

**Faculty Senate Minutes
September 5, 2006**

The meeting was called to order at 4:15 p.m. All departments were in attendance.

I. Minutes of the June 20, 2006 meeting

A comment was made regarding the FORL proposal specifying a grade of B- or better when graduate students do not have a +/- grading scheme. GCPRC will address this issue with no need to return the item to Senate.

The minutes of the June 20, 2006 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as written.

II. Report of the Faculty Senate Chairperson

Dr. Börger-Greco welcomed Senators back to the new academic year. She reported that the Council of Trustees has extended Dr. McNairy's appointment for an additional three years. Dr. Börger-Greco also reminded Senators of the responsibility of electing four faculty members to serve on the Educator of the Year Selection committee as established last year. She also noted that GERC has requested scheduling of a special Senate meeting on the 5th Tuesday of October to discuss Gen Ed issues.

A DeCaria/Warmkessel motion to schedule a special Senate meeting on October 31, 2006 to discuss Gen Ed issues was approved without dissent.

III. Report of the Student Senate President

Student Senate President Andrew Moyer indicated that the Student Senate held elections at its first meeting and is looking forward to a strong year. He noted that they plan to collaborate with many on-campus organizations.

IV. Report of the Graduate Student Organization

None

V. Report of the Administrative Officers

President McNairy

President McNairy welcomed the Senate back and reminded Senators of the annual Garden Party this Friday. She reported that fall enrollments are solid but with slightly fewer graduate students. Dr. McNairy then introduced the new Executive Assistant to the President, Dr. James McCollum. She also expressed gratitude for faculty members who

participated in new student orientation events. She then asked Dr. Bob Thomas to address two recent incidents involving MU students.

Vice-President for Student Affairs Thomas

Vice-President for Student Affairs Thomas shared that an online source recently reported that an MU student was charged with aggravated assault, biased crime and possession of a weapon in relation to a summer altercation with off-duty police in Sea Isle, NJ. He indicated that the school is awaiting confirmation of details regarding this situation that would determine what action might be taken by MU against the student. Dr. Thomas then reported on an incident that occurred on campus Friday night at a dance party in the SMC. A fight erupted that resulted in an injury to a university police officer who responded to the situation. Investigations are underway to gather information that will be used in holding responsible students accountable for any violations of the law or the MU Student Code of Conduct.

Dr. Thomas also echoed appreciation of faculty members who participated in both summer orientation and opening weekend activities that help students in their transition to the MU community. He noted that many students will be involved in the Day of Caring sponsored by United Way this Saturday.

Provost Prabhu

Provost Prabhu welcomed Senators and commented that he will be returning to Senate this fall with a number of issues for consideration. He then introduced the new Associate Provost for Academic Administration, Dr. Thomas Burns.

Interim Assistant Provost Redmond

Interim Assistant Provost for Academic Services Redmond welcomed Senators and also offered his appreciation for faculty members assisting with summer orientation and fall convocation.

A question was addressed to all administrators regarding the standard course of action taken when students or parents contact the President's Office or the Office of the Provost with an academic issue. It was noted that some students seem to see this as a way to expedite a resolution in their favor. Dr. McNairy responded that the President's Office takes only initial information and refers the issue to the Office of the Provost to be forwarded to the appropriate level. She noted that the President's Office does not resolve academic matters and encourages students to address any issue at the appropriate level. Dr. McNairy stressed that faculty members should not feel pressured to go against their established academic standards and policies but indicated that, in some cases, more thoroughly explaining policies to the student may help resolve a situation.

Dr. Prabhu responded that further information is gathered from persons referred to the Office of the Provost from the President's Office, and the issue is then passed to the appropriate Dean's Office. The Dean then makes the direct contact with the student, faculty member or department chair. He noted this approach is meant to avoid making faculty members feel intimidated by involvement of the Provost. Dr. Prabhu indicated that most issues are adequately resolved in this manner, but if they are not, his office will check into where the issue stands. He did highlight the fact that FERPA regulations stipulate that student information cannot be discussed with parents. Dr. Prabhu commented that he supports the established policies and recognizes the importance of getting students to deal directly with their professors. It was noted that across campus we should be encouraging students to use proper channels to address academic issues, beginning with their professors.

VI. Reports of the Faculty Senate Standing Committees

UCPRC

In response to the overwhelming number of curriculum items brought to UCPRC and Senate at the very end of last year, Dr. White distributed a proposed timeline for the process during the 2006-2007 year [see Attachment #1]. The schedule is based on the UCPRC guidelines for Preparation and Approval of Proposals. It was suggested that this timeline could be converted to relative dates for use in future years as well. Although, concrete dates are certainly helpful for faculty members trying to meet these deadlines.

A question was raised about whether this was a recommendation or a policy. It was noted that there might be unique situations requiring an extension but that most new proposals are expected to meet the proposed timeframe. Dr. Prabhu noted that last-minute considerations of curriculum proposals also affect review by Dean's Council, incorporation into the registration system and the ability to adequately communicate changes to students. Discussion continued regarding the options for expediting the course approval process. One idea was that higher committees could begin their review of proposals while waiting for a final approval from the preceding committee. This has occurred previously but requires careful communication. Another concept that had been considered before was to implement some sort of online tracking system to monitor the progress of individual proposals. However, it was noted that the faculty proposing the course already has the responsibility to guide it through the various steps. Dr. McNairy suggested that a student might undertake a research project analyzing the process to create an appreciation for the typical timeframe and to identify places where efficiency might be improved. Dr. White noted that delays can be minimized if proposers respond quickly to requests for information or clarification from curriculum committees.

Academic Outcomes

Dr. White encouraged Senators to attend the upcoming luncheon focused specifically on General Education assessment to be held on Thursday, September 28.

