

**ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE**  
2016-2017

Friday, May 5, 2017  
2-3:30pm, Sacramento Hall 161

---

**MEMBERS**

Sue Escobar, Chair (Criminal Justice, HHS)  
VACANT  
James Fox (Library)  
Jean Gonsier-Gerdin (Teaching Credentials, EDU)  
Amber Gonzalez (Undergraduate Studies, EDU)

Megan Heinicke (Psychology, SSIS)  
Jacqueline Irwin (Communication Studies, A&L)  
Yang Li (Marketing & Supply Chain Management, CBA)  
Matt Schmidlein, (Geography, NSM)  
Tara Sharpp (Nursing, HHS)  
VACANT

**NON-VOTING/EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS**

Julian Heather (Faculty Senate)  
Dennis Geyer (Office of the University Registrar)  
Gabriel Hernandez (University Staff Assembly)  
Don Hunt (Division of Student Affairs)

Jasmine “Jazzie” Murphy (Division of Student Affairs)  
Don Taylor (Office of Academic Affairs)  
Marcellene Watson-Derbigny (Division of Student Affairs)  
Abraham Mendoza (Associated Students, Inc.)

---

**AGENDA**

**1. Call to Order**

**2. Open Forum**

Brief period for members to raise issues related to the committee charge that are not on today’s agenda.

**3. Approval of the Agenda**

**4. Approval of the Minutes for April 21<sup>st</sup> (Appendix A)**

**5. Discussion Items:**

**Senate Bill 412: The California Promise and Priority Registration (Appendix B).** FPC Response to APC Referral (attached).

**Academic Honesty Policy and Procedures (Appendix C).** O’Connor Policy Revision Proposal/Outline Attached; UPM for the Academic Honesty Policy & Procedures: <http://www.csus.edu/umannual/student/stu-0100.htm> and EO 1098 – Student Conduct Procedures: <http://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1098.html>

**6. Meeting Schedule for Spring 2017**

February 3	March 17	May 5
February 17	April 7	
March 3	April 21	

**7. Adjournment**



**2016-2017 FACULTY SENATE  
ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE**

**April 21, 2017**

*Approved:*

May 2, 2017

Members Present: Escobar, Fox, Gonsier-Gerdin, Geyer, Heinicke, Hernandez, Li, Schmidlein

Members Absent: Gonzalez, Heather, Hunt, Mendoza, Murphy, Newsome, Sharpp, Taylor, Watson-Derbigny

Guests Present: Trigales

**Call to Order:** Called to order at 2:15 p.m.

**1. Open Forum:**

**2. Approval of the Agenda:** Approved 2:25pm

**3. Approval of the Minutes for March 3, 2017.** Approved 2:25pm

**4. Discussion Item: CA Promise, SB 412.** The Committee continued to discuss revisions to the amended priority registration policy that deals specifically with the CA Promise and the criteria for student participation in the program. At the time of the meeting, the Committee was still awaiting a response from FPC regarding their feedback on the advising component of the CA Promise. Chair Escobar stated that she would continue to work on this draft and bring it back at the next meeting, which will be the final meeting of the semester and academic year.

**Discussion Item: Academic Honesty Policy.** Matt O'Connor, Student Conduct Officer, was invited to provide an overview of the issues that Jill Peterson, University Counsel, raised about the policy and to answer any questions the Committee may have had about those problems and some of the ways in which clarity for all parties (faculty and students) can be made to happen. M. O'Connor shared that the problems in the Sac State policy included the fact that it is very long and contains a lot of legalistic language, or jargon, that makes it challenging for students and faculty to understand. Some questions that have come up about it: who has the final say on the grade that is awarded (if there is a claim of cheating/plagiarism)? What about the final decisions on discipline? (in other words, can an administrator overrule a faculty member or does the faculty member have the final say?). The ultimate goal is to make the policy legally 'tight.' M. O'Connor went on to say that structural fairness in the policy is important. Presently, reporting of incidents of cheating and/or plagiarism is very low. He suggested that some of the changes to the policy include a place for faculty to indicate that they'd like to refer the case to student conduct for

investigation and to have a place where faculty can explicitly indicate that they do not want administrative discipline to be the final outcome. The development of a student conduct flow chart was discussed and this would provide for clarity around the process. M. O'Connor added that he had begun working on a 'skeleton draft' of a revised policy which he said he'd share with the Committee. The Committee was appreciative as this will provide folks with a starting point.

