



**A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE CHANGES TO THE CODE OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY
(21/15)**

WHEREAS, GW’s Code of Academic Integrity (hereafter “the Code) was last revised in 2016;
and

WHEREAS, the Code indicates a review should occur at least every five years; and

WHEREAS, the Code should promote academic integrity and education on the same topic;

WHEREAS, the Code should offer pathways to resolve low-level academic integrity violations
through mutual agreement;

WHEREAS, the Code should position faculty and instructors as witnesses on behalf of the
community’s values, rather than individual complainants;

WHEREAS, the Code should take a restorative and educational approach for most initial and
low-level academic integrity violations;

WHEREAS, panelists for academic integrity hearings should represent the academic and
demographic diversity of the University community;

WHEREAS, the academic integrity process should be streamlined where reasonable to promote
regular reporting of alleged violations and prompt case resolution;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE
WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**

That the Faculty Senate hereby recommends the proposed changes to the Code of Academic Integrity
(summarized below and detailed in Appendix “Redline of Proposed Changes”) be implemented effective
July 1, 2021.

- a. Positioning the instructor of record more like a witness bringing forth information and less
like an active complainant:
 - i. Providing a pathway for case consideration when students report violations and the
instructor of record declines to pursue the case.
 - ii. Allowing the department chair (or equivalent) to recommend a sanction for an
Academic Integrity Agreement if the instructor of record declines to do so.
 - iii. Providing that only the responding student(s) has a right to an advisor and that this
right is not extended to the instructor of record.
 - iv. Instructors of record may not appeal.
- b. Allowing for Academic Integrity Agreements in all cases not resulting in suspension or
expulsion.

- c. Clarifying that a student not enrolled in the course in question (e.g., a TA or students who previously took the class) may be charged with facilitation of academic integrity violations, so long as those people are still students.
- d. Clarifying that students who are (post-admission and matriculation) found to have engaged in academic integrity violations on their application for admission may be held accountable under the Code of Academic Integrity.
- e. Specifying that a student may withdraw from the course in question while allegations are pending and that, in such an event, a transcript notation may still occur.
- f. Panelists shall be recruited and selected toward a goal of academic and demographic representation of the University community.
- g. Students who have resolved prior violations may serve on panels following review by the Director of Student Rights & Responsibilities.
- h. Allowing for a reduced panel if the responding student and instructor of record agree to that, with the presiding officer then having voting rights.
- i. Specifying possible consideration in sanctioning decisions, including the significance of the assignment(s) in question.
- j. Permitting the presiding officer of the panel a tie-breaking vote as regards sanctions.
- k. Sanctions resulting from a hearing will be reviewed by the dean (or designee) of the school hosting the course, rather than the Provost.
- l. Records within Student Rights & Responsibilities will no longer be permanent by default. Instead, they will only be retained as active records until graduation or until any applicable transcript notations are removed whichever is longer. Following that, they may be retained in an administrative archive only, and such files are not subject to general third-party releases, even with authorization from the relevant student. This change will apply retroactively.
- m. Transcript notations shall be implemented as follows:
 - i. Failure of assignment (typical for a first-time violation) will result in no transcript notation.
 - ii. Failure of course will result in a transcript notation until graduation and successful petition for removal.
 - iii. Suspension will result in a transcript notation until seven years from the date of the incident and successful petition for removal.
 - iv. Expulsion will result in a permanent transcript notation.
- n. Appeals shall be revised as follows:
 - i. Students will have five business days from the date of decision to appeal.
 - ii. Appeals may be based on “a material deviation from the procedures that affected the outcome” and/or “new and relevant information that was unavailable at the time of the proceeding, with reasonable diligence and effort, that could materially affect the outcome.”
 - iii. Appeals will be reviewed by the Provost (or designee).
- o. Minor (non-substantive) changes to language and phrasing.
- p. Minor changes to typical timeline to promote clarity and efficiency.

Educational Policy & Technology Committee
February 19, 2021

Adopted by the Faculty Senate
March 12, 2021

Appendix 1: A Summary of Proposed Changes to the Code of Academic Integrity (Code)

Timeline:

- 2016: The Code was last updated.
- 2019: Student Rights & Responsibilities (SRR) conducted benchmarking and effective practices research.
- January 2020: The Faculty Senate's EPT Committee provided a subcommittee to review the Code of Academic Integrity. Membership included: Candice Johnson (MSPH), Mary Jean Schumann (SON), Lisa Schwartz (SMHS), Daniel Ullman (CCAS), Sarah Wagner (CCAS), with Christy Anthony (SRR) and Deane Highby (SRR) serving as staff.
- November 2020-January 2021: The EPT subcommittee provided an initial draft of proposed changes to the Faculty Senate EPT Committee and the Student Association Faculty Senate for initial review. Copies were also provided to the Council of Academic Deans, the Council of Associate Deans, the Office of General Counsel, the Provost, and the Vice President for Student Affairs. Feedback was incorporated.
- February 2021: The Subcommittee provided the final draft for review and a vote by the Faculty Senate and the Student Association Senate in March 2021. The Office of General Counsel, the Provost and the Vice President for Student Affairs also received the final draft.
- March 2021: Following vote by the Faculty Senate and the Student Association Senate, the Provost and President will receive the approved changes for confirmation and submission to the Board of Trustees.
- May 2021: Anticipated vote on the changes by the Board of Trustees. Followed by comprehensive rollout planned for students, faculty, and staff.
- July 1, 2021: Anticipated implementation date.

Key Proposed Changes (full detail in provided redline)

- Clarifies the following may be addressed through the Code: (a) a student engages in an academic integrity violation on their admissions application, and such a violation is reported after their admission and (b) a student who commits academic integrity violation through a course in which they are not actively enrolled (e.g., a teaching assistant who provides an exam in advance).
- Provides students who allege violations with a pathway for those allegations to be considered if the instructor of record declines to do so.
- Allows for Academic Integrity Agreements in all cases not resulting in suspension or expulsion.
- Allows for a reduced panel if the responding student and instructor of record agree, with the presiding officer then having voting rights.
- Specify that if a student withdraws from the course in question while a case is pending, they may still receive a transcript notation.
- Positions the instructor of record as a witness, rather than an individual complainant through the following measures: (a) Identifies this role as "instructor of record" rather than "complainant" and (b) Provides the rights to an advisor and of appeal only to the responding student(s).
- Specifies possible consideration in sanctioning decisions, including the significance of the assignment(s) in question.
- Encourages educational sanctions and provides accountability through a course registration hold.
- Revises timeline for transcript notation duration.
- Removes the provision that all academic integrity records are permanent by default. Expulsion for academic integrity violations would remain a permanent record.
- Adjusts decision-review levels: Deans will now review in violation finding from hearings (rather than the Provost) and the Provost will now review appeals (rather than the President).
- Revises appeal grounds for "procedural error" and greater specificity regarding "new evidence."
- Changes to panelist selection, including towards academic and demographic representation.
- Minor changes to "typical" timeline, with a goal of more expedient resolutions where reasonable.
- Other minor changes to clarify procedure or language.