GCPRC

Dr. Mowrey distributed a proposal to reduce the number of allowed graduate transfer credits from 12 to 9. [See Attachment #2] She noted that rolling admission for graduate students has reduced the need to transfer in credits taken at Millersville while waiting for admission. She also pointed out that two recently approved MU graduate programs, MSW and MSEM, have a 9-credit cap, following national trends.

VII. Reports of the Faculty Senate Special Committees

Honor Code Committee

Dr. Kathy Schreiber brought a report from the Honor Code Committee indicating that development of an Academic Honor Code at Millersville is both feasible and advisable. [see Attachment #3] She reviewed a summary document for Senators [see Attachment #4] and indicated that adoption of an honor code can result in a reduction in academic dishonesty when students are educated about the policies and strong sanctions are enforced. Dr. Schreiber pointed out that APSCUF requires that faculty members have options regarding how to address cases of academic honesty in their classes. She will return to Senate at the next meeting to answer questions about the recommendation. If approved by Senate, the proposal would be considered by the whole faculty for adoption.

VIII. Proposed Courses and Programs

UCPRC

First Readings

None

Second Readings

(1) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

ESCI, BS Oceanography. Proposal to rename to BS Ocean Sciences and Coastal Studies and revise options.

Dr. Yin Soong and Dr. Andrew Muller were in attendance to address questions raised regarding pre-requisites for this proposal. They noted that appropriate changes to the pre-requisites have been approved by Dean Shane. A DeCaria/Luek motion to approve the revised proposal to rename to BS Ocean Sciences and Coastal Studies and revise options was approved without dissent.

(2) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

BIOL 360: Histology, 4 credits. Proposal to create course to study cellular architecture and cell and tissue function in mammalian systems was approved without dissent.

(3) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

WSSD 390: Athletic Training Techniques with Surface Anatomy, 3 credits. Proposal to create course to introduce fundamental principles and basic techniques used by Certified Athletic Trainers was approved without dissent.

IX. Faculty Emeritus

None

X. Committee Elections

Nominations were accepted for open Senate committee positions. Concern was raised regarding the fact that no general call for nominations was made until today, but it was noted that elections are always held at the first meeting of the fall semester.

An Igyor/Wismer motion to close nominations was approved without dissent.

A Mowrey/Luek motion to unanimously elect all unopposed candidates was approved without dissent.

XI. Other/New Business

None

Meeting was adjourned after voting was completed.

Respectfully Submitted,

Aimee L. Miller
Secretary of the Senate

Action Summary:

A DeCaria/Warmkessel motion to schedule a special Senate meeting on October 31, 2006 to discuss Gen Ed was approved without dissent.

A DeCaria/Luek motion to approve the revised proposal to rename to BS Ocean Sciences and Coastal Studies and revise options was approved without dissent.

An Igyor/Wismer motion to close nominations was approved without dissent.

A Mowrey/Luek motion to unanimously elect all unopposed candidates was approved without dissent.

Attachment #1

To: University Faculty
From: Janet A. White: Chair, Undergraduate Course and Program Review Committee (UCPRC)
Re: Meeting schedule and deadlines for proposals, 2006-2007

As indicated in the guidelines for Preparation and Approval of Proposals:

“Proposers need to initiate proposals early enough to make sure they are completely approved in time to be included in the schedule of courses for a given semester. (1) The last step in the approval process-approval by the Provost-can occur no later than the very beginning of the semester before the course is scheduled to be offered. Courses that have not been approved by the Provost will not be printed in the published schedule of classes. (2) In turn, this means that recommendation for approval by Faculty Senate must be complete by the end of the previous semester. Proposals are considered for approval by Faculty Senate the meeting after they are presented (or placed on the agenda). (3) Therefore, courses must receive recommendation for approval by UCPRC or GCPRC, no later than one month before the end of the semester. UCPRC or GCPRC has the same procedure as does Senate, to consider for approval the meeting after a course is presented. (4) This means that a course must pass divisional curriculum committee no later than two months before the end of that semester.”

In order to help this year’s proposal process go smoothly and to meet the schedule of the Senate, please see the following schedule of meetings for the 2006-2007 year.

Special Note: ALL course and program proposals that are intended to be in place for the Fall 2007 semester must follow the timeframe indicated below.

- Presentation to UCPRC no later than March 27 (vote to occur: April 10).
- If approved by UCPRC,
 - 1st reading at Senate no later than April 17.
 - 2nd reading and vote at Senate no later than May 1.
- If not approved by UCPRC by April 10, the course or program proposal will not be able to be put into place for the Fall 2007 semester.

UCPRC Meeting Calendar 2006-2007

2nd and 4th Tuesdays, 4:00-5:30 (Wickersham Hall)

September 26 (consideration of DL only)

October 10

October 24

November 14

November 28

January 23

January 30 (if needed)

February 13

February 27

March 27* (deadline to allow for Senate approval by May 1)

April 10

April 24

Attachment #2

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 1, 2006

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Rebecca J. Mowrey, GCPRC Chairperson

RE: Transfer of Credit Policy for Graduate Students

Millersville University's Current Transfer of Credit Policy for graduate students (page 21 of the Graduate Catalog)

“Transfer credit may amount to a maximum of twelve credit hours from other accredited institutions, subject to completion of the residency requirement, and is subject to the time limit for the completion of all degree requirements. Except in the most extenuating circumstances, no transfer credit will be allowed for work completed more than five years prior to admission to Millersville University.”

The proposed policy:

“Transfer credit may amount to a maximum of ~~twelve~~ *nine* credit hours from other accredited institutions, subject to completion of the residency requirement, and is subject to the time limit for the completion of all degree requirements. Except in the most extenuating circumstances, no transfer credit will be allowed for work completed more than five years prior to admission to Millersville University.”

The Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Honor Code Committee Recommendation on the Development of an Academic Honor Code at Millersville University

The Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Honor Code Committee (HCC) was created in late spring 2000 with the charge of determining the feasibility and advisability of introducing an academic honor code system at Millersville University (MU). An initial report of the findings was presented to faculty senate in spring 2002, and included a recommendation for the development of an MU honor code and its associated policy elements. The present document is a modification of that original report and addresses expressed senate concern on issues of overlap with the *Student Code of Conduct*, potential conflicts with APSCUF recommendations on faculty freedom in the classroom, and the severity of sanctions for violations of the honor system.

Since its initiation, the HCC has encouraged the campus to consider how the university community might best address academic integrity. Toward this end, the HCC has conducted a faculty forum on options toward academic integrity, surveyed both students and faculty, and organized a convocation centered around issues of academic integrity. Using the feedback from these initiatives, and the existent literature and resources on college academic integrity, the HCC finds:

- A. The introduction of a new academic honor system to an already-existing institution of higher education is feasible, and would be feasible at Millersville University.** Elements of honor systems have been successfully introduced to a number of schools in recent years, including University of Maryland at College Park, University of Tennessee, University of Georgia, University of Minnesota, and Kansas State University.¹ Kansas State, like many other colleges, supports their newly instituted honor code system with a well-developed web site which allows students and faculty to quickly and easily access all information related to the program online. The success of this program may be partially assessed by viewing the extensive web site (<http://www.ksu.edu/honor/>).

We believe an honor system would work for MU. However, institution of such a program should not be taken lightly and needs substantial support and commitment from the faculty, administration, and students. The HCC believes, given adequate campus commitment, resources, and training, the MU community could effectively develop and institute an honor system.

- B. The implementation of an academic honor code system at MU is advisable.** Specifically, the HCC recommends development of an honor code system which has the following key elements:
1. required signing of the MU Honor Pledge upon admission to the university and/or at new student orientation,
 2. signing of an academic honesty statement on submitted course work at the option of the course instructor,
 3. a judiciary composed of both students and faculty for adjudication of alleged student dishonesty, and
 4. the creation of an Academic Honor Council, consisting of both students and faculty, which would among other things promote a culture of academic integrity on campus through education, motivational programs, and a system of sanctions for violations of academic honesty.

HCC supports an academic honor system either with or without required student reporting of observed violations of the honor code. The committee believes that a system which is representative of the majority of opinions of faculty members on required student reporting will best serve the interests of the university. The

committee therefore leaves it to the university community to determine whether student reporting should be optional or required.

Full details of the proposed program are outlined in the attached *Proposed Millersville University Academic Honor System Constitution and By-Laws*. These **recommended** elements of the proposed academic honor system are subject to faculty discussion and approval. ***It is essential that MU develop the system which best reflects the ideals of the faculty and students. Revision of these recommendations may be in order to best meet the needs of the university community.***

The HCC believes that the benefits of an honor code system would be substantial and sustained for the following reasons:

1. Significantly fewer cases of cheating are believed to occur on campuses with honor codes^{2,3}, probably because of the culture of mutual trust and respect that develops between faculty and students^{4,5}, and the clarification of expectations and definitions of cheating behaviors. It therefore becomes less easy for the student to rationalize cheating behaviors³.
2. Greater consistency in addressing cases of academic dishonesty is likely to occur.
3. Students commonly take considerable pride in their code schools, and find a sense of prestige in having attended such an institution.
4. Having served on the student judiciary often advances career opportunities for students.
5. Honor code schools are highly respected by the local community, academia, and potential employers. Such prestige may be attractive to high-achieving prospective students.
6. Moral norms are more likely to operate within an honor code structure³. Furthermore, learned values may be carried away with students when they leave the university.
7. The greater discussion and awareness of the value of academic integrity promoted by the honor system supports key elements of General Education Objective 16: Personal, Ethical, and Civic Values and Decision-making.
8. The academic honor code system is consistent with that part of the university mission statement designed to "foster the examination, development and understanding of personal values and appreciation of values of others." The honor code system embodies MU community values and provides a means to foster them in our students.

Key to the success of any campus integrity program is the promotion of a culture of academic integrity which clearly and frequently communicates the value of and requirements for achieving academic honesty. This culture is promoted by 1) establishing clear guidelines toward academic integrity with frequent encouragement to know the rules, 2) providing an atmosphere which inspires students to value and practice academic honesty, 3) initiating open university dialog on honesty issues, 4) encouraging high student involvement in the integrity program, and 5) carefully monitoring dishonesty and taking offenses very seriously.⁶ Recognizing this need, the HCC recommends establishment of an MU Honor Council. This committee would function to oversee the honor system, promote education on academic integrity, and develop and maintain the culture of academic integrity that is so integral to the success of integrity programs.

This document has outlined the ingredients the HCC believes will lead to a successful academic integrity program at MU. These include the use of honor pledges, clear guidelines on how to achieve academic honesty, an active student role in the educational function of the Honor Council, and strong sanctions for violations of the honor code. Given the needed resources and campus commitment, the HCC is confident the proposed MU honor system can truly enhance the educational experience of our students.

REFERENCES*

¹D. McCabe and G. Pavela. 2000. Some Good News about Academic Integrity. *Change*. September/October: 32-38.

²Bowers, W.J. 1964. *Student dishonesty and its control in college*. New York Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University.

³McCabe, D.L., and Trevino, L.K. 1993. Academic dishonesty: Honor codes and other contextual influences. *Journal of Higher Education*. 64: 522-538.

⁴McCabe, D.L. and Drinan, P.F. 1999. Toward a culture of academic integrity. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. 46(8,Oct. 15):B7.

⁵Lowry, J.D. 1996. Communities of trust: A recent graduate's experience with honor codes. *Journal of College Science Teaching* 26(1): 6.

⁶McCabe, D.L., Trevino, L.K., and Butterfield K.D. 1999. Academic integrity in honor code and non-honor code environments. *The Journal of Higher Education*. 70(2): 211-234.

* A list of other works consulted is available upon request.

