The second regular meeting of the 2018-2019 Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, October 16, 2018, at 2:10 in the Mendenhall Student Center Great Room.

Agenda Item I. Call to Order
Jeff Popke, Chair of the Faculty called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes
The September 11, 2018 meeting minutes were approved as presented.

Agenda Item III. Special Order of the Day
A. Roll Call
Senators absent were: Professors Drake (Business), Alves and Keim (Dental Medicine), Robinson (Mathematics), Baltaro (Medicine), Gruber (Music), Bolin (Nursing) and Deale and Parker (UNC Faculty Assembly Delegates).

Alternates present were: Professors Eblin for Turnage (Allied Health Sciences), Kirchoff for Justice (Business), Howard for Richards (Communication) and Bauer for Thomas (English).

B. Announcements
Jeff Popke, Chair of the Faculty, spoke briefly about the importance of shared governance and then asked former Chair of the Faculty, John Stiller, to step forward for a token of appreciation. Professor Stiller was presented with a framed copy of Faculty Senate Resolution #18-28 Commendation for Dr. John W. Stiller, Chair of the Faculty, (2015-2018).

C. Cecil Staton, Chancellor
Chancellor Staton stated that the Senate has reached halfway point of Fall semester and congratulated us on making it to this point of the semester. Chancellor Staton also noted that the support demonstrated by our ECU family for those affected by Hurricane Florence has been extraordinary. He then listed how ECU employees and students have contributed to the recovery effort:

- 600 volunteers sign up via ECU initiatives
- 2500 volunteer hours (and climbing)
- ECU website for Hurricane Florence had 36,5000 page views
- 50,000 pounds of food and hygiene products were donated
- $210,000 worth of donations
- Aid given to 10 counties

Chancellor Staton said there is more to be done and we have only begun to show what Pirates can do in the aftermath of Hurricane Florence.
Next, Chancellor Staton mentioned the Faculty Results from the UNC system-wide Employee Engagement Survey (which Professor Popke will discuss in F.). Chancellor Staton said there have been and will continue to be townhalls related to this employee engagement survey. He said these townhalls were helpful and he thanked ECU employees for engaging. Chancellor Staton said that the administration are taking this feedback seriously and that he sees a need for deeper communication across various levels of university. He explained that he is forming an academic administrative council, which will ensure that administration is communicating effectively, and that messages are distributed to all 5800 faculty and staff at ECU.

Chancellor Staton next granted speaking privileges to Mark Stacy, the Dean of the Brody School of Medicine and Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Medical Affairs at East Carolina University, to speak on Project Unify.

Vice Chancellor Stacy wanted to discuss how the hospital and medical school have been working together over the last few years. He reminded the audience that it was not until 1977 that we desegregated Pitt County Memorial hospital. He explained that Project Unify has been held up at state level. He explained that ECU respects the right of the State of NC to govern its citizens and to make a final decision on the funds to complete this project. He explained that things have improved (financially) in last 3 years (since Project Unify began). He still believes that this project is needed for the health of the medical school.

Questions
Professor Stiller (Biology) asked if Chancellor Staton could elaborate on what the announced academic administrative council would be. Chancellor Staton answered that the academic administrative council would be composed of department chairs, and others who communicate with faculty.

D. Ron Mitchelson, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Ron Mitchelson, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, next delivered the Report on 2018 Freshman Class.

Provost Mitchelson opened by pointing out that we have more instate students than out-of-state students because we may have priced ourselves out of that out-of-state market. Overall our 2018 Freshman class is more diverse and has fewer full-time students. The class has a sizeable number of rural students and low-income students. Standardized scores for admitted freshmen have improved. ECU still maintains a 80% acceptance rate but Provost Mitchelson made it clear that this has not resulted in a decline in overall quality rather, ECU has simply been getting more and more qualified applicants. Provost Mitchelson directed our attention to the discrepancy between the acceptance and attendance rates (which is known as the “yield rate”), as illustrated in the Report on 2018 Freshman Class. The 2018 transfer class is third largest ever (1854 students, 66% yield rate). ECU has also had an 11% increase in 5-year graduation rate.

Provost Mitchelson discussed several steps that ECU is taking to address this year’s lower enrollment numbers:
- Participation in Raise Me (https://www.raise.me/), which provides scholarship opportunities for 9-12 graders. The program already has 7,000 followers and ECU is only UNC school using this system.
• Co-admission agreements with community colleges
• Increase the number of permanent recruiters
• Task force working on various enrollment issues, especially “yield”
• Changes in leadership in and around admissions include John Fletcher, Vice Provost for Enrollment Management retiring January 1st and David Meredith, Director of Undergraduate Admissions resigning immediately from his position. Heidi Puckett, Teaching Assistant Professor within Education and Graduate School has been appointed interim Director of Undergraduate Admissions.
• Promotion of Greenville as a college town (when admitted students visit campus, that increases enrollments dramatically)
• More digital marketing (less paper-oriented)
• Rehabilitate ECU’s academic reputation in the UNC system (ECU is perceived as less academically rigorous than other UNC schools)

Questions
Professor Powers (Sociology) asked if people who declined enrollment were in state or out of state. Provost Mitchelson explained that our increased tuition for out-of-state students might have impacted this number. For many in-state students, we are the “back up” plan to other UNC system schools.

E. Virginia Hardy, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
Vice Chancellor Virginia Hardy discussed the impact of Hurricane Florence on ECU students, beginning with the day of September 11, 2018. Vice Chancellor Hardy notes that ECU kept its emergency call center open from September 11 until September 19. Vice Chancellor Hardy explained that the 19 students who could not evacuate and had to stay on campus were housed in the Gateway dorms (safest location on campus) with food and games.

On September 15, ECU made the decision to re-open school on September 18th. Vice Chancellor Hardy notes that Student Affairs made a mistake making this announcement on a Saturday night because there was no one in Dean of Student’s office to answer student calls. In the future these announcements will only be made during work hours.

