UF DIVISION OF STUDENT LIFE
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO REGULATION 4.040

Regulation 4.040 is reviewed minimally every three years by a committee designated by the Vice President for Student Life. The group is comprised of faculty, staff, and students.

2023 REGULATION REVIEW PROCESS

- Convened in May 2023 and received charge
- Committee provided code update suggestions in-between meetings in Teams
- Group met monthly to review and discuss update suggestions
- August 2023 – Redlined changes finalized by committee to move forward for approval
- Committee Adjournment scheduled for end of August 2023

2023 REGULATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

- Pamela Malyk: Assistant Dean of Students & Director of SCCR
- Dr. Katie Vogel-Anderson: Clinical Associate Professor, UF College of Pharmacy, Former Chair of the Faculty Senate (2018-2019)
- Dr. Alexandra Bitton-Bailey: Director, Center for Teaching Excellence
- Ronald Anderson: UF Ombuds
- Brande Smith: Senior Counsel, Office of the Vice President and General Counsel
- Ryan Rodriguez: Undergraduate Student & Student Conduct Committee Member
- Robbie Belcher: Undergraduate Student & Student Government Representative
- Aimee Peeples: Associate Director, SCCR
- Jemima Francique: Program Manager, Dean of Students Office

Focus Areas for Updates Beneficial to Faculty

SPEED OF PROCESS

Current Regulation:
- Allows for a student to request a hearing if they do not agree with the proposed academic sanction(s)/grade as well as accept or deny responsibility for the alleged violation of the Honor Code
- All Honor Code hearings regardless of hearing type required a review and final decision by the Dean of Students or their designee
- *Result:* 1 out of every 3 of Honor Code hearings were for sanctions only, occupying valuable hearing slots

Proposed Regulation Change:
- Honor Code Process will now mirror Student Conduct Process
- Upon receipt of report, information will be assessed for severity and mitigating factors, and potential for separability determined, prior to student being offered resolution options.
- Student would accept or deny responsibility for the alleged violation
- Hearings would only occur if student denied responsibility for the alleged violation, student would not be able to initiate a hearing due to disagreeing with the proposed academic sanction(s)/grade
- Individual Hearing Officers would make direct decisions and issue sanctions, Conduct Committees would continue to make recommendations to the Dean of Students for a final decision.
- Anticipated Result: 64% of current hearings would likely occur

TIME COMMITMENT OF FACULTY

Current Regulation:
- Language is unclear that Faculty have a choice of their length of participation in a hearing. They can choose to sit through the entire hearing or to participate in a small section as a witness
- Honor Code has no process for faculty to be involved in any educational and restorative conversation with an accused student in a non-hearing setting

Proposed Regulation Change:
- Explicit description added of Faculty choice of participation throughout the entire hearing or during a small portion of time giving information as a witness only
- Introduction of restorative practices as a choice for faculty to participate in
    - If a student accepts responsibility for a violation of the Honor Code, the Faculty, student, and a staff member in Student Conduct may opt in to a restorative dialogue to help determine sanctions and provide an educational opportunity for the student to learn about their role in the academic community
- Reduction in hearings to only those where students deny responsibility for violations. This is anticipated to significantly reduce the time spent in hearing processes for faculty

Focus Areas for Updates Beneficial to Faculty

GRADING AUTONOMY

Current Regulation:
- Faculty reporting alleged violations of the Honor Code, submit proposed academic sanction(s)/grade with their report
- Student accepts or denies responsibility for the violation AND agrees or disagrees with academic sanction(s)/grade, a hearing makes the final decision on all sanctions, including the academic sanction/grade
- Result: Procedural oversight on course grading

Proposed Regulation Change:
- Reporting: Faculty would now propose only if the student should be allowed to drop the course when submitting a report of an alleged violation of the Honor Code
- Sanctions:
  - SCCR Staff would determine educational sanctions based on their knowledge and expertise of campus resources, Faculty no longer bear the burden of determining what educational opportunities to propose.
  - If the student accepts responsibility or is found responsible, the academic sanction will now be listed as "Grade Adjustment", and the faculty member will be notified that the case is resolved and they would release the grade they deem appropriate for the student at that time.
- Result: Increased grading autonomy in the process

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Current Regulation:
- Person specific language in Honor Code violations, such as "student" or "person". Does not capture the lack of human interaction in the use of generative artificial intelligence.

Proposed Regulation Change:
- Creation of the defined term "Entity: This includes but is not limited to generative artificial intelligence, large language models, content generation bots, or other non-human intelligence or digital tools."
- Entity has been added to the following relevant Honor Code violations:
  - Cheating: 3(a)1, 3(a)5, 3(a)6
  - Plagiarism: 3(e)
  - Submission of Academic Work Purchased or Obtained from an Outside Source: 3(f)
  - Unauthorized Taking or Receipt of Materials or Resources to Gain or Provide an Improper Academic Advantage. (3h)

<u>**Proposed Regulation Changes:**</u>
- Addition of a violation to address food and drink spiking with mind altering substances
- Change to term "University credential" to reflect UF's move away from physical ID cards
- Expansion of restorative practices in educational and conflict resolution options
- Correction of formatting in the required Regulation format document, such as consolidation of orphan table boxes, continuity of numbering, page breaks, etc.

PARTNERSHIPS FOR ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

- Recommendations from 2017-18 Academic Integrity Taskforce
  - A standing workgroup on Academic Integrity with leadership from the Provost
    - Result the Provost Important Issues Group (PIIG), Lead by Andy McCollough
- The PIIG explored issues with Honorlock, the need for faculty support, and scholarly research on academic integrity at UF
    - Result – 2 new positions in the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) to assist with academic integrity education/support for faculty and artificial intelligence
    - Result – CTE implementation of the (International Center for Academic Integrity) ICAI survey for students and faculty.
- SCCR and CTE have partnered on development of educational modules to support faculty in the Honor Code process. This is currently in development with staff and instructional designers.
- SCCR and CTE have decided to partner on future development of a UF specific academic integrity educational series that will be available enterprise-wide in Canvas for students, and cover multiple disciplines and educational levels. Ideation and roadmap development of this tool, which replaces a decade old tool, is slated to begin in Fall 2024.

NEXT STEPS

- Proposed regulation changes must be voted in by the UF Board of Trustees to be enacted
- Regulation 4.040 changes are slated for review at the December BOT meeting
- 30 Days prior to UF BOT meeting: the detailed regulation is posted for public review & comment
  - Early November public posting to policy hub
- If passed, changes take immediate effect and would apply to reports submitted any day after the regulation was passed

SCCR Staff is currently working to prepare proactive procedural & informative materials to support faculty and students if these changes to the Honor code are adopted at the December BOT