

ROBERT HOLLAND FACULTY SENATE
UNCORRECTED MINUTES OF MEETING ON February 13, 2009

The Robert Holland Faculty Senate of Mississippi State University held its regular meeting in Coskrey Auditorium of Memorial Hall at 2:00 p.m. on Friday, March 13, 2009.

Excused: Mary Kathryn Barbier, Mike Brown, John Byrd, Gary Ervin, Stephen Foster, Terry Hanson, Jeffrey Haupt, Joe Massey, Tom Matney, Vince McGrath, Dan Reynolds, Juan Silva, Shu-hui Wu

Unexcused: none

The meeting was broadcast real-time over the World Wide Web. The file will be left active for a few weeks and can be reviewed by clicking on the Senate homepage at [://www.facultysenate.msstate](http://www.facultysenate.msstate).

President David Nagel called the meeting to order.

Adoption of Minutes: Moved by Senator Bridges and seconded by Senator Ebanks to approve the minutes as corrected. Motion passed.

Introduction of Guests:

Dr. Mark Keenum, President

President Keenum indicated he came to give an update on activities and to listen. He has been traveling and meeting with alumni and supporters, including a trip to Washington, DC to meet with Mississippi's congressional delegation. He indicated he had spent a lot of time in Jackson working on the budget and appropriations with the other presidents and the IHL Board

President Keenum said they were watching the development of the stimulus package and how much MSU might get. The package includes an additional \$14-15 mil in competitive grants on top of the 30 mil plus already annually funded. Some of which could come to MSU

At this point the university may not have to take the 5% cuts that have been warned. He is working with other president to try and work things out so that might be possible. He gave some possible numbers but nothing has been decided yet.

Looking ahead to FY 10-11, Dr. Keenum indicated it would take an additional \$9.3 mill to make us whole but the legislature does not want to raise tuition.

The federal government has just passed the 2009 omnibus federal appropriations bill, which should have been passed last October. Mississippi is in the nation in earmarked dollars, behind California and Texas. MSU got \$75 mil in direct or indirect

appropriations. This includes an additional \$3.1 mil poultry center of excellence and \$6.5 mil for the multi-tenant building at the research park that will house high tech firms. There was \$4.5 plus for the Northern Gulf Research Center at the Stennis Center to go with \$4.5 from previous allocations. The Mississippi Congressional delegation stepped up and fought for us.

NSF reported MSU in the nation in research dollars expended and 5th in agricultural research as well as in engineering research

Two searches are under way. The VP DAFVM committee consists of 13 member with 7 elected from the faculty plus stake holders from around the state. The search for the VP for Research will be starting soon and President Keenum asked that faculty senate begin the election process for faculty members to serve on the committee.

Dr. Peter Rabideau, Provost

Dr. Rabideau was asked to address teaching evaluations and evidence of good teaching to be used in annual evaluations. He discussed using a teaching portfolio and possible content. He indicated the provost's website would have additional information.

Student evaluation of teaching is really student perception of teaching. The university average is 4.3 out of 5 which would indicate good teaching across the board. The evaluations can be effected by class size, required classes vs electives and other factors.

Complementary methods of evaluation using a teaching portfolio. Thus providing evidence of teaching excellence other than student evaluations. Include:

Evaluation of student learning on standardized or accreditation exams.

Course portfolios including syllabi and examples of student work

Class room visits by department head or other faculty that will observe the teaching and write an evaluation.

Dr. Rabideau indicated that P and T will not be hampered if faculty choose not to do a teaching portfolio.

Dr. Rabideau talked about the importance of faculty retention and about the new faculty orientation and multiple workshops held to encourage retention.

The university is planning to add formal exit interviews. Dr. Linda Morse has been tasked with development of the instrument to be reviewed by the faculty senate. The Provost is also looking at some standardized instruments to survey faculty, such as the COACH survey, to provide information to support faculty and retain

Greg Bradshaw asked about software for student records to help with advising. CAPS works well toward the end of the students career but not in the beginning. Do we have a way to indicate what the advisor has recommended? Response – students don't always take your advice. Students are ultimately responsible for their own graduation.

