Academic Integrity

Statement

Preamble

Eastern Kentucky University is a community of shared academic values, foremost of which is a strong commitment to intellectual honesty, honorable conduct and respect for others. In order to meet these values, students at EKU are expected to adhere to the highest standards of academic integrity. These standards are embodied in this policy, which all students shall pledge to uphold by signing the Eastern Kentucky University Honor Code. By honoring and enforcing this Academic Integrity Policy, the University community affirms that it does not tolerate academic dishonesty. This policy defines the various forms of academic dishonesty, and it outlines the consequences for each. Additionally, this policy gives the method for appealing an instructor's belief that some form of academic dishonesty has in fact occurred.

Statement

Academic Integrity (AI) is a fundamental value for the Eastern Kentucky University community of students, faculty, and staff. It should be clearly understood that academic dishonesty and incidents of academic dishonesty will have serious consequences. Anyone who knowingly assists in any form of academic dishonesty shall be considered as responsible as the student who accepts such assistance and shall be subject to the same sanctions. Academic dishonesty can occur in different forms, some of which include cheating, plagiarism, and fabrication.

Entities Affected by the Policy

- Colleges
- Departments
- Faculty
- Students

Procedures

Signing the Eastern Kentucky University Honor Code

The AI Pledge, below, is administered through the Terms of Usage for EKU Direct.

The Pledge

I hereby affirm that I understand, accept, and will uphold the responsibilities and stipulations of the Eastern Kentucky University Honor Code and Academic Integrity policy.
Procedures for Dealing with Academic Integrity Cases

**Step 1**
When aViolation is Suspected

If an incident of alleged violation of the AI Policy is suspected, any member of the EKU community can initiate the process of review by reporting the incident, directly to the responsible faculty/staff member. The responsible faculty/staff member may elect to conduct his/her own review of the allegations (Option A) or may elect for the matter to be referred to the Academic Integrity Office (Option B). Prior to selecting either option, the faculty/staff member should (1) contact the AI office to determine if the student has a prior violation, and (2) inform the appropriate Department Chair of the incident.

If a mid-term or final grade is to be reported to the University during the pendency of the academic integrity procedures, the responsible faculty member shall report an “incomplete” for the involved student until the final resolution of the matter.

**Option A: Faculty/Staff Member Conducts Review**

- If the responsible faculty/staff member chooses to continue the review of the allegations autonomously, the faculty/staff member should obtain and assess the applicable information in determining whether a violation of the AI policy has occurred. If the faculty/staff member determines that an AI policy violation has occurred, a notification of the violation must be made to the Office of Academic Integrity for recordkeeping within 10 academic days of the alleged violation. At this point, the faculty/staff also notifies the student in writing of the allegations, the sanction, and the right to contest the allegation and sanction according to the AI Policy procedure. If the student accepts responsibility for the violation and the sanction in writing, the case is closed. There is no appeal from this decision. Upon determination of responsibility, the Assistant Director for Student Rights and Responsibilities, for Academic Integrity (Assistant Director for AI) will enter the report data in the database.

- Note: The faculty/staff involved in Step 1 should request information from the Assistant Director for AI regarding the student’s previous violations of the AI Policy prior to determining a sanction in this particular case.

- If the student does not accept responsibility and chooses to contest the allegation and/or sanction, the faculty/staff member will refer the case to the AI Office, within five academic days of the meeting. The Assistant Director for AI will meet with the student to discuss the charge and/or sanctions and the right to contest these. If the student chooses not to contest the charge and sanction, the case is closed. There is no appeal from this decision. If the student contests the allegation and/or sanction, the AI Office will schedule a hearing, as soon as practicable, with the specific College Academic Integrity Committee from which the incident occurred.

**Option B: Faculty/Staff Member Refers Case to AI Office**

- If a faculty/staff member chooses to refer the case directly to the AI Office, the faculty/staff member will send all information concerning the matter to the AI Office and the Assistant Director for AI will meet with the student to discuss the alleged violation. If the student chooses not to contest the allegation and sanction, the sanction is imposed; the case is closed. There is no appeal from this decision. If the student contests the allegation and/or sanction, the AI Office will schedule a hearing, as soon as practicable, with the specific College Academic Integrity Committee from which the incident occurred.

**Step 2**
College Academic Integrity Committee Hearing

At the College AI Hearing both the student and the faculty/staff member will present their information. Both the student and faculty/staff member are permitted to bring witnesses with relevant testimony to the hearing in person. At the College AI Hearing the faculty/staff member will only function as a witness and shall not serve in any adversarial capacity. The Committee members will review all of the information presented and then deliberate in private. At the discretion of the Chair of the Committee, the proceeding may be extended to an additional meeting. At this level of hearing and continuing throughout the process, the student has the option of having a Peer Advisor present. Absent exceptional circumstances beyond the control of the student as determined by the Chair of the Committee, if the student who has been notified of the hearing fails to
appear, the proceeding may take place in his or her absence; the Committee’s decision will be binding. If the Committee determines that the student has violated the AI Policy, before the sanctioning stage of the hearing, the Assistant Director for AI will provide the Committee information regarding whether the student has any previous AI Policy violations recorded or sanctions imposed. The Committee will deliberate again in private in order to determine the appropriate sanction for this violation. The Chair will announce the decision of the Committee, within five academic days, after the close of the hearing.

**Step 3**  
**Appealing the Decision of the College Academic Integrity Committee**

A student can appeal the decision of the College AI Committee to the University AI Committee. This appeal can only be made based upon irregularities in procedure, new evidence not available for the first hearing, or punishment not consistent with the violation. The student will notify, in writing, the AI Office of their request to appeal to the University AI Committee within five academic days of the College AI Committee’s decision, and a meeting of the University AI Committee will be scheduled as soon as practicable.

**Step 4**  
**University Academic Integrity Committee Hearing**

At the University AI Committee appeal review meeting, the Committee members will consider all the written information supplied by the student, and the material considered by the College AI Committee, including any response from the faculty/staff member. The Committee can modify or set aside the applied sanction, refer the case back to the College AI Committee, or uphold the decision. The decision of the University AI Committee is final, unless the Committee determines that suspension or expulsion is the appropriate sanction to be imposed. The Chair will announce the decision of the committee, within five academic days, after the close of the hearing.

**Steps 5 through 8**

The following steps will ONLY be necessary if it is determined that the student may face the sanctions of suspension or expulsion for the alleged AI Policy violation. According to KRS 164.370, the Eastern Kentucky University Board of Regents may delegate its authority to suspend or expel a student. The Board has designated the Student Disciplinary Council as the only body authorized to suspend or expel a student (See Board of Regent’s minutes October 7, 1978).

KRS 164.370 provides that: “Each Board of Regents may invest the faculty or a committee of the faculty and students with the power to suspend or expel any student for disobedience to its rules, or for any other contumacy, insubordination, or immoral conduct. In every case of suspension or expulsion of a student the person suspended or expelled may appeal to the Board of Regents. The Board of Regents shall prescribe the manner and the mode of procedure on appeal. The decision of the Board of Regents shall be final.”

**Step 5**  
**Suspension, Expulsion, or “FX” Grade Recommendation**

If the College AI Committee or University AI Committee or Assistant Director for AI recommends that the sanction of suspension or expulsion is appropriate or if the “FX” grade is recommended as a sanction for an AI Policy violation, the matter must be referred to the Student Disciplinary Council. As soon as practicable, the AI Office will schedule a hearing before the Student Disciplinary Council.

**Step 6**  
**Student Disciplinary Council Hearing**

At the Student Disciplinary Council hearing, both the student and the faculty/staff member will present their information. At the Student Disciplinary Council hearing, the faculty/staff member will function only as a witness and shall not serve in any adversarial capacity. The Council will review all of the information presented and then deliberate in private. Absent exceptional circumstances beyond the control of the student as determined by the Chair of the Council, if the student who has been notified of the hearing fails to appear, the proceeding may take place in his or her absence, and the Committee’s decision will be binding.

If the Council determines that the student has violated the AI Policy, before the sanctioning stage of the meeting, the Assistant Director for AI will provide the Council information regarding whether the student has
any previous AI Policy violations recorded and sanctions imposed. The Council will deliberate again in private in order to determine the appropriate sanction for this violation. The Chair will announce the decision of the Council to those present at the conclusion of the hearing.

Step 7
Appealing the Decision of the Student Disciplinary Council

If the student chooses to contest the allegation and/or sanction, the student can appeal to the Provost. The student will notify, in writing, the Office of the Provost of his or her request and grounds for such request, within five academic days of the Student Disciplinary Council’s decision. An appeal to the Provost can only be based upon irregularities in procedure, new evidence not available for the first hearing, or punishment not consistent with the violation. The Provost will render a decision, in writing, within ten academic days of receipt of the appeal.

Step 8
Appealing the Decision of the Provost

If the Provost upholds the decision of the Student Disciplinary Council, and if the student chooses to contest the allegation and/or sanction, the student can appeal to the Board of Regents. The student will notify, in writing, the AI Office of his or her request and grounds for such request, within five academic days of the Provost’s decision. As soon as practicable, the AI Office will schedule a hearing. An appeal to the Board of Regents can only be based upon irregularities in procedure, new evidence not available at the first hearing, or punishment not consistent with the violation; the decision of the Board of Regents is final.

Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director for Student Rights and Responsibilities (Assistant Director for AI)</td>
<td>A faculty member who coordinates the implementation of the EKU Academic Integrity Policy. The Assistant Director for AI does not take part in any actual hearings, but is available to answer procedural questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheating</td>
<td>Cheating is an act or an attempted act of deception by which a student seeks to misrepresent that he or she has mastered information on an academic exercise. Cheating includes, but is not limited to, the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Academic Integrity Committee</td>
<td>The College Academic Integrity Committee is comprised of 5 members (1 faculty from the department where the incident arose, 2 faculty from the college at large, and 2 students from the college at large but not from the department where the incident arose.) If this case involves a graduate student, at least one of the students on the Committee will be a graduate student. One member, elected by the Committee, will serve as Chair. The College may form a standing committee for this purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>In this document, day refers to days within an academic term. If the academic day occurs on a weekend, holiday, or University break or if the University is closed due to inclement weather, an action required within a specified number of academic days shall be due on the first day practicable on which University is open during an academic term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabrication</td>
<td>Fabrication is a form of deception and occurs when a student misrepresents written or verbal information in an academic exercise. Fabrication includes, but is not limited to, the following:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assistant Director for Student Rights and Responsibilities (Assistant Director for AI)

A faculty member who coordinates the implementation of the EKU Academic Integrity Policy. The Assistant Director for AI does not take part in any actual hearings, but is available to answer procedural questions.

Cheating

Cheating is an act or an attempted act of deception by which a student seeks to misrepresent that he or she has mastered information on an academic exercise. Cheating includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Giving or receiving assistance not authorized by the instructor or university representative
- Participating in unauthorized collaboration on an academic exercise
- Using unapproved or misusing electronic devices or aids during an academic exercise
- Turning in substantially similar papers/assignments as other student(s)

College Academic Integrity Committee

The College Academic Integrity Committee is comprised of 5 members (1 faculty from the department where the incident arose, 2 faculty from the college at large, and 2 students from the college at large but not from the department where the incident arose.) If this case involves a graduate student, at least one of the students on the Committee will be a graduate student. One member, elected by the Committee, will serve as Chair. The College may form a standing committee for this purpose.

