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Section 1: Introduction

Marymount Honor Pledge
I agree to uphold the principles of honor set forth by this community in the Marymount University mission statement and the Academic Integrity Code and Community Conduct Code, to defend these principles against abuse or misuse, and to abide by the regulations of Marymount University.

Philosophy of Academic Integrity
Academic integrity is founded upon and encompasses the values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility. Supporting and affirming these values is essential to promoting and maintaining a high level of academic integrity, and educating community members about the value and practice of academic integrity is central to Marymount University’s mission. 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 Marymount community are expected to foster in their own work the spirit of academic honesty and not to tolerate its abuse by others.

The responsibility for academic integrity lies with individual students and faculty members of this community. A violation of academic integrity is an act harmful to all other students, faculty and, ultimately, the university.

Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity
The Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity is committed to an educational and developmental process that balances the needs of the individual students with the needs of the Marymount University community. In order to accomplish this aim, there are four philosophical tenets of the student conduct program.

- Prevention – The student conduct program educates students about appropriate standards of conduct within a university community through programming and dialogue before issues occur. The program seeks to reduce incidents by educating students about healthy decision-making, constructive discourse, and bystander intervention.

- Intervention – The student conduct program identifies the personal, educational, and social influences that result in misconduct on campus and intervenes through diverse methods of resolution that place emphasis on relationships, personal decision making, community obligations, and student learning.

- Harm Reduction – The student conduct program engages students in the examination of the impact of their behaviors on their relationships with the community and community members. After identifying the impact of their behaviors students are guided in repairing these relationships and reducing harm.

- Retention – The student conduct program focuses on retaining students, when possible, through creating opportunities for students to learn from their experiences and affect positive change in decision-making. By taking an active role in designing conduct outcomes, the student conduct program offers students an opportunity to remain a part of the Marymount University community.
Section 2: Jurisdiction over Academic Work

The Marymount University Academic Integrity Code exists to promote and maintain academic standards and rigor. The Academic Integrity Code supports faculty, staff, and students by addressing failures to uphold the values of Marymount University.

The Academic Integrity Code has jurisdiction over:

a) Any academic work, draft or final product, submitted by a student or alumna/alumnus for completion of an academic, degree, or program requirement;

b) All claims by a student or alumna/alumnus to academic awards, honors, or distinctions; and

c) Any activity performed at an internship, externship, study abroad, consortium school, or other academic program while a student a Marymount University;

d) Any work submitted in completion of a sanction issued to a student by the Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity; and

e) Any acts committed by a student or alumna/alumnus that are detrimental to the academic interests of the University.

In some cases, the Academic Integrity Code, the Community Conduct Code, and departmental, school, or college codes of ethics may have jurisdiction over the same incident. In conversation, the parties responsible for each process will determine which process(es) is most appropriate to the alleged violation. However, since each process fulfills a different need at the university, a student may be required to respond to alleged violations in each process for one act. Additionally, when students participate in academic classes or programs at a consortium schools, the students are subject to the rules and regulations of those schools in addition to the policies, guidelines, and expectations of Marymount University. Special programs not mentioned by this jurisdiction policy, such as summer high school programs, are subject to the policies of that program.


Section 3: General Provisions

A. University as Complainant

Marymount University reserves the right to initiate a complaint and to serve as complainant without a formal complaint by an instructor. This type of action is typically reserved for cases where:

a) There are multiple reports from different classes and/or instructors;

b) Reports are presented to the University by an individual outside the University;

c) The timing is such that the instructor would otherwise be unable to file the allegation; and

d) There is allegation of academic misconduct on a dissertation, thesis, or other significant academic requirement that could result of revocation of a degree, award, or honor.

B. Official Means of Communication

Marymount University email is the official means of communication with students. The Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity communicates with students through official university email. The student is responsible for checking his/her university email daily. At the discretion of the Academic Integrity Coordinator and when believed to be in the best interest of the student and/or University, the University may deliver communication by one or more of the following methods: in person by the Academic Integrity Coordinator or Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity; mailed to the local or permanent address of the student as indicated in official University records; or emailed to the student’s University-issued email account.