Past and Present Honor Code Committee Members

Thomas 'Chugger' Baker, Student
Eric Blazer, Business
Jane Bray, School of Education
Robert Buchanan, Mathematics
Jill Craven, English
Brandon Danz, Student
Barry David, Industry & Technology
Jessica George, Library
Carol Heintzelman, Social Work
Sandra Hoffman, Elem. & Early Childhood Education
John McLarnon, History
Jennifer Miller, Philosophy
Andre Moine, Foreign Language
James Mone, Biology
Elba Rohena, Special Education
Jane Rudden, Elem. & Early Childhood Education
Carol Phillips, Academic Affairs
Kathleen Schreiber, Geography, Chair

* *The MU Honor Code Committee would like to acknowledge and thank both Kansas State University and the New Jersey Institute of Technology for the permitted use of many ideas from their honor code constitutions in the development of this document.*

Proposed Millersville University Academic Honor System Constitution

ARTICLE I. PURPOSE AND ROLE OF THE ACADEMIC HONOR SYSTEM AND ACADEMIC HONOR COUNCIL

1. The Academic Honor System is designed to promote an environment of academic honesty at Millersville University by 1) educating the academic community on the value of academic integrity, and means by which it may be achieved, and 2) providing timely adjudication for alleged violations of the honor code.
2. The Honor Code and Pledge are designed to reaffirm and foster the value of integrity within the community. Upon acceptance to the university, all students shall sign the following:

Honor Code:

The University is an academic community dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge in a supportive academic climate of mutual respect, integrity, and high ethical standards. To this end, the Millersville University Honor Code is designed to promote an environment of ethical conduct, the foundation of which includes the pursuit of academic honesty and integrity. Through an atmosphere of mutual respect we enhance the value of our education and strive for the highest standard of academic excellence. Members of the University community, including students, faculty, staff, administrators and trustees, must not commit any misrepresentation or deception in academic or professional matters.

Pledge:

As an incoming student to Millersville University of Pennsylvania, I pledge to support the university in its efforts to maintain an academic community founded in honesty and integrity. As such, I understand and agree to abide by the Academic Honesty Policy as defined in the *Academic Integrity at Millersville University* brochure, as well as the principles of the Millersville Honor Code, in all my academic endeavors.

3. The Honor Statement provides further reinforcement of the values of the Millersville University Community. Teaching faculty may require the following signed statement on student assignments, papers, and/or exams:

On my honor, I have neither plagiarized in any form, nor given or received unauthorized aid in this academic work.

The Honor Statement is implied for all academic work whether or not the instructor requires the written statement on the work.

4. Violations of the Academic Honor Code include plagiarism, fabrication, cheating, and/or academic misconduct as defined in the *Academic Integrity at Millersville University* (formerly *Academic Honesty and Dishonesty at Millersville University*) brochure and in the schedule of sanctions in the By-Laws of this document.
5. The MU Academic Honor Council is responsible for overseeing the MU Academic Honor System; coordinating and conducting hearings with the Associate Provost for Academic Administration;

and providing counsel and support to faculty reporting, and students charged with, academic integrity violations. The Academic Honor Council is also responsible for developing/coordinating educational activities on campus related to academic integrity, and for appointing judicial members to the Academic Honor Court.

6. The MU Academic Honor Court, with the Associate Provost for Academic Administration, adjudicates alleged student violations of the Academic Honor Code, and imposes sanctions in appropriate cases. The Academic Honor Court consists of student and faculty Academic Honor Council members who are appointed by the Academic Honor Council Chair at the time of each hearing. The composition of the Academic Honor Court may change from case to case.
7. Academic dishonesty and plagiarism by faculty is specifically prohibited under Section 5 of the MU Governance Manual. The Collective Bargaining Agreement between APSCUF and the State System of Higher Education prohibits alleged cases of faculty academic dishonesty from being adjudicated by faculty and students. Allegations of faculty academic dishonesty shall be handled consistent with the Collective Bargaining Agreement between APSCUF and the State System of Higher Education.
8. The Student Honor Education and Activities Council (SHEAC) consists of the student members of the Academic Honor Council, and other interested students, who carry out campus educational activities on academic integrity.

ARTICLE II. HONOR COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

1. The Academic Honor Council includes two faculty members from each of the three schools: Education, Humanities and Social Sciences, and Science and Mathematics; and one non-school faculty member. The Academic Honor Council also includes at least eight student members. A faculty chair oversees the operation of the Academic Honor Council, and 3 student counselors coordinate educational and administrative functions.
2. Selection of Student Members
 - A. Student nominees must have completed 24 semester hours at Millersville University, be in good academic standing and be enrolled with a minimum of 6 credit hours.
 - B. At the start of each academic year, students interested in serving on the Academic Honor Council apply for membership to Academic Honor Council through the Student Senate.
 - C. Student Senate elects 8 - 12 Academic Honor Council members and forwards the names to the chair of Academic Honor Council.
3. Selection of Faculty Members
 - A. Faculty members are elected in the faculty senate elections at the start of the academic year.
4. Selection of Chair and Vice Chair
 - A. The Chair is elected by majority vote from among the faculty membership of Academic Honor Council at the start of the academic year in which the former Chair's position ends.
 - B. The Vice Chair is elected by majority vote from among the faculty membership of Academic Honor Council at the start of the academic year in which the former vice chair's position ends.

5. Selection of Student Counselors

- A. Each Student Counselor is elected by majority vote from among the student membership of the Academic Honor Council at the start of the academic year in which the former counselor's position ends.

ARTICLE III. ACADEMIC HONOR COURT MEMBERSHIP

1. Two faculty and three student members of the Academic Honor Council are appointed by the Academic Honor Council Chair to the Academic Honor Court for each alleged violation that is tried.
2. The Associate Provost for Academic Administration shall preside over hearings.

