

University of Rochester College of Arts, Sciences and Engineering Academic Honesty Policy

Table of Contents

I. Introduction	1
II. Who is Covered under the Policy	2
III. Educating the College Community about Academic Honesty and the College Policy	2
IV. Honor Pledge	3
V. Violations of Academic Honesty	3
VI. Addressing Academic Honesty in the Classroom	7
VII. Board on Academic Honesty	7
VIII. Reporting Cases of Suspected Academic Dishonesty: General Guidelines	8
IX. Procedures for Reporting: Instructor Resolution Processes	10
X. Procedures for Reporting: Board Resolution Process	14
XI. Board on Academic Honesty Hearings	16
XII. Sanctioning Guidelines	20
XIII. Disposition of Cases	25
XIV. Appeals	26
XV. Confidentiality, Records, Internal and External Reporting, and Self-reporting by Students	27

I. Introduction

The students, faculty and administrators of the College comprise a community of scholars who are committed to the pursuit of excellence in learning, teaching, creativity and research. Academic honesty is the cornerstone upon which excellence in these endeavors is based, as it creates the necessary conditions of mutual trust and open communication that make intellectual inquiry and growth possible. The AS&E Academic Honesty Policy, in parallel to the College Statement of Communal Principles, recognizes our shared obligation to promote honesty and the related principles of respect and responsibility among all members of our institution. It establishes high standards of academic conduct, and requires that each individual meet those standards. All members of the College community further understand that adherence to our shared expectations for integrity requires not only clear communication about those expectations, but the individual and collective courage to uphold them.

Academic honesty means acting with truthfulness and sincerity in carrying out all aspects of our individual and collaborative work, maintaining ownership over our work and acknowledging our debt to the work of others.

Students can best meet their obligation to academic honesty by adhering to the Academic Honesty Policy in all academic matters. This includes completing their work through their own honest efforts and expecting and encouraging honesty among their peers.

Faculty members, course instructors, teaching assistants and staff have the responsibility to uphold the College policy, model integrity in their own practices and educate students about disciplinary standards.

Administrators have the obligation to model integrity through their leadership and to provide the resources necessary to promote best practices in teaching, learning, assessment, research and citizenship.

The specific policy measures that follow have been designed to promote a just and trustworthy community, and to ensure equity, clarity and consistency in our adjudication of all alleged academic dishonesty cases.

II. Who is Covered under the Policy

- A.** College of Arts, Sciences and Engineering undergraduate students.
- B.** College of Arts, Sciences and Engineering graduate students. Graduate students are covered by this policy, with the exception that this policy does not apply to misconduct in sponsored research.
- C.** Students who are matriculated in both Arts, Sciences and Engineering and one or more other University of Rochester divisions will have all suspected violations adjudicated under the Arts, Sciences and Engineering policy if their primary campus designation is Arts, Sciences and Engineering at the time of the suspected violation, regardless of the division in which the suspected violation occurred. Students who are matriculated in both Arts, Sciences and Engineering and one or more other University of Rochester divisions and whose primary campus designation is not Arts, Sciences and Engineering will be adjudicated under the policy of their primary campus at the time of the suspected violation, including suspected violations that occur in Arts, Sciences and Engineering.
- D.** All other students, matriculated or non-matriculated, who are enrolled in College courses.
- E.** College of Arts, Sciences and Engineering faculty members, course instructors, staff and teaching assistants in their role as educators.

III. Educating the College Community about Academic Honesty and the College Policy

- A.** Language expressing the central importance of academic honesty in the College will be included in student recruitment and admissions materials, and in the College's offer of admission letter.
- B.** Pre-enrollment communications with all incoming undergraduate and graduate students will include the Academic Honesty Policy and require students to sign off on their acceptance of the Policy prior to arrival on campus for orientation.
- C.** The orientation program for first-year and transfer students at the undergraduate level will include a discussion of the Academic Honesty Policy.
- D.** Departments will provide their incoming graduate students with an orientation to the policy.
- E.** Course-specific materials such as syllabi and websites will refer to the Academic Honesty Policy and how it applies to the class.
- F.** All new instructors of College undergraduate and graduate courses at all ranks and in all schools across the University and all new academic staff will receive an orientation to the Academic Honesty Policy through a combination of College-wide and departmental efforts.
- G.** The College will aim to provide regular updates on the Academic Honesty Policy to all instructors of College courses and academic staff.

H. The Dean of the College shall appoint a designated academic honesty liaison to provide confidential advising to students, faculty, and staff about the College honesty policy and to design and oversee the implementation of educational outreach measures described herein.

I. Other means of engaging the College community in awareness of academic honesty issues will be overseen by mechanisms established by the Deans of the College.

IV. Honor Pledge

The following Honor Pledge will be copied and signed by all students on all examinations: “I affirm that I will not give or receive any unauthorized help on this exam, and that all work will be my own.”

It is recommended that course instructors also require the following wording as a sign-off for other graded assignments:

“I affirm that I have not given or received any unauthorized help on this assignment, and that this work is my own.”

Suggested for group projects, to be signed by each group member:

“I accept responsibility for my role in ensuring the integrity of the work submitted by the group in which I participated.”

Note: Students are responsible for upholding the AS&E Academic Honesty Policy whether or not they are instructed to write and sign a pledge.

V. Violations of Academic Honesty

A. General Principles

In the academic work of students in the College, “the ability to rely on the truth of someone or something is a fundamental pillar of academic pursuit and a necessary foundation of academic work. Members of the academic community must be able to trust that work ... is not falsified and that standards are applied equitably” (International Center for Academic Integrity, *Fundamental Values* 2021). Dishonest behavior undermines the trust that is fundamental to academic enterprise—indeed, that is fundamental to how we build knowledge in and for society—and threatens the intellectual freedom upon which our community thrives.

There are many different forms of academic dishonesty (also referred to as honesty violations). The following list of honesty violations and their descriptions is not meant to be exhaustive. Rather, it provides examples of the most common kinds of unacceptable academic conduct by students. The policy also covers dishonest actions committed by students when the effects extend beyond the University and are judged to be prejudicial to the work or the reputation of the University.

Intent—or lack thereof—should never be taken into account when deciding whether or not an action or set of actions violated the honesty policy. However, fairness dictates that intent may be considered when proposing penalties (for individual instructors) or when applying sanctions (for hearing Boards).

Similarly, neither degrees of (in)experience nor extenuating circumstances should be taken into account when determining whether or not a student or students' behavior amounted to policy violation. Once the question of responsibility has been addressed, either or both *may* be considered when deliberating on what outcome(s) are in order. Ignorance of the policy does not excuse actions that violate its requirements.

Dishonest conduct that is detected after the end of a course, or after a student graduates or otherwise leaves the College, is subject to being reported and adjudicated under the Academic Honesty Policy. Assigned grades and earned degrees may be affected as a result of the decision made in such a case.

B. Violations

1) Receiving, Using or Having Access to Unauthorized Aid:

Using unauthorized notes or other study aids during an examination; using unauthorized technology during an examination; improper storage of prohibited notes, course materials and study aids during an exam such that they are accessible or possible to view; looking at other students' work during an exam or in an assignment where collaboration is not allowed; attempting to communicate with other students in order to get help during an exam or in an assignment where collaboration is not allowed; obtaining an examination prior to its administration; altering graded work and submitting it for re-grading; allowing another person to do one's work and submitting it as one's own; submitting work done in a class taken at the University of Rochester or at another school for credit in another class without the instructor's permission; submitting work done in a prior semester without the instructor's permission, when the student is retaking that course; obstructing or interfering with another student's academic work; undertaking any action that attempts to confer (whether carried through or not) or has the appearance of conferring (whether actually conferred or not) unfair advantage over other students.

2) Giving Unauthorized Aid:

Aiding another person in an act that violates the standards of academic honesty. Examples include allowing other students to look at one's own work during an exam or in an assignment where collaboration is not allowed; unauthorized editing or revising of another student's work; providing information, material, or assistance to another person in a form that is likely to be used in violation of course, departmental, or college academic honesty policies; failing to take reasonable measures to protect one's work from copying by others.

