



University of New Haven

Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures

Effective August 21, 2023

Table of Contents

<i>I. Philosophy</i>	3
<i>II. Policy</i>	3
<i>A. Cheating</i>	3
<i>B. Collaboration/Collusion</i>	4
<i>C. Plagiarism</i>	4
Resources on Proper Citation of Sources.....	5
<i>D. Fabrication</i>	5
<i>E. Facilitating Academic Dishonesty</i>	6
<i>III. Faculty and Student Responsibilities for Upholding the Academic Integrity Policy</i>	6
<i>A. Faculty</i>	6
<i>B. Students</i>	6
<i>IV. Procedures for Addressing Cases of Academic Dishonesty</i>	7
<i>A. Instructor’s First Steps</i>	7
<i>B. Addressing Integrity Violations</i>	8
<i>C. Academic Integrity Board (AIB)</i>	9
<i>D. Academic Integrity Board (AIB) Hearing Process</i>	10
<i>E. Sanctions for Academic Integrity Violations</i>	14
<i>F. Appeals to the Provost</i>	15
<i>G. Maintenance of Records</i>	16
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	16

I. Philosophy

The University of New Haven is an academic community based on the principles of honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility. Academic integrity is a core University value which insures respect for the academic reputation of the University, its students, faculty and staff, and the degrees it confers.

The University expects that all students, graduate and undergraduate, will learn in an environment where they work independently in the pursuit of knowledge, conduct themselves in an honest and ethical manner and respect the intellectual work of others. Each member of the University community has a responsibility to be familiar with the definitions contained in, and adhere to, the Academic Integrity Policy.

The policy and procedures to follow apply to *all* University of New Haven students.

II. Policy

Violations of the Academic Integrity Policy include, but are not limited to, the following examples—

A. Cheating

“Using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in any academic exercise.”ⁱ Cheating includes, but is not limited to:

1. Having unauthorized notes during an exam or quiz, or communication of information by any means concerning the content of an examination during or after the testing period to anyone who has not yet taken the examination. The only materials permitted during an exam are those that an instructor explicitly instructs students they may use.
2. Copying the work of another during a test or quiz.
3. Use of translation software such as Google Translate without instructor permission.
4. Use of generative Artificial Intelligence without instructor permission
5. Obtaining or providing unauthorized prior knowledge of exam or quiz content.
6. Using another student’s work for an academic exercise or presenting the work of another as one’s own.
7. Using unauthorized materials or information from others for a take-home exam. It is expected that students do independent work for exams whether they are take-home or in-class. Students are expected to comply with the guidelines set by the instructor.
8. Seeking, receiving, or giving aid during examinations through electronic means (*e.g.*, use of web browsers, cell/smart phone/watch, email, text messaging, Bluetooth communications).
9. Purchasing papers, research, reports, *etc.* from commercial services or other individuals for use in any manner other than research for which the source of information is appropriately referenced in the student’s work.

B. Collaboration/Collusion

1. *Nonpermitted Collaboration.* In some instances, instructors may indicate permitted forms of collaboration with other students. If the instructor does *not* indicate that collaboration is permitted, it should be understood that none is permitted. Students are encouraged to seek clarification from their instructors regarding the acceptable parameters for collaboration should they be in doubt regarding assignments that require group work. Acknowledgement of collaboration is required when presenting authorship of student work.

2. *Study Groups and Tutoring.* Academic integrity standards do not prohibit students from studying together or from tutoring each other if done in conformance with other provisions of this policy.