ARTICLE IV. RESPONSIBILITIES OF ACADEMIC HONOR COUNCIL MEMBERS

1. Attend scheduled meetings of the Academic Honor Council.
2. Serve in one of the student, special-duties positions, as called: Community Education Counselor, Administrative Counselor, Hearings Counselor.
3. Teach and advance the MU Honor System.
4. Advise faculty and students reporting/charged with academic honesty violations.
5. Serve as judging members on the Academic Honor Court.
6. Participate in a training process that is coordinated by the Academic Honor Council chair.

ARTICLE V. RESPONSIBILITIES OF SPECIAL DUTIES COUNSELOR POSITIONS

1. The COMMUNITY EDUCATION COUNSELOR is responsible for developing educational programs that encourage academic integrity at Millersville University, and educating the Millersville community about the Honor Code.
2. The ADMINISTRATIVE COUNSELOR is responsible for compiling annual statistics on cases and hearings related to the Honor Code at Millersville University. The counselor reports cases and outcomes, in a general sense without naming the person(s) involved, to the MU newspaper *The Snapper*.
3. The HEARINGS COUNSELOR is responsible for coordinating and scheduling hearings on alleged violations of the Honor Code.

ARTICLE VI. RESPONSIBILITIES OF OFFICERS OF THE ACADEMIC HONOR COUNCIL

Chair

- A. Schedule and preside over meetings of the Academic Honor Council.
- B. Receive alleged violations of the Academic Honor System.
- C. Select members of Academic Honor Court as necessary for hearings.
- D. Review Academic Honor System policies and report annually to the Associate Provost for Academic Administration.
- E. Serve as an ex-officio member of the Academic Honor Council.
- F. Develop and conduct a training program for members of the Academic Honor Council, and the incoming Chair.
- G. Supervise the various activities of the Academic Honor Council.

Vice Chair

- A. Perform the duties of the Chair when the Chair is unable to do so.
- B. Maintain the records of all Academic Honor Council proceedings.

Associate Provost for Academic Administration

- A. Preside over hearings.
- B. Record findings of the hearing and appeal panels.

ARTICLE VII. ACADEMIC HONOR COUNCIL TERM OF OFFICE

1. Members' terms are two years. Initial appointments are divided equally between one-year and two-year terms.
2. Members' terms begin at the start of the fall semester and end at the beginning of the fall semester of the final year of their appointment.
3. If a member resigns or is removed from office, a replacement appointment for the remaining portion of the member's term shall be made by the student senate or faculty senate, as appropriate.
4. Removal from Academic Honor Council
 - A. A member of the Academic Honor Council may be removed from office by 2/3 vote of the Academic Honor Council for reasons of misconduct, failure to perform duties, or improper execution of duties.
 - B. The Academic Honor Council Chair may be removed from office by action of the Associate Provost for Academic Administration for reasons of misconduct, failure to perform duties, or improper execution of duties.

ARTICLE VIII. CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

1. Constitutional amendments may be recommended by any member of the faculty or student body at Millersville University.

2. All amendments must be approved by 3/4 vote of the entire Academic Honor Council body.
3. All amendments are subject to approval by Faculty Senate and Student Senate.

ARTICLE IX. BY-LAW REVISIONS

1. By-Law revisions must be approved by a 2/3 vote of the entire Academic Honor Council body.

By-Laws

ARTICLE I. RESPONSIBILITIES

To administer the Millersville University Academic Honor System.

ARTICLE II. REPORTING AND PRELIMINARY ACTIONS

1. Any student or staff member who witnesses a violation is encouraged to report the violation directly to the instructor of the class in which it was observed. The reporter may choose to remain anonymous, and is not required to confront the alleged violator. The witness is encouraged but not required to testify before the Academic Honor Court. Student reports of observed violations of academic dishonesty shall not proceed to hearing unless evidence of the violation exists beyond the observation of the student. This evidence may include copies of exams, papers, or other assignments.
2. After observation or report of an alleged violation, the class instructor chooses whether to invoke *formal procedures* involving actions of the Academic Honor Council, or *informal procedures*, where the faculty member handles the case without involving Academic Honor Council.
3. If a class instructor chooses *informal procedures*, the only academic sanctions that can be applied by the course instructor are minor academic sanctions, which include 1) verbal reprimand, 2) written reprimand, 3) requirement that the student redo/resubmit the assignment, test, or project, and/or 4) reduced grade for the assignment, test or project. If the instructor chooses to impose minor sanctions, the following steps should be taken:
 - A. Collect and organize all pertinent evidence.
 - B. Discuss the alleged dishonesty and any proposed academic sanctions with the department chair.
 - C. Notify the student(s) involved that an act of academic dishonesty is suspected. This should include:
 - i. discussing the alleged acts
 - ii. hearing any defense the student may have
 - iii. discussing any proposed academic sanctions
 - iv. informing the student of his/her right to appeal faculty-imposed sanctions to the Department Chair.
 - D. Apply minor sanction(s), if desired and warranted.
 - E. Optionally complete the violation of academic dishonesty form (recommended) and check either the 'no further action warranted' box on the violation form, or the 'instructor-applied

sanction' box. A reason for the choice should be provided. The form is then submitted to the Academic Honor Council Chair within 5 school days of meeting with the student. No further action shall result from Academic Honor Council unless a second student appeal is made, triggering involvement by Academic Honor Council.