C. Drafts and Works in Progress

The University expects that as a student is developing an academic work, the student is engaging in academically honest work and only using resources and materially permitted by the instructor and academic discipline. Further, while developing academic work, students must engage in the practice of proper citation and acknowledgement. As such, drafts are expected to adhere to the same expectations as finished products.

D. Group Violations

When multiple individuals are accused of participation in related conduct that violates the Academic Integrity Code, the University may hold a group hearing for all students involved. The students do not need to be aware of the other students’ involvement, rather their testimony need only be germane. For example, multiple students purchase an exam from another student. The purpose of a group hearing is to hold a hearing where the testimonies of each student are relevant to the responsibility of at least some of the other students. Group hearings may not be used simply for expediency.

E. Technology-assisted Meetings

In the event that a complainant or respondent is unable to attend a hearing, conference, or other form of meeting in person, the University may proceed with the meeting by providing an opportunity for the individual to attend a technology-assisted meeting. Examples of technology-assisted meetings include but are not limited to phone and video conference. The method used will be at the discretion of the Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity.
Section 4: Expectations

A. Definitions

a) The term “the University” refers to Marymount University.
b) The term “student” includes all persons who have accepted admission to, enrolled at, are taking courses at, and/or have a continuing relationship with the University, including those who attend full- or part-time at the undergraduate, graduate, or doctoral or non-matriculated level.
c) The term “faculty member” and “faculty” refers to individuals with faculty appointments except adjunct appointments.
d) The term “instructor” refers to any person employed by the University to conduct instructional activities, including University librarians.
e) The terms “alumnus” and “alumna” refer to persons who have received a degree or certificate from the University.
f) The term “advisor” refers to a student or university employee who provides personal support for a respondent. The full description and rules for advisors are delineated in Section 5.G.
g) The term “complainant” refers to the individual or department making the complaint of academic dishonesty or a designee. The full description of and policies for complainants are delineated in Section 5.A.
h) The term “respondent” refers to the student or alumnus/a accused of violating the Marymount University Academic Integrity Code.
i) The term “Academic Integrity Coordinator” refers to the faculty member appointed to this role which is described in Section 7 or a designee.

B. Violations of the Code

a) Cheating: Using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in any academic exercise.

Cheating includes but is not limited to unauthorized copying from the work of another student, using notes or other unauthorized materials during an examination, giving or receiving information or assistance on work when it is expected that a student will do his/her own work, or engaging in any similar act that violates the concept of academic integrity. Cheating may occur on an examination, test, quiz, laboratory work report, theme, out of class assignment, during online work, or on any other work submitted by a student.

A student who premeditates the use of unauthorized materials, information, or aids commits a more serious offense than a student who employs unauthorized assistance on the spur of the moment. The following are typical but not exclusive examples of premeditated cheating: conspiracy to copy from another student’s work during an examination, obtaining unauthorized copies of the examination to be administered prior to the time of examination, or using unauthorized notes during an examination.

b) Plagiarism: Representing the works of another as one’s own in any academic exercise.
Plagiarism may occur on any paper, report, or other work (including design and distance learning work) submitted to fulfill course requirements or as part of an educational activity (e.g., design shows, conferences). This includes submitting work done by another, whether a commercial or non-commercial enterprise, including websites, as one’s own work.

Plagiarism includes, but is not limited to:

- Misrepresentation caused by failure to document acknowledged sources accurately, thoroughly, and appropriately;
- The use of unacknowledged sources: use of information or phrasing from any source not cited or included in the bibliography and references by the student; and
- Submitting as one’s own work done by, copied from, or purchased from another which includes work done by anyone other than the student.

c) Falsification: Invention or alteration of any information or citation in an academic exercise.

Falsification includes knowingly 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; or submission of falsified excuses for tardiness or not attending or participating in such experiences. Falsification also includes submitting work to meet the requirements of one assignment when it was done in whole or in part to meet the requirements of another assignment, unless approval to do so has been granted by the instructor.

d) Facilitating or soliciting academic dishonesty: Soliciting the assistance of another to commit an act of academic dishonesty; intentionally or knowingly helping or attempting to help another commit an act of academic dishonesty.