C. Plagiarism

“Representing the words or ideas of another as one’s own in any academic exercise or resubmitting one’s own work under false pretenses.”ⁱⁱ

1. Plagiarism includes but is not limited to:

- a. Copying without proper citation from another student’s paper(s) partially or entirely or from any source, such as a book, article, notebook, video, or other source material, whether published or unpublished.
- b. Purchasing or securing content from any source, to include term-paper vendors, generative artificial intelligence, and internet sources, and submitting that paper or specific portions of the paper as one's own work.
- c. Inserting a passage from the internet or any digital source into one's paper without proper citation.
- d. Copying data from another source without a proper citation.
- e. Appropriating another person's computer programming work for submission as an assignment.
- f. Failing to attribute material that comes from other media sources or failing to obtain proper permission for the use of such material when creating a web page, film, musical composition, or other forms of presentation or artistic expression as a course assignment.
- g. Any other appropriation of another's intellectual property without proper attribution.
- h. Submitting an assignment that was written during a prior semester or submitting the same assignment for more than one class simultaneously, including resubmitting all or substantial portions of previously written work for a current assignment, unless instructors in multiple courses are informed of and approve of the submission. Students should consult their instructors if they are unsure of what work of their own they may use in preparing an assignment. The student should assume that, unless the instructor specifically permits it, the

use of work from one previous or simultaneous course to satisfy the expectations of another course will be perceived as deceptive, and in addition, the work so used fails to qualify as original work for the assignment.

i. Citing sources improperly, which includes, but is not limited to, failure to use quotation marks or other appropriate notation for direct quotes or for an author's distinctive phrases, and following an author's structure of writing and ideas, but rephrasing the sentences partially to give the impression that the whole passage reflects the student's structure and ideas.

2. Guidance on proper citation may be found below or through other designated resources indicated by your academic department.

Resources on Proper Citation of Sources:

American Psychological Association. (2010) *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, D.C.: Author.

Chicago Manual of Style (16th ed.).(2010) Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gibaldi, J. (2009) *MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers*. (7th ed.), New York: Modern Language Association.

Sources online <http://www.newhaven.edu/library/research-tools.php/>

Strunk, W. & White, E.B. (2000). *The Elements of Style* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Turabian, K.L. (2013) *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses and Dissertations* (8th ed.), Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

D. Fabrication

“Unauthorized falsification or invention of any information or citation in an academic exercise.”ⁱⁱⁱ Fabrication includes:

1. Furnishing false information, distorting data or failing to provide all necessary required information to the University's advisor, registrar, admissions counselor, instructor, etc., for any academically related purpose.
2. Forging a signature to certify completion of a course assignment or a recommendation to graduate school or to employers, internship sponsors, or other sponsors of on- or off-campus engagements.
3. Fabricating data in support of laboratory or field work, whether for course-related assignments or for non-course-related internally- or externally-funded, extracurricular, or co-curricular projects.
4. Misrepresenting one's academic accomplishments.

5. Fabricating or falsifying a bibliography.

E. Facilitating Academic Dishonesty

Knowingly helping or attempting to help another to violate any provision of this Policy,^{iv} or otherwise facilitating academic dishonesty.

1. Examples include but are not limited to:
 - a. Providing to other students one's own work or that of others with the reasonable expectation that these will be used for the purpose of cheating or plagiarism.
 - b. Maintaining academic content with the reasonable expectation that these will be used for the purpose of cheating or plagiarism.
 - c. Unfairly advancing one's academic position by hoarding, stealing, or damaging library materials.
 - d. Theft of other students' academic content, or textbooks for academic gain.
 - e. Placing another person's academic content on the internet without his or her permission for academic gain.
2. The use of any electronic means to assist another without authorization is strictly prohibited.

Copyright infringements shall be considered violations of the academic integrity policy. More information on copyright issues and copyright law can be found at: <http://www.newhaven.edu/library/services/faculty/copyright.php>.

III. Faculty and Student Responsibilities for Upholding the Academic Integrity Policy

A. Faculty

1. Faculty are responsible for creating an educational environment where academic integrity is defined and understood, perhaps by referencing the University's policy on academic integrity in their course syllabi and explaining, modeling and reinforcing expectations for academic integrity and the consequences for violations.
2. Departments and/or instructors may choose to implement standards more stringent than those contained in this policy, provided they are clearly communicated to students.

