor Council. A student accused of an honor violation may not withdraw or exercise the late credit/no credit option from the applicable course once the referral has been made.

## **Self-Referral** <sup>1</sup>

Students who commit acts of academic dishonesty may demonstrate their renewed commitment to academic integrity by reporting themselves in writing to the Chair of the Honor Council before someone else has reported the violation. Students may not exercise the self-referral option more than once during their enrollment at the College.

If a student self-reports, then the student will not be charged with academic dishonesty. Instead, the Academic Honor Council will notify the Dean of the Faculty or a designee and the faculty member involved. The Dean or designee shall then convene a conference between the student and the faculty member. The purpose of this conference will be to ensure that the self-referral provisions of this Code are followed and to levy a sanction. The Dean (or designee) will notify the Academic Honor Council in writing of the outcome of the conference.

In all cases where a student self-reports, the student will be required to successfully complete the non-credit integrity seminar offered by the Academic Honor Council. The faculty member has the discretion to reduce the student's grade for the academic exercise, failing grade on the assignment, a zero on the assignment, a grade reduction in the course in which the violation occurred, or a failing grade in the course. The "HF" designation, however, will not apply. The student will be placed on Academic Honors Probation.

## **Resolution Through Academic Honor Council**

The Academic Honor Council investigates and adjudicates reported cases not resolved through self-referral.

1. Purpose of the Academic Honor Council.  
The Academic Honor Council hears cases of academic honor code violations, determines responsibility, and assigns academic penalties. The Academic Honor Council provides opportunities for student, faculty, and staff service. Faculty participation in the process is crucial for historical consistency and guidance, and the faculty will designate two advisors to the Academic Honor Council. An additional role of the Academic Honor Council is to educate the Rollins College community about the honor system.
2. Membership. The Academic Honor Council shall consist of fourteen student members who shall be selected through an application process administered by the Dean of the Faculty's Office. The Dean of the Faculty [screens applicants for minimal GPA and conduct infractions and] forwards qualified applicants to the Student Government Association (SGA), which reviews the essays and recommends acceptable applicants to the Dean of the Faculty. In the event that there are more applicants than positions, the Academic Honor Council will conduct interviews and make recommendations to the Dean of the Faculty. Applicants submit a written

---

<sup>1</sup> Used with permission from the University of Maryland.

application that includes a personal statement explaining why they believe academic integrity is important and why peer review is essential. In this application, students should explain any conduct infractions for which they may have been held responsible, and why such events, if any, should not remove them from consideration for the Academic Honor Council. All full time A&S students are eligible. A minimum GPA of 3.0 is required and the student cannot be or at any time have been on academic, disciplinary or community probation.

The term of office is one year. A member may serve no more than two terms. Members who seek a second term must follow the application process. Students shall be removed from the Academic Honor Council if they are found to be in violation of the Academic Honor Code, or if they have been placed on academic, disciplinary, community, or resident hall probation. The Academic Honor Council will hold a required training session for members and advisors. This will be conducted to the end of the spring term. At that time, officers will be elected.

3. Officers. There shall be a Chair, Vice-Chair, and Secretary. These three officers, and the staff advisor, shall comprise the Executive Committee. The Chair must have served for one year on the Academic Honor Council (except during the transition year of this policy). The Chair shall preside over Academic Honor Council meetings and shall decide questions of procedure and interpretation. The decision of the Chair is subject to veto of two thirds of the Academic Honor Council members. The Vice Chair serves as chair in the absence of the Chair. The Secretary shall keep a taped recording of all meetings, a record of findings and a brief summary of the facts of the case and penalties imposed. Both the Vice Chair and Secretary shall participate in discussions and shall be voting members of the Council. All communication to an accused student will come from the Academic Honor Council Chair, supported by the Office of the Dean of the Faculty. Annually, the Chair shall prepare a report of the activities of the Academic Honor Council and submit the report to the Academic Affairs Committee.

4. Faculty and Staff Advisors. The Faculty Executive Committee shall appoint two faculty advisors to the Academic Honor Council. They shall serve two-year terms, staggered if possible. The primary role of the faculty advisors is to participate in training of the Academic Honor Council members and to assist members of that Council in understanding and interpreting the application of the Honor Code as it pertains to academic exercises. Additionally, a designee appointed by the Dean of the Faculty will serve as a staff advisor, assisting in recruitment, selection and training of the members of the Academic Honor Council, and advising on issues of procedure.

## **Informal Resolution of Possible Violations 2**

---

<sup>2</sup> Used with permission from the University of Maryland.

If a student does not self-refer before a violation has been reported, then he/she may resolve allegations of Honor Code violations through an informal resolution process.

