

University of San Diego

Digital USD

Faculty Newsnotes

Faculty News

1984-04-27

Faculty Newsnotes 1984 No. 164

Office of the Provost

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/faculty-newsnotes>

Digital USD Citation

Office of the Provost, "Faculty Newsnotes 1984 No. 164" (1984). *Faculty Newsnotes*. 163.
<https://digital.sandiego.edu/faculty-newsnotes/163>

This Newsletter is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty News at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Newsnotes by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact digital@sandiego.edu.

FACULTY NEWSNOTES

Edited by Debbie Gough

April 27, 1984

164

UNIVERSITY SENATE

The University Senate has begun deliberations on a proposal for Academic Integrity guidelines for the University (see attached pages at the back of these Newsnotes). The senators will begin debate on the proposal at a meeting of the Senate on May 10, 1984. Faculty are encouraged to review the proposal and discuss it with their senators.

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST

Undergraduate Majors at USD:

The Registrar's Office, at the request of my office, has provided a listing of the number of students who have declared a major in the various academic disciplines. This information has been provided each fall semester for the past several years, and for the spring semester as well a few times. It seems useful to continue supplying this data for spring as well as fall. Data on declaration of majors is in constant flux as students change their majors or move from "undeclared" status to a declared major. The data should, therefore, be considered only an approximation. Data is based on official declaration of major on proper forms in the Registrar's Office; informal arrangements with faculty or department chairs do not constitute a declaration of major by the student. Because changes of major are rare among seniors, less common among juniors, and quite usual among sophomores and freshmen, it is relevant to know the level of students listed. Hence, information on undergraduate majors has been subdivided into upper division and lower division students.

UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS - SPRING, 1984

<u>COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES</u>	<u>UPPER DIVISION</u>	<u>LOWER DIVISION</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
AMERICAN STUDIES	5	0	5
ANTHROPOLOGY	8	0	8
ART	21	4	25
BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE	26	9	35
BIOLOGY	50	41	91
CHEMISTRY	11	4	15

UNIVERSITY RELATIONS

Development:

March, 1984, income of \$402,031 (280 gifts) brought the 1983-1984 fiscal year total to \$3,024,277 (1,626 gifts). At the end of March, 1983, the month's gift income was \$229,395 (244 gifts) for a 1982-1983 total of \$2,167,469 (1,492 gifts).

Faculty/staff gifts in March, 1984, totalled 26 gifts equalling \$2,916. Alumni giving for March in support of the Irvine Challenge totalled \$11,874 (136 gifts) for a current fiscal year total of \$60,937.

Alumni Relations:

Please help us keep current on the whereabouts of our alumni by forwarding any address information you receive or of which you become aware. These can be sent to Guadalupe 203, Development Services, or DeSales 260, the Alumni Office. The information we have received so far has been most helpful and we thank you all for your support.

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Congratulations to David Light on the successful defense of his doctoral dissertation at North Texas State University on April 3.

LAW SCHOOL

Law School exams begin on Monday, April 30 and continue through Monday, May 14. Your help in curtailing excessive noise around More Hall is most appreciated.

VARIA

Dr. Dan Moriarty of the Psychology Department presented a paper, co-authored with USD graduate Ellette Elwin and Dr. John Allen of Point Loma College, to the meeting of the Western Psychological Association in Los Angeles last month. The paper reviewed the often contradictory results of experiments in which appetitive motivation is added to a situation requiring an instrumental response for escape from aversive stimulation. On the basis of their experiments, Moriarty, Elwin and Allen concluded that many of the contradictions could be resolved by considering the interactions among species typical defense responses elicited by the aversive stimulus, behaviors elicited by the appetitive motivation, and the nature of the instrumental response required for escape.

A History of American Business by Dr. C. Joseph Pusateri, published by Harlan Davidson, Inc., has now appeared in both hardcover and paperback. Noted Columbia University economic historian Stuart Bruchey in his review of the work has called it the best survey of the topic in print. Prior to his two-month stay in Kaiser Hospital for a fractured hip, Dr. Pusateri attended the annual meeting of the American Conference of Academic Deans in San Francisco. At the meeting, he was elected to a three-year term on the board of directors. Earlier, Dr. Pusateri conducted a workshop for the faculty of Our Lady of Holy Cross College in New Orleans on the subject of values education.

