THE UNIVERSITY *of* NORTH CAROLINA
GREENSBORO
Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda	**Wednesday, May 3, 2017**
Virginia Dare Room, Alumni House	**3:00 – 5:00 PM**

3:00 **Welcome & Remarks**
Anne Wallace, Faculty Senate Chair

3:10 **Approval of April 5, 2017 Minutes** **[Enc. A]**
Brad Johnson, Faculty Senate Secretary

3:15 **Dana Dunn, Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor**
(10) Remarks
(10) Questions from the floor

3:35 **Retired Faculty Association**
Pamela Williamson, Faculty Fellow to the Provost & Associate Professor,
Specialized Education Services, Director of Graduate Studies and Doctoral
Program Coordinator, SES Department
(5) Presentation
(10) Questions and discussion

3:50 **Resolutions from the Academic Policies Committee** **[Enc. B]**
Colleen Fairbanks, Chair, Academic Policies Committee
Donna Nash & Ken White, AI Task Force Members
(20) **Resolution #FS05032017/1:** To Revise the Academic Integrity Policy

4:10 **Resolution from General Education Council** **[Enc. C]**
David Carlone, General Education Council Chair
(30) **Resolution #FS05032017/2:**
To Approve a Self-Study of the General Education Program

4:40 **Senate Elections Committee Report**
(5) *Stoel Burrowes, Elections Committee Chair*

4:45 (10) **Remarks**
Andrea Hunter, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect

4:55 (5) **Announcements**

Upcoming Events:	**Commencement! Friday, May 12, 2017**
	10:00 AM, Greensboro Coliseum

Refreshments are available at 2:30 p.m. for Senators to meet and greet faculty colleagues
NOTE: We encourage Senators, non-voting faculty and visitors to speak upon being recognized by the Senate Chair

Sign Language Services provided as needed and requested (please allow 72 hours) by:
Communications Services for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing.
Contact: 336-275-8878, or the Faculty Senate Office, 336-334-5345/mlwolfe@uncg.edu

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, April 5, 2017
3:00pm-5:00pm
Virginia Dare Room, Alumni House
pending approval at the May 3, 2017 meeting

Call to Order and Introductory Remarks
Anne Wallace, Chair of the General Faculty and Faculty Senate
- **Ballots for the At-large Senate Committees** will go out very soon (probably tomorrow morning), with closing date of Monday, April 17.
  - Committees with vacancies:
    - Government
    - Due Process
    - Grievance
    - Faculty Assembly Delegation
- **April 19 General Faculty Meeting** will include a few business items and remarks from the Provost. I anticipate a fairly short meeting, and that's good, because we can then adjourn to the reception at the Faculty Center. As we did after Fall Convocation, Faculty Senate joins with AAUP and UTLC in sponsoring a reception—this time, "well done, and happy (almost) end-of-year!", plus some brief remarks on the UTLC's mentoring program.
- **May 3 Faculty Senate meeting** will be the last Faculty Senate Meeting of the year and will include discussion of proposed revisions to Academic Integrity Policy and Univ. P&T Committee elections (of which more later in an email).

Approval of the March 1, 2017 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Brad Johnson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate (Enc. A)
- No corrections.
- Minutes passed.

Provost Remarks & Questions from the Floor
Dana Dunn, Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor
- Remarks
  - Shared brief update on the UNC GA's Strategic Planning Initiative
    - effort has currently turned to the development of metrics to track institutions' progress toward goals tied to the plan
    - 9 metrics that will be considered by GA:
      - low-income enrollment: defined as Pell eligible
      - rural enrollment
      - low income completions
      - 5 year graduation rates

- undergraduate degree efficiency measure--on-time graduation
- achievement gaps in UG degree completion
- critical workforces
- research productivity
    - There is a negotiation between GA and campuses to determine foci
        - 5 in the top category
        - 3 in the middle category
        - 1 to sustain/not necessarily improve upon
        - This process will unfold between now and possibly May
    - How will these metrics and our progress impact the institution? The funds that GA periodically award (most often through requests for proposals for particular areas) will be tied in the future on initiatives that will have an impact on these metrics
  - Brief preview of a couple of items on the upcoming BOG agenda
    - May meeting has 2 items up for approval:
        - new degree program: Bachelors in Professional Studies program (fully online)--has been in development for 2 years, to operate starting new Fall
        - 2 Millennial Campus districts proposed:
            - Gate City: focused on Health & Wellness
            - Tate Street corridor: focused on the Arts
    - Provost recently began series of budget meetings with direct reports (deans of colleges and schools)
        - budgets by Deans will submitted
        - goal will be to become in a state of readiness to allocate resources
        - goal is that budgets will be finalized by end of this fiscal year
    - Budget--no clear prognosis on what state budget means for University
        - surplus could bode well but talks about tax cut could influence surplus that would come to UNCG
        - Enrollment growth, if funded or largely funded, would still bring us substantial resources which will be used to make investments in hires and other areas of the University
- Questions from the Floor
  - Has the University experienced any effects of the fixed tuition?
    - University will experience effects--this year is the start of the fixed tuition and will be locked for the next 4 years (8 consecutive semesters) for this cohort
    - Impact of locking tuition for 4 years means the recent increase approved by BOG at 3% means the increase gets pulled down to a fraction of the original percentage because of this tuition fix
  - Do we lose funds if students drop out?
    - we do not lose funds

- the penalty in fixed tuition comes to the student who takes longer than 8 semesters to complete--increase in tuition will occur based on the then-current rate
  - points to the need of faculty to be sound advisors and help students graduate in 8 consecutive semesters
- Does this fixed tuition apply to graduate students?
  - Only applies to undergraduate students
- Will there be any faculty involvement with the Title IX policies
  - Julia Jackson-Newsom shared that there will be faculty involvement--she has emailed Anne Wallace for participation
- Request that the Provost give a copy of the 9 metric areas--Provost will
  - should be visible on the UNC GA website
- Does 8 semester tuition fix include transfer students?
  - there is a formula for transfer students so that students do not start clean with 8 semesters
  - goal was to not penalize community college transfers as well as not provide them with any advantage
- Provost asked for any questions or clarifications on the Senate Budget Committee Questions responses that she submitted--no questions asked

Government Committee Resolutions
Greg Bell, Committee Chair & Senate Liaison
- Three (3) Senate Committees on Faculty Issues and Support
  - Resolution #FS04052017/1: To Establish the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty Issues *(Enc. C)*
    - This resolution is seeking to make the ad hoc committee a permanent committee within Faculty Senate
    - Greg read the resolution to the Senate
    - Anne reminded that motions from Government Committee do not require second motions
    - Note changes to Resolution in notes
    - Question from floor about the 25% of committee being tenure track and/or tenured faculty and 1 voting Faculty member being from each electoral division
      - Committee realized could be difficult with rotating of membership but left these requirements/decisions to the Committee on Committees
    - Question from floor: Does the Senate Liaison vote?
      - Anne clarified that unless the liaison is explicitly excluded, then the liaison is a voting member. No committee charges that she could think of at that moment include such an exclusion.
    - Question from floor: Does charge/mission change for this committee?
      - Anne shared that charge does not change once committee becomes permanent committee within the Senate

