

Rutgers University
Academic Integrity Policy
Effective September 1, 2011

I. Academic Integrity

As an academic community dedicated to the creation, dissemination, and application of knowledge, Rutgers University is committed to fostering an intellectual and ethical environment based on the principles of academic integrity. Academic integrity is essential to the success of the University's educational and research missions, and violations of academic integrity constitute serious offenses against the entire academic community. This academic integrity policy is designed to guide students as they prepare assignments, take examinations, and perform the work necessary to complete their degree requirements.

The principles of academic integrity require that a student:

- properly acknowledge and cite all use of the ideas, results, or words of others.
- properly acknowledge all contributors to a given piece of work.
- make sure that all work submitted as his or her own in a course or other academic activity is produced without the aid of unsanctioned materials or unsanctioned collaboration.
- obtain all data or results by ethical means and report them accurately without suppressing any results inconsistent with his or her interpretation or conclusions.
- treat all other students in an ethical manner, respecting their integrity and right to pursue their educational goals without interference. This requires that a student neither facilitate academic dishonesty by others nor obstruct their academic progress.
- uphold the canons of the ethical or professional code of the profession for which he or she is preparing.

Adherence to these principles is necessary in order to insure that

- everyone is given proper credit for his or her ideas, words, results, and other scholarly accomplishments.
- all student work is fairly evaluated and no student has an inappropriate advantage over others.
- the academic and ethical development of all students is fostered.
- the reputation of the University for integrity in its teaching, research, and scholarship is maintained and enhanced.

Failure to uphold these principles of academic integrity threatens both the reputation of the University and the value of the degrees awarded to its students. Every member of the University community therefore bears a responsibility for ensuring that the highest standards of academic integrity are upheld.

The University administration is responsible for working with faculty and students to foster a strong institutional culture of academic integrity, for providing effective educational programs that create an understanding of and commitment to academic integrity, and for establishing equitable and effective procedures to deal with allegations of violations of academic integrity.

The faculty shares with the administration the responsibility for educating students about the importance and principles of academic integrity. Faculty members¹ are expected to inform students of the particular requirements regarding academic integrity within their specific courses, to make reasonable efforts to minimize academic dishonesty, and to respond appropriately to violations of academic integrity. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to provide a statement concerning academic integrity and a link to the Academic Integrity Policy on their course syllabi.

Students are responsible for understanding the principles of academic integrity and abiding by them in all aspects of their work at the University. Students are also encouraged to help educate fellow students about academic integrity and to bring all alleged violations of academic integrity they encounter to the attention of the appropriate authorities.

To promote a strong culture of academic integrity, Rutgers has adopted the following honor pledge to be written and signed on examinations and major course assignments submitted for grading: ***On my honor, I have neither received nor given any unauthorized assistance on this examination (assignment)***. In addition, students are required to take an online tutorial and pass an online examination on academic integrity in their first semester at Rutgers and to affirm periodically that they understand the Rutgers Academic Integrity Policy and will abide by it in all their academic work.

II. Violations of Academic Integrity and Recommended Sanctions

A. Types of Violations

This section describes various ways in which the principles of academic integrity can be violated. Examples of each type of violation are given but neither the types of violations nor the lists of examples are exhaustive.

Plagiarism: Plagiarism is the use of another person's words, ideas, or results without giving that person appropriate credit. To avoid plagiarism, every direct quotation must be identified by quotation marks or appropriate indentation and both direct quotation and paraphrasing must be cited properly according to the accepted format for the particular discipline or as required by the instructor in a course. Some common examples of plagiarism are:

- Copying word for word (i.e. quoting directly) from an oral, printed, or electronic source without proper attribution.
- Paraphrasing without proper attribution, i.e., presenting in one's own words another person's written words or ideas as if they were one's own.
- Submitting a purchased or downloaded term paper or other materials to satisfy a course requirement.
- Incorporating into one's work graphs, drawings, photographs, diagrams, tables, spreadsheets, computer programs, or other nontextual material from other sources without proper attribution.

¹ For purposes of the Academic Integrity Policy, the term faculty member includes not only tenured, tenure-track, and nontenure-track faculty members, but also part-time lecturers, coadjutants, TAs, staff members, and administrators who are serving as the instructor of record in a course; i.e., the instructor responsible for assigning final course grades.

Cheating: Cheating is the use of inappropriate or prohibited materials, information, sources, or aids in any academic exercise. Cheating also includes submitting papers, research results and reports, analyses, etc. as one's own work when they were, in fact, prepared by others. Some common examples are:

- Receiving research, programming, data collection, or analytical assistance from others or working with another student on an assignment where such help is not permitted.
- Copying another student's work or answers on a quiz or examination.
- Using or possessing books, notes, calculators, cell phones, or other prohibited devices or materials during a quiz or examination.
- Submitting the same work or major portions thereof to satisfy the requirements of more than one course without permission from the instructors involved.
- Preprogramming a calculator or other electronic device to contain answers, formulas, or other unauthorized information for use during a quiz or examination.
- Acquiring a copy of an examination from an unauthorized source prior to the examination.
- Having a substitute take an examination for one.
- Having someone else prepare a term paper or other assignment for one

Fabrication: Fabrication is the invention or falsification of sources, citations, data, or results, and recording or reporting them in any academic exercise. Some examples are:

- Citing a source that does not exist.
- Making up or falsifying evidence or data or other source materials.
- Falsifying research papers or reports by selectively omitting or altering data that do not support one's conclusions or claimed experimental precision.

