AGENDA
COUNCIL ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES
Friday—October 9, 2009—1:30 P.M.
111 Rhodes Annex

I. Call to Order

II. Introductions

III. Consideration of minutes of September 11, 2009 meeting

IV. Old business

V. New business

a. Undergraduate committee reports.

   i. Academic Advising Committee—Janice W. Murdoch, Chair
   ii. Academic Grievance Committee—David E. Barrett, Board Chair
   iii. Academic Integrity Committee—Jeffrey R. Appling, Chair
   iv. Admissions Committee—Robert Barkley, Chair
   v. Calhoun Honors College Committee—Bill Lasser, Director
   vi. Academic Eligibility Committee—Julia Lusk
   vii. Council on Freshman Year—Casey Berkshire, Freshman Year Programs
   viii. ePortfolio Program—Gail Ring, Director
   ix. Scholarships and Awards Committee—Elizabeth Lomas, Keith Reeves
   x. Registrar’s Report—Stan Smith, Registrar
   xi. Transfer and Bridge Programs—Sue Whorton, Director
   xii. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee—Janice W. Murdoch, Chair

b. Proposal for changing the date of the last day to withdraw from a course without a final grade—Calendar Committee

VI. Other business

   a. Proposal for changing the Academic Integrity Policy—Appling
   b. NSF RCR training requirements—Tracy S. Arwood

VII. Adjournment
Minutes
Council on Undergraduate Studies
September 11, 2009

PRESENT: Janice W. Murdoch, presiding; Becky Bowman; Sandy Edge; Vic Shelburne; Brad Putman; Kyle Cornelius; Tyrone Gayle; Kristen Goodenow; Lib Crockett; Suzanne Atkinson; Constancio Nakuma; Dave Barrett; Roxanne Amerson (for Arlene Johnson); Shirley Timmons; Casey Berkshire; Jeff Appling; Stan Smith; Jonathan Beecher Field; Amy Sanders; Patrice Noel; Julie Lusk; Hugh Spitzer; Jeff Brown; Verna Howell; Sarah Delay; Micky Hall; Sue Whorton; Robert Barkley; Keith Reeves; Sean Brittain; Meredith Newby Spano; Mary Von Kaenel; Forrest Short; Elizabeth Milam; and Barbara Rogers.

Murdoch called the September 11, 2009 meeting of the Council on Undergraduate Studies to order at 1:30 PM in the Student Senate Chambers. After introductions, Murdoch welcomed the new members.

The minutes of the April 10, 2009 meeting were amended as follows, page 1, paragraph 6, sentence 2, “Appling reported an uptick in second time offenders.”

New business included the following committee reports:

**Academic Advising Committee**—Murdoch reported the committee had attempted to meet over the summer and reported everyone did a superb job at orientations and registrations, which seemed to please all the students.

Murdoch expressed gratitude for all the support.

**Academic Grievance Committee**—Barrett reported the Academic Grievance Panel has received one grievance from spring semester. The panel will forward the grievance to the Academic Grievance Committee.

**Academic Integrity Committee**—Lusk presented the Spring Term, 2009 Academic Integrity Report and the Summer Term 2009 Academic Integrity Report and stated “interestingly” there were more cases involving upper classmen and the number of cases for summer has doubled over last year.

Lusk added there are already two cases of plagiarism for fall term.

Appling stated there is a proposal in process to change the Academic Integrity Policy.

There was discussion on the Academic Integrity Resolution Form.

**Admissions Committee**—Barkley stated enrollment stats for fall 2009 were frozen on September 10th, which includes 3386 freshmen enrolled; 1225 SAT; 274 ACT; 45% top 10; and 980 transfers.

The Office of Admissions has received 1,800, 2010 applicants, which is 5% above last year. A number of Admission’s staff members are on the road recruiting.

**Calhoun Honors College Committee**—Lasser reported in the spring semester, the Academic Council approved an additional fee for Honors students entering the Honors College on August 15th. These funds will be used to enhance the Honors College experience. The fee is $300.00 per semester and was applied to 267 new freshmen.

**Academic Eligibility Committee**—Lusk presented the Academic Eligibility report, which was presented to Academic Council on August 31, 2009. The report included information on the number of appeals (74); number of appeals for readmission (10); the number readmitted on appeal (7); the number subject to dismissal (6); the number of successful appeals (3); the number subject to suspension (52); the number of successful appeals (24); the number who applied for academic renewal (6); the number of academic renewals granted (6); the percent successful (54%); and the percentage unsuccessful (46%).

Noel stated last spring a proposal was presented to Academic Council and the Board of Trustees to access a $100 fee to students on academic probation. The recommendation was approved and this fall, 350 students were...
invited to workshops; 40% participated in the initial workshop and there have been one-on-one meetings with many others.

Noel stated this is a team effort between the Office of Undergraduate Studies and academic advisors.

**Council on Freshman Year**—Berkshire stated the council will meet on September 14, 2009.

**E-Portfolio**—Appling reported the following for Ring.
1. There have been many portfolio workshops.
2. Seniors graduating in December will be required to have an e-Portfolio.
3. A successful evaluation/assessment was held by the e-Portfolio group this summer.