On September 16, the Dean of Students created a form for students to fill out about the impact of the hurricane. Students could self identify as having major or minor damage. The Dean of Students office then responded to students and passed that information on to professors. During this time there were 25-30 answering phone calls and ultimately 2,140 forms were completed. 964 students reported minor damage and could return to ECU on time. 902 students reported major damage and some in that group were unsure of when they could return to ECU. These 902 students were tracked by the Dean of Students office (some even tracked by their One Cards). Ultimately, 7 students had to withdraw from the semester due to Hurricane Florence. 5 students had to withdraw from individual courses. Starfish now has capiblity to track storm-related absences. On September 19, 2018, Student Affairs closed down the emergency call center. Hardy thanked the Dean of Students office for their hard work in the aftermath of Hurricane Florence

Questions
Professor Powers (Sociology) asked about students who have not been in touch and have not returned. Vice Chancellor Hardy said to please tell Dean of Students who these students are so they can reach out to them.
Professor Popke (Geography) mentioned how the Faculty Senate agenda is put together and why individuals like Vice Chancellor Hardy are speaking on the issues they are. Popke invited faculty senate representatives to get in touch with the Agenda Committee (chaired by Margaret Bauer), if they have agenda requests.

F. Jeff Popke, Chair of the Faculty
Professor Popke provided the following remarks about Faculty Results from the ECU Employee Engagement Survey to the Faculty Senate. His edited remarks appear below:

“The UNC employee engagement survey that took place last spring is a 3-year initiative undertaken by the UNC System and implemented by ModernThink, a consulting firm. Our campus-wide results were announced by the Chancellor in an e-mail on September 25th and ModernThink came to campus to discuss them in a couple of forums on October 4. Kitty Wetherington and Justin Yeaman provided the data I analyze below.

The survey was comprised of 60 statements that respondents could agree or disagree with, that were grouped into 15 “dimensions” (see Figure 2). ModernThink presents the percentage of respondents who either agreed or strongly agreed with each statement, so the numbers basically represent an indicator of the ‘positivity’ expressed for each statement or dimension. The Faculty Results from the ECU Employee Engagement Survey also provide comparative scores for some of ModernThink’s benchmark groups, including the UNC system average (see Figure 1)

Overall Thoughts:
Figure 3 Shows the employment dimensions for the system overall against two different benchmarks, in order from left to right according to their divergence from a group of universities that ModernThink had identified as best places to work.

Figure 4 Shows that ECU’s overall survey responses reflect less positive assessments in every single dimension when compared to the system average.

Figure 5 Breaks down the 15 Engagement Dimensions for each of the UNC system campuses.

Figure 6 Shows the 8 questions where ECU scores were higher than the system average.

Figure 7 Shows the questions for all ECU employees that had the lowest scores in comparison to the UNC System. ModernThink noted during their visit that these results suggest that we are not operating in a high trust environment, and they point to the need for an improved culture of communication.

Figure 8 Ranks the scores for each of the dimensions, with a comparison to all employees in the UNC system.

Figure 9 Shows the ECU faculty’s highest scoring responses.

Figure 10 Shows the ECU faculty’s lowest scoring responses.

Figure 11 Shows the Category scores for ECU faculty versus ECU non-faculty.
Figure 12 Shows the ECU faculty’s highest scoring responses when compared to ECU non-faculty.

Figure 13 Shows the ECU faculty’s lowest scoring responses when compared to ECU non-faculty.

Figure 14 Shows the Category scores for Assistant Professors versus Associate Professors.

Figure 15 Shows questions with the highest difference between Assistant and Associate Professors.

Figure 16 Shows the questions for which Full Professors had the highest scores.

Figure 17 Shows the questions for which Full Professors had the lowest scores.

Figure 18 Shows the Category scores for non-tenure stream faculty versus tenured and probationary term faculty.

Figure 19 Shows the questions for which non-tenure stream faculty responses were highest when compared to tenured and probationary term faculty.

Figure 20 Shows the questions for which non-tenure stream faculty responses were lowest when compared to tenured and probationary term faculty.

[Below are Professor’s Popke’s conclusions, which appear full and unedited]

“There are, I think, a few positives that we can take away from the results. Faculty overall express positive sentiments about our sense of mission, and very positive assessments of our departments and department chairs. Tenure-track faculty appear comfortable that they have the ability to do their jobs, and they express satisfaction about processes of evaluation and career advancement.

Assistant professors and our fixed-term and part-time faculty, all have relatively positive views overall. They have more favorable assessments of senior leadership, and collaboration, and appear to have a strong sense of pride.

But there are also reasons for concern. Whatever we might think of the response rate, or the value of surveys like this, the results depict an atmosphere of low faculty morale at ECU, especially among Associate, and to some extent full, professors. We know that some of this is driven by dynamics beyond our campus, and indeed this is evidenced by relatively low scores across the system. In addition to the evident failure of the legislature to provide resources for faculty raises, the system and its governing board have become ever-more partisan and intrusive, and this has helped to create a climate antithetical to faculty development and success. It is my hope that those who oversee the UNC system will take heed of these results, engage in some self-reflection, and seek to redress some of these issues.

But that does not leave us entirely off the hook, for the survey results also speak to more local issues, especially among our established faculty. Their responses point to low levels of trust and poor
communication, and a diminished sense of investment in our institutional culture. Our fixed-term and part-time faculty express additional concerns about performance review and expectations, and all faculty appear to have somewhat negative opinions about the role of teaching and how it is rewarded on our campus.

I do not purport to suggest solutions to these problems today. Instead, I would like to initiate a conversation, and to invite each of you to engage with your colleagues in seeking to better understand and address those factors that we can control that may be contributing to low faculty morale. At least a part of this conversation, I believe, should be to ask whether our systems of shared governance, including the activities of this Senate, are as effective and as transparent as they can be. Concerns about communication, collaboration, collective mission, and institutional leadership are issues that cut to the heart of shared governance, and to the extent that we are falling short at ECU, I want to encourage all faculty to embrace the challenge of working together with the administration and other campus constituencies to seek meaningful ways to make improvements. I will likely have more to say about some of these matters in the coming weeks. Meanwhile, I look forward to engaging you in conversation, and I encourage you contact me with any thoughts and ideas.”

