

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

The December 3, 1996 meeting of the University Senate was called to order by Chairperson Alarcon at 3:15 p.m. in Beard Auditorium.

The following Senators were excused from the meeting: Affaneh, Anthony, Barton, Bozylinski, Caraway, B. Ender, Gerwick, Imes, Krevel, Krishnan, Lynch, R. Mutchnick, Nardi, Nunn, Peterson, Sadler, Steigmann, Storm, Thompson, Wijekumar.

The following Senators were absent from the meeting: Allen, Antelo, Beisel, Bravo, Bullard, Buterbaugh, Camp, Castro, Condino, Conrad, Crocker, Cullum, Demacok, Distanislao, Horst, C. Johnson, Kroah, Manson, McClay, Mukasa, Numan, Orchard, Pearce, Rafoth, Receski, Riesenman, Shildt, Shiring, Snyir, Steele, Sullivan, Szalontai, Trautwine, Treaster, Trimble, Vella, Vold, Wade, Welsh, Wheatley, Wiggins, N. Wilson, Wyriek, Yoshimura, Zanicky, Zimny.

The minutes of the November 5, 1996 senate meeting were ACCEPTED.

The Agenda items and order were APPROVED.

REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

PRESIDENT'S REPORT (Dr. Pettit)

The President made no formal remarks. During the question-and-answer segment of his report, he discussed the status of the Sexual Harassment Policy. Senator Walz expressed his concern about a possible flaw in the policy, and wanted to know if the Senate would have an opportunity to review the policy. Dr. Pettit indicated that he would welcome Senator Walz's feedback in spite of the fact that the extended comment period on the policy had expired on November 1.

PROVOST'S REPORT (Dr. Staszkievicz)

It is not unusual in my role as Provost to get requests from departments to add courses to the master schedule or to grant exceptions to listing only approved courses. I would like to begin sharing these exceptions with you. With early registration students are registering a semester in advance and in order for them to register, courses must appear on the schedule. I have given approval for HC 101, 102 and 201 to be listed under the schedule for next year.

At the last meet and discuss session with APSCUF, Dale Landon and I agreed to send a letter to all the faculty reminding them of what the final exam policy is as we enter the final exams next week. That letter is being duplicated and distributed to all faculty. I would like to share the policy that was agreed to several years ago by APSCUF and the Administration.

The final examination week is part of the regular academic program and must be incorporated into each instructors course plan for the semester. Final examinations are not the only legitimate type of terminating activity, and therefore, the instructor may choose an appropriate activity that conforms to course objectives.

The terminating activity shall take place only at the time and location assigned by the Scheduling Center. Unless granted an excused absence, the faculty member

responsible for the course must be present for the full examination period to direct the terminating activity. Faculty members may require student attendance at the terminating activity.

Faculty who do not schedule or do not attend the terminating activity for a course may be subject to disciplinary action commensurate with unexcused absences. Block finals must be held as scheduled. Once the final examination has been set by the Scheduling Center, changes and absences must be approved by the instructor's Dean.

During the examination period, the following general rules apply where conflicts exist:

1. The higher numbered course takes precedence. Thus a student enrolled in GE102 and EC325 would take the EC325 exam at the assigned time and the make-up in GE102.
2. If courses in conflict are the same level and number an plain alphabetical determination by full name of the department will be made. For example, a student enrolled in AG421 and CS421 would take the AG421 exam at the assigned time and a make-up in CS421.

Every year we do have courses during exam week and they have no terminated activity and that does create a real morale problem I think among the faculty. I would like everyone to be aware of the policy as we go into final exams week.

VICE CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT (Mr. Dubrovsky)

Typed report was not received on time to be include in the minutes. It will be included in the future minutes upon receipt.

CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT (Dr. Alarcon)

Let me thank Mr. Yaw Asamoah who very generously has agreed to take notes for the minutes of today's meeting for Ramesh Soni, the Senate Secretary. As some of you may know, Ramesh's baby daughter was born several weeks ago with a heart problem. She had to undergo an open-heart surgery and she is now experiencing some complications. Ramesh and his family have been having to spend a lot of time in Pittsburgh and this is the reason he is not here today. Our best wishes and prayers go to them.

At my last meeting with President Pettit we discussed, among other things, the Sexual Harassment Policy and more generally the fact that we may need to clarify just which items should come to the University Senate for information only and which should come for action. As I meet with Dr. Pettit or possibly with Provost Staszkwiecz to clarify this I will be making periodic reports to keep everyone up to date.

Finally, let me remind everyone that anybody needing assistance with downloading minutes and or agendas for the meetings should contact Dr. Soni for assistance.

OLD BUSINESS (carryover from the November 3, 1996 meeting)

There was no old business.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. RULES COMMITTEE--Chairperson Stineman

Chairperson Stineman presented (the first reading of) a proposal to amend the Senate Bylaws. The purpose of the proposed amendment is to authorize Senate committee chairpersons to monitor the attendance of their members at committee meetings, and to report unexcused absences to the Rules Committee.

A Duntley/S. Ender motion to return the proposal to the committee was **APPROVED**.

B. Research Committee--Chairperson Neusius

No report.

C. STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE--Chairperson Trump

Chairperson Trump presented a proposal to change the Deferred Rush Policy. The text of the current policy is reproduced below for purposes of comparison:

Each organization may pledge into membership only full-time students who demonstrate a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.00 and the successful completion of twelve academic credit hours.