Dr. Rosalie Rhoads, Assistant Professor of Education, attended the California Association of Professors of Special Education Conference held in San Francisco on March 9-19, 1984. Dr. Rhoads is a member of the Executive Board of the CAPSE organization representing private universities and colleges.

Dr. Philip Hwang, Associate Professor of Education, Division of Counseling, and Dr. DeForest Strunk, Division of Special and Gifted Education, have been appointed to the Program Planning Committee for the California Association for Counseling and Development Annual Convention to be held in San Diego in February, 1985.

Assistant Professor Jan Writer presented a full-day workshop on Education of the Severely Handicapped in conjunction with the California State Department of Education and the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps in Sacramento on March 31. Accompanying Dr. Writer were three graduate students in the program for the severely handicapped: Ms. Rhonda Addington, Mrs. Susan Oliviera-Knudson and Ms. Susan Scardino, who presented a poster session of "New Faces on Campus", an explanation of the field placement program for students with severe handicaps on the campus of the University of San Diego.

Several members of the School of Education have recently participated in evaluations of the parochial schools for the Western Association of School and Colleges. They include Dr. Robert Nelson, Dr. Edward Kujawa, Dr. William Foster, and Dr. Robert Infantino.

In the Political Science Department, Chairman Patrick Drinan presented a paper to the Western Social Science Association, April 26, in San Diego: "Reagan's 'Star Wars' Speech and Orwell's 1984." An International Relations graduate student, Paul Uhlir, was co-author. Dr. Drinan will have published in The American Political Science Review this fall a book review of Vladimir C. Nahirny's The Russian Intelligentsia: From Torment to Silence. He has also been invited to participate in the University of California Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation summer institute at Santa Cruz in late June.



Dr. Michael Ross, also of the Political Science Department, attended the 1984 Annual Meeting of the Western Political Science Association and participated in a panel on State and Local Intergovernmental Relations.

Dr. Lou Burnett, Department of Biology, has had an article accepted for publication in the Journal of Experimental Zoology. The title of the article is "The CO₂ Specific Sensitivity of Hemocyanin Oxygen Affinity in the Decapod Crustaceans" and is co-authored by biology student Robert Infantino, Jr.

Dr. Burnett has also been invited to present a lecture in a symposium at the First Congress of the International Union of Biological Sciences, Section of Comparative Physiology and Biochemistry in Liege, Belgium in August, 1984. Dr. Burnett has received a travel grant to attend the congress from the American Society of Zoologists.

Dean Ed DeRoche, School of Education, gave the following talks in April: "Strange Facts About the Civil War", Invisible University, Rancho Santa Fe, La Costa, Kiwanis Club, South Bay; and "Newspapers in Education," Rocky Mountain Council for the Social Sciences, Phoenix, Arizona.

A paper describing research completed during her sabbatical leave in Spring, 1983, "Sterically Protected Hemins with Electronegative Substituents: Efficient Catalysts for Hydroxylation and Epoxidation" by Patricia S. Traylor, David Dolphin and Teddy G. Traylor has just been published in the Journal of the Chemical Society, Chemical Communications (1984), 279.

Dr. Joan Anderson, School of Business, presented a paper "Efficiency in Mexican Apparel Assembly Firms" to the Rocky Mountain Council for Latin American Studies in Tucson, February 23-25. The paper was awarded the Business Administration in Latin American Studies prize. Another paper, "The Response of Labor Effort to Falling Real Wages: The Mexican Devaluation of February, 1982", co-authored with Dr. Roger Frantz of San Diego State University, will be published in the July, 1984, issue of World Development. Dr. Anderson was recently named secretary of the Association of Borderland Scholars and will present a paper "Impact of Political Intention on the Cooperative System in Northern Mexican Border States" at the annual meeting of the ASB on April 26 in San Diego.

Dr. James Otte, History Department, presented a paper entitled "Barbara Meets Freydis: A Comparison of Germanic Women in Tacitus with Some Women in the Old Norse Sagas" at the Medieval Association of the Pacific's 1984 Annual Meeting in Seattle.

Dr. Dennis Rohatyn, Philosophy Department, presented "What Makes Winston Run? Hope, Despair and the Human Prognosis in 1984" at the Western Social Science Association meeting in San Diego, April 24, 1984.