3) Plagiarism:

Broadly understood as the representation of another person's work as one's own, and/or the use of "... language, ideas, or other original (not common-knowledge) material without acknowledging its source" (Council of Writing Program Administrators, December 2019: http://wpacouncil.org/aws/CWPA/pt/sd/news_article/272555/PARENT/layout_details/false).

The reuse of an idea or phrase, or the borrowing of significant influence or contribution(s) from a written, spoken, visual source or a technology (such as text-generative tools or translation software) should be clearly and transparently signaled at the place of use in a work for which the student claims authorship. Expectations to signal contributions from other people, sources, or technologies apply whether the sources themselves or the students' work appears in written, spoken, visual, or in some other form. When students submit assignments that build on their own previous work, the expectation

remains that they will signal how much of the work is original to the current assignment and how much is drawn from past assignments.

Attribution specifics—how, where, and when to appropriately signal contributions from other people, sources, or technologies—vary according to discipline, field, or mode of communication. It remains each student’s individual responsibility to ensure that their instructors and other audiences know, at any point while reading or grading the student’s work, which words and idea(s) belong to that student and which originated from other people, sources, or technologies (including the student’s own previous work).

Act(s) of plagiarism or misattribution of source material will therefore reflect a range of seriousness and a range of intent (or lack thereof). Some examples include, but are not limited to, the following:

- misrepresentation of source material used in a work for which the student claims authorship, as in (1) failing to signal the extent to which sources have influenced the overall organizational structure of a student’s work, or (2) starting from paragraphs and sentence patterns devised by another person or AI technology then making superficial, word-by-word line edits to incorporate synonyms selected by the student;
- treating as common knowledge material that which an instructor expects to be cited, including but not limited to personal communication, information delivered in face-to-face or online lectures, overreliance on language from course material (assignment instructions, essay prompts, and so on), or overreliance on material generated by AI tools (Grammarly, ChatGPT, DALL-E, translation software, or similar);
- submission of work such as laboratory reports, computer programs or coding, journals, reflections, or other types of papers, which have been copied from work done by other students, either in whole or in part, with or without these students’ knowledge or consent;
- submission of work such as laboratory reports, computer programs or coding, journals, reflections, or other types of papers, which have been copied from comments made by instructors or instructor-created materials; as when a student includes parts of a group project or borrows from assignment instructions to create professional profiles via online platforms like Github, without having obtained written permission to do so in advance;
- submission of work that duplicates or substantially borrows from assignments the student has turned in previously, earlier in the same semester *or* previous semesters, if an instructor stated or could reasonably have been assumed to expect original work (known as double submission or “self-plagiarism,” this will vary in severity depending on the context of a course or assignment);
- use of papers and projects that are purchased or otherwise bartered for, then turned in as the student’s own original work (known as “contract cheating,” this is always taken very seriously).

Students can avoid the suspicion of plagiarism (i.e., misattribution of source material or technologies) in written papers, oral presentations, and other coursework by clearly and transparently indicating the source of any idea, wording, or visual reference they did not produce themselves, either in footnotes or within the paper, presentation, or other work. Indication may be given in a list of references (a works

cited page or bibliography), or through some other form of attribution relevant to the genre, discipline, or professional setting, as expected/agreed upon by the instructor(s) who assign and assess the work. Credit to source material or source technologies (DALL-E, ChatGPT, or similar) must be given regardless of whether the idea, phrase or other material is quoted directly, or whether a student subsequently paraphrases or summarizes into their own words. In addition to any and all other citation information required (e.g., page numbers), verbatim quotes must *always* be placed in quotation marks.

4) Misconduct in Group Projects:

Failure to carry out the work in adherence with the academic honesty guidelines and expectations established by the course instructor.

5) Fabrication and Falsification:

Falsifying or inventing any information, citation, text or data; using improper methods of collecting or generating data and presenting them as legitimate; misrepresenting one's qualifications or one's status in the University, as in an application for a fellowship or employment on campus or externally.

Forging signatures or falsifying information on official documents for the purpose of academic gain. Examples include: drop/add forms, incomplete forms, petitions, letters of permission, applications for positions or awards in the College, course attendance sheets, email communications and physician's notes.

6) Denying Others Access to Information or Material:

Any act that deliberately hinders the use of or access to library or course materials. Examples include: the removal of pages from books or journals or reserve materials; the removal of books from libraries without formally checking out the items; the intentional hiding of library materials; the refusal to return reserve readings to the library.

7) Unauthorized Recording, Distribution or Publication of Course-Related Materials:

Students may not audio or video record class lectures or other classroom or laboratory activities without the instructor's permission.

The sharing of course materials on an individual level for educational purposes (e.g., working with groups or with a tutor) is permitted, provided that it has not been prohibited by the instructor. Students may not publish, distribute, or sell--electronically or otherwise--any course materials that the instructor has developed in any course of instruction in the University (e.g., presentation slides, lecture aids, video or audio recordings of lectures, and exams) without the explicit permission of the instructor. The sharing or distribution of course materials for purposes of giving or gaining unfair advantage in a course is prohibited. Students must further respect the requirements of copyright protection for materials that are made available for instructional purposes.

8) Misuse of a Student's Username and Password:

The username given to students and the password that they set authorize student access to course materials through Blackboard or other password-protected sites. Students are responsible for protecting

their access to these materials, many of which are copyrighted. It is a violation of the University Information Technology Policy and the Academic Honesty Policy to allow unauthorized access to protected materials by the sharing of any usernames and passwords.

9) Impeding the Investigation or Conduct of Any Board on Academic Honesty Matter:

Providing false information, including false alibis, to any member of the Board on Academic Honesty (hereafter also called the Board).

Providing false testimony during a hearing.

Causing or requesting another person to provide a false alibi or other false information in connection with a Board matter.

VI. Addressing Academic Honesty in the Classroom

A. Course-specific Academic Honesty Statement

Because academic honesty is of vital concern to the College and because each discipline may have its own specific expectations and protocols, all course instructors must include an academic honesty statement on each course syllabus or on the course Blackboard page or website indicating any unique way(s) in which the policy applies in the course. This may take several forms, e.g., an appended set of guidelines formulated by the instructor or by the department, the address of a website that contains this information, a course-specific statement linked to an “Academic Honesty” button on Blackboard or, at minimum, simply a link to the policy. During the first two weeks of class, the course instructor must call attention to this information during at least one class session.

B. Assignment-specific Requirements

In addition, course instructors should make any discipline-specific or otherwise unique expectations and guidelines for academic honesty clear for each assignment given. This assignment-specific orientation may be conveyed in written or oral form early in the semester, or it may occur throughout the semester as assignments are given. The academic procedures that vary from discipline to discipline, such as proper and improper forms of academic collaboration and citation, demand particular attention on a course-by-course basis.

VII. Board on Academic Honesty

A. Purpose

The Board on Academic Honesty exists to hear and adjudicate cases of alleged academic dishonesty brought by any member of the College teaching, administrative or support staff against any student, matriculated or non-matriculated, who is or was enrolled in College courses.

B. Composition and Selection of the Board

1) The Board on Academic Honesty is composed of a Chair, at least eleven faculty members, at least eleven undergraduate students, and at least two graduate students.

2) The Chair of the Board is a tenured faculty member selected by the Dean of the College from among faculty members who have previously served on the Board or are current Board members. The length of the Chair's term is four years, and is renewable.

3) Faculty members of the Board on Academic Honesty are selected and invited by the Dean of the College from among full-time faculty (tenured, pre-tenure and non tenure-track). The Dean may consult with the Chair of the Board on Academic Honesty, the Arts, Sciences and Engineering (AS&E) Dean of Graduate Studies, department chairs and others as appropriate. Members serve for four-year terms, and may be reappointed once for a second continuous term. Terms will be staggered in order to achieve a balanced mix of new and experienced members each year. In the case of the early resignation by a member, the person appointed to replace that position will serve out the remainder of the term and may then be appointed for a full term, with the possibility of reappointment for a second full term. The faculty cohort on the Board will represent all of the disciplines in the College: humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, and engineering.