The proposed policy that would **REPLACE** the existing policy:

PROPOSED POLICY TO REPLACE DEFERRED RUSH

Each pledge/associate/new member class of a chapter and the active membership of the chapter must both achieve at least a combined minimum cumulative Grade Point Average (GPA) of 2.00.

For violations to this, the chapter will be permitted to initiate into pledge/associate/new membership, for one (1) calendar year following the violation, only full-time students who demonstrate a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.00 and who have successfully completed twelve (12) credit hours of academic study. This sanction shall be known as "Limited Rush."

Chapters demonstrating, at the end of Limited Rush (one year), that the combined cumulative GPA, over that year, of both the pledge/associate/new members and the active membership of the chapter are both at least 2.00 will be removed from Limited Rush. Those chapters, at the end of Limited Rush (one year), not meeting this requirement will remain on Limited Rush for another full Limited Rush.

Implementation: This policy, upon approval of both the University Senate and the Board of Trustees, is to take effect in the Fall 1997 semester using the Spring 1997 semester grades as a basis for each chapter.

The Senate APPROVED a Jackson/Rosetti motion to limit debate on the proposal to 30 minutes.

The Senate then discussed and **APPROVED** a Stonebraker/Wade motion to amend the first paragraph of the proposal to read:

Each pledge/associate/new member class of a chapter must achieve an average GPA of at least 2.0 in the semester it pledges. In addition, the active membership of the chapter must achieve an average cumulative GPA of at least 2.0.

Having DEFEATED an Akers/Rosetti motion for a roll-call vote, the Senate **APPROVED** the amended proposal to replace the Deferred Rush Policy by a vote of 70 yeas, 48 nays and 8 abstentions.

D. UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT & FINANCE COMMITTEE --Chairperson Heckroth

No report.

E. ACADEMIC COMMITTEE--Chairperson Duntley

The committee's recommendation that the following persons be awarded Professor Emeritus status effective at the May 10, 1997 Commencement was **APPROVED**:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Department</u>	<u>service</u>
Dr. Donald Duncan	Mathematics	29
Ms. Marylouise Eltz	Health & Physical Ed	27
Dr. Frank Fazio, Jr.	Chemistry	25.9
Dr. Bernard Moreau	OfficeSystems & Bus Ed	29
Dr. Gould F. Schrock	Biology	27.9
Dr. J. David Truby	Journalism	27.6

Chairperson Duntley submitted the following items for Senate information:

1. Toward a Concept of "Emeritus"

Each year the university confers the title "Emeritus" on qualified retired faculty and academic administrators who have been recommended through a department-based process.

What does it mean to be "professor emeritus"? "Emeritus" is rooted in Latin e (from) and meritus (deserve, earn). Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary gives these definitions of emeritus:

- adj. 1. holding after retirement an honorary title corresponding to that held last during active service. 2. retired from an office or position <professor ~>
- n. one retired from professional life but permitted to hold the rank of his last office as an honorary title.

Emeritus status is an honor bestowed by colleagues to show respect for a distinguished career. It says "even though you are no longer an official part of this organization, you have shown such merit that we claim you as a continuing part of our professional group; we gather glory from your reflected glory."

Recommendations to departments:

- 1. When a faculty member announces retirement, the department chairperson

should try to acquire a resume covering the individual's career to keep in department files for future reference.

2. Each department should have a process for consideration of retired (retiring) faculty for possible nomination for emeritus status. Some departments assign this to the departmental Evaluation Committee, since the last five-year evaluation may also be a source of information. The nomination comes at the initiative of the department; it is not an honor for which one applies.
3. Documentation prepared by the department should be specific to enable a dean, provost, and committee members (university-wide faculty, administrators, students) to make informed decisions about recommending or not recommending the nominee. The minimum documentation should include a substantial narrative addressing how the individual's career achievements satisfy each of the established criteria, a resume, and evidence such as the summary of the last five-year evaluation or similar report. The criteria to be addressed are: (1) exceptional teaching, managerial or administrative performance, and at least two from the next three: (2) scholarly growth through research and publications, (3) active participation in departmental or administrative unit activities, and (4) active participation in university activities. These materials are open to inspection by all Senators before Senate action and are used by Public Relations in preparing news releases.
4. Departments should anticipate a call for nominations from the pool of those faculty who have retired within the last two calendar years. The call is sent to chairs, deans, and vice presidents in early to mid-October each year and all materials are due in early November. The department need not wait until the call is received to prepare materials for review and vote in the department.

2. A Revised Academic Integrity Policy

Pending final review by University Counsel, the Committee moves approval of the revised Academic Integrity Policy. The policy has been reviewed by APSCUF legal counsel, Senate Graduate Committee, English Department leadership, and Student Affairs leadership. The Committee acknowledges the productive contributions from all of these reviewers. The effective date of the policy will be June 1, 1997. The policy is attached as an appendix.

Senator Duntley indicated that a completed proposal would be ready for Senate action once final review by University Legal Counsel is completed.

F. AWARDS COMMITTEE--Chairperson Wheat

Chairperson Wheat reminded Senators that the deadline for nominations for Faculty Awards is December 16 at 4:30 p.m.

G. UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE--Chairperson Kuzneski

Chairperson Kuzneski presented the following items for Senate information:

1. The UWUCC accepted the following **Liberal Studies report**:

The Liberal Studies Committee approved

Type I Writing Proposal (Professor Commitment) for Maryanne Brandenburg, Office Systems/Business Education

Type II Writing Proposal (Departmental Course) for CO 493 Internship

2. HP 485 Student Assistance Training Program: This new course proposal was accepted at the Senate meeting on 10-1-96 with an understanding that the UWUCC would verify that the course number (485) is appropriate for such a course. The committee has done this and the course number remains 485, as it was proposed and approved.

