

Academic Integrity & Code of Student Conduct Committee Policy Recommendations

Table of Contents:

Rationale for Policy Changes	Pages 2-6
Academic Integrity Policy with suggested edits [DRAFT]	Pages 7-13
Academic Integrity Sanction Rubric with suggested edits [DRAFT]	Pages 14-17

The following changes are recommended to the Academic Integrity Policy by the Academic Integrity and Code of Student Conduct Committee:

New Violation Type:

- Buying, selling, or otherwise obtaining or providing academic work to be used for the purpose of contract cheating.

Define Contract Cheating within the policy as a Definition:

- Contract cheating is defined as a form of academic dishonesty where students get academic work completed on their behalf, which they then submit for academic credit [and/or advantage] as if they had created it themselves.

Reason: Contract cheating is a serious topic that has become more prevalent within the world of academic integrity in recent years. In Spring 2018 a student posted via Facebook, as well as on campus, ads offering his services to write papers for other students. Examples of websites that are offer services to students:

<https://www.boostmygrade.com/>
<https://www.takeyourclass.com/>
<https://www.noneedtostudy.com/>
<https://paymetodoyourhomework.com/>
<https://takemyonlineclassnow.com/>

** This definition of contract cheating was taken from www.contractcheating.com, which was cited in the International Center for Academic Integrity's "Institutional Toolkit to Combat Contract Cheating." The authors of www.contractcheating.com are Thomas Lancaster and Robert Clarke, who coined the phrase "contract cheating."

The following level 2 violation should be modified:

Current: Buying, selling or otherwise obtaining or providing information about an examination not yet administered.

- Recommended Change: "Buying, selling, obtaining, or providing information about an examination not yet administered (or attempting to do such)."

Reason: Case Example

- Student offered to pay group mates to do her portion of assignment, and it was not clear if money was ever exchanged.
- AIM recommended Level 1 violation for "Facilitating/aiding"
- AUAIB felt level 2 violation per current policy more appropriate

The following level 1 violation should be modified:

- Current: Facilitating or aiding any act of dishonesty.
- Recommended change: Attempting to, facilitating and/or aiding any act of dishonesty.

Reason: The current policy does not address any attempt to facilitate or aid an act of academic dishonesty.

The following Level 1 violation should be modified:

Current Policy: Using any materials or resources that are not authorized by the instructor for use during an examination or in completing any assignment having value equal to or greater than 10% of the course grade, or second offense.

- Recommended change: Using or possessing any materials or resources that are not authorized by the instructor for use during an examination or in completing any assignment having value equal to or greater than 10% of the course grade, or second offense.”

Reason: The AUAIB has treated any case in which a student is in possession of unauthorized material during an exam as a violation of the policy. This policy change takes the burden off faculty/AIMs/AUAIB members if they suspect a student is in possession of unauthorized materials during an examination, and it provides greater clarity to students regarding expectations. As Apple watches become more common and functional, this policy distinction could be important moving forward.

New Level 1 Violation:

- Substituting for another person or permitting any other person to substitute for oneself for a graded activity (ie, attendance, quiz, or assignment), having a value of less than 10% of the course grade.

Reason: This policy is mostly related to the practice of student’s using i-clickers during class to complete assignments/quizzes for other students who are not in attendance. Currently, AIMs and the AUAIB have used the following level 1 violation for this type of offense:

- Falsification of attendance and/or participation. (With participation being the in-class quiz).

The argument has been made the more appropriate change for this type of violation would be the level 2 violation:

- Substituting for another person or permitting any other person to substitute for oneself to take an examination.

If this new policy were adopted, it would provide a clear option for the AIMs/AUAIB in relation to how to address lower-level in class assignments in which student's complete work for others.

Other recommendations outside of specific policies within rubric:

- Insert “quiz/” in front of the term “examination” within all level 1 violations that use the term “examination.”

Reason: The rubric does not stipulate the difference between an exam, quiz, or assignment. In practice, AIM’s and the AUAIB have treated ‘quiz’ like an ‘exam’ for the most part. However, there have been times in which this has been debated, and clearly stipulating a quiz is a form of an exam would provide language AIMs and the AUAIB could rely on moving forward. The level 2 violations that use the word “examination” would not be altered under this recommendation.

- Create a new 'Level 4 Violation' that would result in expulsion due to 3 sanction points. This would essentially be using the current Level 3 consequences.
- Create a new 'Level 3 Violation' which would result in a semester long suspension due to 1.5 sanction points.