4) The process for selecting undergraduate student representatives shall be decided and conducted by the Center for Student Conflict Management in collaboration with the All-Campus Judicial Council.

5) At least two graduate students are selected by the AS&E Dean of Graduate Studies, who may consult with the President of the Graduate Students Association and others as appropriate. Graduate student members serve for two-year terms, with at least one new member per year joining the Board.

C. Training

All Board members will undergo uniform training on the policy, hearing procedures and proper conduct of hearings on an annual basis

D. Responsibilities of Chair and Board Members

1) Responsibilities of the Chair:

Participate in the selection of faculty members of the Board on Academic Honesty; serve as a resource for faculty, staff, students and parents in Board matters; oversee training of new and continuing Board members, as well as all aspects of the work of the Board; supervise the work of the Board Secretary; carry out other tasks specified in the Policy.

2) Responsibilities of All Board Members:

Faculty and student members of the Board on Academic Honesty will share as equally as possible in service on the Hearing Boards that are scheduled throughout the year. Board members are expected to be available to participate in hearings on the days and times established by the Chair and the Board Secretary.

VIII. Reporting Cases of Suspected Academic Dishonesty: General Guidelines

A. Requirement to Report

1) The "College Faculty Rules and Regulations" require that all cases of suspected academic dishonesty be reported to the Board on Academic Honesty through one of the Instructor Resolution processes or the Board Resolution process. Course instructors may not come to a private agreement with a student in

a case of suspected academic dishonesty. Course instructors may not ask or allow a student to drop or withdraw from a course, or impose a penalty of any kind on a student through any means that fall outside of the procedures for reporting cases outlined below.

The one exception is when an instructor, after meeting with a student about a suspected violation, is convinced that no violation was committed. In this situation, the case no longer counts as a suspected violation and does not need to be reported.

2) When a course instructor becomes aware of an incident of suspected academic dishonesty committed in a course they are teaching, s/he should contact the academic honesty liaison. Course instructors who have had experience with submitting similar cases in the past may proceed directly with the Instructor or Board Resolution process. Any reporting person always has the option of contacting the Chair of the Board at any point in the process with questions or for assistance in understanding and complying with our procedures.

3) Exam proctors (students, course instructors or staff members) who observe suspicious behavior during a quiz or exam, and teaching assistants who detect evidence of dishonest behavior in an assignment that they are grading must speak with the course instructor. They must provide a written report and all pertinent documentation to the instructor. The instructor must then follow established procedures for reporting the case.

Originals of exams, lab reports, essays, homework or other written, electronic, recorded or visual work must be retained by the course instructor to submit with the case, and should not be returned to the student or students in question. In the case of suspected dishonesty during an oral presentation, the student's electronic presentation and/or handouts should be retained by the instructor.

4) Some violations are not related to a specific course and incidents of suspected academic dishonesty will not always or exclusively be detected by course instructors, as in the following situations:

a. If false information is given by a student in communications with any member of the Board on Academic Honesty, that member should alert the Chair of the Board, who will write up and submit the case on behalf of the Board using the Board Resolution process.

b. With the exception of students who are serving as exam proctors or teaching assistants, students are not required to report, but they have several avenues for voluntarily reporting suspected academic dishonesty:

- i. They may report an incident to the course instructor if the incident involves coursework.
- ii. They may contact the Chair of the Board with information about an incident of suspected policy violation (through in-person meeting, phone call, email, or use of the 'Academic Honesty Concern Report'; reporting persons may request their names be kept private, but anonymous reports cannot be acted upon).
- iii. They can also always contact the academic honesty liaison for confidential, impartial, non-binding advice about how to proceed.

c. Administrative, academic and support staff members in AS&E are strongly encouraged to report potential violation(s) to the relevant course instructor if they learn about an incident that involves coursework. They are *required* to report when they suspect a policy violation is practiced against them

(e.g., their signature falsified, their permission to add/drop a course misrepresented, or something similar), and must contact the Chair of the Board to report any such violations. As with faculty and students, staff can always contact the academic honesty liaison for confidential advice in these kinds of situations.

B. Notification of Board Actions

All notices of all kinds that must be sent to students and/or reporting persons will be sent by email to their University of Rochester email account. The Board on Academic Honesty Decision Letter resulting from a hearing will also be sent to the student's CMC. In the case of a student who is on suspension or is no longer enrolled in the College, the notification will be sent to the most current email address on file, if one is available, and mailed in hard copy form to the most current permanent address that is on file with the College.

IX. Procedures for Reporting: Instructor Resolution Processes

A. Instructor Resolution Warning Letter: Undergraduate Students Only

1) Purpose and Limitations:

a. If improper academic conduct committed by an **undergraduate** student is judged to be minor and resulting from inexperience, the Warning Letter procedure may be followed at the instructor's discretion. Consultation with the Director of Academic Honesty/Academic Honesty Liaison or the Chair of the Board prior to meeting with the student is strongly recommended.

b. The Warning Letter resolution may only be used to settle incidents that fall into the category of "Minor Violations" as described in Section XII, "Sanctioning Guidelines." They pertain for the most part to coursework, and therefore are usually handled by course instructors. The determination of a student's relative experience or inexperience in the type of assignment or course in which the incident occurred will be made by the instructor upon speaking with the student. The Warning Letter may not be used in cases involving graduate students.

c. The Warning Letter option recognizes that the incident is best addressed as an educational opportunity. It is never required that a suspected incident be handled through the Warning Letter resolution. It is an available option to be used at the instructor's discretion.

2) Process:

a. The instructor becomes aware of evidence of improper academic conduct and determines if the allegation has merit and is minor. That person will write up the incident using the Warning Letter template in consultation with either the academic honesty liaison or Chair of the Board and will contact the student to set up a meeting. They will meet in a confidential setting to discuss the allegation and show the evidence. The student will have a chance to respond to the allegation by asking questions about the evidence and/or providing an explanation to demonstrate that s/he is not responsible for the alleged improper conduct.

b. If the instructor is convinced that no improper conduct occurred, no further action is required, as stated above (Section VIII.A).

c. If the instructor is convinced that improper academic conduct was committed, the student will have 48 hours to accept responsibility and sign the Warning Letter or decline to do so, unless circumstances justify giving the student additional time. This waiting period must be offered and the student must be referred to the Academic Honesty Policy, but a student is permitted to sign the Letter or decline to sign at the time of the meeting. The waiting period can be extended, but should not exceed two weeks without consultation with the Board Chair.

d. If the student accepts responsibility, the signed Warning Letter will be submitted by the instructor in hard copy or electronically to the Board Secretary, who will request that a "C" hold (confidential hold) be placed on the student's record, as transcripts may not be sent out until the case is fully resolved. The letter will specify either a rewrite of the work in question or an alternative equivalent assignment to be completed for educational purposes, but not for credit or a grade.

If a review of Board records reveals no prior finding of responsibility, the Chair of the Board will review the letter and either approve the resolution or contact the instructor for a modification. If a modification is needed, the Chair will then contact the student with the modification agreed to by the instructor and the Chair, and at that time, the student may accept the modification, or withdraw their original acceptance of responsibility and go to a hearing.

Final approval must be granted by the Chair. The approval process will take place within a week of receipt of the Letter, unless the Chair is temporarily unavailable to review it.

Upon notification of approval of the Letter (as above, Section VIII.B), the instructor will assign a grade to the assignment as originally submitted, discounting the parts under question as appropriate. The student must complete a required academic honesty tutorial. The "C" hold will remain in place on the student's record until the Board Secretary has received confirmation that the student has completed the assigned tutorial.

In the case of a violation that is not connected to a course, the "C" hold will remain in place until the Secretary has received confirmation that the student has completed the assigned tutorial.

e. A Warning Letter does not affect the student's option to drop, withdraw or declare the S/F grading option as permitted under College rules. If a student drops or withdraws from the course in question, the "C" hold will remain on their record until the academic honesty tutorial has been completed.

f. If the student declines to sign the Letter, the incident must be reported using the Board Resolution process (Section X).

g. If the Letter is the first academic dishonesty report of any kind submitted for the student, it will open a Board on Academic Honesty file on that student.

h. If a student with a prior finding of academic dishonesty on file is reported again by either of the Instructor Resolution processes, a hearing must be held and the reporting person will be asked to complete a Board Resolution Form (Section X). The Warning Letter on file will be taken into account when determining a sanction for a subsequent finding of responsibility for academic dishonesty and may result in a more severe penalty than is typical for a first offense in light of the educational measures that have been offered.