**Meeting Schedule for Spring 2017**

~~February 3~~  
~~February 17~~  
~~March 3~~

~~March 17~~  
~~April 7~~  
~~April 21~~

May 5

**Adjournment:** Meeting adjourned at 3:30pm.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sue C. Escobar, Committee Chair

## CA Promise Program Priority Registration section

**I.** Priority Registration Groups and Eligibility Criteria Process

~~Until the SIS records system is in operation, p  
Priority registration is defined according to the group to which a student is assigned, based  
upon specific eligibility criteria. shall be implemented as follows:~~

Fourth Priority

SB 412, the California Promise (2016). This law requires a number of specific campuses  
of the California State University, including Sacramento State, to establish a California  
Promise program. Under this program, the campus works with qualifying entering  
students and transfer students who commit to completing at least 30 semester units per  
academic year in order to graduate within 4 academic years or within 2 years,  
respectively. Units completed by the student during a summer term may count towards  
the previous or following academic year as determined by the trustees. Each  
participating student must be a California resident for purposes of in-state tuition  
eligibility.

The CA Promise Program Participation Eligibility Criteria:

~~Students must meet specific eligibility criteria specified in the legislation.~~

~~1. A low income student. For purposes of this section, “low income student” shall have  
the same meaning as specified in Section 89295.~~

~~2. A student who has graduated from a high school located in a community that is  
underrepresented in college attendance.~~

~~3. A student who is a first-generation college student.~~

~~4. A transfer student. A student who successfully completes his or her associate degree  
for transfer at a community college shall be guaranteed participation in the California  
Promise program~~

All incoming students will lose CA Promise Program status if they do not make  
satisfactory progress toward a degree. In order to make satisfactory progress toward a  
degree, students are required to meet the following expectations:

1. Complete a minimum of 12 units of course work with passing grades in the current  
semester, of which at least 2 of these courses must satisfy requirements in a declared  
major, General Education, university Graduation Requirements, and/or supplemental  
admission criteria for an impacted degree program.
2. Enroll in a minimum of 12 units of course work for the following semester;
3. Earn a 2.0 GPA or higher in the current semester;
4. Review and update the tools within Keys to Degree in the current semester;
5. Complete at least 30 semester units in each prior academic year.

## CA Promise Program Priority Registration section

1  
2 Note: A student shall not receive priority registration in coursework under the program if  
3 he or she qualifies for priority registration under another policy or program, as  
4 determined by the campus or the Office of the Chancellor of the California State  
5 University.

6  
7 Students who meet these eligibility criteria and commit to the CA Promise Program are given  
8 a registration day and time at the beginning of the student's class status.

9  
10 CA Promise Program eligibility and compliance will be conducted by the Division of Student  
11 Affairs at the end of each semester to see if CA Promise Program students are meeting the  
12 conditions of eligibility. Should they fall out of compliance, students will be notified that  
13 they no longer have fourth priority status and registration. Students who are removed from  
14 this priority group shall have the opportunity for appeal in the event that special  
15 circumstances precluded them from meeting the necessary conditions to remain in the  
16 priority group or if the student was removed in error.

17  
18 ~~A. Should eligibility for priority registration exceed seven percent of total enrollment, the~~  
19 ~~issue of priority shall be brought back to the Senate during the following semester.~~  
20  
21

Date: April 19, 2017

To: Julian Heather, Chair, Faculty Senate

CC: Sue Escobar, Chair, Academic Policies Committee

Re: FPC Response to California Promise, SB 412, referral

---

The Faculty Policy Committee recommends that the following guidelines be considered regarding possible workload issues due to increased advising responsibilities as a result of California Promise, SB 412:

- Recommend a dedicated staff/faculty advisor at the department or college level.
- Consider compensation as assigned WTUs for Temporary Faculty to assist with advising duties.
- Project the number of students eligible to participate in the program, and determine expected increase in need for advising.
- Determine if the use of Smart Planner can be considered advising for students.