Appling stated Ring had presented information regarding the assessment to the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee on September 4, 2009, which triggered much discussion specifically the number of competencies.

**Scholarships and Awards Committee**—Reeves reported that the Office of Financial Aid had survived an audit over the summer, which has initiated minor updating procedures. There was an increase in Palmetto Scholar Fellows in Engineering and Science.

**Registrar’s Report**—Smith stated numbers are up 950 over same period last year. There are increases in grad school as well as increases in retention.

Smith reiterated the requirement of South Carolina law for students to have proof of citizenship or proper immigration papers in order to be in compliance.

**Transfer Programs and Bridge Program**—Whorton stated 220 of the 980 transfer students entering this fall are Bridge students (23%); 75% met all requirements; this is 2% better than last year. There are 446 freshmen at Tri-County Technical College in the Bridge Program; this is 134 more than last year. The housing for Bridge Program students has changed from Heritage at River Wood to Highpoint.

**Undergraduate Curriculum Committee**—Murdoch stated the committee met on September 4, 2009 and had a lively discussion regarding e-Portfolio, general education and the number of competencies. Representatives were asked to take the information back to their colleagues, engage faculty in discussions about what had happened during the last five years, discuss ways to revise general education, and develop an approach to re-examine the number of competencies.

Smith presented a proposal from the Calendar Committee for changing the date of the last day to withdraw from a course without a final grade, which had engaged discussion with faculty, staff and students.

Murdoch appointed the following subcommittee:

Becky Bowman  
Casey Berkshire, Chair 
Jonathan Field 
Kristin Goodenow 
Kyle Cornelius 
Stan Smith 
Vic Shelburne

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted: Barbara Rogers
Proposed changes to Academic Integrity Policy, Oct. 2009

1. Add new language in I.B. to restrict “recycled” work (i.e., self-plagiarism)
2. Change “faculty member” to “course instructor” where appropriate
3. Add new language in II.B. to allow supervisors to present charges in the absence of the original course instructors
4. Add time limit for return of student rebuttals in II.B.5.
ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

As members of the Clemson University community, we have inherited Thomas Green Clemson’s vision of this institution as a “high seminary of learning.” Fundamental to this vision is a mutual commitment to truthfulness, honor, and responsibility, without which we cannot earn the trust and respect of others. Furthermore, we recognize that academic dishonesty detracts from the value of a Clemson degree. Therefore, we shall not tolerate lying, cheating, or stealing in any form.

I. Academic Integrity Policy

A. Any breach of the principles outlined in the Academic Integrity Statement is considered an act of academic dishonesty.

B. Academic dishonesty is further defined as:

1. Giving, receiving, or using unauthorized aid on any academic work;

2. Submitting work that has been turned in for credit for a previous course without consent of the instructor.

32. Plagiarism, which includes the intentional or unintentional copying of language, structure, or ideas of another and attributing the work to one’s own efforts;

43. Attempts to copy, edit, or delete computer files that belong to another person or use of computer accounts that belong to another person without the permission of the file owner or account owner;

C. All academic work submitted for grading contains an implicit pledge and may contain, at the request of an instructor, an explicit pledge by the student that no unauthorized aid has been received.

D. It is the responsibility of every member of the Clemson University community to enforce the Academic Integrity Policy.

II. Academic Integrity Committee

The power to hear cases of academic dishonesty is vested in an Academic Integrity Committee.
A. Structure—The Academic Integrity Committee is composed of twenty members as follows:

1. Ten tenured members of the faculty; two members from each college elected by their respective collegiate faculties. Faculty members will be elected on a staggered term basis, serving for a period of two years after initiation of staggered terms. Terms commence with fall semester late registration.

2. Ten members of the undergraduate student body; two from each college. Student members are nominated by the Student Body President, through an application and interview process in the spring semester, approved by the Student Senate, and appointed by the provost for terms of two years. Students must have a 3.0 grade-point ratio at the time of appointment and must have completed 30 hours by the end of the spring semester. Nominations will be made in the spring semester with terms of service commencing with fall semester late registration.

3. The committee is divided into four standing boards, hereafter referred to as hearing boards, which will hear the cases of academic dishonesty. Hearing boards convene on a weekly, rotational basis unless there are no cases to be heard. For summer sessions, the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies must maintain at least one hearing board to hear cases.

4. Hearing boards are comprised of two faculty members, two students, and one chairperson. Quorum, for a hearing board, is one student, one faculty member, and a chairperson. Decisions by the hearing board will be by majority vote.

5. Chairpersons will be elected from within the Committee’s membership. Two chairpersons are selected from the faculty membership and two from the student membership.

6. Before hearing any cases, a new member of the committee must undergo a training session(s) with the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies.

7. The Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies is the administrative coordinator of the Academic Integrity Committee.