There was no discussion.

G. Approval of Fall 2018 Graduation Roster, including Honors College graduates
Professor Stiller (Biology) moved approval of the Fall 2018 Graduation Roster, including Honors College graduates. There was no discussion and the Fall 2018 Graduation Roster, including Honors College graduates was approved as presented. **RESOLUTION #18-53**

H. Question Period
Professor Chambers (Education) asked about the issue of communication and how it was understood by the survey. Chair Popke agreed that good communication requires opportunities for input and debate, not just reports. We need spaces of collaboration and deliberation.

Professor Roberson (Nursing) asked Dean Stacy about Project Unify and how it is “less critical“ than before. Professor Stacy responded that when leadership first brought Project Unify up, it was a critical component to the health of the system. However this is no longer the case. Vidant and Medical School will not put each other at risk. His point was to communicate the idea that “the sky is not falling” and having Project Unify paused until the legislature determines the funding is not a crisis situation.

**Agenda Item IV. Unfinished Business**
There was no unfinished business to come before the body at this time.

**Agenda Item V. Report of Graduate Council**
Professor Ron Preston (Education), Chair of the Graduate Council noted that Graduate Council members discussed a number of important issues, but there were no action items approved at the **September 24, 2018** council meeting and the minutes have been posted for review and comments.

**Agenda Item VI. Report of Committees**
A. Faculty Grievance Committee
Professor Gregory Lapicki (Physics), Vice Chair of the Committee presented the Overview of 2017-2018 Committee Activities (attachment 1. of the meeting agenda).
Questions
Professor Schinasi (Foreign Languages and Literatures) wished this report had more information. For example, “why did Chancellor not concur on some cases?” Professor Schinasi asked if this report could be culled from data taken over a period of 10 years because he felt that would paint a better picture of the grievance procedure. Professor Schinasi made a motion that the Grievance Committee provide Faculty Senate with a cumulative report covering a period of 10 years.

Professor Roberson (Nursing), also indicated confusion over the data presented in the report.

Professor Schinasi (Foreign Languages) added that one year and 2 cases do not provide much useful information about grievance and due process at ECU. He reiterated that the Faculty Senate needs more data regarding the Chancellor’s rulings, and if not concurring with grievance cases should be something of concern. Professor Schinasi did not attribute any sinister motive to the report’s findings but he wanted to be sure that this issue doesn’t need further exploration.

Professor Brimhall (Human Development and Family Science) said that it does look like Chancellor agrees with grievance committee 100%. Furthermore, based on the Faculty Results from the ECU Employee Engagement Survey discussed earlier, should the Senate really ask a committee to “do more work just to do more work”? Professor Schinasi (Foreign Languages) responded that this will be very easy to do utilizing past Committee annual reports to the Faculty Senate.

Following the discussion, the motion requesting the Faculty Grievance Committee to provide the Faculty Senate with a cumulative report of their annual Overview of Committee Activities covering the past 10 years was approved as presented. RESOLUTION #18-54

The Overview of the 2017-2018 Faculty Grievance Committee Activities was accepted as presented.

B. Committee on Committees
Professor Gregory Lapicki (Physics), Chair of the Committee presented the names of nominees for the two Appellate Faculty Grievance Committee vacancies and one Appellate Hearing Committee vacancy. There was no discussion and Professor Mario Rey (Music) was elected to the 2019 open regular member seat and Professor Mary Gilliland (Medicine) was elected to the 2021 open regular member seat on the Faculty Grievance Committee. Professor Birgit Jensen (Foreign Languages and Literatures) was elected to the 2021 open alternate member seat on the Hearing Committee.

C. Educational Policies and Planning Committee
Professor Mark Bowler (Psychology), Chair of the Committee presented curriculum and academic matters contained in the meeting minutes of October 12, 2018 including a request to establish a BS in Entrepreneurship within the Miller School of Entrepreneurship; request to establish a new certificate: Leadership in Organizations within the College of Business; request to discontinue a certificate: Business Foundations within the College of Business; request to change five “strands” to concentrations (re-designation) including: Academically Gifted, Content Pedagogy, Early Childhood, Teacher Leadership in the Elementary School and Teaching English as a Second Language and establish one new concentration entitled Teaching Children in Poverty in the MAEd in Elementary Education within the College of Education; and Academic Program Review responses for the Department of Chemistry and the Brody School of Medicine Office of Research and Graduate Studies: Biomedical Sciences (MS).
There was no discussion and the curriculum and academic matters contained in the Educational Policies and Planning Committee meeting minutes of October 12, 2018 including a request to establish a BS in Entrepreneurship within the Miller School of Entrepreneurship; request to establish a new certificate: Leadership in Organizations within the College of Business; request to discontinue a certificate: Business Foundations within the College of Business; request to change five “strands” to concentrations (re-designation) including: Academically Gifted, Content Pedagogy, Early Childhood, Teacher Leadership in the Elementary School and Teaching English as a Second Language and establish one new concentration entitled Teaching Children in Poverty in the MAEd in Elementary Education within the College of Education; and Academic Program Review responses for the Department of Chemistry and the Brody School of Medicine Office of Research and Graduate Studies: Biomedical Sciences (MS) were approved as presented. RESOLUTION #18-55

D. Admission and Retention Policies Committee
Professor Jay Newhard (Philosophy and Religious Studies) Chair of the Committee presented proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI, Section II. Academic Integrity (attachment 3. of the meeting agenda). There was no discussion and the proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI, Section II. Academic Integrity were approved as presented. RESOLUTION #18-56

**Agenda Item VII. New Business**
There was no new business to come before the body at this time.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 3:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Amanda Klein  
Secretary of the Faculty

Lori Lee  
Faculty Senate

Department of English

**FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE OCTOBER 16, 2018 MEETING**

Resolution #18-53
Approval of the Fall 2018 Graduation Roster, including Honors College graduates.

Resolution #18-54
Request that the Faculty Grievance Committee provide the Faculty Senate with a cumulative report of their annual Overview of Committee Activities covering the past 10 years.