Day

In this document, day refers to days within an academic term. If the academic day occurs on a weekend, holiday, or University break or if the University is closed due to inclement weather, an action required within a specified number of academic days shall be due on the first day practicable on which University is open during an academic term.

Fabrication

Fabrication is a form of deception and occurs when a student misrepresents written or verbal information in an academic exercise. Fabrication includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Citation of information not taken from the source indicated. This may include the incorrect documentation of secondary source materials.
- Listing sources in a bibliography not directly used in the academic exercise
- Submission in a paper, thesis, lab report, practicum log, or other academic exercise of falsified, invented, or fictitious data or evidence or deliberate
and knowing concealment or distortion of the true nature origin or function of such data or evidence
- Submitting as your own any academic exercise (verbal, written, electronic, or artistic work) prepared totally or in part by another person

“FX” Notation
“FX” grade denotes failure in the course due to academic dishonesty.

Peer Advisor
An accused student has the right to have another willing student act as his or her advisor/advocate and to assist the student throughout the process, beginning at step 2 and continuing through step 8. The student can be any presently enrolled EKU student.

Plagiarism
Plagiarism occurs when a student represents work taken from another source as his or her own. It is imperative that a student give credit to information, words, ideas, and images that are integrated into his or her own work. Acknowledgement of a source of information in any form should consist of complete, accurate, and specific references and, if verbatim statements are included, quotation marks as well. Examples of plagiarism include, but are not limited to, the following:
- Using words, ideas, or images from another source (including the Internet), whether in quotation marks or not, without giving credit to that source in the form of a bibliographic citation
- Using facts, statistics, or other supporting materials that are not clearly common knowledge without acknowledgement of the source

Provost
Refers to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs or the Associate Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs

Silent Advisor
An accused student has the right to have an attorney present at any proceedings at step 2 and continuing through step 8. The attorney is not permitted to speak in any hearing through this process.

Student Disciplinary Council
The Student Disciplinary Council is comprised of seven members, one faculty from each of the Colleges and two students (one undergraduate and one graduate student) named by the President of the University. One member, elected by the Council, serves as Chair.

Triviality
A case may be dismissed if it is found to be trivial. A trivial case is one with no possible consequences to a matter of legitimate concern of the academic community or one with no tendency to undermine trust within the community.

University Academic Integrity Committee
The University Academic Integrity Committee is comprised of six members. At the beginning of the academic year, there will be two names (1 faculty, 1 student) from each college and one name (faculty/staff) from the Library submitted to the President’s office for appointment to the Committee. For each AI hearing, the college from which the incident arose will have both the faculty and student serve as members of this specific Committee. The remaining members of the Committee will be randomly drawn from two separate categories in order for the make-up of the Committee to be three faculty and three students. One member, elected by the Committee, will serve as Chair. An appeal to this Committee can only be based upon irregularities in procedure, new evidence not available for the first hearing, or punishment not consistent with the violation.

University
Eastern Kentucky University

Responsibilities

Assistant Director for AI
The Assistant Director for AI is responsible for maintaining all records of all incidents involving the EKU AI policy.

College Academic Integrity Committee
The Committee is responsible for determining the facts, and, if the student is found to have violated the AI Policy, the Committee must determine the appropriate sanction. A minimum
of 3 Committee members must be present. To determine that a violation has occurred, 3 of the 5 Committee members must agree. To determine the sanction, 3 of the 5 Committee members must agree.

Faculty
If a mid-term or final grade is to be reported to the University during the pendency of the academic integrity procedures, the responsible faculty member shall report an "incomplete" for the involved student until the final resolution of the matter.

University Academic Integrity Committee
The Committee is responsible for hearing appeals from the College AI Committee of AI policy sanctions. It can modify or set aside the applied sanction, refer the case back to the College AI Committee, or uphold the decision. A minimum of 4 Committee members must be present. To determine that a violation has/has not has occurred, 4 of the 6 Committee members must agree. To determine the sanction, 4 of the 6 Committee members must agree. The decision of the University AI Committee is final, unless the Committee determines suspension or expulsion or the awarding of the “FX” grade is the appropriate sanction to be imposed.

Violations of the Policy

Minimum Sanction: The standard minimum sanction for an AI Policy violation shall be the assignment of an “F” for the test, assignment or activity in which an incident of academic dishonesty occurred; the student will not be allowed to retake or rewrite the test, assignment or activity. A student so assigned an “F” for the course will not be permitted to drop or withdraw from the course.

Sanctions: In addition to the minimum sanctions for an AI Policy violation, other appropriate educational sanctions may be assigned; these sanctions may be given even if this is the first violation of the AI Policy. Such sanctions could include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Removal from the course
- Educational sanctions
- Community service
- Precluded from graduating with Honors
- An assigned “F” for the course
- “FX” notation on transcript *
- Suspension**
- Expulsion**

*Note: Per the Academic Integrity Policy 4.1.3, Eastern Kentucky University’s Student Disciplinary Council is the only body authorized to make a permanent “FX” notation on transcript.

**Note: In accordance with KRS 164.370, the Board of Regents of Eastern Kentucky University has delegated authority to the Student Disciplinary Council as the only body authorized to suspend or expel a student.

"FX" Notation:
The “FX” grade is a final and permanent notation on the student’s transcript. The “FX” grade can only be imposed by the Student Disciplinary Council. Upon exhaustion of the appeals process set forth in the Academic Integrity Policy 4.1.3, the notation cannot be removed. A student may retake the course where the “FX” notation is applied, and the new grade will replace the “FX” in the calculation of the student’s GPA. The “FX” notation, however, will remain on the student’s transcript.

Interpreting Authority

- Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs
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Minutes of a Regular Meeting  
Eastern Kentucky University  
Board of Regents  
June 11, 2012

A regular quarterly meeting of the Eastern Kentucky University Board of Regents convened at 1:30 p.m. on June 11, 2012, in Room 549, Student Success Building (SSB), Eastern Kentucky University, Richmond, Kentucky. Mr. Gary Abney, Chair of the Board, presided. Mr. Abney noted the presence of a quorum. The following members of the Board were present:

Mr. Gary Abney  
Ms. Nancy Collins  
Ms. Janet Craig  
Dr. Malcolm Frisbie  
Mr. Steven Fulkerson  
Mr. Ernie House  
Ms. Rachel Mollozzi  
Mr. David Sloan  
Mr. David Tandy  
Mr. Craig Turner

Other persons present at the meeting were:

Dr. Doug Whitlock, President  
Mr. Barry Poynter, Treasurer  
Ms. Virginia Underwood, Assistant Secretary  
Members of the faculty and staff  
Members of the media

Approval of the April 26, 2012 Minutes

Mr. Turner made a motion, seconded by Mr. House, that the minutes of the regular quarterly meeting of April 26, 2012, be approved as distributed. The motion passed by voice vote.

President’s Report

Mr. Abney noted that prior to the Board meeting Board members enjoyed a presentation provided by Mr. Marc Whitt, Associate Vice President of Public Relations, regarding the recent International Town and Gown Association Annual Conference (ITGA), which EKU and the city of Richmond hosted. He noted the ITGA had over 200 participants and he appreciated the collective efforts of EKU, ITGA and the Richmond community. Additionally, Mr. Abney congratulated Mr. Fulkerson on his reelection as a staff regent.

Mr. Abney recognized President Whitlock to provide the President’s Report.
Policy Revision, Academic Integrity 4.1.3P

Dr. Sherry Robinson, Executive Assistant to the Provost, presented for Board review and approval revisions to Policy 4.1.3P, Academic Integrity. Board members engaged Dr. Robinson in discussion pertaining to specific revisions for the policy, including a request for amended language to clarify that the Board has delegated authority to the Student disciplinary Council. Dr. Frisbie made a motion to approve the revisions to Policy 4.1.3P, Academic Integrity, as amended. Ms. Collins seconded. Revisions to Policy 4.1.3P as amended were approved by voice vote. A copy of this item as amended and approved is included with the Official Minutes of the Board of Regents.

Resolution of Appreciation for Ms. Rachel Mollozzi and Mr. David Sloan

Mr. Gary Abney recognized Board members Ms. Rachel Mollozzi and Mr. David Sloan for their service, dedication and commitment to the Board and recommended the Board approve a Resolution of Appreciation for Ms. Mollozzi and Mr. Sloan. Ms. Craig seconded. The motion was approved by voice vote.

Ms. Mollozzi stated it was a pleasure to work with the Board and she has personally and professionally gained from the relationships made during her tenure as Student Regent. Mr. Sloan addressed the Board and stated he appreciated his time with the Board personally and professionally noting it was a professional privilege. He noted that EKU provides and presents opportunity for students. Mr. Abney thanked both Ms. Mollozzi and Mr. Sloan for their service to the Board. A copy of the Resolutions of Appreciation is included with the Official Minutes of the Board.

New Business

Resolutions: Real Property, One-Time Waiver Option to Purchase Patti A Clay Hospital; Release of Undefined Portion of Retained Easement

President Whitlock recommended the Board approve and adopt a Resolution authorizing a Waiver of Option to Purchase which provides that the University waives its rights under the Option to Purchase in connection with a proposed transaction between Patty A. Clay and Baptist Healthcare and that the Board authorize the Chair of the Board to sign all necessary and proper documents required for such one-time waiver. He noted the Waiver provides that, subject to the one-time waiver by EKU, the property will remain subject to all of the terms and conditions of the Option and conveyance documents.

Additionally, President Whitlock recommended the Board adopt a resolution authorizing a release of an undefined portion of an easement retained in a 1987 deed conveying a .78 tract to Pattie A. Clay Infirmary Association along the western boundary of prior conveyances to the hospital and authorize the Chair of the Board to execute all necessary and proper documents required for the aforementioned easement release.
April 4, 2012
8:30 a.m.
Martin Room

Members Present: Ault, Allen; Compton, Melinda; Conneely, James; Davis, Tina; Fossen, Linda; Gardner, Betina; Good, Claire; Hickox, Charles; Moore, Sandra; Noblitt, Lynnette; Phillips, Bill; Pogatshnik, Jerry; Reagle, Michael; Robinson, Sherry; Rogow, Robert; Taylor, Christiane; Vice, Janna; Wachtel, Libby; Wade, John; Whitehouse, Deborah; Zeigler, Sara

Guests: Bohannon, Betsy; Christenson, Burke; McGee, Rick; Means, Shannon

Recorder: Peggy Williams

I. Call to Order
Dr. Janna Vice, Chair, called the meeting to order.

II. Approval of the Minutes
The minutes of the March 1, 2012, meeting were approved as written.

III. Informational/Discussion Items
1. Provost’s Update: The Academic Affairs 2012-13 budget process has been ongoing in preparation for a proposal to the the Joint FPC/SPC. The $7-8M projected budget shortfall has been a challenging task for all areas of the university. The FPC/SPC will meet all day on April 5 in preparation for submitting a formal budget proposal to President Whitlock.


3. Promotion and Tenure Policy, 4.6.4P: The revised Promotion and Tenure Policy, 4.6.4P, was approved by Faculty Senate on April 2. The policy will return to the Provost’s Council for approval on May 2. The policy will be presented to faculty at large at the Fall Convocation.