Appendix 2—Redline of Proposed Changes

Code of Academic Integrity

Preamble

We, the Students, Faculty, Librarians, Staff, and Administration of the George Washington University, believing academic integrity to be central to the mission of the University, commit ourselves to promoting high standards for the integrity of academic work. Commitment to academic integrity upholds educational equity, development, and dissemination of meaningful knowledge, and mutual respect that our community values and nurtures. The George Washington University Code of Academic Integrity is established to further this commitment.

Article I: The Authority of the Code of Academic Integrity

Section 1: Application of the Code of Academic Integrity The Code of Academic Integrity (“Code”) shall apply to students enrolled in all colleges and schools within the University, except the following schools and programs:

- 1) The Law School and
- 2) The Medical Doctor Program in the School of Medicine and Health Sciences.

Section 2: Precedence of the Code of Academic Integrity

This Code takes precedent over all other academic integrity policies of the George Washington University (except as referenced in Section I). This Code applies to reports of academic integrity violations that are received by the University on or after the effective date of this Code, regardless of when the alleged violation occurred. Where the date of the reported violation precedes the effective date of this Code, the definitions of academic integrity violations in existence at the time of the alleged incident will be used, except where use of such definition would be contrary to law. The remainder of this Code, however, including the procedures, will be used to resolve all reports of academic integrity violations subject to this Code made on or after the effective date of the Code, regardless of when the alleged incident occurred.

Section 3: Interpretation

Conflicts or questions about this Code (including its interaction with other policies of the University) should be forwarded to the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (“Provost”). The Provost or a designee shall be the final interpreter of this Code.

This Code and any changes to it will be interpreted to comply with applicable legal requirements.

Article II: Basic Considerations

Students are responsible for the honesty and integrity of their own academic work, which may also include their applications for admission, in addition to any group or collaborative academic work attributed to them that is submitted for academic evaluation or credit in an academic course, program, or credential. Behavior not addressed by this Code may be

addressed by another policy at the University.

Section 1: Definition of Academic Integrity Violations

(a) Academic integrity violations are cheating of any kind, including misrepresenting one's own work, taking credit for the work of others without crediting them and without appropriate authorization, and the fabrication of information.

(b) Attempts to commit acts prohibited by this Code constitute a violation of this Code and may be sanctioned to the same extent as completed violations, even if such attempts are unsuccessful or incomplete.

(c) Common examples of academic integrity violations include, but are not limited to, the following, whether they occur in-person or remotely:

- 1) *Cheating* - intentionally or knowingly using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in any academic exercise; engaging in unauthorized collaboration in any academic exercise; copying from another student's examination; submitting work for an in-class examination that has been prepared in advance; representing material prepared by another as one's own work (including contract or paid cheating); submitting the same or substantially the same work in more than one course without prior permission of both instructors; violating rules governing administration of examinations; violating any rules relating to academic integrity of a course or program.
- 2) *Fabrication* – intentionally or knowingly, without authorization, falsifying or inventing any data, information, or citation in an academic exercise; giving false or misleading information regarding an academic matter.
- 3) *Plagiarism* - intentionally or knowingly representing the words, ideas, or sequence of ideas of another as one's own in any academic exercise; or failure to attribute any of the following: quotations, paraphrases, or borrowed information. Contract or paid cheating may be included here.
- 4) *Falsification and forgery of University academic documents* - intentionally or knowingly making a false statement, concealing material information, or forging a University official's signature on any University academic document or record; making false statements to or concealing material information from a University employee that results in the creation of a false academic record or document. Such academic documents or records may include transcripts, registration/add-drop forms, requests for advanced standing, requests to register for undergraduate or graduate-level courses, etc. (Falsification or forgery of non-academic University documents, such as financial aid forms, may be considered a violation of the Code of Student Conduct and/or other relevant university policies.)
- 5) *Facilitating academic integrity violations* - intentionally or knowingly helping or attempting to help another to commit a violation of academic integrity. This may

include circumstances in which the facilitator is not enrolled in the course, but is an enrolled student.

- 6) *Sanction Violation* - violating the terms of any disciplinary sanction imposed in accordance with this Code.

Section 2: Reporting violations

It is the communal responsibility of members of the George Washington University to respond to suspected academic integrity violations by:

- 1) consulting the individual(s) thought to be involved and encouraging them to report it themselves, and/or
- 2) reporting it to the instructor of record for the course, and/or
- 3) reporting it to the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities. Reporting oneself after committing academic integrity violations is strongly encouraged and may be considered a mitigating factor in determining sanctions.

Section 3: Assignments and Examinations

(a) The instructor of record for a given course is solely responsible for establishing academic assignments and methods of examination in that course.

(b) Instructors of record are encouraged to provide clear explanations of their expectations regarding the completion of assignments and examinations, including permissible collaboration. This includes detailed examples about what collaboration is and is not permitted and what resources may and may not be used.

(c) Instructors of record are encouraged to choose assignments and methods of examination believed to promote academic integrity. Examples of these include opportunities to display critical thinking around a unique set of issues, creative assessments developed by students, careful proctoring of examinations, and the regular creation of fresh exams and assignments. Nothing in this Code is intended to eliminate or prohibit the use of collaborative projects or unproctored examinations or other assessments. When assigning collaborative projects or using unproctored examinations, the instructor of record should explicitly state the expectations of performance for all participants.

(d) Instructors of record are encouraged to provide opportunities for students to affirm their commitment to academic integrity in various settings, including examinations and other assignments. The following statement may be used for this purpose: “I, (student's name), affirm that I have completed this assignment/examination in accordance with the Code of Academic Integrity.”

Article III: The University Integrity and Conduct Council

Section 1: Mission of the University Integrity and Conduct Council

(a) The University Integrity and Conduct Council (UICC) will be responsible for promoting academic integrity and for administering all procedures in this Code.

(b) Administrative and logistical support for the UICC shall be provided by the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities, within the Division for Student Affairs. The Office shall be the repository for records pertaining to this Code and the UICC.