"Politics and the Corruption of Language: Tocqueville and Orwell" was his topic at a conference on 1984: Manifested Destinies at UC, Riverside April 14-15.

Dean Ray Brandes served as a commentator at the Sixth Annual conference on Public History in a session on "The Public Historian's Role in Cultural Resource Management."

Dr. Steven Schoenherr presented a lecture entitled "Coronado: An Illustrated History" for the San Diego Historical Society lecture series on April 23 at the Manchester Conference Center.

History Chairperson Iris Engstrand's article entitled "The Unopened Gift: Spain's Contribution to Science During the Age of Enlightenment" has been accepted for publication in Terra, the Journal of the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County. She has recently been elected a council member of the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association and to the International Council, Phi Alpha Theta History Honor Society.

Dr. James Gump chaired a session on "The Politics of the Left" for the Phi Alpha Theta Regional History conference at Occidental College on April 14. Four history students were on the program.

Five history students at USD won the top six awards at the 16th annual Institute of History sponsored by the San Diego Historical Society. These awards will be presented at Point Loma College on April 28.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AT U.S.D.

A Guide for Students and Faculty

The university is an academic institution, an instrument of learning. As such the university is predicated on the existence of an environment of integrity. Any academic institution that tolerates dishonesty will experience a decrease in quality, in credibility and, ultimately, in reputation and prestige.

An academic institution's integrity can be insured in either of two main ways. One way would be to turn the atmosphere of the campus and classroom into that of an armed camp, the activities of which were predicated on members' distrust of one another. Another way is to rely on the basic trustworthiness and dignity of those who are engaged in the institution's endeavors. There can be no doubt that the second way of insuring academic integrity is greatly to be preferred in a university like U.S.D. which follows the principles of Catholic humanistic, value-oriented education.

All members of the university community -- faculty, students, and administration -- share the responsibility for maintaining an environment of academic integrity at this university. Without the full support of all students, neither faculty nor administration can preserve the university's high principles of academic integrity and excellence within an atmosphere of trust and openness. Without a display of trust and confidence on the part of faculty and administration, students cannot be expected to give their full support to these high principles and to implement them by responsible behavior.

Similarly, the entire university community bears the responsibility for taking action against individuals who are involved in acts of academic dishonesty. Where there is clear indication that one of the university's members is unwilling to abide by the principles by which its integrity is measured, he or she should not be allowed to remain in the university without sanction. Otherwise the principles by which the university strives to function will be reduced to mere rhetoric and the premises of trust and dignity will be severely compromised.

For these reasons the university's standards and procedures should be understood by which academic dishonesty is defined and by which action is taken against academic dishonesty. Part I of this Statement of Policy sets forth the university's standards regarding academic dishonesty. Part II sets forth the procedures by which those standards are implemented.

I. Academic Dishonesty

Academic dishonesty, no matter how unintended or inconsequential, is a substantial threat to academic integrity in a humanistic, value oriented university. An act of academic dishonesty is an act that violates the community of trust upon which pursuit of truth in an academic setting is based.

An act of academic dishonesty may be either a serious violation or an infraction. Serious violations are the following acts:

(1) Examination Behavior. Any intentional giving or use of external assistance during an examination shall be considered a serious violation if knowingly done without express permission of the instructor giving the examination.*

(2) Fabrication. Any intentional falsification or invention of data, citation, or other authority in an academic exercise shall be considered a serious violation, unless the fact of falsification or invention is disclosed at the time and place it is made.*

(3) Unauthorized Collaboration. If the supervisor of an academic exercise has stated that collaboration is not permitted, intentional collaboration between one engaged in the exercise and another shall be considered a serious violation by the one engaged in the exercise, and by the other if the other knows of the rule against collaboration.*

(4) Plagiarism. Any intentional passing off of another's ideas, words, or work as one's own shall be considered a serious violation.*

(5) Misappropriation of Resource Materials. Any intentional and unauthorized taking or concealment of course or library materials shall be considered a serious violation if the purpose of the taking or concealment is to obtain exclusive use, or to deprive others of use, of such materials.*