IV. Action Items
1. Academic Integrity, 4.1.3P: Following discussion and minor revisions, the Academic Integrity Policy was approved by the Provost’s Council. After a 30-day comment period, it will be submitted to the President for approval and recommendation to the Board of Regents.

2. Faculty Authored Texts, 4.7.1P: The Faculty Authored Texts Policy was approved by Faculty Senate on March 12. Following discussion, a recommendation was made to seek a professional external review on the
practice of royalties. A motion was made to post the policy for a 30-day comment period. The policy will return to the Council for approval in June.

3. **Student Assistance and Intervention Team, 5.2.1P:** The Student Assistance and Intervention Team Policy was approved by the Provost’s Council.

4. **Staff Grievance Policy and Procedures, 8.3.1P:** Following discussion, the Provost’s Council approved the policy with the following amendments that will be reviewed by the policy drafting team:
   a. Page 3, Step 1:
   The Grievant will communicate with the Executive Director of Human Resources within ten (10) Business Days from the first knowledge of an actual or supposed grievable circumstance to determine if a solution can be mediated without filing a formal Grievance. Upon notification, the Executive Director of Human Resources will inform the appropriate dean or unit head and the appropriate vice president of a possible grievance.
   b. Page 5:
   Staff Grievance Committee/Hearing Panel, final paragraph of section, final sentence
   The President shall present a final and binding answer to the Grievant within five (5) Business Days from receipt of the Advisory Opinion with copies to the Executive Director of Human resources and to the appropriate dean/unit head and the appropriate vice president.

V. **Good of the Order/Announcements**

1. Dr. Noblitt will not be serving as the Chair of Faculty Senate in 2012-13 so that she can serve as the Chair Elect of the Chairs’ Association.

2. At the April 2 Faculty Senate meeting, Professor Sheila Pressley was nominated for Faculty Senate Chair and Dr. Jerry Palmer was nominated for Faculty Senate Vice Chair. Elections will be held at the Faculty Senate meeting in May providing there are enough members in attendance for a quorum.

3. Training for First Responders in the *We Care Customer Service Program* will begin June 4-8.

4. Institutional funding will continue for the student Work Study program.

5. Dr. Conneely was congratulated on his new appointment as President of Notre Dame of Maryland.

VI. **Adjournment**
The meeting adjourned at 9:50 a.m.
The Faculty Senate of Eastern Kentucky University met on Monday, February 7, 2011, in the South Ballroom in the Keen Johnson Building. Senator Taylor called the fifth meeting of the academic year to order at approximately 3:30 p.m.

The following members were absent:

*indicates prior notification of absence
^ ALT Connie Lamb attended for L. Wray

Visitors to the Senate: Tina Davis, Registrar; Jerry Pogatshnik, Graduate Education & Research; Sherry Robinson, Provost Office

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
The January 10 minutes were approved as written.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT: Senator Whitlock
Senator Whitlock is in Houston, Texas for the SACS on-site reaffirmation visit at Texas Southern University and sends his regrets for missing the Senate meeting.

Senator Whitlock shared the following in his written report to the Senate.

The Legislative session is in full swing. The biggest issue to affect Eastern Kentucky University is the discussion to amend the statute to authorize comprehensive universities to offer advanced practice doctorates. If enacted, this would mean the legislature would no longer have to act on specific degree programs as it did last year on EKU’s Doctoral of Nursing Practice.

The Board of Regents met on January 26. The Board advised on positive results of a feasibility study on the proposed public and private partnership for a hotel conference center near the performing arts center. The University's only tangible contribution to this project will be a long-term land lease. No University funds will be used in the development of this project.

The Board also discussed and passed a resolution in support of the University submitting a proposal to become the fixed base operator at the Madison County Airport.

NEW BUSINESS:

Rules Committee Election. Senator May was nominated and accepted by acclamation to fill the vacancy on the Rules Committee.

Academic Quality Committee Recommendation. Based on feedback from the AQC survey, the Academic Quality Committee previously recommended changing the date of mid-term grades to the seventh week of the semester and moving the last day to drop a class to the eighth week of the semester. After further discussion on the issue, Senator Taylor requested that the AQC bring the recommendation back to the Senate in the form of a motion for the March meeting with a vote anticipated at the April meeting.
Report from Council on Academic Affairs. - Senator Vice

New Program
1. Minor in Land Surveying

Program Revisions
2. Technology A.A.S.
   Reduce the total number of credit hours from 64 to 60. In the Digital Imaging Design option, drop CSC 160, TEC 190 and NET 303, and add GBU 204 and GCM 318. In the Computer Aided Drafting option, drop AEM 192 and CON 303 and add AEM 338 (4) and CON 294.
3. Technical Agriculture A.A.S.
   Allow a broader array of courses in the humanities area. Revise Supporting Course requirements from "three hours of general education humanities" to "three hours from General Education block IIIA, IIIB or IIIA/B*".
4. Associate of General Studies Concentration in Broadcasting and Electronic Media
   Establish a Concentration in Broadcasting & Electronic Media for the Associate of General Studies degree program.
5. General Dietetics B.S.
   a. incorporate course revisions to NFA 325 Quantity Food Production and NFA 326 Field Experiences in Quantity Food Production (increase hrs from 2 to 3 for both courses)
   b. add supporting courses BIO 171 Human Anatomy, EHS 380 Food Hygiene, and EMC 105 Survey of Medical Terminology
   c. delete major courses NFA 321 Meal Management and NFA 415 Seminar in the Dietetics Profession
   d. delete supporting course BIO 273 Clinical Microbiology
6. Community Nutrition M.S.
   Clarify the difference between Option 1 and Option 2 for the MS in Community Nutrition. Remove subscripts from all course numbers listed, as suggested by the Grad Council.
7. Health Education B.S.
   Change name of major from Health Education to Public Health. Correct a number in Worksite Health Promotion Option from HEA 360 to HEA 460. That course number was changed last year but was missed in the revised catalog.
8. Master of Public Health
   Add HEA 856 to MPH program electives for Health Education.
9. Occupational Therapy M.S.
   Add the revised text "or OTS 855S" to reflect the creation of service-learning courses within the program.
10. Correctional/Juvenile Justice Studies M.S.
    Revise the existing Correctional/Juvenile Justice Graduate Studies Program into the Adult Juvenile & Community Corrections Leadership Graduate Program, revise the Certificate in Adult/Juvenile Correctional Leadership, and revise/create/delete courses.

Action Items
The Council approved the following item in the December 16, 2010, CAA meeting. This item was reviewed as information in the January Faculty Senate meeting:

11. Declaring a Program of Study/Change of Major

The Council approved the following item in the January 20, 2011 meeting. This item was reviewed as information in the January Faculty Senate meeting:

12. Academic Integrity, Policy Revision
Senator Richardson moved approval of item 1, seconded by Senator DeBolt. Motion carried.

Senator Vice moved approval of items 2-10, seconded by Senator Wade. Motion carried.

Senator Vice moved approval of item 11, seconded by Senator May. Motion carried.

Senator Vice moved approval of item 12, seconded by Senator Noblitt. Motion carried.

**REPORT FROM SENATE CHAIR: Senator Taylor**

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met on January 24th and agreed to list changing the time of midterm grades and the last day to drop as an informational item for today's agenda. A vote on this issue is anticipated in the Senate's April session. The Executive Committee agreed that the Academic Quality Committee should continue to review the issue of posting syllabi and bring a motion to the Senate with their recommendation.

The AAUP has responded to the EKU Promotion and Tenure draft policy. The information is very useful and notes several key areas that need attention. Below are six of the areas included in the AAUP response:

1. crediting of prior service at other institutions
2. "Bona fide financial exigency" as a possible basis for termination of a tenured appointment
3. affording faculty members the opportunity for a pre-termination hearing before an elected body of peers
4. that it is not at all typical for an administrator, qua administrator, to be granted faculty tenure
5. the omission in the draft policy of any mention, as possible grounds for an appeal, based on alleged violations of academic freedom or of governing policies forbidding improper discrimination
6. limited sharing of the final report with anyone other than the president

Senator Taylor thanked Senators Nancy McKenney and Jerry Palmer and their committees for their work on promotion and tenure.

During the January 21st Financial Planning Council meeting the FPC discussed the Mid Year Financial Update, 2011-2012 Fixed Cost Projections (pay raises were included under this area), Graduate Tuition Recommendations, Tuition Models and Enrollment Management Implications, Capital Funding Requests and Fund Availability, and the Spring 2011 Budget Timeline. Included on the agenda for Future Discussion: the Drop Fee, Course Repeat Fee, Online Depository of Course Syllabi, and Revenue Sharing of online tuition.

**REPORT FROM FACULTY REGENT: Senator Frisbie**

The Board met on January 26, 2011 for a regular quarterly meeting.

The Board approved the following:

1. Fifty curriculum items involving program revisions, creation of concentrations within the Associate of General Studies degree program, and certificate programs.
COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
Minutes from January 20, 2011


Members Absent: Linda Fossen*, Linda Frost, Claire Good*, E. J. Keeley, Sandra Moore, Claire Schmelzer*.
*indicates prior notification

Non-Members Present: Sheila Adkins, Sandy Cain, Julie Robinson.

Dr. Janna Vice called the Council on Academic Affairs to order at 1:00 p.m. on January 20, 2011.

Approval of the Minutes – December 16, 2010
The minutes were approved as distributed.

CURRICULUM ITEMS

Business and Technology

ACTION ITEM

Approved

New Program

Minor in Land Surveying

- New program proposal was introduced in the December CAA meeting for discussion.

Proposed Effective Term: Fall 2011

New Course

Approved

GCM 318 Flexographic Printing

Fall 2011

Course Revision

Approved

GCM 319 Printing Processes – revise course prerequisite and course description

Fall 2011

Program Revision

Approved

A.A.S. in Technology - Reduce the total number of credit hours from 64 to 60. In the Digital Imaging Design Option, drop CSC 160, TEC 190 and NET 303 and add GBU 204 and GCM 318.

In the Computer Aided Drafting Option, drop AEM 192 and CON 303 and add AEM 338 (4) and CON 294.

Proposed Effective Term: Fall 2011

Agriculture

Program Revision

Approved

Technical Agriculture A.A.S. - Allow a broader array of courses in the humanities area. From "three hours of general education humanities" to "three hours from General Education Block IIIA, IIIB or IIIA/B*".

Proposed Effective Term: Fall 2011
Criminal Justice Program Revision

Approved: Correctional/Juvenile Justice Studies M.S. - revise the existing Correctional/Juvenile Justice Graduate Studies Program into the Adult, Juvenile & Community Corrections Leadership Graduate Program, revise the Certificate in Adult/Juvenile Correctional Leadership, and revise/create/delete courses.