4. For class instructors choosing *formal procedures*, a reasonable effort should be made by the course instructor to meet with the alleged violator to discuss the allegation. If after making a reasonable effort to meet with the student, a student cannot be reached or does not meet with the instructor, the instructor may proceed to complete an academic honesty violation form.
5. The instructor-student meeting should occur within 5 school days of the report or faculty observation of the alleged violation. During this meeting, the following events shall occur:
 - A. The alleged violator shall be informed of the nature of the allegation.
 - B. The alleged violator shall be presented with any evidence of the alleged violation.
 - C. The alleged violator shall be given the opportunity to explain the circumstances surrounding the alleged violation.
 - D. The alleged violator shall be given an opportunity to self-report the incident to Academic Honor Council.
 - E. The alleged violator shall be informed of instructor's intent to trigger an Academic Honor Court hearing, and the student's right to contest the allegation in the Academic Honor Court.
 - F. The alleged violator must be informed of the availability of an Academic Honor Council advisor to answer procedural questions relating to the allegations, Academic Honor Court process, possible sanctions, and mechanisms for appeal. The advisor shall appear with, but shall not defend, the student in Academic Honor Court.
 - G. Third parties may attend meetings between student and instructor as an observer upon the approval of both course instructor and student.
 - H. An academic honesty violation form shall be completed at the instructor/student meeting describing the allegation, the evidence supporting the allegation, the instructor-recommended sanction(s) to be applied if different from the schedule of sanctions, with the reason, and any other information deemed relevant by the course instructor. The instructors shall check the 'further action warranted' box. The form shall be signed by both the instructor and the alleged violator, and submitted to the Academic Honor Council Chair within 5 school days of the meeting.

ARTICLE III. INVESTIGATION

1. The collection of evidence to support an allegation of academic dishonesty in Academic Honor Court shall be the responsibility of the course instructor, who may request the assistance of the Honor Council. Upon such a request, the Hearings Counselor shall appoint investigators from among the membership of Academic Honor Court for this purpose.
2. The evidence shall consist of more than the allegation itself, and may contain copies of exams, reports or other relevant materials. Faculty observation of student cheating is considered relevant evidence.

ARTICLE IV. THE ACADEMIC HONOR COURT

1. Meetings of the Academic Honor Court

- A. The Academic Honor Court shall first meet within 30 calendar days after student notification of a suspected academic honesty violation to hear the charge of academic dishonesty and make a determination of whether a breach of academic honesty has occurred. First meeting within 15 calendar days is expected when possible.
- B. All members of the Academic Honor Court must be present when considering charges and sanctions. If a member cannot be present, a proxy must be designated by the Chair of the Academic Honor Council. This proxy shall be selected from the list of active Academic Honor Council members.

2. Membership

- A. The Academic Honor Court, selected by the Chair of the Academic Honor Council, shall be composed of two voting faculty members and three voting student members of the Honor Council.
- B. The Associate Provost for Academic Administration shall form the sixth non-voting member of the Academic Honor Court, and shall preside over the hearing.
- C. The investigators of a case may not serve on the Academic Honor Court for that same case.
- D. Both the alleged violator and the instructor of the class in which the alleged violation occurred are expected to attend the hearing. Applicable student reporter(s) may attend the hearing, or, if choosing not to attend, may submit an anonymous written statement detailing evidence of the violation.
- E. Upon approval of the Associate Provost for Academic Administration and the student, third parties may attend meetings of the Academic Honor Court as an observer, and only in that capacity.

3. Procedures of the Academic Honor Court

- A. If the student, having been properly notified, fails to appear at the hearing, the Academic Honor Court chooses whether to proceed in the student's absence.
- B. The charge and associated facts of the case shall be considered by the Academic Honor Court, but the honor hearing is not a trial and therefore does not require formal rules of evidence associated with civil or criminal trial. The Associate Provost for Academic Administration shall accept all evidence and testimony, whether submitted by faculty, staff, or students, which reasonably appears to hold probative value in the conduct of the Academic Honor Court's affairs. Character references shall not be allowed as part of the proceedings. The review of facts shall be non-adversarial.
- C. The alleged violator has the right to examine the evidence and documents presented.
- D. Only members of the Academic Honor Court shall question participants and/or witnesses.
- E. The accused student may decline to answer questions and shall not be penalized for not answering those questions.
- H. If a student accused of a breach of academic honesty chooses to present an explanation for her/his actions, he/she must present this defense alone; the student may use optional counsel only in an advisory capacity.
- I. The evidence considered and a final vote regarding disciplinary action by the Academic Honor Court shall focus on whether a breach of academic honesty occurred and the seriousness of the act.
- J. A majority vote among the members of the Academic Honor Court shall be required to reach a decision on the guilt of the alleged violator.

- K. The Associate Provost for Academic Administration shall inform the Honor Council Chair in writing of the final decision. The Academic Honor Council Chair shall then notify the alleged violator, instructor, and student reporter of the decision in writing.
- L. If a breach of academic honesty arises during the summer, that case shall be tabled until hearings resume in the fall.
- M. The alleged violator has a right to notification of the decision of the Academic Honor Council no later than 5 school days after the end of the hearing.

4. Academic Honor Court Records

- A. The results of the hearing are recorded and kept as part of the permanent record.
- B. All records are confidential and subject to the provisions of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act.

ARTICLE V. SANCTIONS

1. Only the Academic Honor Council can authorize and apply sanctions, except course instructors applying minor sanctions. If charges of academic dishonesty are upheld by the Academic Honor Council, a sanction must be applied.
2. Student actions already addressed in the *Student Code of Conduct* shall be addressed by the procedure outlined in that document, and are not addressed herein. Actions which could fall under both policies shall be addressed under the *Student Code of Conduct*.
3. In the interest of consistency and fairness, the Academic Honor Council should follow the sanctions outlined in Article V. Section 3. However, if a course instructor believes that the sanction outlined in Article V, Section 3 is inappropriate, the course instructor may, upon providing compelling reasons, ask the Academic Honor Council to impose an alternative sanction. The Academic Honor Council must honor this request, or provide a compelling justification for any alternative sanction.
4. Schedule of Sanctions for Violations of Academic Honesty
 - A. Class 1. The most serious breaches of academic honesty fall into this category, as well as any and all second or more offenses of any sort. Sanctions: 1) XF grade and suspension, or 2) XF grade and disciplinary probation. The XF grade indicates that a student has failed a course due to academic dishonesty. Examples of violations include, but are not limited to:
 - i. cheating on a test where premeditation and/or conspiracy of effort can be shown,
 - ii. taking a test for someone else, or permitting someone else to take a test or course in one's place,
 - iii. plagiarizing, where the majority of the submitted work was written or created by another,
 - iv. obtaining or sharing all or part of an unadministered exam,
 - v. acquiring another's course paper and resubmitting it as one's own work, whether altered or not, and
 - vi. changing, altering, or being an accessory to changing and/or altering a grade in a grade book, on a test, on a "Change of Grade" form, or other official academic University record which relates to grades.