(6) Serious Violations Defined by Instructor. Any intentional violation of rules or policies established by a course instructor or supervisor of an academic exercise is a serious violation in that course or exercise, provided that: (a) before or at the commencement of the course or exercise the instructor or supervisor has announced the rule or policy and has announced that violation of the rule or policy will be considered a serious violation of academic integrity; and (b) the rule or policy, and the announcement that it is considered a matter of academic integrity, has been communicated in writing and in advance of the course or exercise to the instructor's or supervisor's department head or, if there is no department head other than the instructor or supervisor, to the dean of the college or school in which the course or exercise is given; and (c) the department head or dean has not informed the instructor or supervisor that the rule or policy is not to be considered a matter that, if violated, would be a serious violation.*

Infractions are the following acts:

(1) Any unintentional act is an infraction that, if it were intentional, would be a serious violation.*

(2) Any violation of the rules or policies established for a course or academic exercise by the course instructor or supervisor of the academic exercise is an infraction in that course or exercise if such a violation would not constitute a serious violation.*

* Illustrations of these acts of academic dishonesty are given in the Appendix to this Statement of Policy.

II. Academic Dishonesty: Sanctions and Procedures

Academic dishonesty, and allegations of academic dishonesty, are matters of university-wide concern in the same way that academic integrity is a matter of university-wide concern. Students bear the responsibility not only for their own academic integrity but also for bringing instances of suspected academic dishonesty to the attention of the proper authorities. Members of the faculty are obligated, not only to the university but also to the students they supervise, to deal fully and fairly with instances and allegations of academic dishonesty. The university administration bears the responsibility of dealing fairly and impartially with instances and allegations of academic dishonesty.

Academic honesty begins in the course or classroom. For this reason the responsibility to insure academic honesty, and to initiate action with respect to suspected academic dishonesty, likewise begins in the course or classroom. If the instructor of a course or supervisor of an academic exercise appears to be unable or unwilling to assure the academic integrity of the course or exercise, then those engaged in the course or exercise should bring the situation to the attention of the instructor's or supervisor's department head or dean.

The following sanctions and procedures will be followed with respect to instances and allegations of academic dishonesty as defined in Section I of this Guide:

A. Initiation of Procedures. The instructor or supervisor has the initial responsibility for determining whether a person has engaged in academic dishonesty in a course or academic exercise. Therefore, information concerning possible academic dishonesty in a course or academic exercise should be brought to the attention of its instructor or supervisor. If the instructor or supervisor is unavailable, then information concerning possible academic dishonesty should be brought to the attention of the appropriate department head or dean, who will then assume the role of the instructor or supervisor in the procedures that follow.

(1) When information of an act of academic dishonesty comes to his or her attention, the instructor or supervisor must undertake an investigation of the information or allegations in a manner that is reasonable under the circumstances.

(2) Unless it clearly appears that there has been no dishonesty, the instructor or supervisor must contact the person who may have engaged in the dishonest act and give that person the opportunity to deny or to explain the events with respect to which allegations of dishonesty have been made. If the person in question is not able to be contacted or fails to respond, then the instructor or supervisor must refer the matter in accordance with "Administrative Procedures," discussed below.

(3) After investigation and discussion with the affected person, the instructor or supervisor must determine whether (a) no act of academic dishonesty has occurred, (b) an infraction has occurred, or (c) a serious violation probably has occurred.

(4) The instructor or supervisor must prepare a written record of the investigation and summary of discussions with the affected person if any, together with his or her determination made in accordance with paragraph (3) above. A copy of this record, together with any penalty imposed upon the person by the instructor or supervisor with respect to the course or academic exercise, must be made available to the affected person.

B. Sanctions Regarding Course or Exercise; Procedures Regarding Infractions.
Unless the instructor or supervisor has erred in his or her determination that the affected person has engaged in an act of academic dishonesty, the instructor's or supervisor's imposition of penalty with respect to the course or academic exercise is final and unreviewable.

(1) The instructor or supervisor of a course or academic exercise may impose a penalty for dishonesty with respect to the course or academic exercise, regardless whether the affected person has engaged in an infraction or likely serious violation.

(2) Penalties imposed by the instructor or supervisor with respect to a course or academic exercise may include: reduction in grade of the affected person in the course or exercise; the requirement that the affected person withdraw from the course or exercise; the requirement that all or part of the course or exercise be retaken; the requirement that the person engage in additional work in connection with the course or exercise.

(3) One who has been determined by the instructor or supervisor to have committed an infraction may appeal the determination of infraction, but may not appeal the sanction imposed by the instructor or supervisor unless the determination of infraction is successfully appealed, in accordance with "Administrative Procedures" discussed below.