The members of the FPC discussed current advising practices in several departments. Generally, students are assigned to a tenure-line faculty, though students are free to go to anyone eligible to do major advising. The chairs also do academic advising. Students seek advising about once per year, though these are mainly the proactive students. One department considered doing advising once per term, but with 300+ students for 6 or 7 tenure-line faculty, this would have been a significant increase in workload. Several departments were mentioned that have a full-time staff member who does academic advising. The College of Business Administration has their own advisors, and faculty are consulted more about career options.

De-Laine Cyrenne  
Chair, Faculty Policies Committee

## APPENDIX C

**From:** [O'Connor, Matt](#)  
**To:** [Escobar, Sue C.](#)  
**Subject:** 4-page policy and form  
**Date:** Monday, May 1, 2017 10:08:26 AM  
**Attachments:** [3 pg version of policy with edit.docx](#)

---

Hi Sue,

Per the APC request for my skeletal version --- I have attached a 3.5 page *academic honesty policy*, including 2 sample forms to this email.

I think this is one way to address the current policy. In my document:

- The policy itself is the same -- ***Faculty evaluation and grading rights are identical*** (no material change)
- The legal terms and some wordiness have been removed
- The process to notify my office for *record keeping only* is clarified—and a sample form is included.
- Due process review by SA is slightly more clear.
- ACA-0110 is cross-referenced.
- NB There is a new element: An instructor would have the option to ask Student Affairs for a preliminary investigation. This strikes me as needed:
  - Faculty may struggle to investigate a large case (10+ \_ students) of misconduct and want assistance. I have already had this happen.
  - Faculty may lack the investigatory tools to build a case in complex online/hybrid class cheating cases. (I have already run into this as well).

I hope this helps your committee frame the next conversations. Please let me know if I can be of help.

Best,

-Matt

### **Matt O'Connor**

#### **Director, Office of Student Conduct**

California State University, Sacramento  
Lassen Hall 3008 | 6000 J Street  
Sacramento, CA 95819-6062  
T: (916) 278-6060 | F: (916) 278-5443



## ACADEMIC HONESTY POLICY AND PROCEDURES

### I. General Principles

Truth and honesty are fundamental to a community of scholars. Academic dishonesty defrauds those who depend upon the integrity of the University curriculum, research, and degrees. Accordingly, Faculty and students share a responsibility to defend the integrity of academic work and student grades.

### II. Responsibilities of Students, Instructors, and the Student Conduct Administrator

#### a. Students are responsible for:

- Knowing what constitutes academic dishonesty and taking steps to avoid it
- Knowing the rules and expectations for individual classes and, if ambiguous, seeking clarification before submitting graded coursework

#### b. Instructors are responsible for:

- Fair grading
- Designing assignments and exams to discourage misconduct
- Educating students on the requirements of the curriculum, expectations for collaboration, and the consequences of academic dishonesty
- Reporting academic dishonesty to the Student Conduct Administrator

#### c. The Student Conduct Administrator is responsible for:

- Administrative discipline
- Serving as a resource for faculty, staff and students on matters of academic honesty
- Maintaining centralized records for actions taken under this policy

### III. Prohibited Conduct

Cheating: Any use or attempt to use work from an unauthorized person or source, such as another exam, an unauthorized device, or a crib sheet.

Unfair conduct in exams and coursework: Any act that interferes with a fair grading environment. Examples include talking, texting, or communicating during an exam; working past allotted time; helping another student to cheat; sharing or showing coursework to other students before submission; and stealing or interfering with other student's work.

Plagiarism: Any student work in any format that contains another person's work without a clear identification of the source. The facts, ideas, arguments, code, data, images, and organizational structures of others must be clearly distinguished from a student's own work and properly cited.

Fraud and misrepresentation: Any form of dishonesty for academic advantage. Examples include false excuses for missed deadlines; falsified data or results; re-submitting an altered exam for a re-grade; submitting false information in a grade appeal; or forging a signature in an academic document.

## APPENDIX C

Multiple submissions: A student may not submit the same or substantially similar work in more than one class without explicit permission from the relevant instructor(s).