- Question from floor: The name seems to be problematic given that the name suggests faculty who "lack something" in their work and responsibilities--suggestion for us to keep thinking about this
  - Greg acknowledged that this issue has been raised before but the Committee doesn't know how else to address it
- Statement from floor: NTT faculty in their department is called Academic Professionals
  - Anne shared a variety of titles used for NTT faculty-- difficulty is that none of these are applied universally and none of these more clearly recognize the value of these faculty over others
- Anne called for a vote of Senate; unanimous vote to pass resolution
  - Resolution #FS04052017/2: To Change the Name and Charge of the Faculty Teaching and Learning Commons Committee to the Professional Development Committee *(Enc. D)*
    - this change is linked to the next resolution (#FS04052017/3) where "Professional Development" is removed from the name of that Committee
    - Greg read the resolution to Faculty Senate
    - Question from the floor: If we're taking out teaching and learning, this seems like a major change and that professional development doesn't limit itself to teaching and learning but where is it that we're going to have a committee to deal with teaching and learning?
      - Anne shared that by liaising with UTLC is to broaden the scope of the committee and not to limit or exclude teaching and learning
      - Senator shared that their perspective indicated that teaching and learning
        - Senator shared "professional development" does seem to include teaching and learning and the UTLC Director is listed as someone who is/was involved with the development of this resolution, teaching and learning should not be overlooked in the work of this committee.
    - Anne called for a vote of Senate; unanimous vote to pass resolution
  - Resolution #FS04052017/3: To Change the Name and Charge of the Faculty Professional Development, Compensation and Welfare Committee to the Faculty Professional Compensation and Welfare Committee *(Enc.E)*
    - Greg read this resolution to the Faculty Senate
    - Question from the floor: understand the logic of decoupling UTLC from the Professional Development but don't understand the logic of uncoupling UTLC from Professional Compensation and Welfare

- Laurie Kennedy Malone stated that the rationale was to remove the charge of development since it was going to be the charge of the new committee instead of this current committee
  - Question from the floor: Why have 2 committees instead of just 1?
    - Anne shared that committee conversations debated this idea--not adding committee but changing charges of the 2 committees
    - Made sense given the role of the old FTC versus the new UTLC
    - Laurie shared there have been more issues related to Welfare and Compensation and that issues related to professional development were not addressed as much or as often
  - Anne called for a vote of Senate; unanimous vote to pass resolution

Resolutions from Academic Policies Committee
Colleen Fairbanks, Chair, and Wake Maki, Senate Liaison
- Resolution #FS04052017/4: On Faculty Accessibility *(Enc. F)*
  - Colleen shared these concerns were brought forward by Provost as well as student concerns
  - Rationale: to make sure students knew how to access faculty outside of classroom
  - Peer institutions were surveyed to locate policies on their websites--varied policies were discovered
  - Faculty Senators were also surveyed for thoughts and suggestions on faculty accessibility policy
  - Committee tried to do 2 things:
    - make sure faculty are making themselves available to students-- acknowledging there are many ways by which faculty can be accessible
    - communicate accessibility in course syllabi
    - a minimum of 2 hours per week is expected for faculty to be available to students
  - Committee is not mandating set office hours or requiring faculty to be available by particular means; also not trying to override existing unit/departmental policies
  - Question from the floor: For online classes, there is always a challenge: can you provide an example of how this would be into effect for these courses?
    - Provide means of accessibility in course syllabi and set parameters by which faculty can be reached
  - Statement from floor: Senator shared they went beyond giving their Google number and provided their mobile phone and found that students did not abuse this method and response time to each text/communication was no more than 30 seconds.

- ■ Concern still shared by Senator that expectation from online students is that faculty accessibility is 24/7
- ○ Statement from floor: Issue may be with wording that minimum of 2 hours a week; how are these 2 hours measured
    - ■ If limits are not set on availability, then there may be an expectation that you're available 24/7
    - ■ Follow-up discussion shared that this policy with minimum could in effect make us less accessible
    - ■ Wade Maki also reminded Senators that unit/department policies would layer on top of these expectations to provide more parameters for availability
- ○ Statement from floor: If we explicitly set a low bar, it erodes expectations and provides the opportunity that people will lower their expectations and guidelines and could make us look bad
- ○ Provost asked Senators to consider how this language would look to someone outside the University
    - ■ shared that she doesn't see this as responsive in any way to the concerns brought forward by students to her for face-to-face interaction with faculty
    - ■ could have uneven landscape across departments and units for faculty availability
    - ■ asked the Senate to consider further discussion on this important issue
    - ■ this statement is at odds for what the Provost and Chancellor are championing UNCG as being to outside constituencies
- ○ Colleen shared information from surveys that showed that even with specific office hours, not all students would be served with specific hours
- ○ Statement from floor: Policy seems to read that faculty could be available over email and adequately cover availability requirement; suggestion is to separate out email from other means
- ○ Statement from floor: recommendation to take out the 2 hours a week expected and let the rest of the policy stand
- ○ Statement from floor: suggestion to have policy that address in-person office hours as well as policy that addresses other means by which faculty can be accessed
    - ■ Colleen shared that Canvas can be used to vary hours available for students
    - ■ Anne shared that Committee wanted to make it clear that faculty needed to be available to classes for a reasonable time and that faculty were flexible with courses that may have other/different expectations for availability
- ○ Statement from floor: Email concern raised by Senator earlier is a concern because some faculty could interpret
- ○ Anne offered options available:
    - ■ Send resolution back to the committee for further work/modification

- ■ Bring forward an amendment to the resolution and call for a vote
- ○ Senator asked if committee reviewed Faculty Handbook to see how/if other important policies were covered and handled
    - ■ Wade shared original version of resolution did not include the 2 hour clause but was later added based on feedback received on original version
- ○ Provost asked if department heads/chairs were surveyed; they may call for more clarity as to how they are to approach such matters
    - ■ Wade shared that some department chairs and deans responded and asked for the committee to not override their ability to do things with their own faculty
    - ■ Colleen shared that as a chair, she does not want the responsibility of checking office hours of their faculty each week
- ○ Senator shared that the minimum of 2 hours a week be expected be eliminated and more importance be placed on the "Faculty will respond to students seeking access via these methods in a timely fashion."
- ○ Motion to strike the minimum of 2 hours per week; seconded by another Senator
    - ■ Senator asked if the improvement was approved by the Provost
        - ● She said it is improved but it doesn't address the original request by students (who were not polled to see if program/department specific) who were reluctant to reach out to faculty; felt more comfortable if something was set that they know they'd be welcomed by the faculty
        - ● Would still like to see some specific expectation for face-to-face availability
    - ■ Colleen shared that when she met with students, she asked students about being able to meet with faculty because stated office hours were not conducive for meeting and they all shared this has been a concern
    - ■ Statement from floor: We have an opportunity to have a dialogue as to what would serve our students best
        - ● some standard of availability of faculty
        - ● some soft policy to accommodate students who can't make standard office hour
        - ● some sense of control of accessibility for online courses (?)
    - ■ Statement from floor: Senator liked the original statement mentioning the 2 hours minimum; the key is to be very specific about availability and response time on course syllabi for students; need to give faculty guidance as to what to put in syllabi to be more clear to students
    - ■ Senator asked for some guidelines for face-to-face courses and online courses be established
    - ■ Senator cited the last sentence in resolution ("Units, departments, or programs may create additional…") and asked if this statement

could be moved earlier in the resolution and if this would be more effective in learning students' needs and how to best meet those
- Anne called for vote for motion to strike the 2 hour minimum: hand vote 14 ayes; 10 nays; ayes have it and the sentence is stricken from the resolution
- Anne shared options for this resolution:
  - a "no" vote sends it back to the committee for further work
  - a "yes" vote could support the resolution with the new wording of the 2 hours a week minimum being removed
- Parliamentarian shared that the resolution could not come back in exactly the same form/wording if defeated, but could return in a modified form.
- Question from floor: Does this resolution focus primarily on undergraduate students or are graduate students included as well? Graduate education seems to be different in terms of faculty interaction between undergraduate and graduate student populations
  - Wade shared that last sentence addresses that in terms of individual units and departments addressing availability of faculty
- Motion proposed to table this resolution; motion seconded; no discussion
  - Anne called for vote; ayes have majority, **the resolution is tabled**
- Resolution #FS04052017/5: To Revise the Academic Good Standing Policy *(Enc. G)*
  - BOG mandated policy change; students with GPA under 2.0 or who haven't completed 67% of their courses would be placed on academic probation (?)
  - Colleen read the resolution to the Faculty Senate
  - Students who drop courses they are having difficulty in would be responsible for just the courses they are currently taken; they would not be penalized by including courses they have dropped
  - Senator asked about possible consequences of Financial Aid and requiring students to complete percentage of coursework?--need to complete 67% before consequences occur
  - Anne called for vote: passed unanimously

UNC Faculty Assembly Report Feb. 20 Meeting (*Enc. H*)
Anne Wallace, Faculty Senate Chair
- Thanks to Spoma, who got me to edit this report to a reasonable length in text! Anna couldn't be here today, so I'm bringing the report to you from our delegation.
- This will be the even shorter version:
- Gabriel Lugo, Chair of FA, opened with an inspiring call for faculty to safeguard the integrity of our universities and carry on the search for truth ("truthiness?"). He also remarked on the changes to BOG, and ongoing (not yet successful) efforts to seat several ex-officio members, one of who would be FA chair.
- President Spellings addressed FA, as she regularly does, and foregrounded several concerns: UNC's online profile, which she feels needs updating in several ways; the uses of technology to advance the SP goals of access, completion, and

affordability; and financial aid distributions in the state, which she feels need change to support those same three areas of concern.