Section 2: Composition of the UICC and Academic Integrity Panels (AIPs)

(a) The UICC shall include student and faculty members from each of the schools whose students are subject to this Code. The terms of all members shall be one academic year. Members may be renewed for additional terms. The process for identifying and selecting candidates to serve on the UICC shall be determined by the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities, pursuant to Article III, Section 3, below. Recruitment should yield broad and diverse representation of the University community.

(b) The Academic Integrity Panels (AIP), which are selected from members of the UICC, shall adjudicate cases referred to a hearing under this Code. The Director of the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities or a designee (the "Director") will select and convene AIPs as needed. An AIP shall be comprised of three student members (one of whom serves as presiding officer) and two faculty members. At least one member should be from the school or college of the course in which the violation was reported. If UICC members from the school or college of the course are unavailable to adjudicate a case, the Director may appoint other UICC members as substitutes.

(c) The presiding officer for an individual case shall be a student member of the AIP and shall be selected by the Director prior to the start of a hearing. The presiding officer may participate but will have no vote in the deliberations or recommending a sanction at the hearing, except in the circumstances outlined below. Following the hearing, the presiding officer will write a report on the hearing.

(d) In the event a full AIP cannot be convened in a timely manner, a case may be heard by an Ad-Hoc AIP, consisting of at least one student and one faculty member, so long as both the instructor of record and the respondent agree. In such an event, a student will serve as the presiding officer and all students (including the presiding officer) and faculty members will have the ability to vote to resolve the case.

(e) Any case that arises before or during a summer, academic, or holiday break period may be heard during that same break period providing that members of the UICC are available. Otherwise, the case will be adjudicated during the following academic term.

(f) All members of the UICC shall participate in training organized by the Director.

Section 3: Selection and Removal of UICC Members

(a) Annually and typically by July 1 preceding a new academic year, the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities will handle the nomination, application, and selection processes of the UICC members who will serve in the next academic year. The Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities may confer with the following entities in the nomination and selection process:

- 1) the Chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on Educational Policy and Technology;
 - 2) GW's academic deans of schools or colleges subject to this Code;
 - 3) the President of the Student Association and student associations of the schools and colleges subject to the Code or a designee; and
 - 4) other offices and student leaders at the University to promote diverse membership that represents the academic and demographic identities of the University communities.
- (b) The following criteria shall be used in the selection of the student members:
- 1) They must be students registered for at least three credit hours in a degree-granting program of a school or college subject to this Code;
 - 2) They must have made satisfactory academic progress and be in good academic standing;
 - 3) Students with a pending case or incomplete sanctions may not be selected for the UICC. Students with resolved cases and who have completed all sanctions may be selected at the discretion of the Director of Student Rights and Responsibilities or designee;
 - 4) They may not hold any executive position, either elected or appointed, in the Student Association.
- (c) The following criteria shall be used in the selection of the faculty members:
- 1) They must be full-time faculty members in a school or college subject to this Code;
 - 2) They may not be elected members of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.
- (d) Current members of the UICC who are alleged to have committed any violation of this Code, the Code of Student Conduct, or any other university policy shall be suspended from participation during the pendency of any investigation or proceeding into the alleged violation. Members found in violation of this Code or the Code of Student Conduct shall be disqualified from any further participation in the UICC until all sanctions are completed and with the approval of the Director. Faculty members serving as an instructor of record or witness in a pending case under this Code shall not participate on an AIP until that case is resolved.
- (e) The UICC, by a two-thirds vote of the membership, or the Director may remove a member for non-participation. The Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities may define additional expectations of participation for the UICC membership.
- (f) Vacancies, as they occur, shall be filled by the Director.

Section 4: Case Procedures

(a) All attendant procedures and records of the UICC and its AIPs, from the initial allegation to the final resolution, shall be confidential, to the extent allowed by applicable law and university policy.

(b) In any circumstance where the matter is referred to the department chair or other comparable official, that person may assume the role of instructor of record for purposes of the academic integrity case process.

(c) Allegations involving violations of this Code may be initiated by instructors of record, students, librarians, or administrators. Anyone with awareness of a violation may report it to the instructor of record or the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities. Any allegations should be made as expeditiously as is reasonably possible (normally within ten business days except in the summer or during academic breaks and holidays) from the discovery of the alleged violation. Allegations may be initiated as follows:

- 1) A student may initiate an allegation of academic integrity violations against another student, by referring the case to the instructor of record and/or to the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities. If the case is brought directly to the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities for action, then the Director shall promptly notify the instructor of record. If the instructor of record will not or is unable to address the case, the matter will be referred to the department chair or other comparable official.
- 2) When an instructor of record reports an allegation or is made aware of a violation that the instructor of record determines to be substantive, the instructor of record shall contact the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities in order to discover whether the student has ever been found in violation of this Code.
- 3) However reported, the instructor of record will present the student with specific allegations and may propose a sanction. The instructor of record may consult with the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities on sanctioning considerations. Sanctions will be determined in accordance with the relevant sections of this Code.

If the instructor of record declines to propose a sanction, the matter will be referred to the department chair or other comparable official for proposed sanctions.

- 4) In the event a student withdraws or drops the relevant course while a case is pending, the case may still proceed under this Code.
- 5) Cases may be resolved by one of the following:
 - a) Academic Integrity Agreements, in which both the respondent and the instructor of record agree to the finding of violation for all allegations and sanctions, in accordance with [insert relevant numbered sections of this Code]. The written agreement will be provided to the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities to advise regarding sanctioning consistency, with the final determination being the mutual agreement of the instructor of record and respondent, evidenced by each person's signature.

- b) AIPs shall resolve cases in which the respondent does not accept responsibility for the alleged violations or does not accept the proposed sanction. In such cases, the AIP will review the case in accordance with the procedural guidelines outlined below.
 - 6) All actions, on any level, shall be recorded with the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities. Instructors of record must notify and submit the appropriate documentation about any violation of this Code to the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities for proper retention of records.
- (c) The following procedures shall guide AIP Hearings.
- 1) Respondents and instructors of record shall be given notice of the hearing date and the specific allegations at least five calendar days in advance and shall be accorded reasonable access to the case file, which will be retained in the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities. The appropriate academic dean, department chair, and the Vice President of Student Affairs and Dean of Students, or any designees shall also receive notification of the pending allegations at least five calendar days before the hearing.
 - 2) Any party may challenge an AIP member on the grounds of personal bias. In such cases, AIP members may be disqualified from the hearing at the determination of the Director.
 - 3) Hearings will be closed to the public, without exception. Prospective witnesses, other than the instructor of record and respondent, shall be excluded from the hearing except while providing their statements. All parties and witnesses shall be excluded from AIP deliberations.
 - 4) The respondent may be accompanied by an advisor. The role of the advisor shall be limited to consultation with the respondent they are advising. Under no circumstances are advisors permitted to address the AIP, speak on behalf of their advisee, or question other participants. At the discretion of the presiding officer, violations of this limitation will result in the advisor being removed from the hearing. The University retains the right to have legal counsel present at any hearing.
 - 5) Hearings will occur in the absence of respondents who fail to appear after proper notice. If respondent(s) fail to appear, the instructor of record will still be required to present a case.
 - 6) The presiding officer shall exercise control over the proceedings to achieve orderly and timely completion of the hearing. Any person, including the instructor of record and respondent, who disrupts a hearing may be excluded by the presiding officer. The presiding officer shall direct the hearing through the following stages: statements from both the instructor of record and respondent, questioning of witnesses by both the instructor of record and respondent, the questioning of the instructor of record,