Course Drop

Approved: COR 806 Advanced Workshop

New Course

Approved: COR 809 Program/Policy Evaluation & Analysis

Course Revision

Approved: COR 810 Understanding Crime, Delinquency & Correctional Programs – revise the course title and description

New Course

Approved: COR 812 Leading with Political, Ethical and Emotional Intelligence

Course Revisions

Approved: COR 818 Research in Corrections & Juvenile Justice – revise the title and description

Approved: COR 820 Juvenile Justice – revise the title and description

New Courses

Approved: COR 825 Illicit Offender Networks

Approved: COR 826 International Responses to Juvenile & Adult Offenders

Approved: COR 827 Corrections and Crime Mythology

Approved: COR 828 Mental Health/Substance Abuse Issues in the Correctional Setting

Course Revisions

Approved: COR 830 Corrections and Society – revise the title and description

Approved: COR 835 Administration of Corrections & Juvenile Justice – revise title and description

Approved: COR 840 Adult Corrections – revise the title and description

Approved: COR 850 Offender Rehabilitation Strategies – revise title and description

Approved: COR 856 Law & Ethics in Corrections & Juvenile Justice – revise title and description

New Courses

Approved: COR 857 Community Context of Adult/Juvenile Corrections

Approved: COR 878 Capstone Applied Research Project

Action Items

Approved: 1. Academic Integrity, Revision
   - Proposal was introduced in the December CAA meeting for discussion.
   
   Office of the Provost

Discussion Items

The following items will return for vote by the CAA in the February 17, 2011, meeting.

1. 3 + 2, Joint Graduate/Undergraduate Degrees
   
   Graduate Program and Research

2. Clarification to the Graduate Tuition Waiver for the Graduate Assistants
   
   Graduate Program and Research

3. Graduation Pre-Check
   
   Office of the Provost
Academic Integrity

Policy Statement

Academic integrity (AI) is a fundamental value for the Eastern Kentucky University community of students, faculty, and staff. It should be clearly understood that academic dishonesty and incidents of academic dishonesty will have serious consequences. Anyone who knowingly assists in any form of academic dishonesty shall be considered as responsible as the student who accepts such assistance and shall be subject to the same sanctions. Academic dishonesty can occur in different forms, some of which include cheating, plagiarism, and fabrication.

Purpose

This policy defines the various forms of academic dishonesty, and it outlines the consequences for each. Additionally, this policy gives the method for appealing an instructor’s belief that some form of academic dishonesty has in fact occurred.

Entities Affected by the Policy

- Colleges
- Departments
- Faculty
- Students

Policy Background

Eastern Kentucky University is a community of shared academic values, foremost of which is a strong commitment to intellectual honesty, honorable conduct and respect for others. In order to meet these values, students at EKU are expected to adhere to the highest standards of academic integrity. These standards are embodied in the Eastern Kentucky University Academic Integrity Policy, which all students shall pledge to uphold by signing the Eastern Kentucky University Honor Code. By honoring and enforcing this Academic Integrity Policy, the University community affirms that it does not tolerate academic dishonesty.
### Procedures

#### When a Violation is Suspected

If an incident of alleged violation of the AI Policy is suspected, any member of the EKU community can initiate the process of review by reporting the incident, in writing directly to the responsible faculty/staff member. The responsible faculty/staff member may elect to conduct his/her own review of the allegations or may elect for the matter to be referred to the Academic Integrity Office.

**Option A: Faculty/Staff Member Conducts Review**
- If the responsible faculty/staff member chooses to continue the review of the allegations autonomously, the faculty/staff member should obtain and assess the applicable information in determining whether a violation of the AI policy has occurred. If the faculty/staff member determines that an AI policy violation has occurred, a notification of the violation must be made to the Office of Academic Integrity for recordkeeping. At this point, the faculty/staff also notifies the student in writing of the allegations, the sanction, and the right to contest the allegation and sanction according to the AI Policy procedure. If the student accepts responsibility for the violation and the sanction, the case is closed. There is no appeal from this decision. Upon determination of responsibility, the AI Coordinator will enter the report data in the database. If the student does not accept responsibility and chooses to contest the allegation and/or sanction, the process proceeds to step 2. Note: The faculty/staff involved in Step 1 should request information from the AI Coordinator regarding the student's previous violations of the AI Policy prior to rendering a sanction in this particular case.

**Option B: Faculty/Staff Member Refers Case to AI Office**
- If a faculty/staff member chooses to refer the case directly to the AI Office, the AI Coordinator will meet with the student to discuss the alleged violation. If the student chooses not to contest the allegation and sanction, the sanction is imposed; the case is closed. There is no appeal from this decision. If the student contests the allegation and/or sanction, the AI Office will schedule a hearing, as soon as practicable, with the specific College Academic Integrity Committee from which the incident occurred.

#### When an Academic Integrity Charge or Sanction Is Contested

After the faculty/staff member and student have met and the student chooses to contest the charge and/or sanction, the faculty/staff member will refer the case to the AI Office, within five academic days of the meeting. The AI Coordinator will meet with the student to discuss the charge and/or sanctions and the right to contest these. If the student chooses not to contest the charge and sanction, the case is closed. There is no appeal from this decision. Notification of the violation is made by the AI Office into the database for recordkeeping. If the student contests the allegation and/or sanction, the AI Office will schedule a hearing, as soon as practicable, with the specific College Academic Integrity Committee from which the incident occurred.

#### College Academic Integrity Hearing

At the College AI Hearing both the student and the faculty/staff member will present their information. The Committee members will review all of the information presented and then deliberate in private. At the discretion of the Chair of the Committee, the proceeding may be extended to an additional meeting. At this level of hearing and continuing throughout the process, the student has the option of having a Peer Advisor present. Absent exceptional circumstances beyond the control of the student as determined by the Chair of the Committee, if the student who has been notified of the hearing fails to appear, the proceeding may take place in his or her absence; the Committee’s decision will be binding. If the Committee determines that the student has violated the AI Policy, before the sanctioning stage of the hearing, the AI Coordinator will provide the Committee information regarding whether the student has any previous AI Policy violations recorded or sanctions imposed. The Committee will deliberate again in private in order to determine the appropriate sanction for this violation; the Chair will announce the decision of the Committee to those present at the conclusion of the hearing.
Appealing the Decision of the College AI Committee

A student can appeal the decision of the College AI Committee to the University Academic Integrity Committee. This appeal can only be made based upon irregularities in procedure, new evidence not available for the first hearing, or punishment not consistent with the violation. The student will notify, in writing, the AI Office of their request to appeal to the University AI Committee within five academic days of the College Academic Integrity Committee’s decision, and a meeting of the University AI Committee will be scheduled as soon as practicable.

University Academic Integrity Committee Hearing

At the University AI Committee appeal review meeting, the Committee members will consider all the written information supplied by the student. The Committee can modify or set aside the applied sanction, refer the case back to the College AI Committee, or uphold the decision. The Chair of the Committee will notify the student of its decision, in writing, within five academic days of the hearing. The decision of the University AI Committee is final, unless the Committee determines that suspension or expulsion is the appropriate sanction to be imposed.

The following steps will ONLY be necessary if it is determined that the student may face the sanctions of suspension or expulsion for the alleged AI Policy violation. According to KRS 164.370, Eastern Kentucky University’s Student Disciplinary Council is the only body authorized to suspend or expel a student.

Appealing a Sanction of Suspension or Expulsion

If the College AI Committee or University AI Committee or AI Coordinator determines that the sanction of expulsion or suspension is appropriate for the AI Policy violation and the student wishes to appeal the sanction, the student must notify, in writing, the AI Office, within five academic days of the decision of the College or University AI Committee’s decision, of his or her desire to appeal. As soon as practicable, the AI Office will schedule a hearing before the Student Disciplinary Council.

Student Disciplinary Council Hearing

At the Student Disciplinary Council hearing, both the student and the faculty/staff member will present their information. The Council will review all of the information presented and then deliberate in private. At the discretion of the Chair of the Student Disciplinary Council, the proceeding may be extended to an additional meeting. Absent exception circumstances beyond the control of the student as determined by the Chair of the Council, if the student who has been notified of the hearing fails to appear, the proceeding may take place in his or her absence, and the Committee’s decision will be binding.

If the Council determines that the student has violated the AI Policy, before the sanctioning stage of the meeting, the AI Coordinator will provide the Council information regarding whether the student has any previous AI Policy violations recorded and sanctions imposed. The Council will deliberate again in private in order to determine the appropriate sanction for this violation. The Chair will announce the decision of the Council to those present at the conclusion of the hearing.

Appealing Decision of the Student Disciplinary Council

If the student chooses to contest the allegation and/or sanction, the student can appeal to the Provost. The student will notify, in writing, the AI Office of his or her request and grounds for such request, within five days of the Student Disciplinary Council’s decision. An appeal to the Provost can only be based upon irregularities in procedure, new evidence not available for the first hearing, or punishment not consistent with the violation. The Provost will render a decision, in writing, within ten academic days of receipt of the appeal.

Appealing the Decision of the Provost

If the Provost upholds the decision of the Student Disciplinary Council, and if the student chooses to contest the allegation and/or sanction, the student can appeal to the Board of Regents. The student will notify, in
writing, the AI Office of his or her request and grounds for such request, within five academic days of the 
Provost’s decision. An appeal to the Board of Regents can only be based upon irregularities in procedure, 
new evidence not available at the first hearing, or punishment not consistent with the violation; the decision of 
the Board of Regents is final.

### Definitions

| **Academic Integrity Coordinator** | A faculty member who coordinates the implementation of the EKU Academic Integrity Policy. The AI Coordinator does not take part in any actual hearings, but is available to answer procedural questions. |
| **Academic Integrity Pledge** | “I hereby affirm that I understand, accept and will uphold the responsibilities and stipulations of the Eastern Kentucky University Honor Code and Academic Integrity Policy.” |
| **Cheating** | Cheating is an act or an attempted act of deception by which a student seeks to misrepresent that he or she has mastered information on an academic exercise. Cheating includes, but is not limited to, the following:  
- Giving or receiving assistance not authorized by the instructor or university representative  
- Participating in unauthorized collaboration on an academic exercise  
- Using unapproved or misusing electronic devices or aids during an academic exercise |
| **College Academic Integrity Committee** | The College Academic Integrity Committee is comprised of 5 members (1 faculty from the department where the incident arose, 2 faculty from the college at large, and 2 students from the college at large but not from the department where the incident arose.) If this case involves a graduate student, at least one of the students on the Committee will be a graduate student. One member, elected by the Committee, will serve as Chair. |
| **Fabrication** | Fabrication is a form of deception and occurs when a student misrepresents written or verbal information in an academic exercise. Fabrication includes, but is not limited to, the following:  
- Citation of information not taken from the source indicated. This may include the incorrect documentation of secondary source materials.  
- Listing sources in a bibliography not directly used in the academic exercise  
- Submission in a paper, thesis, lab report, practicum log, or other academic exercise of falsified, invented, or fictitious data or evidence or deliberate and knowing concealment or distortion of the true nature origin or function of such data or evidence  
- Submitting as your own any academic exercise (verbal, written, electronic, or artistic work) prepared totally or in part by another person |
| **Peer Advisor** | An accused student has the right to have another willing student act as his or her advisor/advocate and to assist the student throughout the process, beginning at step 3 and continuing through step 9. The student can be any presently enrolled EKU student. |
| **Plagiarism** | Plagiarism occurs when a student represents work taken from another source as his or her own. It is imperative that a student give credit to information, words, ideas, and images that are integrated into his or her own work. Acknowledgement of a source of information in any form should consist of complete, accurate, and specific references and, if verbatim statements are included, quotation marks as well. Examples of plagiarism include, but are not limited to, the following:  
- Using words, ideas, or images from another source (including the Internet), whether in quotation marks or not, without giving credit to that source in the form of a bibliographic citation  
- Using facts, statistics, or other supporting materials that are not clearly common knowledge without acknowledgement of the source |
Silent Advisor
An accused student has the right to have an attorney present at any proceedings at step 3 and continuing through step 9. The attorney is not permitted to speak in any hearing through this process.

