

# Student Rules & Regulations Committee

October 4, 2024  
3:00 PM-5:00 PM  
Koldus 110/Zoom Meeting



## October 4, 2024 Minutes

**Approval of 9.6.24 minutes after spelling edits of Venesa Heidick and Angie Hill Price names**  
**Move to accept minutes by Chris Cherry, seconded by Susan Phillips, motion passes with 1 abstention**

**Voting members in attendance:** Jacob Becker, Chris Cherry, Robert Rahm, Katarina McIlveene, Venesa Heidick, Brandon Rea, Angie Hill Price, Trent Smith, Reese McDonald, Jennifer Lightfoot, Dale Rice, Susan Phillips, Grace Townsend

**Non-voting members in attendance:** Blair Alvarado, Neil Golemo, Lori Moore, Shelby Hearn

Rob Rahm appointed to the Student Rules and Regulations Committee as faculty

Dr. Harrell updated status of Rules 18.1.5, 7.3.1.1, 7.3.1.5. These will be on the Agenda for the October 14<sup>th</sup> FS meeting.

### Rule 20: Academic Misconduct

#### Discussion:

Dr. Harrell pointed out that some of the edits for Rule 20 were simply editorial issues, others are philosophical issues. The suggestion was made to create a subcommittee to discuss/make changes and bring back to the whole committee either for November or possibly December, considering how extensive this rule is.

Vote taken to agree, for this meeting, to discuss philosophical issues to get a sense of the Committee's perspective, then the subcommittee can discuss issues with submitter, and also make editorial issues. Majority of voting members agreed, defer to subcommittee the best avenue to have conversations. Angie Hill Price to send Heather Klein notes to subcommittee.

subcommittee consists of Heather Klein, Rob Rahn, Dale Rice, Chris Cherry, Trent Smith, Katarina McIlveene

20.1.1.2 - The last paragraph has " ... a body of students and faculty established to investigate ... " Aren't staff added as eligible for service later in this document (in 20.2.3.1 )? If yes, should "staff" be added here? (Side note: I have mixed feelings about staff being added as eligible to serve on the Honor Council and would love to know your thoughts.)

Philosophically began with question about adding staff to Honor Council

Fellow Senators feel this is a faculty-student issue, concern about staff making decisions on issues regarding students and faculty. Submitter stated that staff would serve/facilitate as non-voting chair only.

Needs to be reframed in clearer fashion, subcommittee will address this.

20.1.1.4 - Should "Minimum Syllabus Requirement" (something that applies to faculty) be included in the student rules? I think I've brought this up before, and I think I remember Angie and I wondering if students could somehow point to this rule as a way to blame the professor in a case of academic dishonesty in a course where a professor fails to include the "section that states the Aggie Code of Honor and refers the student to the Aggie Honor System Rules and Procedures on the web" on their syllabus.

There's a concern that this puts the burden of proof on faculty regarding academic dishonesty instead of putting the responsibility on the individual student. If, for whatever reason, the Aggie Honor Code gets left off of a syllabus,

# Student Rules & Regulations Committee

October 4, 2024  
3:00 PM-5:00 PM  
Koldus 110/Zoom Meeting



there are opportunities to shift the blame from student to Faculty/Graduate Assistant. Faculty are not bound by student rules. There are a number of places in the student rules that provide expectations for the institution. The rule is the better place to store this information. Shift language from "instructors are expected" to "instructors are encouraged"

Submitter states there is no standard administrative procedure for how faculty should address instances of academic misconduct. Original spirit of the rule: This rule addresses that academic integrity is a community responsibility, therefore the faculty should include The Aggie Code of Honor as part of the minimum syllabus requirement, realizing that students are also responsible for academic integrity.

If a faculty member did forget to include this on their syllabus, there are few instances where a student could argue they didn't know the institution's stance on the expectation of academic integrity.

Suggestion to include a statement that says, "this information missing off a syllabus does not absolve the student for responsibility." Students still are responsible for following the Aggie Honor Code, rules of plagiarism, etc.

