

DRAFT DOCUMENT
Last Revised: April 16, 2007

Document Key

Plain text – language of current AIP

Double strikethrough in text (~~example~~) – language removed from current policy

Red text in bold – new language

NOTES in bold – explanatory notes to be removed from final draft

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

- I. Standards of Academic Conduct
- II. Violations of Academic Integrity: Categories of Academic Dishonesty
- III. Violations of Academic Integrity: Levels
- IV. Responsibilities for Upholding the Academic Integrity Policy
- V. Student Due Process Rights in Academic Integrity Investigations
- VI. Reporting, Investigation and Resolution of Academic Integrity Policy Violations
 - First Stage Investigation and Resolution
 - Second Stage Investigation and Resolution / Student Appeal to the Department
 - Third Stage Investigation and Resolution / Student Appeal to the College
 - Deadlines and the General Time Frame for Appeals / Provision of this Policy to Students

I. Standards of Academic Conduct

As an academic institution committed to the discovery and dissemination of truth, William Paterson University expects that all members of the University community shall conduct themselves honestly and with professional demeanor in all academic activities.

William Paterson University has established standards of academic conduct because of its belief that academic honesty is a matter of individual and university responsibility and that, when standards of honesty are violated, each member of the community is harmed.

All members of the University community – **students, faculty, and staff** - are expected to acknowledge their individual responsibility to be familiar with and adhere to the Academic Integrity Policy.

[NOTES: This introductory statement expresses the scope of the policy in the most general terms; the additional language is intended to make explicit the fact that it is binding on all members of the WPUNJ community, not just students.]

The purpose of this document is to set forth the terms of the University's academic integrity policy in the event of violations. It details:

- **the categories of academic dishonesty and examples of violations within each category;**
- **the process of reporting academic integrity violations, including the potential parties to any investigation, the rights and responsibilities of each party, the documentation requirements, and the timeframe for the resolution of investigations;**
- **the potential penalties for academic integrity violations and how those penalties are imposed**

[NOTES: The purpose of this additional language is to explain what is contained in the rest of the document so readers may have some idea about what is and is not part of the policy.]

II. Violations of Academic Integrity: Categories of Academic Dishonesty

[NOTES: Academic integrity policies typically organize violations in terms of definitional categories, or in terms of levels of severity (in which different types of violation may be grouped together), or in some cases both (e.g., Rutgers). Whenever a “levels of severity” hierarchy is used in a policy, it is always coupled with a corresponding hierarchy of penalties. There are some potential problems with using a “levels of severity” hierarchy. It usually obliges the policy to assign acts within each category of violation to a specific level (and these judgments may be questionable); it often calls for several circumstantial thresholds to be met as a justification for assigning a specific act to a specific level of severity (e.g., plagiarism or collusion *because of* inexperience or ignorance *involving* only a small portion of total course work on in the context of a minor assignment); and it tends to remove a great deal of discretion from those charged with investigating and enforcing the policy.

Nevertheless, there may be some value in using a limited form of a “levels of severity” hierarchy in a policy. It can serve as an aid to faculty by suggesting appropriate penalties for specific types of violations (all other things being equal) and also cover the issue of repeat violations.

The emphasis in the WPUNJ policy is on definitional categories of violations.]

Violations of the Academic Integrity Policy will include, but not be limited to, the following ~~examples~~ **categories**:

A. Cheating: **Cheating is an act of deception by which a student misrepresents his or her mastery of material on a test or other academic exercise. Examples of cheating are:**

- **Copying from another student’s work**
- **Allowing another student to copy your work**
- **Using unauthorized materials such as a textbook or notebook during an examination**
- **Using specifically prepared materials such as notes written on clothing or other unauthorized notes, formula lists, etc., during an examination**
- **Collaborating with another person during an examination by giving or receiving information without authority.**

[NOTES: The definition of cheating is identical to the language used by Kean, NJCU, and Ramapo. The examples are taken from Ramapo’s policy, and the language is almost identical to that used by NJCU. The advantage of this definition over the current language is that it is not tied exclusively to an examination setting.]