C. Hearing Committee. Each allegation of serious violation, each matter referred in accordance with section II.A(2) above, and each appeal from the determination of an infraction, will be heard by a Hearing Committee.

(1) The Hearing Committee will be composed of five members of the university community, as follows:

(a) The dean, associate dean, or acting dean of the school or college with jurisdiction over the course or exercise in which the act of academic dishonesty is alleged to have occurred;

(b) A member of the fulltime faculty of the school or college with jurisdiction over the course or exercise in which the act of academic dishonesty is alleged to have occurred;

(c) A student of the school or college with jurisdiction over the course or exercise in which the act of academic dishonesty is alleged to have occurred;

(d) Two members of the fulltime faculty from schools or colleges other than the school or college with jurisdiction over the course or exercise in which the act of academic dishonesty is alleged to have occurred.

(2) The deans of each school or college covered by this Guide, shortly after commencement of each academic year, will appoint two members of the fulltime faculty and two students of that school or college to serve on Hearing Committees, with respect to allegations of academic dishonesty either in that school or college or in other schools or colleges. In making these appointments, the dean may rely on recommendations made by the faculty or general student organization of that school or college.

(3) No dean, faculty member, or student who has a conflict of interest with respect to the subject matter of the hearing may participate as a member of the Hearing Committee. One who, having a conflict of interest, is appointed to serve on a Hearing Committee must disqualify himself or herself, after which the dean will appoint another member of the same category as the disqualified member [see II.C(1) above] to serve on the Hearing Committee as an ad hoc member.

D. Administrative Procedures. The following procedures apply when (a) an instructor or supervisor has determined that a serious violation probably has occurred [section II.A(3)(c) above]; (b) a matter is referred in pursuance of section II.A(2) above; (c) one appeals from an instructor's or supervisor's determination of infraction [section II.B(3) above].

(1) Administrative Procedures commence upon filing written notice of their invocation with the dean of the school or college in which the course or academic exercise was given.

(2) Upon request of the dean, the instructor or supervisor must promptly transmit to the dean a copy of the written record in accordance with section II.A(4) above.

(3) Upon receipt of the written record, the dean will convene a Hearing Committee to hear the matter.

(4) The Hearing Committee, as soon as is practicable after reviewing the record prepared by the instructor or supervisor, and after consultation (or attempted consultation) with the instructor or supervisor who has determined an infraction or alleged serious violation and with the person who is accused of having engaged in the dishonest act, will:

(a) establish the procedures that are to be applied with respect to the hearing to be held, and communicate those procedures to the affected persons;

(b) establish the date, place and time at which a hearing before the Hearing Committee will be held or, if the hearing is to be by written presentations only, the date and place by which written presentations are to be submitted to the Hearing Committee;

(c) hold a hearing and determine whether the serious violation or infraction in fact occurred; and

(d) in the event a serious violation has occurred as alleged by the instructor or supervisor, determine the appropriate sanction.

(5) The hearing held before the Hearing Committee, and the deliberations of the Hearing Committee, will be closed to the public, except that the Hearing Committee has discretion to hold a public hearing at the request of the person who has been accused of having engaged in the dishonest act.

(6) If the Hearing Committee determines that a serious violation has occurred, it must determine the sanction to be imposed. A sanction may be:

(a) expulsion from the University;

(b) suspension from the University or any or all of University rights and privileges, for a period up to one academic year, except that any such suspension may not have the effect of determining the grade received in any course;

(c) letter of censure;

(d) the requirement that additional courses or credits be taken as a prerequisite to graduation from the University;

(e) in the event of (b) or (c), imposition of a period of probation on such conditions as the Hearing Committee considers to be appropriate.

(7) If a Hearing Committee determines that no serious violation or infraction has in fact occurred, or if it determines that an infraction has occurred with respect to matters referred to it in accordance with section II.A(2) above, it will remand the matter to the instructor or supervisor who determined the infraction or probability of serious violation with a request that the instructor or supervisor take further action with respect to the course or exercise that is consistent with the Hearing Committee's determination.

