

April 26, 1983

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

I. Principle

Academic integrity is expected of every East Carolina University student. Academic honor is the responsibility of the students and faculty of East Carolina University.

II. Academic Integrity Violations

Academically violating the Honor Code consists of the following:

- A. Cheating - Unauthorized aid or assistance or the giving or receiving of unfair advantage on any form of academic work.
- B. Plagiarism - Copying the language, structure, ideas, and/or thoughts of another and adopting same as one's original work.
- C. Falsification - Statement of any untruth, either spoken or written, regarding any circumstances relative to academic work.
- D. Attempts - Attempting any act which if completed would constitute an academic integrity violation as defined herein.

III. Student Observation of Suspected Violation

A student or group of students knowing of circumstances in which an academic violation of the Honor Code may have occurred or is likely to occur is encouraged to bring this knowledge to the attention of the responsible faculty member, or to the Dean or Department Chairperson or to the attention of a member of the University Academic Integrity Board.

IV. Organization and Procedures

- A. The faculty member has original jurisdiction in all suspected violations. In cases where the faculty member believes a violation has occurred, the faculty member must either summon the student to a primary interview or waive the primary interview and notify the Associate Dean for Orientation and Judiciary that a hearing should be conducted before the University Academic Integrity Board.

B. Primary Interview

- 1. Notification. A student who is believed to have violated academically the Honor Code, shall be informed of the charge by the faculty member who identified the violation. Subsequently, the student will be called to an interview in the office of the professor concerned. The interview shall be set within three class days after the alleged violation has come to the attention of the faculty member.

2. Composition. The student and the faculty member may each have a non-participating observer at the interview. The faculty observer shall be the Chairperson of the Department, or Dean, Associate Dean or Assistant Dean of the College or School. The student may select a student or faculty member as he/she desires.

3. Procedure.

a. At the interview, the faculty member shall present evidence in support of the charge or charges against the student. The student shall be given an opportunity to respond and present evidence to rebut the charge or charges.

b. After hearing the student, the faculty member may either dismiss the charge or find it supported on the basis of the evidence. If supported, the faculty member may record a failing grade in the course or some portion thereof or take other appropriate action. He/she shall report the action taken to the Associate Dean for Orientation and Judiciary.

c. The observer(s) is/are to observe the procedures impartially, and to be prepared to testify in the event of an appeal from the judgment of the faculty member.

d. A student wishing to appeal the decision of the faculty member may request a hearing before the Academic Integrity Board. A request for a hearing must be submitted to the Office of the Associate Dean for Orientation and Judiciary within five class days after notification of the decision by the faculty member.

C. University Academic Integrity Board

1. Composition.

a. Four faculty members and four alternates elected for three-year staggered terms by the Faculty Senate.

b. Three students and four alternates nominated by the SGA Executive Council and elected by the SGA Legislature. These students shall serve for a year and may be reelected for one additional year.

c. A quorum shall consist of four faculty members and three students.

d. The Chairperson, elected for a one-year term, shall be a faculty member of the Board, elected by members of the entire Board and may be reelected.

e. The Associate Dean for Orientation and Judiciary shall serve as administrative officer of the Board.

2. Original Jurisdiction. The Academic Integrity Board shall have original jurisdiction over academic violations of the Honor Code only if the faculty member elects to omit the primary interview.

3. Appeals.

a. The student may appeal the decision of the primary interview if:

i. The student believes the penalty too severe considering the offense.

ii. The student contests the decision of the faculty member on the basis of the evidence presented.

b. The faculty member may refer the case to the Academic Integrity Board if he/she believes a failing grade in the course(s) too lenient.

4. Procedures:

a. The Associate Dean for Orientation and Judiciary, on behalf of the Chairperson, shall notify the parties involved of a meeting of the Academic Integrity Board within ten class days after an appeal by a student. The faculty member, the student, witnesses, and the independent non-participating observer(s), shall be provided not less than seven days notification of the date, time, and place of the meeting. If a grade for the student in the course must be submitted, the faculty member shall record a grade of incomplete, pending a decision by the Board.

b. Those present at the hearing shall be:

i. The student, who has the right to be accompanied by witnesses.

ii. The faculty member, who has the right to be accompanied by witnesses.

iii. Independent non-participating observer(s) if present at the primary interview.

iv. Any other person called by the Chairperson.

v. The Student Attorney-General, and the Student Public Defender.

c. Should the student or the faculty member fail to appear without prior approval of the administrative officer, the Academic Integrity Board shall proceed with an absentia hearing.

d. The Academic Integrity Board will follow the hearing procedures established for the University Honor Board.