~~during examinations includes any attempt to (1) look at another student’s examination with the intention of using another’s answers for attempted personal benefit; (2) communicate, in any manner, information concerning the content of the examination during the testing period or after the examination to someone who has not yet taken the examination; (3) use any materials, such as notebooks, notes, textbooks, or other sources, not specifically designated by the professor of the course for student use during the~~

~~examination period, or (4) engage in any other activity for the purpose of seeking aid not authorized by the professor.~~

B. ~~Plagiarism: Plagiarism is the copying from a book, article, notebook, video, or other source material, whether published or unpublished, without proper credit through the use of quotation marks, footnotes, and other customary means of identifying sources, or passing off~~ **representing** ~~as one's own the ideas, words, writings, programs, and experiments of another, whether or not such actions are intentional or unintentional. Plagiarism will also include submitting, without the consent of the professor, an assignment already tendered for academic credit in another course.~~

To avoid a charge of plagiarism, a student should be sure to include an acknowledgment of indebtedness:

- **Whenever he or she quotes another person's words directly**
- **Whenever he or she uses another person's ideas, opinions, or theories, even if they have been completely paraphrased in one's own words**
- **Whenever he or she uses facts, statistics, or other illustrative material taken from a source, unless the information is common knowledge.**

[NOTES: The language used in the examples section is taken from Ramapo's policy. The violation of reusing an assignment completed for one course in another course should be reclassified under academic misconduct; it is not really plagiarism.]

~~C. — Collusion is working together in preparing separate course assignments in ways not authorized by the instructor. Academic work produced through a cooperative (collaborative) effort of two or more students is permissible only upon the explicit consent of the professor. The collaboration must also be acknowledged in stating the authorship of the report.~~

[NOTES: Collusion is not so much a category of academic dishonesty as a mode for carrying out violations of any type. It should not be treated as a separate category.]

~~D. — Lying is knowingly furnishing false information, distorting data, or omitting to provide all necessary, required information to the University's advisor, registrar, admissions counselor, professor etc., for any academically related purpose.~~

[NOTES: Lying may often accompany an academic integrity violation, but it is unclear from the above description whether or how it should be treated as a separate category of violation in itself. Part of the problem may stem from the extremely vague phrase "any academically related purpose." Tying a lie to an "academic" purpose may provide the grounds for including lying in the policy, but this connection may be difficult to prove, and it seems the real focus of a charge and investigation should be on the violation for which lying has been used as a cover-up tool.]

~~E. — Other concerns that relate to the Academic Integrity Policy include such issues as computer security, stolen tests, falsified records, and vandalism of library materials. No list could possibly include all possible violations of academic integrity. These examples, should however, give a clearer idea of the intent and extent of application of this policy.~~

[NOTES: Other concerns to be covered by the policy should be listed under a separate category of academic misconduct.]

C. Fabrication: Fabrication refers to the deliberate use of invented information or the falsification of research or other findings with the intent to deceive. Examples of fabrication are:

- Citation of information not taken from the source indicated
- Listing of sources in a bibliography or other report not used in that project
- Fabricating data or source information in experiments, research projects, or other academic exercises
- Falsifying information or signatures on registration, withdrawal, or other forms.

[NOTES: Language for the fabrication category – including some examples - taken from Ramapo’s policy. The definition is also used by NJCU and Kean.]

D. Academic Misconduct: Academic Misconduct is any other act of academic dishonesty that does not specifically fall in one of the above categories. It includes the alteration of grades; involvement in the acquisition or distribution of unadministered tests; denying others access to scholarly resources; and the unauthorized submission of student work in more than one class. Examples of academic misconduct are:

- Changing, altering, falsifying, or being the accessory to the changing, altering, or falsifying of a grade report or form, or entering any College office or building for that purpose;
- Stealing, buying, selling, giving way, or otherwise obtaining all or part of any unadministered test or entering any College office or building for the purpose of obtaining an unadministered test;
- Making library material unavailable to others by stealing or defacing books or journals, or by deliberately misplacing or destroying reserve materials;
- Submitting written work to fulfill the requirements of more than one course without the explicit permission of both instructors.

