

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS**  
**URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE**  
Senate Executive Committee  
(Final; Action)

CG.13.01      Revisions to the Academic Integrity Portions of the Student Code

**BACKGROUND**

From the Academic Integrity Taskforce 2.0 Executive Summary:

In the fall of 2008, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Dr. Renee Romano charged a task force of students, faculty and staff to review the policies and procedures in the Student Code related to academic integrity. The goal of the task force was to fine tune the language and structure of the policy to make it clear and accessible while also working to address gaps in the policy that caused confusion in how it was enforced and implemented.

The task force developed a draft policy and submitted it to a variety of campus stakeholders for review and comment in the spring of 2012. Seeking broader input from the entire Illinois community, the Vice Chancellor posted the draft policy on a website for public comment for the month of October 2012. The Vice Chancellor then appointed a new task force (consisting of both new and former members) to review and consider all comments for possible inclusion and discussion. The new task force met several times in November and December to carefully review all 35 unique submissions.

The task force considered and implemented a number of small grammatical corrections and suggestions to sharpen the language. The task force also appreciated the submission of a number of comments about issues that were broader than the purview of the current task force. Those issues have been documented in the complete text of the Academic Integrity Taskforce 2.0 Executive Summary which is attached.

The Conference on Conduct Governance conducted an initial review in the spring of 2013. After incorporating several suggestions to further clarify and fine tune the language of the document, CCG formally endorsed the current draft on March 7, 2013. In addition, the attached draft was endorsed by the Educational Policy Committee on Monday, April 15, 2013.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Conference on Conduct Governance recommends endorsement of the proposed revisions to Part 4, Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure in the Student Code. The proposed revisions will go into effect fall of 2013.

CONFERENCE ON CONDUCT GOVERNANCE

George Gollin, Chair  
Abbas Aminmansour  
Chris Cheng-De Vries  
Adriana Cuervo  
Leah Dinh  
Brian Farber  
Sarah Halko  
Rachel Heller  
Rod Hoeing

Tim Knudsen  
Kristi Kuntz  
Jim Maskeri  
James Rooney  
Kevin Seymour  
Miranda Terry  
Casey Thiel  
Kevin Waspi  
H.F. (Bill) Williamson

## PART 4. ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY AND PROCEDURE

### 1-401 Policy Statement; Application; Definitions

- a. Policy Statement. The University has the responsibility for maintaining academic integrity so as to protect the quality of education and research on our campus and to protect those who depend upon our integrity.
  1. *Expectations of Students.* It is the responsibility of each student to refrain from infractions of academic integrity, from conduct that may lead to suspicion of such infractions, and from conduct that aids others in such infractions. Students have been given notice of this Part by virtue of its publication. Regardless of whether a student has actually read this Part, a student is charged with knowledge of it. Ignorance is not a defense.
  2. *Expectations of Instructors.* It is the responsibility of each Instructor to establish and maintain an environment that supports academic integrity. An essential part of each Instructor's responsibility is the enforcement of existing standards of academic integrity. If Instructors do not discourage and act upon violations of which they become aware, respect for those standards is undermined. Instructors should provide their students with a clear statement of their expectations concerning academic integrity.
- b. Application. This Part contains the procedures for addressing course-based academic integrity infractions, including proficiency tests taken after enrollment, for all courses in all colleges except for courses in the College of Law, the College of Medicine, and the College of Veterinary Medicine. This Part also does not apply to pre-enrollment infractions (see § 1-301 and § 1-303) or infractions of the [Academic Integrity in Research and Publications Policy](#).
- c. Definitions. For purposes of this Part, the following definitions shall apply:
  1. *Business Day.* Monday through Friday, excluding University and campus holidays and reduced service days.
  2. *Consultant.* A person with whom a student or Instructor may privately consult during the process. A Consultant may attend hearings with a student or Instructor, but may not participate in the hearings, and may not

serve as a witness. Each participant may be accompanied by only one Consultant.

3. *Dean*. The dean of the college or head of the equivalent academic unit in which a course or examination is conducted or his/her designee.
4. *Executive Officer (EO)*. The executive officer or head of the department or unit in which a course or examination is conducted or his/her designee.
5. *Instructor*. A faculty member or authorized staff member who supervises any academic endeavor.
6. *Notice*. A written communication conveying information to or from a participant in the process. E-mail notices are strongly encouraged.
7. *Record*. The Instructor's Allegation Notice, written student Response, any materials relied upon by the Instructor to make the Instructor's decision, the course syllabus, and the Instructor's Decision Notice.