### IV. Instructor Response to Evidence of Academic Dishonesty

- a. When an instructor responsible for a course has evidence of misconduct, the instructor may
  - i. Investigate and resolve the matter independently;
  - ii. Seek an initial consultation with the Student Conduct Administrator, Academic Dean, or Department Chair; or
  - iii. Refer the suspicion to the Student Conduct Administrator to investigate.
- b. Instructors must report every finding of academic dishonesty to the Student Conduct Administrator. This requirement allows for centralized record keeping; helps identify patterns in behavior; and ensures a due process review. Instructors have two reporting options: a *Notice of Action Report* and a *Disciplinary Referral Report*.
  - A Notice of Action report permits an instructor to resolve a case independently and record the resolution in the conduct records system *without* administrative discipline. Unless a student was issued a prior notice or sanction, disciplinary charges will not result from a *Notice of Action* report.
  - A Disciplinary Referral report is a request for the Student Conduct Administrator to investigate and/or adjudicate academic misconduct. Disciplinary Referrals may result in educational and remedial measures, administrative sanctions, or both.

### V. Procedure for Resolution by Instructor

- a. The instructor shall promptly notify the student of the concern and offer an opportunity to respond (conference by phone or in-person) within seven days.
  - Notice, an explanation of the evidence, and an invitation to respond should come in a private format (email or office hours).
  - If an instructor or proctor observes suspicious behavior during an exam, the proctor may re-seat a student but the student should be permitted to finish the exam unless a student is disruptive.
- b. **Decision without a student response:** If the student does not respond to the instructor's notice within seven days, the instructor may determine if a preponderance of evidence supports a finding of misconduct based on the information available.
  - If the instructor determines the evidence is insufficient to prove the student more likely than not engaged in misconduct, the matter is closed.
  - If the instructor determines the evidence is sufficient to prove the student more likely than not engaged in misconduct, the instructor shall:
    - a. Award a grade penalty, if appropriate, under the standards describe in Section VI (c) of this policy; and
    - b. Submit either a *Notice of Action Report* or a *Disciplinary Referral Report* to the Student Conduct Administrator.

## APPENDIX C

- c. **Decision with a student response:** After communicating the concerns, the evidence, and the possible consequences with a student, the instructor must determine if a preponderance of evidence supports a finding of misconduct based on the information available.
- If the instructor determines either (1) the evidence is insufficient to prove the student more likely than not engaged in misconduct or (2) the student is responsible for a level of carelessness that falls short of academic dishonesty, the instructor may counsel the student and dismiss the case.
  - If the instructor determines the evidence is sufficient to prove the student more likely than not engaged in misconduct, the instructor shall:
    - a. Award a grade penalty, if appropriate, under the standards describe in Section VI (c) of this policy;
    - b. Counsel the student, as appropriate; and
    - c. Submit either a *Notice of Action Report* or a *Disciplinary Referral Report* to the Student Conduct Administrator.

### VI. Grading

a. **Grade Submissions for Open Cases**

When a case of suspected misconduct is not resolved by the end of a semester, the instructor shall submit an RD (Report Delayed) grade for the student.

b. **Final Disposition of Allegations**

- In cases where allegations of misconduct are adjudicated by an instructor under Section V of this policy (absent a formal hearing), the instructor's determination that academic misconduct did or did not occur is final and binding on all parties.
- In cases adjudicated by administrative hearing, the finding of a Hearing Officer that academic misconduct did or did not occur is final and binding on all parties.

c. **Grading for a Finding of Misconduct**

- Upon a finding of academic misconduct, the instructor of record may assign a grade penalty, including a failing grade, for any assignment. When appropriate, the instructor may instead apply a penalty to the course grade as a whole, including an award of "F" for the course.
- Grade penalties must be proportionate to the gravity of the offense in light of the totality of circumstances. Grossly disproportionate grade penalties are "arbitrary" and may be appealed through the ACA-0110 Grade Appeal Policy.