1. If the Executive Committee of the Academic Honor Council determines, after a preliminary investigation, that a report of academic dishonesty is supported by reasonable cause, it will inform the accused student in writing of the charges, and shall offer him/her an opportunity for an informal meeting with the AHC board to review the case. The AHC informal hearing board will be comprised of at least one member of the executive board serving as chair and two at large members from the Academic Honor Council. The staff advisor must be present at this meeting. The Executive Committee shall also provide the accused student with a copy of this Code and a statement of procedural rights approved by the Academic Honor Council. The accused student is entitled to select a Rollins College student, faculty, or staff advisor. The advisor may accompany the accused student to the informal meeting and may consult with the accused student prior to or during the course of the meeting. The role of the advisor in this meeting is limited to making sure that the accused student understands his procedural rights and responsibilities. The advisor may not question or challenge the nature of the evidence that led to the charges. If the student cannot select an advisor, the Council will appoint one in advance of the informal meeting.

The student pleads not responsible and requests a full review of the case that may lead to a formal hearing (see section on Formal Resolution).

The student acknowledges responsibility for committing a violation of the code and accepts the standard “HF” sanction.

The student accepts responsibility, but requests a review for purposes of sanctioning only.

If the accused student selects option c. and has no prior record of academic dishonesty or serious disciplinary misconduct, the Executive Committee of the Council and the student, in consultation with the faculty member of the course, may reach an agreement concerning how the case should be resolved. The Council may impose grade penalties including a failing grade on the assignment, a grade reduction in the course in which the violation occurred, or a failing grade in the course. If the student receives a failing grade in the course as part of the sanction, it will be noted on the transcript as an HF (Honors Failure). Students found responsible for a violation of the Academic Honor Code are also placed on Academic Honors Probation and required to participate in and successfully complete an ethical principles seminar.

A written statement signed by the student and the Council must support any sanction agreed upon by the student and the Council. The Academic Honor Council shall inform both the student and the Dean of the Faculty of the sanction imposed.

## **Formal Resolution of Possible Violations**

If a student pleads not responsible at his/her informal review, then he/she may resolve allegations of Honor Code violations through a formal resolution process.

### **The Investigation.**

The Executive Committee shall appoint two Investigators from members of the Academic Honor Council for each reported violation. The appointments as Investigator shall be made on a rotating basis among the members of the council, except for the Chair. In addition to the investigators, the Executive Committee shall appoint five additional members of the council to be voting members at a particular hearing. In this way, all Academic Honor Council members, excluding the Chair, will be given the responsibility to be an Investigator or a voting member at a formal hearing.

Investigators will interview all accused students and witnesses and assemble all pertinent documents. Honor investigators should interview all witnesses together. It is the accused student's responsibility to fully cooperate with the investigators.

Both Investigators review the case with the Academic Honor Council Chair in order to determine if there is sufficient evidence to recommend that a formal hearing be held. If it is determined that there is insufficient evidence of a violation, then the Chair will write a letter of clarification to the accused student and the case is dropped.

### **The Hearing.**

If a formal hearing is required, then the Chair of the Academic Honor Council shall notify the student in writing of the possible times available to the Academic Honor Council to hold the formal hearing. The Chair will contact the accused student to explain the charges and the student's rights, obtain a plea to the charges, and discuss all aspects of the process. If the accused student needs and requests support and assistance in preparing for the hearing, the Chair will arrange for that assistance, within reason.

Names of witnesses listed in the report will be edited out for confidentiality reasons and their testimony made available to the accused. All parties must understand that the investigation is confidential and its details, findings, and conclusions may not be released. Retaliation against witnesses as a consequence of statements they may make will be considered as a possible violation of the *Code of Students' Rights and Responsibilities*.

The Chair schedules a timely hearing and again, notifies the student of the time and place of the hearing. The accused student is expected to be present during the hearing. The accused student may also bring witnesses to the hearing. If the student chooses not to attend, the hearing will still be held, and the student's absence shall not invalidate the results of the hearing nor be in itself a reason to challenge the results of the hearing.

The order of the proceedings in a hearing shall be as follows:

Presentation of the charge.

Request for a plea.

Presentation of evidence by Investigators.

Opportunity for a response by the accused student.

Closed deliberations by the Council.

The Academic Honor Council shall conduct hearings according to the following guidelines:

Hearings will be conducted in private subject to the list of attendees noted below.

Admission of any person to the hearing shall be at the discretion of the Academic Honor Council Chair, with advice, if needed, from the Council's Advisors.

The accused student is entitled to select a Rollins College student, faculty, or staff advisor to assist in preparation for the hearing. The advisor may accompany the accused student to the hearing and may consult with the accused student prior to or during the course of the hearing, but may not address the Chair or the Academic Honor Council.