- We heard reports from: UNC Online Task Force; the GA Fellow on "Climate," diversity and inclusion; Drew Moritz, the VP for State Gov't Relations; Junius Gonzales, Senior VP for Academic Affairs; and Andrew Kelly, Sr. VP for Strategy and Policy. I'll be glad to answer any questions you might have about the details in the agenda packet report, but will bring forward only one particular item: Vidya Garyega will be a GA Fellow this summer. Congratulations to Vidya, and thanks for adding to UNCG's visibility there in Chapel Hill.
- Preparations went forward for Faculty Assembly leadership elections, which will take place at our April 21 meeting. I will note that officers of FA do not have to be delegates: any member of the UNC faculty is eligible. So . . .
- When we meet April 21, in addition to electing the leadership, we'll be discussing possible resolutions on cuts to higher Ed, and on the so-called "Free Speech" bill (H527) that has been introduced to the legislature. Our theme for this last meeting of the year is—"Academic Freedom."

Nomination of Honorary Degrees Committee Member
Stoel Burrowes, Senate Elections Committee Chair
- Stoel shared that Spoma Jovanovic has been nominated for membership onto this committee
- Anne reminded that the Honorary Degrees Committee is not a Committee of the Faculty Senate
- No further nominations were received from the floor
- Anne called for vote to recommend Spoma as the Faculty Senate nominee for membership on the Honorary Degrees Committee.
- Nomination of Spoma Jovanovic, unanimously approved by voice vote.

Announcements
- Faculty Forum on April 19, 2017 from 3pm-5pm
    - Reception immediately following in the Faculty Center
    - Refreshments provided by UTLC, Faculty Senate, & AAUP
- Next Meeting of the Faculty Senate: Wednesday, May 3, 2017, 3pm-5pm in the Virginia Dare Room of the Alumni House

Adjournment
- Move to adjourn. Seconded
- Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Brad Johnson,
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Pending approval at the May 3, 2017 Faculty Senate Meeting

THE UNIVERSITY of NORTH CAROLINA
GREENSBORO
Faculty Senate

Resolution #FS05042017/1
To Revise the Academic Integrity Policy
Presented by Colleen Fairbanks and Donna Nash

WHEREAS, academic integrity is an essential requirement of education; and

WHEREAS, the policies related to academic integrity should be clear, provide guidance to faculty and students, and be subject to faculty oversight; and

WHEREAS, academic integrity is distinct from student code of conduct infractions; and

WHEREAS, the current policy conflates student code of conduct and academic integrity hearings; and

WHEREAS, the current Executive Committee that oversees academic integrity policies places primary oversight with the Dean of Students Office;

WHEREAS, this administrative organization does not provide for sufficient faculty oversight; and

WHEREAS, the current policy does not include infractions related to unauthorized behavior during an assessment; and

WHEREAS, academic integrity process must ensure student rights to due process and confidentiality; and

WHEREAS, a Task Force on Academic Integrity established by Provost Dunn has reviewed and made recommendations for policy changes;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the current policy on Academic Integrity be replaced with the revised policy (attached) recommended by the Task Force on Academic Integrity.

Rationale for Recommending a Revised Academic Integrity Policy

At the beginning of Fall 2016, Provost Dunn established an ad hoc Task Force to review the Academic Integrity policy and procedures. She had received feedback from some faculty and department heads expressing serious concerns with the policy, particularly with the management of appeals hearings.

The committee recommended several changes to the policy:

1. *Re-establish faculty oversight.* The committee found that the Dean of Students office managed all aspects of the policy and its implementation with no faculty oversight as the Academic Integrity Advisory Committee described in the current policy had not been constituted for many years. The proposed revision recommends a new description of the committee and its charge, the Academic Integrity Advisory Committee, now to be called the Academic Policies Subcommittee on Academic Integrity that would be attached to the Academic Policies and Regulations Committee of the Faculty Senate.
2. *Establish an unauthorized behaviors policy.* The committee learned that a student's failure to follow the rules (established by an instructor) under which an assessment (for instance, test, in-class exercise, etc.) took place was not, in and of itself, a violation of the Academic Integrity policy. For example, in a recent case, two students who persisted in breaking such a rule (talking with each other during a test) were found "not responsible" for violating the AI policy on the grounds that the instructor could not prove that they had actually cheated while they had been talking. The new category of violations covers that kind of situation.
3. *Separate Academic Integrity from Student Code of Conduct hearings.* Currently, if a student pleads "not responsible" ("innocent" in AI violation terms), a hearing is held that follows the procedures developed for Student Code of Conduct hearings. The use of Code of Conduct hearing procedures for AI appeals hearings has caused a number of problems including, but not limited to, a great deal of confusion regarding the role of the instructor in the hearing process. The committee generated a new, separate set of procedures for Academic Integrity allegation appeals hearings. These procedures are outlined in the revised policy under consideration by the Faculty Senate at the May 3 meeting.
4. *The addition of Student Rights and FERPA.* Two additional sections to the policy have been recommended. The first is a clear statement of students' due process rights in any violations proceeding. The second is a clear statement requiring that all proceedings adhere to regulations related to the students' right to confidentially as indicated by federal law.
5. *General organizational and terminology updating.* The committee also updated titles and made suggestions for organizational clarity of the policy.

Academic Integrity Policy

Approved Fall 2009. Modified Summer 2016.

I. PHILOSOPHY

Academic integrity is founded upon and encompasses the following five values: *honesty, trust, fairness, respect,* and *responsibility.* Supporting and affirming these values is essential to promoting and maintaining a high level of academic integrity.[1] Each member of the academic community must stand accountable for his or her actions. As a result, a community develops in which students learn the responsibilities of citizenship and how to contribute honorably to their professions.

If knowledge is to be gained and properly evaluated, it must be pursued under conditions free from dishonesty. Deceit and misrepresentations are incompatible with the fundamental activity of this academic institution and shall not be tolerated. Members of the UNCG community are expected to foster in their own work the spirit of academic honesty and not to tolerate its abuse by others.

Responsibility for academic integrity lies primarily with individual students and faculty members of this community. A violation of academic integrity is an act harmful to all students, faculty and, ultimately, the University.

[1] The Center for Academic Integrity (1998). Fundamental principles of academic integrity.

II. AUTHORITY

A. The *Academic Integrity Policy* is one of three formal processes governing student conduct at UNCG. The *Academic Integrity Policy* governs student conduct directly related to the academic life of the institution and is in effect during all phases of a student's academic career. The *Policy* is applicable to any academically related experience involving UNCG students whether on or off the campus. All alleged violations of the *Policy* must be resolved in accordance with this *Policy* and under the direct authority of a UNCG faculty member or the Dean of Students Office as detailed in the *Policy.* The Dean of Students Office will be responsible for advising the Vice Provost for Graduate Education of all cases and

resolutions involving UNCG graduate students. For the purposes of this *Policy*, faculty are defined as all instructors of record including teaching assistants (TA).

B. The *Student Code of Conduct* addresses general student conduct, usually excluding academic responsibilities. The *Student Code of Conduct* details the due process and hearing requirements for student conduct proceedings; it does not duplicate or contravene the purposes of the *Academic Integrity Policy* nor of other graduate or professional proceedings related to schools, departments or professions.