B. Instructor Resolution with Penalty: Undergraduate students

1) Purpose and Limitations:

The Instructor Resolution with Penalty process is appropriate for many cases involving undergraduate students. However, instructors using this process may not assign XE or XF grades (see Section XII.D.1), nor impose suspension or expulsion, nor impose sanctions listed under Academic Disciplinary Probation. These are reserved for Board actions based on a hearing. The reporting person (r.p.), that is, the person who completes and submits the form, will most often be a course instructor, but may also be a University staff member or administrator. The reporting person will never be a student.

2) Process:

a. The reporting person becomes aware of evidence of dishonesty and determines if the allegation merits further investigation. That person will fill out the Instructor Resolution with Penalty Form. S/he should consult with the academic honesty liaison or at a minimum review Section XII, "Sanctioning Guidelines" before offering a penalty to the student.

b. The r.p. will meet with the student in a confidential setting to explain the allegation and show the evidence. If more than one student is involved, individual meetings are required. The student will have the opportunity to respond to the allegation by asking questions about the evidence and/or providing an explanation to demonstrate that s/he is not responsible for the alleged violation.

c. If the r.p. is convinced that no violation was committed, no further action is required, as stated above (Section VIII.A.1).

d. If the r.p. is convinced that a violation was committed, the student will have 48 hours to accept responsibility and sign the Form or decline to do so, unless circumstances justify giving the student additional time. This waiting period must be offered and the student must be referred to the Academic Honesty Policy, but a student is permitted to sign the Letter or decline to sign at the time of the meeting. The waiting period should not exceed two weeks without consultation with the Board Chair.

d.1) If the student accepts responsibility the signed Instructor Resolution with Penalty Form will be submitted by the instructor in hard copy or electronically to the Board Secretary, who will request that a "C" hold (confidential hold) be placed on the student's records, as transcripts may not be sent out until the case is fully resolved.

If a review of Board records reveals no prior finding of responsibility, the Chair will review the Form and either approve it or contact the course instructor to discuss any needed modification. If they agree that any change should be made, the Chair will work with the student to modify the Form. At this point in the process, the student may choose to have a hearing before the Board rather than accept the modified penalty. Final approval must be granted by the Chair before any penalty can be applied. The approval process will take place within a week of receipt of the Form, unless the Chair is temporarily unavailable to review it. Students and reporting persons will be notified as above (Section VIII.B).

Students may not drop, or withdraw from, or choose the S/F grading option for the course during this process or when an Instructor Resolution with Penalty Form has been signed and filed. If the student

drops or withdraws, s/he will be reinstated in the course. The S/F option will be rescinded whether declared prior to or after the violation.

The student must complete a required academic honesty tutorial. The "C" hold will remain in place on the student's record until two conditions are met: The student's semester grade has been submitted by the course instructor; and the Board Secretary has received confirmation that the student has completed the assigned tutorial.

In the case of a violation that is not connected to a course, the "C" hold will remain in place until the Secretary has received confirmation that the student has completed the assigned tutorial.

d.2. If the student signs the form and is found to have a prior responsible finding, the reporting person will be informed of the need to complete and submit a Board Resolution Form, and the student will be informed of the need to appear at a Board hearing for adjudication of the case (as above, Section VIII.B).

Students may not drop, or withdraw from, or choose the S/F grading option for the course during this process or when a Board Resolution Form has been filed. If the student drops or withdraws, s/he will be reinstated in the course. The S/F option will be rescinded whether declared prior to or after the violation.

d.3. If the student does not accept responsibility and declines to sign the form, the reporting person will submit the case on a Board Resolution form (Section X).

C. Instructor Resolution with Penalty: Graduate Students

Course instructors and other reporting persons (r.p.s) may offer Instructor Resolution with Penalty to graduate students, following processes described above for undergraduates, after required consultations with both the Chair of the Board on Academic Honesty (who will check for prior violations) and the AS&E Dean of Graduate Education and Postdoctoral Affairs (who will help determine the appropriate penalty to offer in accordance with Section XII "Sanctioning Guidelines"). Only first reports at graduate level are eligible for resolution through IRWP—as with undergraduate students, all second and subsequent reports for graduate students must be resolved with a Board hearing.

If the student accepts responsibility, the signed Instructor Resolution with Penalty form will be submitted by the reporting person in hard copy or electronic form to the Board Secretary. A "C" hold is placed on the student's records by the AS&E Graduate Studies Office, as transcripts may not be sent out until the case is fully resolved.

The student must complete a required academic honesty tutorial. The "C" hold will remain in place until two conditions are met: The student's semester grade has been submitted by the course instructor; and the Board Secretary has received confirmation that the student has completed the assigned tutorial.

In the case of a violation that is not connected to a course, the "C" hold will remain in place until the Secretary has received confirmation that the student has completed the assigned tutorial.

If the student declines to accept the Instructor Resolution, then the case will go to a hearing before a Board on which the two student members are graduate students.

X. Procedures for Reporting: Board Resolution Process

A. Purpose

1) The Board Resolution process is used to adjudicate cases under four (4) circumstances:

- a. A course instructor chooses to refer the matter directly to the Board.
- b. The reporting (r.p.) person is not a course instructor and/or there is no course-based penalty that could be applied.
- c. The student declines to accept responsibility and/or the proposed sanction(s) when the Warning Letter (for undergraduates) or the Instructor Resolution with Penalty (for undergraduates or graduate students) has been offered.
- d. A review of the Board's database reveals a prior finding or findings of responsibility for academic dishonesty when a Warning Letter (undergraduates) or an Instructor Resolution with Penalty (undergraduates or graduate students) has been received.

2) Under limited circumstances (e.g., only with first reports and only for those who were not offered a Warning Letter or an Instructor Resolution with Penalty), *undergraduate* students who were initially reported via Board resolution may request that their case be resolved via Chair's resolution.

- a. Similar to instructor resolution, signing a Chair's resolution ultimately entails accepting responsibility for action(s) that violate policy and agreeing to sanction(s), except in Chair's resolution all sanctions will be proposed by and/or negotiated directly with the Board Chair.
- b. For further information about rights, responsibilities, and what the Chair's resolution process entails, refer to Section X.D, "Preparing for the Hearing," below.

B. Process: Submission of Form and Immediate Actions

1) The reporting person completes a Board Resolution Form and submits it with all pertinent documentation in hard copy or electronically to the Board Secretary. The r.p. may choose to notify the student that s/he has taken this action, but is not required to do so. The r.p. should retain a copy of all materials submitted.

2) Receipt of a Board Resolution Form triggers several actions:

- a. For undergraduate students The Board Secretary will request that a "C" hold (confidential hold) be placed on the student's records, as transcripts may not be sent out until the case is fully resolved.
- b. For graduate students: A "C" hold is placed on the graduate student's records by the AS&E Graduate Studies Office as transcripts may not be sent out until the case is fully resolved.

For all students: The "C" hold will remain in place until two conditions are met: The student's semester grade has been submitted by the course instructor; and the Board Secretary has received confirmation that the student has completed the assigned tutorial.