B. Students

1. Students are responsible for the completion of their own academic work and for encouraging their peers to act with integrity in all academic matters by:

- a. Acting with honesty and integrity in all academic matters.
 - b. Learning the principles of ethical conduct, and being familiar with and abiding by the definitions contained in the policy on academic integrity and any other policies established by their instructors, departments, and Colleges.
 - c. Informing the instructor or the Dean of Students if they become aware that any form of academic dishonesty has occurred.
 - d. Clarifying with the instructor/supervisor what their expectations are regarding proper conduct in the completion of assignments (*e.g.*, collaboration, citations, use of study aids on examinations, etc.).
2. Individual students may report a violation of academic integrity to the Dean of Students who will forward the report to the appropriate academic department for investigation.

IV. Procedures for Addressing Cases of Academic Dishonesty

For instances of dishonesty in the context of non-course-related research and other co-curricular academic projects (*e.g.*, grant-funded research, internship placements, summer research fellowships, work study assignments in laboratory settings), the term “supervisor” may be substituted for the term “instructor” in the procedures to follow. For this policy, “supervisor” is defined as research supervisor, administrative supervisor, or a University official as defined in the *Student Handbook*.

Similarly, reference to a University official (*e.g.*, *Provost, Dean of Students*) is interpreted to include “*or designee*” such that the policy or procedure being described may be applied to or carried out by the official’s designee.

The procedures below outline the process for adjudicating academic integrity violations only, and are unique to this process. Non-academic Code of Conduct violations follow the procedures outlined in the *Student Handbook*.

A. Instructor’s First Steps

When an instructor or supervisor suspects, or receives an allegation, that a student has engaged in an act of academic dishonesty:

1. The instructor is encouraged to consult with his or her program coordinator, director, or chair regarding the alleged violation. This consultation is suggested so as to allow the instructor to clarify issues of procedure if necessary, and may provide a second opinion regarding the suspected violation.
2. The instructor and department chairperson together will speak with the student, if possible, and inform the student of the alleged violation and to gather more information as necessary. The student will be provided with the option of accepting responsibility for the violation and the sanction, accepting responsibility but not the sanction, or not

accepting responsibility. The instructor will then complete the [Academic Integrity Online Submission Form](#) and indicate the student's decision in the narrative section. [If the student is not available for a conference or does not accept responsibility for the violation, this step may be skipped at this point, and will be addressed by the Dean of Students or the Student Conduct Administrator, per IV.B.3 below.] For violations reported to an instructor/supervisor by others, the instructor will investigate the reported violation and its circumstances, documenting the findings, and then attempt to meet with the accused student to discuss the alleged violation.

3. The instructor and department chairperson will determine whether a violation has occurred and proceed as outlined in Section IV.B below. The student should be advised by the instructor/supervisor of the availability of an appeals procedure, as described below.

4. The instructor will report the violation to the Dean of Students, through the Academic Integrity Online Submission [Form](#). Any supporting documentation will be electronically attached to the online form. Alternatively, a description of the violation and supporting documentation, if any (e.g., a copy of the assignment with plagiarized passages identified), must be provided to the Dean of Students by office mail or email. Notation should be made regarding what effort was made at remedial education with the accused student, and how the student was informed of the violation.

5. *Time Limit.* Note that violations discovered by an instructor/supervisor more than one year after the time of the alleged violations might not be subject to formal proceedings. Refer to section D.1.b. for guidance.

B. Addressing Integrity Violations

1. Instructors may choose to handle violations of academic integrity with the student at their own discretion, and report the outcome to the Dean of Students, preferably through the Academic Integrity Online Submission Form, accompanied by supporting documentation. The student will be notified of the placement of the form in the file by the Dean of Students if and when this occurs. (If a grade of "F" is given for a course, the instructor may notify the Registrar immediately, or may proceed normally to do so through on-line end-of-term grading.)

2. The first finding of a violation of academic integrity will result only in an academic penalty. It will be recorded as written warning, but not a code of conduct violation. Subsequent violations will be recorded in the student's conduct record.