C. Graduate or professional schools within the University may initiate charges against students for alleged violations of professional standards or ethics as a separate issue or as an extension of alleged acts of academic dishonesty or violations of the *Student Code of Conduct.* Double jeopardy is not involved since the student is accountable to separate jurisdictions – institutional standards of academic dishonesty, general conduct and/or the ethical standards of the particular profession. In resolving cases of alleged violations of professional standards or ethics, the schools and departments are responsible for devising procedures appropriate to their programs and for provision of due process for all students. The University Counsel can provide guidance in such practices.[2] The Vice Provost for Graduate Education will be responsible for advising the Dean of Students Office of all such cases and resolutions involving UNCG graduate students where those cases may also involve academic integrity issues.

1. Violations in this category include both violations of the code of ethics specific to a particular profession and violations of more generally applicable ethical requirements for the acquisition, analysis, and reporting of research data and the preparation and submission of scholarly work for publication. Some examples are: Violating a canon of the ethical or professional code of the profession for which a student is preparing. Using unethical or improper means of acquiring, analyzing, or reporting data in a senior thesis project, a master's or doctoral research project, grant-funded research, or research submitted for publication. Misuse of grant or institutional funds. Violating professional ethics in performing one's duties as a Teaching Assistant or Graduate Assistant.

D. Students agree that by taking courses at UNCG, all required papers may be subject to submission for textual similarity review to *Turnitin.com* for the detection of plagiarism. All submitted papers will be included as source documents in the *Turnitin.com* reference database solely for the purpose of detecting plagiarism of such papers. Use of the *Turnitin.com* service is subject to the Usage Policy posted on the *Turnitin.com* site. To review the *Turnitin* agreement, please go to: https://its.uncg.edu/Canvas/Support/turnitin-registration-agreement.pdf.

[2] Information in this section was adapted from language used in Gehring, D. and Pavela, G. (1986) Issues and Perspectives on Academic Integrity, second edition, Washington: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

III.   VIOLATIONS

A.   The UNCG community subscribes to the following fundamental values of academic integrity: honesty; trust; fairness; respect; responsibility. All violations of the *Policy* are violations of the value of honesty but may also create questions related to trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility. The violations of the *Academic Integrity Policy* listed below are typical, but not exhaustive, examples of the acts that constitute breaches of the *Policy.* Faculty should take into account whether the student has had the opportunity to learn appropriate citation procedures based on previous course work successfully completed before formalizing Academic Integrity charges.

1.   **Cheating:** Using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in any academic exercise. Misrepresenting the source, nature, or other conditions of academic work, or to cooperate with someone else in such misrepresentation. Such misrepresentations may, but need not necessarily, involve the work of others. Examples of cheating include, but are not limited to, the following: unauthorized copying from the work of another student, using notes, textbooks or other information in examinations, tests and quizzes, except as expressly permitted; obtaining or retaining partial or whole copies of examination, tests or quizzes before these are distributed for student use; obtaining confidential information about examinations, tests or quizzes other than that released by the instructor; securing, giving or exchanging information or assistance during examinations and other academic exercises, except as expressly permitted; presenting data or other material gathered by another person or group as one's own; having another person take one's place for any academic performance without the specific knowledge and permission of the instructor; purchase an assignment from an online site or online platform; obtain assistance from someone else that goes beyond mere editing to writing of the assignment or solving of the problem; participate in unauthorized discussion group or sharing answers to an assignment on file sharing sites or other online platforms including social media; post or purchase answers to an exam, assignment, problem or any other assessed work; cooperating with another to do one or more of the above.. Cheating may occur on an examination, test, quiz, laboratory work report, theme, out of class assignment or any other work submitted by a student to fulfill course requirements and presented as solely the work of the student.

2.   **Plagiarism:** Representing the words, thoughts, or ideas of another, as one's own in any academic exercise. Plagiarism may occur on

any paper, report, or other work submitted to fulfill course requirements. Examples of plagiarism include, but are not limited to, the following: submitting work done by another, whether a commercial or non-commercial enterprise, including the Internet, as one's own work; failure to properly cite references and/or sources; submitting, as one's own, work done by or copied from another including work done by a fellow student, work done by a previous student, or work done by anyone other than the student responsible for the assignment. Plagiarism also occurs in a group project if one or more members of the group does none of the group's work and participates in none of the group's activities, but attempts to take credit for the work of the group.

3. **Misuse of Academic Resources:** The use, misuse or alterations of University materials or resources so as to make them inaccessible to other users. Examples of misuse of academic resources include, but are not limited to, the following: the unauthorized use of computer accounts; alteration of passwords; violation of library procedures; or other intentional misuse or destruction of educational materials. This violation is differentiated from a conduct violation in that the primary result of actions is the inaccessibility of resources to other students.

4. **Falsification:** Inventing, altering, or falsifying any data, information or citation in an academic exercise. Examples of falsification include, but are not limited to, the following: reporting data, research, or reports so that either the process or the product is shown to be different from what actually occurred; falsely reporting having met responsibilities of attendance or participation in class, practicum, internship, or other types of field work experience; submission of falsified excuses for attendance or participation in such experiences; work submitted for the requirements of any pre/post-secondary course cannot be submitted to meet the requirements in another course without the expressed permission of the instructor(s) to whom the work is to be submitted; falsifying experimental data or information; forging or falsifying any academic-related University document; presenting falsified information in order to postpone or avoid examinations, tests, quizzes, or other academic work.

5. **Facilitating Academic Dishonesty:** Helping or attempting to help another to commit an act of academic dishonesty. Facilitating academic dishonesty includes acts that may not directly benefit the accused but assist another student in violations of the *Policy*.

6. **Unauthorized Behaviors:** Instructors may communicate to their students additional behaviors that constitute a violation of the Academic Integrity Policy in their course. Such behaviors may include, but are not limited to, the following: talking during an exam; having unauthorized materials present during any academic

exercise; violating class conduct rules that are pertinent to academic integrity (for instance, rules governing the use of electronic devices) Instructors must clearly identify the additional unauthorized behaviors as academic integrity violations in their syllabus. Instructors may also communicate what these behaviors are orally, and may change or add to the list of unauthorized behaviors. Oral communications, and all changes, must also be clearly communicated in text (syllabus, email to whole class, etc.) as soon as possible after the oral communication and/or change.

IV. SANCTIONS

A. Both the academic experience and the classification of the student should be considered in the assignment of sanctions. Faculty have discretion in assigning any grade-related sanction. **Whenever a grade-related sanction is imposed for a violation of academic integrity, faculty are strongly encouraged to follow this Policy.** When a student is found responsible of a first violation, whether by accepting responsibility during the Faculty-Student Conference, or through the panel process, the faculty member makes the final decision about any grade related sanctions. Additional sanctions, including suspension or expulsion, may only be assigned by a hearing panel.

B. Faculty do not have to decide on a sanction before meeting with the student or before the student indicates responsibility but a grade-related sanction must be specified and communicated to the student before the student signs the Academic Integrity Violation Report Form indicating their plea decision. Faculty may reduce the severity of a grade sanction at any point in the process. In cases in which a student pleads not responsible, faculty may consider other sanctions after the Faculty/Student Conference if justified on the basis of new evidence regarding the violation, but must do so before the start of the hearing.

C. Any change in the grade-related sanction must be communicated to the student prior to the hearing and students will have the option at that time to change their plea. In cases in which a sanction has been changed following the Faculty-Student Conference, faculty must hold a second Faculty/Student Conference with the student so the student can review the revised sanctions and enter a plea decision. Any sanction revision necessitates the completion of a new Academic Integrity Violation Form which restarts the Faculty-Student Conference process.

D. If an accused student fails to respond to faculty notification of the new Faculty-Student Conference via UNCG email address within five (5) business days, the accused student will forfeit their option to enter a plea. In this case, the faculty member will make a decision based on the information available and the accused student may be found responsible of the violation. Any sanctions determined by the faculty member will subsequently go into effect.