Facilitation of Dishonesty: Facilitation of dishonesty is knowingly or negligently allowing one's work to be used by other students without prior approval of the instructor or otherwise aiding others in committing violations of academic integrity. A student who intentionally facilitates a violation of academic integrity can be considered to be as culpable as the student who receives the impermissible assistance, even if the facilitator does not benefit personally from the violation. Some examples are:

- Collaborating before a quiz or examination to develop methods of exchanging information.
- Knowingly allowing others to copy answers to work on a quiz or examination or assisting others to do so.
- Distributing an examination from an unauthorized source prior to the examination.
- Distributing or selling a term paper to other students.
- Taking an examination for another student.

Academic Sabotage: Academic sabotage is deliberately impeding the academic progress of others. Some examples are:

- Intentionally destroying or obstructing another student's work.
- Stealing or defacing books, journals, or other library or University materials.
- Altering computer files that contain data, reports or assignments belonging to another student.
- Removing posted or reserve material or otherwise preventing other students' access to it.

Violation of Research or Professional Ethics: Violations in this category include both violations of the code of ethics specific to a particular profession and violations of more generally applicable ethical requirements for the acquisition, analysis, and reporting of research data and the preparation and submission of scholarly work for publication. Some examples are:

- Violating a canon of the ethical or professional code of the profession for which a student is preparing.
- Using unethical or improper means of acquiring, analyzing, or reporting data in a senior thesis project, a master's or doctoral research project, grant-funded research, or research submitted for publication.
- Misuse of grant or institutional funds.
- Violating professional ethics in performing one's duties as a Teaching Assistant or Graduate Assistant.

Violations Involving Potentially Criminal Activity: Violations in this category include theft, fraud, forgery, or distribution of ill-gotten materials committed as part of an act of academic dishonesty. Some examples are:

- Stealing an examination from a faculty member's or University office or from electronic files.
- Selling or distributing a stolen examination.
- Forging a change-of-grade form.
- Falsifying a University transcript.

B. Levels of Violations and Sanctions

Any violation of academic integrity is a serious offense and is therefore subject to an appropriate sanction or penalty. Academic integrity violations at Rutgers University are classified into two levels called nonseparable and separable. Nonseparable violations are less severe violations for which the possible sanctions do not include suspension or expulsion from the University; separable violations are more severe violations for which the possible sanctions include suspension or expulsion. Whether a given violation is classified as nonseparable or separable depends on a number of factors including: the nature and importance of the academic exercise; the degree of premeditation or planning; the extent of dishonest or malicious intent; the academic experience of the student; and whether the violation is a first-time or repeat offense.

1. *Nonseparable Violations*

Nonseparable violations are less serious violations of academic integrity. They may occur because of inexperience or lack of understanding of the principles of academic integrity and are often characterized by a relatively low degree of premeditation or planning and the absence of malicious intent on the part of the student committing the violation. These violations are generally quite limited in extent, occur on a minor assignment or quiz or constitute a small portion of a major assignment and/or represent a small percentage of the total course work. Below are a few examples of violations that are most often considered nonseparable, at least when committed by an undergraduate student as a first-time offense. This list is not exhaustive and classification of a given violation as separable or nonseparable is always heavily dependent on the specific facts and circumstances of the violation.

- Improper citation without dishonest intent.
- Plagiarism on a minor assignment or a very limited portion of a major assignment.

- Unpremeditated cheating on a quiz or minor examination.
- Unauthorized collaboration with another student on a homework assignment.
- Citing a source that does not exist or that one hasn't read on a minor assignment.
- Making up a small number of data points on a laboratory exercise.
- Signing in for another student via attendance sheet or clicker in a course in which attendance counts toward the grade.

However, an alleged second nonseparable violation shall be treated as an alleged separable violation. Moreover, some violations that would be considered nonseparable for an undergraduate student may be treated as separable for a graduate student².

Sanctions for nonseparable violations include, but are not limited to, one or more of the following, and do not include suspension or expulsion:

- Required participation in a noncredit workshop or seminar on ethics or academic integrity.
- An assigned paper or research project related to ethics or academic integrity.
- A make-up assignment that may be more difficult than the original assignment.
- No credit for the original assignment.
- A failing grade on the assignment.
- A failing grade for the course.
- Disciplinary warning or probation.

2. *Separable Violations*

Separable violations are very serious violations of academic integrity that affect a more significant portion of the course work compared to nonseparable violations. Separable violations are often characterized by substantial premeditation or planning and clearly dishonest or malicious intent on the part of the student committing the violation. Below are some examples of violations that are most often considered separable. Again, the list is certainly not exhaustive and classification of a given violation as separable or nonseparable is always heavily dependent on the exact facts and circumstances of the violation.

- A second nonseparable violation.
- Substantial plagiarism on a major assignment.
- Copying or using unauthorized materials, devices, or collaboration on a major exam.
- Having a substitute take an examination.
- Making up or falsifying evidence or data or other source materials for a major assignment, including falsification by selectively omitting or altering data that do not support one's claims or conclusions.
- Facilitating dishonesty by another student on a major exam or assignment.
- Intentionally destroying or obstructing another student's work.
- Knowingly violating research or professional ethics.
- Any violation involving potentially criminal activity.

² In this policy, the term graduate student refers to post-baccalaureate students pursuing advanced degrees of any type or enrolled in a graduate course or courses. The term also includes students in the advanced stages of a professional program that leads to a masters or doctoral degree without conferral of a baccalaureate degree.

Sanctions for separable violations include, but are not limited to, one or more of the following, and may, but need not, involve suspension or expulsion:

- A grade of XF (disciplinary F) for the course.
- Disciplinary probation.
- Dismissal from a departmental or school honors program.
- Denial of access to internships or research programs.
- Loss of appointment to academically-based positions.
- Loss of departmental/graduate program endorsements for internal and external fellowship support and employment opportunities.
- Removal of fellowship or assistantship support.
- Suspension for one or more semesters.
- Dismissal from a graduate or professional program.
- Permanent expulsion from the University with a permanent notation of disciplinary expulsion on the student's transcript.