3. As necessary, the Dean of Students will consult with the instructor/supervisor who reported the violation to gather information about the events, the sanctions imposed by the instructor/supervisor, and the rationale for the sanctions. The Dean of Students may suggest alternative or additional courses of action to the instructor/supervisor, recognizing that the decision regarding the sanction remains the prerogative of the instructor/supervisor except in circumstances described in IV.E.3, IV.F.3, and IV.F.4 of this policy. If not completed previously by the reporting instructor/supervisor, the Dean will solicit the information required to complete Academic Integrity Online Submission Form.

4. The Dean of Students will consult the records of the student to determine if prior violations have been reported, and will notify the student in writing that a meeting with the Dean is necessary in order to discuss the reported violation with the student. If not done previously, the student will indicate whether they accept responsibility for the violation and/or sanction.
5. The Dean of Students will counsel the student on the consequences of the violation. If no sanction has been imposed by the instructor/supervisor, the Dean may determine what consequences are appropriate, in light of the consultations in steps 2 and 3 above and the student's record. Generally, the sanction imposed by the instructor/supervisor will be supported.
6. However, if the student a) does not accept responsibility for the violation, b) requests that the sanction imposed be reviewed, or c) requests that the Dean's actions or other elements of the disciplinary procedure be reviewed, the Dean will counsel the student on the availability of further recourse through the Academic Integrity Board, as described below in section IV.D.1.
7. A student found responsible for his/her first violation of academic integrity will be required by the Dean of Students to participate in a training session and satisfactorily complete an educational module on Academic Integrity. Students who fail to complete the educational module will have a hold placed on their subsequent course registrations until the module is completed.
8. If, when the case is sent to the Dean of Students, it is determined that the student has a prior record of academic integrity policy violations, the Dean of Students will forward the case to the Academic Integrity Board for a hearing in order to determine whether additional consequences are appropriate.
9. If the case is closed following the Dean's actions, the Dean will communicate as appropriate to the instructor/supervisor, the student, the Student Conduct Administrator, and other staff regarding the outcomes of the case, and will retain necessary records in the student's conduct file.

C. *Academic Integrity Board (AIB)*

1. Membership. a) The voting membership of the Academic Integrity Board will comprise seven (7) individuals from the University community:
 - Four(4) full-time faculty members appointed by the Chair of the Faculty Senate for staggered two-year terms;
 - one (1) administrative staff member appointed by the Dean of Students; and
 - two (2) students in good academic standing (one [1] of graduate status appointed by the Graduate Student Council and one [1] of junior or senior status appointed by the Undergraduate Student Government Association).
- b) The Student Conduct Administrator^v shall serve as the non-voting Chair of the Board. A pool of alternate members in each of the three categories above may be called upon by the Conduct Administrator in order to address temporary absences or issues of conflict of interest affecting specific cases. Judgments regarding conflict of interest are at the discretion of the Student Conduct Administrator.

2. Quorum. The necessary quorum for the AIB to hear cases and conduct its business shall be 4 of the 7 voting members, and will include at least 1 student member and at least 2 of the faculty members. In all cases, the number of faculty members must be greater than the number of student members—student members may be dismissed by the Conduct Administrator as necessary to maintain a faculty majority. The Student Conduct Administrator must be present, in addition to the membership quorum defined above.

D. Academic Integrity Board (AIB) Hearing Process

1. Submitting Appeals to the Academic Integrity Board

a. *Format*. An appeal brought to the AIB as indicated above in IV.B.6 must be prepared in writing through the Academic Integrity Online Submission [Form](#). Appeals must contain (a) the name(s) of the individual(s) involved; (b) the circumstances of the complaint; and (c) supporting documentation if available, including specific dates, times, and locations. The student requesting the appeal (“student appellant”) will prepare a letter addressed to the AIB explaining the reasons for the appeal and the resolution sought. The Dean of Students is expected to determine that the materials assembled are ready for AIB review.

b. *Timing*. Appeals should be forwarded by the Dean of Students as soon as possible after the conference with the student (IV.B.5, preferably within 5 days).