respondent, and any witnesses by panel members, and concluding statements by the instructor of record and respondent.

- 7) Hearings shall be conducted in accordance with the investigatory model of administrative hearings, in which the AIP assumes responsibility for eliciting relevant evidence. The purpose of the hearing is to establish the facts. The standard of proof for making a finding of in violation will be the preponderance of evidence standard (i.e., based on the evidence presented, it is more likely than not that a violation occurred). Where the AIP vote outcome is tied, the preponderance of evidence standard has not been met and the AIP's decision is that the respondent will be found not in violation.
- 8) Formal rules of evidence shall not be applicable in proceedings conducted pursuant to this Code. The presiding officer shall have the discretion to admit all matters into evidence that reasonable persons would accept as relevant.
- 9) Hearings will be recorded. These recordings will be retained as part of the record.
- 10) The Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities or the presiding officer may request the attendance of witnesses upon request by any AIP member or of either party. Only witnesses who can provide direct knowledge about the given case shall be called. Requests must be approved by the Director. University students and employees are expected to comply with such requests. Instructors of record and respondents shall be accorded an opportunity to question those witnesses who participate for either party at the hearing. Failure of witnesses to appear will not invalidate the proceedings.
- 11) Witnesses shall be asked to affirm that their statement is truthful. Any student, faculty, or staff member who knowingly provides false information during this process will be referred to Student Rights & Responsibilities, Human Resources, and/or the Office of the Provost as appropriate for review and appropriate disposition.

In lieu of oral statements, authenticated written statements or other forms of participation may be accepted at the discretion of the Director.

- 12) AIP's deliberation following the hearing shall occur in two stages: the determination regarding responsibility and if applicable, recommendation of sanctions. To find a respondent in violation of the Code, a majority of the voting AIP members must agree. If the AIP finds a respondent in violation, they shall also make a sanctioning recommendation. A sanction other than expulsion can be recommended by the affirmative vote of three-quarters of the voting AIP members. In the event of a tie regarding sanctions other than expulsion, the presiding officer casts the deciding vote. A sanction of expulsion can be recommended only by an affirmative vote of all voting AIP members.
- 13) Reports of the AIP shall include a determination of the responsibility of the respondent. If the respondent is found in violation, then the report will also include a

recommendation of sanctions. Sanctions will be recommended and determined in accordance with the relevant sections of this Code. If an AIP determines that a respondent is in violation of the Code, the report shall be forwarded to the dean of the school in which the academic integrity violation occurred or a designee without a conflict of interest in the case, as determined by the dean. If in the judgement of the dean or designee the sanction recommended by the AIP is a significant deviation from the sanctions imposed in closely similar cases, the dean or designee may revise the sanction before notifying the respondent of the determination and sanction. The dean or designee may not modify or revise the AIP's determination of responsibility. The instructor of record and department chair of the course shall receive a copy of the determination and sanction.

- 14) These proceedings should be concluded as expeditiously as possible. The AIPs should strive to have proceedings concluded within four weeks of the report of the violation. However, failure to do so shall not constitute improper procedure under the Code.

Section 5: Sanctions

- a) In each case, the following factors may be considered in determining an appropriate sanction:
 - 1) the nature of the violation and the incident itself;
 - 2) the significance of the assignment(s) in question to the academic course or program;
 - 3) the impact or implications of the conduct on the University community and its learning environments;
 - 4) prior misconduct by the respondent, including the respondent's relevant prior academic integrity or behavioral misconduct history or lack thereof, both at the University and elsewhere;
 - 5) maintenance of an environment conducive to the integrity of learning and knowledge;
 - 6) protection of the University community;
 - 7) necessary outcomes in order to eliminate the prohibited conduct, prevent its recurrence, and remedy its effects on members of the University community; and,
 - 8) any mitigating, aggravating, or compelling circumstances in order to reach a just and appropriate resolution in each case, including the respondent's demonstration of the understanding and impact of the violation.
- b) Possible sanctions include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - 1) educational sanctions intended to improve the respondent's understanding and implementation of academic integrity. This may be assigned in combination with any

other sanction. If the respondent fails to complete these sanctions, a registration hold may be placed on their student account.

- 2) reduction in academic credit for the assignment or course.
- 3) failure of assignment (generally recommended for first violation).
- 4) failure of course, including a transcript notation until graduation and successful petition for removal (generally recommended for second violations or egregious first violations).
- 5) suspension from the University for a specified period of time, including a transcript notation until seven years from the date of the incident and successful petition for removal. Suspension may include requirements the student will need to complete in order to return or upon return.
- 6) expulsion (permanent removal from the University), including a permanent transcript notation.

c) Sanction recommendations of suspension or expulsion, as a result of academic integrity violations, may be determined only by an AIP.

d) Transcript notations for failure of course or suspensions may be removed upon expiration of the dates set forth above and only after successful petition of the respondent to the Provost or designee.

e) Records shall be maintained and released by the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities in accordance with University policy and applicable law.

f) Following graduation or removal of transcript notation, whichever is later, the respondent's record will be transferred to an administrative archive status and therefore become internal and administrative (i.e. non-conduct) records. Such files are not part of general third-party releases, even with authorization from the respondent. Such records may be released to third-parties upon specific request of the respondent or as required by law. g) Respondents found in violation of this Code may also be removed from or determined to be ineligible for certain University programs or activities, in accordance with the policies, rules, or eligibility criteria of that program or activity.

h) No outcomes shall prohibit any program, department, college, or school of the University from retaining records of violations and reporting violations as required by their professional standards; the University may retain, for appropriate administrative purposes, records of all proceedings regarding violations of this Code.

i) Sanctions assigned to a respondent found in violation of this Code may also have subsequent ramifications upon their academic standing in an academic course or academic

program in accordance with the faculty member's syllabus or in the academic college, school, or department regulations and bylaws.