- e. A majority of the Board shall decide the issue. The Chairperson shall vote only in the case of a tie.
- f. The Associate Dean for Orientation and Judiciary shall serve as administrative officer for maintaining accurate and complete records of the proceedings.
- g. The administrative officer of the Academic Integrity Board shall, on behalf of the chairperson, notify each party of the decision of the Board.

5. Actions By the Board

a. Evidence insufficient to sustain charge or charges

When this action is taken, in order to protect both the student and the faculty member, continuation in the class(s) and other related issues must be resolved by the unit head in consultation with the student and the faculty member.

b. Evidence sufficient to support the charge or charges

The Board may impose one or more of the following sanctions:

- i. Sustain the decision of the faculty member; or, in the case where the primary interview has been waived, recommend to the faculty member that the student receive a failing grade for the course(s) or some portion thereof.
- ii. Impose probation for a period of time not to exceed one year.
- iii. Impose suspension or dismissal from the University.
- iv. Require a period of counseling with a member of the University staff or a counseling professional of the student's choice. It will be the responsibility of the student to provide evidence to the Board of having fulfilled this requirement.
- v. Take any other action commensurate with the findings. (Reference: SGA Documents Handbook, Section IV, Penalties.)

6. An appeal of a decision of the Academic Integrity Board may be submitted to the Vice Chancellor for Student Life. The Vice Chancellor for Student Life and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall jointly review the decision and take appropriate action.

7. Annual Reports. The Academic Integrity Board shall submit a summary report of its proceedings to the Faculty Senate, the SGA Legislature, the Vice Chancellor for Student Life and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

April 26, 1983

(Called Meeting)

A called meeting of the Faculty Senate was held Tuesday, April 26, 1983, at 2:10 p.m. in Mendenhall Student Center, Room 244. The following members were absent: Downing, Watson, Brett, Chauncey*, Williams, Rosenfeld*, Bredderman*, Brinn*, Barnes*, and ex officio Howell, Warner, Laopus. Alternates present were: Haggard for Davis, Spruill for Neal*, Hankins for Petterson*, Steelman for Wease*, Adler for Sayetta, P. Daugherty for Ryan, and Thomas for Somes*.

The only item on the Agenda was the Academic Integrity Proposal as requested on the petition for the called meeting.

Chairman Ayers granted floor privileges to Dave Stevens, James Mallory, and Hannah Lewis.

Tom Johnson of the Educational Policies and Planning Committee presented the revised proposal for Section IV.C.5 (III.C.5 in the previous version) and made some editorial changes. (The complete revised copy with all changes made is attached.) Read requested that the new senators be given a review of what had previously occurred. Haney moved to approve IV.C.5. as presented. Jones seconded. Atkeson moved to delete part 5.b.iv. There was no second. The motion to approve IV.C.5. was passed.

New Section III, Student Observation of Suspected Violation, was presented. The word "required" rather than "encouraged" would mean a new document. Muzzarelli moved to strike "or" and add "If the evidence indicates a possible violation, the faculty member, dean or department chairperson will proceed as outlines in Section IV." Kledaras seconded. Hankins asked about the right of the student who is falsely accused. The student does not initiate any action. No action could be taken without evidence. The Muzzarelli amendment failed with 19 against and 16 for. The vote was taken on Section III. Section III was approved.

In Section IV.A. Longhill moved to delete "of suspected violations" and insert in its place "where the faculty member believes a violation has occurred." J.O. Smith seconded. It was ruled that this was an editorial change. This allows the faculty member to make a ruling on whether to take action when a student reports a suspected violation. It is the intent of the document that a faculty member cannot ignore a violation. He must use the primary interview or must waive the interview and send it to the Academic Integrity Board. The student who reports the violation can appeal to the Board if the faculty member takes no action. The annual report will include cases and actions taken but no names.

Grossnickle moved to insert in IV.C.1.b. "and four alternates". Hough seconded. The motion passed. Tom Johnson noted substantive changes in IV.C.1.a. where alternates were increased to four. This change passed. Also, a substantive change was made in the quorum in IV.C.1.c. This change was

approved. The document as amended was approved.

Adler thanked the committee for its work.

J.O. Smith moved that the secretary take special note of the absences of those who signed the petition. Hough seconded. The motion passed. In the first paragraph of these minutes, those persons are indicated by an asterisk.

Hough moved and Adler seconded that the minutes include substantive interpretations. The motion failed.

James LeRoy Smith moved the resolution that Caroline Ayers be congratulated for her fine and constant work this year as Chair of the Faculty and that she receive the appreciation of the Senate. The resolution was approved unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Stella Daugherty
Secretary of the Faculty