In the case of a violation that is not connected to a course, the C-hold will remain in place until the Secretary has received confirmation that the student has completed the assigned tutorial.

c. The student (undergraduate or graduate) is notified of the receipt of the Form and the need for a hearing to resolve the case (as above, Section VIII.B).

d. With the notification, the student will be directed to review the Board on Academic Honesty website and will be informed of the availability of consultation with the academic honesty liaison.

e. Students may not drop, or withdraw from, or choose the S/F grading option for the course during this process or when an Instructor Resolution with Penalty Form has been signed and filed. If the student drops or withdraws, s/he will be reinstated in the course. The S/F option will be rescinded whether declared prior to or after the violation.

f. The Chair of the Board on Academic Honesty will review the Form and the other materials submitted within one week of receipt, and will contact the reporting person if any additional materials are required to complete the case file or if any clarification of the report or the evidence is needed.

g. In undergraduate cases, once a reporting person has submitted a board resolution form, the reporting person may submit additional evidence that confirms or challenges their original suspicion(s). However, the reporting person may not retract the form unless the Chair of the Board on Academic Honesty and the reporting person both approve the substitution of a signed Instructor Resolution Warning Letter or signed Instructor Resolution with Penalty (or if this is the student's first time being reported, a Chair's Resolution). Only the Dean of the College, acting upon the joint recommendation of both the reporting person and the Board Chair, may retract a board resolution form without substituting a signed Instructor Resolution Warning Letter, signed Instructor Resolution with Penalty, or (if this is the student's first time being reported and circumstances permit) a signed Chair's Resolution.

h. In graduate cases also, once a reporting person has submitted a board resolution form, the reporting person may submit additional confirming or challenging evidence. The r.p. may not retract the board form unless the AS&E GEPA Dean and the r.p. both approve the substitution of a signed Instructor Resolution with Penalty Form. Only the University Provost, upon the joint recommendation of both the r.p. and the AS&E GEPA Dean, may retract a board resolution without substituting a signed Instructor Resolution with Penalty. As described in Section IX, cases involving graduate students are never eligible for resolution via Warning Letter.

C. Scheduling Hearings

1) A hearing will generally be held within one month of the receipt of the Form, except when College recesses, the summer break or an excess number of cases to be heard make it impossible to schedule a hearing within the one-month time frame.

2) Hearings will be scheduled with knowledge of the student's class schedule and will not be scheduled during class hours. A student's employment or extracurricular activities schedule will not be taken into account.

3) The student will be notified of the hearing date, time and location as specified above at least five business days in advance of the hearing.

D. Preparing for the Hearing

- 1) The student is permitted to review the case file by making an appointment with the Board Secretary. In order to protect the confidentiality of Board documents, the student must review the file in the College Deans' Office and is not permitted to photocopy, photograph or otherwise reproduce the documents contained in the file, although s/he may take notes on the contents of the file to assist in formulating a response to the allegation. A student may invite one person to accompany him or her to review the file, but such person may not photograph, photocopy or otherwise reproduce the case documents.
- 2) The student may submit a written response to the allegation for distribution to the Board in advance of the hearing, but this is not required. The student may seek advice from the academic honesty liaison in writing a response.
- 3) Members of the Hearing Board will have access to the case file in electronic form at least five business days in advance of the hearing.
- 4) The Presiding Officer of the Hearing Board will contact the reporting person once prior to the hearing.
- 5) Cases reported after students have left campus at the end of the Fall semester will be heard no later than in the first four weeks of the Spring term. Cases reported after students have left campus at the end of the Spring semester will be heard no later than in the first four weeks of the following Fall term.
- 6) Eligible students who wish to accept responsibility for the reported infraction(s) without going to a full Board hearing should indicate interest in filing a Chair's Resolution with Penalty by contacting the Chair of the Board on Academic Honesty. Students may indicate this interest before or after viewing their case file, but must do so at least 48 hours before their hearing is set to take place.
- 7) Upon receiving this email, the Board Chair will schedule a meeting with the student to discuss accepting responsibility for the alleged infraction(s) and to agree upon a penalty or penalties proposed in accordance with the Sanctioning Guidelines (see section XII).
- 8) Once penalties have been formally proposed, the student will have 48 hours to consider signing a Chair's Resolution with Penalty form. As is also true of Instructor Resolution, this window may (but does not have to) be extended at the Chair's discretion.
- 9) Signing a Chair's Resolution indicates acceptance of responsibility as well as agreement with the proposed penalties. By signing the form, a student forfeits their right to appeal either the finding of responsibility or the penalties involved. As is also true of Instructor Resolution, students are encouraged to consult the Academic Honesty Liaison while considering whether to sign the Chair's Resolution form.

XI. Board on Academic Honesty Hearings

A. Who Attends a Hearing

- 1) The student who has been reported via a Board Resolution Form is expected to attend the hearing. If the student does not attend, the Hearing Board may proceed to deliberate, reach a determination of responsibility and assign a penalty, or decide to exonerate the student in the student's absence.

2) The student has the right to bring one community member (University of Rochester faculty, administrator, student or staff member) to the hearing for moral support and advice during the hearing. This community member must not be acting as attorney for the student.

3) The hearing board will consist of two faculty members and two student members of the Board. At a hearing for an undergraduate student, the student Board members will be undergraduate students—unless scheduling conflicts that would cause unacceptable delay preclude an undergraduate board member from serving.

a. Under exceptional circumstances (**e.g., unavoidable scheduling conflicts or conflicts of interest**), trained graduate students may substitute for one (1) or both undergraduate board members. At a hearing for a graduate student, student Board members must be graduate students.

b. Ordinarily, a hearing may not be held without all four members present, whether in person or over Zoom. The role of the Board Chair is to oversee the hearing process, being available to review process and cast tie-breaking votes if needed. In cases where a scheduling conflict would cause unacceptable delay, the Chair may substitute for one (1) of the designated faculty Board members or may select an appropriate proxy (**e.g., a Deputy Chair or Associate Dean**) to serve instead.

c. If the scheduling conflict that occurs is with a student Board member, hearings may proceed with two faculty members and one student *as long as a reported student gives their consent*; however, a reported student will always have the option to reschedule the hearing for a later date. Hearings may not proceed with fewer than two (2) faculty Board members; in general, three-member hearing boards should be the exception and not the rule.

One faculty member of the Hearing Board will be designated in advance to serve as the Presiding Officer with the role of reading the opening and closing statements, determining if a line of questioning is appropriate, moderating the post-hearing deliberations, counting ballots when votes are taken, and drafting the decision letter. The Presiding Officer will have a vote, but their vote shall not outweigh that of any other Hearing Board member; ties in voting will be broken by the Board Chair after a thorough review of case file/hearing records. If the Board Chair has substituted for one of the two faculty Board members due to scheduling conflicts, they may designate an appropriate proxy to review the case and break the tie.

4) The reporting person for the case will not be present at the hearing, but s/he must be available by telephone to answer questions during the hearing except under circumstances pre-approved by the Chair of the Board on Academic Honesty.

B. Hearing Procedures

1) Board on Academic Honesty hearings will be held in a quiet, confidential setting.

2) All hearings will be recorded, but not transcribed. The recording will be limited to the introductions of those attending the hearing, the opening statement made by the Presiding Officer, the student's statement, the question period and the closing of the hearing. Any Board deliberations during the hearing when the student is excused from the room and the final deliberations of the Board will not be recorded. The recordings will be kept confidential and will be used only by the Hearing Board during deliberations, by the Board Chair or designated proxy in case of a tie-breaking vote, or by administrators

with a need to know. Recordings will be maintained for a period of seven years after the date of the hearing, then they will be destroyed.

3) Every student who is suspected of academic dishonesty will be given an individual hearing; two or more students will never be heard together.