Discoveries of violations a year or more after the date of the alleged violation typically will not be addressed formally through this procedure. In extraordinary circumstances, complaints may be accepted beyond this period, but reasons for doing so must be explained in the complaint. The Dean of Students will determine if a reported violation warrants an exception to the one-year limit. Instructors/supervisors are encouraged to report violations upon discovery, regardless of their latency. Students so reported will be called by the Dean of Students to respond to the allegations described in the Academic Integrity Online Submission Form. The record of the reported violation will remain in the student’s file.

c. *Scope of hearing*. If the student appellant does not admit to the violation, the hearing will result in a *finding* regarding whether a violation has occurred. If the student appellant admits to the violation but disagrees with the sanction or with elements of procedure, the hearing will result in a *recommendation* regarding these issues alone. If the case is referred to the Board by the Dean of Students because of multiple violations, the hearing will result in a *recommendation* to the Dean regarding appropriate sanctions.

d. *Notification*. The student will be notified in writing that the appeal has been received by the Academic Integrity Board. A time shall be set for an Academic Integrity Board Hearing, not less than five nor more than thirty working days after the student has been notified. Maximum time limits for scheduling of Academic Integrity Board Hearings may be extended at the discretion of the Student Conduct Administrator.

e. *Notice of hearing*. The student appellant and instructor shall be notified of the date, time, and location of the hearing by electronic mail (delivered to the student’s and

instructor's UNH email addresses of record,) at least 5 working days prior to the scheduled hearing. Both will be advised that the case file may be reviewed prior to the hearing in the Dean of Student's office in the presence of the Dean.

f. *Access to records.* The student appellant shall have access to the evidence that may be used against him/her. Access shall be defined as the ability to review records to be used in the hearing, and in the presence of a Student Conduct Administrator in the Dean of Students' Office.

g. *Hearing procedure.* Academic Integrity Board Hearings shall be conducted according to the following guidelines:

1. *Confidentiality.* Academic Integrity Board Hearings normally shall be conducted in private. Findings and recommendations issued by, and discussions of, the AIB will be kept confidential.

2. *Attendance.* The instructor, student appellant, and their advisors, if any (see "4" below), shall be allowed to attend the entire portion of the AIB hearing at which information is received (excluding deliberations). Admission of any other person to the AIB hearing shall be at the discretion of the Board and/or its Student Conduct Administrator.

3. *Multiple respondents.* In AIB hearings involving more than one student appellant, the Student Conduct Administrator, in his or her discretion, may permit the Academic Integrity Board hearings concerning each student to be conducted either separately or jointly.

4. *Right to an advisor.* The instructor/supervisor and the student appellant have the right to be assisted by an advisor they choose from among a pool of trained advisors as described below who is a full-time staff member of the University community, is not a faculty member, and is not an attorney^{vi}. Each party is responsible for presenting his or her own information, and therefore, advisors are not permitted to speak or to participate directly in any AIB Hearing.

- a. *The advisory pool.* The office of the Dean of Students will train and maintain a pool of approximately 5–10 full-time UNH staff members to be available for service as advisors to those involved in AIB hearings. The advisors will be trained regarding this AI policy, the AIB hearing process, the role and conduct of advisors in the administration of this AI policy, protecting confidentiality, and related skills.

- b. *Selecting an advisor.* The office of the Dean of Students will present the student or instructor/supervisor, upon request, with the full list of available advisors, from which the student or instructor/supervisor will choose one. A student should select as an advisor a person whose schedule allows attendance at the scheduled date and time for the hearing because delays will not normally be allowed due to the scheduling conflicts of an advisor. The Dean of Students office will contact the chosen advisor to arrange for their participation and to assure that no conflict of interest exists regarding their service as an advisor. If the

chosen advisor is unavailable or unsuitable, the student or instructor/supervisor may choose another from the list following the same procedure.