The student will be notified in writing of the outcome by the Dean of Students Office.

E. Non-grade related sanctions (except for suspension or expulsion) may be decided upon by faculty, a Hearing Panel (cases where the student has a prior violation and will be suspended), the Dean of Students Office (in cases in which a student has accepted responsibility) or, a Hearing Panel (in cases in which a student has not accepted responsibility and a hearing has been held). In all cases adjudicated before a Hearing Panel and which result in a decision that the student is responsible for the violation, the panel may recommend suspension or expulsion.

F. When determining sanctions, faculty of undergraduates may choose to use the Educational Resolution Program that is further described below, or may proceed under the Academic Integrity Permanent Record process. Faculty are encouraged to consult with the Dean of Students' Office when weighing these options. Faculty members may only mandate grade-related sanctions, but may recommend the imposition of additional educational experiences and/or suspension or expulsion to an Academic Integrity Hearing Panel. When it is a student's first violation and a faculty member recommends the panel process must be used whether or not the student accepts responsibility and the recommended penalty. In such cases, students who accept responsibility will have a panel whose sole purpose is to determine an appropriate sanction. A recommendation for suspension must also address whether the student is to be withdrawn with or without the loss of credit or assignment of an "F" in the specific course in which the violation occurred. The recommended sanctions apply only to the first violation. The second proven or admitted violation requires either suspension or expulsion as a sanction from the hearing panel.

G. Educational Resolution Program

   1. The Educational Resolution Program option is available to undergraduate students with no other Academic Integrity violations. Faculty may make use of the Educational Resolution Program if the faculty member feels the student: (1) has violated the Policy in a minor way; (2) has the attitude and ability to learn from the process; and (3) does not deserve to have a permanent Academic Integrity violation on their record due to the nature of the violation (consideration should be given to the student's year in school and knowledge of Academic Integrity violations).

   2. If the instructor still believes there has been a violation, and believes the situation warrants the use of the Educational Resolution Program, the instructor will explain this program to the student. The instructor will complete the "Academic Integrity Violation Report Form" concerning the violation. The instructor will select option A (Educational Resolution program) and note the educational experiences from the options and assign due dates. The instructor may also choose to impose a grade-related sanction. If the student successfully completes the Educational Resolution Program by the deadlines indicated, upon graduation, the

student's conduct record will not reflect an Academic Integrity violation. If the student does not successfully complete the educational experiences by the due dates, the Academic Integrity violation will become a permanent record. Faculty will choose one or more of the educational sanctions listed below instead of or in addition to a grade-related sanction.

3. Educational Experiences include:

Complete online Library Tutorial	Write a reflection paper about the experience
Perform community service through a recognized non-profit agency	Attend Geek Week events (September)
Attend Making Better Choices Seminar	Interview a professional in the field of student about ethics and write reflection
Complete online plagiarism video and reflection	Create a handout for other students describing plagiarism and resources to learn about appropriate citations
Meet with reference librarian about important resources, citation and writing style for the field	Submit the next assignment through Turnitin program
Other educational experiences identified by the instructor	

H. Academic Integrity Permanent Record
   1. An Academic Integrity Permanent Record designation means that a student's disciplinary record will permanently reflect an Academic Integrity violation. If the instructor determines the situation warrants a permanent record, the instructor will explain this designation to the student. The instructor will complete the "Academic Integrity Violation Report Form" concerning the violation. The instructor will select option B (Academic Integrity Permanent Record) and note any educational experiences from the options and assign due dates. The instructor may also choose to impose a grade-related sanction. **Failures to satisfactorily complete tasks imposed under the Academic Integrity Permanent Record will result in a hold being placed on the student's account which prohibits the student from registering for classes, receiving their transcript, and graduating. This hold will not be removed until all sanctions are completed.**
   2. Educational Experiences include:

Complete online Library Tutorial	Write a reflection paper about the experience
Perform community service through a recognized non-profit agency	Attend Geek Week events (September)
Attend Making Better Choices Seminar	Interview a professional in the field of student about ethics and write reflection
Complete online plagiarism video and reflection	Create a handout for other students describing plagiarism and resources to learn about appropriate citations
Meet with reference librarian about important resources, citation and writing style for the field	Submit the next assignment through Turnitin program
Other educational experiences identified by the instructor	

3. Sanctioning Guide for Faculty Members Using the Permanent Record Process

To aid in the assignment of appropriate sanctions for various violations under the Permanent Record process, the following examples are provided for first violations. Faculty have discretion in assigning any grade-related sanction. When a student is found responsible of a first violation, whether by accepting responsibility during the Faculty-Student Conference or through the panel process, the faculty member makes the final decision about any grade related sanctions. Additional sanctions, including suspension or expulsion, may only be assigned by a hearing panel.

Charge
Suggested Range of Sanctions

Cheating
From redoing an assignment/retaking a test, to F on assignment/test or F in course, to recommendation for expulsion

Failure to cite references
From requiring the student to re-do the paper to a zero on the paper

Submitting, as one's own, work done by or copied from another
From F on assignment to a recommendation for expulsion

Misuse of academic resources
From loss of privileges to use of materials for a set period of time, to repayment of costs of repair or replacement of materials to a recommendation for expulsion.

Falsification by an undergraduate

From requiring the experience to be re-done to an F in the course

Falsification by a graduate student
From F in the course to a recommendation for expulsion

Facilitating academic dishonesty
From F on assignment/test to a recommendation for expulsion

V. PROCEDURES FOR HANDLING ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

A. **Faculty-Student Conference**
In the event of a suspected violation of academic integrity, the instructor will schedule a conference with the student. The following statements outline the proper sequence of events for such a conference:
1. The faculty member contacts the student in writing via email to inform them that an allegation has been made and a faculty-student conference needs to be held to discuss this matter.
2. At the time of this notification, the instructor shall provide the student with the following statement of rights:
    a. The student has the right to postpone the conference for at most two (2) business days if student desires.
    b. The student should realize that they are under no pressure, either overt or implied, to admit responsibility. The student may postpone entering a plea for at most two (2) business days after the conference.
    c. Before the conference, the student should review the entire *Academic Integrity Policy.* The student is encouraged to consult the Student Government Attorney General staff and/or the Dean of Students Office.
3. The conference is held. The instructor may invite a neutral observer to the conference. A full time faculty member or academic advisor are suggestions of possible observers. The faculty member should introduce the observer as someone to help insure that the student understands their rights, and will witness the student initialing each of their rights on the "Academic Integrity Violation Report Form." The student may bring one support person to the meeting who acts as a silent observer during the conference. During the conference, the instructor shall inform the student of the particulars of the suspected violation and the reason(s) for believing such has occurred (the faculty member is under no obligation at this time to reveal identities of third party individuals who may have reported the allegation). The student should explain their perception of the events.
4. **One of four recourses will be pursued:**
    a. If the instructor believes the alleged violation is not supported by the facts, it will be dismissed;

b. If the instructor still believes there has been a violation, and believes the situation warrants the use of the Educational Resolution Program, the instructor will explain this option to the student. The instructor will complete the "Academic Integrity Violation Report Form" concerning the violation. The instructor will select option A (Educational Resolution Program) and note the educational experiences from the options and assign due dates. The instructor may also choose to impose a grade-related sanction. If the student successfully completes the Educational Resolution Program by the deadlines indicated, upon graduation, the student's conduct record will not reflect an Academic Integrity violation. If the student does not successfully complete the educational experiences by the due dates, the Academic Integrity violation will become a permanent record.

c. If the instructor still believes there has been a violation, and the situation warrants a permanent record of an Academic Integrity violation, the instructor will explain this designation to the student. The instructor will complete the "Academic Integrity Violation Report Form" concerning the violation. The instructor will select option B (Academic Integrity Permanent Record) and note any educational experiences from the options and assign due dates. The instructor may also choose to impose a grade-related sanction. **Failures to satisfactorily complete tasks imposed under the Academic Integrity Permanent Record will result in a hold being placed on the student's account which prohibits the student from registering for classes, receiving their transcript, and graduating. This hold will not be removed until all sanctions are completed.**

d. If the student disagrees with the finding, the instructor will request a hearing by completing the "Academic Integrity Violation Report Form" and forwarding it to the Dean of Students Office along with all supporting documentation and/or evidence after the conference

5. All completed "Academic Integrity Violation Report Forms" are to be submitted to the Dean of Students Office along with all supporting documentation and/or evidence after the conference for appropriate action.