(8) The Hearing Committee must prepare a written record of the proceedings, including a summary of the procedures for hearing that it has established, a summary of the information submitted to it by interested persons, and its decision in accordance with section II.D(4)(c) and (d) above, together with any dissenting opinions and any other material the Hearing Committee deems appropriate to include. A copy of this record, together with any sanction imposed upon the person by the Hearing Committee, must be made available to (a) the affected person, (b) the affected instructor or supervisor, (c) the dean of the school or college with jurisdiction over the course or academic exercise involved, and (d) the President and Provost of the University.

(9) In the event the Hearing Committee determines that expulsion is the appropriate sanction, or in the event of two dissenting votes on the Hearing Committee, the person who is adversely affected by the Hearing Committee's decision may appeal that decision to the Provost, who may finally determine the matter in the exercise of sound discretion.

APPENDIX: ILLUSTRATIONS OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

The following hypothetical situations are meant to furnish guidance to faculty and students with respect to determinations of instances of academic dishonesty as defined in section I of this Guide. These situations are illustrative only, and are not meant to furnish an inclusive list of instances of academic dishonesty.

Examination Behavior:

Definition: Any intentional giving or use of external assistance during an examination shall be considered a serious violation if knowingly done without express permission of the instructor giving the examination.

Illustrations:

1. In setting forth the rules to govern an examination, the instructor specifically states that the examination is to be taken "closed book." Knowing this rule, a student who is taking the examination refers to a written course outline he or she has prepared in the course. The student has engaged in a serious violation.
2. In setting forth the rules to govern an examination, the instructor does not state whether the examination is to be taken "closed book" or "open book." Knowing that the instructor has not specifically stated that the examination may be taken "open book," a student refers to course notes in taking the examination. The student has engaged in a serious violation.
3. In setting forth the rules to govern an examination, the instructor states that the examination is to be taken "closed book." Knowing this rule, a student who is taking the examination, without the knowledge of another student, peers over the other student's shoulder and copies a portion of the other student's examination answer. The first student has engaged in a serious violation.
4. In setting forth the rules to govern an examination, the instructor does not state whether the examination is to be taken "closed book" or "open book." Prior to taking the examination, a student inquires of another student whether the examination is "open book" or "closed book," and is informed that the instructor stated that the examination was "open book." Relying on this information, the student employs course notes and other materials in taking the examination. The student has not engaged in a serious violation, but has engaged in an infraction. The other student, who misinformed the first, may have engaged in a serious violation.

Fabrication:

Definition: Any intentional falsification or invention of data, citation, or other authority in an academic exercise shall be considered a serious violation, unless the fact of falsification or invention is disclosed at the time and place it is made.

Illustrations:

1. In a research paper, a student invents a magazine article, quoting from it and citing to it in the paper. The student does not disclose that the article has been invented by the student. The student has engaged in a serious violation.

2. A teacher requires, as part of the exercises given in a course, that students interview a local public figure and report the results of that interview. Instead of engaging in this exercise, a student reports an imaginary interview with a local public figure without disclosing that the interview has been imagined. The student has engaged in a serious violation.

3. A teacher requires that students perform a certain laboratory experiment. Instead of performing the experiment, a student consults another source and fabricates the results of that experiment based upon that other source, without disclosing the fabrication. The student has engaged in a serious violation.

4. The same situation as either 1, 2, or 3 on this page above, except that the student discloses, in the written or oral presentation of the project in question, that all or part of the project has been fabricated. The student has not engaged in the serious violation of fabrication, although the student may have engaged in an infraction.

5. A student reports to an instructor that other students have been cheating on an academic exercise; this report is made by the student knowing the report to be untrue. The student has engaged in a serious violation.

Unauthorized Collaboration:

Definition: If the supervisor of an academic exercise has stated that collaboration is not permitted, intentional collaboration between one engaged in the exercise and another shall be considered a serious violation by the one engaged in the exercise, and by the other if the other knows of the rule against collaboration.

Illustrations:

1. A teacher requires a written exercise to be prepared by students in the class, and states that collaboration among students is forbidden. Two students collaborate in preparing their written exercises. Both students have engaged in a serious violation.

2. A teacher requires a written exercise to be prepared by a student in a class, and states that collaboration is forbidden between that student and other students in the course. The student who has been assigned the exercise collaborates with two other students, one of whom knows of the teacher's rule against collaboration and the other of whom does not know of the teacher's rule. The student who has been assigned the exercise has engaged in a serious violation. The student who collaborated with knowledge of the teacher's rule has engaged in a serious violation. The student who collaborated without knowledge of the teacher's rule has not engaged in a serious violation.