Student Disciplinary Council
The Student Disciplinary Council is comprised of seven members, one faculty from each of the Colleges and two students (one undergraduate and one graduate student) named by the President of the University. One member, elected by the Council, serves as Chair.

A case may be dismissed if it is found to be trivial. A trivial case is one with no possible consequences to a matter of legitimate concern of the academic community or one with no tendency to undermine trust within the community.

The University Academic Integrity Committee is comprised of six members. At the beginning of the academic year, there will be two names (1 faculty, 1 student) from each college and one name (faculty/staff) from the Library submitted to the President’s office for appointment to the Committee. For each AI hearing, the college from which the incident arose will have both the faculty and student serve as members of this specific Committee. The remaining members of the Committee will be randomly drawn from two separate categories in order for the make-up of the Committee to be three faculty and three students. One member, elected by the Committee, will serve as Chair. An appeal to this Committee can only be based upon irregularities in procedure, new evidence not available for the first hearing, or punishment not consistent with the violation.

University Academic Integrity Committee
The Committee is responsible for determining the facts, and, if the student is found to have violated the AI Policy, the Committee must determine the appropriate sanction. To determine that a violation has/has not has occurred, 4 of the 5 Committee members must agree. To determine the sanction, 3 of the 5 Committee members must agree.

University
Eastern Kentucky University

Academic Integrity Coordinator
The Coordinator is responsible for maintaining all records of all incidents involving the EKU AI Policy.

College Academic Integrity Committee
The Committee is responsible for determining the facts, and, if the student is found to have violated the AI Policy, the Committee must determine the appropriate sanction. To determine that a violation has/has not has occurred, 4 of the 5 Committee members must agree. To determine the sanction, 3 of the 5 Committee members must agree.

University Academic Integrity Committee
The Committee is responsible for hearing appeals of AI policy sanctions. It can modify or set aside the applied sanction, refer the case back to the College AI Committee, or uphold the decision. The decision of the University AI Committee is final, unless the Committee determines suspension or expulsion is the appropriate sanction to be imposed.

Violations of the Policy

Minimum Sanction: The standard minimum sanction for an AI Policy violation shall be the assignment of an “F” for the test, assignment or activity in which an incident of academic dishonesty occurred; the student will not be allowed to retake or rewrite the test, assignment or activity. A student so assigned an “F” will not be permitted to drop or withdraw from the course.

Minimum Sanction for student with one previous AI Policy violation: The standard minimum sanction for an AI Policy violation for a student with one previous AI Policy violation will be an “FX” recorded for the course on the student’s transcript; the “FX” grade denotes failure in the course due to academic dishonesty. A student so assigned an “FX” for a course will not be permitted to drop or withdraw from the course.

Sanctions: In addition to the minimum sanctions for an AI Policy violation, other appropriate educational sanctions may be assigned; these sanctions may be given even if this is the first violation of the AI Policy. Such sanctions could include, but are not limited to, the following:
Violations of the Policy, continued

- Restriction of computer access
- Precluded from graduating with Honors
- An assigned "F" for the course
- "FX" notation on transcript
- **Suspension***
- **Expulsion***

*Note: According to KRS 164.370, Eastern Kentucky University’s Student Disciplinary Council is the only body authorized to suspend or expel a student.

"FX" Notation:
The “FX” grade will be changed to an “F” on the student’s transcript upon completion of the educational sanctions so specified by the faculty/staff (Step 1) or other hearing bodies. A course with a grade of “FX” may not be repeated until the “FX” grade is changed to a “F”. The student can then choose to repeat the course with the grade earned in the later taking replacing that of the “F” grade.

Interpreting Authority

- Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs

Statutory or Regulatory References

KRS 164.370

Relevant Links

NA

Policy Adoption Review and Approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 5, 2005</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Recommended Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 12, 2006</td>
<td>Board of Regents</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Model Laboratory School Full Day Kindergarten Proposal

Dr. Chapman presented for approval a recommendation for Model Laboratory School to demonstrate best practices in kindergarten by moving to a full day schedule. Dr. Bizzack made a motion to approve, and Ms. Rogers seconded. The roll was called and the following members voted “aye”: Mr. Abney, Ms. Barton, Dr. Bizzack, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Moon, Ms. Rogers, Dr. Schlomann, Mr. Williams, and Mr. Bates. The motion passed.

Model Laboratory School Calendar

Dr. Chapman presented for approval the 2006-07 Model Laboratory School calendar for academic year 2006-07. Dr. Bizzack made a motion to approve. Mr. Williams seconded, and the motion passed by voice vote.

Academic Integrity Policy

Dr. Chapman presented for approval the proposed Academic Integrity Policy to update the University’s present Academic Honesty Policy and to closely align the University’s processes and policy on academic integrity with the Strategic Plan and adequately respond to the evolving technologies in the academic setting. Dr. Bizzack made a motion to approve. Ms. Barton seconded. The motion passed by voice vote. The full text of the revised Faculty Handbook language for the Academic Integrity Policy and a detailed comparison of the EKU Academic Honesty Policy and the approved Academic Integrity Policy are included with the Official Minutes of the Board.

Lancaster Higher Education Center

Dr. Chapman presented for approval a proposal to offer courses beginning in Fall 2006 in conjunction with Bluegrass Community and Technical College (BCTC) at an education center in Lancaster, Kentucky. Dr. Chapman advised the Board that community interest and need had been demonstrated through a needs-assessment survey. Also, he informed the Board that the proposal has both private and legislative support as demonstrated by private and public funding having been secured to support the lease and operation of the facility for an initial period of two years. Mr. Gilbert made a motion to approve. Dr. Bizzack seconded. The roll was called and the following members voted “aye”: Mr. Abney, Ms. Barton, Dr. Bizzack, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Moon, Ms. Rogers, Dr. Schlomann, Mr. Williams, and Mr. Bates. The motion passed.

Finance and Planning Committee

Adoption of 2006-07 University Budget

Ms. Newsom presented for approval the 2006-07 operating budget recommended by President Glasser. Ms. Newsom referred Board members to the Budget Book that had been distributed to them and shared with them two handouts, her slide presentation of the
I. President’s Recommendation to Approve the proposed Academic Integrity Policy to Replace the Existing Academic Honesty Policy

II. Issue

Update EKU’s Academic Honesty Policy by adopting the proposed Academic Integrity Policy to closely align the University’s processes and policy on academic integrity with the Strategic Plan and adequately respond to the reality of our changing society and evolving technologies in the academic setting.

III. Background and Process

The President appointed an ad hoc Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) in spring 2004, consisting of faculty, students and administrative staff. The President charged the committee with the responsibility of assessing the present climate at EKU regarding academic honesty issues, reviewing and evaluating the existing policy and processes, making recommendations for policy and process improvements, making recommendations for the design and implementation of a process for handling academic honesty issues at EKU and the design and implementation of an integrative plan dedicated to provide learning opportunities for students, faculty and administration on issues of academic honesty. An academic integrity survey was conducted at EKU, and the AIC studied academic integrity policies from other universities within and outside the Commonwealth of Kentucky. The AIC developed a draft policy and disseminated it to the university community for review, comment and feedback through campus wide focus groups and on the AIC web site. The Faculty Senate voted to approve the policy at its February 6, 2006 meeting and the revised Faculty Handbook language for the Academic Integrity Policy (set forth on the attached) at its May 1, 2006 meeting. Also, included with the agenda materials are a comparison of the present policy with the proposed revised policy and an academic integrity case flow chart.

IV. Alternatives

Continue to operate with the existing policy.

V. President’s Recommendation

Upon the recommendation of the Academic Integrity Committee and the Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and the approval of the Faculty Senate, the President recommends approval.
B. Academic Honesty Integrity Policy

Eastern Kentucky University is a community of shared academic values, foremost of which is a strong commitment to intellectual honesty, honorable conduct, and respect for others. In order to meet these values, students at Eastern Kentucky University are expected to adhere to the highest standards of academic integrity. These standards are embodied in the Eastern Kentucky University Academic Integrity Policy, which all students shall pledge to uphold by signing the Eastern Kentucky University Honor Code. By honoring and enforcing this Academic Integrity Policy, the University community affirms that it DOES not tolerate academic dishonesty.

Academic integrity is a fundamental value for the Eastern Kentucky University community of students, faculty, and staff. It should be clearly understood that INCIDENTS OF academic dishonesty will have serious consequences. Anyone who knowingly assists in any form of academic dishonesty shall be considered as responsible as the student who accepts such assistance and shall be subject to the same sanctions. Academic dishonesty can occur in different forms, some of which include cheating, plagiarism, and fabrication.

1. Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the act of presenting ideas, words, or organization of a source (published or not) as if they were one's own, without acknowledgment of the source. Since university instructors assume material presented by students is their own unless otherwise indicated, all quoted material must be in quotation marks, all paraphrases, quotations, significant ideas, and organization must be acknowledged by footnotes or by some other form of documentation acceptable to the instructor for the course. Plagiarism also includes presenting material which was composed or revised by any person other than the student who submits it, as well as the deliberate falsification of footnotes. The use of the term "material" refers to work in any form including written, oral, or electronic (as in the case of computer files).

Plagiarism occurs when a student represents work taken from another source as his/her own. It is imperative that a student gives credit to information, words, ideas, and images that are integrated into his/her own work. Acknowledgement of a source of information in any form should consist of complete, accurate, and specific references and, if verbatim statements are included, quotation marks as well. Examples of plagiarism include, but are not limited to:
2. Cheating

Cheating includes buying, stealing, or otherwise fraudulently obtaining copies of examinations or assignments for the purpose of improving one's academic standing. During examinations or in class work, it includes receiving information from others and referring to unauthorized notes or other unauthorized information. In addition, copying from others, either during examinations or in the preparation of homework assignments, is a form of cheating.

Computers should not be used to acquire or provide information in conflict with the academic honesty policy. Furthermore, the Code of Ethics for Computing and Communications makes it the responsibility of computer users to keep information, data, and programs in their computer accounts secure from others.

Cheating is an act or an attempted act of deception by which a student seeks to misrepresent that he/she has mastered information on an academic exercise. Cheating includes, but is not limited to:

- Giving or receiving assistance not authorized by the instructor or University representative;
- Participating in unauthorized collaboration on an academic exercise;
- Using unapproved or misusing electronic devices or aids during an academic exercise.

3. Fabrication

Fabrication is a form of deception and occurs when a student misrepresents written or verbal information in an academic exercise. Fabrication includes, but is not limited to:

- Citation of information not taken from the source indicated. This may include the incorrect documentation of secondary source materials;
- Listing sources in a bibliography not directly used in the academic exercise;
- Submission in a paper, thesis, lab report, practicum log, or other academic exercise of falsified, invented, or fictitious data or evidence, or deliberate and knowing concealment or distortion of the true nature, origin, or function of such data or evidence;
- Submitting as your own any academic exercise (verbal, written, electronic, or artistic work) prepared totally or in part by another person.
Anyone who knowingly assists in any form of academic dishonesty shall be considered as guilty as the student who accepts such assistance. Students should not allow their work to be copied or otherwise used by fellow students, nor should they sell or give unauthorized copies of examinations to other students.