### **1-402 Academic Integrity Infractions**

- a. Cheating. No student shall use or attempt to use in any academic exercise materials, information, study aids, or electronic data that the student knows or should know is unauthorized. Instructors are strongly encouraged to make in advance a clear statement of their policies and procedures concerning the use of shared study aids, examination files, and related materials and forms of assistance. Such advance notification is especially important in the case of take-home examinations. During any examination, students should assume that external assistance (e.g., books, notes, calculators, and communications with others) is prohibited unless specifically authorized by the Instructor. A violation of this section includes but is not limited to:
  1. Allowing others to conduct research or prepare any work for a student without prior authorization from the Instructor, including using the services of commercial term paper companies.
  2. Submitting substantial portions of the same academic work for credit more than once or by more than one student without authorization from the Instructors to whom the work is being submitted.
  3. Working with another person without authorization to satisfy an individual assignment.

- b. Plagiarism. No student shall represent the words, work, or ideas of another as his or her own in any academic endeavor. A violation of this section includes but is not limited to:
1. *Copying*: Submitting the work of another as one's own.
  2. *Direct Quotation*: Every direct quotation must be identified by quotation marks or by appropriate indentation and must be promptly cited. Proper citation style for many academic departments is outlined in such manuals as the *MLA Handbook* or K.L. Turabian's *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses and Dissertations*. These and similar publications are available in the University bookstore or library. The actual source from which cited information was obtained should be acknowledged.
  3. *Paraphrase*: Prompt acknowledgment is required when material from another source is paraphrased or summarized in whole or in part. This is true even if the student's words differ substantially from those of the source. A citation acknowledging only a directly quoted statement does not suffice as an acknowledgment of any preceding or succeeding paraphrased material.
  4. *Borrowed Facts or Information*: Information obtained in one's reading or research that is not common knowledge must be acknowledged. Examples of common knowledge might include the names of leaders of prominent nations, basic scientific laws, etc. Materials that contribute only to one's general understanding of the subject may be acknowledged in a bibliography and need not be immediately cited. One citation is usually sufficient to acknowledge indebtedness when a number of connected sentences in the paper draw their special information from one source.
- c. Fabrication. No student shall falsify or invent any information or citation in an academic endeavor. A violation of this section includes but is not limited to:
1. Using invented information in any laboratory experiment or other academic endeavor without notice to and authorization from the Instructor or examiner. It would be improper, for example, to analyze one sample in an experiment and covertly invent data based on that single experiment for several more required analyses.
  2. Altering the answers given for an exam after the examination has been graded.
  3. Providing false or misleading information for the purpose of gaining an academic advantage.

- d. Facilitating Infractions of Academic Integrity. No student shall help or attempt to help another to commit an infraction of academic integrity, where one knows or should know that through one's acts or omissions such an infraction may be facilitated. A violation of this section includes but is not limited to:
  - 1. Allowing another to copy from one's work.
  - 2. Taking an exam by proxy for someone else. This is an infraction of academic integrity on the part of both the student enrolled in the course and the proxy or substitute.
  - 3. Removing an examination or quiz from a classroom, faculty office, or other facility without authorization.
- e. Bribes, Favors, and Threats. No student shall bribe or attempt to bribe, promise favors to or make threats against any person with the intent to affect a record of a grade or evaluation of academic performance. This includes conspiracy with another person who then takes the action on behalf of the student.
- f. Academic Interference. No student shall tamper with, alter, circumvent, or destroy any educational material or resource in a manner that deprives any other student of fair access or reasonable use of that material or resource.
  - 1. Educational resources include but are not limited to computer facilities, electronic data, required/reserved readings, reference works, or other library materials.
  - 2. Academic interference also includes acts in which the student committing the infraction personally benefits from the interference, regardless of the effect on other students.