The recommendations for sanctions at each level are not binding, but are intended as guidelines for the University community. For both nonseparable and separable violations, the severity of the sanction imposed should be proportional to the severity of the violation committed.

Sanctions for a given violation may be imposed differently on those with more or with less experience as students. Thus violations of academic integrity by graduate students² will normally be penalized more severely than the same violations by inexperienced undergraduate students. In particular, violations that would be considered nonseparable for an undergraduate student may be treated as separable for a graduate student.

Some professional schools or programs may have codes of professional conduct with customary sanctions for violations thereof that may be more severe than those recommended under this Policy. These schools or programs have the responsibility to educate their students about their profession's code of professional conduct. Students are responsible for understanding the requirements of the code of professional conduct for the particular professional program in which they are enrolled and the penalties for violating that code.

III. Administration of the Academic Integrity Policy

A. Role of CAOs and CAIDs

The Chief Academic Officer (CAO) on each Rutgers campus; i.e., the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs in New Brunswick/Piscataway and the Chancellor in Newark and in Camden, has the ultimate responsibility for implementing and overseeing the Academic Integrity Policy on his or her campus; this includes deciding the sanction for students found responsible for separable violations of academic integrity and providing high-level oversight of the selection, training, and performance of Academic Integrity Facilitators (see subsection B below) and of the Honor Council (see subsection F below), in cooperation with the Director of the Office of Student Conduct. The CAO shall either exercise these responsibilities personally or delegate them to one or more academic administrators called Campus Academic Integrity

Designees (CAIDs). The Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs also has the responsibility to ensure that the Academic Integrity Policy is implemented consistently and fairly across all the University's campuses, schools, and colleges.

B. Role of AIFs and Faculty Members

Academic Integrity Facilitators (AIFs) shall ordinarily be academic staff or faculty members appointed by the deans of their respective schools or colleges. AIFs shall help to educate students and faculty members concerning academic integrity, advise faculty members concerning academic integrity policies and procedures, and investigate and adjudicate allegations of first-time nonseparable violations of academic integrity that faculty members choose not to handle themselves. AIFs may also carry out the Preliminary Review of cases of alleged separable violations of the Academic Integrity Policy, as described in the *University Code of Student Conduct*.

Faculty members may also play a role in the administration of the Academic Integrity Policy by investigating and adjudicating allegations of first-time nonseparable violations of Academic Integrity under the guidelines provided in this Policy.³

C. Role of Campus Advisers

Campus advisers are staff or faculty members trained to provide assistance to complainants or respondents in University Hearings or Disciplinary Conferences.

D. Role of University Hearing Boards and Hearing Officers

University Hearing Boards consider cases of students accused of separable violations of academic integrity who do not accept responsibility for the alleged violation. Hearing Boards consist of students and faculty members (normally three students and two faculty members) chosen by the Director of the Office of Student Conduct from a pool of trained students and faculty members. Hearings are conducted by a *Hearing Officer*, who must be a member of the University community, normally a staff or faculty member.

E. Role of the Appeals Committees

Each Rutgers campus (New Brunswick/Piscataway, Newark, and Camden) shall have its own Appeals Committee, which shall be a standing committee of faculty members and staff members appointed by the campus CAO and student members from the Honor Council (see III.F below), all trained by the Office of Student Conduct. The Appeals Committees shall have three functions with regard to appeals of findings of responsibility and/or sanctions for violations of academic integrity:

1. considering student appeals regarding determination of responsibility and/or sanctions for nonseparable violations of academic integrity.
2. considering student appeals regarding determination of responsibility and/or sanctions for separable violations of academic integrity.
3. considering student appeals for removal of the X from an XF grade.

³ Faculty members may not handle allegations of separable violations of academic integrity, but must refer such allegations to an appropriate AIF, to the Office of Student Conduct, or to the Senior Student Conduct Officer on their campus.

All three types of appeals are considered by panels consisting of three voting members: two students and one faculty member. In addition, panels considering appeals of findings of responsibility and/or sanctions for nonseparable violations have a non-voting staff member called the Staff Investigator. Appeals are decided on the basis of written submissions by the parties involved. Appeals panels do not conduct hearings nor take direct testimony.

F. Role of the Honor Council

The Honor Council is an organization of undergraduate and graduate students from each of the three Rutgers campuses dedicated to promoting academic integrity. The Honor Council plays a key role in educating students and other members of the University community about academic integrity. Members of the Council also play a number of roles in the administration of the Academic Integrity Policy. These roles may include:

1. serving as student members of University Hearing Boards and Appeals Committee panels.
2. serving as the complainant at a University Hearing; i.e., presenting the case against the respondent. Such Honor Council members are called *Community Advocates*.
3. providing information, advice, and assistance to students accused of violating the Academic Integrity Policy, including accompanying students to meetings with faculty members or AIFs and assisting the respondent during a University Hearing or Disciplinary Conference. Such Honor Council members are called *Student Advocates*. They are permitted to address the Hearing Board at a University Hearing or the Conduct Officer at a Disciplinary Conference and to question witnesses in either case.

G. Role of the Office of Student Conduct and Student Conduct Officers

The Office of Student Conduct (OSC) and Camden and Newark Student Conduct Officers handle cases of alleged separable violations of academic integrity under the *University Code of Student Conduct*. The OSC provides University Hearings on all three campuses; Camden and Newark Student Conduct Officers handle other aspects of cases of alleged separable violations on their respective campuses. The OSC and Student Conduct Officers also play a key role in educating students, faculty, and staff about academic integrity.

