



# OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

## Oakland University Senate

Fifth Meeting  
Thursday, February 17, 1977  
3:00 p.m.  
128 - 130 Oakland Center

### **AGENDA**

Submitted by George T. Matthews, for the Steering Committee

#### I. Old Business:

None

#### II. New Business:

##### 1. Motion from the Graduate Council (Mr. Johnson)

**MOVED THAT THE UNIVERSITY SENATE RECOMMEND TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE BOARD THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A PROGRAM OF GRADUATE STUDIES LEADING TO THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF MUSIC.**

First Reading: debatable and amendable but not eligible for final vote at this meeting.

Comment: The motion before the Senate is sponsored by the Graduate Council and Mr. G. Philip Johnson, Dean of Graduate Studies is prepared to answer any question if requested. The proposal to establish a Master of Music degree program has been studied and approved by the Academic Budget and Planning Committee of the University Senate. Mr. Joel Russell of the Academic Budget and Planning Committee is prepared to comment if requested. The Assembly of the College of Arts and Sciences has also approved the measure. The full and detailed proposal may be found in the Office of Graduate Studies and in the office of the Department of Music. Attached to this agenda is a summary (dated October 26, 1976) of the original proposal containing all essential information in shortened form.

2. Presentation of a report from the Academic Conduct Committee entitled **University Policy Statement on Academic Conduct**, dated January 31, 1977. Mr. Peter Bertocci, Chairperson of the Academic Conduct Committee, will present the report to the Senate. The report is reproduced below and will not be read unless called for. Mr. Bertocci and members of the Committee are prepared to discuss the policy embodied in the report under rules of informal consideration.

The Chair orders that discussion will terminate upon consideration of a motion to recommend to the President the adoption of the report as University policy or upon consideration of a motion to recommit for further study. A motion to recommend adoption will be considered as substantive and hence in first reading with further debate possible at second reading but with the report itself regarded as unamendable, a motion to recommit will return the report to committee for further study and may contain suggestions for the committee's guidance as well as a specific date for resubmission.

The following is the report, dated January 31, 1977, from the Academic Conduct Committee, recommending approval of certain changes in the University Policy Statement on Academic Conduct.

---

### ***UNIVERSITY POLICY STATEMENT ON ACADEMIC CONDUCT***

January 31, 1977

All members of the academic community at Oakland are expected to practice and uphold standards of academic integrity and honesty. An instructor is expected to inform and instruct students about the procedures and standards of research and documentation required of students in fulfilling course work. A student is expected to follow such instructions and be sure the rules and procedures are understood in order to avoid inadvertent misrepresentation of his work. Students must assume that individual (unaided) work on exams and lab reports and documentation of sources is expected unless the instructor specifically says that is not necessary.

\* ACADEMIC INTEGRITY MEANS REPRESENTING ONESELF AND ONE'S WORK HONESTLY. MISREPRESENTATION OF ONE'S WORK IS CHEATING AND TAKES TWO FORMS. THE FIRST OF THESE IS CLAIMING CREDIT FOR IDEAS AND WORK WHICH ARE ACTUALLY NOT ONE'S OWN AND THEREBY TRYING TO GET A GRADE ONE HAS NOT ACTUALLY EARNED. THE SECOND IS SUBMITTING WORK FOR A COURSE ONE IS PRESENTLY TAKING WHICH ONE HAS ACTUALLY COMPLETED FOR A COURSE TAKEN IN THE PAST OR IS, IN FACT, ALSO COMPLETING FOR ANOTHER PRESENT COURSE. UNDER SOME CIRCUMSTANCES, AN INSTRUCTOR MIGHT PERMIT A STUDENT TO SUBMIT FOR A PRESENT COURSE WORK COMPLETED FOR A PAST COURSE OR ANOTHER PRESENT COURSE, BUT THE INSTRUCTOR'S PERMISSION MUST BE RECEIVED BEFORE A STUDENT DOES THIS. THE FOLLOWING DEFINITIONS ARE EXAMPLES OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY:

1. Cheating on examinations by
  - a. using materials such as books and/or notes when not authorized by the instructor,
  - b. by taking advantage of prior information not authorized by the instructor regarding questions to be asked on the exam,
  - c. copying from someone else's paper,
  - d. helping someone else copy work or
  - e. other forms of misrepresentation.

Students would be well advised to be careful to avoid the appearance of cheating.

Wording in upper case is entirely new wording and represents the principal change proposed by the Committee. The previous wording of this paragraph is as follows: Academic integrity means representing oneself and one's work honestly; misrepresentation is cheating since it means a student is claiming credit for ideas or work that is not actually his and is thereby trying to get a grade that is not actually earned.