Section 6: Appeals

- (a) After a decision has been confirmed by the relevant dean or designee, the respondent may file a written petition of appeal with the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities within five (5) business days of the outcome.
- (b) Appeals of the decision of the AIP or of the sanction imposed by the relevant dean or designee may be based only on the following grounds:
 - 1) There was a material deviation from the procedures of this Code that affected the outcome.
 - 2) There is new and relevant information that was unavailable at the time of the proceeding, with reasonable diligence and effort, that could materially affect the outcome.
- (d) Appeals will be reviewed by the Provost or a designee. The Provost or a designee will then make a decision on the appeal, based on the appeal petition and the reports of the AIP and the relevant dean or designee. The appeal decision of the Provost will typically be rendered and provided to the instructor of record and the respondent within 10 business days of the appeal materials being received by the Provost.
- (e) The decision of the Provost or designee in connection with the appeal shall be final and conclusive and no further appeals will be permitted. The dean of the respondent's home school at the University shall also receive final notice of the case outcome.

Article IV: Changes and Reports Regarding the Code of Academic Integrity

Section 1: Changes to the Code of Academic Integrity

- (a) Substantial changes to this Code shall be referred to or initiated by the Provost or designee. Changes may also be initiated by either the Faculty Senate or the Student Association. Substantial changes must be approved by a majority vote of both the Faculty Senate and the Student Association.
- (b) The Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students shall coordinate with the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students through the Provost to conduct a review of the Code of Academic Integrity at least once every five years.
- (c) Substantial changes will then be forwarded to the President of the University for confirmation and submission to the Board of Trustees.

Section 2: Reports and Reviews

The Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students or designee shall make an annual report on the work of the UICC to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees, Joint Committee of Faculty and Students, the Faculty Senate Educational Policy and Technology Committee, the Student Association Senate Academic Affairs Committee, and the Council of Deans.

Approved [insert updated date]

1 **Appendix 3—Clean Version**

2 **Code of Academic Integrity**

3 **Preamble**

4 We, the Students, Faculty, Librarians, Staff, and Administration of the George Washington
5 University, believing academic integrity to be central to the mission of the University, commit
6 ourselves to promoting high standards for the integrity of academic work. Commitment to academic
7 integrity upholds educational equity, development, and dissemination of meaningful knowledge, and
8 mutual respect that our community values and nurtures. The George Washington University Code of
9 Academic Integrity is established to further this commitment.
10
11

12 **Article I: The Authority of the Code of Academic Integrity**

13 **Section 1: Application of the Code of Academic Integrity**

14 The Code of Academic Integrity (“Code”) shall apply to students enrolled in all colleges and
15 schools within the University, except the following schools and programs:
16
17

- 18 1) The Law School and
 - 19 2) The Medical Doctor Program in the School of Medicine and Health Sciences.
- 20
21

22 **Section 2: Precedence of the Code of Academic Integrity**

23 This Code takes precedent over all other academic integrity policies of the George Washington
24 University (except as referenced in Section I). This Code applies to reports of academic integrity
25 violations that are received by the University on or after the effective date of this Code, regardless of
26 when the alleged violation occurred. Where the date of the reported violation precedes the effective
27 date of this Code, the definitions of academic integrity violations in existence at the time of the alleged
28 incident will be used, except where use of such definition would be contrary to law. The remainder of
29 this Code, however, including the procedures, will be used to resolve all reports of academic integrity
30 violations subject to this Code made on or after the effective date of the Code, regardless of when the
31 alleged incident occurred.
32

33 **Section 3: Interpretation**

34 Conflicts or questions about this Code (including its interaction with other policies of the University)
35 should be forwarded to the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs
36 (“Provost”). The Provost or a designee shall be the final interpreter of this Code.
37

38 This Code and any changes to it will be interpreted to comply with applicable legal requirements.
39

40 **Article II: Basic Considerations**

41 Students are responsible for the honesty and integrity of their own academic work, which may
42 also include their applications for admission, in addition to any group or collaborative academic
43 work attributed to them that is submitted for academic evaluation or credit in an academic
44 course, program, or credential. Behavior not addressed by this Code may be addressed by
45 another policy at the University.
46
47

48 **Section 1: Definition of Academic Integrity Violations**

49 (a) Academic integrity violations are cheating of any kind, including misrepresenting one's own
50 work, taking credit for the work of others without crediting them and without appropriate

51 authorization, and the fabrication of information.

52
53 (b) Attempts to commit acts prohibited by this Code constitute a violation of this Code and may be
54 sanctioned to the same extent as completed violations, even if such attempts are unsuccessful or
55 incomplete.

56
57 (c) Common examples of academic integrity violations include, but are not limited to, the
58 following, whether they occur in-person or remotely:

- 59
60 1) *Cheating* - intentionally or knowingly using or attempting to use unauthorized materials,
61 information, or study aids in any academic exercise; engaging in unauthorized collaboration
62 in any academic exercise; copying from another student's examination; submitting work for
63 an in-class examination that has been prepared in advance; representing material prepared by
64 another as one's own work (including contract or paid cheating); submitting the same or
65 substantially the same work in more than one course without prior permission of both
66 instructors; violating rules governing administration of examinations; violating any rules
67 relating to academic integrity of a course or program.
- 68
69 2) *Fabrication* – intentionally or knowingly, without authorization, falsifying or inventing any
70 data, information, or citation in an academic exercise; giving false or misleading information
71 regarding an academic matter.
- 72
73 3) *Plagiarism* - intentionally or knowingly representing the words, ideas, or sequence of ideas
74 of another as one's own in any academic exercise; or failure to attribute any of the
75 following: quotations, paraphrases, or borrowed information. Contract or paid cheating may
76 be included here.
- 77
78 4) *Falsification and forgery of University academic documents* - intentionally or knowingly
79 making a false statement, concealing material information, or forging a University official's
80 signature on any University academic document or record; making false statements to or
81 concealing material information from a University employee that results in the creation of a
82 false academic record or document. Such academic documents or records may include
83 transcripts, registration/add-drop forms, requests for advanced standing, requests to register
84 for undergraduate or graduate-level courses, etc. (Falsification or forgery of non-academic
85 University documents, such as financial aid forms, may be considered a violation of the
86 Code of Student Conduct and/or other relevant university policies.)
- 87
88 5) *Facilitating academic integrity violations* - intentionally or knowingly helping or attempting
89 to help another to commit a violation of academic integrity. This may include circumstances
90 in which the facilitator is not enrolled in the course, but is an enrolled student.
- 91
92 6) *Sanction Violation* - violating the terms of any disciplinary sanction imposed in accordance
93 with this Code.

