

MEMORANDUM

May 11, 1977

RECEIVED
MAY 11 1977

TO: George T. Matthews, Chairperson
University Senate Steering Committee

FROM: Peter J. Bertocci, Chairperson
Senate Committee on Academic Conduct

SUBJECT: Report on Committee Activities for 1976-1977

I Members Serving

Members serving on the Committee this year have been:

A. Faculty and Administration

Nancy Barry, one year
Peter J. Bertocci, two years, chair
Esther Goudsmit, one year
William Hamlin, two years, alternate
Mildred Merz, one year
Diane Norman, two years
Manuel Pierson, Dean of Student Services, ex officio

Vincent Khapoya, who was to have served a second year, went on leave in Fall 1976. He was replaced in January by David Stonner.

B. Students

Gary Foster
Joe Thomas
Julia Watkins

been

Ms. Watkins was to have/an alternate member of the Committee, but withdrew from membership; although she was to have been replaced no name has been submitted to me in her stead. Mr. Thomas graduated in December and was replaced on the Committee by Ms. Sue Brown.

II Summary of Cases Coming before the Committee

As of the present writing, the Committee has held a total of 9 hearings since September 1976 involving charges ranging from plagiarism to cheating in examinations brought against a total of 13 students. There are two possible additional cases pending from

May 11, 1977

Winter 1977. The disposition of these cases and the penalties imposed upon guilty parties in each individual student case are summarized below.

Not Guilty	6
------------	---

Guilty	7
--------	---

Penalties imposed:

Suspension with immediate readmission:	4
--	---

Suspension with immediate readmission cum academic probation until graduation:	2
--	---

Suspension, with permission to apply for readmission in next semester:	1
--	---

Totals	7	13
--------	---	----

In two cases appealed to the Senate Steering Committee, the judgements of, and penalties imposed by, the Committee on Academic Conduct were upheld.

The total number of individual student cases of misconduct coming before the Committee this past year has been roughly equal to that of last year (14). Data compiled by a subcommittee headed by Mr. Osthaus during 1975-76 (see below) indicate long term 1971-1975 trends in Committee caseload. As these may be of interest, they are summarized below, along with the data for the past two years.

Year	Number of Cases
1971-72	41
1972-73	19
1973-74	21
1974-75	16
1975-76	14
1976-77	13*
Totals	124

*Two more possible cases pending for this year

As is evident, a marked decline in the number of cases coming to the Committee occurred between 1971-72 and the subsequent year. Since 1973-74, the current caseload of the Committee appears to have become

stabilized at around 15 per year. Explanation of the variation between 1971-72 and subsequent years cannot be attempted at this time.

III Administrative Actions

A. Changes in the Role of the Dean of Student Services

In accordance with the recommendations of last year's Committee report, we began this year by deciding that Mr. Pierson would not pre-interview students against whom charges were brought. Rather, a member of his staff would be delegated the duty of investigating the allegations and informing the students charged of their rights, as well as of Committee procedures. We have proceeded in this manner this year, but have found that the investigatory process prior to actual Committee hearings is an unnecessary first step. Accordingly, in future hearings, the preliminary investigation will be dispensed with, and students charged with academic offenses will meet with either Mr. Pierson or a member of his staff to receive information regarding Committee procedures and their due process rights.

B. The Osthaus Subcommittee Report

In November 1975, a subcommittee was established to review and recommend changes in procedures for dealing with cases of academic misconduct. This subcommittee was chaired by Carl Osthaus, with the following additional members: Robert Edgerton, Edward Liddle, Harvey Smith and Julia Watkins (student member). The subcommittee reported on October 19, 1976.

The subcommittee found, on the basis of questionnaire surveys of faculty and students, that a large number of persons in both groups preferred that cases of academic misconduct be handled in the first instance by the faculty member and the students involved. This, of course, contrasts with the present policy which requires all faculty members or other persons to bring charges of academic misconduct directly to the Committee on Academic Conduct.

Given these findings, the Osthaus subcommittee made the recommendations summarized below:

1. That there be instituted the procedure of "instructor-student" hearings;
2. That such hearings be conducted with due process, including the right of the parties to have observers present;
3. That in the event of guilt, the instructor determine the

penalty to be imposed, subject to his/her limitations as regards control of course grade, and not involving suspension, etc.;

4. That if any of the parties to an "instructor-student" hearing are dissatisfied with the hearing conduct, or its verdict or penalty imposed, an appeal to the Academic Conduct Committee be the next step.

After three readings, the Committee voted not to adopt the recommendations of the Osthaus subcommittee. It was felt that the difficulties involved in ensuring adequate due process for "instructor-student" hearings were considerable. This being the case, it was feared that ensuring adequate due process in such hearings might involve so cumbersome a procedure as to discourage faculty from employing it; thus, the net gains from it as a more "efficient" and less stressful procedure would not be forthcoming. Accordingly, while it appreciated the work of the Osthaus subcommittee in gathering data and deliberating about the current procedure's possible inadequacies, the Committee decided against submission of these recommendations for policy change to the Senate.

C. Recommended Changes in the University Academic Conduct Policy Statement

The Committee decided that the Academic Conduct Policy Statement ought to include warnings to students to seek the permission of instructors before turning in work completed for a previous course or being completed for another present course. Wording to this effect was submitted to the Senate in a recommended policy change. This was adopted by the Senate at its sixth meeting, March 17, 1977.