6. If an accused student fails to respond to faculty notification of the Faculty-Student Conference via UNCG email address within five (5) business days, the accused student will forfeit the options described above. In this case, the faculty member will make a decision based on the information available and the accused student may be found responsible of the violation. Any sanctions determined by the faculty member will subsequently go into effect.

The student will be notified in writing of the outcome by the Dean of Students Office.

7. A student may not withdraw from a course to avoid an academic integrity allegation or assigned sanction resulting from a proven allegation.

8. If the student admits to the violation and accepts the sanction, or is found responsible in the hearing process, and if this is the student's second violation, suspension or expulsion shall be mandatory. The hearing panel will make a decision regarding the sanctions. The Dean of Students Office shall then report the decision in writing to the student and the faculty member.

B. **Academic Integrity Hearings**
1. An academic integrity hearing will be held if the student does not admit to the violation.
   a. A request for the hearing shall be made by the faculty member to the Dean of Students Office on the "Academic Integrity Violation Report Form."
   b. Within five (5) business days after the charge is received, the Dean of Students Office shall contact the accused and provide information concerning scheduling.
   c. The Dean of Students Office shall proceed to select a hearing panel as described under this *Policy*, and except as otherwise directed under the Academic Integrity Policy, shall convene and conduct that panel in a hearing under the terms described in the *Student Code of Conduct.* Any appeal from the decision of the hearing panel will be directed in the manner prescribed by the *Student Code of Conduct.*
2. Cases occurring during summer sessions for which a hearing is requested present special problems due to the brief term and the limited availability of hearing committee members. Such hearings shall be conducted, when necessary, through ad hoc committees appointed by the Dean of Students Office. Regularly enrolled UNCG students attending the summer session may ask to have their cases heard by such committee or postpone the hearing until the beginning of the regular semester when the normal hearing process is available, at the discretion of the Dean of Students Office. Such carryovers of hearings may also be utilized for students, other than students nearing graduation, who request hearings at periods when there is not sufficient time remaining in the regular academic year to arrange for the hearing process.
3. The authority of the hearing panel is limited to the work and/or course in which the violation has occurred and to a finding of "responsible" or "not responsible." The faculty member retains final discretion in assigning the grade related sanction if the student is found "responsible," unless the student alleges and proves that the faculty member's decision was based upon personal malice or

illegal motive. The panel can assign educational sanctions in addition to the grade-related sanction assigned by the faculty member.

4. All decisions before academic integrity hearing panels must be decided according to whether it is "more likely than not" (preponderance of evidence) that the alleged violations have occurred. In finding responsibility under this standard of proof, a panelist must be convinced, based upon information presented in the course of the hearing, that the conduct described is more likely than not to have occurred.

C. **Peer Reported Violations**

If a student suspects another student of a violation of the *Academic Integrity Policy,* he/she is urged to inform the instructor and/or the Dean of Students Office of the alleged circumstance. In such cases, the instructor is urged to arrange a conference with the accused student as provided in the Faculty-Student Conference, above. If a student falsely accuses another student of a violation, they will be subject to disciplinary action under the *Student Code of Conduct.*

VI. STUDENT RIGHTS AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

A. Right to postpone the Faculty/Student Conference for two (2) business days

B. Right to postpone entering a plea for two (2) business days

C. Student is under no pressure, either overt or implied, to admit responsibility

D. Right to plead not responsible and have matter go through the Academic Integrity Hearing Panel process

E. Student cannot withdraw from a class in which an Academic Integrity Violation is alleged or has occurred

F. Student cannot grade replace a course in which an Academic Integrity Violation has occurred

G. Student may consult with the Student Government Attorney General (234 Elliott University Center) and the Dean of Students Office

H. Student may bring a silent support person to the Faculty-Student Conference

I. Dishonesty as part of the Academic Integrity allegation process (including information shared during a Faculty-Student Conference) is itself a violation of the Academic Integrity Policy and student will be charged with falsification under the Academic Integrity Policy

VII. CONFIDENTIALITY AND RECORDS

A. Pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), Academic Integrity proceedings will be closed in order to protect education records and information from such records. Academic Integrity proceedings are considered to be confidential and, therefore, are not to be

divulged outside the hearing, subject to applicable policy and law. Violation of the confidentiality of a hearing is a violation of the Student Code of Conduct.

B.   Records generated by the Academic Integrity hearing procedure are maintained in the Dean of Students Office. These are considered part of the student's educational record under FERPA. These records are accessible only to the student and others as provided by that Act and University policy. These records are also used to follow progress of students under assigned sanctions, including warning, probation, or for assessment/evaluation requirements. Such records are created and purged according to the Student Records Policy (FERPA at http://sa.uncg.edu/handbook/policies/). Information about expulsion and Academic Integrity violations may be maintained permanently in the student's conduct record.

C.   The disclosure of an Academic Integrity allegation and/or an Academic Integrity hearing (including, but not limited to, the outcome of the hearing and the sanction, if any) is governed by FERPA. As such, information may only be communicated between UNCG parties who have a "Legitimate Educational Interest" in the communication of the information.

D.   Students who wish to contest information contained in the record, including a request for removal of information from the record, must address such requests in writing to the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs or designee, who shall review the request and notify the student of any actions related to the contention or request pursuant to FERPA and University policy.

E.   All transcripts or recordings of each panel hearings shall be preserved in accordance with the University's Record Retention Policy (http://policy.uncg.edu/electronic_records/). Following this period, the transcript or recording shall be destroyed. The transcript or electronic recording and any written record pertaining to the hearing process shall remain the property of the University and may be reviewed by the parties, by appointment. Reasonable conditions for this review will be established by the Dean of Students or designee.

VIII.   ADMINISTRATION OF THE *ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY*

A.

This person shall be the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs or his/her designee, normally the Dean of Students. Duties shall include the following:

1.   The Dean of Students Office shall receive forms recording the agreement that an academic violation occurred and the sanction

assigned for those violations handled by faculty member and student.

2. All requests for hearings on cases of alleged academic violations shall be directed initially to the Dean of Students Office, who shall then be responsible for drawing the hearing panel, and notifying the student concerning the allegations and conduct of the hearing process in accordance with the standards of the Academic Integrity Hearing Procedures.

3. The Dean of Students Office shall maintain all records of academic violations by students whether resolved by Faculty-Student Conference or by the judgment of a hearing panel. These files shall be maintained in the Dean of Students Office in accordance with the *Policy.*

4. The Dean of Students Office shall provide procedural interpretations of the *Academic Integrity Policy*, make recommendations to the Academic Policies Subcommittee on Academic Integrity concerning proposed changes in the *Policy* and provide advice and information concerning the *Policy* to the general campus community.

B. **The Academic Integrity Faculty Advisory Group**
This group shall be composed of one faculty member from each of the Faculty Senate's electoral divisions, plus Chair of the Faculty Senate Academic Policies and Regulations Committee.. The faculty members representing the electoral divisions will be appointed by their respective Deans for a two- year term, with the expectation that in units with departments, programs, and/or divisions, appointments will be rotated among these. Convened by the Dean of Students, the Faculty Advisory Group will meet at least once per year; the Chair of the Faculty Senate Academic Policies and Regulations Committee will serve as chair of the convened meeting. Additional meetings may be called by either the Dean of Students or the Chair of the Faculty Senate Academic Policies Committee as needed. The functions of the Faculty Advisory Group are:

1. To provide each School and the College, and the Library, with an interested and committed faculty member who can provide leadership to and education of other faculty members on academic integrity matters.

2. To serve as an advisor to other faculty members on academic integrity issues as questions arise.

3. To provide feedback to the Dean of Students Office and the Academic Integrity Executive Committee on matters related to the *Policy* and its enforcement.