94 **Section 2: Reporting violations**

95 It is the communal responsibility of members of the George Washington University to respond to
96 suspected academic integrity violations by:

- 97
98 1) consulting the individual(s) thought to be involved and encouraging them to report it themselves,
99 and/or
00

02 2) reporting it to the instructor of record for the course, and/or

03
04 3) reporting it to the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities. Reporting oneself after committing
05 academic integrity violations is strongly encouraged and may be considered a mitigating factor in
06 determining sanctions.

07
08 **Section 3: Assignments and Examinations**

09 (a) The instructor of record for a given course is solely responsible for establishing academic
10 assignments and methods of examination in that course.

11
12 (b) Instructors of record are encouraged to provide clear explanations of their expectations
13 regarding the completion of assignments and examinations, including permissible collaboration.
14 This includes detailed examples about what collaboration is and is not permitted and what resources
15 may and may not be used.

16
17 (c) Instructors of record are encouraged to choose assignments and methods of examination believed
18 to promote academic integrity. Examples of these include opportunities to display critical thinking
19 around a unique set of issues, creative assessments developed by students, careful proctoring of
20 examinations, and the regular creation of fresh exams and assignments. Nothing in this Code is
21 intended to eliminate or prohibit the use of collaborative projects or unproctored examinations or other
22 assessments. When assigning collaborative projects or using unproctored examinations, the
23 instructor of record should explicitly state the expectations of performance for all participants.

24
25 (d) Instructors of record are encouraged to provide opportunities for students to affirm their
26 commitment to academic integrity in various settings, including examinations and other
27 assignments. The following statement may be used for this purpose: "I, (student's name), affirm that
28 I have completed this assignment/examination in accordance with the Code of Academic Integrity."
29

30 **Article III: The University Integrity and Conduct Council**

31
32 **Section 1: Mission of the University Integrity and Conduct Council**

33 (a) The University Integrity and Conduct Council (UICC) will be responsible for promoting
34 academic integrity and for administering all procedures in this Code.

35
36 (b) Administrative and logistical support for the UICC shall be provided by the Office of Student
37 Rights & Responsibilities, within the Division for Student Affairs. The Office shall be the repository
38 for records pertaining to this Code and the UICC.

39
40 **Section 2: Composition of the UICC and Academic Integrity Panels (AIPs)**

41 (a) The UICC shall include student and faculty members from each of the schools whose students
42 are subject to this Code. The terms of all members shall be one academic year. Members may be
43 renewed for additional terms. The process for identifying and selecting candidates to serve on the
44 UICC shall be determined by the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities, pursuant to Article III,
45 Section 3, below. Recruitment should yield broad and diverse representation of the University
46 community.

47
48 (b) The Academic Integrity Panels (AIP), which are selected from members of the UICC, shall
49 adjudicate cases referred to a hearing under this Code. The Director of the Office of Student Rights &
50 Responsibilities or a designee (the "Director") will select and convene AIPs as needed. An AIP shall
51 be comprised of three student members (one of whom serves as presiding officer) and two faculty
52 members. At least one member should be from the school or college of the course in which the

53 violation was reported. If UICC members from the school or college of the course are unavailable to
54 adjudicate a case, the Director may appoint other UICC members as substitutes.

55
56 (c) The presiding officer for an individual case shall be a student member of the AIP and shall be
57 selected by the Director prior to the start of a hearing. The presiding officer may participate but will
58 have no vote in the deliberations or recommending a sanction at the hearing, except in the
59 circumstances outlined below. Following the hearing, the presiding officer will write a report on the
60 hearing.

61
62 (d) In the event a full AIP cannot be convened in a timely manner, a case may be heard by an Ad-
63 Hoc AIP, consisting of at least one student and one faculty member, so long as both the instructor of
64 record and the respondent agree. In such an event, a student will serve as the presiding officer and all
65 students (including the presiding officer) and faculty members will have the ability to vote to resolve
66 the case.

67
68 (e) Any case that arises before or during a summer, academic, or holiday break period may be
69 heard during that same break period providing that members of the UICC are available.
70 Otherwise, the case will be adjudicated during the following academic term.

71
72 (f) All members of the UICC shall participate in training organized by the Director.

73 **Section 3: Selection and Removal of UICC Members**

74
75 (a) Annually and typically by July 1 preceding a new academic year, the Office of Student Rights &
76 Responsibilities will handle the nomination, application, and selection processes of the UICC
77 members who will serve in the next academic year. The Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities
78 may confer with the following entities in the nomination and selection process:

- 79 1) the Chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on Educational Policy and Technology;
- 80 2) GW's academic deans of schools or colleges subject to this Code;
- 81 3) the President of the Student Association and student associations of the schools and colleges
82 subject to the Code or a designee; and
- 83 4) other offices and student leaders at the University to promote diverse membership that
84 represents the academic and demographic identities of the University communities.

85
86
87
88
89
90 (b) The following criteria shall be used in the selection of the student members:

- 91 1) They must be students registered for at least three credit hours in a degree-granting program
92 of a school or college subject to this Code;
- 93 2) They must have made satisfactory academic progress and be in good academic standing;
- 94 3) Students with a pending case or incomplete sanctions may not be selected for the UICC.
95 Students with resolved cases and who have completed all sanctions may be selected at the
96 discretion of the Director of Student Rights and Responsibilities or designee;
- 97 4) They may not hold any executive position, either elected or appointed, in the Student
98 Association.

99
00
01
02
03 (c) The following criteria shall be used in the selection of the faculty members:

- 1) They must be full-time faculty members in a school or college subject to this Code;
- 2) They may not be elected members of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.

(d) Current members of the UICC who are alleged to have committed any violation of this Code, the Code of Student Conduct, or any other university policy shall be suspended from participation during the pendency of any investigation or proceeding into the alleged violation. Members found in violation of this Code or the Code of Student Conduct shall be disqualified from any further participation in the UICC until all sanctions are completed and with the approval of the Director. Faculty members serving as an instructor of record or witness in a pending case under this Code shall not participate on an AIP until that case is resolved.

(e) The UICC, by a two-thirds vote of the membership, or the Director may remove a member for non-participation. The Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities may define additional expectations of participation for the UICC membership.

(f) Vacancies, as they occur, shall be filled by the Director.

Section 4: Case Procedures

(a) All attendant procedures and records of the UICC and its AIPs, from the initial allegation to the final resolution, shall be confidential, to the extent allowed by applicable law and university policy.