4. Pledge
“I hereby affirm that I understand, accept, and will uphold the responsibilities and stipulations of the Eastern Kentucky University Honor Code and Academic Integrity Policy.”

4. Institutional Procedures
In instances of academic dishonesty, the instructor shall confront the student as soon as possible. The instructor may take any of four sanctions, depending on the seriousness of the infraction:

a. The instructor may assign a failing grade for the assignment;
b. The instructor may assign a failing grade for the course, in which case the instructor shall notify the chair of the department, the dean of the college in which the course is offered, the dean of the college of the student's major, the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, if appropriate, and the Registrar;
c. The instructor may refer the matter to the departmental committee on academic practices for consideration and possible referral to the Student Disciplinary Council;
d. If the student is assigned a grade of "F" and the instructor thinks the matter is serious enough, the instructor may submit the case to the departmental committee on academic practices with the recommendation that the student, if otherwise eligible, not be permitted to graduate with honors. This recommendation shall be made no later than the date on which the faculty member submits to the Registrar the grade report on which the "F" for plagiarism or cheating is assigned. At the time the recommendation is submitted to the academic practices committee, the Registrar shall be informed that the recommendation has been submitted.

If the departmental committee on academic practices decides that the offense is serious enough to prohibit the student from being graduated with honors, the case shall be submitted to the Student Disciplinary Council for review. If the Student Disciplinary Council concurs with the departmental academic practices committee that the student should be prohibited from being graduated with honors, the chair of the Student Disciplinary Council shall inform the Registrar in writing. The Registrar shall keep a list of students prohibited from being graduated with honors because of plagiarism or cheating and shall check the graduation list for names of such students.

5. Procedures for Dealing with Academic Integrity Cases

*Step 1. When a violation of the Academic Integrity Policy is suspected:*
If an incident of alleged violation of the AI Policy is suspected, any member of the EKU community can initiate the process of review by reporting the incident, in writing, directly to the responsible faculty/staff member. The responsible
faculty/staff member may elect to conduct his/her own review of the allegations or may elect for the matter to be referred to the Academic Integrity Office.

Option A: The Faculty/Staff Member Conducts a Review of the Allegations:
If the responsible faculty/staff member chooses to continue the review of the allegations autonomously, the faculty/staff member should obtain and assess the applicable information in determining whether a violation of the AI policy has occurred. If the faculty/staff member determines that an AI policy violation has occurred, a notification of the violation must be made to the Office of Academic Integrity for recordkeeping. At this point, the faculty/staff also notifies the student in writing of the allegation, the sanction, AND the right to contest the allegation and sanction according to the AI Policy procedure. If the student accepts responsibility for the violation and the sanction in writing, the case is closed. There is no appeal from this decision. Upon determination of responsibility, the AI Coordinator will enter the report data in the database. If the student does not accept responsibility and chooses to contest the allegation and/or sanction, the process proceeds to Step 2. Note: The faculty/staff member involved in Step 1 should request information from the AI Coordinator regarding the student's previous violations of the AI Policy prior to rendering a sanction in this particular case.

Option B: The Faculty/Staff Member Refers the Case to the Academic Integrity Office:
If a faculty/staff member chooses to refer the case directly to the AI Office, the AI Coordinator will meet with the student to discuss the alleged violation. If the student chooses not to contest the allegation and sanction, the sanction is imposed and the case is closed. There is no appeal from this decision. If the student contests the allegation and/or sanction, the AI Office will schedule a hearing, as soon as practicable, with the specific College Academic Integrity Committee from which the incident occurred. (Then proceed on to Step 3.)

Step 2. When an Academic Integrity charge or sanction is contested:
After the faculty/staff member and student have met and the student chooses to contest the charge and/or sanction, the faculty/staff member will refer the case to the AI Office, within five academic days of the meeting. The AI Coordinator will meet with the student to discuss the charge and/or sanctions and the right to contest these. If the student chooses not to contest the charge and sanction, the case is closed. There is no appeal from this decision. Notification of the violation is made by the AI Office into the database for recordkeeping. If the student contests the allegation and/or sanction, the AI Office will schedule a hearing, as soon as practicable, with the specific College Academic Integrity Committee from which the incident occurred. (Then proceed on to Step 3.)

Step 3.
At the College Academic Integrity Committee hearing, both the student and the faculty/staff member will present their information. The Committee members will review all of the information presented and then deliberate in private. At the discretion of the Chair of the Committee, the proceeding may be extended to an additional meeting. At this level of hearing and continuing throughout the process, the student has the option of having a Peer Advisor present. Absent exceptional circumstances beyond the control of the student as determined by the Chair of the Committee, if the student who has been notified of the hearing fails to appear, the proceeding may take place in his/her absence and the Committee's decision will be binding. If the Committee determines that the student has violated the AI Policy, before the sanctioning stage of the hearing, the AI Coordinator will provide the Committee information regarding whether the student has any previous AI Policy violations recorded and sanctions imposed. The Committee will deliberate again in private in order to determine the appropriate sanction for this violation. The Chair will announce the decision of the Committee to those present at the conclusion of the hearing.

**Step 4.**
A student can appeal the decision of the College Academic Integrity Committee to the University Academic Integrity Committee. This appeal can only be made based upon irregularities in procedure, new evidence not available for the first hearing, or punishment not consistent with the violation. The student will notify, in writing, the AI Office of their request to appeal to the University Academic Integrity Committee within 5 academic days of the College Academic Integrity Committee’s decision, and a meeting of the University Academic Integrity Committee will be scheduled as soon as practicable.

**Step 5.**
At the University Academic Integrity Committee appeal review meeting, the Committee members will consider all the written information supplied by the student. The Committee can modify or set aside the applied sanction, refer the case back to the College Academic Integrity Committee, or uphold the decision. The Chair of the Committee will notify the student of its decision, in writing, within five academic days of the hearing. The decision of the University Academic Integrity Committee is final, unless the Committee determines suspension or expulsion is the appropriate sanction to be imposed.

**Step 6 through Step 9.**
The following steps will ONLY be necessary if it is determined that the student may face the sanctions of suspension or expulsion for the alleged AI Policy violation. According to KRS 164.370, Eastern Kentucky University’s Student Disciplinary Council is the only body authorized to suspend or expel a student. KRS 164.370 provides that:

"Each board of regents may invest the faculty or a committee of the faculty and students with the power to suspend or expel any student for disobedience to its rules, or for any other contumacy, insubordination, or immoral conduct. In every
case of suspension or expulsion of a student the person suspended or expelled may appeal to the board of regents. The board of regents shall prescribe the manner and the mode of procedure on appeal. The decision of the board of regents shall be final."

**Step 6.**
If the College Academic Integrity Committee or University Academic Integrity Committee or AI Coordinator determines that the sanction of expulsion or suspension is appropriate for the AI Policy violation and the student wishes to appeal the sanction, the student must notify, in writing, the AI Office, within 5 academic days of the decision of the College or University Academic Integrity Committee’s decision, of his/her desire to appeal. As soon as practicable, the AI Office will schedule a hearing before the Student Disciplinary Council.

**Step 7.**
At the Student Disciplinary Council hearing, both the student and the faculty/staff member will present their information. The Council will review all of the information presented and then deliberate in private. At the discretion of the Chair of the Student Disciplinary Council, the proceeding may be extended to an additional meeting. Absent exceptional circumstances beyond the control of the student as determined by the Chair of the Council, if the student who has been notified of the hearing fails to appear, the proceeding may take place in his/her absence and the Committee’s decision will be binding. If the Council determines that the student has violated the AI Policy, before the sanctioning stage of the meeting, the AI Coordinator will provide the Council information regarding whether the student has any previous AI Policy violations recorded and sanctions imposed. The Council will deliberate again in private in order to determine the appropriate sanction for this violation. The Chair will announce the decision of the Council to those present at the conclusion of the hearing.

**Step 8.**
If the student chooses to contest the allegation and/or sanction, the student can appeal to the Provost. The student will notify, in writing, the AI Office of his/her request and grounds for such request, within five class days of the Student Disciplinary Council’s decision. An appeal to the Provost can only be based upon irregularities in procedure, new evidence not available for the first hearing, or punishment not consistent with the violation. The Provost will render a decision, in writing, within 10 academic days of receipt of the appeal.

**Step 9.**
If the Provost upholds the decision of the Student Disciplinary Council, and if the student chooses to contest the allegation and/or sanction, the student can appeal to the Board of Regents. The student will notify, in writing, the AI Office of his/her request and the grounds for such request, within five academic days of the Provost’s decision. An appeal to the Board of Regents can only be based upon irregularities
in procedure, new evidence not available at the first hearing, or punishment not consistent with the violation. The decision of the Board of Regents is final.

5. Further Actions
Students who are assigned a grade of "F" in a course due to academic dishonesty will not be permitted to drop the course.

If a student fails more than one course as a result of academic dishonesty, the dean of the college of the student's major shall refer the case directly to the Student Disciplinary Council for further action.

6. Sanctions

Minimum Sanction: The standard minimum sanction for an AI Policy violation shall be the assignment of an "F" for the test, assignment, activity in which an incident of academic dishonesty occurred. The student will not be allowed to retake or rewrite the test, assignment, or activity. A student so assigned an "F" will not be permitted to drop or withdraw from the course.

Minimum Sanction for student with one previous Academic Integrity Policy violation: The standard minimum sanction for an AI Policy violation for a student with one previous AI Policy violation will be an "FX" recorded for the course on the student's transcript. The "FX" grade denotes failure in the course due to academic dishonesty. A student so assigned an "FX" for a course will not be permitted to drop or withdraw from the course.

Sanctions: In addition to the minimum sanctions for an AI Policy violation, other appropriate educational sanctions may be assigned. These sanctions may be given even if this is the first violation of the AI Policy. Such sanctions could include, but are not limited to, the following:
- Removal from the course
- Educational sanctions
- Community service
- Restriction of computer access
- Precluded from graduating with Honors
- Assigned an "F" for the course
- "FX" notation on transcript
- Suspension *
- Expulsion *

* Note: According to KRS 164.370, Eastern Kentucky University's Student Disciplinary Council is the only body authorized to suspend or expel a student, Steps 6 through Step 9.

"FX" Notation: The "FX" grade will be changed to an "F" on the student's transcript upon completion of the educational sanctions so specified by the
faculty/staff (Step 1) or other hearing bodies. A course with a grade of “FX” may not be repeated until the “FX” grade is changed to an “F”. The student can then choose to repeat the course with the grade earned in the later taking replacing that of the “F” grade.

6. Helpful Definitions

Scheduling of hearings: Hearings will be scheduled as soon as practicable after the AI Coordinator receives written notification of the charge of an Academic Integrity violation.

Coordinator: The AI Coordinator is a faculty member who coordinates the EKU Academic Integrity Policy and procedure. The AI Coordinator does not take part in any actual hearings, but is available to answer procedural questions. The Coordinator is responsible for maintaining all records of all incidents involving the EKU Academic Integrity Policy.