4) The following rules governing the hearing process are intended to provide consistency across hearings, and are meant to permit the student and the Hearing Board to come to as clear and complete an understanding of evidence in the case as possible. Civil or criminal court procedures are not applicable.

a. The Presiding Officer will open the hearing by having all individuals present introduce themselves. Then they will read an opening statement that outlines the hearing process.

b. Next the student will be asked to make a statement addressing the allegation and the evidence contained in the case file. The student may read a prepared statement, speak extemporaneously, or present a combination of the two.

c. After the student has finished the statement, the Hearing Board will ask questions of the student. These questions may pertain not only to the case under consideration, but also to the student's academic experience in other courses as it may be relevant to the alleged violation. The Presiding Officer may excuse the student from answering a question that they consider too leading, irrelevant, or otherwise not pertinent to the proceeding.

d. If any member of the Hearing Board wishes to ask the reporting person a question, s/he will write down their question and notify the Presiding Officer, who will determine if it is advisable to contact the reporting person by phone. If a Hearing Board member wishes to consult with other members about a more extensive matter than a single question for the reporting person, the Presiding Officer may excuse a reported student and their person of support (if applicable) from the room (and/or the virtual hearing) during consultation. A call will be placed on speaker phone to the reporting person once the student has returned to the room. Any questions posed to him or her and the answers given will be heard by the student and the Hearing Board. If the student wishes to ask a question of the reporting person, the student must address the question directly to the Presiding Officer, who will determine the question's relevance. If deemed relevant, the Presiding Officer will pose the question to the reporting person on behalf of the Board. The reporting person and the student should never engage in a direct exchange of questions or comments.

e. When the Hearing Board agrees by informal consensus that they have no further questions to ask a reporting person, the phone call will be terminated. Follow-up calls by the Hearing Board will be permitted, provided that the procedures in (d) above are followed.

f. When the question period is concluded, the student will be invited to make a final statement, but is not required to do so. The Board will have an opportunity to respond to a student's closing statement. When the student is finished speaking and Board responses are complete, the Presiding Officer will read a closing statement that outlines next steps and explains the confidentiality of our hearings and decisions. At that time, all except the Hearing Board members will be excused from the room.

C. Deliberations and Decision

1) The Hearing Board will deliberate on all of the evidence presented and may review the recording as needed. When Board members determine by informal consensus that their deliberations are complete, the Presiding Officer will conduct a vote using secret ballots to find the student responsible or not responsible for a violation of academic honesty. Ordinarily, this decision will be reached by majority vote. In cases where initial voting results in a tie, at their discretion, the Presiding Officer may exercise one of two options: they may request additional discussion and deliberation among the members of the Board, or they may suspend proceedings so the Board Chair (or designated proxy) can review the case file/hearing recording and cast a tie-breaking vote.

2) The standard of proof is preponderance of evidence, that is, if it is more likely than not that a student acted (or failed to act) in a way that amounts to either a warning letter or a policy violation.

3) If a student is found not responsible for either a warning letter or a policy violation (either by vote of original hearing board members or by vote that includes a tie-breaker cast by the Chair or appropriate proxy), no further information is revealed and the case is ended.

4) If the student is found responsible for either a warning letter or a policy violation (either by vote of the original hearing board members and/or by vote that includes a tie-breaking vote cast by the Board Chair or designated proxy), the Presiding Officer will open an envelope provided by the Board Secretary to see if the student has any prior violations or warning letters in their confidential Board record.

a. If the student has a prior violation or warning letter, the current hearing board must issue a finding for policy violation (*misconduct*) in the current case—as students may not be found responsible for warning letter behavior (i.e., an educational issue or failure to meet policy expectations through oversight) more than once.

b. The current Hearing Board will have the opportunity to review the file from any prior case(s) if they determine this information necessary for deliberation or for selecting appropriate sanction(s) in the current case. The Hearing Board will determine a sanction, consulting with the Chair of the Board as needed regarding fair interpretation of Sanctioning Guidelines as well as consistency with Board precedent.

c. While Board members should have substantial input in the process, both individually and collectively, it is ultimately up to the Chair's discretion to approve sanctions (because it is the Chair's duty to oversee fair and consistent application of policy). If the Board Chair has substituted for one of the two faculty Board members and voted as to responsibility, it is recommended (not formally required) for the Chair to seek the advice of an outside proxy such as the Deputy Chair in selecting appropriate sanction(s).

5) If the final vote is tied at the hearing for an undergraduate student, the Chair will be informed immediately and they will cast the deciding vote at their earliest opportunity, after reviewing the case file and (as needed) the hearing recording. If a responsible finding is reached, the Hearing Board will reconvene to determine a sanction (with the option to include the Chair during their deliberations as needed). Board members may reconvene over email; at Chair's discretion (e.g., in cases where the Board members are at an impasse), they may be required to reconvene on Zoom or in person.

If the final vote is tied at the hearing for a graduate student, the AS&E GEPA Dean will be informed immediately and they will cast the deciding vote after reviewing the case file and (as needed) the hearing recording. If a responsible finding is reached, the Hearing Board will reconvene to determine a

sanction (with the option to include the AS&E GEPA Dean during deliberations as needed). As with undergraduate hearings, Board members may be asked to reconvene over email, via Zoom, or in person (at the Dean's discretion).

This concludes the hearing process.

XII. Sanctioning Guidelines for Hearing Boards and/or Individual Instructors

A. Purpose

The free exchange of ideas is the foundation of our academic community and rests upon the integrity of all members of the University and on our trust in that integrity. Violating that integrity and trust undermines our core purpose by deeply damaging academic endeavors. For this reason, violations of the Academic Honesty Policy are considered serious breaches of our accepted codes of conduct; the related sanctions reflect the seriousness with which these breaches of conduct are viewed by the University.

Sanctions are based on the following principles:

- 1) The Policy is founded on the conviction that all students in AS&E, undergraduate and graduate alike, must accept responsibility for understanding and upholding its provisions. Ignorance and/or failure to verify policy expectations ahead of time will not be grounds for exoneration or avoiding responsibility.
- 2) Repeat offenses require sanctions that are graduated in severity and in their impact on a student's academic career.
- 3) Sanctions for similar offenses should generally be consistent. The Chair of the Board has the responsibility to ensure the fairness and the consistency of sanctions.

B. Sanctioning Guidelines for Undergraduate Students

The following provisions apply to all offenses:

- 1) All first-time offenders must complete a designated academic honesty tutorial.
- 2) Effective with courses taken starting in Fall 2015, any failing grade of E or XE that results from a finding of academic dishonesty will be recorded as a permanent grade for purposes of the calculation of the student's grade point average (GPA). If the student repeats the course subject to the College repeat policy, both the original grade of E or XE and the new grade will count towards the student's GPA.

The grade and credit policies listed here will go into effect beginning with courses taken in the semester when the registrar's system is updated and capable of their implementation: *Any semester grade that results from a finding of academic dishonesty reached through either the Instructor Resolution with Penalty process or the Board Resolution process will be recorded as a permanent grade for purposes of the calculation of the student's grade point average (GPA). If the student repeats the course subject to the College repeat policy, both the original grade and the new grade will count towards the student's GPA. If the student earns credit with a grade of D- or higher as a result of a finding of academic dishonesty, and then decides to repeat the course, no additional credits will be awarded.*

3) With the exception of the XE and XF grade, grades recorded as a result of a Board on Academic Honesty decision will not be marked as such on the transcript.

C. Three Categories of Violations

Refer to Section V for more complete descriptions of the violations categorized below.

1) Minor Violations:

- a. Submitting work that misrepresents or does not fully or fairly acknowledge the contributions of others due primarily to inexperience.*
- b. Unauthorized collaboration on assignments when the identical work constitutes a small portion of the work submitted.
- c. Other behavior not directly linked to course work that is judged by the Chair of the BAH to be minor and having an academic implication.

*Note: “primarily” and “inexperience” are determinations made by individual instructors and/or hearing Boards, under the guidance of the Board Chair, in consideration of such factors as students’ previous training, clarity of assignment instructions, and overall judgment of how much responsibility students demonstrated and/or how much initiative they took for knowing, clarifying, and following rules set by the policy and applied within individual courses or assignments.

2) Moderate violations:

Moderate violations are quantitatively and/or qualitatively more serious than minor violations, as follows:

- a. Submitting work that misrepresents or does not fully or fairly acknowledge the contributions of others. A moderate level violation typically shows an attempt to credit at least some of the language or ideas that influenced the work in question. Although attribution may be inconsistently executed and not all source(s) may be properly acknowledged, the majority of the work remains under the intellectual control of the student(s) who submitted it. These behaviors fail to meet expectations, and are thus considered policy violations, but fall somewhat short of the whole-scale intentional cheating and/or transgressive borrowing represented in Section XII.C.3.a (Major violations).
- b. Submission of work done for another course, or work done in a previous attempt of a repeated course without instructor permission.
- c. Providing a fraudulent excuse for missed coursework or when requesting an extension on an assignment or a rescheduled exam.
- d. Facilitating or permitting copying of one’s own work by another student.
- e. Falsifying a signature on any official university document (e.g., drop/add form, UHS form, attendance sign-in sheet).
- f. Misuse of College-issued username and password.