4. To consult with the Faculty Senate Academic Policies and Regulations Committee, providing any recommendations regarding the *Policy* to the Senate Committee for review and possible action.

C. **A Panel of Faculty and Students**
    A Hearing Panel shall be selected for those cases in which hearings are requested.
    1. Each Hearing Panel shall consist of three faculty and three students drawn from a pool of panelists identified and coordinated by the Dean of Students Office. When possible, panel members shall be selected to correspond with the affiliation of the student as graduate or undergraduate. No panel member may be selected from the accused student's major department. Four panelists evenly divided between faculty and students must be present for the duration of the hearing in order for the hearing to proceed.
    2. Attendance at the hearing shall be limited to the accused student(s) and Student Conduct Advisor, one support person who may not interact in any way during the hearing, faculty member(s) making the allegation and Case Coordinator, members of the hearing panel and the Dean of Students or his/her designee serving as hearing officer. The Hearing Officer may approve the presence of others as necessary due to the nature of the case or in the interest of training new panelists.

Appendix A: Encouraging the Practice of Academic Integrity

1. **Student Obligations**
    a. Students should recognize their responsibility to uphold the *Academic Integrity Policy* and to report apparent violations to the appropriate persons. Students who do not understand the *Policy* or its application to a particular assignment are responsible for raising such questions with their faculty member. By enrolling in the University, each student agrees to abide by the *Academic Integrity Policy.* At the faculty member's discretion, each student may be required to attest to abiding by or sign the Academic Integrity Pledge given below on all major work submitted to an instructor. A student's work need not be graded until they have signed the statement. In signing the pledge, the student indicates their knowledge that the *Academic Integrity Policy* governs their academic activities at the University.
    Academic Integrity Pledge:

    I HAVE ABIDED BY THE UNCG ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY ON THIS ASSIGNMENT.

    Signature_____ Date_____

    b. During the orientation period for new students, students are asked to affirm their understanding and acceptance of the principles of

the *Academic Integrity Policy* as follows:
Academic Integrity Policy: Statement of Personal Responsibility

> My words and actions will reflect Academic Integrity. I will not cheat or lie or steal in academic matters. I will promote integrity in the UNCG community.

2. **Faculty Obligations**
Faculty members are expected to become familiar with the Academic Integrity Policy and to take the lead in discussing the meaning of academic integrity with all students. For example, faculty can and are encouraged to clarify their expectations on the course syllabus. Early in their courses, they shall state clearly course requirements and expectations including examination procedures and grading rationale as they relate to the Academic Integrity Policy. Faculty should inform students of any requirement to submit signed copies of the Academic Integrity Pledge for all major written assignments. Most importantly, faculty members must recognize their responsibility to exemplify the values of academic integrity in their own conduct and to convey by example as well as precept their expectation that the Policy shall be followed in all University activities in which they have a part.

3. **Guidelines for Academic Work and Examinations**
Early in the course the instructor should make special efforts to explain to the class what constitutes plagiarism. Examples of acceptable and unacceptable style for acknowledging source material should be presented. Faculty should relate to students specific instances where the Policy may apply in a class assignment; for example, the prohibition against cheating as applied to out of class assignments or the place for group versus individual work. Such information is especially important to students early in their academic experience. Prior to examinations, the instructor should do whatever possible to arrange room conditions for examinations so as to reduce temptations to violate academic integrity. Such conditions may include arranging for as widely spaced seating as possible, preferably using alternate rows, and the use of "scrambled" versions of multiple choice type tests. The instructor should elect to remain in the classroom during the administration of an examination or provide for other qualified proctoring of the examination.

THE UNIVERSITY of NORTH CAROLINA
GREENSBORO
Faculty Senate

Resolution #FS05032017/1
To approve a self-study of the General Education Program
General Education Council
Approved by Council, March 24, 2017

WHEREAS, the General Education Council is charged with ongoing review and maintenance of the General Education Program goals, assessment of student achievement of these goals, oversight of the General Education Program requirements, and approval of requests for General Education markers and designations, and

WHEREAS, the last self-study of General Education at UNCG occurred during the 2005-2006 academic year, and

WHEREAS, periodic and regular review of General Education should be undertaken to ensure the integrity, intentionality, and relevance of the Program for UNCG students and faculty, and

WHEREAS, faculty discussions about General Education in fall 2016 revealed both areas of strength and areas for improvement, **therefore**

BE IT RESOLVED that the faculty undertake a self-study of the General Education Program during the 2017-2018 academic year. A Task Force comprised of voting members of the General Faculty and representing the College of Arts and Sciences, College of Visual and Performing Arts, Joseph M. Bryan School of Business and Economics, School of Education, School of Health and Human Sciences, School of Nursing, and University Libraries shall be formed to undertake the study. Non-voting members may be appointed by the Council and/or Provost as necessary. The Task Force will report to and be supported by the General Education Council and the Office of the Provost. The Task Force will produce a report regarding what aspects of General Education work well and what aspects might be revised. (Please see attached Charge for details.)

General Education Self-Study Charge
Approved March 24, 2017

During the 2017-2018 academic year, a task force of UNCG faculty will conduct a self-study of the UNCG General Education Program. The study should result in a report that highlights those aspects of our General Education Program that work well and those aspects that might be revised. The task force will deliver the self-study report by April 1, 2018 to the General Education Council, Faculty Senate, and Provost.

For several reasons, members of the General Education Council believe the time is right for a self-study of our General Education Program. The last self-study of General Education occurred during the 2005-2006 academic year. That review led to numerous changes, including the creation of the General Education Council. Through the Council, UNCG faculty have made significant changes and improvements to our General Education Program. Those improvements clarify what questions we should now ask, offering an opportunity to reflect on general education at UNCG.

In addition, several other changes indicate a need for this self-study:
- The demographic makeup of the undergraduate student body has grown more diverse, with UNCG now a Minority-Serving Institution (https://oedi.uncg.edu/msi-status-at-uncg/);
- Substantial growth of the student body, which now stands at approximately 19,000 (approximately 16,000 undergraduates);
- Significant numbers of transfer students enrolling at UNCG, and
- Changing local/national expectations for general education.

Finally, discussions among UNCG faculty during the 2016 fall semester revealed numerous strengths of our Program as well as areas for review and, perhaps, improvement.

Specifically, discussions among faculty and members of the General Education Council suggest the following questions should help guide the self-study.
- What is our overall purpose for the Program? What do we want students to learn? What are our students learning?
- What should the relationship be between UNCG student demographics and our Program? How do various groups of undergraduate students (e.g., transfer, non-traditional, adult, international, etc.) move through our Program? How does the Program foster student success, such as through retention and graduation? How might we aid student success?
- How might high impact teaching methods (e.g., community based learning or undergraduate research) that often aid student success be incorporated into General Education?
- How might we revise Program content and structure to broaden and deepen faculty participation?
- How might our General Education Program offer distinct connections to UNCG, perhaps by linking to the University Strategic Plan? How does our Program meet or connect to SACS guidelines and UNC System expectations?

- How may we build upon what faculty and others appreciate about our Program, while also making changes to address shortcomings? For example, how might we preserve current course offerings, but build a different structure around those courses, perhaps to integrate across categories/markers? How might we make changes without adding requirements?
- How does our Program perform administratively (e.g., properly resourced, Council governance appropriate)?
- How does our Program perform logistically (e.g., students able to move through Program, units able to support program, course offerings adequate)?

A task force comprised of voting members of the General Faculty with expertise and interest in general education should undertake the review. Council members recommend that TT and NTT faculty serve on the Task Force. The Task Force will report to and be supported by the General Education Council and the Office of the Provost.