### **1-403 Procedures**

- a. Suspicion of infraction – Initial Determination.
  - 1. *Allegation.* An Instructor who has reason to believe that a student has committed an academic integrity infraction shall notify the student in writing of the basis for the belief. E-mail notice is strongly encouraged. The Allegation Notice must contain sufficient information to permit the student to respond to the concern. A copy of the Allegation Notice shall be provided to the department and college in which the course or examination is conducted. The college should, where applicable, submit a copy of the

- Allegation Notice to the college with which the student is affiliated (for graduate students, the Graduate College is always the applicable college).
2. *Response.* The student has ten (10) business days from the date of the Allegation Notice to submit a written Response to the Instructor. The Response should include all relevant information, materials and witness statements the student wishes the Instructor to consider. Upon good casue shown, an extension may be requested in writing and may be granted by the executive officer (EO).
  3. *Fact-Finder.* The Instructor shall act as fact-finder and explore information relevant to the alleged infraction. The Instructor should consider all information provided by the student in the Response. The instructor may collect additional relevant information to assist in making a determination. The Instructor will pay due regard to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ([FERPA](#)) when making inquiries, including interviewing involved parties.
  4. *Timing.* The Instructor shall work to resolve the matter and make a determination on a timely basis.
  5. *Instructor's Decision.*
    - A. If the Instructor concludes that the student did not commit an infraction, the student shall be permitted to:
      - i. Continue in the course and be given whatever grade the student is entitled to without regard to the charge of an infraction; or
      - ii. Drop the course at any time during the semester without a "W" on the transcript. However, to drop the course after the applicable drop deadline, the student must indicate his/her desire to drop the course within 10 business days of the Instructor's decision; or
      - iii. Change sections in the course, if possible.
    - B. If the Instructor concludes, based on available information, that it is more probably true than not true that the student has committed an infraction, the Instructor shall make a finding of a violation and impose a sanction as permitted in 1-404.
    - C. In either case (A or B), Notice of the Instructor's decision shall be given to the student and to the department and college in which the course or

examination was conducted. The college should, where applicable, submit a copy of the Instructor's Decision Notice to the college with which the student is affiliated (for graduate students, the Graduate College is always the applicable college). When an infraction is found, the Instructor's Decision Notice shall include at least: 1) the finding of violation, 2) a brief explanation of the facts establishing the violation, 3) the sanction and the basis for the same, and 4) a statement such as: "*You have the right to appeal this decision and/or sanction by [insert date, i.e. within five (5) business days from the date of the Instructor's Decision Notice] pursuant to 1-403(b) of the Student Code.*"

6. *Multiple students.* When two or more students have been accused of cooperating in an academic infraction, any fact-finding inquiries should establish their independent responsibility and the sanctions for each individual should be decided separately.
7. *Student not enrolled in course.* If a student is not enrolled in the course affected, the Instructor shall not make an allegation but shall instead forward that student's case to the Senate Committee on Student Discipline for handling pursuant to its policies and procedures.
8. *Finality of Instructor's Decision.* If a student does not appeal the instructor's decision, it shall be final except to the extent the sanction includes a recommendation for suspension or dismissal from the University. A recommendation of suspension or dismissal will be handled pursuant to 1-403(d).
9. *Forwarding the Record.* Once a decision has been made, the Instructor shall forward the Record to the department or unit executive officer for retention pursuant to applicable policy.

b. Contested Determination or Sanction - Appeal.

1. *Timing and Content of Appeal.* A student wishing to appeal an Instructor's decision must file a written appeal within five (5) business days from the date of the Instructor's Decision Notice, except as provided in 1-403(d)(1)(A). The appeal shall include at least: the name of the student, the course involved, the name of the Instructor, the applicable grounds for

appeal (see b.2 below), and an explanation for the basis of appeal. The appeal shall be submitted to the executive officer (EO) in the department or unit in which the infraction is alleged to have occurred.

2. *Burden of Proof; Grounds for Appeal.* A student wishing to appeal bears the burden of establishing at least one of the following grounds for appeal:
    - A. The Instructor did not follow these procedures as outlined in the Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures and the deviation resulted in significant prejudice against the student;
    - B. The Instructor's decision was clearly not objectively reasonable based upon information available at the time of the Instructor's decision;
    - C. The sanction was disproportionate to the violation; or
    - D. New information exists that was not available at the time of the Instructor's decision and that information proves conclusively that the student did not commit the violation.
  3. *EO handling of Appeal.* Upon receipt of the appeal and Record, the EO shall:
    - A. Schedule a departmental hearing if the highest sanction was a Category 2 as provided in 1-404. If the department consists of nine or fewer full-time faculty members, the appeal will be directed to a similarly constituted committee of the school or college.
    - B. Refer the Record to the Dean of the college offering the course for a college hearing if the highest sanction is Category 3 as provided in 1-404.
  4. *Automatic Review.* A recommendation for suspension or dismissal by an Instructor shall be automatically reviewed pursuant to 1-403(d).
- c. Appeal Hearing Procedures.
1. *Configuration*
    - A. *Departmental Level Appeal.* The EO shall appoint a Chair, who shall serve as a non-voting member. The EO shall select a hearing committee which shall be composed of at least two faculty members and at least one student to hear and vote on the matter. Only faculty and students without a conflict of interest (as determined by the EO) shall serve.