Dr. Steve Turner, Faculty Athletic Representative

Dr. Turner reported on student athlete's grades from fall a GPA of 2.94 for all scholarship athletes. Academic Progress rates were also presented two factors, eligibility and retention, make up this score. A 92.5% plus is required to stay in good standing with NCAA. Only one sport, men's BB was below the requirement and lost a scholarship.

Mr. Dan Mullen, MSU Head Football Coach

Mr. Mullen indicated he has been trying to build relationships with alumni, athletics in the south, state and community since he began at MSU. He is trying to instill in the players that "Championship is an all the time attitude." Champions just not on the field but also in the classroom, weight room, and in your chosen field in the future. His goal is to teach them how to compete and how to win.

He gave the spring practice schedule and invited faculty to observe and come to the Maroon and White game April at 5:30.

Mr. Mullen indicated he has a master's degree in education and that he and the other coaches are there to help young people succeed in life. He said it feels good to win a championship, but it doesn't last long. The most important of his job is to insure that the players are successful in whatever they do in the future.

Mr. Mullen and his staff are working hard to give MSU a team we can be proud of both on and off the field. A good university with a good reputation makes recruitment of top athletes easier. He is also looking for ways to involve faculty with football players.

3. Report of the President:

President's Report
March 13, 2009

Faculty evaluation was a topic for discussion through the month. We will be looking at the new form this meeting. Please read it carefully and be prepared to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of three versus five versus some other number of descriptors in the evaluation process. The reliance on student evaluations by department heads is another matter of concern to faculty.

O.P. 64.02 on catering is being revised and should be completed in the near future.

The election of seven faculty from the agriculture division for the vice president for agriculture search committee went smoothly with over 50 % participation.

The Confidence in Administrators survey concluded March 6. Participation was less than last year. Results will not be posted until faculty evaluations have been completed.

There are several things in the packet concerning ethics this month. I was given the drafts that are in the packet late in the afternoon of March 6. President Keenum would like to have these discussed and our advice on these ideas this semester. We will meet March 13 and April 3. The April Senate will have the newly elected faculty seated, so those of us who are rotating off the Senate need to speak this month on this topic.

Officer elections will be held at the April Senate meeting. Elected officers are the president, vice-president and secretary. President and vice-president are allowed to serve no more than two consecutive terms. Please consider running for office yourself or nominating someone you feel would be a good representative of the faculty. Candidates for office must have served one year in the senate to be eligible. Officers serve from July 1 to June 30.

Report of the Vice President:

Vice President's Report
March 13, 2009

As a function of my Faculty Senate Vice-Presidential duties, I attended Academic Dean's Council and Traffic Committee meetings. Below are the discussions that I feel are pertinent to the interest of fellow Senators.

Highlights of the Dean's council included:

- Jeff Slaughter of the Student Association discussed a new Peer Tutoring program which will enlist students to help other students with advice relative to their classes and major. The goal is to have one peer tutor per major. The program will be on the Student Association website.
- The Teacher/Student Recognition program needs students to nominate deserving faculty and teachers to nominate deserving students for the awards recognizing excellence in academics. The recognition banquet is April 15. Faculty and students interested in this program can find the committee chairman's information on the Student Association website.
- Julie Fulgham discussed a malfunction in the new scanning equipment on campus which caused some issues with certain student evaluations of courses for the fall semester. The situation was recognized and addressed. Those affected evaluation packets were to be re-submitted for re-processing.
- The Post Tenure Review and Dean's Performance Evaluation documents were discussed in a general manner. No action was taken relative to either document.