Reason: The current sanction rubric does not allow for any one specific behavior to result in a semester long suspension. If the new language regarding contract cheating is adopted (see above), the committee felt it would be appropriate to have a violation type that could result in a semester long suspension immediately given the serious nature of this type of offense.

Updates after meeting with the Academic Integrity and Student Conduct Code Committee:

I. The level zero violation collaboration definition has been modified:

- **Current:** Unauthorized collaboration on homework assignments constituting less than 10% of the assignment (first offense only).
- **Recommended change:** Collaboration on any assignment constituting less than 10% of the assignment when instructed to work independently (first offense only).

II. The 2 level 1 violations related to collaboration have been combined:

- **Current:** Unauthorized collaboration on homework assignments constituting 10% or more of the assignment, or less than 10% of the assignment on a second offense.
- **Current:** Collaborating on laboratory work, or other assigned work when instructed to work independently.
- **Recommended change:** Collaboration on any assignment constituting more than 10% of the assignment when instructed to work independently.

Reason: The recommended modifications condense the types of collaboration violations within the policy to provide more clarity. Collaboration is a complex topic and consistently one of the most common violation types. It's important to note that there is a different violation type of unauthorized collaboration on a quiz/exam which does not dictate that a student must be instructed to work independently – the assumption is that students would need to get permission from the instructor in order to collaborate on those types of assignments. This is no different than what the policy has always been, the changes just provide further clarity in the code committee's opinion.

III. Modified the following level 2 policy:

- **Current:** Substituting for another person or permitting any other person to substitute for oneself to take an examination.
- **Recommended Change:** Substituting for another person or permitting any other person to substitute for oneself to take an examination, or any assignment having value of more than 10% of the course grade.

Reason: This is an addition that is necessary if the new level 1 policy is adopted.

IV. Remove the word 'homework' from the Sanction Points = 0.0 section.

V. Suspension and Expulsion section:

- **Current:** Students suspended may not receive credit for University work completed by correspondence or in residence at another university without permission from the Provost or designee. Records of suspension are maintained indefinitely.
- **Recommended Change:** Students suspended may not receive credit for University work completed by **distance** or in residence at another university without permission from the Provost or designee. Records of suspension are maintained indefinitely.

Updates after second meeting with Academic Integrity Conduct Code Committee in December:

- I. The Code Committee found a typo in which I left out the word ‘credit’ in the definition of contract cheating – this has been edited.
- II. The third level 0 violation regarding using any materials not authorized by the instructor was edited to include ‘or possessing.’ This is consistent with the changes we have recommended to the level 1 violation that is similar.
- III. 2 notes were added under the level 0 violation:
 - Note: The percentage of an assignment shall be based on the content in question’s overall impact on the grade, or the content in question compared to the overall content submitted. This determination will be made in consultation with the instructor for the course, with consideration as to what would be most appropriate under the circumstances.

Reason: This is to assist faculty, AIMS and the AUAIB in defining what constitutes a percentage of the assignment. In practice, this would provide guidance that encourages AIM/Instructor collaboration and input in the determination.

- Note: A level zero violation is not available for a quiz or exam.

Reason: This provides clear guidance and consistency.

- IV. **‘(XF)’** was added to the section in which the policy explains infractions in which point levels are accrued to the level of 1.5 or above would result in an XF grading penalty. This adds clarity.
- V. Edit the following version of the following modified level 2 violation:
 - **Current:** Substituting for another person or permitting any other person to substitute for oneself to take an examination, or any assignment having value of more than 10% of the course grade.
 - **Recommended Change:** Substituting for another person or permitting any other person to substitute for oneself for a graded activity (i.e., examination or assignment) having a value of more than 10% of the course grade.

Reason: This change is being recommended to remain consistent with the modification of the similar type of violation recommended at level 1. That modification is: Substituting for another person or permitting any other person to substitute for oneself for a graded activity (ie, attendance, quiz, or assignment), having a value of less than 10% of the course grade. Without this change, any ‘examination’ that is less than 10% of the course grade would be in conflict with the policy. Both changes made together would dictate that the level violation is completely dependent on the graded activity’s value within the course grade.

VI. Further define what the definition of a semester long suspension within the sanction rubric as follows:

- **Current:**

For infractions involving point levels of 1.5 and above, the course grade/project failure sanction will apply in addition to suspension or expulsion.

