

Academic Ethics Policy and Procedures

Students enrolled in a Whiting School of Engineering Pre-College program assume a duty to conduct themselves in a manner appropriate to the University's mission as an institution of higher learning. Students are obliged to refrain from acts which they know, or under circumstances have reason to know, violate the academic integrity of the University.

Academic misconduct is prohibited by this policy. Academic misconduct is any action or attempted action that may result in creating an unfair academic advantage for oneself or an unfair academic advantage or disadvantage for any other member or members of the academic community. This includes a wide variety of behaviors such as cheating, plagiarism, altering academic documents or transcripts, gaining access to materials before they are meant to be available, and helping another individual to gain an unfair academic advantage. Nonexclusive examples of academic misconduct are listed below.

Cheating. The following are nonexclusive examples of cheating:

- fraud, deceit, or dishonesty in an academic assignment, text or examination.
- use or consultation of unauthorized materials (e.g., notes, books, etc.) on assignments, tests, or examinations.
- unauthorized discussion of a test or exam during its administration.
- copying content on an assignment, test, or examination from another individual.
- obtaining a test or examination or the answers to a test or examination before administration of the test or examination.
- studying from an old test or examination whose circulation is prohibited by the faculty member.
- use or consultation of unauthorized electronic devices or software (e.g., calculators, cellular phones, computers, tablets, etc.) in connection with assignments, tests or examinations.
- use of paper writing services or paper databases.
- unauthorized collaboration with another individual on assignments, tests or examinations.
- submission of an assignment, test, or examination for a regrade after modifying the original content submitted.
- permitting another individual to contribute to or complete an assignment, or to contribute to or take a test or examination on the student's behalf.
- tampering with, disabling or damaging equipment for testing or evaluation.
- unauthorized submission of the same or substantially similar work, assignment, test, or exam (e.g., a paper, etc.) to fulfill the requirements of more than one course or different requirements within the same course.

Plagiarism. The following are nonexclusive examples of plagiarism:

- use of material produced by another person without acknowledging its source.
- submission of the same or substantially similar work of another person (e.g., an author, a classmate, etc.).
- use of the results of another individual's work (e.g., another individual's paper, exam, homework, computer code, lab report, etc.) while representing it as your own.
- improper documentation or acknowledgment of quotations, words, ideas, or paraphrased passages taken from published or unpublished sources.
- wholesale copying of passages from works of others into your homework, essay, term paper, or dissertation without acknowledgment.
- paraphrasing of another person's characteristic or original phraseology, metaphor, or other literary device without acknowledgment.

Forgery/Falsification/Lying. The following are nonexclusive examples of forgery, falsification and lying:

- falsification or invention of data or information for an assignment, test or exam, or in an experiment.
- citation of nonexistent sources or creation of false information in an assignment
- attributing to a source ideas or information that is not included in the source.
- forgery of university or other official documents (e.g., letters, transcripts, etc.).
- impersonating a faculty member.
- request for special consideration from faculty members or university officials based upon false information or deception.
- fabrication of a reason (e.g., medical emergency, etc.) for needing an extension on or for missing an assignment, test, or examination.
- claiming falsely to have completed and/or turned in an assignment, test or examination.
- falsely reporting an academic ethics violation by another student.
- failing to identify yourself honestly in the context of an academic obligation.
- providing false or misleading information to an instructor or any other University official.

Facilitating Academic Dishonesty. The following are nonexclusive examples of facilitating academic dishonesty:

- intentionally or knowingly aiding another student to commit an academic ethics violation.
- allowing another student to copy from one's own assignment, test, or examination.
- making available copies of course materials whose circulation is prohibited (e.g., old assignments, texts or examinations, etc.).
- completing an assignment or taking a test or examination for another student.
- sharing paper mill/answer bank websites or information with other students.

Unfair Competition. The following are nonexclusive examples of unfair competition:

- intentionally damaging the academic efforts of another student.
- stealing another student's academic materials (e.g., books, notes, assignments, etc.)
- denying another student needed University resources (e.g., hiding library materials, stealing lab equipment, etc.).

Responsibilities of Students & Faculty

Faculty members and instructors are responsible for specifying at the beginning of each semester or term the basic rules and procedures for any and all coursework, examinations, and other academic exercises. Under this policy, instructors of record for a course assume the same responsibilities and expectations of faculty members. They are also responsible for exercising a reasonable degree of caution while writing, transporting, and administering examinations and other graded work. All faculty members and instructors are responsible for taking appropriate actions in accordance with this policy in all cases of suspected violations of academic ethics.

It is the responsibility of each student to report to the faculty member in charge of the course or to the Assistant Dean of Pre-Collegiate Programs any suspected violations of academic ethics.

Procedures for Handling Suspected Violations of Academic Integrity

First-Time Offenses

If a student is suspected of a possible violation of academic ethics, the faculty member in charge of the course must review the facts of the case promptly with the student(s). If, after speaking with the student(s), the faculty member believes that a violation of academic ethics has occurred, the faculty member must first contact the Assistant Dean of Pre-Collegiate Programs to determine whether the offense is a first offense or a second or subsequent offense.