A few seats remain open at the Spring Faculty Roundtable for both General Faculty members as well as Faculty Senators. The event is scheduled for Saturday, March 21, from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. at the McKay Enology Laboratory located on the north side of

campus. This year the Roundtable discussion will center on the subject “22,000 by 2015? Considerations for Reasonable, Manageable and Sustainable Student Growth at MSU.” Please consider joining the discussion and encourage your colleagues to attend as well. You can volunteer at @msstate. or call me at 325-7726.

The Faculty Senate now has a new email box address. Any questions or concerns can be emailed to @msstate. Thanks to Mike Rackley, Tim Griffin, and Mike Hicks in ITS for their help in facilitating the new address.

The first cycle for promotion and tenure using the latest version of the Faculty Handbook (approved by the Faculty Senate 3-18-08 and signed Dr. Watson on 6-30-08) is being completed. If you are aware of any issues encountered by your constituency relative to the document and the process please bring it to the attention of the Faculty Senate so it can be addressed in a timely manner.

Respectfully Submitted,
R. H. “Hart” Bailey

Report from Faculty Designates on University Committees: None

Business to be sent to Committees:

Letter from J. Gilbert, re: Annual Faculty Reviews

Last year the faculty senate recommended three evaluation descriptors – the Dean’s Council wanted five but don’t have a real definition for the descriptors.

Senator Adebiyi asked about the appeal process. Senator Brashier reviewed the process.

Emison asked if this had been reviewed by HR because asking the person to sign that the faculty members agrees with the department. No one could answer the question.

Senator Millea moved and Senator Porter seconded the motion to refer the matter back to committee. Motion passed

Letter from J. Picone, re: Student Evaluations of Faculty. Senator Millea moved Bridges second the motion to send the letter to faculty affairs. The motion passed

Jason moved to group together. the following items: Draft OP: Ethics and Integrity Policy, Draft OP: Whistleblower Policy, Draft OP: MSU Code of Honor Training & Awareness. Senator Seal seconded the motion which passed.

Motion was made by Senator Bridges and seconded by Senator Lueg to refer the grouped items to the Ancillary Affairs Committee. The motion passed.

Standing Committee Reports: None

Executive Committee Action:

Report to the Faculty Senate
Executive Committee
March 13, 2009

Background:

The executive committee was asked to give quick approval to the Mississippi State University Diversity Strategic Plan. We recommended that portions of the document be deleted since the recitation of past accomplishments should not be part of a plan for the future. The paragraphs struck through on pages 4 and 6 were the only changes to the document.

It was moved by Senator Bridges, and seconded by Senator Bradshaw to approve the executive committee recommendation. Motion Passed

Note: a copy of the diversity plan is in the March 13, 2009 agenda.

Academic Affairs – no report

Ancillary Affairs –
9.3.1 –

Report to the Faculty Senate
Ancillary Affairs Committee
March 13, 2009

Background

During the February Senate meeting, the Ancillary Affairs Committee was asked to look into the possibility of a faculty under-representation situation with respect to membership on the MSU Traffic Policy Committee. The Ancillary Affairs Committee met on February to review and discuss membership on the subject committee.

Discussion

The current MSU Traffic Policy Committee consists of nineteen members (one of which is an alternate member) and is chaired by Dr. John Byrd. Of the nineteen members, it appears that six members report to the VP for Student affairs and four others are student representatives. This representation does place the faculty membership in a minority when considering policies that jointly affect faculty and students. While there is no evidence to suggest that this has been a problem to date, we believe that the committee membership should be reevaluated and that the following guidelines should be followed:

- **Staff Representation:** 4 (appointed by Professional and Support Staff Advisory Council)
- **Faculty Representation:** One representative from each College on the MSU main campus (Agriculture and Life Sciences; Architecture, Art, and Design; Arts and Sciences; Business; Education; Engineering; Forest Resources; and Veterinary Medicine) appointed by the respective Dean.
- **Library Representation:** 1 appointed by the Dean of Libraries.

