

Senate ✓
RECEIVED

JUL 29 1991

MEMORANDUM

Office of the Provost

July 29, 1991

To: Keith R. Kleckner
Provost and Senior Vice President for University Affairs

From: William C. Fish, Chair *W. F.*
Academic Conduct Committee

Subject: Annual Report, 1990-91

Data:

The ACC heard 15 cases this year from 7 departments and the Registrar.

The departments presenting cases were:

College: Art History (2), Biology (1), English (2), Pol Sci (1), Rhetoric (2)

School of Nursing (2)

SBA: Accounting (4)

In 14 of the cases, the students were found guilty. Sanctions imposed were:

Probation until graduation: 2

Suspension and probation: 11 (including 2 required to pass RHT 101)

Expulsion: 1

Comments and Recommendations:

1) As noted above, only 7 departments presented cases. It is hard for me to believe that there is no academic misconduct occurring in the other departments and Schools. Therefore, it is time, perhaps, for the ACC and the Senate to engage in consciousness raising about the importance of discerning and reporting cases of academic misconduct. It is my impression that the School of Nursing has done this in the recent past and seems to be conscientiously dealing with the need for continuing vigilance in these matters. Even though the ACC is not eager for more work, it seems that a more forceful policy may be called for in dealing with the apparent obliviousness to or tolerance of academic misconduct. In conversations with faculty on this point, I have discerned a certain fear in faculty that bringing cases to the ACC may somehow endanger the reporting instructor. Reassurance and clarification of procedures for reporting misconduct may help reduce the reasons for resistance. Copies of current university policy on misconduct might be sent to departments heads for discussion with faculty and faculty might be urged to discuss this policy on the first day of class with students. Continuing education on what constitutes academic misconduct and how to report it seems imperative.

2) A policy regarding the presence of faculty other than the reporting instructor is also needed. Two of the cases presented in the last year were seriously complicated by the demand of the department head to be present for the hearing, to which the accused student objected. Precedents conflict on this matter. On the one hand, no other departments made such a demand; on the other hand, this department claimed it regularly followed this practice. Since the student may be already overwhelmed by facing 4-6 faculty, I tend to think the student's discomfort outweighs whatever advantage there may be to the department for the head to be present. In addition, since other departments do not routinely make such a demand, there may also be a question of fairness involved. A clear and universal policy is needed.

3) The question of legal representation arose in a two cases. Even though the two students were adamant, the committee maintained the policy of the past several years that only university personnel be allowed to advise the student. I think this is a wise course for minimizing litigiousness. Though the committee seeks to guarantee due process, it's proceedings should be clearly distinguished from a court of law.

4) Finally, I would like to commend the members of the committee and the very able and helpful assistance of Nancy Schmitz and David Herman. Nancy organized the meetings of the committee so that we could meet in an orderly and efficient manner. Dave was an invaluable source of information regarding past practice for the committee and a sensitive, caring Dean for the students. The committee members were faithful, prompt, sensitive, insightful and fair. Altogether these factors created the most pleasant "chairship" I have experienced. The faculty members were: Fay Hansen-Smith, Anahid Kulwicki, Frank Lepowski, Lawrence Lilliston, Subbaiah Perla, Ren-Jyh Gu, Robert Kliman and Carol Zenas. Our student members, who were also superb, were: Maura Conroy, Tonja Long, Laurie Rutkowski, and Cheryl Talbot. All deserve "kudos" for a job well done.

cc. David Herman

ACADEMIC CONDUCT REPORT LOG

FROM 9/90 TO 5/91

Case No.	Date Reported	Charges(s)	Academic Department	Hearing Date	Decision	Sanction	Final Letter	Appeal Y/N
90-11	9/24/90	Cheating on exam	Nursing	10/30/90	Guilty	Prob. until grad.	11/1/90	Y
90-12	10/13/91	Cheating on care plan	Nursing	11/13/90	N. Guilty	Insufficient evidence	11/15/90	N
90-13	10/15/90	Forgery trans. & diploma	Registrar	--	Guilty	Expulsion; student not present @ hrng.		
90-14	11/15/90	Cheating on comp. proj.	Accounting	12/18/90	Guilty	Susp. until 4/25/91 prob. until grad.	12/19/90	N
90-14	11/15/90	Cheating on comp. proj.	Accounting	12/18/90	Guilty	Susp. until 4/25/91 prob. until grad.	12/19/90	N
90-15	11/19/90	Cheating on quiz	Political Sci.	12/11/90	Guilty	Prob. until grad.	12/18/90	N
90-16	11/27/90	Cheating on comp. proj.	Accounting	2/18/91	Guilty	Susp. w/immed. rein. prob. until grad.	2/21/91	N
90-16	11/27/90	Cheating on comp. proj.	Accounting	2/18/91	Guilty	Susp. w/immed. rein. prob. until grad.	2/21/91	N
90-17	12/13/90	Plagiarism	Rhetoric	3/15/91	Guilty	Susp. until 12/21/91 prob. until grad.	3/21/91	N
90-18	12/18/90	Plagiarism	Rhetoric	3/4/91	Guilty	Susp. until 9/1/91 repeat RHT 101; prob. until grad.	3/7/91	Y
91-1	3/5/91	Cheating on exam	Biology	4/12/91	Guilty	Susp. until 4/26/93 prob. until grad.	4/17/91	N
91-2	3/11/91	Plagiarism	English	5/10/91	Guilty	Susp. until 12/31/91 prob. until grad.	5/10/91	
91-3	3/26/91	Plagiarism	Art History	4/15/91	Guilty	Susp. until 8/16/91 prob. until grad.	4/17/91	N
91-3	3/26/91	Plagiarism	Art History	4/15/91	Guilty	Susp. until 8/16/91 prob. until grad.	4/17/91	N
91-4	4/29/91	Plagiarism	English	5/10/91	Guilty	Susp. until 8/16/91 pass RHT 101; prob. until grad.	5/13/91	

acndlog1