- B. *College Level Appeal.* The Dean shall appoint a Chair who shall be a nonvoting member. The Chair shall select a hearing committee which shall be composed of at least two faculty members and at least one student member to hear and vote on the matter. Only faculty and students without a conflict of interest (as determined by the Chair) shall serve.
- C. *Student Committee Members.* The student members on the hearing committees shall be of the same status as the respondent(s) (undergraduate or graduate). In matters involving both undergraduate and graduate student(s), both an undergraduate and a graduate student shall serve on the committee. The undergraduate committee member shall vote on the undergraduate respondent(s) and the graduate student committee member shall vote on the graduate respondent(s).
2. *Notice of Hearing.* Notice of Hearing shall be sent at least five (5) business days prior to the hearing, unless the student requests an expedited hearing and the request is granted.
  3. *Attendance.* Attendance is restricted to committee members and to the student(s), Instructor(s), and their Consultants. Both the student and the Instructor shall be permitted to be present throughout the hearing but are not required to attend. When multiple students are involved, their hearings may be combined except when discussing the educational record of each student with regard to sanctions. Students and Instructors shall represent themselves in the hearing. Any person, including a student or Instructor, who disrupts a hearing or who fails to adhere to the directives of the Chair may be removed from the hearing at the discretion of the Chair. All parties shall be excluded during committee deliberations.
  4. *Information Considered.* Appeals are intended to determine if the student has established the grounds for appeal. The student and the Instructor may each make a brief opening statement, and then respond to questions from the committee. The student and the Instructor may suggest questions to be asked of each other. The Chair shall decide whether or not to pose the questions. The committee, through the Chair, may solicit information or statements from any person it deems relevant to the matter in dispute,

either at its own initiative or at the suggestion of the student or Instructor. All such information must be presented in the hearing and not in closed deliberation. The confidentiality of all information shall be preserved. Formal rules of evidence shall not apply.

5. *Committee Deliberations and Disposition.* The deliberations of the Committee are confidential. The decisions and recommendations of the committee must be agreed to by a simple majority of the voting members of the committee hearing the matter. The committee shall submit a written report to the EO (or Dean of the college offering the course in the case of a college level hearing) within five (5) business days from the date of the hearing. The report should include:
  - A. A brief overview of the allegation(s) and response;
  - B. A summary of the relevant information considered at the hearing;
  - C. A statement as to whether the student has met the burden establishing the grounds for an appeal; and
  - D. A recommendation. The recommendation may include upholding, overturning or adjusting the instructor's decision or sanction, or such other recommendation as may be appropriate. Failure by the Instructor, department or college to follow the procedures of this Part shall not absolve a student of his/her responsibility to refrain from violations of academic integrity. The committee may recommend that a matter be returned to the level where the error occurred for reconsideration. The committee shall not recommend a sanction of a higher Category than the Instructor's original sanction. (*See 1-404 of this Part.*)
6. *EO or Dean's decision.* Following the receipt of the Report and on a timely basis, the EO or Dean may do any of the following:
  - A. If the EO or Dean accepts a committee recommendation to uphold the Instructor's decision and sanction, he or she shall inform the Instructor and the student of the same in writing.
  - B. If the EO or Dean accepts a committee recommendation to overturn or adjust the Instructor's decision and/or sanction, the EO or Dean shall inform the Instructor and permit the Instructor five (5) business days to

concur with the committee's recommendation or submit a statement of objection. If the Instructor objects, the EO or Dean shall take that objection into account when making a final decision in the case. No response from the Instructor within the allotted time shall be construed as no objection to the recommendation.

C. If the EO or Dean disagrees with the committee's recommendation, the EO or Dean shall direct the committee to reconsider the matter. The specific errors or concerns shall be identified and the committee need only address the issues raised. The EO or Dean may then accept or decline the committee's recommendation in whole or in part.

7. *Finality of Decision.* The decision of the EO or Dean shall be final, and shall be communicated to the student and Instructor in writing.

d. Handling of a Recommendation for Suspension or Dismissal from the University

1. Upon receipt of a recommendation for suspension or dismissal from the University, the EO shall review the record and discuss the matter with the Instructor and with the student.