(b) In any circumstance where the matter is referred to the department chair or other comparable official, that person may assume the role of instructor of record for purposes of the academic integrity case process.

(c) Allegations involving violations of this Code may be initiated by instructors of record, students, librarians, or administrators. Anyone with awareness of a violation may report it to the instructor of record or the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities. Any allegations should be made as expeditiously as is reasonably possible (normally within ten business days except in the summer or during academic breaks and holidays) from the discovery of the alleged violation. Allegations may be initiated as follows:

- 1) A student may initiate an allegation of academic integrity violations against another student, by referring the case to the instructor of record and/or to the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities. If the case is brought directly to the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities for action, then the Director shall promptly notify the instructor of record. If the instructor of record will not or is unable to address the case, the matter will be referred to the department chair or other comparable official.
- 2) When an instructor of record reports an allegation or is made aware of a violation that the instructor of record determines to be substantive, the instructor of record shall contact the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities in order to discover whether the student has ever been found in violation of this Code.
- 3) However reported, the instructor of record will present the student with specific allegations and may propose a sanction. The instructor of record may consult with the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities on sanctioning considerations. Sanctions will be determined in accordance with the relevant sections of this Code.

55 If the instructor of record declines to propose a sanction, the matter will be referred to the
56 department chair or other comparable official for proposed sanctions.
57

- 58 4) In the event a student withdraws or drops the relevant course while a case is pending, the case
59 may still proceed under this Code.
60
- 61 5) Cases may be resolved by one of the following:
62 a) Academic Integrity Agreements, in which both the respondent and the instructor of
63 record agree to the finding of violation for all allegations and sanctions, in accordance
64 with Section 5 of this Code. The written agreement will be provided to the Office of
65 Student Rights & Responsibilities to advise regarding sanctioning consistency, with the
66 final determination being the mutual agreement of the instructor of record and
67 respondent, evidenced by each person's signature.
68 b) AIPs shall resolve cases in which the respondent does not accept responsibility for the
69 alleged violations or does not accept the proposed sanction. In such cases, the AIP will
70 review the case in accordance with the procedural guidelines outlined below.
71
- 72 6) All actions, on any level, shall be recorded with the Office of Student Rights &
73 Responsibilities. Instructors of record must notify and submit the appropriate documentation
74 about any violation of this Code to the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities for proper
75 retention of records.
76
77

78 (c) The following procedures shall guide AIP Hearings.

- 79 1) Respondents and instructors of record shall be given notice of the hearing date and the
80 specific allegations at least five calendar days in advance and shall be accorded reasonable
81 access to the case file, which will be retained in the Office of Student Rights &
82 Responsibilities. The appropriate academic dean, department chair, and the Vice President
83 of Student Affairs and Dean of Students, or any designees shall also receive notification of
84 the pending allegations at least five calendar days before the hearing.
85
- 86 2) Any party may challenge an AIP member on the grounds of personal bias. In such cases,
87 AIP members may be disqualified from the hearing at the determination of the Director.
88
- 89 3) Hearings will be closed to the public, without exception. Prospective witnesses, other than
90 the instructor of record and respondent, shall be excluded from the hearing except while
91 providing their statements. All parties and witnesses shall be excluded from AIP
92 deliberations.
93
- 94 4) The respondent may be accompanied by an advisor. The role of the advisor shall be limited
95 to consultation with the respondent they are advising. Under no circumstances are advisors
96 permitted to address the AIP, speak on behalf of their advisee, or question other participants.
97 At the discretion of the presiding officer, violations of this limitation will result in the
98 advisor being removed from the hearing. The University retains the right to have legal
99 counsel present at any hearing.
00
- 01 5) Hearings will occur in the absence of respondents who fail to appear after proper notice. If
02 respondent(s) fail to appear, the instructor of record will still be required to present a case.
03
- 04 6) The presiding officer shall exercise control over the proceedings to achieve orderly and
05 timely completion of the hearing. Any person, including the instructor of record and

06 respondent, who disrupts a hearing may be excluded by the presiding officer. The presiding
07 officer shall direct the hearing through the following stages: statements from both the
08 instructor of record and respondent, questioning of witnesses by both the instructor of record
09 and respondent, the questioning of the instructor of record, respondent, and any witnesses by
10 panel members, and concluding statements by the instructor of record and respondent.
11

- 12 7) Hearings shall be conducted in accordance with the investigatory model of administrative
13 hearings, in which the AIP assumes responsibility for eliciting relevant evidence. The
14 purpose of the hearing is to establish the facts. The standard of proof for making a finding
15 of in violation will be the preponderance of evidence standard (i.e., based on the evidence
16 presented, it is more likely than not that a violation occurred). Where the AIP vote outcome
17 is tied, the preponderance of evidence standard has not been met and the AIP's decision is
18 that the respondent will be found not in violation.
19
- 20 8) Formal rules of evidence shall not be applicable in proceedings conducted pursuant to this
21 Code. The presiding officer shall have the discretion to admit all matters into evidence that
22 reasonable persons would accept as relevant.
23
- 24 9) Hearings will be recorded. These recordings will be retained as part of the record.
25
- 26 10) The Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities or the presiding officer may request the
27 attendance of witnesses upon request by any AIP member or of either party. Only witnesses
28 who can provide direct knowledge about the given case shall be called. Requests must be
29 approved by the Director. University students and employees are expected to comply with
30 such requests. Instructors of record and respondents shall be accorded an opportunity to
31 question those witnesses who participate for either party at the hearing. Failure of witnesses
32 to appear will not invalidate the proceedings.
33
- 34 11) Witnesses shall be asked to affirm that their statement is truthful. Any student, faculty, or
35 staff member who knowingly provides false information during this process will be referred
36 to Student Rights & Responsibilities, Human Resources, and/or the Office of the Provost as
37 appropriate for review and appropriate disposition.
38

39 In lieu of oral statements, authenticated written statements or other forms of participation
40 may be accepted at the discretion of the Director.
41

- 42 12) AIP's deliberation following the hearing shall occur in two stages: the determination
43 regarding responsibility and if applicable, recommendation of sanctions. To find a
44 respondent in violation of the Code, a majority of the voting AIP members must agree. If
45 the AIP finds a respondent in violation, they shall also make a sanctioning recommendation.
46 A sanction other than expulsion can be recommended by the affirmative vote of three-
47 quarters of the voting AIP members. In the event of a tie regarding sanctions other than
48 expulsion, the presiding officer casts the deciding vote. A sanction of expulsion can be
49 recommended only by an affirmative vote of all voting AIP members.
50
- 51 13) Reports of the AIP shall include a determination of the responsibility of the respondent. If
52 the respondent is found in violation, then the report will also include a recommendation of
53 sanctions. Sanctions will be recommended and determined in accordance with the relevant
54 sections of this Code. If an AIP determines that a respondent is in violation of the Code, the
55 report shall be forwarded to the dean of the school in which the academic integrity violation
56 occurred or a designee without a conflict of interest in the case, as determined by the dean.