Facilitation is any offer, whether acted upon or not, for unauthorized assistance on any academic work. Solicitation is any request, whether acted upon or not, for unauthorized assistance on any academic work. Students should be aware of a request or assistance that violates this code, because it either violates another provision of this code, such as plagiarism, cheating or falsification, or it is expressly forbidden by the instructor or the culture of the academic discipline. Tutoring is typically considered an authorized means of assistance. Marymount University tutors are trained to understand the obligations of academic honesty. Students are cautioned that outside tutors and other persons providing assistance are likely not trained in Marymount University’s standards. At all times, the student is responsible for determining that the assistance being provided is permissible and authorized.
Section 5: Procedures

A. Complainants

The instructor(s) of the course in which the violation was alleged to have occurred, the Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity, or either’s designee may act as the complainants.

Academic integrity is a core principle of higher education. The success of an academic community is dependent upon the agreement of the community that acts of academic dishonesty violate our mission. As such, it is central to the mission of the university that all members of the community report acts of academic dishonesty. All members of the Marymount University community are encouraged to report academic dishonesty to the course instructor or Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity.

The University may proceed with a hearing without the complainant being present. The complainant may designate another instructor, department chair, dean, or representative of the Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity to act as complainant. If neither the complainant nor a designee is able to attend the hearing, the complainant may submit a written statement and supporting materials to the Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity.

B. Filing Complaints

While there is no limit to when an Academic Integrity complaint may be filed, complainants are expected to initiate the Academic Integrity process and file complaints in a timely manner. It is encouraged that complainants initiate a conference within 5 days of the date of discovery of the violation. This is a guideline not a steadfast rule.

C. Conference

When a complainant discovers academic dishonesty, the complainant completes the Academic Integrity Incident Report-Instructor Statement and requests that the student (now referred to as the respondent) meet for a conference within seven calendar days during the complainant’s normal business and office hours or a mutually agreed upon time. It is the respondent’s responsibility to reply to the complainant’s request and schedule the conference. If the respondent fails to attend a conference within seven days, the case will be referred to the Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity, which will attempt to meet with the respondent. If no conference is held, the case will be referred to a hearing, which is the maximum process right afforded to students.

At the conference, the complainant explains the alleged violation and appropriate sanction, reviews the respondent’s rights as articulated on the Academic Integrity Incident Report-Student Response, and provides an opportunity for the respondent to complete the Student Response form indicating either:

a) I accept responsibility for the violation.

b) I do not accept responsibility for the violation. (The case will be referred to a hearing)

During the conference, the respondent may choose to:

a) postpone the conference one time for up to two business days. It is the respondent’s responsibility to reschedule at a mutually agreeable time. If the respondent fails to resume the conference, the case will be referred to a hearing.

b) stop the conference and refer the case to a hearing.

If a respondent and/or complainant cannot hold the conference in person, it may be held by video conference, phone, or in rare cases email. If the respondent is unable to complete the Student Response
form, the complainant should note on the form the method by which the conference was held and the respondent’s response.

D. Hearing
   a) Notice

The respondent will be provided seven calendars days’ notice of a hearing. Notice is provided to the respondent by University email. If the University is aware that the respondent will not be able to access University email, the University may notify the student by other approved means. The respondent is expected to make the appropriate arrangements to his/her schedule in order to attend the hearing.

   b) Changing Pleas

Changing pleas by accepting responsibility may be done at any time prior to the hearing. If the respondent accepts responsibility for the violation and it is the respondent’s first violation, the hearing will be cancelled.

c) Panel Composition and Quorum

A panel is composed of two faculty members and one student and led by a non-voting chair. At least, two panelists and a chair must be present to conduct the hearing. The faculty and student panelists review the case, ask questions, and determine responsibility. The chair conducts the proceedings, asks questions, and ensures the Academic Integrity Code is followed. During deliberations, the chair may discuss the case with the panelists but does not vote. Only student and faculty panelists may vote during deliberations.

d) Single-Respondent Hearing

Most hearings will be conducted in the single-respondent format (i.e., one person accused of a violation). In this format, the complainant will present the case and the respondent will respond to the allegation before the panel. The purpose of the hearing is both investigatory and adjudicatory. As such, the format is often conversational with the panelists asking direct questions of all parties. The format for the hearing is as follows:

i. Participants will introduce themselves.

ii. The complainant will present the allegation and evidence that a violation occurred. In the event that the complainant is not present, the chair will summarize the information submitted by the complainant.