The Senate APPROVED the following proposal for a new minor in Pan-African Studies and a new course proposal:

1. New Minor Program: Pan-African Studies

Overview

Several departments in IUP's College of Humanities and Social Sciences offer African- and African-American-related courses on a regular basis. This practice has become more and more noticeable since IUP began to hire a significant number of faculty with teaching and research interests in African and African-American issues. The collection of such courses currently being offered at IUP is now substantial enough to support a minor course of study. As a multi-disciplinary minor, this proposal offers another opportunity for IUP students to bring together insights from several disciplines while studying the various perspectives of the Pan-African experience, thereby enriching the non-Western component of our Liberal Studies curriculum. This proposed program also offers the University a unique opportunity to strengthen its claim to a truly universal search for the truth, since it focuses on the African heritage and the links between Africa and other people of African ancestry. Finally, by helping acquaint our students with our multi-cultural inheritance, and by inspiring the offering of new courses that will stimulate the intellect and enhance the sensitivity of our student population, this program will enhance IUP's efforts to create an environment that promotes cross-cultural understanding on campus.

The Curriculum Sub-committee of the Pan-African Studies Committee will work in consultation with the College Dean to identify a Program Coordinator who will serve a three year term. The faculty Coordinator will develop course schedules from participating departments, promote the program, schedule supporting co-curricular activities and advise students. The Pan-African Studies Committee will continue to be a resource and advisory group for the program.

Resources: This program proposal was presented at the Senate meeting on September 10, 1996. Questions about resources were raised during discussion. As clarification of the resource issue the UWUCC shares the following information:

The new program proposal requires the approval of one new course, AF 131

Introduction to Pan-African Studies (3 credits). All other courses in the proposed program are currently in place in the Departments of History, Anthropology, Sociology, Political Science, Economics, English, Philosophy and Religious Studies, Geography, and Communications Media. Letters of support from all of these departments have been received.

The College of Humanities and Social Sciences is committing these additional resources to support the program:

- a. .25 alternate workload equivalency with replacement for the coordinator in the fall OR spring of the first year
- b. a 3 week summer contract for the coordinator in the first year
- c. office space in the Dean's complex in McElhaney Hall
- d. an annual budget of approximately \$2000 to cover expenses such as office supplies and institutional membership in the National Council for Black Studies
- e. The second year of operation shall either be the same AWE for the coordinator or reduced to a summer contract only depending upon program evaluation at that time.
- f. By year three, the coordinator shall receive a three week summer contact only.

The resources as listed have the support of the involved departments, the college curriculum committee and dean in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences, the Provost, and the UWUCC.

Catalog Description

Pan-African Studies Minor

The Pan-African Studies minor is a multi-disciplinary program that brings together courses focusing on the vitality and accomplishments of pre-colonial African societies, the cultural and racial heritages of people of African descent in relationship to western societies, and aspects of modern-day African cultures. The cluster of courses included in this program represents a broad diverse look at the diaspora of people of African origin. The minor would help enrich the cross-cultural studies of IUP students, heighten students' awareness of, and sensitivity to cultural diversity, and expand their knowledge of world contributions of people of African heritage.

In a nation with a labor force that is becoming increasingly diversified in terms of ethnic mix, future employers will look more favorably on students who have some appreciation of international and multi-cultural issues. Academic research in Pan-African studies will thus be of increasing value.

Minor - Pan-African Studies **18 s.h.**

Required Courses:	6 s.h.
AF 131 Introduction to Pan-African Studies	3 s.h.
HI 365 The History of Black America Since Emancipation	3 s.h.

Electives: four courses from the following list:	12 s.h.
AN/SO 271 Cultural Area Study: Africa	3 s.h.
GE 255 Geography of Africa	3 s.h.
PS 382 African Politics	3 s.h.
HI 355 African History I - Antiquity to 1600	3 s.h.
HI 356 African History II - 1600 to Present	3 s.h.
HI 366 African-American Women	3 s.h.
EC 339 Economic Development I	3 s.h.
EN 348 African-American Literature	3 s.h.
RS 360 African Religions	3 s.h.
CM 380 The History of African Americans in Film	3 s.h.
AF 281 Special Topics in Pan-African Studies	3 s.h.
AF 481 Special Topics in Pan-African Studies	3 s.h.
AF 482 Independent Study	3 s.h.

With the Program Coordinator's approval, 3 credits of an internship may be counted towards the Pan-African studies minor.

The senate APPROVED the following new course.

AF 131 Introduction to Pan-African Studies

3c-01-

A multi-disciplinary introduction to Africa and the African diaspora. The course explores the effects of Africa's history, in particular colonialism and independence, on present-day Africa; it examines the relationship between Africa and the African diaspora with special attention to African arts, social systems, and political and economic development; it also looks at Africa's contribution to contemporary culture in the Americas.

H. GRADUATE COMMITTEE--Chairperson Williamson

Chairperson Williamson presented the following proposals to change prerequisites and a course title for Senate information:

1. Minor Course Revision - Prerequisite Change

FROM

GE 614 Thought and Philosophy in Geography and Regional Planning 3c-01-3sh

This course examines the status of current and past thought and philosophy in geography and regional planning using the literature in planning, geography, and the philosophy of science. Topics examined are regional development, local planning, environmentalism and physical geography, and cultural geography. Prerequisites: GE 610 and GE 612.