Sanction points = 1.5: The student will be suspended for the following semester (the student will be allowed to complete the current semester).

Sanction points = 2.0: The student will be suspended for two full semesters (the student will be allowed to complete the current semester).

Sanction points = 2.5: The student will be suspended for three full semesters (the student will be allowed to complete the current semester).

- **Recommended change:**

For infractions involving point levels of 1.5 and above, the course grade/project failure sanction (XF) will apply in addition to suspension or expulsion. In the event of a suspension, the student will be allowed to complete the current semester of enrollment.

Sanction points = 1.5: The student will be suspended from the university for one major semester (Spring or Fall) and all contiguous summer and intersessions from the close of the term which resulted in the suspension.

Sanction points = 2.0: The student will be suspended from the university for two major semesters and all contiguous summer and intersessions from the close of the term which resulted in the suspension.

Sanction points = 2.5: The student will be suspended from the university for three major semesters and all contiguous summer and intersessions from the close of the term which resulted in the suspension.

Reason: The current policy has been followed literally, and its application is not what the code committed believes was originally intended. Summer sessions and intersessions are not addressed within the current policy. For example, the current interpretation of the policy would allow a student that is suspended at the conclusion of the Spring 2019 semester to enroll in classes throughout Summer Session 2019. The policy change being recommended is pulled from the academic suspension language the Registrar's Office currently uses for student's placed on academic suspension due academic performance.

VII. Define what a quorum is for the AUAIB.

- **Recommended change:** In the definition of the AUAIB within the AI Policy include - A quorum for the Board is defined as 4 faculty representatives and 1 student.

University of Arkansas Academic Integrity Policy

I. Preamble:

As a community of scholars, we uphold academic integrity and our Honor Statement as foundational to appropriate conduct within the university setting. The fundamental trust that work presented as one's own truly represents one's own intellect and effort underlies our mission as an educational, research and service institution; moreover, this trust is central to our peers' recognition of the value of a University of Arkansas degree. Thus, this document represents a deeply-and commonly-held set of values. Because this trust is so essential to the enterprise of the University of Arkansas, this policy has been established to set forth the University's commitment to academic integrity and to create procedures to address allegations of academic misconduct in a fair and unified manner. This policy includes, but is not limited to, any work occurring online or through any form of distance education for a course, degree or program.

Responsibility for understanding and adhering to the values of academic integrity, including being familiar with and complying with this policy, lies with individual students as members of the University community. The University shall assist students in meeting this responsibility through educational efforts such as training held during both undergraduate and graduate new student orientation, and on-line training modules, and may also include training during program-level orientation and in individual classrooms. The University shall also provide a statement on academic integrity that faculty will be encouraged to include in all course syllabi. Again, however, as developing scholars, students must take the initiative to familiarize themselves with and clarify expectations regarding academic integrity.

II. Definitions:

Academic Dishonesty: Academic dishonesty involves acts that may subvert or compromise the integrity of the educational or research process at the University of Arkansas, when such acts have been performed by a UA student. Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to, any act by which a student gains or attempts to gain an academic advantage for him/herself or another by misrepresenting his/her or another's work or by interfering with the independent completion, submission, or evaluation of academic work. The unauthorized use of technology to gain this academic advantage is itself an act of academic dishonesty, and each item in the Rubric should be considered to include any electronic means by which this behavior could be accomplished.

Academic dishonesty may include those acts defined as research or scholarly misconduct; such academic integrity issues are subject to review under this policy as well as under the *University's Research and Scholarly Misconduct Policy*. Which policy applies to particular allegations is addressed in more detail below; if necessary, the Research Integrity Officer, in consultation with the student's dean, shall determine which policy is most appropriate for a given case.

Academic Honesty Syllabus Statement: Faculty are encouraged to include this statement on their syllabus:

"As a core part of its mission, the University of Arkansas provides students with the opportunity to further their educational goals through programs of study and research in an environment that promotes freedom of inquiry and academic responsibility. Accomplishing this mission is only possible when intellectual honesty and individual integrity prevail."

"Each University of Arkansas student is required to be familiar with and abide by the University's 'Academic Integrity Policy' which may be found at <http://provost.uark.edu/>. Students with questions about how these policies apply to a particular course or assignment should immediately contact their instructor."