Persons to be present at hearings include the Academic Honor Council Chair, five members of the council, two investigators, advisors, the accused student, the accused student's advisor, and witnesses relevant to the case. The presence of all the appointed members of the council is required to hold a meeting. Relevant witnesses shall be present only during their own testimony, subject to questions from the Academic Honor Council; however, they may be required to remain available for the duration of the hearing. The witness making the accusation is not required to be present at the same time as the accused. The accused student does not have the right to cross-examine witnesses, unless permission is granted by the Chair.

The Academic Honor Council, at the discretion of the Chair, may accept pertinent records, exhibits, and written statements as evidence for consideration. However, formal rules of process, procedure, and/or technical rules of evidence, such as are applied in criminal or civil court, are not used in Academic Honor Code proceedings. The accused student does not have the right to have an attorney present in Academic Honor Code proceedings.

All procedural questions are subject to the final decision of the Academic Honor Council Chair. After the hearing, the Council shall determine by at least a four to one vote whether the student has violated the Academic Honor Code. If two or more voting members dissent, the accused shall be found not responsible.

The chair of the Council is a non-voting member.

The Academic Honor Council's determination of whether the student violated the Honor Code shall be based solely on the standard of whether there is clear and convincing evidence that the accused student violated the Academic Honor Code.

The staff advisor and at least one faculty advisor to the Academic Honor Council must be present at all meetings.

There shall be a single verbatim record, such as a tape recording or equivalent, of all hearings. The record will not include deliberations and will be used only for the appellate process. The record shall be the property of the College and destroyed seven (7) years after graduation or date of last attendance.

Any hearing may be postponed, recessed, or continued at the discretion of the Academic Honor Council Chair.

The Findings.

If the student is found not in violation of the Academic Honor Code, a letter will be written from the Chair to the student and faculty member informing him/her of the decision of the Academic Honor Council.

No finding of violation or setting of penalties may be based solely on the student's failure to appear at the hearing.

If a violation of the Code is found, the Academic Honor Council will impose each of the following sanctions:

The minimum penalty for a finding of responsibility by the Academic Honor Council is a grade of HF in the course; and  
Required participation in and successful completion of an ethical principles seminar; and  
Academic Honor Code Probation until graduation.

The finding and sanction (if applicable) will be communicated in writing to the student and the faculty member of the course in which the incident took place.

### **Sanctioning Guidelines**

Depending on the nature of the violation and any extenuating circumstances, one or more of the following penalties will be imposed:

Any student who is found guilty of an Honor Code violation shall automatically be placed on Honor Probation. Probation remains in effect until graduation.

Any student who is found guilty of an Honor Code violation shall have a written letter of reprimand placed in his/her permanent file that censures the inappropriate action in writing.

Upon a finding of responsibility, the Academic Honor Council shall impose the following sanctions:

Grade Penalty – The minimum penalty shall be a failure in the course, recorded as an Honors Failure (HF), and provide a recommendation to the Dean of Faculty regarding (b) Suspension, or (c) Dismissal.

Suspension - Suspension may be any period of time through three years and is an appropriate sanction for intentional dishonesty, even on the first offense and is a recommended penalty for the second offense. A student may not receive credit for work taken at another institution during the period of the suspension.

Dismissal - This is an appropriate sanction for intentional dishonesty on a second offense and is recommended for a third offense.

Students found responsible for failure to report an academic honor violation shall at a minimum be placed on Academic Honors Probation and shall be required to attend the ethics seminar.

### **Appeal Procedures**

A written appeal from a finding of guilt of the Academic Honor Council may be made to the Dean of the Faculty within 10 class days of the decision. Only findings of responsibility by the council can be appealed.

Prior to an appeal, if the student believes that there is new evidence or relevant facts that were not brought out in the original hearing and that may be sufficient to alter the original finding, the student may make a request that this information be considered. The student must make such a request in writing to the Academic Honor Council Chair by the date designated in the sanction letter. If the purported new evidence or relevant facts are deemed by the Chair to be substantial enough to potentially change the Council's decision, the matter will be returned to the Academic Honor Council for reconsideration.

If a student is found to have violated the Academic Honor Code by the Academic Honor Council and the student believes the finding was prejudicial or biased, the student may appeal. Appeals must be made in writing to the Dean of the Faculty by the designated date in the sanction letter. The Dean will provide the Academic Honor Appeals Committee with the written appeal. In making the appeal, the student must furnish evidence that there was procedural misconduct by the Academic Honor Council that was prejudicial to the accused student.

The Academic Honor Appeals Committee is comprised of the Dean of the Faculty, the Chair of the Academic Honor Council and the Faculty Advisor to the Honor Council not present at the hearing. The Academic Honor Appeals Committee will meet to determine if grounds for appeal exists. The review will be limited to the verbatim record of the Informal and Formal hearing, supporting documents, and the written appeal. New evidence or other relevant facts not part of the original hearing will not be considered.