Resolution #18-55
Curriculum and academic matters contained in the Educational Policies and Planning Committee meeting minutes of October 12, 2018 including a request to establish a BS in Entrepreneurship within the Miller School of Entrepreneurship; request to establish a new certificate: Leadership in Organizations within the College of Business; request to discontinue a certificate: Business Foundations within the College of Business; request to change five “strands” to concentrations (re-designation) including: Academically Gifted, Content Pedagogy, Early Childhood, Teacher Leadership
in the Elementary School and Teaching English as a Second Language and establish one new concentration entitled Teaching Children in Poverty in the MAEd in Elementary Education within the College of Education; and Academic Program Review responses for the Department of Chemistry and the Brody School of Medicine Office of Research and Graduate Studies: Biomedical Sciences (MS).

Resolution #18-56

Proposed revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI, Section II. Academic Integrity as follows.

During the course of the 2017-2018 Academic year the University Committee on Academic Integrity reviewed this section of the manual and presented their recommended revisions to Professor John Stiller, Chair of the Faculty who requested the Admission and Retention Policies Committee’s review and report to the Faculty Senate.

The following proposed changes are being submitted and are reflected in the full document that follows.

1. Add the following link to the document: [Fostering Academic Integrity in Distance Education](#).
   a. The Distance Education and Learning Technology Committee had been working on additional information for distance education students. It was suggested that information be added to the Faculty Manual and a place has been designated for the additional information. (Section II.C.)

2. Add information pertaining to AI violation found when working on final grades.
   a. Currently there is no specific language that states what to do when a faculty member finds a violation at the end of the semester. The current practice is to give the student an incomplete or “I” for the semester and begin to reach out to the student per the faculty manual procedures. This addition would make that practice part of the process. (Section II.C.1.)

3. Add information pertaining to students in different sections
   a. This addition will help clear up how to proceed when two students are involved in an academic integrity violation but are in different sections.
   b. This addition will also assist with how to proceed with a student who took the section during a different semester. (Section II.C.1.)

4. Remove the section regarding a second appeal.
   a. Currently there are two levels of appeal for students who have violated the AI process. The first level of appeal is to appeal the decision of the faculty which goes to an AI review committee composed of a faculty, student and a member of the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities. Students are to submit all information to support their reasons to appeal. If the review committee favors the information submitted by the student than it goes to an Academic Integrity Appeal Board. If the review committee favors the information submitted by the faculty then the decision of the faculty stands and an AIAB is denied.
   b. At this time, students have a right to submit a second appeal with the stipulation that they are to submit new information.
   c. Historically, students who submit a second appeal do not submit new information. Typically, they just do not like the sanction they are given, and many times will indicate that they did in fact violate the Academic Integrity Process.
d. The committee is recommending removing the second appeal. The students will still have a single appeal process therefore they have due process. (Section II.D.2.)

For reference, listed are the number of AI violations, appeals and second appeals for the last few years. The table also shows that of the second appeals no new information was submitted therefore the student was denied a hearing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>AI Violations</th>
<th>AI Appeals</th>
<th>AI second appeals</th>
<th>Second Appeal denied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Changes to the Student Code of Conduct regarding Student Advisors
   a. This past year the student code of conduct was changed and now students must request the assistance of a student advisor if they wish to use one.
   b. Information regarding how to request a student advisor has been added to the faculty manual.
   c. Due to the code change there is also not a case presenter. This information is now read by the faculty chair as part of the script for the hearing. (Section II.I.)

In addition, the Committee offered minor editorial revisions reflected throughout the document.

The below document includes all proposed revisions and would replace what is currently in the ECU Faculty Manual.

(Document tracking all proposed revisions is available here.)

“PART VI - TEACHING AND CURRICULUM REGULATIONS, PROCEDURES AND ACADEMIC PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT
SECTION II

Academic Integrity

CONTENTS
I. Principle of Academic Integrity.
II. Purpose and Scope
   a. Definition of Academic Integrity Violations
   b. University-Wide Responsibility to Report Academic Integrity Violations
   c. Procedures for Responding to a Suspected Academic Integrity Violation
   d. Appeals of Decisions Reached by the faculty Member
   e. University Committee on Academic Integrity (UCAI)
   f. Academic Integrity Board (AIB)
   g. Academic Integrity Appeal Board (AIAB)
I. Principle of Academic Integrity

Academic integrity is a cornerstone value of the intellectual community at East Carolina University. Academic integrity is required for students to derive optimal benefit from their educational experience and their pursuit of knowledge. Violating the principle of academic integrity damages the reputation of the university and undermines its educational mission. Without the assurance of integrity in academic work, including research, degrees from the university lose value, and the world beyond campus (graduate schools, employers, colleagues, neighbors, etc.) learns that it cannot trust credits or a diploma earned at ECU. For these reasons, academic integrity is demanded of every ECU student.

Maintaining the academic integrity of ECU is the responsibility of all members of the academic community. Faculty should ensure that submitted work accurately reflects the abilities of the individual student. Toward this end, faculty should—through both example and explicit instruction—instill in students a desire to maintain the university’s standards of academic integrity and provide students with strategies that they can use to avoid intentional or accidental violation of the academic integrity policy.

II. Purpose and Scope

This document sets forth procedures to be followed for suspected academic integrity violations at ECU. It also details possible penalties for violations. Additional penalties may be established by academic departments, programs, colleges, and schools. Any such additional penalties must be established democratically by the faculty in a means compatible with school or college policies and/or unit codes. In addition to the penalties outlined below, individual units may have additional ethical and behavioral expectations of their students, particularly at the graduate level, including expectations for the conduct of research, and may take corrective action according to their regulations or rules.

ECU’s policy on research misconduct, as elaborated by the Division of Research and Graduate Studies (http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/rgs/Research-Policies.cfm), is necessary to ensure university compliance with this UNC system policy as well as with state and federal laws. All faculty, staff, and students should be familiar with it. The procedures for reporting, investigating, and determining penalties in cases of academic integrity violations shall not supersede procedures for reporting, investigating, and determining penalties for research misconduct.

