



Eastern Kentucky University Policy and Regulation Library

4.1.3

Volume 4, Academic Affairs
Chapter 1, Academic Practices
Section 3, Academic Integrity
Approval Authority: Board of Regents
Responsible Executive: Provost
Responsible Office(s): Student Conduct and
Community Standards
Effective: February 22, 2019
Last Revised: February 22, 2019
Issued: June 12, 2006
Next Review Date: Spring 2027

Academic Integrity

Policy Statement

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 and the Student Code of Conduct. 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 a complainant's allegation that some form of academic dishonesty has in fact occurred.

Academic dishonesty can occur in different forms, some of which include cheating, plagiarism, and fabrication. The University treats all instances of academic dishonesty seriously.

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.

Entities Affected

- Colleges
- Departments
- Faculty
- Students

Procedures

Signing the Eastern Kentucky University Academic Integrity Pledge

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 Academic Integrity policy.

Procedures for Dealing with Academic Integrity Cases

Step 1

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 to the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards (SCCS) or to a faculty/staff member. If a faculty/staff member receives a report of an alleged academic integrity violation, they shall notify the SCCS Office. The SCCS Office is responsible for notifying the affected responsible faculty/staff member and the appropriate Department Chair/Unit Head of the alleged violations reported to the SCCS Office.

The responsible faculty/staff member may elect to conduct their own review of the allegations (Option A) or may elect for the matter to be referred to the SCCS Office (Option B). Prior to selecting either option, the faculty/staff member should contact the SCCS office to determine if the student has a prior violation.

If a final grade is to be reported to the University before the academic integrity procedures are completed, 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 SCCS Office. The faculty/staff member must request information from the SCCS Office regarding the student’s previous violations of the AI Policy prior to determining a sanction in this particular case.

- Following receipt of information from the SCCS Office, the faculty/staff member 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. The responsible Faculty/staff

member is encouraged to meet with the student and discuss the allegation and the policy. If the student accepts responsibility for the violation and the sanction in writing, the case is closed. There is no appeal of this decision. Upon determination of responsibility, the SCCS Office 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 faculty/staff member will refer the case to the SCCS Office, within five academic days of the meeting. The SCCS Office will meet with the student to discuss the charge and/or sanctions and the right to contest these. If the student accepts responsibility for the violation and the sanction, the case is closed. There is no appeal from this decision. Notification of the violation is made by the SCCS Office into the database for recordkeeping. If the student contests the allegation and/or sanction, the SCCS 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 SCCS Office

- If a faculty/staff member chooses to refer the case directly to the SCCS Office, the faculty/staff member will send all information concerning the matter to the SCCS Office and the SCCS Office will meet with the student to discuss the alleged violation. If the student accepts responsibility for the violation and the 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 SCCS 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

A minimum of 4 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.

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 SCCS Office 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 information not available for the first hearing, or punishment not consistent with the violation. The student will notify, in writing, the SCCS 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

A minimum of 4 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.

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 response including sanction, refer the case back to the College AI Committee, or uphold the decision. The Chair will announce the decision of the committee, within five academic days, after the close of the hearing.

The decision of the University AI Committee is final and can only be appealed if the sanction is suspension, expulsion, or "FX" grade

Step 5

Appealing the Decision of the University Academic Integrity Committee

If the student chooses to contest the sanction of expulsion, suspension, or "FX" grade, 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 University AI Committee's decision. An appeal to the Provost can only be based upon irregularities in procedure, new information 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 6

Appealing the Decision of the Provost

If the Provost upholds the sanction imposed by the University AI Committee I, and if the student chooses to further contest the sanction, the student can appeal to the Board of Regents. The student will notify, in writing, the SCCS 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 SCCS Office will submit the appeal to the Board secretary. An appeal to the Board of Regents can only be based upon irregularities in procedure, new information not available at the first hearing, or punishment not consistent with the violation; the decision of the Board of Regents is final.

Definitions

- **Academic Day:** In this document, academic 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.
- **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 (2 faculty from the department where the incident arose, 1 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. The student members and a student alternate, who shall serve if one of the student members is not available or if there is a conflict of interest, shall be selected by a procedure determined by the college.
- **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 information or deliberate and knowing concealment or distortion of the true nature origin or function of such data or information
- Submitting as your own any academic exercise (verbal, written, electronic, or artistic work) prepared totally or in part by another person
- **“FX” Notation Plagiarism:** “FX” grade denotes failure in the course due to academic dishonesty. 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 a silent advisor present, who may be an attorney, student, friend, etc., at any proceedings at step 2 and step 4. The silent advisor is not permitted to speak in any hearing through this process.
- **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 pool is comprised of thirteen members: 2 members nominated from each college and 1 student. The college members shall constitute a pool from which to select the sitting committee for an appeal. The student member and a student alternate, who shall serve if the student member is not available or if there is a conflict of interest, shall be nominated by the Student Government Association Members, except for the student member, shall serve two year, staggered terms. The Chair of the committee shall be elected by the Committee membership. Information

Responsibilities

- 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.
- 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.
- Student Conduct and Community Standards Office
 - Student Conduct and Community Standards Office is responsible for maintaining all records of all incidents involving the ECU AI policy.
- University Academic Integrity Committee
 - The Committee is responsible for hearing appeals from the College AI Committee of AI policy

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. **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**

“F” for the Course:

A student given a sanction of an “F” for the course will not be permitted to drop or withdraw from the course.

"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 University Academic Integrity Committee. 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

Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

Statutory or Regulatory References

KRS 164.370

Review and Approval

Policy Revised

<u>DATE</u>	<u>ENTITY</u>	<u>ACTION</u>
June 22, 2019	Board of Regents	Adopted
October 24, 2018	President	Approved
October 3, 2018	Provost Council	Approved
May 7, 2018	Faculty Senate	Approved
May 6, 2013	Executive Assistant to the Provost	Editorial Revision
June 11, 2012	Board of Regents	Adopted
May 14, 2012	President	Approved
April 4, 2012	Provost Council	Approved
February 7, 2011	Faculty Senate	Approved
January 20, 2011	Council on Academic Affairs	Approved

Policy Issued

<u>DATE</u>	<u>ENTITY</u>	<u>ACTION</u>
June 12, 2006	Board of Regents	Adopted
December 5, 2005	Faculty Senate	Approved
May 1, 1989	Faculty Senate	Approved as Academic Dishonesty