iii. The respondent will present his/her response to the allegations and evidence.

iv. The complainant and respondent may then call witnesses to testify.

v. At any time throughout the hearing, panelists and the chair may direct questions to any party present. The complainant and respondent may not ask questions of each other or witnesses. However, they may request that the chair ask a question on their behalf. All questions are at the discretion the chair.

vi. The panelists will recess and deliberate regarding the responsibility of the respondent. The respondent may be found either responsible or not responsible. The chair will call for a final vote when the chair determines that further deliberations will no longer be productive. A minimum of two votes are required for a student to be found responsible of a violation.
vii. The panelists, complainant, and respondent will then reconvene. The chair will present the decision and a short summary of the rationale on behalf of the panel.
   a. If the finding is not responsible, the hearing will end.
   b. If the finding is responsible, the hearing will continue as outlined below.

viii. Before the panel deliberates on sanctioning, the respondent will have the opportunity to present any mitigating circumstances. The complainant may also provide input on sanctioning.

ix. The complainant and respondent are then dismissed and the panelists and chair enter deliberations regarding the sanction.

x. The chair will send the final decision to both parties by University email within seven calendar days.

e) Group Hearing

Group hearings may be used when several students are accused of the same violation or acting in concert with one another. As noted in Section 3.D, group hearings may not be used simply for expediency. Group hearings follow the format outlined above except for the following differences:

i. Each respondent will be provided the opportunity in an order determined by the chair to respond to the initial allegation and present evidence and witnesses.

ii. Any information presented by any respondent may be used in determining the outcome for any respondent.

iii. If any respondent denies responsibility, all persons in that hearing will be provided a hearing following procedures for denies responsibility.

iv. Each respondent will be provided his/her finding of responsibility and given the opportunity to present mitigation in private.

f) Witnesses

The complainant and respondent are permitted to present witnesses during a hearing. The party presenting the witness is responsible for assuring that the witness is aware of the time and date of the hearing and attends the hearing. If a witness cannot attend the hearing, the witness may submit a written statement. In order to verify the identity of the witness, witness statements from members of the Marymount Community must be sent from his or her official university email.

The witness will be instructed to wait outside the hearing until the panel chair determines that it is an appropriate time for the witness to testify. The panelists and the chair are the only individuals permitted to question a witness. After the panel finishes questioning the witness, the complainant or respondent may request that the chair ask specific questions of the witness.

It is a violation of the community conduct code for witnesses to knowingly provide partial, inaccurate, misleading, or false information during any investigation or hearing.

g) Advisors

Respondents are permitted to have an advisor present during their hearing. The advisor may be a Marymount University employee or student. The advisor may not be a witness, legal counsel, and/or parent/guardian. If the respondent brings someone who is ineligible to serve in that the role of advisor, the individual will not be allowed to participate. Hearings times and dates will not be modified to meet the
schedule of the advisor. The respondent is responsible for assuring that the advisor is aware of the time and date of the hearing and attends the hearing. To ensure the integrity of the academic integrity conduct process, the role of an advisor is to provide personal and emotional support for the respondent. Advisors may not speak during a hearing.

**h) Evidence**

During panel hearings, complainants and respondents may present evidence in support of their case. The panel chair is responsible for determining whether evidence is relevant and permissible. The University does not hire experts to evaluate the authenticity or validity of evidence. In order to provide a fair and reasonable conduct process, panelists will exercise reasonable judgment in evaluating evidence and may consult with others within reason.

**E. Appealing a Decision**

Respondents and complainants may request a review of a decision within seven (7) calendar days of issuance of a decision letter. All requests for review must be in writing and delivered to the Provost as indicated in the decision letter.

Appeals will only be considered for one or more of the following purposes:

- a) To consider new information which was unavailable at the time of the original hearing that could change the outcome; or
- b) To assess whether a material deviation from written procedures resulted in an unfair outcome of the hearing.

If the Provost determines that the appeal meets the criteria above and has merit, the Provost may return the panel hearing decision to the original hearing panel for review, initiate a new hearing with a new panel, or modify the decision. It is preferable to return the case to the original hearing panel for review. When determining if the appeal meets the criteria and has merit, the review of a hearing panel’s decision will be limited to the record of the original hearing and all supporting documents. The Provost will be deferential to the original decision, changing a decision only if a compelling justification to do so exists.