57 If in the judgement of the dean or designee the sanction recommended by the AIP is a
58 significant deviation from the sanctions imposed in closely similar cases, the dean or
59 designee may revise the sanction before notifying the respondent of the determination and
60 sanction. The dean or designee may not modify or revise the AIP's determination of
61 responsibility. The instructor of record and department chair of the course shall receive a
62 copy of the determination and sanction.

- 63
- 64 14) These proceedings should be concluded as expeditiously as possible. The AIPs should
65 strive to have proceedings concluded within four weeks of the report of the violation.
66 However, failure to do so shall not constitute improper procedure under the Code.

67

68 **Section 5: Sanctions**

- 69 a) In each case, the following factors may be considered in determining an appropriate sanction:

- 70 1) the nature of the violation and the incident itself;
- 71
- 72 2) the significance of the assignment(s) in question to the academic course or program;
- 73
- 74 3) the impact or implications of the conduct on the University community and its learning
75 environments;
- 76
- 77 4) prior misconduct by the respondent, including the respondent's relevant prior academic
78 integrity or behavioral misconduct history or lack thereof, both at the University and
79 elsewhere;
- 80
- 81 5) maintenance of an environment conducive to the integrity of learning and knowledge;
- 82
- 83 6) protection of the University community;
- 84
- 85 7) necessary outcomes in order to eliminate the prohibited conduct, prevent its recurrence, and
86 remedy its effects on members of the University community; and,
- 87
- 88 8) any mitigating, aggravating, or compelling circumstances in order to reach a just and
89 appropriate resolution in each case, including the respondent's demonstration of the
90 understanding and impact of the violation.

- 91
- 92 b) Possible sanctions include, but are not limited to, the following:

- 93 1) educational sanctions intended to improve the respondent's understanding and
94 implementation of academic integrity. This may be assigned in combination with any other
95 sanction. If the respondent fails to complete these sanctions, a registration hold may be
96 placed on their student account.
- 97
- 98 2) reduction in academic credit for the assignment or course.
- 99
- 00 3) failure of assignment (generally recommended for first violation).
- 01
- 02 4) failure of course, including a transcript notation until graduation and successful petition for
03 removal (generally recommended for second violations or egregious first violations).
- 04
- 05 5) suspension from the University for a specified period of time, including a transcript
06 notation until seven years from the date of the incident and successful petition for

07 removal. Suspension may include requirements the student will need to complete in order to
08 return or upon return.

09
10 6) expulsion (permanent removal from the University), including a permanent transcript
11 notation.

12
13 c) Sanction recommendations of suspension or expulsion, as a result of academic integrity
14 violations, may be determined only by an AIP.

15
16 d) Transcript notations for failure of course or suspensions may be removed upon expiration of the
17 dates set forth above and only after successful petition of the respondent to the Provost or designee.

18
19 e) Records shall be maintained and released by the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities in
20 accordance with University policy and applicable law.

21
22 f) Following graduation or removal of transcript notation, whichever is later, the respondent's
23 record will be transferred to an administrative archive status and therefore become internal and
24 administrative (i.e. non-conduct) records. Such files are not part of general third-party releases,
25 even with authorization from the respondent. Such records may be released to third-parties upon
26 specific request of the respondent or as required by law. g) Respondents found in violation of this
27 Code may also be removed from or determined to be ineligible for certain University programs or
28 activities, in accordance with the policies, rules, or eligibility criteria of that program or activity.

29
30 h) No outcomes shall prohibit any program, department, college, or school of the University from
31 retaining records of violations and reporting violations as required by their professional
32 standards; the University may retain, for appropriate administrative purposes, records of all
proceedings regarding violations of this Code.

33
34 i) Sanctions assigned to a respondent found in violation of this Code may also have subsequent
35 ramifications upon their academic standing in an academic course or academic program in
36 accordance with the faculty member's syllabus or in the academic college, school, or
department regulations and bylaws.

37
38 **Section 6: Appeals**

39 (a) After a decision has been confirmed by the relevant dean or designee, the respondent may file a
40 written petition of appeal with the Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities within five (5)
41 business days of the outcome.

42
43 (b) Appeals of the decision of the AIP or of the sanction imposed by the relevant dean or designee
44 may be based only on the following grounds:

- 45
46 a. There was a material deviation from the procedures of this Code that affected the
47 outcome.
48 b. There is new and relevant information that was unavailable at the time of the proceeding,
49 with reasonable diligence and effort, that could materially affect the outcome

50
51 (c) Appeals will be reviewed by the Provost or a designee. The Provost or a designee will then
52 make a decision on the appeal, based on the appeal petition and the reports of the AIP and the
53 relevant dean or designee. The appeal decision of the Provost will typically be rendered and
54 provided to the instructor of record and the respondent within 10 business days of the appeal

55 materials being received by the Provost.

- 56
- 57 (d) The decision of the Provost or designee in connection with the appeal shall be final and
- 58 conclusive and no further appeals will be permitted. The dean of the respondent's home school
- 59 at the University shall also receive final notice of the case outcome.
- 60

61

62 **Article IV: Changes and Reports Regarding the Code of Academic Integrity**

63

64 **Section 1: Changes to the Code of Academic Integrity**

- 65 (a) Substantial changes to this Code shall be referred to or initiated by the Provost or designee. Changes
- 66 may also be initiated by either the Faculty Senate or the Student Association. Substantial changes must
- 67 be approved by a majority vote of both the Faculty Senate and the Student Association.
- 68 (b) The Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students shall coordinate with the Joint
- 69 Committee of Faculty and Students through the Provost to conduct a review of the Code of
- 70 Academic Integrity at least once every five years.
- 71 (c) Substantial changes will then be forwarded to the President of the University for confirmation
- 72 and submission to the Board of Trustees.
- 73

74 **Section 2: Reports and Reviews**

75 The Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students or designee shall make an annual report

76 on the work of the UICC to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees, Joint

77 Committee of Faculty and Students, the Faculty Senate Educational Policy and Technology

78 Committee, the Student Association Senate Academic Affairs Committee, and the Council of Deans.

79

80

81

82 *Approved [insert updated date]*