The OSC provides a number of additional university-wide services, including serving as the central University repository of student disciplinary records and providing training for Academic Integrity Facilitators, Campus Advisers, Student Advocates, Community Advocates, Hearing Officers, and members of Hearing Boards, Appeals Committees, and the Honor Council, in cooperation with the campus CAOs and CAIDs.

IV. Policies Regarding Adjudication of Alleged Violations of Academic Integrity

A. Reporting and Adjudicating Alleged Violations

The policies for reporting and adjudicating alleged violations of academic integrity are different for nonseparable and separable violations with regard to both the persons authorized to handle the allegations and the procedures to be followed.

A faculty member who observes or is apprised of a possible separable violation of academic integrity by an undergraduate student shall report the allegation to the Office of Student Conduct or authorized Student Conduct Officer or AIF for handling under the procedures specified in the *University Code of Student Conduct*. The faculty member may recommend a sanction should the student be found responsible for the violation and that recommendation shall be given substantial weight.

A faculty member who observes or is apprised of a possible nonseparable violation of academic integrity by an undergraduate student shall do one of the following:

1. The faculty member may refer the matter to an AIF of the school or college offering the course (for an alleged violation occurring in a Rutgers course), or to an AIF of the school or college in which the student is enrolled (for an alleged violation occurring outside a Rutgers course⁴).
2. The faculty member may investigate and adjudicate the matter as described in the *Procedures for Adjudicating Alleged Nonseparable Violations of Academic Integrity* provided that the accused student has not previously been found responsible for a violation of academic integrity and is not on disciplinary probation. Before proceeding to investigate and adjudicate the allegation, therefore, the faculty member must check with the Director of the Office of Student Conduct or authorized Student Conduct Officer or AIF to make sure that the student does not have a previous academic integrity violation and is not on disciplinary probation. The faculty member is also strongly advised to consult informally with an AIF or Student Conduct Officer to verify that the alleged violation is indeed nonseparable and to obtain information about typical sanctions for such a violation.
3. If the student has previously been found responsible for a violation of academic integrity or is on disciplinary probation, the faculty member may not handle the allegation but must refer it to the Office of Student Conduct or authorized Student Conduct Officer or AIF for handling as an alleged separable violation under the procedures specified in the *University Code of Student Conduct*.

Since all violations of academic integrity by a graduate student (as defined in this Policy) are potentially separable under the Academic Integrity Policy, faculty members shall not handle allegations of academic integrity violations by graduate students, but shall refer all such allegations to an appropriate AIF in the accused student's school of matriculation.

Members of the University community other than faculty members (as defined in this Policy) should normally report evidence of a violation of academic integrity in a Rutgers course to the instructor of record in the course or to the Chair of the department offering the course; evidence of a violation of academic integrity occurring outside a Rutgers course⁴ should normally be reported to the faculty member supervising the accused student or to the student's Department Chair or Graduate Director. However, any member of the University community is permitted, according to the *University Code of Student Conduct*, to initiate a formal complaint of a violation of academic integrity with the Office of Student Conduct or the Camden or Newark Senior Student Conduct Officer.

⁴ Examples include alleged violations of academic integrity committed in a research project, scholarly paper, or examination not tied to a particular Rutgers course.

Upon receipt of a report of an alleged nonseparable violation of academic integrity from a faculty member or other member of the University community, an AIF shall check to see if the student has previously been found responsible for a violation or violations of academic integrity or is on disciplinary probation. If the student has been found responsible for an academic integrity violation or is on disciplinary probation, the AIF shall forward the allegation to the Office of Student Conduct or authorized Student Conduct Officer for handling as an alleged separable violation under the procedures of the *University Code of Student Conduct*. Otherwise, the AIF shall investigate and adjudicate the matter as specified in the *Procedures for Adjudicating Alleged Nonseparable Violations of Academic Integrity*.

The faculty member or AIF handling an allegation of a first-time nonseparable violation of academic integrity shall meet with the student respondent⁵, review all available evidence, make a determination regarding responsibility, and choose an appropriate sanction if he or she decides the student is responsible for the alleged violation. The student can then accept responsibility for the violation and accept the chosen sanction or appeal the finding of responsibility and/or the sanction in writing to the appropriate campus Appeals Committee.

For nonseparable violations of academic integrity, faculty members and AIFs may impose only educational sanctions, such as grade penalties for assignments or the course, make-up assignments that may be of a more difficult nature, assignments pertaining to academic integrity, and required attendance at a noncredit workshop or seminar on academic integrity. Faculty members and AIFs may also request that the Office of Student Conduct or Senior Student Conduct Officer add disciplinary warning or probation to the educational sanctions chosen by the faculty member or AIF.

The procedures for adjudicating allegations of first-time nonseparable violations are summarized briefly in Appendix B, Part I of this policy. The summary is meant only to give the reader an overview of the procedures. Anyone seeking a detailed understanding of the procedures for adjudicating nonseparable violations of academic integrity, including the rights and responsibilities of the respondent and all others involved in the process, must consult *Procedures for Adjudicating Alleged Nonseparable Violations of Academic Integrity*. Additional explanatory material on the procedures may be found on the Student Conduct website: <http://studentconduct.rutgers.edu>

Allegations of separable violations of academic integrity must be adjudicated according to the procedures specified in the *University Code of Student Conduct*. These procedures begin with a Preliminary Review carried out by an AIF or Student Conduct Officer for the purpose of deciding whether to charge the student with a separable violation of academic integrity. If the student is charged with and accepts responsibility for a separable violation, the AIF or Student Conduct Officer selects a sanction, which must be approved by the CAO or CAID if it involves separation. If the student is charged with but does not accept responsibility for a separable violation, he or she has the right to a University Hearing before a student and faculty Hearing Board or, if he or she prefers, a Disciplinary Conference with a Student Conduct Officer. Any determination of responsibility for a separable violation of academic integrity by a University Hearing Board or Student Conduct Officer at a Disciplinary Conference or any sanction assigned for such a violation by a CAO or CAID, a Student Conduct Officer, or an AIF may be

⁵ The respondent is the student accused of violating the Academic Integrity Policy.

appealed to the Appeals Committee of the campus in which the respondent is enrolled. If not satisfied with the decision of the Appeals Committee, the respondent may petition the President of the University to review the finding and/or sanction.