**F. Sanctions**

Complainants have the authority to determine sanctions when a respondent accepts responsibility before a hearing is held. Complainants are expected to follow the sanctioning guidelines outlined in Appendix A. Sanctions will be reviewed by the Academic Integrity Coordinator in order to ensure that sanctions conform to the sanctioning guidelines in Appendix A. Assigned sanctions that fail to comport with the guidelines will be returned to the complainant for revision.

The hearing panel has the authority to determine sanctions resulting from a hearing. When reasonably consistent with policy and past practice, the panel should give deference to the complainant’s proposed sanctions.

A sanction of suspension or expulsion must be approved by the Director of the Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity.
Marymount University sanctions are divided into three categories: status, academic, and educational. Multiple sanctions from each category may be assigned. Respondents are responsible for paying any costs associated with the sanctions assigned. Sanctioning guidelines are located in Appendix A.

a) **Status Sanction**: Status sanctions are an indication of the respondent’s relationship with the university. Sanctions are determined based upon the nature of the offense after reviewing aggravating and mitigating factors in concert with the established sanctioning guidelines.
   i. **Formal Notice of First Violation**: This is notice that the respondent was found responsible for a first violation.
   ii. **Suspension**: The respondent is separated from the University for a specified period of time, and upon the satisfaction of specific conditions, after which the respondent is eligible to return. Suspension is the standard and required sanction for second violations. Exceptions to this policy are extremely rare and only on a case-by-case basis. Additionally, those respondents who commit egregious violations of the Academic Integrity Code may be subject to suspension for a first violation. Typically, a suspension is one academic semester.
   iii. **Expulsion**: The respondent is permanently separated from the University. The respondent may not apply for admission to any academic program at Marymount University. Expulsion is the standard and required sanction for third violations. Exceptions to this policy are extremely rare and only on a case-by-case basis. Additionally, those respondents who commit egregious violations of the Academic Integrity Code may be subject to expulsion for a first or second violation.

b) **Academic Sanctions**: Academic sanctions relate to the respondent’s academic coursework.
   i. **Redo of Assignment or Test**: The respondent is required to redo the assignment or test. This may be assigned with or without grade penalty.
   ii. **Assignment or Test Grade Penalty or Failure**: A grade penalty is assigned to the academic work in which the violation occurred.
   iii. **Additional Academic Work**: The respondent is required to complete additional academic work such as, but not limited to, writing papers creating educational materials, meeting with tutors. The goal of such activity is for the respondent to demonstrate that she/he has sufficient understanding of the academic skills necessary to continue at Marymount University.
   iv. **Course Grade Penalty or Failure**: A grade penalty is assigned to the final course grade.
   v. **Other Reasonable Academic Sanction**: In coordination with the Academic Integrity Coordinator, the complainant or hearing panel may assign a different academically-related sanction so long as it is reasonable and consistent with policy.

c) **Educational Sanctions**: Educational sanctions are designed to improve a respondent’s understanding of academic integrity and/or the values and mission of Marymount University. Educational sanctions may also be restorative in nature requiring a respondent to demonstrate repaired relationships harmed through the violation.
   i. **Educational Class or Workshop**: The respondent is required to complete a specific academic class, workshop, or series of these events. These programs may be external to the university. Any fees associated with these programs are at the respondent’s expense.
ii. **Educational Program**: Requirement to attend, present and/or participate in a program related to the violation. It may also be a requirement to sponsor or assist with a program for others on-campus to aid them in learning about a specific topic or issue related to the violation for which the student was found responsible. Audience may be restricted.

iii. **Community/University Service Requirements**: Requirement for a respondent to complete a specific supervised University service. [This will not fulfill the University’s community service requirement for graduation]

iv. **Behavioral Requirement**: This includes required activities such as, but not limited to, seeking academic counseling, writing a letter of apology, seek tutoring, etc.

G. **Special Process for Academic Dishonesty on a Capstone, Thesis, or Dissertation**

Theses and dissertations are the culminating document or project that demonstrates mastery of an academic discipline. They are representations of the student, their chair, and their committee. While the standards between undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral theses and dissertation vary based upon academic standard and discipline, academic dishonesty in these pursuits is especially egregious. As such, it requires a special process.