Academic Initiatives and Integrity (AI&I) (formerly Office of Academic Integrity and Student Conduct): Housed in the Office of the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, this is the University-level office tasked with processing academic misconduct cases that are sent forward from the colleges. This Office is responsible for reporting back to the academic colleges, the Provost, and the Faculty Senate, consistent with the requirements of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), an annual total of cases heard and their outcomes, as well as the general basis for the decisions made. This Office is the repository of all records pertaining to academic integrity cases across campus.

Academic Integrity Monitor: In each college/school, one or more Associate Deans will be designated by the Dean, subject to approval by the Provost, as the Academic Integrity Monitor(s). The Academic Integrity Monitor shall be responsible to conduct an initial review of allegations of academic dishonesty at the college/school level to determine whether there is sufficient evidence of a violation for the matter to be considered by the All-University Academic Integrity Board (Board or AUAIB), as defined below. The Academic Integrity Monitor is the person responsible for determining whether charges will be filed against a student; the Monitor may make such a determination even if the faculty member does not wish to pursue a case. When a student admits responsibility for an infraction, the Academic Integrity Monitor recommends a sanction to the Board, based on the Sanction Rubric. The Academic Integrity Monitor is the School or College's liaison to the Board, and will have primary responsibility for presenting a case to the Board when necessary. If the Academic Integrity Monitor determines the evidence is not sufficient for consideration by the Board, the case will be dismissed unless the instructor (with the support of the Chair) appeals the Monitor's determination to the Board.

All-University Academic Integrity Board (Board or AUAIB): The Board is responsible for reviewing contested allegations of academic dishonesty and contested sanctions referred by the Academic Integrity Monitor. The Board is responsible for making sure that any finding of responsibility for academic misconduct is supported by a preponderance of the evidence and for imposing sanctions consistent with the Sanction Rubric when a student is found responsible for a violation. The Board is responsible for ensuring that academic integrity sanctions are applied in a consistent manner. Ordinarily, in making its determinations, the Board will not take student intent into account, but instead will focus primarily on the actions of those involved. The Board reviews and makes a determination on all cases in which 1) students are contesting their responsibility (or instructors, with the support of the Department chair, are contesting findings that students are not responsible) for alleged infractions or 2) students are contesting sanctions. In addition, in cases where the student accepts responsibility and does not contest sanctions, the Board reviews sanctions recommended by the Academic Integrity Monitor and imposes sanctions consistent with the Sanctions Rubric. When reviewing cases, the Board may request further information and require participation in a hearing by the instructor and/or students (if deemed appropriate by the Board).

The Board is composed of seven faculty or instructional staff (one from each undergraduate academic college), one faculty representative of the library, one representative of the Graduate School, and two students (one graduate and one undergraduate). In order to facilitate timely review of cases, there will be two such committees constituted each year and each of these committees will meet one time per month. The committees will elect their own chair. The Director of All will be an ex officio member of the AUAIB. (Note: The School of Law has its own academic integrity process.) There will also be a pool of trained alternates who can serve on the Board in the event that a member is unable to attend a hearing due to a schedule conflict, illness, conflict of interest, or the like. A third committee, which may be comprised of members of the other two committees, will meet during the summer. Ordinarily, board hearings should consist of at least seven (7) faculty (at least one of which has graduate faculty status) and two (2) students. **A quorum for the Board is defined as 4 faculty representatives and 1 student.**

Complete Written Record: The complete written record for each case refers to all relevant documents submitted by the student as well as a University representative as evidence related to the allegations of academic dishonesty. The complete written record is initially compiled by the Academic Integrity Monitor but subsequently is forwarded to and maintained by, and may be added to, by Academic Initiatives and Integrity.

Faculty Compliance: As the Academic Integrity Policy and Sanction Rubric are faculty-approved University policies, it is expected that all University faculty will comply. If faculty impose sanctions for academic dishonesty without following this policy, the student's grade will be overturned upon appeal and returned to the grade the student would have received without the sanction.