The procedures for adjudicating allegations of separable violations of academic integrity are summarized in more detail in Appendix B, Part II of this policy. The summary is meant only to give the reader an overview of the procedures. Anyone seeking a detailed understanding of the procedures for adjudicating separable violations of academic integrity, including the rights and responsibilities of the respondent and of others involved in the process, must consult the *University Code of Student Conduct*. Additional explanatory material on the procedures may be found on the Student Conduct website: <http://studentconduct.rutgers.edu>

B. Withdrawal and Assignment of Grades During Adjudication

Once a student has been notified of an alleged violation of academic integrity, he or she may not drop the course or withdraw from school until the adjudication process is completed. The student may, however, file a petition with the Office of Student Conduct or Senior Student Conduct Officer and the dean of his or her school of matriculation, requesting permission to withdraw retroactively from the course if and only if he or she is found not responsible for the alleged violation.

If a faculty member must submit a final course grade before an allegation of a violation of academic integrity is resolved, the student respondent shall be given a temporary grade of Incomplete or TZ, which does not affect the student's GPA, until the adjudication process is completed.

C. Removal of XF Grades

Requests for removal of the X from an XF grade must be submitted in writing to the appropriate Campus Appeals Committee and will be considered by a panel of two student members and one faculty member of the Appeals Committee. Such requests will not be considered until at least 18 months from the time of the violation that resulted in the XF. In order for the request to be granted, the student, at a minimum, must have an exemplary record with respect to academic integrity since the original violation, must have completed a Rutgers academic integrity workshop or seminar, and must satisfactorily answer a required series of essay questions on why the X should be removed. The appeals panel shall make the final decision concerning the request. If the request is denied, the student must wait another year to submit another request.

V. Amendments

Minor changes to this Academic Integrity Policy must be approved by the Academic Standards, Regulations, and Admissions Committee of the University Senate. Major changes must also be approved by the full University Senate and by the Campus CAOs, in consultation with their deans.

Acknowledgments

This Academic Integrity Policy was written by an *ad-hoc* committee of students, faculty, staff, and administrators from the Camden, Newark, and New Brunswick/Piscataway campuses, with extensive input from many other members of the Rutgers Community. The Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) gratefully acknowledges the help of all who shared their insights and suggestions with the committee.

The AIC particularly acknowledges the assistance received from the Office of Student Conduct and from members of the University Senate, especially the Senate Academic Standards, Regulations, and Admissions Committee. The committee also thanks members of two previous Academic Integrity Committees who made major contributions to the policies and procedures for handling nonseparable violations of academic integrity.

Major aspects of this Policy are modeled on the academic integrity policies of the University of Maryland and of the Pennsylvania State University. The AIC gratefully acknowledge the guidance obtained from those policies and from the staff and faculty members at those institutions who so generously shared their knowledge and experience with us.

Appendix A: Glossary of Terms

Academic Integrity Facilitators (AIFs) are academic staff or faculty members appointed by the deans of their respective schools or colleges to (1) investigate and adjudicate allegations of first-time nonseparable violations of academic integrity referred to them by faculty members or other members of the University community and (2) help educate and advise members of the academic community about academic integrity. AIFs may also carry out the Preliminary Review of cases of alleged separable violations of academic integrity.

Campus Academic Integrity Designees (CAIDs) are academic administrators to whom the Chief Academic Officer on a campus delegates some or all of the responsibilities for administering the Academic Integrity Policy on that campus.

Campus Advisers are staff or faculty members trained to provide assistance to complainants or respondents in University Hearings or Disciplinary Conferences.

Campus Appeals Committees are standing committees of students, faculty members, and staff members on each of the three Rutgers campuses. Panels of Appeals Committee members consider student appeals of determinations of responsibility and/or sanctions for both nonseparable and separable violations of academic integrity. Members also consider student requests for the removal of the X from an XF (disciplinary F) grade.

Chief Academic Officers (CAOs) are the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs in New Brunswick/Piscataway and the Chancellor in Newark and Camden. The CAO has the ultimate responsibility for implementing and overseeing the Academic Integrity Policy on his or her campus.

Community Advocates are members of the Honor Council who may serve as the complainant at a University Hearing; i.e., present the case against the respondent, when the faculty member or other member of the University community who initiated the complaint does not wish to do so.

The **Complainant** is a member of the University community who brings forward a complaint against a student respondent; i.e., who presents the case against the student at a University Hearing for an alleged separable violation of academic integrity. The complainant may be the faculty member or other member of the University community who initiated the complaint against the respondent, a Community Advocate from the Honor Council, or an AIF or member of the dean's staff of the respondent's school or college.

The **Complaint Initiator** is the faculty member or other member of the University Community who initiated the complaint of a separable violation of academic integrity against the respondent.

A **Disciplinary Conference** is a more informal alternative to a University Hearing for adjudicating cases of alleged separable violations of academic integrity. Disciplinary Conferences are conducted by Student Conduct Officers assigned by the Director of the Office of Student Conduct or by the Camden or Newark Senior Student Conduct Officer. The Student Conduct Officer decides whether the respondent is responsible or not for the alleged violation of academic integrity and selects an appropriate sanction if he or she finds the respondent responsible.