Any student accused of academic dishonesty on a capstone, thesis, or dissertation, either before or after it is defended will be afforded a hearing following the procedures outlined in Section 5.D: Hearing. However, in this special process the hearing panel will consist of the chair of the awarding department (or senior faculty member of the awarding department, where a conflict of interest exists), the dean of the awarding school or college (or Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, where a conflict of interest exists), and an alumna/alumnus of the awarding program.

If the respondent is an alumna or alumnus, notice of the hearing and decision letter will be sent to the last known email and physical address of the respondent. If the panel finds the respondent responsible, it can recommend revocation of the degree.

H. **Revocation of Degree**

Through the awarding of an academic degree, the University attests to individuals, professionals, and the community that the recipient has met the requirements of degree completion in accordance with the mission and values of Marymount University. In cases where the recipient of a degree has achieved that honor through academic dishonesty, a process must exist for the University to revoke its certification to the community.

The revocation of a degree is the most serious sanction that any university may impose. The revocation of a degree for violation of the Academic Integrity Code is limited to misconduct on capstones, theses, or dissertation. As such, certain procedural safeguards exist. If a panel recommends the revocation of a degree, the decision will be reviewed by the Provost for approval. If the Provost approves the revocation of a degree, the respondent may then appeal to the President of the University for the grounds outlined in Section 5.D.

I. **Interpretation**
If questions of interpretation, scope, or authority of the Academic Integrity Code arise during a hearing, it is the responsibility of the panel chair to determine the answers using his or her professional judgment. In all other circumstances, the Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity is responsible for the interpretation of this code.

J. Withdrawal

In the event that a respondent withdraws from a course or the University after a complaint has been made of an academic integrity violation, the University will proceed with the academic integrity process. Even if the respondent has completely withdrawn from University, the University will follow the usual means of notification and provide the student an opportunity to respond to the charges within the designated timeframe. As an outcome of the academic integrity process, the University may change transcript notations to reflect assigned sanctions.
Section 6: Records Policy

A. Records Disclosure

For records created since 2003, the University does not disclose first time academic integrity violations that result in penalties other than suspension or expulsion, except under lawful subpoena. Second offenses and cases resulting in suspensions and expulsions will be released to agents as authorized by the respondent, such as in the case of a background check.

B. Records Retention

Academic integrity violation records are maintained by the University for seven (7) years after the graduation or withdrawal of the student. Any records of second offenses, suspensions, and expulsion are maintained in perpetuity, notwithstanding acts of God, human error, or changes to this policy.

C. Copies of Records

While case materials are being collected, the Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity will not make copies of records. During this time, respondents may visually inspect the record by contacting the Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity which will arrange an opportunity for the student to inspect the record during normal business hours. At the discretion of the Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity, a copy of the record may be provided to the respondent in situations in which inspecting the record in person would create a significant hardship.

After case materials have been collected, a respondent may request a copy of his or her record by contacting the Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity. Students will be required to complete a record request form. Requests may take up to ten (10) business days to complete. Copies of records will be limited to photocopies of written records. Videos, audiotapes, and other documentary evidence will not be copied and distributed. However, respondents may request to view these items in person.
Section 7: Authority and Approval

A. Authority

The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and Enrollment Management, as an extension of her or his authority as granted by the President and Board of Trustees, authorizes the following individuals and entities to oversee Academic Integrity as described and enumerated in this document.

a) The Executive Committee on Academic Integrity

This group shall be composed of one faculty member from each School, one graduate student, and one undergraduate student. The faculty members shall be elected by their respective Schools for three-year terms. The undergraduate student will be appointed by the Student Government Association. The graduate student will be appointed by Graduate Student Council. The Academic Integrity Coordinator and Director of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity shall serve as ex-officio to the committee. A committee chair shall be elected from the voting faculty members of the committee. The committee shall first strive for consensus. The duties of the committee are:

i. To inform faculty, staff, and students about the Academic Integrity Code and encourage ongoing discussions and training for faculty, staff, and students.

ii. To review annually the Academic Integrity Code and its practices and ensure that these practices and policy statements remain an accurate reflection of the community’s concerns with academic integrity. In this light, the committee shall submit an annual report on the Academic Integrity Code to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and Enrollment Management.