5. *Role of witnesses.* The instructor/supervisor, the student appellant, and the Academic Integrity Board may arrange for witnesses to present pertinent information to the Board. Witnesses will provide information to and answer questions from the AIB. Questions may be asked by the student appellant and/or instructor/supervisor to be answered by each other or by other witnesses. Deviations from this procedure will be at the discretion of the Student Conduct Administrator. Questions of whether potentially relevant information and evidence will be received shall be resolved by the Student Conduct Administrator.

6. *Evidence.* Pertinent records, exhibits, and written statements (including student impact statements) may be accepted as information for consideration by the Academic Integrity Board at the discretion of the Student Conduct Administrator.

7. *Rulings on hearing procedure.* All procedural questions are subject to the final decision of the Student Conduct Administrator.

8. *Majority decision.* After that portion of the AIB Hearing concludes during which all available pertinent information has been received, the Board shall determine by majority vote the Board's findings and recommendations regarding those elements of the appeal in its scope as determined at IV.D.c above.

9. *Standard of proof.* The Academic Integrity Board's findings shall be made on the basis of a preponderance of evidence that the student appellant violated the Academic Integrity Policy.

10. *Rules of evidence.* Formal rules of process, procedure, and/or technical rules of evidence, such as are applied in criminal or civil court, are not used in Academic Integrity proceedings.

11. *Absence of parties.* If a student appellant, having been duly notified of a hearing, does not appear before the AIB for a scheduled hearing, the hearing may proceed or be rescheduled, depending on the Board's judgment regarding the circumstances surrounding the failed appearance. Hearings may proceed without the instructor/supervisor in attendance. The student and instructor are expected to indicate to the Board, through a response to the notification at IV.D.e above, whether s/he intends to appear at the hearing.

12. *Participation in absentia.* In exceptional circumstances, the Student Conduct Administrator shall consider allowing the use of technological means to allow the student to participate in the hearing. The Academic Integrity Board may accommodate concerns for the personal safety, well-being, and/or fears of confrontation of the instructor/supervisor, student appellant, and/or other witness during the hearing by providing separate facilities, by using a visual screen, and/or by permitting participation by telephone, videophone, closed circuit television, video conferencing, videotape, audiotape, written statement, or other means, where and as determined in the sole judgment of the Student Conduct

Administrator to be appropriate.

2. Record of hearing

There shall be a single verbatim record, such as a tape recording, of all Academic Integrity Board Hearings before an Academic Integrity Board (not including deliberations). Deliberations shall not be recorded. The record shall be the property of the University, and retained in the custody of the Student Conduct Administrator. No other recordings are permitted.

3. Determining sanctions

All findings of student responsibility for violations will be based only on the information presented before the hearing body, but previous action taken against students for violations of academic integrity will be used in the consideration of the recommended sanction in a given appeal, and in recommending sanctions to the Dean of Students in cases recommended to the Board by the Dean involving multiple sanctions, as required in IV.B.7.

4. Notice of findings and recommendations

Written notification of the Board's findings and recommendations and a rationale for them will be provided within five (5) working days after the conclusion of the hearing. The Student Conduct Administrator will so notify the parties to the case and to the Dean of Students. The decision of the Academic Integrity Board is advisory in nature; the AIB is not authorized to impose sanctions.

5. Notice of Faculty Member's Response

If the Academic Integrity Board recommends changes to the faculty member's sanctions, the faculty member will notify the Student Conduct Administrator of the faculty member's decision regarding the recommendation within five (5) working days. The Student Conduct Administrator will so notify the parties to the case and the Dean of Students.

6. Appeal

- a. *Student appeal of AI process or outcomes*: appellants have the right to appeal to the Provost regarding negative findings or recommendations of the Academic Integrity Board or notice of the faculty member's declining any Academic Integrity Board recommended change in sanctions within five (5) working days of receipt of the notice of the faculty member's response. (See Section IV.F below)
- b. *Access to General Grievance Committee (GGC)*: The GGC does *not* serve as a forum for appeal of AI procedures or outcomes. Students retain their rights to pursue the grievance process, for reasons not related to the academic integrity issue, separate from the AI process. However, the AI process must be completed, including any appeal of the AI process under IV.D.6.a above, before any grievance may be pursued.