The Task Force will include the following 11 members, selected by the Council, Provost, and Deans:
Task Force Chair: 1, non-voting
General Education Council: 1
College of Arts and Sciences: 3
College of Visual and Performing Arts: 1
Bryan School of Business and Economics: 1
School of Education: 1
School of Health and Human Sciences: 1
School of Nursing: 1
University Libraries: 1

As needed, non-voting members will complement the work of the General Faculty members. Council members strongly recommend that, among others, the following offices and groups have non-voting members on the Task Force: Registrar, Assessment and Accreditation, Admissions, Advising Council, and the Honors College, Freshman Seminar, and Residential College programs. In addition, Task Force members should consult closely with those offices and constituencies they find to be relevant to their work. In addition, the task force should seek significant input from current and past undergraduate students regarding their experiences of the General Education Program.

Task Force members will need substantial support, such as:
- Administrative support
- One course release each semester for the Chair: $7,000
- Relief from other service duties and a summer stipend for each member: 11 @ $1,000=$11,000
- Funds for members to attend AAC&U or similar general education conference(s): $12,000
- Funds to purchase books, reports, etc.: $1,500
- Funds to bring experts/consultants/speakers to campus: $8,000

SACSCOC guidance regarding general education
Compiled by David Carlone, Chair, General Education Council
April 13, 2017

Excerpts quoted from:
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. (2012). *Resource manual*
for the Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for quality enhancement (2nd ed.). Decatur, GA:
SACSCOC. Retrieved from: http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/Resource%20Manual.pdf

2 Core Requirements
2.7.3 (pp. 20-22)
In each undergraduate degree program, the institution requires the successful completion of a
general education component at the collegiate level that (1) is a substantial component of each
undergraduate degree, (2) ensures breadth of knowledge, and (3) is based on a coherent rationale.
For degree completion in associate programs, the component constitutes a minimum of 15
semester hours or the equivalent; for baccalaureate programs, a minimum of 30 semester hours or
the equivalent. These credit hours are to be drawn from and include at least one course from each
of the following areas: humanities/fine arts; social/behavioral sciences; and natural
science/mathematics. The courses do not narrowly focus on those skills, techniques, and
procedures specific to a particular occupation or profession. If an institution uses a unit other than
semester credit hours, it provides an explanation for the equivalency. The institution also provides
a justification if it allows for fewer than the required number of semester credit hours or its
equivalent unit of general education courses. *(General education)*

Rationale and Notes
This Core Requirement establishes four key principles regarding general education courses:
- General education courses are college-level and comprise a substantial component of each
  undergraduate degree.
- In order to promote intellectual inquiry, general education courses present a breadth of
  knowledge, not focusing on skills, techniques, and procedures specific *to the student's*
  occupation or profession.
- General education is based on a coherent rationale.
- The general education component constitutes a minimum number of semester hours, or its
  equivalent, and courses are to be drawn from specific academic areas.

It is essential to understand the general education component of the degree program within the
context of the institution's mission and within the expectations of a college-level institution.
Through general education, students encounter the basic content and methodology of the
principal areas of knowledge: humanities and fine arts, social and behavioral sciences, and natural
sciences and mathematics. Courses in each of these specific areas introduce a breadth of
knowledge and reinforce cognitive skills and affective learning opportunities for each student.
Therefore, it is important that courses selected by students do not focus on skills, techniques, and

procedures *specific to that student's occupation or profession*. Such courses may also include interdisciplinary courses. It is important that institutions have criteria for evaluating courses for inclusion in the core curriculum.

Note: Courses in basic composition that do not contain a literature component, courses in oral communication, and introductory foreign language courses are skill courses and not pure humanities courses. Therefore, for purposes of meeting this standard, none of the above may be the one course designated to fulfill the humanities/fine arts requirement in CR 2.7.3. (Interpretation adopted by the Executive Council February 2010)

In its publications, an institution is obligated to clearly designate the specific general education courses included in the three areas of knowledge: humanities and fine arts, social and behavioral sciences, and natural sciences and mathematics. Publications should clearly indicate or direct students in their options for selecting general education courses and, in particular, those considered pure humanities/fine arts that are in accord with the interpretation above. Finally, the institution should indicate how it ensures that all students follow the pathway for the selection of general education courses as described in its publications.

In its assessment of institutions, the Commission's review committee will evaluate whether credit hours that constitute the general education program at an institution are (1) drawn from and include at least one course from each of the following areas: humanities/fine arts, social/behavioral sciences, and natural science/mathematics, (2) include at least one pure humanities course as defined above, and (3) include courses that do not narrowly focus on those skills, techniques, and procedures specific to a student's particular occupation or profession. The Committee will analyze and report on each of the above elements in its determination of compliance with CR 2.7.3.

Relevant Questions for Consideration
- What evidence is found of an institutional rationale for general education that serves as the basis for including selected courses?
- How does the institution ensure that the student's breadth of knowledge acquired through the general education component of the degree program is sufficient and appropriate to its mission?
- What measures does the institution use to ensure that general education represents a substantial component of the undergraduate degree program?
- What process is used to ensure that general education courses support the goals of the general education component?
- What criteria does the institution use to assure that the required skill level meets collegiate standards?
- Do all undergraduate degree programs include at least one course from the three required areas of study?
- Does the institution designate in its publications those general education courses that are considered pure humanities/fine arts in accord with the interpretation above? How has the institution validated that the courses that the institution designates are in accord with CR

2.7.3?
- How does the institution direct students in their choice of general education courses; that is, is it clear for students how the general education course work should be followed?
- How does the institution ensure that all students follow the pathway for the selection of general education courses as described in its publications?
- How does the general education program apply to transfer students, distance and correspondence education programs, etc.?

3.5 Undergraduate Educational Programs
3.5.1 (pp. 65-66)
The institution identifies college-level general education competencies and the extent to which students have attained them. *(General education competencies)*

Rationale and Notes
Since general education requirements are central to educational programs, this standard assumes that the institution will define specifically which competencies are appropriate to the goals of its general education program and consistent with principles of good practice. The institution is responsible for identifying measures to determine the extent to which students have attained those competencies during their course of study as well as the extent to which students have actually attained those competencies.

Note: This standard addresses college-level competencies within the general education core; it does not require a specific course to address each competency. In addition, there is no requirement regarding when the institution must determine student attainment of competencies.

Relevant Questions for Consideration
- What are the specific college-level competencies within the general education program?
- What evidence is available to show the extent to which students have attained these competencies?
- What evidence exists that demonstrates that the institution identifies competencies that are college-level?
- What criteria does the institution use to set an acceptable benchmark for student attainment of competencies?

3.5.3 (pp. 67-68)
The institution publishes requirements for its undergraduate programs, including its general education components. These requirements conform to commonly accepted standards and practices for degree programs. *(See Commission policy "The Quality and Integrity of Undergraduate Degrees.") (Undergraduate program requirements)*

Rationale and Notes
Each undergraduate program of study identifies courses that are designed as introductions to the major, required courses, electives, general education, capstone courses, and any other program

requirements. Undergraduate program requirements allow for an integrated understanding of the discipline. Such programs display a clear rationale and design and include clearly stated and measurable outcomes consistent with the mission of the institution.

Commonly accepted practices for the requirements of an undergraduate program address an appropriate number of semester hours, or its equivalent; a coherent course of study appropriate to higher education; and the completion of an appropriate general education component at the collegiate level.

The general education program defines the underlying learning experience that supports the institution's mission and traditionally provides the "breadth" component to an undergraduate education. Through general education, students encounter the basic content and methodology of the principal areas of knowledge that introduce a breadth of knowledge and reinforce cogni- tive skills and affective learning opportunities for each student. An effective general education program has underlying rationale and design with goals consistent with the mission of the institution.

Relevant Questions for Consideration
- What evidence exists that the institution defines and publishes requirements for each undergraduate program?
- What is the process for determining what coursework is included and for establishing how coursework conforms to commonly accepted standards and practices in the program requirements?
- What is the process for determining what coursework is included in the major program requirements?
- How does the institution demonstrate that all appropriate publications provide clear, complete, and consistent information about each program?

Appendix B: Glossary of Terms (p. 113)
General Education: Courses in general education introduce students to the basic content and methodology of the principal areas of knowledge – humanities and the fine arts, the social and behavioral sciences, and the natural sciences and mathematics