Suggestion to aim for broader language: "all student work must be exclusively their own, except in the circumstances, you know, spelled out by the instructor..."

Dr. Harrell made sure subcommittee understood the issue and a sense of how the larger committee feels to have an independent conversation.

20.1.2.2.1 - In Example c., should the use of ChatGPT or other artificial intelligence services be explicitly mentioned?

Suggested edit: the default is that you do all of the work on your own, unless you are told that you're allowed to use certain resources.

Dr. Harrell indicated that this revision for 20.1.2.2.1 and 20.1.2.2.2 go beyond the original revision by the submitter. Referring to subcommittee to discuss how granular to get in describing some items under cheating, false, and fabrication.

20.1.2.2.2 - If "artificial intelligence" is being struck, then "(AI)" should also be

struck. However, I have no idea what "large language models" means, so if this means AI, then I think it's too soon to strike that language (since obviously not everybody knows the new words).

Comment for 20.1.2.2.1 applies here also.

20.1.2.2.5 - Minor thing (but I try to watch for): In earlier parts of the document, the Oxford comma is employed. In the new addition to the preamble of this part of the rule, it is not (i.e., add a comma between "knowingly" and "or"). Also, since Example a. was moved up to the definition, all examples will need to be renamed. Finally, what is currently e. uses "World Wide Web" in reference to the internet. While I appreciate this wording (since I remember one of the first commercials to advertise the World Wide Web that had a 10- year-old girl standing in the middle of a dirt road out in the middle of nowhere saying, "It's coming ... "), I'm not sure that this wording is used much today. This is definitely not a big issue, just something that made me smile.

Oxford commas, no discussion, sent to subcommittee

# Student Rules & Regulations Committee

October 4, 2024  
3:00 PM-5:00 PM  
Koldus 110/Zoom Meeting



20.1.3.1 - For Option #2, it has been edited to say, "The instructor refers the case for adjudication by the Honor Council for further investigation and decision-making." By adding "for adjudication by the," is it still necessary to keep "for further investigation and decision-making"? This seems redundant.

Grammatical edit, referred to subcommittee for discussion and clarification

20.1.3.2 - The Aggie Core Values have been added to the end of the first paragraph, but I noticed that they are not in the RELLIS order. I'm not necessarily proposing a change; I just expected "respect" to be first, followed by "excellence," etc.

Grammatical edit, referred to subcommittee for discussion and clarification

20.1.4.7 - At the top of page 16, the end of the first paragraph has been changed to " ... will be used in computing the GPA." Which GPA? I think some clarity here would be good. Do they mean, " ... will be used in computing the student's overall GPA"? Also, for the last paragraph on page 16, the new last sentence confuses me a bit. Do they mean "A sanction may also be imposed that specifies a shorter deadline ... "?

GPA is calculated into both the cumulative and semester GPA in which it was earned. Question raised for Program GPA, suggestion to leave it broad rather than delineating which GPA, Discussion back and forth regarding a second sanction of a shorter deadline, Clarification of language edit for subcommittee

20.1.5.1 - "Withdrew" does not need to be capitalized. I'm also not sure that the English is correct in that same sentence. For the sentence preceding this, I have a question: if the case's adjudication completes after the Q-drop/withdrawal deadline, is the student still able to Q-drop or withdraw? I see that the statement says, " ... the student may be allowed to Q-drop ... " Is there significance to the word "may"?

No discussion on this

20.1.5.2 - Should these applicable rules be enumerated with letters? I've been typing so many 4-level rule numbers that all of these new rule numbers threw me off a bit.

Grammatical edit, referred to subcommittee for edit

20.2.1.2 - In #5, the "Academic Program Council" is mentioned. Does this council still exist? If yes, is this the correct name for it?

Submitter will take a look at this and report back

20.2.1.2 and 20.2.1.3 and 20.2.1.5 - In the STAFF DIRECTOR section, the first instance of

"director" is not capitalized, and in the ASSISTANT DIRECTOR section, the first instance of "Assistant Director" is capitalized. In the ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR section, the first instance of "administrative coordinator" is not capitalized. I think these should be consistent with each other.