B. Procedures

1. When, in the opinion of a faculty member/course instructor, there is evidence that a student has committed an act of academic dishonesty, the faculty member shall that person must make a formal
written charge of academic dishonesty, including a description of the misconduct, to the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies. At the same time, the faculty member—may, but is not required to—inform each involved student privately of the nature of the alleged charge. In cases of plagiarism (I.B.2.) instructors may use, as an option, the Plagiarism Resolution Form available from the Office of Undergraduate Studies.

2. When, in the opinion of the student, there is evidence that another student has committed an act of academic dishonesty, he/she should contact the faculty member— instructor for the course to discuss the incident. After being contacted, if, in the opinion of the faculty member—instructor, there is evidence that a student has committed an act of academic dishonesty, the faculty member—instructor must make a formal written charge of academic dishonesty, including a description of the misconduct, to the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies. At the same time, the faculty member—instructor may, but is not required to, inform each student involved privately of the nature of the alleged charge.

3. If, for any reason, the person who first discovered an integrity violation is not available to present a charge, the department chair (or designee) or college Associate Dean for the department in which the course is taught may submit the charge to the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies.

4. When the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies has received a formal charge of an alleged violation, he/she will contact the student involved privately to notify him/her of the charge and at the same time will provide the student with a copy of the charge and a copy of the procedures that the Academic Integrity Committee has adopted, pursuant to number 6-7 below. If a student is charged with academic dishonesty, he/she may not withdraw from the course unless he/she is exonerated of the charge. If a student is found in violation of an academic dishonesty violation and receives a D or F grade, he/she will not be allowed to redeem that grade under the Academic Redemption Policy. If the student fails to respond to the Associate Dean’s requests for a meeting, the student is considered to have waived his/her right to a hearing, thus admitting to being in violation of the Academic Integrity Policy.

45. After informing the student involved, the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies will convene one of the boards of the Academic Integrity Committee within 14 calendar days (exclusive of
University holidays) from the date that the accused student provides a written rebuttal to the charge, no later than five calendar days following notification of the charge. (Students charged in the spring term, but not enrolled in summer sessions, may be given a continuance to the next fall term. Should the University schedule be interrupted due to emergency circumstances, academic integrity cases will be resolved as soon as possible once classes resume.) All students will be presumed not in violation of a charge until found in violation by a hearing board. Each party is responsible for having present at the hearing all witnesses that he/she wishes to speak on his/her behalf. Witnesses must have first-hand knowledge of the events under discussion.

65. A charge of academic dishonesty in a course must be made within thirty days after the beginning of the next term, exclusive of summer vacation. For cases that are not resolved before course grades are due, instructors will assign a # as a placeholder for the grade. This symbol will be replaced with the course grade once the case is resolved.

76. The Academic Integrity Committee will adopt its procedures, to be followed by all hearing boards, prior to the first case heard by a hearing board. In addition to providing the student with a copy of the procedures, as stated in number 43 above, the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies will provide a copy of the procedures to the involved faculty member/course instructor and also the hearing board members. The Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies will also retain copies of these procedures. The procedures must afford both faculty members and students the opportunity to present their cases and the opportunity for rebuttal.

87. In cases in which there is a finding of “in violation,” the faculty member/course instructor may consult with the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies to consider any past precedent established regarding academic penalties levied in similar cases. Faculty members Instructors must inform the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies of the academic penalty for a student found “in violation” by a hearing board.

98. The Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies is responsible for notifying the registrar and all other appropriate University personnel of the finding of “in violation” and the academic penalty. The Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies retains all records of academic dishonesty cases and their findings in accordance with the University’s Records Retention Policy.
C. Penalties

1. Upon a finding of “not in violation” by a hearing board, the student’s record will not reflect the incident.

2. Upon a finding of “in violation” by a hearing board, the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies will notify the student and faculty member/course instructor of the decision immediately. If the offense is the first for the student, then the faculty member/course instructor has the ability to determine the academic penalty, which shall not exceed a grade of F for the course.

3. If the finding of “in violation” is not the student’s first offense, the student will receive a grade of F for the course, will be suspended from the University for one or more semesters, and may be permanently dismissed from the University. The hearing board will determine the period for which the student will be suspended or, if applicable, permanently dismissed. If the accused student waives his/her right to a hearing and the incident is not a first offense, the student will receive a grade of F for the course and will be suspended from the University for one or more semesters. The length of the suspension will be determined by the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies. Suspension or dismissal requires the approval of the President of the University.

D. Appeals

1. Students do not have the option to appeal a decision rendered by the hearing board, whether it is the first, second, or any subsequent offense. Students do not have the option to appeal the penalty determined by the faculty member/course instructor for first offenses or to appeal the grade of F for the course given for second offenses.

2. For offenses resulting in suspension or permanent dismissal, students have the option to present written information to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies to appeal the length of the suspension or to appeal a decision of permanent dismissal. Students must present information in their defense, as allowed in this paragraph, to the Dean within five working days after receipt of written notification of the suspension or dismissal. However, as stated in number 1 above, students cannot appeal a decision rendered by the hearing board.