[NOTES: The most common categories of academic integrity violations are:

- Cheating
- Plagiarism
- Fabrication
- Facilitating Academic Dishonesty (i.e., allowing one’s work to be used by another)
- Academic Misconduct (a catch-all for items not covered by other categories)

Collusion, which is treated as a separate category under WPUNJ’s current policy, is usually classed as a form of cheating or as one or more persons engaged in another category of violation. It should be subsumed under other categories in the revised policy.

Lying, which is also treated as a separate category under WPUNJ’s current policy, should be considered for reclassification under other academic misconduct in a revised policy.

In addition to these categories, some institutions make special reference to a section of the New Jersey Statutes regarding those who sell term papers (NJSA 18A:2-3):

“18A:2-3. Preparation, offering for sale of certain documents; penalty

12. a. No person shall, for any fee, or other remuneration, prepare, offer to prepare, cause to be prepared, sell or offer for sale any term paper, thesis, dissertation, essay, report or other written, recorded, pictorial, artistic or other assignment knowing, or under the circumstances having reason to know, that said assignment is intended for submission either in whole or substantial part under a student's name in fulfillment of the requirements for a degree, diploma, certificate, course or courses of study at any university, college, academy, school or other educational institution.

b. Nothing contained in this section shall prevent any person from providing tutorial assistance, research material, information or other assistance to persons enrolled in a university, college, academy, school or other educational institution, which is not intended for submission directly or in substantial part as an assignment under the student's name to such educational institution in fulfillment of the requirements for a degree, diploma, certificate or course of study. Nor shall any person be prevented by this act from rendering services for a fee which include the typing, research, assembling, transcription, reproduction or editing of a manuscript or other assignment which he has not prepared at the request of or on behalf of the purchaser.

c. Anyone convicted of violating any provision of this act shall be subject to a civil penalty of up to \$1,000.00 which shall be collected in a summary manner pursuant to "the penalty enforcement law" (N.J.S.2A:58-1 et seq.) in the Superior Court or any municipal court. The Superior Court may also grant further relief necessary to enforce the provisions of this section, including the issuance of an injunction.

d. Actions for injunction under the provisions of this act may be brought in the name of the people of this State upon their own complaint or upon the complaint of any person, or any public or private college, university, academy, school or other educational institution which is chartered, incorporated, licensed, registered or supervised by this State, acting for the interest of itself, its students, or the general public.

L.1999,c.90, s.12.”

Although this law refers primarily to the sellers of term papers, it could be argued that those who “cause [such papers] to be prepared” are the buyers.]

III. Violations of Academic Integrity: Levels

Although any violation of academic integrity is a serious matter, it may be helpful to those responsible for enforcement of the policy to consider specific violations in terms of a hierarchy of severity. These can provide guidance when considering the enforcement process and the application of specific penalties. It is expected that in the majority of cases individual faculty members will be the first to identify or have referred to them suspected or alleged cases of academic integrity violations. This classification is therefore intended primarily for faculty assistance.

Level One Violations

Level One violations may occur because of inexperience or lack of knowledge of principles of academic integrity on the part of persons committing the violation. These violations are likely to involve a small fraction of the total course work, are not extensive, and/or occur on a minor assignment. They are also likely to occur in the initial semesters of a student's enrollment.

Level Two Violations

Level Two violations are characterized by dishonesty of a more serious character or which affects a more significant aspect or portion of the course work.

Level Three Violations

Level Three violations include dishonesty that affects a major or essential portion of work done to meet course requirements, or involves evidence of premeditation, or is preceded by one or more violations at levels one and two.