A. Definitions of academic integrity violations

An academic integrity violation is defined as any activity that exhibits dishonesty in the educational process or that compromises the academic honor of the university. Examples of academic integrity violations include, but are not limited to, the following:

Cheating - Unauthorized aid or assistance or the giving or receiving of unfair advantage on any form of academic work. Examples of cheating include, but are not limited to: copying from another student's paper or receiving unauthorized assistance during a quiz or examination; using books, notes, or other devices when these are not authorized; improperly obtaining tests or examinations; collaborating on academic work without authorization and/or without truthful disclosure of the extent
of that collaboration; allowing or directing a substitute to take an examination.

Plagiarism - Copying the language, structure, ideas, and/or thoughts of another and adopting the same as one’s own original work. Examples of plagiarism include, but are not limited to: submitting a paper that has been purchased or downloaded from an essay-writing service; directly quoting, word for word, from any source, including online sources, without indicating that the material comes directly from that source; omitting a citation to a source when paraphrasing or summarizing another’s work; submitting a paper written by another person as one’s own work.

Falsification/Fabrication - The statement of any untruth, either spoken or written, regarding any circumstances related to academic work. This includes any untrue statements made with regard to a suspected academic integrity violation. Examples of falsification/fabrication include, but are not limited to: making up data, research results, experimental procedures, internship or practicum experiences, or otherwise claiming academic-related experience that one has not actually had; inventing or submitting deceptive citations for the sources of one’s information; submitting a false excuse for an absence from class or other academic obligation.

Multiple submission - The submission of substantial portions of the same academic work for credit more than once without authorization from the faculty member who receives the later submission. Examples of multiple submission include, but are not limited to: submitting the same essay for credit in two courses without first receiving written permission; making minor revisions to an assignment that has already received credit in a course and submitting it in another class as if it were new work.

Violation assistance - Knowingly helping or attempting to help someone else in an act that constitutes an academic integrity violation. Examples of violation assistance include, but are not limited to: knowingly allowing another to copy answers during an examination or quiz; distributing test questions or examination materials without permission from the faculty member teaching the course; writing an essay, or substantial portions thereof, for another student to submit as his or her own work; taking an examination or test for another student; distributing information involving clinical simulation and skills assessments.

Violation attempts - Attempting any act that, if completed, would constitute an academic integrity violation as defined herein. In other words, it does not matter if a student succeeds in carrying out any of the above violations—the fact that a violation was attempted is itself a violation of academic integrity.

In addition, specialized definitions of some terms as they apply to research are defined in the University of North Carolina Policy on Research Conduct. For example, this Policy defines research misconduct as “fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting the results.” Further,

- Fabrication is making up data or results and recording or reporting them.

- Falsification is manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record. The research record is the record of data or results that embody the facts resulting from the research inquiry and includes, but is not limited to research proposals, laboratory records; both physical and
electronic, progress reports, abstracts, theses, oral presentations, internal reports, books, dissertations, and journal articles.

- Plagiarism is the appropriation of another person’s ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit.

- Research misconduct does not include honest error or differences of opinion. B. University-wide responsibility to report academic integrity violations because academic integrity violations are unfair to honest students and because they damage the reputation of the entire university, ignoring academically dishonest behavior is almost as problematic as actively participating in a violation.

1. Faculty Member Responsibility
If a faculty member suspects that a student has violated the academic integrity policy in a manner severe enough to merit a grade reduction or other substantial academic penalty, he or she should, as a matter of academic duty, follow the procedures outlined below, making sure that the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities (OSRR) is aware of students who might be endangering the integrity of the university. Faculty are strongly encouraged to include a statement regarding this policy in their syllabi because it puts students on notice of the faculty member’s policy and alerts students to the importance of academic integrity to the ECU community. Sample policy language is available from the OSRR.

In some instances, a faculty member may deem it best to approach a potential matter involving academic dishonesty as a learning opportunity. In such cases, a faculty member may require that a student complete additional work to help them better understand the severe nature of academic dishonesty and to learn ways of avoiding future infractions. If at any point, however, the faculty member determines that a grade reduction or other substantial academic penalty is merited, either as a result of the initial infraction or as a result of a student not sufficiently completing the additional work agreed to, she or he must follow the process outlined below, including reporting the situation to the OSRR for its review and handling.

2. Student Responsibility
Students are expected to promote academic integrity in the ECU community, both by upholding it in their own work and by taking the responsibility to report any suspected violations. A student knowing of circumstances in which an academic integrity violation may have occurred or is likely to occur should bring this knowledge to the attention of a faculty member or the OSRR.

3. University Community Member Responsibility
All other university community members are expected to promote academic integrity in the ECU community, both by upholding it in their own work and by taking the responsibility to report any suspected violations. A university community member knowing of circumstances in which an academic integrity violation may have occurred or is likely to occur should bring this knowledge to the attention of a faculty member or the OSRR.

4. OSRR Responsibility
When a suspected violation is reported to the OSRR, the office will, if applicable, first discuss the suspected violation with the faculty member(s) in charge of the course(s) involved. The OSRR, in
consultation with the faculty member(s), will follow the procedures outlined in this policy.

C. Procedures for responding to a suspected academic integrity violation
These procedures apply to all students. If face-to-face meetings are not possible, alternative arrangements will be made as appropriate. Procedural guidelines for working with distance education students on issues of academic integrity are available from the OSRR.

For additional information on distance education please reference: Fostering Academic Integrity in Distance Education.

For undergraduate students, if a suspected academic integrity violation occurs outside of a specific course, the case will be referred directly to the University Committee on Academic Integrity for an Academic Integrity Board hearing (see “University Committee on Academic Integrity” below).

For graduate students, if a suspected academic integrity violation occurs outside of a specific course, the case will be referred to the student’s faculty advisor who will serve in the role of the faculty member in the steps that follow. In the event that no faculty advisor can be identified, the graduate program director will serve in the role of the faculty member in the process outlined below.