If a first offense, and the instructor feels that the violation does not warrant failure of the course or a more severe penalty, the faculty member may – in consultation with the Assistant Dean of Pre-Collegiate Programs – choose to resolve the case directly with the student (i.e., the faculty member and student may reach an agreement on the resolution of the alleged misconduct. Note, neither the faculty member nor the student is obligated to resolve an allegation of academic misconduct under this section).

If such an agreement is reached, the faculty member must promptly provide the student

with a resolution agreement form outlining the resolution that includes the charges, a summary of the information, the findings, and the sanctions agreed upon. A student has two (2) business days from the date of receipt to sign the resolution agreement form. Once a student signs an agreement with the faculty member or instructor of record, there are no further avenues for appeal.

The faculty member may also decline this option and defer to the Assistant Dean of Pre-Collegiate Programs. If the faculty member attempts to resolve the case directly but cannot reach an agreement with the student (e.g., the student denies violating policy or the student does not agree with the proposed sanction, etc.); if the offense is a second or subsequent offense; or if in the case of a first offense, the faculty member believes that the sanction warranted is a failure in the course or more severe, the faculty member must promptly notify the Assistant Dean of Pre-Collegiate Programs in writing of the alleged violations, information, including potential witnesses, and other pertinent details of the case. In such instances, the case will proceed to the next phase of resolution as outlined below.

Hearing

In the case of a first offense that is not resolved between the faculty member and student, a first offense where the sanction imposed would be a failure in the course or more severe; or a second or subsequent offense, the Assistant Dean of Pre-Collegiate Programs will be assigned to the case and gather information regarding the alleged academic misconduct to determine the appropriate means of resolution.

This gathering of information may include without limitation meetings with or requests for statements from the student and witnesses, and review of any related information. The Assistant Dean of Pre-Collegiate Programs may dismiss a case for a lack of sufficient information or if the alleged conduct does not fall within conduct prohibited by this policy. Absent these circumstances, the case will be resolved through a hearing process.

The faculty member or instructor of record should submit all relevant documents to the Assistant Dean of Pre-Collegiate Programs at least two business days prior to a hearing. The student should submit all relevant documents to the Assistant Dean of Pre-Collegiate Programs at least two (2) business days prior to the hearing. If any documents are submitted after this date, both parties will be notified of its addition.

The hearing involves a meeting between the students and an ad-hoc hearing committee comprising three individuals who are serving, or have served as an instructor, teaching fellow, or teaching assistant in a WSE pre-college program selected by the Assistant Dean of Pre-Collegiate Programs. The hearing committee members may also meet with

witnesses and others involved and obtain and review relevant evidence. The committee will review the allegations and evidence with the student and give the student an opportunity to respond. The hearing committee will then determine based on the preponderance of the evidence whether the student is responsible for the alleged policy violation(s), and, if so, issue (an) appropriate sanction(s)

Multiple students charged with academic misconduct arising from a single joint incident or occurrence may have their hearings joined at the discretion of the Assistant Dean of Pre-Collegiate Programs. When a hearing involves a joinder of charges, the determination of responsibility of each student shall be determined separately.

The hearing is a closed proceeding, meaning that no one other than the student, reporter, witness, faculty member or instructor of record, hearing committee members, and necessary University personnel may be present, except as follows. The exception to this is that the student is encouraged to have a support person accompany the student throughout the hearing. The Assistant Dean of Pre-Collegiate Programs will be present to provide policy and procedural guidance but will not adjudicate. The student, support person and any witnesses called to the hearing will be present in the hearing room only when making a statement or being questioned by the board. The hearing committee hearing is recorded, but the deliberations of the hearing committee are not recorded. Following the hearing, the hearing committee and the student may listen to the recording upon request; however, all copies of the recording will remain in the University's possession.

In general, hearings will proceed as follows, although the hearing committee has discretion to alter the order or manner in which it hears or receives evidence, and to impose time limits on any stage of the process:

- introductions
- opening statement from the reporter, if applicable
- opening statement from the student
- questioning of the reporter by the hearing committee, if applicable
- questioning of the student by the hearing committee
- questioning of the witnesses, if any, by the hearing committee
- closing statement from the reporter, if applicable
- closing statement from the student

Witnesses

The Assistant Dean of Pre-Collegiate Programs and/or hearing committee may request the presence of any witness with relevant information about a case. The student may request the hearing committee to hear from witnesses with relevant information. Absent

exceptional circumstances, the student must inform the Assistant Dean of Pre-Collegiate Programs in writing at least two (2) days in advance of any meeting or hearing of the names of the witnesses and to what they will attest. The Assistant Dean of Pre-Collegiate Programs or hearing committee may determine whether and the extent to which witnesses will be permitted to participate or be questioned in any meeting or hearing, including whether their testimony is relevant.