The accused student will be notified in a timely fashion of the Academic Honor Appeals Committee's determination. Decisions of the Academic Honor Appeals Committee are final.

If a student elects to file an appeal, pending a decision from the Academic Honor Appeals Committee, the student may continue to attend all courses and participate in College life as usual. However, until a case has been completely resolved (hearing, all appeals, etc.) the student may not graduate from the college. Similarly, a student who has received sanctions must complete any requirements of those sanctions prior to graduation.

A student with an "HF" and no other record of academic dishonesty may request, no earlier than one semester before graduation and no later than one academic year after graduation, that the Academic Honor Appeals Committee remove the "H" from the "HF" so that the transcript does not reflect in perpetuity that the failing grade was the result of a case of academic dishonesty. Seniors that receive an "HF" can make a similar appeal no more than one academic year after graduation.

### **Impeachment Procedures**

If any officer or member of the Academic Honor Council is accused of failure to discharge the duties of the office, the Council sitting as a board of impeachment shall hear the accusation. A quorum of two thirds, excluding the accused, is required for a valid hearing. A majority vote of those present and voting, excluding the accused, is

required to uphold the impeachment charge. The chair shall vote with the Council members. Proceedings in such cases shall be initiated by a petition from three members of the Council or by a petition signed by five members of the student body.

### **Amendment Procedures**

The Academic Honor Code may be amended in the following manner: Proposed amendments may come from the Student Government Association, the faculty governance system or the Dean of the Faculty.

Amendments are submitted to the Executive Committee of the Faculty. The Executive Committee will then forward the proposed amendment to the body or bodies that did not submit the amendment for approval.

Once approved by the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the Student Government Association, the proposed amendment will become part of the Academic Honor Code.

### **Miscellaneous Guidelines**

#### **Rights and Responsibilities of Faculty Members:**

The faculty member in whose course the infraction may have occurred may appeal the finding of the Council to the Academic Honor Appeals Committee.

It is a faculty member's responsibility to be clear about which assignments are collaborative and which are not. A faculty member may wish to include a "collaborative statement" on an assigned work that requires students to identify the names of other collaborators. A sample statement could read "I worked on this assignment with \_\_\_\_\_ and received help from \_\_\_\_\_."

It is the instructor's discretion whether to proctor an exam. Unproctored exams shall be optional but are highly encouraged.

ALL complaints in regards to the Academic Honor Council go to the Dean of the Faculty's Office and will be reviewed by the Academic Honor Council Appeals Committee.

**Student Organization "Test Files"** The keeping of unauthorized tests, papers, and other assignments belonging to former students violates the spirit of academic integrity. Organizations keeping unauthorized files must dispose of those files. Organizations who retain these unauthorized files will be cited as a judicial violation, subject to *The Code of Students' Rights and Responsibilities*. This does not preclude the keeping of tests, papers, and other assignments when specifically authorized by the instructor.

Assessment. Implementation will begin in fall 2006. Annual reports will be submitted to the Dean of the Faculty and to the Academic Affairs Committee so that this process may be assessed and changes implemented. The Academic Affairs Committee will request a periodic review at least once every five years. The review committee will consist of two faculty members appointed by the Dean of the Faculty, two students appointed by the Dean of Faculty, and one member of the administration.

### **Education**

This honor system, like any honor system, works only to the extent that participants understand and embrace the values and process by which these values are upheld and celebrated.

To this end, it is the responsibility of all members of the academic community to educate new members of the community about the honor system. There should be agreement amongst all members that an honor system is critical to the educational process, to the institution's mission, and to student's personal and academic success.

Although not exhaustive, the following are some of the ways in which the College community can learn about (and embrace) the honors system:

Presentation to all first year students through the RCC. The Honor Council could provide a common orientation, followed by in class discussions with Peer Mentors and faculty.

Peer Mentors, Residential Assistants, and Student Government Association members incorporate a training block as part of their preparation.

An on-line web site will be developed with links, expanded details, and descriptions of academic integrity concepts. Specific examples may be cited.

Peer education is highly effective, and all efforts should be made to encourage peer education (through the Honor Council).

Each faculty member should address the issue of academic integrity not only in the syllabus, but also in class throughout the term.

### **Acknowledgments**

This policy is adapted, with permission, from the University of Maryland, the University of Richmond, and Washington and Lee University. We gratefully acknowledge the contributions of many other schools including Trinity University (TX), Birmingham Southern College, James Madison University, Wheaton College, Gettysburg College, Vanderbilt University, Rhodes College, St. Olaf College, University of Miami, Davidson

College, Emory University, University of Denver, Valparaiso University and Bucknell University.