### VII. Administrative Sanctions

The Student Conduct Administrator will review every *Notice of Action Report* or a *Disciplinary Referral Report* to determine if administrative discipline is appropriate. Administrative

## APPENDIX C

Discipline is frequently educational, requiring a student participate in an academic integrity workshop, complete assignments related to academic integrity, or engage in other remedial measures.

Grave or repeated academic dishonesty may be sanctioned by probation, suspension or expulsion.

Because recommendation of the referring instructor is one important element of the decision to apply administrative discipline, the *Disciplinary Referral Report* permits a referring instructor to comment on recommended discipline.

### **VIII. Due Process Review**

- The Student Conduct Administrator will review every report to determine if the instructor denied an accused student basic due process. If a procedural error is found, the report shall be returned to the instructor with advice to cure the defect.
- Any student accused of academic misconduct may request that the Student Conduct Administrator review an instructor's response and finding in any academic case. Such a review is limited to a review of procedural due process. If a procedural error is found, the report shall be returned to the instructor with advice to cure the defect.
- Upon re-consideration, the instructor's decision shall be final. In such cases, the date the course grade is awarded for the purposes of an ACA-0110 Grade Appeal Policy shall be the date of the re-consideration.



California State University, Sacramento
Office of Student Conduct
6000 J Street • Lassen Hall 3008 • Sacramento, CA 95819-6062
T (916) 278-6060 • F (916) 278-5443

Academic Misconduct: Notice of Action

Available Online: https://csus-advocate.symlicity.com/public\_report

The Sacramento State Academic Honesty Policy STU-0100 permits an instructor to work directly with a student to resolve an academic misconduct issue, provided the outcome is reported to Student Affairs.

Unlike a Disciplinary Referral, this Notice of Action allows an instructor to record an academic honesty resolution in the conduct records system without administrative discipline (except when a student has a previous record of academic dishonesty).

After review by the Student Conduct Administrator, both student and instructor will receive a confirmation for their records.

Instructor Name: \_\_\_\_\_
Instructor Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Instructor email: \_\_\_\_\_
College: \_\_\_\_\_ Department: \_\_\_\_\_
Class: \_\_\_\_\_ Section: \_\_\_\_\_
Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Student ID: \_\_\_\_\_

SUMMARY OF INCIDENT and DISPOSITION:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Did the student respond to your request to review the violation? Yes ( ) No ( )

Did the student respond to your request to review the violation? Yes ( ) No ( )

Grade Penalty:

( ) No Penalty ( ) Penalty on Affected Assignment(s) and / or Rewrite ( ) Course Grade Penalty

APPENDIX C

For questions about this form, the Academic Honesty Policy, or the conduct process, please contact the Student Conduct Administrator via [conduct@csus.edu](mailto:conduct@csus.edu)



California State University, Sacramento  
Office of Student Conduct  
6000 J Street • Lassen Hall 3008 • Sacramento, CA 95819-6062  
T (916) 278-6060 • F (916) 278-5443

**Academic Misconduct: Disciplinary Referral**

Available Online: [https://csus-advocate.symplicity.com/public\\_report](https://csus-advocate.symplicity.com/public_report)

Sacramento State Academic Dishonesty Policy <http://www.csus.edu/umannual/student/stu-0100.htm>

*A Disciplinary Referral report is a request for the Student Conduct Administrator to investigate and/or adjudicate academic misconduct. Disciplinary Referrals may result in educational measures or administrative sanctions, as appropriate.*

Instructor Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Instructor Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Instructor email: \_\_\_\_\_

College: \_\_\_\_\_ Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Class: \_\_\_\_\_ Section: \_\_\_\_\_

**Student Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Student ID:** \_\_\_\_\_

**INCIDENT DESCRIPTON** Please describe the concern, attaching a supplemental memo or additional pages if needed. Please include with this referral form all supporting documents or evidence. If you are sending original copies of documents that must be returned, please indicate so.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Did the student respond to your request to review the violation within seven days? Yes  No

Grade Penalty:

## APPENDIX C

No Penalty     Penalty on Affected Assignment(s) and / or Rewrite     Course Grade Penalty     TBD

---

For questions about this form, the Academic Honesty Policy, or the conduct process, please contact the Student Conduct Administrator via [conduct@csus.edu](mailto:conduct@csus.edu)