- **Student Representation:** Two at-large representatives; one from the Student Association; one from the Graduate Student Association.
- **Faculty Senate Representation:** 1
- **VP Student Affairs:** Dean of Students; Director of Parking Services; MSU Police Department; Housing and Resident Life
- **MSU Physical Plant:** 1 representative

The above formula would provide for a committee of 23 individuals and would allow for each major constituency on main campus to be represented. Student, Staff, Library, and Facilities representation is maintained.

Recommendation:

The Ancillary Affairs Committee recommends that the Senate approve this recommended committee membership and that it be forwarded to the VP for Student Affairs for his consideration.

Committee: George Adebisi, John Bailey, John Byrd, LaDonne Delgado, Gary Ervin, Stephen Cline, Vince McGrath, and Ray Vaughn (Chair)

It was moved by Senator Vaughn and seconded by Senator Hamil to approved the committee recommendation. Motion approved.

Charter & Bylaws – no report

Faculty Affairs –

Report to the Robert Holland Faculty Senate

Faculty Affairs Committee

March 13, 2009

Background

Last year, after several months of debate, the Robert Holland Faculty Senate voted to approve and submit AOP 13.13 Extended Leave Guidelines for Tenure and Workload Modification (see below). During this process, AOP 13.13 was converted and approved as OP 13.13 on 1/31/08, although it continued to be published as an AOP on the MSU website (see below).

Discussion/Recommendation

Given the recent changes in administration, and a tentative agreement with the intent of the policy as approved last year by the Robert Holland faculty senate by the new administration, the Faculty Affairs committee recommends that the new administration be given a chance to fully evaluate and respond to the AOP as passed last year, and recommends that the AOP be resubmitted as passed.

Senator Brashier moved to resubmit the AOP passed last year to the new administration and Senator Dampier seconded the motion. Motion passed with one abstention.

MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY

Academic Operating Policy and Procedure

MEMORANDUM TO: All Holders of Mississippi State University Academic
Operating Policy and Procedure Manual

DATE: April 17, 1989
Revised (Date of President's Signature)

SUBJECT: AOP 13.13 –Extended Leave Guidelines for Tenure and
Workload Modification

PURPOSE

The purpose of this Academic Operating Policy and Procedure (AOP) is to ensure an understanding of the university extended leave policies as they apply to promotion and tenure. In addition to federal and state law, several university policies exist that affect faculty related parental/medical and other reasons for extended leave. These policies are to be effectively utilized by departments and colleges to support faculty members who request assistance in arranging parental/medical leave, other approved leave requests, and/or modified assignment.

REVIEW

This AOP will be reviewed every four years (or whenever circumstances require an earlier review) by the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs (APAA) with recommendations for revision presented to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

POLICY/PROCEDURE

The procedures for requesting leave (HRM form 60-201) are outlined in the policies maintained by Human Resources Management on their web site [.hrm.msstate.edu](http://hrm.msstate.edu). For tenure track faculty, a request for extended leave during the probationary period may impact progress toward tenure. As stated in the Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures, section 4.8.3, an extension of the probationary period of up to 2 years can be requested. At the faculty member's request, an extension may be granted with the approval of the department head or director, the dean, and/or the Provost. If a request for an extension of the probationary period that falls within section 4.8.3 of the University Promotion and Tenure document guidelines is denied by the faculty member's immediate supervisor, the request and reason for denial shall automatically be forwarded to the next higher administrator. The departmental promotion and tenure committee shall be notified of the extension and the revised probationary period of approved extensions.

Promotion and Tenure

The University Promotion and Tenure document section 4.8.3 permits a faculty member to request a stoppage of the tenure clock for certain exigencies. If granted, the clock may stop for up to two years, if the faculty member's request precedes the approved extended leave period or is received within the first half year (183 days) following the faculty member's return to work. The request must come prior to May 15 in the year of the mandatory submission of the application for tenure.

Stopping the tenure clock simply delays the year in which the faculty member must apply for tenure. In all other aspects, the faculty member shall have all rights and privileges as other members of the MSU faculty.