A. If the EO declines to forward the recommendation for suspension or dismissal, the EO shall provide Notice declining the recommendation to the student and the Instructor. The Instructor's finding(s) and other sanction(s) remain in effect. The student shall have five (5) business days from the date of the EO's Decision Notice to appeal the Instructor's finding and/or sanctions, pursuant to the provisions of 1-403(b).

B. If the EO agrees with the recommendation and the student waives his/her right to a college-level appeal hearing, the matter shall be forwarded to the Senate Committee on Student Discipline for review and action.

C. If the EO agrees with the recommendation and the student does not waive his/her right to appeal, the EO shall forward the matter to the Dean for a hearing by the college in which the course or examination was offered. The college shall conduct a hearing in accordance with 1-403(c) except, in the event the student is affiliated with a different college, the dean of the student's college shall be invited to name a representative

from the student's college, who shall serve as a non-voting member of the committee. The hearing committee shall consider the facts of the case and make a judgment on whether suspension or dismissal is warranted. If the student also wishes to appeal the Instructor's finding(s) and/or other sanction(s), that appeal shall be heard at the same hearing. In that case, the burden rests with the student to establish that at least one of the grounds for appeal found in 1-403(b)(2) are present.

2. If, after a hearing, the dean of the college in which the course or examination was offered accepts a recommendation for suspension or dismissal, the dean shall forward the recommendation to the Senate Committee on Student Discipline for review and action.
  3. The question before the Senate Committee on Student Discipline would be whether the breach of academic integrity in question is of such a nature as to warrant suspension or dismissal of the student. The Committee may take into consideration prior findings of academic integrity violations against the student when determining if suspension or dismissal from the University is warranted. If the hearing committee or the Senate Committee on Student Discipline does not concur with the recommendation of suspension or dismissal, it may impose a lesser formal sanction and/or educational sanctions, along with the course-based sanction imposed by the Instructor. (See SCSD Student Disciplinary Procedures for permissible sanctions.) The Committee shall inform the Dean of its decision and the Dean shall notify the Instructor and EO of the unit in which the infraction occurred. The decision of the Senate Committee on Student Discipline shall be final.
- e. Student Status. While an academic integrity infraction is pending (from the date of the Allegation Notice until final resolution), no change in enrollment status in the course shall be permitted.
1. If the final deadline for reporting a grade occurs prior to the resolution of the case, the Instructor shall request that the student's college assign an "Incomplete" grade to the student for the course until final resolution.
  2. Upon a finding of no infraction and resolution of the case, the student shall have the options set forth in 1-403(a)(5)(A).

3. Upon a finding of an infraction and resolution of the case:
  - A. If the sanction is Category 1 or 2 as provided in 1-404, an undergraduate student may drop the course or change the course to Credit/ No Credit status if he or she were otherwise eligible under section 3-311(d)(2) at the time of the infraction. Graduate students may drop the course provided the infraction occurred before the usual deadline for dropping a course. A record of the infraction will remain in the student's file even if the student drops the course.
  - B. If the sanction is a Category 3 as provided in 1-404, the student may neither change the course to a Credit/No Credit status nor drop the course.

### **1-404 Sanctions**

- a. Authorized Sanctions. Authorized Sanctions for academic integrity violations are one or more of the following:
  1. Category 1 – Any sanction discussed and agreed to in writing by the Instructor and the student. A Category 1 sanction must also be reported pursuant to 1-405. A student who accepts a Category 1 sanction waives his or her right to appeal either the finding of a violation or the sanction under 1-403(b).
  2. Category 2 –
    - A. A written warning
    - B. Educational Sanctions including make-up assignments of a more difficult nature, assignments pertaining to academic integrity, and/or required attendance at a noncredit workshop or seminar on academic integrity.
    - C. A reduced grade on the assignment
    - D. A failing grade for the assignment
    - E. A reduced grade for the course
    - F. A denial of credit for the proficiency exam
  3. Category 3 – A failing grade for the course.
  4. In addition to any other sanctions imposed, an Instructor may also recommend suspension or dismissal from the University.
  5. If a combination of sanctions is imposed, the sanction from the highest Category shall determine to whom a Contested Determination or Sanction

is forwarded in 1-403(c), except as provided by 1-403(d) for cases involving suspension or dismissal.