The following definitions are examples of academic dishonesty:

2. **Plagiarizing from work of others.** Plagiarism is using someone else's work or ideas without giving the other person credit; by doing this, a student is, in effect, claiming credit for someone else's thinking. Whether the student has read or heard the information he uses, the student must document the source of information. When dealing with written sources, a clear distinction would be made between quotations (which reproduce information from the source word-for-word within quotation marks) and paraphrases (which digest the source information and produce it in the student's own words). Both direct quotations and paraphrases must be documented. Just because a student rephrases, condenses or selects from another person's work, the ideas are still the other person's, and failure to give credit constitutes misrepresentation of the student's actual work and plagiarism of another's ideas. Naturally, buying a paper and handing it in as one's own work is plagiarism.
3. **Cheating on lab reports by**
  - a. falsifying data or
  - b. submitting data not based on student's own work.
4. **Falsifying records or providing misinformation regarding one's credentials.**

If a student feels that practices by the instructor are conducive to cheating, he may convey this information either directly to the instructor or to the student Ombudsperson of the University Congress 5 or to any member of the student-faculty Committee on Academic Conduct (either directly or through the Office of the Dean for Student Services).

Instructors are expected to bring evidence of plagiarism, cheating on exams or lab reports, falsification of records or other forms of academic misconduct before the Academic Conduct Committee of the University Senate for determination of the facts in the case and a if warranted, assessment of penalty. If academic misconduct is determined the Committee assesses penalties ranging from academic disciplinary reprimand (which is part of the student's confidential University file), to academic probation to suspension or dismissal from the University.

## **GUIDELINES FOR INSTRUCTORS**

Instructors have at least three roles to play in maintaining proper standards of academic conduct:

1. To assist their students in recognizing the way in which general standards apply in context of a particular course or discipline.
2. To take practical steps to prevent cheating and to detect it when it occurs.
3. To report academic misconduct to the Dean for Student Services in 134 NFH for the Committee on Academic Conduct.

## FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE SENATE

1. The *ad hoc* Committee on Presidential Review process established by Resolution of the Senate dated January 20, 1977, has been constituted as follows:

Elizabeth Titus, Chairperson, Faculty of the Library

David Evans, Faculty of Engineering

Barbara Hamilton, Faculty Council for General and Career Studies (Learning Skills)

Dorsey Hammond, Faculty of Education

Edward Heubel, Faculty of Arts and Sciences (Political Science)

Robbin Hough, Faculty of Economics and Management (Economics)

William Jones, Graduate Council (Education)

Carl Vann, Faculty Council for Health Sciences (Political Science)

Diane Wilson, Faculty of Nursing

2. The Steering Committee has received the following communication from Mr. Marvin Katke, Chairperson, Board Presidential Review Committee:

January 27, 1977

Mr. George T. Matthews  
Chairperson, Steering Committee  
University Senate  
Oakland University  
Rochester, Michigan 48063

Dear George:

The resolution adopted by the Senate in its meeting Thursday, January 20, 1977, and which you referred to us for consideration, has been reviewed by the Oakland University Board of Trustees in its executive meeting held January 26, 1977. The Board's position at this time is unchanged from that outlined in my letter, dated January 3, 1977, addressed to Ms. Eileen Hitchingham and Mr. John Tower, which, in summary, states our conviction that on the presidential review participation by members of the University community directly with the Board committee permits freedom of expressing individual opinions in the most democratic and confidential way. The Board further states the position that after the Senate committee has been appointed and has formulated its presidential review proposal, our Board committee, or possibly the full Board, will agree to meet with the Senate committee to evaluate its proposal. The Board in its January 26th meeting withholds all commitment at this time to any conditions set forth in the resolution except to meeting with the committee.

In the meantime, as you know, we are proceeding with the presidential evaluation in accordance with the Board's plan. This process was started several weeks ago and the procedure is working quite satisfactorily. When the Senate committee is ready to meet, please advise me and we shall set up a meeting date mutually agreeable to all parties concerned.

Sincerely,

Marve  
M. L. Katke, Chairman  
Board Presidential Review Committee

cc: Members of the Board of Trustees  
(COPY)

GTM;jb  
Office of the Provost  
February 9, 1977  
Attachment: Master of Music Program Summary Proposal (distributed to Senators only)

*Back to*  
OAKLAND UNIVERSITY  
**S E N A T E**  
*Home Page*