Faculty Members are, for purposes of the Academic Integrity Policy, not only tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty members, but also part-time lecturers, coadjutants, TAs, staff members, and administrators who are serving as the instructor of record in a course; i.e., the instructor responsible for assigning final course grades.

Graduate Students are, for purposes of the Academic Integrity Policy, post-baccalaureate students pursuing an advanced degree of any type or enrolled in a graduate course or courses. The term also includes students in the advanced stages of a professional program that leads to a masters or doctoral degree without conferral of a baccalaureate degree.

The **Honor Council** is an organization of undergraduate and graduate students on each of the three Rutgers campuses dedicated to promoting academic integrity. Members of the Honor Council play a major role in educating students and other members of the University community about academic integrity and play a number of roles in the administration of the Academic Integrity Policy.

The **Office of Student Conduct (OSC)** is the primary university office responsible for administering the Academic Integrity Policy. The OSC handles cases of alleged separable violations of academic integrity, plays a key role in educating students, faculty, and staff about academic integrity, and provides a number of university-wide services, including serving as the central university repository of student disciplinary records, providing University Hearings on all three campuses, and providing training for Academic Integrity Facilitators, Hearing Officers, Campus Advisers, and members of the Honor Council, Hearing Boards, and Appeals Committees, in cooperation with the campus CAOs and CAIDs.

A **Nonseparable Violation of Academic Integrity** is a violation for which the possible sanctions do not include suspension or expulsion.

A **Referring Party** is a faculty member or other member of the University community who refers an allegation of a nonseparable violation of academic integrity to an Academic Integrity Facilitator.

A **Respondent** is a student accused of committing a violation of academic integrity.

Senior Student Conduct Officers are the administrators or staff members on each of the three Rutgers campuses who (1) have primary responsibility for handling cases of alleged separable violations of academic integrity under the *University Code of Student Conduct* on their respective campuses and (2) play a key role in educating students, faculty, and staff about academic integrity. The Director of the Office of Student Conduct is the New Brunswick Senior Student Conduct Officer.

A **Separable Violation of Academic Integrity** is a violation for which the sanctions may, but need not, include suspension or expulsion.

A **Staff Investigator** is a nonvoting staff member who serves on an appeals panel considering an appeal of a finding of responsibility and/or sanction for a nonseparable violation of academic integrity. Prior to the meeting of a panel to hear an appeal, the Staff Investigator gathers information pertaining to the allegation as necessary to permit the panel to make an informed decision.

A **Student Advocate** is a member of the Honor Council who provides information, advice, and assistance to students accused of violating the Academic Integrity Policy, including accompanying the student to meetings with a faculty member or AIF and assisting the respondent during a University Hearing or Disciplinary Conference.

A **Student Conduct Officer** is a staff member or administrator authorized by the Director of the Office of Student Conduct to carry out Preliminary Reviews and Disciplinary Conferences and advise students and faculty concerning the Academic Integrity Policy.

A **University Hearing** is a disciplinary proceeding to adjudicate an allegation of a separable violation of academic integrity for which the student respondent does not accept responsibility. The Hearing is conducted by a Hearing Officer and the decision with regard to responsibility is made by a Hearing Board of students and faculty, who also recommend a sanction to the CAO or CAID in the event they find the respondent responsible for a violation of academic integrity.

University Hearing Boards are the panels of students and faculty (normally three students and two faculty members) who adjudicate cases of alleged separable violations of academic integrity at University Hearings.

A **University Hearing Officer** is a member of the University community, normally a staff or faculty member, who conducts a University Hearing. The Hearing Officer makes all necessary decisions regarding evidence and is responsible for conducting an orderly and expeditious Hearing that insures fairness to all concerned.

An **XF Grade** is a disciplinary F, a grade that may be imposed as part of the sanction for a separable violation of academic integrity.

Appendix B: Summary of Procedures for Adjudicating Alleged Violations of Academic Integrity

I. Nonseparable Violations

The procedures to be followed by faculty members and AIFs in investigating and adjudicating alleged first-time nonseparable violations of academic integrity are summarized briefly below¹. This summary is meant only to give the reader an overview of the procedures. Anyone wanting an in-depth knowledge of the procedures for adjudicating nonseparable violations of academic integrity, including the rights and responsibilities of the respondent and all others involved in the process, needs to consult *Procedures for Adjudicating Alleged Nonseparable Violations of Academic Integrity*. Additional explanatory material on the procedures may be found on the Student Conduct website: <http://studentconduct.rutgers.edu>

A. Notification of the Respondent

A faculty member or AIF handling an allegation of a first-time nonseparable violation of academic integrity notifies the student respondent in writing or by electronic communication of the substance of the allegation and requests the student to make an appointment to meet with him or her to respond to the allegation. The notification also informs the student of the availability of a Student Advocate from the Honor Council who can provide information and assistance, including accompanying the student to a meeting with the faculty member or AIF. The faculty member is required to notify the student within ten working days of the time the faculty member identifies or is advised of the alleged nonseparable violation; an AIF is required to notify the student within five working days of receiving a report of the alleged violation. The student then has ten working days from the time of notification to respond to the faculty member or AIF.

B. Investigation and Adjudication

The faculty member or AIF investigates the allegation and reaches a decision by considering all available evidence, interviewing available material witnesses, meeting with the student respondent, and carefully considering the student's response to the allegation. An AIF also interviews the referring party.² If the student does not respond within the prescribed time limit or chooses not to meet with the faculty member or AIF, the faculty member or AIF reaches a decision based on the available evidence, including any written response from the student.

