

Items for the Summary of the Proposed Revision to the Academic Integrity portions of the Student Code

The main goal of our task force was to clarify the sections of the Student Code that deal with academic integrity. This included adjustments to the language and arrangement of the Code, as well as new language to clarify the definitions and processes associated with academic integrity.

The revision retains the overall structure of the current Student Code. The definitions of the most common violations (cheating, plagiarism, fabrication, facilitating violations by others) are essentially the same as before. The process for dealing with alleged violations is also essentially the same: the instructor still plays a central role as finder of fact and determiner of penalty; the student still has the right to respond to an allegation before the instructor makes a finding, and to appeal the instructor's finding, penalty, or both.

Going section by section:

1-402: The language describing academic integrity infractions was sharpened and made more consistent. The example of plagiarism was removed, as being more confusing than helpful. Infraction categories for Computer-related Infractions and for Unauthorized Use of University Resources were removed. These infractions by themselves are conduct discipline matters that can be dealt with through other provisions of the Code. The definition of Sale or Distribution of Lecture Notes or Course Materials was clarified and no longer requires that the instructor explicitly state that students should not sell or distribute their copyrighted course materials.

1-403 Procedures, has been restructured to make the procedure itself more clear, while retaining the existing structure. Among the changes:

The time limit for student's response to the initial allegation has been increased to ten (10) working days (previously 8 working days). The language regarding the student's response to the allegation now indicates that the student should provide all relevant information to the instructor at that time. The intent here is to promote a thorough investigation and interchange between the student and instructor at the early stages.

There is now an explicit basis for an instructor to decide whether a student has committed a violation: "more probably true than not true."

The time limit from an instructor's finding and penalty to the student's notice of appeal has been shortened to 5 working days (previously 15 calendar days). This is justified by the more extensive interaction between student and instructor at the previous phase, and helps resolve cases in a timely manner. The grounds for appeal, and the student's burden of proof for establishing those grounds, is also now made explicit.

A single explanation of appeal procedures at either the departmental or college level is provided, simplifying and unifying these procedures. A baseline procedure and appeal committee structure for

departments is now provided. Previously departments were charged to have their own appeal procedures defined and available in writing, but many departments did not put this in place until a case arose. Student members are required on all appeal committees, with undergraduate members hearing undergraduate-student cases and graduate members hearing graduate-student cases.

The appeal hearing is clearly defined as a review of specific appeal criteria, not as a *de novo* re-examination of the entire case. To this end, witnesses and examination of other evidence is only allowed when the appeal committee judges that such information is useful and appropriate.

The procedures following an appeal are clarified. The Executive Office or Dean reviews the appeal committee's recommendation, and must take into account any subsequent objections by the instructor. If the EO or Dean disagrees with the committee's recommendation, he/she must return the decision to the committee with a request to reconsider specific issues.

Procedures for handling a recommendation of suspension or dismissal are now explained more clearly. A college-level appeal hearing is still required, but now that hearing is held in the college that offered the course or examination. If the student is registered in a different college (including the Graduate College), a representative from that college can serve as a non-voting member of the appeal committee. (Previously the appeal of a suspension/dismissal recommendation was heard by the student's college of registration, while an appeal of the course-based penalty was held in the college conducting the course. This could require two hearings, and potentially recommend for dismissal a student who was then found not to be in violation by a different committee.)

1-404 Sanctions is shifted in location, and new Categories for the penalties are defined to make the rest of the Code easier to read and understand. A new sanction -- "educational sanctions" such as make-up assignments, academic integrity workshops, etc. -- has been added. This gives instructors a broader set of tools, and increases the options for maximizing the learning opportunities for students. Appeals of denial of credit for a proficiency exam are moved from a college-level to a department-level appeal, which seems appropriate since the penalty does not influence the student's academic transcript.