3. A teacher requires a written exercise to be prepared by a student in a class, and states that collaboration is forbidden between that student and any other person. The student who has been assigned the exercise collaborates with another student of the University who is not a student in the course in which the exercise has been assigned, but who knows of the teacher's rule against collaboration. Both students have engaged in serious violations.

4. A former student in a course obtains a section of the course instructor's standard final examination, which the instructor is known to give every year. The instructor is known to keep secret both the examination and the answers to it. The former student gives the examination to some of the present students in the course, and sells both the examination and answers to it to other students in the course. Both the former student and the students who knowingly received the examination and/or answers have engaged in serious violations, whether or not the instructor discovers the situation prior to giving the final examination in the course to present students.

Plagiarism:

Definition: Any intentional passing off of another's ideas, words, or work as one's own shall be considered a serious violation.

Illustrations:

1. A student submits, for evaluation as his or her own work, a paper purchased from a commercial establishment. The student has engaged in plagiarism, a serious violation.

2. A student pays another student to write a term paper for a course, which the first student submits for evaluation as his or her own work. The first student has engaged in the serious violation of plagiarism; the second student, if he or she knows of the use to which the paper is to be put, has engaged in the serious violation of unauthorized collaboration.

3. A student, in researching a topic for a term paper, discovers an unpublished manuscript on the topic and copies two pages verbatim and restates in substantially the same words another two pages of that manuscript in the term paper, intentionally desiring that this material be evaluated as the student's own work. The student has engaged in a serious violation, both with respect to the material copied verbatim and with respect to the material that has been restated in substantially the same words as are found in the manuscript.

Misappropriation of Resource Materials:

Definition: Any intentional and unauthorized taking or concealment of course or library materials shall be considered a serious violation if the purpose of the taking or concealment is to obtain exclusive use, or to deprive others of use, of such materials.

Illustrations:

1. In discussing an upcoming examination in a course, the teacher informs students that it would be desirable to consult a particular book in the library on campus. After class one of the students in the course takes the book from its proper place in the library and, intending to prevent others from having access to it, misshelves the book in another section of the library. The student has engaged in a serious violation.

2. For purposes of a laboratory experiment, the teacher of a lab course constructs equipment to be used by students in performing the experiment. In order to prevent other students from conducting the experiment properly, a student intentionally damages the equipment, or alters it. The student has engaged in a serious violation.

3. A student gains access to a file of student transcripts, and intentionally alters his or her own transcript and/or the transcripts of others. The student has engaged in a serious violation.

2. A teacher determines that, with respect to a particular examination in the course he or she is teaching, the intentional failure of a student to complete the examination within a particular time will be a serious violation. The teacher (a) announces this rule to the class prior to giving the examination and (b) sends a copy of this announcement to his or her department head, who (c) does not inform the teacher that the rule is not to be considered a matter that, if violated, would be a serious violation. Subsequently the examination is given in the course, and a student intentionally fails to complete the examination when time is called. The student has engaged in a serious violation.

3. A teacher determines that, with respect to a course he or she will be teaching, the intentional frequent disruption of class by a student who engages in behavior that is abusive and demeaning of other class participants will constitute an attempt to undermine academic integrity and thus will constitute a serious violation. The teacher (a) announces this rule to the class at the beginning of the course and (b) sends a copy of this announcement to his or her department head, who (c) does not inform the teacher that the rule is not to be considered a matter that, if violated, would be a serious violation. Subsequently during the course, a student intentionally and frequently disrupts class by interrupting the presentations of other students, rudely criticizing the remarks made by teacher and other students, and otherwise engaging in such disruptive behavior, despite frequent requests by the teacher that he or she refrain from doing so. The student has engaged in a serious violation.

Serious Violations Defined by Instructor or Supervisor:

Definition: Any intentional violation of rules or policies established by a course instructor or supervisor of an academic exercise is a serious violation in that course or exercise, provided that: (a) before or at the commencement of the course or exercise the instructor or supervisor has announced the rule or policy and has announced that violation of the rule or policy will be considered a serious violation of academic integrity; and (b) the rule or policy, and the announcement that it is considered a matter of academic integrity, has been communicated in writing and in advance of the course or exercise to the instructor's or supervisor's department head or, if there is no department head other than the instructor or supervisor, to the dean of the college or school in which the course or exercise is given; and (c) the department head or dean has not informed the instructor or supervisor that the rule or policy is not to be considered a matter that, if violated, would be a serious violation.