- B. Class 2. These include other serious offenses for which strong sanctions are applied. Sanctions: 1) grade of F in the course and disciplinary probation. Examples of violations include, but are not limited to:
- i. collaborating during a test with another person by receiving or providing information without the permission of the instructor,
 - ii. submitting the same paper for two different courses, regardless of the term, unless approved by both instructors,
 - iii. plagiarizing, where part of the submitted work was written or created by another,
 - iv. failing to mention others who helped in the preparation of submitted work ,
 - v. allowing another to submit one's work,
 - vi. giving or taking unauthorized aid in a take home exam or paper,
 - vii. falsifying or altering laboratory data or lab reports, or copying lab reports,
 - viii. inventing data or other information for research or other academic projects,
 - ix. using the course textbook, or other material such as notebook that is unauthorized for use during a test,
 - x. using or possessing specifically prepared materials during a test (e.g., notes, formula lists, formulas programmed into calculators, notes written on the student's clothing or person, etc.) that are unauthorized,
 - xi. altering returned and graded assignments or tests, and resubmitting for another grade, and
 - xii. cheating on or copying from an exam in which premeditation cannot be shown.
- C. Class 3. These are significant offenses for which the sanction is a grade of F on the submitted assignment and disciplinary probation. Examples of violations include, but are not limited to:
- i. submitting work for a class that was already submitted for another, when unauthorized,
 - ii. citing information from an incorrect source, or failing to cite when necessary,
 - iii. listing sources in a bibliography that were not used in the paper, and
 - iv. copying, or allowing one to copy, homework assignments that are to be submitted for credit.
- D. Class 4. These are offenses in which a party assists another to cheat, but the assisting party is not enrolled in the course in which the offense has occurred. Sanctions may not thus be applied within the course. The sanction includes a verbal and written reprimand and completion of at least one of the following: a term of service to the MU Academic Honor Council, a written paper exploring the ethics and consequences of academic dishonesty, and/or an independent study on the ethics and consequences of academic dishonesty. Examples of violations include but are not limited to:
- i. A student allows another to submit or copy from his/her previously submitted class work.
 - ii. A student allows another to submit his/her term paper.
- E. All second offenses of any type of academic dishonesty shall be sanctioned with either 1) a grade of XF in the course and suspension, or 2) a grade of XF in the course and expulsion. If the second offense is a Class 4 offense, the sanction shall consist of either suspension or expulsion.

5. XF Grade Policy

- A. If the Academic Honor Court sanctions a student with a course grade of XF, and this sanction is not appealed by the student, the Academic Honor Council Chair notifies the Registrar to place a grade of XF for the applicable course on the student's academic record.
- B. Student appeals of the XF grade follow the procedure for all other appeals of academic dishonesty sanctions, as outlined in Article VI of the By-Laws. If the Appeals Board denies the right to another hearing, or another hearing is granted and the Academic Honor Court decides to uphold the XF grade sanction, the Academic Honor Council Chair notifies the Registrar to assign the XF grade to the student's academic record. If another hearing is granted and the Academic Honor Court finds there was no violation of academic dishonesty, or assigns a different sanction, the Academic Honor Council Chair notifies the Registrar to remove the academic hold on the student's academic record.
- C. If grades are due but an academic dishonesty hearing is still in progress, a grade of 'I' shall be applied to the course until the hearing process is complete.
- D. An XF grade shall maintain a quality point value of 0.0.
- E. The XF must stay permanent on the transcript for at least two years.
- F. After two years, a student may petition the Academic Honor Council to exchange the XF for an F. The petition must be in written form and provide the reason for removal of the XF. Additionally, the petitioner must appear before the Academic Honor Council to explain the request. If the student petitions and a majority of the Academic Honor Council agrees to remove the XF, the council outlines conditions under which the XF is removed. The conditions may include serving on the Academic Honor Council, serving in SHEAC, giving testimony of dishonesty during freshman orientation or other organized council events, and/or performing specific tasks aimed at increasing the education of the violator and/or campus on the value of academic integrity. When these conditions are met, the XF is removed entirely from the transcript, leaving no past evidence of the XF. A grade of F is recorded in its place.
- G. If a petition to change an XF grade to an F has been made and denied, another petition may not be made for another 4 years.
- H. If the student is/has been found guilty of an additional violation of academic honesty, either in the past or future, the XF remains. For cases where the XF was changed to an F and the student is later found guilty of an additional act of academic dishonesty, the XF grade is restored for the course. In these cases, the XF remains permanent. The student may not petition for an F in exchange for the XF in these cases.
- I. A student who has received an XF in a course and needs to pass the course for a requirement may retake the course. If the student passes the course, the requirement is met, but the course grade shall remain as an XF.

ARTICLE VI. APPEALS

1. In the case of *informal procedures*,

- A. A student may appeal the application of a minor sanction to the department chair, who decides whether the instructor has judiciously applied the minor sanction. Faculty observation of student cheating is considered relevant evidence.
- B. If the department chair, finds the instructor acted judiciously, the minor sanction holds. If the chair decides the instructor has not acted judiciously, all minor sanctions are removed.
- C. If the department chair is the instructor for whom the appeal is made, the appeal should be made to the school dean.
- D. All further appeals must be made to Academic Honor Council.