7. Student status during proceedings

- a. Generally, students may continue in their student status until the conclusion of academic integrity proceedings, defined as the final notification of sanctions or the outcome of the student's appeal. Judgments regarding a student's permission to remain enrolled, to continue registration for subsequent terms, or other elements

of a student's academic status are made by the Dean of Students in consultation with the Provost, the reporting instructor/supervisor, and others as appropriate.

b. Withdrawal from a course in which a student has been accused of an academic integrity violation does not protect a student from receiving an F in the course or from other sanctions, nor will a withdrawal stop further academic dishonesty proceedings. Withdrawal from the University or declaring a change of major likewise will not prevent the disciplinary proceedings or entry of violations in the student's permanent record.

E. Sanctions for Academic Integrity Violations

1. *Sanctions.* Dependent on the seriousness of the violation and the student's record, sanctions for academic integrity violations may include the following:

- *From the instructor/supervisor* – course-specific penalties including but not limited to grade penalties or failure for the entire course, or termination of the student's employment in the University position in question.
- *From the Dean of Students and the Provost* - range from disciplinary probation through expulsion or revocation of a degree/earned credential; termination of participation in research or the project in question, University support in research, change in course grade, and restitution for any stipends, research funds, or financial support.

2. The minimum sanctions for academic integrity violations will include participation in a training session and satisfactory completion of an educational module on Academic Integrity.

3. *Sanctions for subsequent violations.* Students found responsible for a second or subsequent violation will receive a minimum sanction of an F in a course (or termination from a co- or extracurricular project). Other sanctions also may be applied.

4. *Additional penalties.* Other penalties may be imposed by the University to include loss of membership in student organizations and honor societies; ineligibility to participate in study abroad, athletics, or other programs; and/or ineligibility to hold office in a student organization that receives University funds or uses University facilities. (Infractions of this policy that relate to research or other co- or extracurricular activity also may expose the student to civil or criminal proceedings.)

5. *Allegations following withdrawal.* Violations relating to course-specific performance reported after a student withdraws from the University or after a grade has been given for a course will result in the grade reverting to a "Grade Not Submitted" (GNS). A notation will be placed on the student's academic record that an academic dishonesty case is pending. The student will have the right to a hearing before the Academic Integrity Board as outlined in this policy. Refer to section D.1.b on time limits.

6. *Revocation of degree.* Violations reported within a year of graduation may result

in revocation of the student's diploma. The grade given for the course in which the allegation has been made will revert to a "Grade Not Submitted" (GNS), and a notation will be placed on the student's academic record that an academic dishonesty case is pending. The student will have the right to a hearing before the Academic Integrity Board as outlined in this policy.

F. Appeals to the Provost

1. *Right to Appeal.* Findings and recommendations reached by the Academic Integrity Board may be appealed to the Provost by the student or by the reporting instructor/supervisor. Appeals shall be in writing and shall be delivered to the Dean of Students' Office within five (5) working days of the date of receipt of the original notification of sanction by the Dean. In extraordinary cases, the Provost may extend this time limit. Either party to the case is limited to *one* appeal to the Provost, within which all elements of the case will be reviewed, including a) whether the violation occurred, b) whether appropriate process was followed, and c) whether an appropriate sanction is to be applied.