If the faculty member or AIF determines that the student has not violated the Academic Integrity Policy, the matter is closed and the student so notified. If the student accepts responsibility for the violation or the faculty member or AIF concludes that the student is responsible for a nonseparable violation of academic integrity, the faculty member or AIF chooses a sanction and informs the student in writing or by electronic communication of the finding of responsibility and/or the chosen sanction. The notification also informs the student of the opportunity to file a written appeal of the finding of responsibility and/or sanction to the Campus Appeals Committee within ten working days.

¹ An allegation of a nominally nonseparable violation of academic integrity by a student previously found responsible for a violation of academic integrity may not be handled by a faculty member or AIF, but must be reported to the Office of Student Conduct or authorized Student Conduct Officer or AIF for handling as an alleged separable violation.

² The referring party is the faculty member or other member of the University community who referred the allegation to the AIF.

C. Sanctioning and Reporting

If the student respondent accepts responsibility for the violation and agrees to the chosen sanction or fails to appeal to the Campus Appeals Committee within the prescribed time period, the chosen sanction is imposed and the disposition of the case reported to the Office of Student Conduct or the Camden or Newark Senior Student Conduct Officer, using a standard form available online. If the student does not accept responsibility for the violation or does not agree with the recommended sanction, he or she may appeal the finding of responsibility and/or chosen sanction in writing to the Campus Appeals Committee. In the latter case, the final decision on responsibility and sanction is made by the Appeals Committee.

D. Review by the Campus Appeals Committee

Appeals Committee reviews of findings of responsibility and/or sanctions for nonseparable violations are conducted by a four-person panel consisting of one faculty member of the Committee, two student members of the Committee, and a nonvoting staff member of the Committee called the Staff Investigator. Prior to the meeting of an appeals panel to consider an appeal, the Staff Investigator gathers information pertaining to the allegation as necessary to permit the panel to make an informed decision. The panel considers appeals on the basis of the written information presented through the Staff Investigator and does not take direct testimony. Its decisions are made by simple majority vote and voting members of the panel are not permitted to abstain.

If the appeals panel overturns the finding of responsibility, the matter is closed and the student and faculty member or AIF are so informed. If the panel upholds the finding of responsibility or if the appeal is only of the chosen sanction, the panel reviews the sanction selected by the faculty member or AIF; makes the final decision concerning sanction; notifies the student respondent, the faculty member or AIF, and the Office of Student Conduct or Camden or Newark Senior Student Conduct Officer; and directs that the sanction be imposed.

II. Adjudicating Alleged Separable Violations

The procedures for investigating and adjudicating allegations of separable violations of academic integrity are briefly summarized below. This summary is meant only to give the reader an overview of the procedures. Anyone seeking an in-depth knowledge of the procedures for handling separable violations of academic integrity, including the rights and responsibilities of the respondent and of others involved in the process, must consult the *University Code of Student Conduct*. Additional explanatory material on the procedures may be found on the Student Conduct web site: <http://studentconduct.rutgers.edu>.

A. Preliminary Review

The first step in the process is the Preliminary Review, which is carried out by an AIF or Student Conduct Officer assigned by the Director of the Office of Student Conduct or the Camden or Newark Senior Student Conduct Officer, for the purpose of determining if there is sufficient evidence to charge the respondent with a separable violation of academic integrity. At the end of the Review, the AIF or Student Conduct Officer does one of the following: (1) dismisses the complaint, (2) charges the student with a nonseparable violation of academic integrity and refers the case for adjudication according to the *Procedures for Adjudicating Alleged Nonseparable Violations of Academic Integrity*, (3) charges the student with a separable violation of academic integrity, (4) charges the student with both separable and nonseparable violations, or (5) defers action on the complaint.

If the student is charged with a separable violation of academic integrity and accepts responsibility for the violation or does not contest the charge(s), the AIF or Student Conduct Officer selects an appropriate sanction. If that sanction involves suspension, dismissal from a graduate or professional program, or expulsion from the University, the AIF or Student Conduct Officer recommends the sanction to the CAO or CAID. The CAO or CAID gives the respondent and the complaint initiator³ at least five working days to submit written statements concerning the sanction. The CAO or CAID then makes a decision regarding sanction and notifies the respondent and other appropriate parties. If the sanction selected by the AIF or Student Conduct Officer does not involve suspension, dismissal from a graduate or professional program, or expulsion from the University, the AIF's or Student Conduct Officer's decision is final, barring appeals, but must be reported to the CAO or CAID.

If the student does not accept responsibility for the alleged separable violation, the case is referred to a University Hearing unless the respondent requests that it be referred to a Disciplinary Conference instead. A request for a Disciplinary Conference is granted only if the complaint initiator³ agrees.

B. University Hearing Procedures

University Hearing Boards normally consist of three students and two faculty members chosen from a pool of trained students and faculty members. The Hearing is conducted by a Hearing Officer, who must be a member of the University community, normally a staff or faculty member. The Hearing Officer and Hearing Board members play an investigatory as well as an adjudicative role during the Hearing: they can call witnesses, question the complainant and all witnesses who testify. They can also question the respondent provided he or she waives the right to remain silent. The Hearing Officer makes all necessary decisions concerning evidence and is responsible for conducting an orderly and expeditious Hearing that insures fairness to all concerned.