[NOTES: The language of the violation level classifications is taken from the Rutgers Academic Integrity policy document at <http://cat.rutgers.edu/integrity/policy.html#LevelOne>, with some minor modifications for clarity. I omitted the Level Four classification, "the most serious breaches of intellectual honesty," because this class is defined only by examples. For our purposes, this can be absorbed into Level Three. The Rutgers classification includes two other features omitted from this list:

- (1) a list of specific violation examples for each Level, and
- (2) specific recommendations of sanctions for violations at each level

I deliberately omitted these for the following reasons:

- (1) I think it is neither necessary nor desirable to assign specific actions to specific levels of seriousness. There are contextual aspects of any possible violation that cannot be captured with a simple list, and in most cases faculty will probably want to use their own judgment in determining how serious a specific violation is. The descriptions are intended only to help faculty situate an academic integrity violation within one context relevant to process and the determination of an appropriate penalty.
- (2) By the same reasoning, I have not linked the seriousness of a violation with a specific penalty or list of penalties. This might be a little harder to defend, as different faculty members may often apply different penalties for the "same" violation; but once again the other contextual factors must be kept in mind along with the importance of preserving the right of faculty members to exercise judgment on specific cases, at least until a case moves to appeal.]

III. ~~Faculty~~ Responsibilities for Upholding the Academic Integrity Policy

A. **All members of the University community** ~~Faculty~~ are expected to be familiar with the academic integrity policy **and are urged to refer students to the full text of the policy**. Each faculty member will inform students of the applicable procedures and conditions early in ~~the~~ each semester before the first examination or assignment is due.

~~B. Ordinarily, class tests and final exams should be proctored. Proctoring is defined as having a faculty member present in the room. Proctoring is the responsibility of the faculty member teaching the~~

~~course although, where necessary, that responsibility may be shared with or delegated to faculty colleagues or graduate assistants assigned to the course.~~

IV. **Student Due Process Rights in Academic Integrity Investigations**

Due Process refers to the concept of fair treatment in the disciplinary process. This includes information on student expectations, providing notice of disciplinary charges, decisions that are made, and the right to appeal. In cases of academic integrity violations, the due process rights of students are as follows.

- **Written or oral notice of the charges.**
- **An explanation of the evidence against them.**
- **An opportunity to present their side of the story.**
- **Notice of sanctions(s) imposed.**
- **An opportunity to appeal the charge(s) and/or the sanction(s) in succession as detailed below.]**

Comment [k1]: Text (with some modifications) taken from Winona State University Student Conduct Policy: http://www.winona.edu/studentaffairs/conduct_policy.htm

V. **Reporting, Investigation and Resolution of Academic Integrity Policy Violations**

[Notes: This is the key section of the policy, and it is intended to integrate the following topics:

Reporting
Investigating
Responsible parties
Rights of accused individuals
Documentation
Communication formats and deadlines
Penalties

In this draft we take as given the current University organization. Parties in the current policy who may be involved in the resolution of academic integrity violations include:

- **accused students**
- **faculty members**
- **Department Chairs**
- **Department Executive Councils (or other appropriate department committees)**
- **Deans**
- **College Councils**

The most serious problems with this section of the current policy are (1) there is no university-wide administrative unit involved in the process, making efficient communication and documentation extremely difficult; and (2) there is no organized student role in the enforcement of the policy. The SGA Constitution does provide for an Academic Affairs Committee, but its powers and duties do not extend to academic integrity issues. It is recommended – at a minimum – that the Office of the Dean of Students be incorporated into the policy as a central repository for violation reports concerning currently enrolled students and as a source of information regarding same. It is also

recommended that organized representatives of the student body be brought into the adjudication process for all formal hearings and reviews.]

Faculty members are usually the first individuals to encounter evidence of possible academic integrity violations in their own classes, although other members of the academic community, including students, may present such evidence to faculty members, department chairs or deans. In all cases the evidence should be communicated to the relevant course instructor for initial review and investigation. Cases that are not resolved through an initial investigation will move to succeeding stages of adjudication, as detailed below.