3) Major violations:

When a minor or moderate offense involves pre-planning, conspiracy with other students or with individuals outside the University, is accompanied by payment to a conspirator, or otherwise violates policy in an egregious way (not an exhaustive list), those factors may increase the severity to the level of a major violation.

- a. Plagiarism (any instance beyond that described in XII. C 1.a or in XII. C. 2.a). Submitting work that does not fully or fairly acknowledge the contributions of others, because there is specific and demonstrable intent to deceive or because the quality or quantity of mis- or unattributed work are so great as to make other explanations implausible.
- b. Receiving unauthorized assistance on quizzes and exams
- c. Deliberately denying others access to library or course materials.
- d. Facilitating or permitting cheating by another student on a quiz or exam.
- e. Submitting an altered exam for re-grading.
- f. Fabrication or falsification of data, information, citations, etc.
- g. Unauthorized distribution or publication of course-related materials.
- h. Impeding the investigation or conduct of any Board on Academic Honesty matter.
- i. Obtaining an examination prior to its administration.

D. Range of Penalties to Be Assigned by the Board or Proposed by Individual Instructors

The following are the most typical penalties to be assigned by the Board, which may also be considered by individual instructors in proposing penalties through the Instructor Resolution process. These are guidelines not mandates, and the Board is not limited to these actions, although fairness requires that precedent be taken into account in determining what constitutes an appropriate sanction. The penalties that affect a student's grade or that involve time away from the University are listed in ascending order of severity for first and second offenses.

Additional sanctions that do not affect the student's grade are listed in Part E, "Academic Disciplinary Probation." A combination of both types of sanctions may be assigned by the Board, or as recommended by the Chair of the Board in the case of either type of Instructor Resolution Process.

The Hearing Board will take into account the seriousness of all violations on record with the Board when determining a penalty. Fairness dictates applying less severe penalties for an offense classified as minor, particularly when it is a first offense.

Moderate and major offenses will be sanctioned at more severe levels. Planning or pre-meditation to commit a violation, involvement of another student in a violation, compromising the integrity of the work of another individual or an entire class when committing a violation, contract cheating, lying to Board members and/or knowingly impeding the progress of a Board investigation—known as "aggravating factors"—may increase the severity of the act.

1) First offense:

For warning letters, the requirement to redo the assignment (or equivalent task) so that it meets expectations, with zero and/or reduced credit on the assignment, without further penalty. For policy violations, zero on the assignment (with or without opportunity to redo) plus further reduction in the semester grade of 1/3, 2/3, or one full grade level, based on the severity of the infraction. Any penalty applied should be independent of the value of the work in question (relative to the student's grade, or to their academic progress if the work is not directly graded/course-based).

Any provision listed below for Academic Disciplinary Probation.

Assigned failing grade of E or F ("F" in the case of a course offered for all students on the P/F basis).

XF or XE grade. **Note:** The XF and XE grades are indicated on the student's transcript as resulting from a violation of the academic honesty policy. The XE or XF grade is not generally used for a first offense, except when the offense is moderate or major and aggravating factors—one or more of the behaviors described above—exist.

XF or XE grade. **Note:** The XF and XE grades are indicated on the student's transcript as resulting from a violation of the academic honesty policy. The XE or XF grade is not generally used for first-time offenses for undergraduates, except when the offense in question is moderate or major and aggravating factors—one or more of the behaviors described above—exist. (Note: As described below, the XE or XF grade is not required but may be more commonly applied in first-time offenses for graduate students.)

Suspension for one semester—or in more extreme cases, up to three semesters. Credits earned at another institution during the period of suspension may not be transferred back to the University of Rochester. Suspension of any length of time is not generally applied for first offense except when the offense is moderate or major, and aggravating factors exist.

Expulsion from the University, only in very rare and egregious cases of a severe nature.

2) Second Finding

One sanction that must be considered but will not be automatically imposed for second offenses is the XF or XE grade and a suspension of one or more semesters. If both violations were minor, or one was minor and one was moderate, the XE/XF grade will not typically be imposed without aggravating circumstances.

Assigned failing grade of E or F ("F" in the case of a course that is offered for all students on the P/F basis), when both offenses were minor.

Any provision listed below for Academic Disciplinary Probation.

XF or XE grade.

XE grade and up to four semesters of suspension. Credits earned at another institution during the period of suspension may not be transferred back to the University of Rochester.

Expulsion from the University, only to be considered when the first offense was moderate or major and the second offense is major.

3) Third Finding

Expulsion from the University.

E. Academic Disciplinary Probation

The following may be used for course-related violations, or when academic dishonesty is not associated directly with coursework. The purposes of academic disciplinary probation sanctions, which are applied at the discretion of hearing Boards and will depend on the nature of the violation(s) committed, are both *punitive* (meant to reflect the seriousness of students' behavior) as well as *educative* in nature (meant to help shape students' decision-making so they can avoid similar behaviors in the future).

Sanctions described below are not expected to replace any sanctions that affect a student's course grade when the offense involves coursework, but may be assigned as additional measures in any cases. A student's failure to comply with the requirements of probation may result in further charges.

Conditions of Academic Disciplinary Probation are in effect for up to two semesters and may include:

- a. Prohibition from course overloads.
- b. Exclusion from extracurricular activities, including athletics and Student Association.
- c. Requirement to meet with the academic honesty liaison or other designated University resource during the period of probation.
- d. Higher likelihood of suspension or permanent separation, based on the severity of the violation, for any subsequent finding of responsibility during the period of probation.

F. Sanctioning Guidelines for Graduate Students

Graduate students may be in violation of the Academic Honesty Policy in their coursework or for any other infraction defined in Section V. These violations, with the exception of misconduct in research, are handled through the Board on Academic Honesty procedures, and they may range in seriousness as described in the preceding paragraphs. Violations raise immediate concerns about the student's ability to conduct original scholarship as required for graduate degrees. They also undermine the trust that a mentor, dissertation committee, or an academic department must have for a graduate student in the pursuit of new knowledge.

Such breaches of trust must therefore be subject to a range of sanctions that reflect the gravity of these concerns, and may result in expulsion from the University.

- 1) All first-time offenders must complete a designated academic honesty tutorial.
- 2) Depending on the student's prior experience and educational background, first-time offenses by graduate students that are considered minor as defined in the previous paragraphs may present important opportunities for education. In collaboration with the AS&E GEPA Dean, the Board should take into account different grading options for AS&E graduate students.
 - a. Students found responsible for violating the policy will be further required to complete a designated academic honesty tutorial, and may also be subject to additional sanctions from their home/sponsoring

department(s) or from the Board itself. Such sanctions may include, but are not limited to, ineligibility for supplemental stipends or teaching awards for a period of time designated in the decision letter.

3) First-time offenses by graduate students that are considered moderate or major must be approved in writing by the AS&E GEPA Dean before being offered to a student. First-time moderate offenses should generally result in the recommendation to the University Dean of Graduate Studies of an XE grade. First-time major offenses *must* include the recommendation of an XE grade, at minimum, and *may* result in the recommendation of expulsion from the graduate program.

4) Second-time or subsequent offenses at any level of severity must go to a hearing of the Board as described above. A responsible finding normally results in the recommendation of expulsion from the graduate program. Following consultation with the department's director of graduate studies and the AS&E GEPA Dean, a subsequent responsible finding *may* result in an XE grade and additional department sanctions rather than expulsion; however, exceptional mitigating factors would have to be documented as present, and this should be the exception rather than the rule.

5) Graduate students who engage in academic dishonesty in the pursuit of sponsored research, also known as "misconduct in research," will not be subject to the AS&E Academic Honesty Policy presided over by the Board. Such violations are in conflict with Federal statutes that bind funding agencies and must therefore be dealt with by department procedures that are approved by the AS&E GEPA Dean. Disciplinary actions following from such procedures range from expulsion to revocation of advanced degrees.