TO

GE 614 Thought and Philosophy in Geography and Regional Planning 3c-01-3sh

This course examines the status of current and past thought and philosophy in geography and regional planning using the literature in planning, geography, and the philosophy of science. Topics examined are regional development, local

planning, environmentalism and physical geography, and cultural geography.
Prerequisite: GE 610.

Rationale: Students need to acquire GE 612 (Quantitative Techniques) earlier in their program so that they can incorporate them in projects for other classes and/or a thesis. GE 610 (Research in Geography and Regional Planning) will be offered in the fall semester and GE 612 and GE 614 in the spring semester. This deletion of GE 612 as a prerequisite will not impact the course content of either course because it simply involves a change in the course scheduling.

Minor Course Revision - Course Title Change

FROM

GE 630 Cultural Development 3c-01-3sh

TO

GE 630 Cultural Geography 3c-01-3sh

Rationale: The university course master file currently lists the course as GE 630 Cultural Development. Prior to the printing of the Graduate School Catalog 1989-91, this course number bore the title, ACultural Geography.@ No Senate records as examined by The Graduate School and Research and the Geography and Regional Planning Department, exist to document this course title even being changed to, ACultural Development.@ The undergraduate component, GE 230, is properly entitled, ACultural Geography.@ Also, the approved course description reads, in part, "the Literature and methods of cultural geography.@ In order to have proper documentation on file and to facilitate a change on the university course master file system, this remedy is sought.

The Senate **APPROVED** the following course revision proposal:

Course Revision - Change in Credit Hours

FROM

ST 850 Thesis 3c-01-3sh

TO

ST 850 Thesis 3c-01-3sh - 6c-01-6sh

Rationale: Student Affairs in Higher Education faculty members wish to encourage a greater number of their students to become involved in scholarly research and elect to complete a thesis as part of their degree requirements.

The proposed change will not affect the number of credits required for graduation in that all students must complete 30 credit hours of required courses and nine credit hours of elective courses. Students who choose the thesis option will enroll for three to six credit hours in ST 850 and those credits can be used to partially satisfy the nine credit hours of electives. A student who completes a thesis for six credit hours, for example, will need three more credit hours of electives to meet graduation requirements. Thus, all students -- whether or not they choose the thesis option -- must complete a total of 39 credit hours to be eligible for graduation.

The proposed change does not have negative implications for institutional resources in that faculty members are provided the same compensation as a thesis advisor regardless of the number of credit hours awarded for completion of a thesis. It is anticipated, however, that this proposed change will make thesis research a more attractive option and, thus, increase the number of students engaged in this scholarly activity each year.

The Senate also **APPROVED** the proposal to delete the Master of Science in Business program.

DELETE Master of Science in Business

Rationale: Only four students have completed the M.S. in Business program between 1983 and 1993. Several students who initially sought admission to the M.S. program switched to the MBA program after considering the relative advantages of the two programs. The MBA degree serves doctoral program entry credentials need very well. The offering of the Eberly College of Business graduate elective courses is spread out in all functional areas and is primarily based on demand patterns of MBA students. This was making specialization in one functional area within a 12 to 18 month period with three to five functional area electives in the area of concentration difficult.

The M.S. thesis requirement was constrained by the number of faculty members who were willing to be part of the thesis committee as well as supervise the thesis. In the placement market, the M.S. degree in Business was not clearly understood and the distinctions between the MBA degree and the M.S. degree at IUP were not sharp enough except for the thesis requirement.

After an evaluation of the trends in graduate programs in business in recent years, it has become clear that we do not have the competitive advantage, regional student demand and special resources in each functional area to be a significant player in the M.S. programs market. We should instead focus our resources in strengthening and upgrading our MBA program.

I. LIBRARY AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES COMMITTEE--Chairperson Jackson

No report.

J. NON-CREDIT COMMITTEE--Chairperson Nardi

No report

NEW BUSINESS

Senate Akers announced that efforts are under way to establish on campus a credit union that would meet the banking needs of IUP students, faculty, staff and alumni.

The meeting was adjourned at 4: 55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ramesh Soni
University Senate

APPENDIX 1

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

A. Introduction

IUP is an academic community within the society at large. All members within this community are expected to accept the responsibility for academic integrity and honesty. Academic dishonesty seriously erodes the quality of educational pursuits and is unacceptable at IUP. The following policies and procedures have been established to preserve the academic integrity of the university community, while also providing a process that protects the rights of students who allegedly violate these policies.