In the case of a suspected violation reported directly to OSRR for which an instructor of record can be identified, that office will first consult with the faculty member(s) in charge of the course(s) affected. The faculty member will determine if he or she wishes to pursue an academic penalty for the student in her or his course. Following this consultation, if the suspected violation involves multiple students, the OSRR may decide to pursue additional academic penalties outside of that course by taking the case to the University Committee on Academic Integrity for an Academic Integrity Board (AIB) hearing. (See below.)

In the procedures outlined below, “faculty member” refers to the faculty member in charge of the course, or, in cases in which the suspected academic integrity violation occurs outside of a specific course at the graduate level, to the student’s faculty advisor or graduate program director.

Except where calendar day is specified, the word “day” in these procedures means any day except Saturday, Sunday, or an institutional holiday. In computing any period of time, the day on which notice is received is not counted, but the last day of the period being computed is counted.

Under documented, exceptional circumstances (e.g., the instructor of the course or the student involved will be traveling or otherwise unavailable for an extended period of time at some point during the steps described below), reasonable adjustments may be made to the stipulated deadlines as needed.

1. Faculty member notifies student in writing of suspected violation and requests a meeting.
When a faculty member believes an academic integrity violation has occurred in her or his class, the faculty member must request--in writing and sent by some method with evidence of dispatch (e.g., email from the faculty member’s official ECU email account to the student’s official ECU email account; hand-delivered letter accompanied by a brief form that the student signs to indicate the note was delivered; receipt-request postal mail)--that the student meet with him or her to discuss the suspected violation. This written notice must be sent to the student(s) involved within 7 calendar days
of the time the suspected violation comes to the attention of the faculty member.

In the event that the violation is discovered or the notification sent during a time when classes are not being held, the 7 calendar days will be counted starting with the next day classes are held. *Note that a student may not withdraw from a course while a suspected academic integrity violation is being investigated.

If a faculty member finds an AI violation at the end of the semester and the student has already attended the last scheduled class session and final, the faculty member should mark a grade of “I” for incomplete until they can meet with the student. The faculty member should also follow the steps below and notify the student in writing of a suspected violation.

If a faculty member finds a suspected violation where the currently enrolled student has used the work of a student in either a different section or taken a class at a different time, the faculty member should begin the AI process for the student enrolled in their class. If the other student involved is enrolled in another section, and another faculty member is teaching that section, the faculty member who found the initial violation should contact the faculty member on record and they should begin the AI process. If the student took the class during a different semester than the faculty member who found the violation, faculty should submit the information to OSRR and the student will be referred to the University Committee on Academic Integrity for an Academic Integrity Board hearing.

In the event that a faculty member discovers a suspected violation at a time immediately after which he or she will no longer be under contract with the university, the instructor should refer the case, including all evidence related to the suspected violation, to the University Committee on Academic Integrity for an Academic Integrity Board hearing. The AIB will review the evidence submitted (i.e. syllabus, any AI statement signed by the student, document such as the paper and SafeAssign or other software used for find a suspected violation, etc.) through its normal hearing procedures and impose an appropriate academic penalty if a violation is found.

In all cases, a faculty member should not penalize the student’s grade or impose any other substantial academic penalty unless and until it is determined, following the procedures below, that a violation has occurred.

2. Student responds to notification.
   a. Upon delivery of the written notification from the faculty member, the student has 7 calendar days to contact the faculty member and schedule a meeting day and time. If the student fails to respond to faculty notification within 7 calendar days, the student will forfeit the opportunity to present his or her understanding of the situation to the faculty member.

   b. In the event that the student fails to respond, the faculty member may find the student responsible for the violation and may impose sanctions as outlined below. In this case, the faculty member will complete an Academic Integrity Violation Form (AIV form) and submit it to the OSRR within 18 calendar days of the date on which the notice of a suspected violation was sent to the student. The OSRR will notify the student, in writing, of the faculty member’s decision and penalty within 7 calendar days of receiving the AIV form.

   In the event that the student involved in the violation is a graduate student or is in a degree program that has additional penalties for or policies regarding academic integrity violations, the OSRR will also
submit a copy of the AIV form to the appropriate program administrator.

The AIV form will be kept for 8 years in the OSRR, unless the student has been suspended or expelled, in which case the disciplinary record is kept permanently.

3. Initial meeting occurs.
   a. Scheduling - The initial meeting between the faculty member and the student suspected of an academic integrity violation should be held within 18 calendar days of the time that the suspected violation has come to the faculty member’s attention.

   b. Nonparticipating observer(s) - The student and the faculty member may each have a nonparticipating observer at the initial meeting. The faculty member’s nonparticipating observer should be another faculty member from the department. The chair of the department should be notified of the meeting. The student may select a faculty member or student who is not involved in the suspected violation. The observer(s) is/are to watch the procedures impartially and take careful notes for reference in the event of an appeal of the faculty member’s decision. (See Appeals of Decisions, below.)

   c. Meeting procedures - At the meeting, the faculty member shall explain the reasons for his or her suspicion of an academic integrity violation. The student shall be given the opportunity to respond and to explain any circumstances that he or she believes the faculty member needs to consider with regard to the situation.

4. Faculty member determines outcomes of the initial meeting. - One of the following outcomes of the initial meeting will be communicated to the student within 10 calendar days of the meeting:

   a. No violation found—no penalty. If the faculty member believes that no violation occurred, he or she will impose no penalty. He or she will notify the student in writing of this decision, and no AIV form will be submitted to the OSRR.

   b. Violation found—academic penalty assigned by faculty member. If the faculty member believes there has been a violation, he or she will assign an appropriate academic penalty, including, for instance, reducing the grade on the assignment or reducing the course grade. The faculty member’s penalty can be as severe as failure for the course and a grade of “XF” recorded on the student’s transcript to indicate that failure in the course was the result of an academic integrity violation. The “X” designation must remain on the student’s transcript for at least one year and will be removed from the official transcript after one year only if the student has completed the academic integrity training module and obtained the approval of the Director of the OSRR. The approval of the Director of the OSRR must be obtained through the submission of a formal written request for removal of the “X” designation. Courses in which a student receives a grade of “XF” are not eligible for grade replacement even if the “X” is removed from the official transcript with the approval of the Director of the OSRR. In all cases, courses for which a student receives an “XF” will be factored into the student’s GPA, even if the “X” is removed from the official transcript and the course is retaken.