The faculty member or other complaint initiator³ normally has two choices as to his or her role in the Hearing: he or she may choose to serve as the complainant; i.e., present the case against the respondent, with the help of a Campus Adviser if desired, or request to have the

³ The complaint initiator is the faculty member or other member of the University community who initiated the complaint against the respondent.

case presented by a Community Advocate from the Honor Council. In the latter instance, the complaint initiator is expected to help the Community Advocate prepare the case and serve as a witness at the Hearing. If the complaint initiator does not wish or is not able to serve as the complainant and no Community Advocate is available, an AIF or member of the dean's staff of the respondent's school or college may serve as the complainant.

The respondent can, if desired, be assisted at the Hearing by an adviser, normally a Student Advocate from the Honor Council or a Campus Adviser.⁴ In addition, the respondent is permitted to have one support person present. The role of support persons is strictly consultative; they are not permitted to make statements at the Hearing, to question witnesses, or to disrupt the hearing in any way.

After the fact-finding phase of the Hearing, the voting members of the Hearing Board (which do not include the Hearing Officer) retire to closed deliberations. The decision is made by majority vote and Hearing Board members are not permitted to abstain.

C. Sanctioning

If the Hearing Board finds the respondent not responsible for a violation of academic integrity, the matter is closed and the respondent and other appropriate parties are so notified. If the Hearing Board finds the respondent responsible for a violation, the respondent, the complainant, the Conduct Officer or AIF who carried out the Preliminary Review, and the Director of the Office of Student Conduct may make statements concerning the appropriate sanction to be imposed. In addition, the past disciplinary record, if any, of the respondent is made known to the Hearing Board for the first time. The Board then retires to determine a recommendation regarding sanction, which is transmitted to the CAO or CAID.

The CAO or CAID then gives the respondent and the complainant at least five working days to submit written statements concerning the sanction recommended by the Hearing Board. The CAO or CAID then makes a decision regarding sanction and notifies the respondent and other appropriate parties.

D. Disciplinary Conferences

A Disciplinary Conference is a more informal process than a University Hearing. It is conducted by a Student Conduct Officer assigned by the Director of the Office of Student Conduct or by the Camden or Newark Senior Student Conduct Officer. The complaint initiator is not required to be present unless his or her participation is requested by the respondent or the Student Conduct Officer. The respondent may (1) request that appropriate witnesses be summoned, (2) be assisted by a Student Advocate from the Honor Council or by a Campus Adviser, and (3) have one support person present. The support person is not permitted to speak to the Student Conduct Officer nor to question witnesses.

If the Student Conduct Officer finds that the respondent has not committed a violation of academic integrity, the matter is closed and the respondent and other appropriate parties are so notified. If the Student Conduct Officer finds the respondent responsible for a violation of

⁴ If no Student Advocate or Campus Adviser is available, another member of the University Community may serve as the respondent's adviser, with the approval of the Director of Student Conduct.

academic integrity, he or she selects an appropriate sanction. If that sanction involves suspension, dismissal from a graduate or professional program, or expulsion from the University, the Student Conduct Officer recommends the sanction to the CAO or CAID. The CAO or CAID gives the respondent and the complainant at least five working days to submit written statements concerning the sanction. The CAO or CAID then makes a decision regarding sanction and notifies the respondent and other appropriate parties. If the sanction selected by the Student Conduct Officer does not involve suspension, dismissal from a graduate or professional program, or expulsion from the University, the Student Conduct Officer's decision is final, barring appeals, but must be reported to the CAO or CAID.

E. Appeal Procedures

Any determination of responsibility for a separable violation of academic integrity by a University Hearing Board or Student Conduct Officer at a Disciplinary Conference or any sanction assigned for such a violation by a CAO or CAID, a Student Conduct Officer, or an AIF may be appealed to the Appeals Committee of the campus in which the respondent is enrolled. Appeals must be submitted in writing to the Director of the Office of Student Conduct, who transmits the appeal to the appropriate Campus Appeals Committee. Such appeals must be received within ten working days from the date of the notification to the respondent of the finding and/or sanction.

Appeals of findings of responsibility and/or sanctions for separable violations of academic integrity are considered by a three-member panel consisting of a faculty member and two students from the Appeals Committee. If the respondent is a graduate student, at least one of the student members of the panel must be a graduate student. The appeal is decided on the basis of the record of the original proceeding and on written statements submitted by the respondent, the complaint initiator, the CAO or CAID, and/or various Student Conduct Officers involved in the case. The appeals panel does not conduct a hearing nor take direct testimony.

If the finding of responsibility is being appealed, the appeals panel will do one of the following: (1) affirm the finding and the sanction, (2) affirm the finding but reject the sanction and send the case back to the appropriate CAO, CAID, or Student Conduct Officer for reconsideration of the sanction, or (3) send the case back for reconsideration to the original Hearing Board or the Student Conduct Officer who conducted the Disciplinary Conference. If the appeal is only of the sanction, the panel will either affirm the sanction or reject it and send the case back to the appropriate CAO or CAID, Student Conduct Officer, or AIF for reconsideration of the sanction. Sanctions may be rejected only if found to be grossly disproportionate to the offense. Cases may be sent back to a Hearing Board or Student Conduct Officer only if new and significant evidence has become available since the original Hearing or Disciplinary Conference or if errors occurred in the original Hearing or Disciplinary Conference and were so serious that they effectively denied the respondent a fair Hearing or Disciplinary Conference.

The Appeals Committee ordinarily notifies the respondent of its decision within 15 working days of the filing of the appeal. If not satisfied with the decision of the appeals panel, the respondent may petition the President of the University to review the finding and/or sanction within ten working days of the decision by the Appeals Committee. Whether or not to review the case is solely at the discretion of the President.

F. Implementation of the Sanction

Once all avenues of appeal have been exhausted or the respondent elects to forego further appeal, the Director of the Office of Student Conduct or the Camden or Newark Senior Student Conduct Officer oversees the implementation of the imposed sanction.