The decision whether to grant tenure to a faculty member should be based upon the applicant's performance in teaching, research, and service during the probationary period. Stopping the tenure clock for parental/medical or other approved leave purposes has no impact upon that decision. Furthermore, the extension of the probationary period does not mean that more output should be expected of a faculty member because of the extended period of time. More specifically, the person should not be expected to have accomplished any more than a candidate who has not had an extension of the probationary period.

Work Load Policy

The university work load policy permits all department heads latitude in faculty FTE assignments allowing a certain amount of flexibility in their specific assignments for a given semester. Taking accrued leave does not require and should not result in work load modification. However, if accrued leave is inadequate to deal with an approved extended leave request, rearranging a faculty member's teaching, research, and service workload, i.e., a modified work load, to accommodate the extended leave is an option that should be considered with the consent and involvement of all participating parties.

Guidelines and examples of a modified workload maybe found at:

[://www.provost.msstate.edu/pdfs/parental](http://www.provost.msstate.edu/pdfs/parental).

Department heads and faculty members may explore and develop other alternatives for restructuring the work load to accommodate the parental or medical requirements of the faculty member.

Leave Accrual and Application

The HRM website maintains the latest forms for leave application as well as leave accrual rates. This may be accessed at [://www.hrm.msstate.edu/benefits](http://www.hrm.msstate.edu/benefits). Leave policy is set by state law and is the same for all state employees. Any and all changes have to go through the legislative process for approval. Should any changes in leave accrual rates and application process occur, faculty will be notified via a campus wide email or other appropriate means.

Position Section Month Day
Associate Vice President Review April (ONY) 1
for Academic Affairs

Policy and Procedure
Academic Operating Policy and Procedure

MEMORANDUM TO: **All Holders of Mississippi State University Academic Operating Policy and Procedure Manual**

DATE: **April 17, 1989**

Revised **01/31/08**

SUBJECT: **AOP 13.13 – Leave Policies**

PURPOSE

The purpose of this Academic Operating Policy and Procedure (AOP) is to ensure an understanding of the faculty leave policies.

REVIEW

This AOP will be reviewed every four years (or whenever circumstances require an earlier review) by the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs (APAA) with recommendations for revision presented to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

POLICY/PROCEDURE

The procedures for requesting leave are outlined in the policies maintained by Human Resources Management on their web site www.hrm.msstate.edu . A request for extended leave during the probationary period for tenure-track faculty may have an impact on the faculty member’s progress toward tenure. As stated in the Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures, section 4.8.3, an extension of the probationary period of up to 2 years can be requested. At the faculty member’s request, an extension may be granted with the approval of the Provost. This request should be submitted with the recommendation of the departmental P&T committee, department head/director and the dean.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Position	Section	Year	
Associate Provost for Academic Affairs	Review	2010	OP 13.13
			01/31/08

9.5.2 -

Report to the Holland Faculty Senate

Faculty Affairs Committee

March 13, 2009

Background

In November, the faculty affairs committee was asked to consider the proposal to insert a sentence into AOP 13.23 - Faculty Workload stating: "However, these adjustments must be temporary and selective, not a continuing departmental policy." after the last sentence in the second paragraph of the Policy/Procedure section of the AOP (see below).

Discussion

After investigating the causes for the request and the complexity of the issues involved, the committee recommends that no action be taken at this time. First, the issue seems to arise primarily from the way the policy is implemented within one segment of the university rather than a widespread systemic problem. Second, the missions of the university are very diverse and require a great deal of flexibility in distributing workload. And, finally, there are several avenues of redress already available when an issue does arise.

Recommendation

The committee recommends that no action be taken.

Moved by Senator Porter and seconded by Senator Coyne to accept the committee recommendation. Motion passed.