B. Types of Violations

Academic dishonesty includes but is not limited to the following:

1. Providing or receiving unauthorized assistance in coursework, **with lab work, theses, dissertations,** or during examinations (**including qualifying and comprehensive exams**) or quizzes.
2. Using unauthorized materials or devices, such as crib notes, during examinations or quizzes.
3. Plagiarizing ~~term~~ papers, **theses, dissertations,** essays, reports, speeches and oral presentations, take-home examinations, computer projects, and other academic exercises by misrepresenting or passing off the ideas, words, formulas, or data of another as one's own. ~~Examples include but are not limited to incorporating verbatim or nearly verbatim portions of other sources into assignments without using quotation marks and specifying the sources of material or incorporating ideas from other sources into assignments without acknowledging the source of ideas.~~ **Plagiarism is dishonest and illegal. Writers are indebted to authors from whom they borrow exact words, ideas, theories, opinions, statistics, illustrative material, or facts of any kind. Writers are also indebted if they summarize or paraphrase in their own words material from sources. All of the examples require the acknowledgement of the source by the use of quotation marks or indentation (if exact wording is incorporated) and, in addition, by use of a note or parenthetical citation that indicates the author and/or date of publication and page number or numbers. If the writer indents a quotation, it must be clearly set off from the body of the text and must be documented in the aforesaid manner. To verify the various documentation procedures, writers should consult the style sheet in the particular discipline for which they are preparing the assignment (MLA, APA, Chicago, BC, etc.).**

4. **Using the same paper or work more than once without authorization of all faculty involved.**
5. Possessing course examination materials before the administration of the exam, without the prior knowledge or consent of the instructor.
6. Intentionally evading IUP academic policies and procedures; for example, improperly processing course withdrawals, grade changes, or other academic procedures.
7. Falsifying information, including **falsification/fabrication of research data and/or statistical analyses**, forging signatures on various forms and documents, or altering or adding answers on academic exercises or exams after work has been graded.
8. Computer dishonesty, including: tampering with or making unauthorized change to another person's or the university's computer system, illegally copying computer software, any use of another person's computer account, unauthorized activity involving another individual's personal computer system or any system belonging to the university, and other unauthorized use or violations involving computer use.
9. Noncompliance: failure to follow through with sanction(s) imposed as a result of an academic violation.

The university reserves the right to discipline any student for any action (or inaction in a situation where the student has a duty to act) that an ordinary, reasonable, intelligent college student knows or should know might lead to the issuance of discipline. This means the university maintains the right to issue discipline for reasonable cause.

C. Procedures

Charges of academic dishonesty may be brought by faculty members or administrators. Students who observe or become aware of an incident of academic dishonesty by another student are strongly encouraged to report it to a university official. Sanction(s) may not be imposed upon a student believed to have engaged in academic dishonesty without following one of the processes outlined in this policy.

A faculty member/administrator who believes that a student has violated an academic policy may elect any of the following procedures to resolve the matter:

1. Option I: Informal Resolution
 - a. The faculty member/administrator and student may meet informally within ~~five~~ **seven** class days of the observation or discovery of the incident and agree to resolve the issue without submitting any formal documentation. **If the violation pertains to work being judged by a committee (examples might include dissertations and comprehensive examinations, both oral and written), the meeting must involve a majority of the committee and the resolution must be agreed to by a majority of the committee.** ~~It is recommended that~~ **It is in the interest of both** the faculty member/administrator **and student to** complete a statement that summarizes the **incident, conference and agreed-upon resolution** ~~which led to the resolution.~~ This factual statement should be signed by both parties and copies provided to the

student, and the faculty member/administrator. If agreement cannot be reached, or at the discretion of the faculty member/administrator, a more formal process as outlined in this policy may be initiated.

2. Option II: Resolution by Documented Agreement

- a. The faculty member/administrator may schedule a conference with the student in an attempt to agree on the facts of the case and to reach a mutually agreeable resolution. This meeting must be scheduled/requested within ~~five~~ **seven** class days of the observation or discovery of the alleged violation or of the failure of resolution by Option I. If an agreement is reached, the faculty member/administrator must complete a Documented Agreement Form outlining the agreement and have it signed by both parties: faculty member/administrator and student. **If the violation pertains to work such as a thesis or comprehensive examination being judged by a committee, the meeting must involve a majority of the committee and the Documented Agreement Form must be agreed to and signed by a majority of the committee.** Copies are distributed to the student, the faculty member(s)/administrator filing the agreement, and ~~the assistant to the vice president for Student Affairs~~ **the department chair, who must also electronically record the information for subsequent entry into the COSMOS database.** The form must be filed within ~~five~~ **seven** class days of the conference.
- b. Once the agreement has been reached and the form is filed the matter is closed. By signing off on the agreement, the student waives the right to appeal the sanctions agreed upon in the conference. If the student fails to fulfill the written agreement, the faculty member/administrator may file an academic dishonesty referral against the student for noncompliance.

~~If a documented agreement resolution is reached, no formal academic violation report is filed. If this is the student's first offense, the resolution agreement remains part of the student's internal university record and is maintained on file as indicated in the recordkeeping section of this policy.~~

- c. If a documented agreement is not reached, the faculty member/administrator should initiate the formal adjudication process by filing an academic dishonesty referral form with the ~~assistant to the vice president for Student Affairs~~ **department chairperson** within ~~five~~ **seven** class days of the conference with the student.

3. Option III: Resolution by Formal Adjudication

A faculty member/administrator should pursue formal **adjudication** ~~resolution of academic violations~~ if:

- he/she cannot reach or chooses not to attempt a mutually agreeable resolution with the student regarding the facts of the case or sanctions to be imposed,
- he/she believes that **the violation is so severe that it warrants a sanction of expulsion, suspension, involuntary withdrawal from part of IUP's academic**

or other programs, or awarding a failing grade on a project or examination (such as a graduate qualifying or comprehensive examination or dissertation) when resubmitting the project or retaking the examination is not possible, ~~suspension or expulsion is an appropriate sanction due to the severity of the violation, or~~