College Academic Integrity Committee: The College Academic Integrity Committee is comprised of five members (1 faculty from the department where the incident arose, 2 faculty from the college at large, and 2 students from the college at large but not from the department where the incident arose.) If this case involves a graduate student, at least one of the students on the Committee will be a graduate student. One member, elected by the Committee, will serve as Chair. The Committee is responsible for determining the facts, and, if the student is found to have violated the AI Policy, the Committee must determine the appropriate sanction. To determine that a violation has/has not occurred, four of the five Committee members must agree. To determine the sanction, three of the five Committee members must agree.

Student Disciplinary Council: The Student Disciplinary Council is comprised of seven members, one faculty from each of the Colleges, and two students (one undergraduate and one graduate student) named by the President of the University. One member, elected by the Council, serves as Chair.

University Academic Integrity Committee: The University Academic Integrity Committee is comprised of six members. At the beginning of the academic year, there will be two names (1 faculty, 1 student) from each college and one name (faculty/staff) from the Library submitted to the President’s office for appointment to the Committee. For each AI hearing, the College from which the incident arose will have both the faculty and student serve as members of this specific Committee. The remaining members of the Committee will be randomly drawn from two separate categories in order for the make-up of the Committee to be three faculty and three students. One member, elected by the Committee, will serve as Chair. An appeal to this Committee can only be based upon irregularities in procedure, new evidence not available for the first hearing, or punishment not consistent with the violation. The Committee can modify or set aside the applied sanction, refer the
case back to the College Academic Integrity Committee, or uphold the decision. The decision of the University Academic Integrity Committee is final, unless the Committee determines suspension or expulsion is the appropriate sanction to be imposed.

Peer Advisor: An accused student has the right to have another willing student act as his or her advisor/advocate and to assist the student throughout the process, beginning at Step 3 and continuing through Step 9. The student can be any presently enrolled EKU student.

Silent Advisor: An accused student has the right to have an attorney present at any proceeding at Step 3 and continuing through Step 9. The attorney is not permitted to speak in any hearing through this process.
### Present Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>EKU Academic Honesty Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preamble</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor Code</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pledge</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Eastern Kentucky University faculty and students are bonded by principles of truth and honesty which are recognized as fundamental for a community of teachers and scholars. The University expects that the students will honor and that faculty will honor and enforce these principles, which contribute to a foundation upon which a quality of education can be built. With this premise, the University affirms that it will not tolerate academic dishonesty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition -</td>
<td>Cheating includes buying, stealing, otherwise fraudulently obtaining copies of examinations or assignments for the purpose of improving one's</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposed Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>EKU Academic Integrity Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preamble</td>
<td>Eastern Kentucky University is a community of shared academic values, foremost of which is a strong commitment to intellectual honesty, honorable conduct, and respect for others. In order to meet these values, students at Eastern Kentucky University are expected to adhere to the highest standards of academic integrity. These standards are embodied in the Eastern Kentucky University Academic Integrity Policy, which all students shall pledge to uphold by signing the Eastern Kentucky University Honor Code. By honoring and enforcing this Academic Integrity Policy, the University community affirms that it will not tolerate academic dishonesty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor Code</td>
<td>Included. Consists of the Introduction, Definitions, Description of process, Pledge, and Signature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pledge</td>
<td>I hereby affirm that I understand, accept, and will uphold the responsibilities and stipulations of the Eastern Kentucky University Honor Code and Academic Integrity Policy. Academic integrity is a fundamental value for the Eastern Kentucky University community of students, faculty, and staff. It should be clearly understood that academic dishonesty is not tolerated and incidents of it will have serious consequences. Anyone who knowingly assists in any form of academic dishonesty shall be considered as responsible as the student who accepts such assistance and shall be subject to the same sanctions. Academic dishonesty can occur in different forms, some of which include cheating, plagiarism, and fabrication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Cheating is an act or an attempted act of deception by which a student seeks to misrepresent that he/she has mastered information on an academic exercise. Cheating includes, but is not limited to:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
academic standing. During examinations or in-class work, it includes receiving information from others and referring to unauthorized notes or other written information. In addition, copying from others, either during examinations or in the preparation of homework assignments, is a form of cheating.

Definition - Fabrication

Not included

Definition - Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the act of presenting ideas, words, or organization of a source (published or not) as if they were one’s own, without acknowledgement of the source. Since university instructors assume material presented by students is their own otherwise indicated, all quoted material must be in quotation marks, all paraphrases, quotations, significant ideas, and organization must be acknowledged by footnotes or by some other form of documentation acceptable by the instructor for the course. Plagiarism also includes presenting material, which was composed or revised by any person other than the student who submits it as well as the deliberate falsification of footnotes. The use of the term “material” refers to work in any form including written, oral, or electronic (as in the case of computer files).

Definition - Co-Responsibility

Anyone who knowingly assists in any form of academic dishonesty shall be considered as guilty as the student who accepts such assistance. Students giving or receiving assistance not authorized by the instructor or University representative; Participating in unauthorized collaboration on an academic exercise; Using unapproved or misusing electronic devices or aids during an academic exercise.

Fabrication is a form of deception and occurs when a student misrepresents written or verbal information in an academic exercise. Fabrication includes, but is not limited to: Citation of information not taken from the source indicated. This may include the incorrect documentation of secondary source materials; Listing sources in a bibliography not directly used in the academic exercise; Submission in a paper, thesis, lab report, practicum log, or other academic exercise of falsified, invented, or fictitious data or evidence, or deliberate and knowing concealment or distortion of the true nature, origin, or function of such data or evidence; Submitting as your own any academic exercise (verbal, written, electronic, or artistic work) prepared totally or in part by another person.

Plagiarism occurs when a student represents work taken from another source as his/her own. It is imperative that a student gives credit to information, words, ideas, and images that are integrated into his/her own work. Acknowledgement of a source of information in any form should consist of complete, accurate, and specific references and, if verbatim statements are included, quotation marks as well. Examples of plagiarism include, but are not limited to: Using words, ideas, or images from another source (including the Internet); whether in quotation marks or not, without giving credit to that source in the form of a bibliographic citation; Using facts, statistics, or other supporting materials that are not clearly common knowledge without acknowledgment of the source.

(Preamble) Anyone who knowingly assists in any form of academic dishonesty shall be considered as responsible as the student who accepts such assistance and shall be subject to the
Faculty confronts student as soon as possible.

Grade appeals wait until end of semester after grade is given.

Computers should not be used to acquire or provide information in conflict with the academic honesty policy. Furthermore, the Code of Ethics for Computing and Communications makes it the responsibility of computer users to keep information, data, and programs in their computer accounts secure from others.

Institutional Procedures:
Timing
Faculty confronts student as soon as possible. Grade appeals wait until end of semester after grade is given.

Violations Reported
Not centralized. Three options:
1) Report violations to Chair then Dean then Registrar; 2) report violations to Student Disciplinary Council; 3) report violations to department Academic Practices Comm.

Centralization of Info Reported
Not included

Peer Advisor
Not included

Disciplinary Process
4 options: 1) The instructor may assign a failing grade for the assignment; 2) the instructor may assign a failing grade for the course, in which case the instructor shall notify the chair of the department, the dean of the college in which the course is offered, the dean of the college of the student's major, the Dean of the Graduate School if appropriate, and the Registrar; 3) The instructor may refer the matter to the departmental committee on academic practices for consideration and possible referral to the Student Disciplinary Council; 4) If the student is assigned a grade of "F" and the instructor thinks the matter is serious enough, the instructor may submit the case to
the departmental committee on academic practices with the recommendation that the student, if otherwise eligible, not be permitted to graduate with honors. This recommendation shall be made no later than the date on which the faculty member submits to the Registrar the grade report on which the “F” for plagiarism or cheating is assigned. At the time of the recommendation is submitted to the academic practices committee, the Registrar shall be informed that the recommendation has been submitted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplinary Sanctions</th>
<th>Fail assignment, fail course, not graduate with honors, not allowed to drop or withdraw from course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Sanctions</td>
<td>Fail assignment, fail course, not allowed to withdraw from class, “XF” notation for course, removal from course, educational sanctions, community service, restriction of computer use, precluded from graduating with Honors, suspension, expulsion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Disciplinary Council</td>
<td>Included. Appeal from Council to Vice President of Student Affairs to President to Board of Regents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per KRS 164.370, this Council is the only body authorized to suspend or expel a student.</td>
<td>Included. Appeal from Council to Provost to President of Regents. Per KRS 164.370, this Council is the only body authorized to suspend or expel a student.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additions to proposed policy not included in the present policy:
1) Honor Code
2) Honor Code Pledge
3) Peer Advisor
4) Silent Advisor
5) Educational components for sanctions
6) Centralized reporting of alleged academic integrity violations
7) Change in appeal process from Student Disciplinary Council
The following steps will ONLY be necessary if it is determined that the student may face the sanctions of suspension or expulsion for the alleged AI Policy violation. According to KRS 164.370, Eastern Kentucky University's Student Disciplinary Council is the only body authorized to suspend or expel a student.
Eastern Kentucky University

Academic Integrity Policy
(EKU Honor Code and Pledge)

Preamble

Eastern Kentucky University is a community of shared academic values, foremost of which is a strong commitment to intellectual honesty, honorable conduct, and respect for others. In order to meet these values, students at Eastern Kentucky University are expected to adhere to the highest standards of academic integrity. These standards are embodied in the Eastern Kentucky University Academic Integrity Policy, which all students shall pledge to uphold by signing the Eastern Kentucky University Honor Code. By honoring and enforcing this Academic Integrity Policy, the University community affirms that it will not tolerate academic dishonesty.

Academic Dishonesty Defined

Academic integrity is a fundamental value for the Eastern Kentucky University community of students, faculty, and staff. It should be clearly understood that academic dishonesty is not tolerated and incidents of it will have serious consequences. Anyone who knowingly assists in any form of academic dishonesty shall be considered as responsible as the student who accepts such assistance and shall be subject to the same sanctions. Academic dishonesty can occur in different forms, some of which include cheating, plagiarism, and fabrication.

Cheating

Cheating is an act or an attempted act of deception by which a student seeks to misrepresent that he/she has mastered information on an academic exercise. Cheating includes, but is not limited to:

- Giving or receiving assistance not authorized by the instructor or University representative;
- Participating in unauthorized collaboration on an academic exercise;
- Using unapproved or misusing electronic devices or aids during an academic exercise.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism occurs when a student represents work taken from another source as his/her own. It is imperative that a student gives credit to information, words, ideas, and images that are integrated into his/her own work. Acknowledgement of a source of information in any form should consist of complete, accurate, and specific references and, if verbatim statements are included, quotation marks as well. Examples of plagiarism include, but are not limited to:

- Using words, ideas, or images from another source (including the Internet): whether in quotation marks or not, without giving credit to that source in the form of a bibliographic citation;
- Using facts, statistics, or other supporting materials that are not clearly common knowledge without acknowledgment of the source.