Policy and Procedure

ACADEMIC OPERATING POLICY AND PROCEDURE

MEMORANDUM TO: All Holders of Mississippi State University
Academic Operating Policy and Procedure Manual

DATE: October 25, 2003

SUBJECT: AOP 13.23 – Faculty Workload

PURPOSE

The purpose of this Academic Operating Policy and Procedure (AOP) is to establish the responsibility and general guidelines for the assignment of workloads for the following faculty members: tenure-track faculty, tenured faculty, and instructors. Furthermore, it will serve to ensure communication and mutual understanding of responsibilities between

faculty and their department heads and also provide institutional accountability for the use of university resources. This policy does not apply to faculty with specific research professor, extension professor, or clinical professor appointments.

REVIEW

This AOP will be reviewed every four years or whenever circumstances require an earlier review by the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs with recommendations for revision presented to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

POLICY/PROCEDURE

Faculty workload consists of a combination of three activities: teaching, research/creative achievements, and service/engagement activities. These occur in varying proportions depending on such factors as faculty talents and interests, unit and institutional needs and strategic plans, and IHL requirements. The workload assignments are the responsibility of the department head in consultation with the faculty member, with the concurrence of the college dean and the provost. First and foremost in this consideration are the needs of the students and quality of the individual academic degree programs. Faculty time distribution must be consistent with the policy outlined in this AOP, although deviations from the policy may occur in times of exigency.

In assigning individual teaching loads for faculty on a single budget, a department head usually relies upon what has become the nationally accepted norm for universities with primarily a baccalaureate mission. Teaching workload is based on the equivalent of eight courses (about 24 hours) per academic year. As a general rule, in disciplines that offer only an undergraduate degree, the average teaching load of a faculty member with an active research agenda is usually equivalent to six courses (about 18 hours) per academic year. In disciplines that offer a master's degree, the average teaching load of a faculty member with an active research agenda is usually equivalent to five courses (about 15 credit hours) per academic year, and for faculty with an active research agenda in most disciplines that offer a doctoral degree, the average teaching load is usually equivalent to four courses (about 12 credit hours) per academic year. The teaching load for an instructor with a full-time appointment is usually equivalent to eight courses (about 24 credit hours) per academic year. The assigned number of courses and corresponding credit hours, however, may be reduced, depending upon a number of factors that include the nature of the course (e.g., studio courses), size of the classes being taught, rank of a faculty member, experience of a faculty member, number of course preparations, number of graduate students, number of directed studies, development of new courses or other curricula, demands of the individual faculty member's research agenda, and level of university, professional, and/or public service. Adjustments to the teaching load of any individual faculty member may be made in any semester depending upon the activity of that faculty member and/or the needs of the program at that time.

The previous descriptions of teaching loads assume that a faculty member is funded solely from E&G funds. When the workload is funded by more than one budget, as in

many of the agricultural units, it is necessary to differentiate between those funds designated for research and those designated for teaching. The proportion of the workload allocated for both teaching and research is determined by the proportion of the individual salary funded by these designated budgets. Service activities may be funded by either of these budgets.

Deciding the sufficiency of an active research agenda is the responsibility of the department head with input from the individual faculty member. The specific scholarly/creative achievement/outcome expectations during a specified period of time must be prescribed in the annual review. In situations where a faculty member is awarded external grant funds for research, adjustments will be made in teaching and/or research and/or service responsibilities proportional to the level of funding received.

Service contributions are considered to be part of the teaching and scholarly activities. Significant contributions to the service of the department, college, or university may result in the allocation of release (from class or research) time. Given that service is operationally different among departments, qualitative and quantitative components of service must be defined by colleges and departments.

Each year, during the annual review process, the department head will address each faculty member's teaching load relative to productivity in research and/or service activities, as well as the teaching needs of the department. A written record of this discussion should be made for subsequent reviews where an assessment again will be made of any differences between expectations and realizations.