- the faculty member/administrator is aware that the student has previously violated this policy. **[The faculty member/administrator may ask the department chairperson to determine the existence of any prior incident(s).]**
- a. The faculty member/administrator should file an academic dishonesty referral form with the department chairperson within ~~five~~ **seven** class days of the observation or discovery of the violation or within ~~five~~ **seven** class days of the documented agreement resolution conference if an agreement could not be reached. In any case, the referral must be filed no more than ~~ten~~ **14** class days from the observation or discovery of the incident. **If the violation pertains to work being judged by a committee, the form must be signed by a majority of the committee.**
 - b. In the event that a chairperson cannot or will not fulfill the above role, or in the event that the person filing the referral is an administrator or department chair, ~~the assistant to the vice president for Student Affairs~~ **Provost or designee** will determine the appropriate individual to fulfill the chair's role and inform the student **and the administrator or department chair filing charges.**
 - c. This referral must describe in detail the alleged violation and the recommended sanctions if the student is found to have violated the policy. Upon receipt of the academic dishonesty referral, ~~the assistant to the vice president for Student Affairs~~ **department chairperson** will review the allegation and determine if the student has a previous violation. If the student has no previous violation, ~~the assistant to the vice president for Student Affairs~~ **department chairperson** will notify the student of the allegation and ~~instruct him/her to follow~~ the adjudication procedures outlined in this section (C. 3). If the student does have a previous violation, ~~the assistant to the vice president for Student Affairs~~ **department chairperson** will ~~instruct the student to follow~~ adjudication procedures outlined under the Multiple Violations section F of this policy.
 - d. Within ~~five~~ **seven** class days of receiving notification of the allegation (first offense), ~~the student must request that the~~ department chair **will send a written notice of the charges to the student containing a description of the alleged violation, including time, date, and place of occurrence, and contact the student to schedule a hearing to review the facts surrounding the allegation and recommended sanctions if the student is found to have committed a violation. This hearing will involve the student, the chair, and the faculty member(s); the chair may invite others if mutually agreeable. The hearing should be scheduled so as to allow the student a reasonable time to prepare a defense (normally within seven class days of being notified of the allegation by the department chairperson.)** ~~Guidelines for academic dishonesty hearings parallel those for judicial hearings found in the IUP judicial system policy. Refer to "General Guidelines for Judicial Hearings" in the judicial system information in The Student Handbook.~~

- e. ~~If a student fails to contact the department chairperson within the five class days to schedule the hearing,~~ **The student may waive his/her right to a hearing in writing. If so,** the sanction recommended by the person filing the referral will automatically be imposed. If the student fails to appear when a hearing has been scheduled, the hearing will be held in the student's absence and the department chairperson will render a decision based upon factual information presented by the faculty member/administrator.
- f. Following the hearing, the department chairperson will render a decision based on the information presented at the hearing. Within ~~five~~ **seven** class days of the hearing, the department chairperson will forward a written report summarizing the hearing that includes the outcome, the factual basis for the decisions reached, the sanction(s) to be issued, and appeal procedures. Copies of this report will be sent to the student, the faculty member/administrator, and the ~~assistant to the vice president for Student Affairs~~ **Provost/designee**. The chairperson will retain a copy for departmental files and **electronically record the information for subsequent entry into the COSMOS database.**
- g. **If the recommended sanction is involuntary withdrawal from part of IUP's academic or other programs, suspension, or expulsion, the case must be referred to the Academic Integrity Board (see section D.). Otherwise, if there is no appeal, the recommended sanction will be automatically imposed.**

D. Academic Integrity Board (AIB)

The AIB will hear all cases in which the chairperson recommends a sanction of **involuntary withdrawal from part of IUP's academic or other programs, suspension, or expulsion**. The AIB will also hear any cases repeat offenders (see section F.) and cases in which appeals to the chairperson's decision are accepted by the Provost/designee (see Appeals section E.1. and E.2.).

1. **The AIB will be made up of four faculty members, one of whom will chair the board, and two students. A quorum requires the presence of four persons, at least one of whom must be a student. All members, including the chair, are voting members.**
2. **When an AIB hearing is called for, the accused student shall be informed of the details of the charges, including the time, date, and place of the alleged offense(s). This notification will also include the time, date, and place of the hearing. The hearing should be scheduled so as to allow the student reasonable time to prepare a defense.**
3. **Any student appearing before an AIB may challenge any member on the board sitting in judgement of his/her particular case. Upon hearing the details of the challenge, the AIB will, by majority vote (challenged member not voting), either uphold the challenge and appoint an alternate member or deny the challenge.**
4. **The AIB will review all material and hear all evidence pertinent to the case from the accused and all witnesses. Members of the AIB shall be free to ask relevant questions to clarify information or resulting issues.**
5. **The student shall have a fair and reasonable opportunity to answer, explain, and defend against information and witnesses presented at the hearing, to submit written, physical, and testimonial evidence, and to call relevant**

- witnesses on his/her behalf.
6. After hearing all evidence, the AIB will privately make its decision. A majority vote of the AIB shall be required for any decision. For cases already heard by a department chairperson, if the AIB finds the student guilty, it may accept, reduce (but not increase) or modify the recommended sanction.
 7. If the student chooses not to appear at the AIB hearing, the case will be adjudicated based upon the evidence presented at the scheduled hearing.
 8. All hearings are closed unless the student requests an open hearing in writing. The AIB chair has the authority to make the final decision regarding access of spectators at the hearing.
 9. A student may waive his/her right to a hearing in writing and accept a sanction. In cases involving a first offense, the AIB will automatically ratify the recommended sanction. In the case of prior violation(s), the AIB will determine a sanction that reflects the severity of the current charges as well as the prior violation(s).
 10. Within seven class days of its decision, the AIB must submit a written report of the decision to the student, faculty member/administrator, department chairperson, and Provost/designee.