- b. General Guidance for Sanctions. The variety of academic settings encountered in the University precludes establishing uniform sanctions for all infractions. Instructors may use their discretion in light of the nature of the class, the educational experience of the student, prior instructions or warnings the Instructor has given to the student, etc.
  1. Relevant aggravating and mitigating factors shall be considered in determining the sanction.
    - A. Knowledge and intent are not necessarily factors in determining whether an infraction occurred, but shall be considered in determining an appropriate sanction. Instructors shall consider whether the student knew or should have known that an infraction was likely to occur based on the circumstances surrounding the incident. Careless conduct that results in an infraction should be sanctioned less severely than intentional conduct.
    - B. Instructors shall consider aggravating factors, such as repeated violations within the same course in the same semester, cheating on the major work for the course, activity that was designed to hinder the academic performance of others, and similar conduct when determining an appropriate sanction.
    - C. Violations in other courses or other semesters will be addressed by the Senate Committee on Student Discipline and shall not be considered by the Instructor when determining a sanction. See Section 1-406.

### **1-405 Reporting and Record Keeping**

- a. Report. Once a violation of academic integrity matter has been resolved (a finding of violation, sanction and completion of appeals process or expiration of time to appeal), the EO shall prepare a report of the violation. The report shall include:
  1. the nature of the alleged violation of academic integrity;
  2. if applicable, the appeal procedures followed and the recommendation of any hearing committee; and
  3. the final decision and sanction(s) imposed.

- b. Transmittal. The EO shall send a copy of this report, including the student's name and University identification number, to the college in which the course or examination was conducted, to the college or equivalent academic unit in which the student is enrolled, and to the executive director of the Senate Committee on Student Discipline within ten (10) business days of the resolution of a case.
- c. Record Retention. A record of the infraction will remain in the student's department and college files (both the student's college of enrollment and the college in which the course or examination was conducted), pursuant to the University's record retention policy. The executive director of the Senate Committee on Student Discipline will retain the information pursuant to the University's records retention policy.
- d. Annual Report. The executive director of the Senate Committee on Student Discipline shall compile an annual report to the Senate on the number and severity of such infractions of academic integrity, without identification of the individuals involved. The report shall be available to the public.

#### **1-406 Continuing Jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Student Discipline**

Nothing contained herein shall be construed to limit or impair the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Student Discipline (SCSD) over student disciplinary matters. Departments that become aware of repeat offenders are encouraged to call these cases to the attention of their college. Colleges are encouraged to make special note of repeat offenders to the SCSD. The SCSD will address multiple violations of the academic integrity policy by the same student.

# ACADEMIC INTEGRITY TASKFORCE 1.0

## Executive Summary

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.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY TASKFORCE 2.0  
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In the fall of 2008, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Dr. Renee Romano charged a task force of students, faculty and staff to review the policies and procedures in the Student Code related to academic integrity. The goal of the task force was to fine tune the language and structure of the policy to make it clear and accessible while also working to address gaps in the policy that caused confusion in how it was enforced and implemented.

The task force developed a draft policy and submitted it to a variety of campus stakeholders for review and comment in the spring of 2012. Seeking broader input from the entire Illinois community, the Vice Chancellor posted the draft policy on a website for public comment for the month of October 2012. The Vice Chancellor then appointed a new task force (consisting of both new and former members) to review and consider all comments for possible inclusion and discussion. The new task force met several times in November and December to carefully review all 35 unique submissions.

The task force considered and implemented a number of small grammatical corrections and suggestions to sharpen the language. The task force also appreciated the submission of a number of comments about issue that were broader than the purview of the current task force. We believe these issues are important and should be a part of the campus dialogue to advance the cause of academic integrity, and will briefly summarize them for future work:

TABLED ITEMS:

1. Definition of plagiarism: Contemporary understandings of the ownership of ideas and how and when the work of other scholars must be cited continues to evolve in an information age. Some scholars on our campus have expressed grave concerns that our definition of plagiarism lags behind contemporary understanding of the issue and does not provide appropriate guidance to students. The primary function of our task force was to review and revise the procedures to address academic integrity violations. However, the task force strongly endorses the work of subsequent work groups with expertise in this area to revise this definition. We believe that changing this definition would not substantively change policy provisions proposed.
2. Instituting a campus honor code: One commenter expressed a more fundamental and substantive change is needed in how we approach academic integrity to a campus honor code. Research from the International Center on Academic Integrity suggests that there is a process by which even an institution of our size could embark on a path toward becoming an honor code school. However, it is our assessment that we are not there yet. It is our hope that the increasing dialogue on this issue will lead to work by new task forces to address this and other issues.
3. Instructor as fact finder vs. an Independent committee as fact finder: There were many concerns offered that perhaps an instructor should not act as the fact finder, but instead that any infraction would immediately be turned over to an independent committee. This suggestion raises many other issues (i.e. a faculty member's academic freedom) and