If the faculty member imposes an academic penalty, he or she should complete an Academic Integrity Violation Form (AIV form, available from the OSRR). The completed AIV form will be submitted by the faculty member to the OSRR within 10 calendar days after the initial meeting. The OSRR will notify the student, in writing, of the faculty member’s decision and penalty within 7 calendar days of
receiving the AIV form. In the event that the student involved in the violation is a graduate student or is in a degree program that has additional penalties for or policies regarding academic integrity violations, the OSRR will also submit a copy of the AIV form to the appropriate program administrator. The AIV form will be kept for 8 years in the OSRR, unless the student has been suspended or expelled, in which case the disciplinary record is kept permanently.

c. Violation found—severe enough for referral to University Committee on Academic Integrity (UCAI, see below) for an Academic Integrity Board (AIB) hearing. If the faculty member believes that a failing grade in the course alone is inadequate disciplinary action given the severity of the violation, he or she may recommend to the OSRR that the case be forwarded to the UCAI to pursue further action. (See below.) The OSRR will inform the student of the referral to the UCAI within 7 calendar days of receiving the faculty member’s recommendation. Note that the role of the AIB hearing in this case is not to review the faculty member’s assignment of an academic penalty but to determine if additional sanctions should be assigned.

Students with repeated violations - If, upon receiving an AIV form from a faculty member, the OSRR discovers that the student has prior academic integrity violations in her or his file, the case will be referred to the UCAI for an AIB hearing to consider more severe academic penalties. If a student is suspended or expelled as a result of an academic integrity violation, a record of the penalty will be kept permanently in the student’s file.

Violations involving multiple students - The OSRR will receive all reports of violations involving multiple students (for example, paper mills or cheating rings). Faculty members, students, and community members should, in all cases, report suspected violations involving multiple students to the OSRR. In the event that the OSRR receives credible reports of multi-student violations, that office reserves the right to refer the case to the University Committee on Academic Integrity for an AIB hearing.

D. Appeals of Decisions Reached by the Faculty Member

1. Conditions for Appeal
If a faculty member imposes a grade penalty or other substantial academic penalty for a first violation of the academic integrity policy, the student may only appeal the decision to the Academic Integrity Appeal Board (AIAB, see below) if one of the following applies:

- The student believes that the faculty member has not sufficiently supported her or his decision based on the materials discussed during the initial meeting.

- The student believes that the penalty is not appropriate for the violation and/or is in conflict with course policies as stated in the syllabus. Note that if specific penalties are indicated in the course syllabus, it is expected that students who have violated the academic integrity policy will be held to those penalties. A student may appeal a faculty member’s imposition of a penalty even if the faculty member has not properly followed the steps outlined above. In such a case, the faculty member should, upon receiving notice that a student has appealed an academic penalty imposed as a result an academic integrity violation, fill out the AIV form indicating the violation and the academic penalty imposed, submit the form to the OSRR, and participate in the appeal process as outlined below.
2. Process for Appeals
Students wishing to appeal a faculty member’s imposition of a penalty for an academic integrity violation must complete the “Academic Integrity Violation Appeal Form,” available from the OSRR. Upon receipt of the completed appeal form, a three-member panel, consisting of one administrator from the OSRR, and one trained student and one trained faculty member from the University Committee on Academic Integrity (UCAI, see below) will review the appeal request to determine if it is appropriate to forward it to the Academic Integrity Appeal Board (AIAB, see below). The student and faculty member participating in this panel will not be eligible to participate in any subsequent hearing of the AIAB. If the three-member panel determines that there is no clear basis for appeal in the student’s request, it will report this finding to the student.

3. Time Limit on Appeals
A student wishing to appeal an academic integrity penalty must submit the “Academic Integrity Violation Appeal Form” to the OSRR within 7 calendar days after receiving notification of the decision made by the faculty member. Failure to do so will result in the faculty member’s initial academic penalty being final, and no further appeal will be possible.

E. University Committee on Academic Integrity (UCAI) Composition/Membership
1. Faculty members - Sixteen faculty members, at least six of whom should have graduate faculty status, elected for three-year staggered terms by the Faculty Senate.

2. Student members – Sixteen students, at least six of whom should be graduate students, elected by and among the members of the Student Conduct Board. These students shall serve for a year and may be reelected for one additional year. The Director of the OSRR, or designee, shall serve as administrative officer of the committee, but shall not participate in hearings.

F. Academic Integrity Board (AIB)
When a case is referred directly to the UCAI (for example, in the case of repeat violations, multi-student violations, or suspected violations at the undergraduate level that occur outside of a specific course), a panel of five UCAI members—three faculty members and two students—will be selected to serve as the AIB for the case. If the case involves possible violations by a graduate student, every attempt should be made to ensure that all three faculty members on the board have graduate faculty status; however, in all cases, at least two of the three faculty members must have graduate faculty status. In cases involving possible violations by graduate students, the student members of the board must be graduate students. The AIB is charged with determining whether a student has violated this policy and, if appropriate, assigning sanctions. The AIB will select a chair from among its faculty membership. All members of the AIB may vote on the selection of a chair.

G. Academic Integrity Appeal Board (AIAB)
In the case of appeals of decisions made by a faculty member or by the AIB, a panel of five UCAI members—three faculty members and two students—will be selected to serve as the AIAB. In the case of appeals to decisions reached by the AIB, the UCAI members hearing the appeal should not have ruled on the initial case. If the appeal involves possible violations by a graduate student, every attempt should be made to ensure that all three faculty members on the appeal board have graduate faculty status, but in all cases at least two of the three faculty members must have graduate faculty status. In cases involving possible violations by graduate students, the student members of the appeal board must be graduate students. The AIAB will select a chair from among its faculty
membership. All members of the AIAB may vote on the selection of a chair.