E. Appeals

These appeal procedures apply to cases resolved through formal adjudication. Cases of academic dishonesty that are resolved through informal resolution or documented agreement cannot be appealed, as the facts of the case, the decision, and sanction(s) have been agreed to by the student and the individual making the charge.

1. If, after receiving the department chair's report on the outcome of the hearing, **the faculty/administrator or** the student disagrees with either the decision, the sanction, or both, he/she may appeal to the ~~assistant to the vice president of Student Affairs~~ **Provost/designee** within ~~five~~ **seven** class days of receiving the report. This appeal must be in writing and must describe in detail the grounds for the appeal. These reasons may include the following:
 - a. Denial of a fair and reasonable hearing,
 - b. New evidence (applies when there is an acceptable reason why the information was not presented at the original hearing), or
 - c. Excessively harsh sanctions. **Sanctions which are specified on course syllabi and have prior department approval will not be deemed excessively harsh.**
- ~~2. If the student does not appeal within the five-class-day period, the recommended sanction will be automatically imposed. The faculty member may also appeal a decision of the department chairperson. The appeal procedures are the same as those previously outlined for the student.~~
2. ~~The assistant to the vice president for Student Affairs~~ **Provost/designee** may deny the appeal or ~~uphold the appeal or~~ direct the appeal to be heard by a ~~hearing officer, a special interim board, or the University Judicial Board.~~ ~~The hearing officer of the UJB may accept, modify, or reduce the recommended sanction.~~ **an AIB within seven class days.**

3. ~~Within five class days of the appeal decision, the hearing officer/UJB must submit a written report of the decision to the student, faculty member/administrator, department chairperson, and vice president for Student Affairs.~~ **Unless the recommended sanction is involuntary withdrawal from part of IUP's academic or other programs, suspension or expulsion, the decision of the hearing officer/UJB AIB in this case is final and will be implemented by the vice president for Student Affairs Provost/designee who will electronically record the information for subsequent entry into the COSMOS database.**
4. **Suspension or expulsion may be recommended by the AIB, but can only be implemented by the vice president for Student Affairs [the President's designee for suspension and expulsion] who is responsible for verifying that due process was followed.**
- F. Multiple Violations
1. Students found in violation of this policy through resolution by documented agreement or through formal adjudication will be informed by the ~~assistant to the vice president for Student Affairs~~ **department chairperson** that subsequent violations may result in additional sanctions, including possible suspension or expulsion from the university.
 2. If a student is found to have **previously** violated ~~academic policies a second time the academic policy,~~ the ~~assistant to the vice president for Student Affairs~~ **department chairperson** will notify the student that he/she will be required to appear before the ~~University Judicial Board or Special Interim Board~~ **AIB**. The faculty member/administrator who filed the second referral will be asked to present information concerning the alleged violation to the board.
 3. The board will review all material and hear all the information pertinent to the second violation. If the student is found in violation of the policy a second time, the board will then review all material from the student's previous academic violation to determine appropriate sanction(s).
 4. **Within seven days of its decision, the AIB must submit a written report of the decision to the student, faculty/administrator, department chairperson and Provost/designee who will electronically record the information for subsequent entry into the COSMOS database.**
 5. The student may appeal the decision or the sanction(s) to the ~~assistant to the vice president for Student Affairs~~ **Provost/designee** using procedures outlined in the Appeals section (D. 1) of this policy. The ~~vice president~~ **Provost/designee** may deny or uphold the appeal or, **on the basis of denial of a fair and reasonable hearing, new evidence, or excessively harsh sanctions,** direct the appeal to be heard by a ~~special interim board or the UJB~~ **second AIB**. **The Provost/designee will electronically record the information for subsequent entry into the COSMOS database.**
- G. Sanctions
1. The following sanctions may be agreed upon by the student and faculty member/administrator through informal resolution or documented agreement. **All grade reductions require the approval of the instructor of record. If the work is graded by a committee, a grade reduction requires the approval of the majority of the committee.** ~~They may also be imposed by the department~~

~~chairperson, hearing officer, or the University Judicial Board through formal adjudication.~~

- a. **Single Grade Reduction:** Reduction of grade or failure on project, examination, quiz, or other academic exercise on which the student is alleged to have cheated. ~~(Requires the approval of the instructor of record.)~~
- b. **Course Grade Reduction:** Reduction of course grade or failure in the course. **If the violation involves a project spanning multiple courses (such as a dissertation or multiple semester internship), the grade reduction may apply to all courses involved.** ~~(Requires approval of the instructor of record.)~~
- c. **Constructive or Educational Task:** A task which requires the student to examine his/her dishonest behavior and which may benefit the student, campus, or community.
- d. **Other:** Sanctions deemed appropriate and tailored to a specific violation as determined by the faculty member/administrator. Any reasonable sanction or combination of sanctions for a given violation may be agreed upon by the student and faculty member/administrator ~~through informal resolution or documented agreement. They may also be imposed by the department chair, hearing officer, or the University Judicial Board through formal adjudication.~~

2. In addition to the above, the following sanctions might be imposed by a department chairperson or AIB through formal adjudication.