First Stage Investigation and Resolution

If a faculty member has sufficient reason to believe ~~that~~ a violation may have occurred on any work submitted for a grade, he/she must attempt to discuss this matter with the student ~~within ten (10) working days of the incident~~ **no more than ten (10) working days after the discovery of a possible violation. Prior to this discussion the faculty member will contact the Office of the Dean of Students to inquire about any previous record of violations for the student.**

In ~~After~~ discussing this matter with the student, **the faculty member will present relevant evidence and argument supporting an academic integrity violation charge. If the student admits to the violation, the faculty member will propose an appropriate penalty.** Depending on circumstances, as assessed by the faculty member who has discussed the matter with the student, the following penalty could be imposed:

1. Resubmission of the assignment;
2. Failure of the assignment;
3. Failure of the course;
4. Forced withdrawal from the course with no credit received;
5. Impose other appropriate penalties with the consent of the student;
6. Recommendation to the president of suspension or expulsion from the University;

If the student accepts the proposed penalty, the student waives his/her right to a hearing. **The faculty member will then prepare a brief written report of the incident, to be signed by the faculty member and the student. A copy of the report will be provided to the student and another copy will be filed with the Office of the Dean of Students. The report will include:**

- * the student's name and ID number
- * the faculty member's name
- * the course title and section, and the semester of enrollment
- * a summary of the violation, including the date the student work was submitted, the date of the meeting with to discuss the matter, and the date the penalty was agreed to by the student
- * the penalty
- * the date of the report

The faculty member must complete the report no more than ten (10) working days following the student's acceptance of the proposed penalty. Once the report is signed and transmitted to the Dean of Students' office the violation will be considered resolved. [The Dean of Students' office will

maintain its copy of the report with the student's departmental file and it will be destroyed when the student graduates or after six years of consecutive non-enrollment by the student. If the student is accused of another academic integrity violation before graduating or before six years of consecutive non-enrollment, the Dean of Students' office may provide information regarding the incident or the resulting agreement identifying an individual student to a faculty member investigating a subsequent suspected violation.]

Comment [k2]: Text (with some modifications) taken from Arizona State University at the West Academic Integrity Policy:
<http://www.west.asu.edu/studentlife/forms/cadinteg.htm>

Second Stage Investigation and Resolution / Student Appeal to the Department

If, after discussing an alleged academic integrity violation with a faculty member, a the student does not admit to a violation or disagrees with the proposed penalty he/she must:

1. Speak directly to the faculty member within ten (10) working days of being informed of a violation or of the proposed penalty. If, after repeated attempts, the student is unable to reach the faculty member within ten (10) working days, the student must notify the department chairperson in writing within that ten (10) day period.
2. If, after discussion with the faculty member, the student is dissatisfied with the outcome, the student must notify the department chairperson presenting a dated, written, and signed statement describing the specific basis for the complaint. At this time, the student will also provide the faculty member with a copy of these written materials.
3. The department chairperson will try to resolve the issue by reaching a settlement that is agreed upon by both the student and the faculty member. **If the issue is resolved at this time, the student, the faculty member, and the department chairperson will sign a violation report containing the details of the agreement. A copy of the report will be provided to the student and another copy will be filed with the Office of the Dean of Students, at which point the violation will be considered resolved.** If the issue is not resolved at the chairperson's level, the student **must** request that the chairperson convene the Department Executive Council (or other appropriate department committee) - excluding the faculty member involved - to hear the appeal. **The faculty member will submit to the council/committee a copy of the original violation report, along with any material evidence supporting the charge and (if appropriate) a written supplement to the violation report containing additional relevant information obtained since the initial investigation. The student will submit to the council/committee a written, dated, and signed statement describing the basis of the complaint, along with any material evidence supporting the complaint. These materials must be submitted no more than ten (10) working days after the request is made to convene the council/committee.** The accuser will assume the burden of proof. When in these cases the faculty member who initiated the charge is the chairperson, the student **must** request that the Dean of the college convene the Department Executive Council (or other appropriate department committee). The Department Executive Council/Committee will submit its decision **in writing** to the chairperson (or college Dean, if the faculty member involved is the chairperson), **and this decision will be transmitted to the student and faculty member. If the issue is resolved at this time, the student and faculty member will sign the Department Executive Council/Committee's decision statement. A copy of this document will be provided to the student and another copy will be filed with the Office of the Dean of Students, at which point the violation will be considered resolved.**