Illustrations:

1. A teacher determines that, in the course he or she will be teaching, the intentional failure of one student to disclose exam cheating by other students will be a serious violation. The teacher (a) announces this rule to the class at the beginning of the course and (b) sends a copy of this announcement to his or her department head, who (c) does not inform the teacher that the rule is not to be considered a matter that, if violated, would be a serious violation. Subsequently the exam is given in the course, and Student A observes cheating on the exam by Student B, but intentionally fails to report it to the teacher. Student B probably has engaged in a serious violation related to Examination Behavior. Student A likewise has engaged in a serious violation.

2. A teacher determines that, with respect to a particular examination in the course he or she is teaching, the intentional failure of a student to complete the examination within a particular time will be a serious violation. The teacher (a) announces this rule to the class prior to giving the examination and (b) sends a copy of this announcement to his or her department head, who (c) does not inform the teacher that the rule is not to be considered a matter that, if violated, would be a serious violation. Subsequently the examination is given in the course, and a student intentionally fails to complete the examination when time is called. The student has engaged in a serious violation.

3. A teacher determines that, with respect to a course he or she will be teaching, the intentional frequent disruption of class by a student who engages in behavior that is abusive and demeaning of other class participants will constitute an affront to academic integrity and thus will constitute a serious violation. The teacher (a) announces this rule to the class at the beginning of the course and (b) sends a copy of this announcement to his or her department head, who (c) does not inform the teacher that the rule is not to be considered a matter that, if violated, would be a serious violation. Subsequently during the course, a student intentionally and frequently disrupts class by interrupting the presentations of other students, rudely criticizing the remarks made by teacher and other students, and otherwise engaging in such disruptive behavior, despite frequent requests by the teacher that he or she refrain from doing so. The student has engaged in a serious violation.

Infractions: Unintentional Acts:

Definition: Any unintentional act is an infraction that, if it were intentional, would be a serious violation.

Illustrations:

1. Before the commencement of an exam, the exam supervisor clearly tells those taking the exam not to open or read the exam before being told to do so. A student, who mistakenly thought the supervisor said to start taking the exam, opens his or her exam book and begins to read the exam. The student has engaged in an infraction.
2. A student intentionally falsifies data that is used in a paper, also intending to disclose in the paper that the data has been falsified but failing to do so. The student has engaged in an infraction.
3. A student forgets to cite properly all references to sources from which quotations are drawn in a paper submitted in a course. The student has engaged in an infraction.
4. In discussing an upcoming examination in a course, the teacher informs students that it would be desirable to consult a particular book in the library on campus. A student consults this book, after which he or she returns it carelessly to the wrong place on the library's shelves. The student has engaged in an infraction.

Infractions: Violation of Rules or Policies for Course or Exercise:

Definition: Any violation of the rules or policies established for a course or academic exercise by the course instructor or supervisor of the academic exercise is an infraction in that course or exercise if such a violation would not constitute a serious violation.

Illustrations:

1. Please consult the illustrations to "Serious Violations Defined by Instructor or Supervisor" in this Appendix above. With respect to each of these illustrations, the teacher announces the rule to his or her class but fails to inform his or her department head or dean of the rule, or of the position that the violation of the rule would be considered a serious violation. In this event, a student who violates the rule or policy could not be considered to have engaged in a serious violation, but could be considered to have engaged in an infraction.

2. Please consult the illustrations to "Serious Violations Defined by Instructor or Supervisor" in this Appendix above. With respect to each of these illustrations, the teacher's rule is communicated to the department head or dean, but the department head or dean informs the teacher that violation of such a rule or policy is not to be considered to be a serious violation. In this instance, violation of the rule or policy nevertheless may be considered to be an infraction.

UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS - SPRING, 1984

<u>SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES</u>	<u>UPPER DIVISION</u>	<u>LOWER DIVISION</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
AMERICAN STUDIES	5	0	5
ANTHROPOLOGY	8	0	8
ART	21	4	25
EDUCATIONAL SCIENCE	26	9	35
BIOLOGY	50	41	91
CHEMISTRY	11	4	15