b) Academic Integrity Coordinator

This person shall be appointed by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and Enrollment Management. The duties shall include the following:

i. The Academic Integrity Coordinator reviews all records of negotiations and assessments of penalties for violations resolved between the instructor and the student for consistency and fairness of assigned sanctions.

ii. All requests for hearings on cases of alleged academic offenses are directed to the Academic Integrity Coordinator, who shall then be responsible for gathering all information related to the charges, including consultation with faculty, department chairpersons, deans, and any other University official, deemed necessary. The Academic Integrity Coordinator is responsible for convening the hearing panel, notifying the respondent concerning the allegations and hearing, and conducting the hearing process.

iii. The Academic Integrity Coordinator provides procedural interpretations of the Academic Integrity Code, makes recommendations to the Executive Committee concerning proposed changes in the Code, and provides advice and information concerning the Code to the general campus community.
c) Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity

The Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity is the administrative office responsible for the day-to-day administration of the academic integrity policy and the maintenance of academic integrity records.

i. The Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity maintains the records of academic offenses by students, whether resolved by faculty-student agreement or by the judgment of a hearing panel.

ii. The Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity provides administrative support to the Academic Integrity Coordinator.

iii. The Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity is responsible for the assessment of and budgetary support and advocacy for the academic integrity process.

iv. The Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity provides training and development for academic integrity hearing panelists.

v. The Director of the Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity is responsible for providing guidance to the Executive Committee on Academic Integrity and the Academic Integrity Coordinator on best practices, trends, legal issues, and policy.

B. Revisions and Approval

The process of revising the Academic Integrity Code depends upon the type of revision: substantive or non-substantive. Substantive revisions are changes that create new policies, delete existing policies, or alter the meaning of the code as intended by the committee. Non-substantive revisions are changes that clarify existing policies or correct typographical errors.

When making substantive revisions, the committee will strive for consensus. However, revisions shall be approved by a simple majority of the seven member committee. The presence of five of the seven voting members is considered quorum. Neither the Academic Integrity Coordinator nor the Director is a voting member. Further, upon approval by the committee, policies shall be presented to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and Enrollment Management for final approval.

Non-substantive changes are reviewed by the Academic Integrity Coordinator, Director of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity, and chair of the Academic Integrity Executive Committee and approved by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and Enrollment Management.

A log of changes that are made during the academic year shall be kept in appendix B of this document until the next yearly version is released.
### Appendix A: Sanctioning Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violation</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Sanction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Cheating: Using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in any academic exercise | Includes:  
- copying from another student’s work during an exam  
- using notes or other impermissible resources during an exam  
- plans to copy from another student during an exam | Minimum: Redo the assignment or retake the exam  
Maximum: Failure of the course |
| Plagiarism: Representing the work of another as one’s own in any academic exercise | Includes misrepresentation, failure to document acknowledged sources accurately, thoroughly, and appropriately caused by a failure to fully understand mechanical and technical requirements.  
Use of unacknowledged sources: use of information or phrasing from any source not cited or included in the bibliography & references by the student  
Submitting as one’s own work done by, copied from, or purchased from another: includes work done by anyone other than the student | Minimum: Redo the assignment or retake the exam  
Maximum: Failure for the course |
| Falsification: Falsifying or inventing information                          | Provides false information:  
- in an official document  
- in an academic exercise or  
- to avoid an academic exercise | Minimum: Failure of the assignment/exam or course  
Maximum: Suspension |
| Facilitating Academic Dishonesty:  
- Soliciting the assistance of another to commit an act of academic dishonesty;  
- Intentionally or knowingly helping or attempting to help another commit an act of academic dishonesty. | Includes:  
- providing answers to an exam  
- asking another student to write a paper | Student who benefits from assistance: Failure of the course  
Student who provides assistance: Failure of Course (if still in course)  
Maximum: Expulsion |

Note to Instructors: You may assign educational sanction(s) (refer to Section 5.F.) in addition to academic sanction(s). Please consult with the Academic Integrity Coordinator before doing so, as the Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity has educational resources available.

As a reminder, all second and subsequent violations are referred to a hearing panel to determine responsibility and appropriate sanctions as outlined in Section 5.F.
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