2. In the case of *formal procedures*:

A. Filing an Appeal

- i. A student has the right to appeal the verdict and/or sanctions imposed during the initial hearing of the Academic Honor Court on any of the following three grounds.
- ii. A student may file one appeal based on availability of substantial new evidence. *Substantial new evidence* is defined as substantial evidence unavailable at the time of the initial hearing that is now available and has a direct bearing on the verdict. An appeal based on substantial new evidence must be filed within three months from the date of the Academic Honor Court's initial decision.
- iii. A student may file one appeal based on sufficient good cause. *Sufficient good cause* is defined as infringement on the rights of the accused student because of any irregularities in the conduct of the hearing process. Irregularities occur when the Academic Honor Court fails to abide by the established procedures as detailed in this document. An appeal based on sufficient good cause must be filed within 10 school days of the initial decision of the Academic Honor Court.
- iv. The student may file one appeal of the sanctions on the grounds of disproportionate severity of the sanction. *Disproportionate severity of a sanction* refers to the excessive severity of a particular sanction compared to the severity of the act for which it was applied. An appeal based on disproportionate severity must be filed within 10 school days of the initial decision of the Academic Honor Court.
- v. Appeal requests must be submitted in writing to the Chair of the Academic Honor Council. The written request must clearly state the grounds for appeal, and fully describe the new evidence, irregularities that occurred in the initial hearing of the Academic Honor Court, and/or reason supporting disproportionate severity of the sanction. This written request shall serve as the primary basis for granting or denying a request for a new hearing.
- vi. The student may appeal on up to three grounds, but generally all the grounds shall be considered together in one hearing. An exception to this policy shall be granted in the case that substantial new evidence becomes available after the appeal hearing is finished, but before the end of the three month period following the date of the Academic Honor Court's initial decision.

B. The Appeals Board and Appeals Process

- i. Upon receipt of a written appeal, the Academic Honor Council Chair shall empanel a separate six-member Appeals Board. The Appeals Board shall consist of three student members, two faculty members, and a non-voting chair selected from the Honor Council. The chair may be either a student or faculty member.
- ii. The Appeals Board shall hold a hearing and either grant or deny appeal requests within 30 school days of receiving a written appeal.
- iii. The Appeals Board shall review the appeal request, transcripts from the initial hearing, and may request additional written statements from any parties involved in the initial hearing.
- iv. If the Appeals Board grants an appeal of the initial Academic Honor Court's *verdict*, the entire investigation/hearing process shall be repeated, and the case shall be assigned to a new Academic Honor Court panel.

- v. If the Appeals Board grants an appeal of the *sanctions* imposed by the initial Academic Honor Court, the appeals board is empowered to impose sanctions in accordance with Article V. Section 3.

ARTICLE VII. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

1. Members of the Academic Honor Council shall immediately notify the Chair of the Academic Honor Council of any conflicts of interest.

Attachment #4

Summary of Honor Code Committee Recommendation to Faculty Senate*

1. Upon admission to MU, undergraduate and graduate students sign an honor pledge (required except for cases of religious conflict). Prior to the signing, students will be given background information on academic dishonesty and how to avoid being charged with it. Resigning of pledge on classroom work is at the option of the course instructor, but the pledge is in effect regardless.
2. Honesty education continues throughout students' program at MU. Possibilities for education exist in Freshman Orientation, Freshman-Year Experience, common freshman courses, all course introductions, and out-of-class workshops and activities. Resources/support will be made available to both students and instructors by the Academic Honor Council. Student members of this council play a major role in its function.
3. The following procedure takes place for alleged cases of academic dishonesty:
 - The course instructor meets with the student and decides whether the case should be pursued. The instructor has the option of reporting the case to Honor Council for further action, or dropping the case entirely (APSCUF requires choice). Completion of an academic dishonesty form is recommended (but not required) in any case for record-keeping purposes. Faculty who wish to fill out the form but drop all further action will indicate on the form that no further action is desired. ***Instructors who choose not to report the incident thus invoking a hearing may then only impose minor sanctions on a student (verbal/written reprimand, lowering grade for assignment/test, requiring student to redo assignment/test). This policy is consistent with our present academic honesty policy.***
 - If further action is recommended, an honor court will be formed consisting of 2 faculty, 3 students, and the Associate Provost for Academic Programs and Services (non-voting member). Evidence is heard, and three of five votes are required to find a student guilty of an act of academic dishonesty.
 - The sanctions schedule classifies acts of academic dishonesty according to their severity and provides recommended sanction(s) for each class of offenses. This is to provide consistency in handling similar cases of dishonesty. For this reason, the schedule should generally be followed, but an instructor who provides justification may request a different sanction. Generally, the request will be followed, unless the court provides compelling justification for not granting the request. Least offenses: failure for assignment. Worst offenses: XF grade and probation, or XF grade and suspension. XF indicates course failure due to academic dishonesty. For one-time offenses only, this grade can be converted after two years to a grade of F. An appeals mechanism is defined to consider new evidence, irregularities in the conduct of the hearing, and excessive severity of a particular sanction.
4. Students are not required to report observed cases of dishonesty.

*More details can be found in the by-laws section of the *Proposed Millersville University Academic Honor System Constitution*.

How is this system different from our current academic honesty program? The proposed system adds the following elements which are now not part of the honesty policy: signing an academic honesty pledge upon admission, provision for greater education/support for both students and faculty in preventing academic dishonesty, a sanctions schedule, creation of the XF grade, and greater opportunity for students to participate in the honesty system, thus allowing students greater ownership of the program. The literature suggests lower incidence of dishonesty where clear and frequent communication related to dishonesty is coupled with high student involvement in the program, careful monitoring of dishonesty, and strong sanctions for offenses.

What benefits would we expect to see if the proposed honor system is implemented? The literature suggests: significantly fewer cases of cheating, greater consistency in addressing dishonesty, promotion of law/ethics-related careers of student honor members, greater community/employer respect of MU as an institution promoting ethics, advancement of general education objectives and parts of the university mission dealing with development of student values and ethics, and benefits to society as students carry away learned moral norms.