fundamentally changes the basic premises of the current and draft Student Code. While this may be an idea worthy of consideration, it is beyond the scope of the current task force and our beliefs about the best approach given our size and complexity. We further believe that the appeals process provides the necessary safeguards for students.

4. A departmental or college appeal committee vs. provost office or student disciplinary appeal committee: One commenter suggested that the authority for hearing appeals should be removed from departments and colleges and should instead be handled by a central appeal committee. The task force discussed the importance that content and context of the academic work may be in understanding and determining a violation of academic integrity and an appreciation of why certain violations may be more serious than others. However, this issue may be something that future task forces would wish to consider if the necessary resources could be allocated to support such a large endeavor.

The task force noted several themes in the comments and spent significant time discussing these and considering changes and alternatives.

1. Standard of Proof: In the current code at § 1-403(b), it states, in part “as the determiner of penalty, the faculty member should feel certain that the student has committed an infraction before determining the penalty”. This statement was frequently a source of confusion for faculty who were uncertain about the degree of certainty that was required to find a student responsible. Those faculty members who sought advice from most academic colleges and University counsel were instructed to use a “preponderance of information” standard as it is the prevailing standard in most administrative proceedings. Of the 10 other Big Ten schools polled at the time of the revision, 8 of them also use a preponderance standard in cases of academic dishonesty. The task force also believes that the phrase “more likely true than not true” (a synonym to “preponderance of the information”) is a clearer expression to all stakeholders of the standard that should be used in determining responsibility.
2. Clarification of Ground for Appeal B: The draft code included a ground for appeal criteria B that seemed to create a higher standard of proof than “more probably true” by stating that the facts must be “sufficient to establish” that an infraction occurred. The task force amended criterion B to read “the instructor’s decision was clearly not objectively reasonable based upon information available at the time of the instructor’s decision.” The task force believes this criterion is clearer for the appealing student and for the committee tasked to consider the merits of an appeal.
3. Timing for filing an appeal: A commenter expressed concern about the shortened timeline for a student to file a written appeal of the instructor’s decision (from 15 days in the current code to 5 days in the draft code). This issue was considered at length numerous times in both the original and subsequent task forces. Our view is that issues of academic dishonesty are ideally resolved at the lowest level possible; between the student and the instructor. The draft policy reinforces the view that the instructor act as fact finder in determining whether or not a violation occurred. At the time the student is provided notice of an allegation, they are instructed to provide a response to the instructor that includes all relevant information including

all materials and witness information the student wishes the instructor to consider. This response period for the student was extended from 8 working days in the current code to 10 business days in the draft code. It is our belief that this extended and robust fact finding period will give the student a better understanding of the relevant issues and will assist them in preparing their information and arguments in their own defense should they wish to file an appeal. Further, by including defined criteria for appeal and a single appeal procedure across all departments and colleges, we believe it will be easier for a student to consider and create an appeal letter if they desire. Finally, we feel it is important to provide enough time for vital functions to occur without unnecessarily dragging the process out into subsequent semesters. Ultimately, the task force has comfort with the existing timelines in the draft.