- a. **Letter of Warning:** A warning letter may be issued indicating that the student has been found in violation of an academic policy and that failure to comply with policies in the future may result in further disciplinary action to be handled as a second offense. The letter of warning will remain in effect for a period of time as specified by the individual or board hearing the case.
- b. **Disciplinary Probation:** Disciplinary probation, which is for a period of time specified by the individual or board hearing the case, is an indication that a student's status at the university is seriously jeopardized. If the student is found in violation of another IUP policy during the probationary period, a more serious sanction will be levied, including possible **involuntary withdrawal from part of IUP's academic or other programs**, suspension or expulsion from the university.

3. Involuntary Withdrawal, Suspension, and Expulsion

All cases in which the department chairperson recommends a sanction of involuntary withdrawal from part of IUP's academic or other programs, suspension, or expulsion must be referred to the AIB for concurrence.

- a. **Involuntary withdrawal from part of IUP's academic or other programs:** A student may be denied the right to participate in some segment of IUP's programs. Such involuntary withdrawal might be imposed on either a temporary or permanent basis.
- b. **Suspension:** A student may be suspended from the university for a specified

period of time, not to be less than the remainder of the current semester. Suspension requires that a student remove him/herself from university premises, not attend classes or social activities, and not be present on university or Student Cooperative Association property during the period of suspension. ~~Suspension can be recommended to the assistant to the vice president for Student Affairs by the department chair after the hearing with the student and faculty member/administrator or imposed by the University Judicial Board, a special interim board, or the vice president for Student Affairs.~~

- c. **Expulsion:** Expulsion may be considered under any of the following circumstances: when there is a very serious violation of the academic integrity policy, when a student is proven to have violated the academic integrity policy on more than one occasion, or when a student appears before the board after already having been suspended. ~~If expulsion is deemed the appropriate sanction by the department chair, administrator or the University Judicial Board, or the assistant to the vice president for Student Affairs a recommendation may be made to the vice president for Student Affairs that the student be expelled from the institution.~~ Expulsion from the institution is permanent. Appeals to the sanction of expulsion must be submitted to the Office of the President. If necessary, the president will consult with legal counsel in these cases.

~~The sanction of suspension can only be imposed on a student by the direct action of the University Judicial Board or by the recommendation of the faculty member/administrator or department chairperson to the assistant to the vice president for Student Affairs.~~ **Suspension and expulsion can be recommended** by a faculty member/administrator, department chair **and AIB**, but can be imposed only by the vice president for Student Affairs [**the President's designee for suspension and expulsion**] who is responsible for verifying that **due process was followed.**

H. Records and Recordkeeping

1. Records of Informal Resolution

Although no official forms are filed at this level of resolution, it is strongly recommended that a faculty member/administrator **and student** who reaches an informal agreement ~~with a student~~ puts the agreement in writing, ~~gives the student a copy, and keeps a copy for his/her files~~ **with a copy to each participant. This protects each party in the event of any future attempt at renegotiation.**

2. **Records of Resolution by Documented Agreement**

~~The records of Documented agreement resolutions are~~ **recorded on the COSMOS database disciplinary files maintained** by the assistant to the vice president for Student Affairs. They are not considered formal disciplinary records until and unless the student is found in violation of this policy a second time. They are internal university records used for monitoring students for multiple violations only. If a second documented agreement form is filed or a student is found in violation of the policy through formal adjudication, the student will then have a formal disciplinary record which includes records of both violations. This formal record is maintained according to the IUP judicial system recordkeeping policies.

3. **Records of Formal Adjudication**

Records of academic dishonesty cases resolved through formal adjudication are **recorded on the COSMOS database disciplinary files maintained by** ~~kept on file in~~ the Office of the Assistant to the Vice President of Student Affairs. They are maintained as formal disciplinary records in accordance with IUP judicial system recordkeeping policies.

I. Operational Notes

1. In cases where a violation is alleged at or near the end of the semester and resolution by informal resolution, documented agreement, or formal adjudication cannot be completed before grades are submitted, the faculty member should submit a grade of "Incomplete" (I) for the student. The "I" grade will remain on the student's record until the case has been resolved. Once the case has been resolved, the "I" grade will be replaced with the appropriate grade.
2. If the violation is alleged during the semester when classes are in session, the accused student should continue attending all classes and continue to complete course requirements during the resolution of the academic dishonesty case.
3. ~~The assistant to the vice president for Student Affairs~~ **Provost/designee** may extend any deadline which cannot be met for what he/she deems legitimate reason.
4. **Requests to constitute the AIB for hearings will be directed to the assistant to the vice president for Student Affairs.**
5. **The Provost/designee may modify the procedural provisions of these rules by the issuance of written orders to deal with particular unusual procedural situations, so long as no order shall contradict the rules of the board of governors of the State System of higher Education governing due process for students, and no such rule shall deny fundamental fairness to students by, for example, effectively constituting a denial of notice or opportunity to be heard.**

The various forms described in this policy are available from the assistant to the vice president for Student Affairs, 215A Sutton Hall, deans' offices, or department chairpersons. Questions concerning the Academic Integrity Policy can be directed to the assistant to the vice president for Student Affairs, 215A Sutton Hall.

=====

Implementation: The policy is targeted for implementation in June, 1997, pending completion of the computer screens that will support a decentralized system focused in the departments.

Draft approved by Academic Committee: April 10, 1996
Circulated to Department Chairpersons for review: April 17, 1996
Submitted for University Senate first review: April 30, 1996
Submitted for University Senate second review: September 10, 1996
Revised by Academic Committee: October 29, 1996