Fabrication

Fabrication is a form of deception and occurs when a student misrepresents written or verbal information in an academic exercise. Fabrication includes, but is not limited to:

- Citation of information not taken from the source indicated. This may include the incorrect documentation of secondary source materials;
- Listing sources in a bibliography not directly used in the academic exercise;
- Submission in a paper, thesis, lab report, practicum log, or other academic exercise of falsified, invented, or fictitious data or evidence, or deliberate and
knowing concealment or distortion of the true nature, origin, or function of such data or evidence;

B Submitting as your own any academic exercise (verbal, written, electronic, or artistic work) prepared totally or in part by another person.

Pledge

AI hereby affirm that I understand, accept, and will uphold the responsibilities and stipulations of the Eastern Kentucky University Honor Code and Academic Integrity Policy.
### Eastern Kentucky University's Academic Integrity Policy
Comparison of Present Policy With Revised Academic Integrity Policy and Honor Code (Fall 2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present Policy</th>
<th>Proposed Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td>EKU Academic Honesty Policy</td>
<td>EKU Academic Integrity Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preamble</strong></td>
<td>Not included</td>
<td>EKU Academic Integrity Policy is a community of shared academic values, foremost of which is a strong commitment to intellectual honesty, honorable conduct, and respect for others. In order to meet these values, students at Eastern Kentucky University are expected to adhere to the highest standards of academic integrity. These standards are embodied in the Eastern Kentucky University Academic Integrity Policy, which all students shall pledge to uphold by signing the Eastern Kentucky University Honor Code. By honoring and enforcing this Academic Integrity Policy, the University community affirms that it will not tolerate academic dishonesty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Honor Code</strong></td>
<td>Not included</td>
<td>Included. Consists of the Introduction, Definitions, Description of process, Pledge, and Signature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pledge</strong></td>
<td>Not included</td>
<td>I hereby affirm that I understand, accept, and will uphold the responsibilities and stipulations of the Eastern Kentucky University Honor Code and Academic Integrity Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td>Eastern Kentucky University faculty and students are bonded by principles of truth and honesty which are recognized as fundamental for a community of teachers and scholars. The University expects that the students will honor and that faculty will honor and enforce these principles, which contribute to a foundation upon which a quality of education can be built. With this premise, the University affirms that it will not tolerate academic dishonesty.</td>
<td>Academic integrity is a fundamental value for the Eastern Kentucky University community of students, faculty, and staff. It should be clearly understood that academic dishonesty is not tolerated and incidents of it will have serious consequences. Anyone who knowingly assists in any form of academic dishonesty shall be considered responsible as the student who accepts such assistance and shall be subject to the same sanctions. Academic dishonesty can occur in different forms, some of which include cheating, plagiarism, and fabrication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition - Cheating</strong></td>
<td>Cheating includes buying, stealing, otherwise fraudulently obtaining copies of examinations or assignments for the purpose of improving one's</td>
<td>Cheating is an act or an attempted act of deception by which a student seeks to misrepresent that he/she has mastered information on an academic exercise. Cheating includes, but is not limited to:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Giving or receiving assistance not authorized by the instructor or University representative; Participating in unauthorized collaboration on an academic exercise; Using unapproved or misusing electronic devices or aids during an academic exercise.

**Definition - Fabrication**  
Fabrication is a form of deception and occurs when a student misrepresents written or verbal information in an academic exercise. Fabrication includes, but is not limited to: Citation of information not taken from the source indicated. This may include the incorrect documentation of secondary source materials; Listing sources in a bibliography not directly used in the academic exercise; Submission in a paper, thesis, lab report, practicum log, or other academic exercise of falsified, invented, or fictitious data or evidence; or deliberate and knowing concealment or distortion of the true nature, origin, or function of such data or evidence.

**Definition - Plagiarism**  
Plagiarism is the act of presenting ideas, words, or organization of a source (published or not) as if they were one's own, without acknowledgement of the source. Since university instructors assume material presented by students is their own otherwise indicated, all quoted material must be in quotation marks, all paraphrases, quotations, significant ideas, and organization must be acknowledged by footnotes or by some other form of documentation acceptable by the instructor for the course. Plagiarism also includes presenting material, which was composed or revised by any person other than the student who submits it as well as the deliberate falsification of footnotes. The use of the term “material” refers to work in any form including written, oral, or electronic (as in the case of computer files).

**Definition - Co-Responsibility**  
Anyone who knowingly assists in any form of academic dishonesty shall be considered as guilty as the student who accepts such assistance. Students (Preamble) Anyone who knowingly assists in any form of academic dishonesty shall be considered as responsible as the student who accepts such assistance and shall be subject to the
### Computer Code of Ethics

Computers should not be used to acquire or provide information in conflict with the academic honesty policy. Furthermore, the Code of Ethics for Computing and Communications makes it the responsibility of computer users to keep information, data, and programs in their computer accounts secure from others.

### Institutional Procedures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Faculty confronts student as soon as possible. Process begins immediately.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violations Reported</td>
<td>Two options: 1) Faculty meets with student who accepts responsibility or violation, then referred to AI Coordinator. 2) Violations referred immediately to AI Coordinator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralization of Info Reported</td>
<td>Included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Advisor Disciplinary Process</td>
<td>Included. Student at EKU. Permits in Steps 3 through 10.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Disciplinary Process

4 options: 1) The instructor may assign a failing grade for the assignment; 2) the instructor may assign a failing grade for the course, in which case the instructor shall notify the chair of the department, the dean of the college in which the course is offered, the dean of the college of the student's major, the Dean of the Graduate School if appropriate, and the Registrar; 3) The instructor may refer the matter to the departmental committee on academic practices for consideration and possible referral to the Student Disciplinary Council; 4) If the student is assigned a grade of "F" and the instructor thinks the matter is serious enough, the instructor may submit the case to
the departmental committee on academic practices with the recommendation that the student, if otherwise eligible, not be permitted to graduate with honors. This recommendation shall be made no later than the date on which the faculty member submits to the Registrar the grade report on which the “F” for plagiarism or cheating is assigned. At the time of the recommendation is submitted to the academic practices committee, the Registrar shall be informed that the recommendation has been submitted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplinary Sanctions</th>
<th>Fail assignment, fail course, not graduate with honors, not allowed to drop or withdraw from course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Sanctions</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Disciplinary Council</td>
<td>Included. Appeal from Council to Vice President of Student Affairs to President to Board of Regents. Per KRS 164.370, this Council is the only body authorized to suspend or expel a student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Included. Appeal from Council to Provost to President to Board of Regents. Per KRS 164.370, this Council is the only body authorized to suspend or expel a student.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additions to proposed policy not included in the present policy:**

1) Honor Code
2) Honor Code Pledge
3) Peer Advisor
4) Silent Advisor
5) Educational components for sanctions
6) Centralized reporting of alleged academic integrity violations
7) Change in appeal process from Student Disciplinary Council
Shearon then moved the adoption of the following statement: "The resale of complimentary examination copies of textbooks is unethical and unprofessional. Furthermore, the activities of textbook solicitors are prohibited, by present administrative policy, on the campus of Eastern Kentucky University." Senator Duncan seconded the motion. Chair LeVan then clarified the present policy for the Senate and noted that it was permissible for solicitors to be on campus by invitation only. After considerable discussion, the motion was approved.

Committee on Legislation:

Senator Wright reported that the Committee held its last formal meeting of the year on April 12, 1989. Dr. Gary Cox and his chief financial aide met with them for several hours discussing the funding formula and proposed changes. Senator Wright felt the committee would need to pay close attention to the fiscal bills as they are referred for the next meeting of the legislature.

Committee on the Rules:

Report presented by Senator Kopacz.

OLD BUSINESS

As nominations for Senate Chair were in order, Senator Rowlett moved suspension of the rules, which was seconded by Senator Falk and approved. Senators Heberle, Willis and Duncan were nominated to fill the Senate Chair vacancy. Senator Jennings moved the nominations cease. Senator Falk seconded and motion was approved.

NEW BUSINESS

Senator Pfotenhauer presented and moved adoption of the following motion from the Executive Committee: "That Faculty/Staff Handbook clarify the procedures of the Faculty Senate by footnoting the sentence which states that the nominations for Senate Chair are to be made at the April meeting of the Senate with the election of Senate Chair to occur at the May meeting of the Senate. The statement should indicate that the election is to be held at the Organizational Meeting of the new Senate." The motion was seconded by Senator Duncan and approved.

Report from the Council on Academic Affairs

Senator Rowlett, seconded by Senator Henson, moved approval of the proposals from the College of Education (See Exhibit III). Motion approved.

Senator Rowlett, seconded by Senator Long, moved approval of the proposals from the Department of Music (Exhibit IV). Motion approved.

Senator Rowlett, seconded by Senator Falk, moved approval of proposed additions to "Recourse for the Student in the Event of Institutional Failure" (page 75 of the Faculty/Staff Handbook) and to "Additional Recourse in the Event of Student Failure" of the Academic Dishonesty Policy (page 77 of the Faculty/Staff Handbook (See Exhibit V). Following clarification, the proposals were approved.

At 4:15, the Senate recessed for fifteen minutes in order for the newly elected Senators to take their seats.

The Senate reconvened at 4:30 with the first order of business being the election of a new Senate Chair.
Proposed Additions to **Recourse for the Student in the Event of Institutional Failure**
(Page 75 of the Faculty/Staff Handbook)
[Additions appear in boldface type]

B. If, after conferring with the instructor, the student feels that a grievance exists, the student may present a complain in writing outlining the basis for the grievance to the department chair within thirty (30) days after the beginning of the next semester. . . .

C. If the grievance remains unsettled, the department chair shall, as soon as practicable, refer the matter to the standing department committee on academic affairs. . . . This decision should be made by mid-semester.

Academic Practices

Meetings of the (departmental academic affairs) committee shall be scheduled at a mutually-agreed upon time, when all all relevant parties can reasonably be expected to participate. A student who has agreed to a time for a meeting of a departmental academic practices committee and who does not appear at that meeting may forfeit the right to present evidence beyond that furnished in the original letter of appeal.

Appeals from the Committee's decision are to be made within twenty (20) days following notification of the departmental committee decision, through administrative channels, and only on procedural grounds.

Proposed Additions to **Additional Recourse in the Event of Student Failure**
Academic Dishonesty Policy
(Page 77 of the Faculty/Staff Handbook)
[Additions appear in boldface type]

The student may appeal the instructor's sanction by requesting, in writing, that the chair of the department call the department's committee on academic practices to hear the case. Such an appeal must be filed in writing within twenty (20) days following notification of the instructor's sanction, and shall outline the basis for the appeal.

Academic Practices

Meetings of the (departmental academic affairs) committee shall be scheduled at a mutually-agreed upon time, when all all relevant parties can reasonably be expected to participate. A student who has agreed to a time for a meeting of a departmental academic practices committee and who does not appear at that meeting may forfeit the right to present evidence beyond that furnished in the original letter of appeal.

Any further appeal by the student must be on procedural grounds only and shall be addressed to the dean of the college in which the course is offered. The instructor may appeal the decision of the the department's committee on academic practices on procedural grounds only, and the appeal shall be addressed to the dean of the college.

**Appeal of a (departmental) academic practices committee decision**, either by a student or a faculty member, must be filed within twenty (20) days following notification of the departmental committee's decision.

. . .

Any additional appeal shall be based on procedural grounds only and shall be addressed to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research. **Appeal of a college level decision must be filed within fifteen (15) days following notification of the decision.**