2. *Criteria for appeal.* Appeals of findings and recommendations issued by the Academic Integrity Board shall be limited to a review of the actions taken by the Dean of Students and/or Conduct Administrator and to the verbatim record of the Academic Integrity Board Hearing and supporting documents for one or more of the following purposes:

a. *Fair process.* To determine whether the AIB hearing was conducted fairly in light of the nature of the reported violation and information presented, and in conformity with the expectation that a reasonable opportunity will be afforded for the reporting instructor to prepare and to present information that the Academic Integrity Policy was violated, and giving the student appellant a reasonable opportunity to prepare and to present a response to the report. Deviations from designated procedures will not be a basis *per se* for sustaining an appeal unless the Provost determines that significant prejudice resulted from such deviation.

b. *Factual basis.* To determine whether the findings and recommendations issued regarding the student's case were based on substantial information, that is, whether there were facts in the case that, if believed by the fact finder, were sufficient to establish that a violation of the Academic Integrity Policy occurred.

c. *Appropriateness of sanction.* To determine whether the sanction(s) imposed by the instructor/supervisor or the Dean of Students, or those supported by the Academic Integrity Board, were appropriate for the violation of the Academic Integrity Policy that the student was found to have committed.

d. *New evidence.* To consider new information or other relevant facts not brought out in the original hearing, sufficient to alter a finding, because such information and/or facts were not known or available to the appealing party at the time of the original AIB hearing.

3. *Acting on an appeal.* Upon review of an appeal submitted by the student or instructor/supervisor, and following consultation with the instructor/supervisor and staff

as appropriate, the Provost will render a final decision on the case and act to implement the decision. No further appeals are possible. To the greatest extent possible, the Provost will honor the academic freedom and authority of the faculty member. The Provost will notify the parties to the case, the Student Conduct Administrator, the Dean of Students, and others as necessary.

4. *Provost's discretion to intervene.* It is not necessary for either party to a case to submit an appeal to the Provost in order for the Provost to intervene in a case. While such unsolicited intervention is expected to be very rare, this discretion is necessary in order to protect the interests of the University and its constituents. A written rationale will be provided by the Provost for such action.

G. Maintenance of Records

Records of academic dishonesty cases will be considered disciplinary (conduct) records after the first documented incident and will be maintained in the Office of the Dean of Students. All academic dishonesty records will be kept on file for a minimum period of seven (7) years from the date the student leaves the University. Records of suspension or expulsion shall be retained indefinitely.

Acknowledgments

This policy has been adapted from the Code of Academic Integrity and Acknowledging the Work of Others, prepared by the Office of the Dean of Faculty, Cornell University and used with permission; Academic Integrity Policies and Procedures at Sacred Heart University, WPI, William Patterson College; and A Model Code of Academic Integrity by Gary Pavela.

ⁱ Pavela, G. (1997) Applying the power of association on campus: A model code of academic integrity. *Journal of College and University Law*, 24(1), pp 9 *et seq.* [journal online] available from http://www.jpo.umd.edu/docs/toomuch2_wrk.pdf; Internet; accessed 30 January 2007.]

ⁱⁱ Based on Pavela, page 11. Note that Pavela's qualifiers "intentionally and knowingly" have been dropped from the definition adopted for the UNH policy.

ⁱⁱⁱ Pavela, page 10. Note that the qualifier "intentionally" has been dropped from the definition adopted for the UNH policy.

^{iv} Pavela, page 10. Note that the qualifier "intentionally" has been dropped from the definition adopted for the UNH policy.

^v As defined in the Code of Conduct found in the *Student Handbook*.

^{vi} For purposes of this policy, "attorney" is defined as: a) an attorney who is admitted to practice law in Connecticut or in any other jurisdiction, regardless of whether the attorney is on active or inactive status, or b) an individual with a law degree, including without limitation a Juris Doctor or Master of Laws (L.L.M.), but who is not licensed or admitted to practice law. This definition has been drafted broadly to protect the University from any liability that could result from allegations that it condoned the unlawful practice of law by unlicensed attorneys, which is forbidden by Connecticut General Statutes § 51-88(a), and punishable under Connecticut General Statutes § 51-88(b), and Connecticut Practice Book § 2-44. Relatedly, the CT Professional Rule of Conduct § 1.18 addresses the obligations of attorneys regarding confidentiality that are relevant to the participation of attorneys in a University hearing process.