H. Bias
Individuals coming before either the AIB or the AIAB may challenge the participation of any panel member due to her/his previous knowledge, experience, belief, or emotion that would influence decision-making either positively or negatively. The challenging party will be asked to provide specific reasons for the challenge. The Chair of the UCAI along with the Director of the OSRR, or designee, will determine whether the identified panel member should be removed. If the removal of a panel member results in less than five panel members being able to serve, parties will be given the option to continue with the existing panel or to reschedule the hearing for review by a full panel.

I. Procedures for the AIB and the AIAB
The Director of the OSRR, or designee, will notify the parties involved of a meeting of the AIB or the AIAB (whichever board is appropriate) within 10 calendar days of receiving an appeal that has been forwarded by the three-member appeal review panel or notice of a case that requires an AIB hearing. The faculty member (if appropriate), the student, witnesses, Student Advisors, and the Student Case Presenter (see below) shall be provided not less than 10 calendar days’ notification of the date, time, and place of the meeting. Appropriate waivers of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) must be obtained prior to any hearing. If a grade for the student in the course must be submitted, the faculty member shall record a grade of incomplete, pending a decision by the board.

Those who may be present at a hearing include:
- The student accused of the suspected violation. If a student would like to request the assistance of a Student Advisor he/she may contact OSRR for assistance. https://cm.maxient.com/reportingform.php?EastCarolinaUniv&layout_id=25

- The faculty member on record. If the faculty member would like to request the assistance of a Student Advisor he/she may contact OSRR for assistance. https://cm.maxient.com/reportingform.php?EastCarolinaUniv&layout_id=25

- The faculty chair, who will give an extensive and detailed summary of the case and present materials relevant to the case.

- The Director of the OSRR or designee (nonparticipating)

- Witnesses for the faculty member or student

- Any other person called by the chair

Attorneys are not permitted to participate unless the student is facing pending criminal charges stemming from the incident in question. In such situations, the attorney may only advise her/his client. The attorney is not permitted to ask questions or present information. The student will assume all responsibility for attorney fees.

Should the student or the faculty member (if appropriate) fail to appear without prior approval of the administrative officer, the AIB or AIAB will proceed with an absentia hearing.
Detailed procedures for AIB and AIAB hearings are available from the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities.

A majority of the appropriate board will decide the issue. The chair will vote only in the case of a tie.

The Director of the OSRR, or designee, will serve as administrative officer and is responsible for maintaining accurate and complete records of the proceedings.

The Director of the OSRR, or designee, will notify each party in writing, through our online database (currently Maxient) of the decision of the board within 10 calendar days after the conclusion of the hearing.

In the event the student involved in the violation is a graduate student or is in a degree program that has additional penalties for or policies regarding academic integrity violations, the OSRR will also submit a copy of the AIV form to the appropriate program administrator.

Possible Actions by the AIB and AIAB

1. Determination that the evidence is insufficient to sustain the charge or charges. In the case of an appeal of a decision reached by a faculty member, the academic penalty imposed by the faculty member will be removed. When this action is taken, in order to protect both the student and the faculty member, continuation in the class(es) and other related issues must be resolved by the unit administrator in consultation with the student and the faculty member. If the department chair is involved in the case, the dean will resolve any issues.

   In the event that the faculty member or student wishes to appeal the unit administrator’s decision, final authority rests with the dean. Any special arrangements for continuation in the course (e.g., switching the student into another section of the course for the remainder of the semester, arrangements for outside assessment/grading of student work, etc.) must be agreed to in writing and kept by the dean, unit administrator, and student for 8 years.

2. Determination that the evidence is sufficient to support the charge or charges. The board’s actions may include, but are not limited to, one or more of the following:

   a. Sustain, following a student appeal, the academic penalty imposed by the faculty member or the AIB.

   b. Issue, following a student appeal, a revised academic penalty if the initial penalty is deemed too severe for the violation. This action may only be taken in cases in which specific penalties for specific violations are not clearly stated in the course syllabus. In all cases in which there is sufficient evidence to support the charges and the specific penalties for violations are clearly stated in the course syllabus, those penalties will be upheld.

   c. Recommend, in cases where a suspected violation has been directly referred to the AIB, that the instructor of record assign a failing grade for the course or assignment.

   d. Recommend that the Provost, in accordance with policies and procedures of the UNC policy manual, impose disciplinary suspension from the University for a designated period of time.
e. Recommend that the Chancellor, in accordance with policies and procedures of the UNC policy manual, impose expulsion from the University. The academic transcript records the expulsion permanently.

f. Recommend to appropriate offices or units that a degree be revoked should a violation be discovered after graduation.

g. Recommend to appropriate offices or units that the student be removed from employment as a graduate assistant.

h. Recommend to the Dean of the Graduate School that the student be dismissed from his or her graduate program.

i. Recommend to appropriate offices or units that the student be required to attend a period of counseling with a member of the university staff or a counseling professional of the student’s choice and at the student’s expense. It will be the responsibility of the student to provide evidence to the OSRR of having fulfilled this requirement.

j. Recommend to appropriate offices or units that the student be prohibited from officially representing the university in any capacity (as a member of an athletic team, as a member of a campus organization or group, etc.).

k. Assign, and ensure the completion of, an educational task.

l. Appeals of decisions reached by the Academic Integrity Board and Academic Integrity Appeal Board

The student may appeal an original decision of AIB to the AIAB following the “Process for Appeals” explained above. With the exception of cases in which a student is being expelled from the university, the decisions of the AIAB are final, and no other avenues of appeal may be pursued. If the student is being expelled from the university, s/he has a right to appeal the decision to the Chancellor, the East Carolina University Board of Trustees, and finally to the University of North Carolina Board of Governors.

K. Annual Reports
At the end of each academic year, the University Committee on Academic Integrity shall prepare a report that summarizes its work. This annual report shall be submitted early in the fall semester to the Faculty Senate, the Student Government Association (SGA), and the Academic Council.
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