Consistency of language, referred to subcommittee for edit; discussion about why there are "job descriptions" in this rule, Dr. Harrell explained that the committee isn't creating job descriptions... "It is incredibly important for us to be clear about their role and scope, because when somebody steps outside of their role and scope, they lose their immunity."

# Student Rules & Regulations Committee

October 4, 2024  
3:00 PM-5:00 PM  
Koldus 110/Zoom Meeting



20.2.1.4 - Missing Oxford comma in #1

referred to subcommittee for edit

20.2.3 - In this entire section, there are many uses of the phrase "Honor Code

violations." In an earlier part of this rule, these words had been replaced with "academic misconduct." Is there a reason that this phrase has not been changed in this section?

Language issue, referred to subcommittee

20.2.3.2 - I don't think the capitalization of "University" has been uniform in this entire rule. In the first sentence of this section, it is capitalized, but I'm fairly certain other instances have not been.

Grammatical concern, referred to subcommittee

20.2.3.3 - What is meant by "except for the initial appointments" in the first bullet? Also, I share Dwight Roblyer's confusion about the third bullet.

Speculation on what this means, possibly to create staggered appointments. Submitter is unclear and will investigate what this means.

20.2.4.1 - In #1, #5, and #6, "proceedings" is not capitalized, but in #2, it is in both instances (and in #3). #4 has both capitalized and uncapitalized versions of "proceedings." (Edit: I keep adding to this line as I keep reading ... Summary: check capitalization for the entirety of 20.2.4.1 for "proceedings" and make it consistent.) Also, there is a run-on sentence in #4: "There is no restriction on who a student may consult or seek advice from, the restriction pertains to the proceedings only." I think changing the comma between "from" and "the" to a semicolon may be sufficient. This exact same sentence also appears in 20.2.5.3.

Grammatical issues referred to subcommittee

20.2.4.1 again - In #7, why change "pertinent" to "factual"? We wouldn't want a witness to present a proof of Fermat's Last Theorem, no matter how factual it is, if it has nothing to do with the case.

Submitter states this is in the interest of clarity, the witness would have been physically present, "factual" is very broad and may have no relevance in the case, may need to change language to "relevant"

Relevant and factual? Pertinent and factual?

20.2.4.1 again - Maybe this doesn't matter, but in #10 and #11, Student Rule 20 is referred to as "Aggie Honor System Rules," but Student Rule 20 is being changed to be called

Format and grammar, referred to subcommittee

"Honor System Rules." This happens again in Step 4 of 20.2.4.2 as well (with both versions of the name being used here).

20.2.4.2 - I don't understand the distinction between what is written in the first paragraph (where allegations are delivered in writing in advance) and what is written in the second paragraph (where, "Alternatively, the student may be notified of the allegation through email"). If the allegation is delivered on paper, then there is no waiting period to make a decision, but if delivered via email, the instructor must wait 5 days for a response? Is it a wise decision in

# Student Rules & Regulations Committee

October 4, 2024  
3:00 PM-5:00 PM  
Koldus 110/Zoom Meeting



this day and age to deliver the allegations to a student on paper? When would a professor do that? During class? Wouldn't that invite questions? (Sorry-it's getting late, and maybe I'm reaching/rambling.)

Submitter provided examples of in person delivery where students receive notification on paper vs email delivery of allegations, faculty have access to templates if they choose to notify via email. Records are kept in the incident report how the faculty member chose to engage in notifying the student and how long they gave the student to respond. If in person, the student can respond then or the faculty member will give the student more time. If via email, the student has five university business days to respond.

Remainder of discussion referred to subcommittee

20.2.4.2 again - At the bottom of Step 2, it says, "Reporters should be prepared to detail all attempts to contact the student and secure a response from them." Does this imply that one email from the instructor is not enough?