XIII. Disposition of Cases

A. Decision Letter

1) The Presiding Officer will draft a decision letter stating either exoneration or a finding of responsibility and send it electronically to the other Hearing Board members for discussion, revision and approval.

2) For cases involving undergraduate students, the decision letter will be forwarded by the Presiding Officer to the Chair of the Board. S/he will review it to ensure that the exoneration or the finding of responsibility and the sanction conform to established guidelines and precedents, and the wording of the letter is consistent with the Policy and with College rules.

3) The Chair may contact the Presiding Officer of the Hearing Board to discuss the decision and the sanction if s/he has questions or finds any discrepancy with the Policy. The Presiding Officer will communicate with the other members of the Hearing Board and respond to the Chair's questions. The Chair, at his or her discretion and after listening to the hearing recording, may reconvene the Board to discuss and reconsider the finding.

4) The Chair will finalize, sign and send out the letter to the student and simultaneously to the reporting person (as above, Section VIII.B).

5) For cases involving graduate students, the Hearing Board letter will be sent to the AS&E GEPA Dean, who will review the finding, sanction(s) and wording of the letter and follow up if needed as specified above (Section XIII A.2 and 3). The Dean will forward the finding along with his or her recommendation to the University Dean of Graduate Studies as per University policy on "Judicial Process for Academic

Misconduct by Graduate Students.” The University Dean of Graduate Studies will issue the final decision letter.

B. New Evidence and Reconsideration of Previously Resolved Cases

1) If new evidence comes to light, a case may always be reopened. The finding from a previously resolved case may always be revisited (whether as a continuation of that same case or as wholly new case and set of allegations).

2) When a case is reopened and the file from a previously resolved case still exists (within 30 days for an exoneration or within seven years for a responsible finding), the original case file will be considered in any additional deliberations (regardless of whether the original hearing Board reconvenes or a new hearing Board convenes as described in points [4] and [5], below).

3) New evidence may be added to that original case file, if the file still exists; if the file does not exist (i.e., it is beyond the 30 day or seven year window and has been destroyed), the reporting person must submit (or as the case may be, resubmit) all evidence that they wish the Board to consider.

4) When new evidence is considered and the case is continued (i.e., a decision letter has not yet been issued, and the Chair determines that the new evidence is sufficient to a) change Board members’ assessment of behavior(s) originally under review, or that b) it brings to light other behavior(s) of which the Board was previously unaware), it must be considered by the same Board that heard the original case.

5) When new evidence is considered and the case is reopened i.e., a decision letter has already been issued, but the Chair determines that the new evidence is sufficient to a) change Board members’ assessment of behavior(s) originally under review, or that b) it brings to light other behavior(s) of which the Board was previously unaware), it must be considered by an entirely different Board from the Board that heard the original case.

6) In no way are either type of hearing Board (whether it is the same Board considering the continuation of a previous case, or a new Board considering a new case) beholden to their original decisions.

XIV. Appeals

A. Officer to Whom Appeals Are Made

1) Undergraduates may appeal the decision of the Hearing Board with regard to the finding of responsibility (criterion one [1] or three [3], below) and/or the sanction (criterion two [2], below) to the Dean of the College.

2) Graduate students may appeal the decision of the Hearing Board with regard to the finding of responsibility (criterion one [1] or three [3], below) and/or the sanction (criterion two [2], below) to the University Provost.

B. Process

1) Appeals must be submitted in writing within seven days of the date of the decision letter. The decision of the College Dean (undergraduate appeals) and/or University Provost (graduate appeals) will

be final. The letter answering the appeal should be sent to the student and the Chair of the Board on Academic Honesty (undergraduate appeals) or to the student, the Chair of the Board on Academic Honesty, and the AS&E GEPA Dean (graduate appeals). If and only if some modification to the finding and/or sanction is granted, the appeal response letter will also be sent electronically to the reporting person.

2) Acceptable bases for appeal are:

a. Criterion one: Procedural error (if the error is substantive enough to alter the decision).

b. Criterion two: Excessive or inappropriate sanction.

c. Criterion three: New information exists that was not available at the time of the hearing (if this information is sufficient to alter the decision).

3. If new information is provided to the Dean or Provost that s/he determines potentially meets criterion three and is sufficient for a reconsideration of the case, the case will be referred back to its original hearing board for a further meeting with the student and (re)determination of a finding. If the Dean or Provost believes referring the case back to its original hearing board would cause an undue delay in the resolution of a case or is inadvisable for any other reason, s/he will reconsider the case in consultation with one member of the Board on Academic Honesty jointly identified by either the Dean and the Chair of the Board (cases involving undergraduates), or the Provost and the AS&E GEPA Dean (cases involving graduate students).

The finding of a reconvened Board or group as described above will be final.

XV. Confidentiality, Records, Internal and External Reporting, and Self-reporting by Students

A. Confidentiality

Reporting persons and Board members must refrain from sharing the names of students involved in reported cases with any other individual or organization except under the conditions described below for Reporting. Instructors who are jointly overseeing academic work, such as co-instructors of a course or dissertation committee members, may confer with each other about suspected or reported violations in the work over which they have joint oversight.

B. Records

1) The files for cases that result in exoneration will be destroyed within thirty days of the date of the exoneration letter.

2) All paper and electronic records and recordings of cases that result in a finding of responsibility after a hearing, will be kept by the College for a period of seven years after the date of the signed Warning Letter or Instructor Resolution with Penalty Form, or the Hearing Decision Letter, and then they may be destroyed. The Board database will be kept permanently.

3) XF or XE grades will be noted on the transcript as due to academic dishonesty.

4) Suspension will be noted on the transcript as due to academic dishonesty during the period of suspension.

5) Expulsion will be noted permanently on the transcript as due to academic dishonesty.

C. Internal and External Reporting, and Self-reporting by Students

1) Internal Reporting:

a. Within the University, applications for on-campus employment, Students' Association positions, membership on the Board on Academic Honesty, Study Abroad, fellowships, scholarships or other awards for undergraduate or graduate students may include a waiver for the student to sign giving permission for the person in charge of the process to request information about the student's Board on Academic Honesty history.

b. Findings of responsibility will be reported, with the following exception: when a Warning Letter is the only report on file, it will not be reported.

c. Without a signed waiver, no information will be released internally for the purposes described in paragraph 1.a.

d. Any record created pursuant to this policy may be disclosed with or without a waiver if required by law (e.g., subpoena, court order or valid discovery request in pending litigation).

2) External Reporting:

a. Findings of responsibility for academic dishonesty will be reported upon request to external entities when a waiver has been signed by the student or when the student submits a request for disclosure directly to the College, as when applying to transfer to another school or for admission to graduate school, or for employment.

b. As for internal reporting, a Warning Letter will not be reported externally unless it is one of multiple findings of responsibility.

c. Any record created pursuant to this policy may be disclosed with or without a waiver if required by law (e.g., subpoena, court order or valid discovery request in pending litigation).

3) Self-reporting by Students:

The Warning Letter process is an educational intervention for matters that do not rise to the level of a reportable violation subject to institutional disciplinary action. Therefore, Warning Letters should not need to be self-reported as a violation of the AS&E Academic Honesty Policy.

Questions about academic disciplinary history, whether on internal or external applications for graduate school, employment, licensure, security clearance, fellowships, scholarships and awards, for example, will vary.

Therefore, definitive guidance on how to answer all such questions cannot be given. If a student is at all in doubt about whether to disclose the existence of a Warning Letter in response to a particular question, being honest and forthright is the recommended approach. A student may fairly describe the

Warning Letter as an educational tool that is not considered by the University of Rochester as a violation of the AS&E Academic Honesty Policy.

Findings of responsibility for academic dishonesty arrived at through the Instructor Resolution with Penalty or Board Resolution processes are properly considered to be reportable violations under our Policy.

Current policy approved by Faculty Council in May 2015. Revisions approved by the Steering Committee of Faculty Council on January 18, 2016, November 1, 2016, February 21, 2017, December 19, 2017, March 30, 2018. Additional revisions approved by full Faculty Council on November 2, 2020, May 6, 2021, March 2, 2022, and May 3, 2023.