Departments should reach an agreement with their deans on overall average teaching loads expected for their department, and the deans and the Provost should reach a similar agreement at the college level. Comparisons of workload data with peer institutions are desirable in establishing standards. In some cases, the development of 'departmental' peers may go beyond the MSU peer group to include institutions with programs that best compare with a department's particular program, goals and objectives.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Position Section

Year

Associate Provost for Academic Affairs Review

2012

13.23

09/30/08

Student Affairs –

Report to the Robert Holland Faculty Senate Student Affairs and Faculty Affairs Committees March 13, 2009

Background

Joe Sullivan asked Faculty Senate to consider the current Honor Code Policy and current practice with respect to a case where a student was allowed to withdraw from a class instead of receiving an XF sanction awarded by an Honor Code Hearing Panel. Additional information provided by Associate Provost Jerry Gilbert was taken into consideration. Jerry Gilbert noted that there was an ambiguity in the policy about whether or not a “lesser” penalty than XF could be given to a student.

Discussion

A joint subcommittee was formed drawing representation from the Student Affairs and Faculty Affairs committees. It seemed clear to the committee that the Honor Code explicitly provided for the possibility of a “lesser” penalty than assigning the grade of ‘XF.’ However, the lesser penalty was not explicitly discussed. The subcommittee considered the wisdom of allowing lesser penalties and came to the conclusion that such an alternative would help faculty adherence to the policy.

We modified the document to allow for a “dishonesty notation” to qualify a grade given by a faculty member.

Recommendation

That the Robert Holland Faculty Senate approve the amendments to AOP 12.07 – Honor Code as recommended by the Joint Student Affairs/Faculty Affairs Subcommittee.

Senator Bradshaw moved to accept the recommendation. Senator Bridges seconded the motion. The vote was 22 in favor, 8 opposed, and 5 abstentions.

Joint Subcommittee

Gary Bradshaw (Chair), Mary Kathryn Barbier, Dave Dampier, Meghan Millea, Janet Rafferty, Brian Rude

I. D. ACADEMIC DISHONESTY SANCTIONS ⁶

Summary:

Establishes the authority of the Honor Code Council to assign any applicable MSU sanction, including grade sanctions and separation from the University.

Establishes the “XF” or “Dishonesty F” grade in the course as the normal sanction for a first offense.

Establishes the authority of faculty members (instructors of record) to assign an XF grade penalty, probation, and referral to the Academic Integrity Intervention Program.

Establishes the authority of Graduate Committees to assign sanctions up to removal from the University.

Instances of academic misconduct represent behavior that is of an especially serious nature. Sanctions assigned for academic misconduct should convey the message that this type of behavior serves as a destructive force within the academic community. However a range of sanctions can be employed in order to strike an appropriate balance between sending a message of accountability and enhancing a student's moral and cognitive development.

The Honor Code Council is empowered with assigning sanctions that are outlined within Mississippi State University's Policies. These sanctions include separation from the institution, probationary status, and documentation that a violation has occurred. In addition, the Honor Code Council is also empowered to assign appropriate academic and/or educational sanctions based upon the specifics of the incident. Examples of appropriate academic sanctions include receiving a failing grade or other grade penalty for the course for academic misconduct. Educational sanctions include requiring a student to complete the Academic Integrity Intervention Program.

Faculty members may assign sanctions up to an XF in the course, probation and referral to the Academic Integrity Intervention Program. In cases involving graduate students, the Graduate Committee may assign sanctions up to separation from the institution. There may be additional consequences for a student within their academic major based upon an involvement in academic misconduct. Students are encouraged to discuss their involvement in an academic misconduct situation with their academic advisor. While this list is not designed to be exhaustive, it demonstrates the wide range of sanctions that can be considered in cases of academic misconduct.