Support Person

The student may be assisted and advised by a supporter of their choice, at any point in the process, including a family member, friend or legal guardian, throughout the investigative and resolution process (including hearing, sanctioning and appeals). This supporter may accompany the party to any meeting or hearing held pursuant to this Policy. During any meeting or proceeding under these Procedures, a supporter may advise and provide support to the party but may not speak on the party's behalf or otherwise participate, or address or question the investigator, resolution panel, or other parties or witnesses. The supporter may make written submission on the party's behalf. Legal counsel is not permitted to be present at any point in the investigative and resolution processes (including hearing, sanctioning and appeals). University personnel employed in the offices responsible for the disciplinary proceedings described in these Procedures, along with those in the chain of command above them, personnel employed by the Office of the General Counsel, and others whose participation could create a conflict of interest and/or reasonably call into question the impartiality of the University's process are not eligible to serve as supporters.

General Procedures

In connection with the resolution of alleged policy violations, a student shall:

- be notified in writing of the allegations in advance of any meeting or hearing;
- be notified in writing of the charges, and the date, time and location of the hearing, and identity of the hearing committee members two (2) business days in advance of the hearing;
- have the opportunity to review in advance of any meeting or hearing in which the student is a participant any information to be considered by any faculty/staff member, administrator or board consistent with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, as amended ("FERPA") and to protect other confidential information;
- be notified in writing of the outcome of any hearing, namely the findings, determination of responsibility, and any sanctions; and
- be notified in writing of the outcome of any appeal.

A student may raise the potential for conflict of interest, bias, or both of any University personnel participating in the resolution process. A student may also decline to participate in the resolution process. The University may however continue the process without the student's participation.

Communications under this policy will primarily be conducted with students through their official University email address, and students are expected to check their official University email on a regular basis.

Evidentiary Standard

A “preponderance of the evidence” standard will be used to determine responsibility for alleged violations of this policy. A “preponderance of the evidence” standard is an evidentiary standard that means “more likely than not.” This standard is met if the proposition is more likely to be true than not true.

Appeals

Except in the case of a resolution for first-time offenses with a faculty member, the student may appeal an administrator or hearing committee’s finding of responsibility and/or sanction(s). A student must file an appeal within five (5) days of the date of the notice of outcome on one or more of the following grounds:

- procedural error that could have materially affected the determination of responsibility or sanction(s);
- new information that was not available at the time of the hearing and that could reasonably have affected the determination of responsibility or sanction(s); and
- excessiveness of the sanction(s).

Any appeal must be filed in writing to the Associate Vice Dean for Graduate Education and Lifelong Learning (or designee), whichever is applicable. An appeal will involve a review of the file and the audio recording of the hearing and as determined necessary, gathering of information from relevant university personnel or hearing committee members; the appeal does not involve another hearing. On review of the appeal, the Associate Vice Dean for Graduate Education and Lifelong Learning (or designee) may:

- enter a revised determination of responsibility and/or revise sanction(s);
- remand the matter to the hearing committee to reconsider the determination of responsibility and/or sanction(s)
- request the appointment of a new hearing committee to hear the charge;
- uphold the original decision

The Associate Vice Dean for Graduate Education and Lifelong Learning (or designee) will simultaneously send the appeal determination, with the reasons therefor, to the Assistant Dean of Pre-Collegiate Programs and to the student. The decision of the Associate Vice Dean for Graduate Education and Lifelong Learning (or designee) is final. No further appeals are permitted.

Sanctions

The following factors may be considered in the sanctioning process:

- the specific academic misconduct at issue;
- the student's academic misconduct history; and
- other appropriate factors.

This section lists some of the sanctions that may be imposed upon students for violations of this policy. The University reserves the right, in its discretion, to impose more stringent or different sanctions than those listed below depending on the facts and circumstances of a particular case. Sanctions for academic misconduct under the policy are generally cumulative in nature.

When a student is found responsible for violations of academic ethics, the sanctions that may be imposed include without limitation one or more of the following; this is a non-exhaustive list:

1. Formal Warning – The student is notified in writing that their actions constitute a violation of this policy, and may be subject to other actions (e.g., re-taking an exam or failure in a course).
2. Retake of the examination, paper, or exercise involved.
3. A score of zero on the examination, paper, or exercise involved.
4. Lowering of the course grade.
5. Failure in the course.
6. Failure of the course with a notation on the transcript that the grade was for a violation of academic ethics.
7. Removal from the program with no refund.

In most cases, the sanction for a second or subsequent finding of responsibility must be failure of the course.

A student found responsible for academic misconduct in a course forfeits the right to withdraw from the course, to change a graded course to pass/fail, or to absolve the grade by repeating the course. Any withdrawal from that course or change effected prior to the finding of responsibility shall be voided and the student will be re-enrolled.

A student who has been presented with a violation of academic ethics from a faculty member forfeits the right to drop or withdraw from the course during the pendency of an allegation.