Third Stage Investigation and Resolution / Student Appeal to the College

If not satisfied with the Department Executive Council's (or other appropriate department committee's) decision, the student will ask the Dean of that college to bring the matter to the College Council. **The faculty member will submit to the College Council a copy of the original violation report, along with any material evidence supporting the charge and (if appropriate) a written supplement to the violation report containing additional relevant information obtained since the initial investigation. The faculty member will also submit a copy of the Department Executive Council's decision. The student will submit to the College Council a written, dated, and signed statement describing the basis of the complaint, along with any material evidence supporting the complaint. These materials must be submitted no more than ten (10) working days after the request is made to convene the College Council.** The accuser will assume the burden of proof. The chairperson of the department concerned will not take part in the final vote (*THIS IS UNCLEAR: though the written decision from the department chairperson will be a part of the record - ??*). The College Council's decision will constitute the University's final decision regarding the substantive nature of the case, **and a copy of the decision will be transmitted to the Office of the Dean of Students, at which point the violation will be considered resolved.** Future appeals based on violations of due process are permitted to the limit of the law.

Deadlines and the General Time Frame for Appeals / Provision of this Policy to Students

Appeals by students during this process must be initiated in writing no more than ten (10) working days after receiving decisions by the faculty, the department chairperson, the Department Executive Council/Committee, or the College Council response [NOTE: not clear who receives the appeal in this final case]. Student appeals must be dated, written, and signed statements at each step. Likewise, at each level, the faculty member(s), chairperson, Department Executive Council/Committee or College Council must complete a review of all pertinent written materials prior to rendering a decision, in writing, within ten (10) working days of receipt of complaint materials, or, in the cases of the Department Executive Council/Committee and College Council, communicate to the student and faculty member the date when that body will be convened to review the complaint materials. In instances of extenuating circumstances affecting students or faculty, it is understood that the student's right to appeal will not be jeopardized and the time constraints will be extended. Nevertheless, it will be the policy of the University to expedite the resolution of academic integrity complaints without undue delay, keeping in mind the constraints of the academic calendar. Due process must be followed at every step of this procedure. No penalty will be changed by anyone other than the faculty member who assigned it unless there is convincing evidence that the penalty was inconsistent with professional standards of the discipline.

~~Each step in the procedure must be initiated within ten (10) working days of the faculty, chairperson, department, or college response. Dated, written, and signed statements are required at each step. Likewise, at each level, the faculty member(s), chairperson, Department Executive Council (or other appropriate department committee) or College Council must complete a review of all pertinent written materials prior to rendering a decision, in writing, within ten (10) working days of receipt of complaint materials. In case the faculty member has verifiably been unable to be contacted, or in other instances of extenuating circumstances affecting students or faculty, it is understood that the student's right to appeal will not be jeopardized and the time constraints will be extended. Due process must be followed at every step of this procedure. No penalty will be changed by anyone other than the faculty member who assigned it unless~~

~~there is convincing evidence that the penalty was inconsistent with professional standards of the discipline.~~

Each student who registers a complaint with a department chairperson must be given a copy of this policy. A copy must be attached to the appeal and signed by the student to indicate that he/she has been given a copy of the procedure, read it, and understands it before the appeal can proceed.

=====