Sanctioning Guidelines:

When it is determined by the Honor Code Council or a faculty member that a student has violated the MSU Honor Code, the normal sanction assigned for a first offense will be an "XF" for the course, probation, and a requirement to complete the Academic Integrity Intervention Program. Only in exceptional circumstances will the Honor Code Council or a faculty member impose a lesser grade sanction (e.g., a final course grade such as XC or XD) instead of an XF. Such a sanction could be imposed when the assignment involved is a minor part of the final course grade. The dishonesty notation ("X"), probation, and the intervention program will be required with all "XA" through "XF" final course grade sanctions. ~~The Honor Code Council or faculty member will only impose a lesser grade sanction (a lowered course grade rather than an F) in exceptional circumstances, such as a case where the assignment involved is a minor part of the final course grade. The dishonesty notation ("X"), probation and the intervention program will be required with all grade sanctions.~~ If a faculty member wishes to impose a more severe penalty than an XF, then the case must be referred to the Honor Code Council. The Honor Code Council has the authority to remove a student from the University, even for first offenses. Decisions by the Honor Code Council Hearing Panels are binding on all parties.

Any grade with and "X" prefix The grade of "XF" is intended to identify a student that has failed to uphold the values of academic integrity at Mississippi State University and

shall be documented on the student's transcript with the notation "due to academic dishonesty." Further, any student who receives a grade with a dishonesty notation will be on disciplinary probation with the university for reasons of academic misconduct until such time as the Honor Code Council decides to remove the X. For the purpose of calculating Grade Point Average and determination of academic class standing, the dishonesty notation will be ignored. ~~The grade of "XF" shall be documented on the student's transcript with the notation "failure due to academic dishonesty". The grade of "XF" shall be treated the as an F for the purposes of calculating Grade Point Average and determination of academic class standing. Further, a student who receives a grade of an "XF" will be on disciplinary probation with the university for reasons of academic misconduct until such time as the Honor Code Council decides to remove the X.~~

In addition, a student who is determined to be responsible for a violation of the MSU Honor Code shall be required to successfully complete an Academic Integrity Intervention Program (see Appendix III) administered through the Honor Code Council Office. This requirement must be completed prior to a student being eligible to petition to have the dishonesty notation removed from ~~the grade of "XF"~~ changed to an F on their ~~his/her~~ transcript. This requirement must also be completed before the student is eligible to repeat the course in which the dishonesty notation ~~"XF"~~ was assigned.

Removal of XF Grade Dishonesty Notation:

The student must file a written petition to the Honor Code Council to have the dishonest notation removed from his/her transcript. The decision to remove this notation ~~the grade of "XF" removed and permanently replaced with the grade of an F. The decision to replace the grade of "XF" will be considered by the Honor Code Council only on the student's successful completion of the Academic Integrity Intervention Program. A student will remain on disciplinary probation until the dishonesty notation ~~notation of "XF"~~ is removed from ~~their~~ his/her transcript and replaced with an F. Additionally, the resulting F grade will not be eligible for any "grade forgiveness policy" and cannot be replaced for the calculation of a student's Grade Point Average.~~

Authority to Revoke a Degree:

Mississippi State University has the authority to revoke the degree of a former student if a finding of academic dishonesty is determined after the student graduated. The basis for revocation of the degree would be if the sanction that is assigned for the dishonesty would have caused the student to be ineligible to receive the degree at the time.

The Honor Code Council will be responsible for investigating the allegation, conducting a hearing if appropriate, and determining the sanction in accordance with the MSU Honor Code. The Honor Code Council's decision may be appealed under the provisions of the Honor Code. If a sanction is assigned to the former student, then the case is referred to the College that awarded the degree to determine if the sanction would have made the student ineligible for the degree. If the answer is no, then the record of the dishonesty is placed in the student's record and on the transcript as appropriate. If the answer is yes, then the College Dean will recommend revocation of the degree to the Provost, who will make the

final decision and notify the student, the College and the Honor Code Council.
The decision by the Provost cannot be appealed.

University Resources – no report

Moved by Senator Adebisi and seconded by Senator Carskadon to adjourn. Motion passed.

Submitted for Review

Jacque Deeds
Faculty Senate Secretary