4. Hearing Committee Composition: There were several concerns noted about the composition of the departmental and college appeal committees. The task force agreed and clarified that at both departmental and college committees, the EO or dean must appoint a non-voting member who shall serve as chair. The role of the chair will be to ensure that the process is fairly executed and will assist in reporting the recommendation from the committee to the EO or Dean (who should not be directly involved in the appeal hearing). Also, concerns were expressed about whether the composition of all committees being at least one student and at least two faculty members might lead an EO or Dean to load a particular committee with more faculty or more students. We wrestled with the idea of requiring that any additional members be invited proportionally (i.e. 2 students and 4 faculty members). We also wrestled with the possibility of explicitly limiting the committee to only three members, but worried that exceptionally long hearings or unforeseen circumstances might lead to committee member attrition and costly delays or continuances. Ultimately, we believe that giving some flexibility to the department or college will benefit both the student and the instructor to ensure that the matter is heard in both a timely and fair way.
5. Standardization of Sanctions: One commenter noted that the third criterion for appeal (the sanction was disproportionate to the violation) creates a conundrum for both the faculty member and the student. Given that our process is structured to have the individual faculty member assign the appropriate sanction, there will likely be some variance from one instructor to the next. The commenter also noted the possibility for variance from one appeal committee to the next. The task force discussed this issue at length and agrees that this variance may lead to confusion and inconsistency in the process. At the same time, the task of deciding a standardized set of sanctions within colleges and departments may be difficult if not impossible and was certainly beyond the purview of this task force. Instead, we appreciate the commenter's suggestion that this issue be discussed and considered regularly within departmental and faculty meetings to create consistency and guiding principles in instructor sanctions. These discussions will also assist appeal committees in recognizing those sanctions that are clearly disproportionate to the violation. The task force recommended no change to the language.
6. Informal Resolution: A commenter noted that neither the current code nor the revision allowed an instructor to informally resolve a suspected academic integrity violation and not formally charge a student or report the infraction to the department or college. While we believe that

this is a well-meaning sentiment, the task force believes that it is best for all parties to follow the formal process to protect the student's rights to due process. Informal conversations without formal charges might lull a student respondent into sharing information without understanding the possible implications. The task force notes that the instructor has wide latitude in determining the appropriate sanction if the violation was less significant or deliberate. We believe it is important that violations of the Student Code be reported and noted so that repeat violations of policy can be appropriately addressed. The task force recommends no change to the language.

7. Sharing Copyrighted Instructor Materials: Several commenters expressed significant concern about the illegal distribution of copyright protected materials provided by instructors and what would constitute a violation. First, the task force notes that the material generated by an instructor and provided to students must be protected from sale or for-profit redistribution. However, the task force wanted to endorse cooperative studying and learning by students enrolled in the same course and believes that the proposed language supports this practice. Finally, the task force believes that violating an instructor's copyright will not necessarily be considered a violation of academic integrity and may not belong in this section of the code. Also, given that in a copyright violation it is the instructor who is the victim, the task force feels it is inappropriate for the instructor to act as both the fact finder and the victim in the academic integrity process. Therefore, the task force suggests that the Sale or Distribution of Lecture Notes or Course Materials section be moved to the § 1-302 student discipline section of the Student Code.
8. Dropping Courses and Academic Integrity violations: Several commenters were concerned and asked for clarity about when and if a student is allowed to drop a course if a violation of academic integrity is determined. There were questions about when a student is found not responsible by an instructor, whether they are eligible to drop the course if they were otherwise eligible at the time of the infraction or at the time of the allegation. The task force clarified the language in § 1-403.a.5.A.ii to specifically allow the student to drop the course even after the drop deadline if they feel that the instructor-student relationship has been so damaged that continuing in the course would be difficult. However, the student needs to make this decision to drop within 10 days of the instructor's decision so that the student may not choose to ride out the term and then drop the course very late for purely academic performance reasons. The student would still be able to use the capricious grading policy if a problem should occur later. The task force further clarified in §1-403.e.3.A that even if a student is found responsible for a violation of the academic integrity policy, they might still be able to drop the course provided that the assigned sanction was from Category 1 or Category 2 (low level sanction) and the student were eligible to drop at the time of the infraction. This protects the student from an instructor who might choose to wait to make an accusation until after the drop period has expired. It also protects the faculty member because a record of the student's infraction is still kept in the student respondent's file.
9. Role of Schools and DGS in Code language: A commenter expressed concern about how some schools (or collection of departments that function as colleges) would process academic integrity violations given the references to Department and its Executive Officer throughout the

Student Code. The task force decided that rather than attempting to account for all of the nuances of our institution's organizational structure in the Student Code, a parallel document to administrators responsible for appeals would provide guidance on how to address these unique concerns. Fundamentally, the recommendation of the task force is that the route of appeal for each course, department, school, or college be determined before an accusation of academic integrity violation is made.

The task force has prepared a "tracked changes" version of the document that compares the language that was proposed from the first task force and the subsequent changes that they made based upon feedback received. Unfortunately, the reorganization and changes from the current code to the final proposal make a "track changes" document useless. However, we hope that this Executive summary along with the summary from the first task force will guide the reader in understanding our rationale for substantive changes.

We are very grateful for the input and support that we have received in emphasizing the importance of integrity in our academic endeavors.