Submitter stated: faculty are advised to give students time to respond, many times faculty are going above and beyond to contact the student (this is not "gotcha"), but if faculty doesn't hear from the student, faculty can turn it over to Ag honor system office without student input. "All attempts" could be a single email or hand delivered copy

20.2.4.2 again - In Step 4, there is mention of "five (5) university business days" (note the lack of capitalization on "university" in this instance), but in 20.1.3.1, it has been edited to suggest "ten (10) university business days." This also reminds me that I think I saw the use of the number 3 without it written out at some point earlier in the document...

Grammatical edits, referred to subcommittee

20.2.4.3 - In Step 5 on page 30, the new added part has "Conference" (capitalized), whereas all other instances of "conference" are not capitalized.

Grammatical edits, referred to subcommittee

20.2.4.3 again - In Step 7, it says the AHSO "notifies the accused student in

writing." Referring back to my question in 20.2.4.2, does this mean that the AHSO mails a physical letter? (same for Step 12 of the Honor Council Hearing Panel)

Submitter stated encrypted email is considered in writing, advise students to print it out if they want a hard copy.

Dr. Harrell: So I think the clarification that will need to be made is between those earlier steps where in writing is implying that the faculty member is literally handing them a piece of paper, because there's not a 5 day waiting period versus how you all are considering in writing to be the encrypted email that gets sent for purposes of consistency across all steps.

20.2.4.3 again - There may not be time to address this, but I have read the steps for "Honor Council Conference" and "Honor Council Hearing Panel," and I cannot figure out when one would be used vs. the other (other than the one clearly defined case-if a student has a previous violation, it has to go to the Honor Council Hearing Panel). Is the "Conference" supposed to be an expedited version of a "Hearing Panel"? Who decides and how is it decided whether to use the "Conference" vs. the "Hearing Panel" if it is the student's first violation? This is not clear to me from reading the rule.

# Student Rules & Regulations Committee

October 4, 2024  
3:00 PM-5:00 PM  
Koldus 110/Zoom Meeting



No discussion, referred to subcommittee, Dr. Harrell charged the subcommittee to keep in mind “whether something goes to a conference or to a hearing, and if you believe it's understandable in reading the rule which would happen in what circumstances next.”

20.2.4.3 again - In Step 8 of the Honor Council Hearing Panel (page 32), it says that the panel consists of 2 students and 2 faculty. Staff were added earlier; can they not serve on a panel? I'm ok with this, but just wanted to ask ... Also in Step 8, I think it should be "or their designee" for consistency.

Goes back to staff question, is clarification needed on that particular step related to the Staff chair

Referred to subcommittee for discussion

20.2.5.2 - It says a student has "five (5) business days from the date of notification of the sanction to file an appeal," but in Step 12 of the Honor Council Hearing Panel in 20.2.4.3, it seems to say that the student receives this notification via a mailed physical letter. How do we know when the student is actually notified?

Submitter stated: Students have five days to file an appeal and time starts when AHSO hits the submit button to send the email, not when students open the email. Students are given a very specific timeline and are informed to be on the lookout for their email/letter.

Referred to subcommittee on whether any clarity needs to be had here

20.2.5.2 again - Should "director" be capitalized in the sentence that states, "Decisions of the appeal reviewers, director, or designee are final"?

Grammatical issue, referred to subcommittee

20.2.5.2 again - At the top of page 36, why has the sentence "Appeal reviews for findings of responsibility and sanctions that do not include separation are scheduled by the director or their designee" been added? I thought this section was for appeals where separation was the sanction.

Submitter stated: for clarity if separation was the sanction, students would go to a separation appeal if their appeal was approved as opposed to a paper review if the sanction was less than separation.

Additional discussion referred to subcommittee.

**Dr. Harrell thanked those willing to help on subcommittee, further discussions will follow with submitter and full committee. Subcommittee members are Heather Klein, Chris Cherry, Rob Rahm, Dale Rice, Brandon Rea, Katarina McIlveene, Blair Alvarado**

**Big kudos to Heather Klein for going item by item. The goal is to clean up Rule 20 and provide clarity for students/faculty**

**Move to adjourn by Angie Hill Price, second by Rob Rahm**

**Meeting adjourned at 4:14 pm**

**Notes/Action Items: Subcommittee will meet and bring revisions to either the November or December meeting.**