Jurisdiction: The Academic Integrity Monitor is responsible for the initial review of all undergraduate cases involving work in courses taken in his/her college. The Academic Integrity Monitor is also responsible for initial review of all cases involving allegations of academic dishonesty in other academic work (with the exception of those cases reviewed under the Research Misconduct Policy), when the faculty member who has oversight responsibility for that student (e.g. major professor, faculty collaborator, honors advisor, advisor) resides within the college. When a student is majoring in a program outside the college in which an academic integrity matter arises, the Academic Integrity Monitor of the other college should be kept informed about the case and its resolution. The Academic Integrity Monitor in the Graduate School is responsible for all cases of alleged academic dishonesty involving graduate students (including, without limitation, all allegations relating to course work or work outside a class), with the exception of those cases that fall under the jurisdiction of the Research Misconduct Policy. For online courses provided through the Global Campus, the Academic Integrity Monitor shall generally be the AIM for the or school offering the course.

Preponderance of Evidence: The standard of proof in a case arising under the Academic Integrity Policy shall be the "preponderance of the evidence." A "preponderance of the evidence" shall mean evidence which is of greater weight or more convincing than evidence to the contrary; evidence which shows that something more likely than not is true.

Reporting: Following initial compilation by the Academic Integrity Monitor, all records will be kept in All. A final report summary for each case will be forwarded to the college Academic Integrity Monitor, to the department chair/head, and to the instructor. Annual summary reports (with no details with respect to specific faculty or students) will be reported to the Colleges and to the Faculty Senate.

Sanction Rubric: The [Sanction Rubric](#) sets forth the educational consequences associated with various levels of academic misconduct. The Sanction Rubric is approved by the Faculty Senate and applicable to all student academic work at the University of Arkansas. All sanctions will be imposed by the AUAIB.

Student: An undergraduate student is one who is enrolled at the University of Arkansas during the semester of the alleged infraction in a baccalaureate degree program or in an undergraduate non-degree-seeking status. A graduate student is one who has been admitted to the Graduate School and need not be enrolled to be considered a student under this policy. "Student" includes both undergraduate and graduate students who withdraw or graduate after allegedly violating this policy or who are not enrolled for a particular term but have an apparent continuing relationship with the University at the time of the alleged infraction.

Work for a course: "Work for a course" consists of any work undertaken or submitted towards the fulfillment of the requirements of a course (whether graded or not), including, but not limited to, exams, quizzes, papers, essays, homework assignments, artwork, designs, programs, and other projects or assignments.

Work outside of a course: "Work outside a course" consists of student work, other than work for a course, undertaken or submitted towards the fulfillment of the requirements of a degree or program, including, but not limited to, candidacy or comprehensive exams, dissertations, honors theses, master's theses, work done for funded research projects, reports submitted to a funding agency or material submitted for publication in a scholarly journal.

Working Days: Working days shall refer to Monday through Friday, excluding official University holidays or days that the University is closed due to exigent circumstances such as weather. For periods of five days or less, University breaks shall also be excluded.

Contract Cheating: Contract cheating is defined as a form of academic dishonesty where students get academic work completed on their behalf, which they then submit for academic credit [and/or advantage] as if they had created it themselves.

III. Procedures:

A. **Infractions Involving Work for a Course at the Undergraduate or Graduate Level**

1. **Reports of Suspected Academic Dishonesty.** When an instructor/department initially suspects that a student has violated the Academic Integrity Policy, the instructor or another appropriate University official may discuss the matter with the student and/or with the Academic Integrity Monitor for the college or school. Should the instructor/department determine that the student may be responsible for academic dishonesty, the instructor or another appropriate University official will, within five working days after determining that there is a potential violation of the Academic Integrity Policy (or as soon as practicable thereafter), report the case to the Academic Integrity Monitor for the college. In reporting the case, the instructor/official will submit a completed "Allegation Evidence Form," available on the All website, to help ensure that all information necessary to the consideration of the case is available for review. Dishonesty (or providing false information) by the student at any point in the academic integrity process may be considered an additional academic integrity violation and may result in additional sanctions if the student is found responsible.

2. **The Academic Integrity Monitor.** The Academic Integrity Monitor will review the case and meet with the instructor to gather any relevant information relating to any alleged violations of the Academic Integrity Policy. The Academic Integrity Monitor shall meet separately with the student to notify the student of the alleged violations of the Academic Integrity Policy, disclose to the student any evidence to be used against him or her, and gather information from the student about the matter. The Monitor will have access to any previous academic integrity-related records for the student from the All and may review pertinent records or speak with other individuals with knowledge about the matter. Information compiled by the Academic Integrity Monitor may be added to the written record. After conducting this review, the Academic Integrity Monitor may proceed as follows:

a. The Academic Integrity Monitor may determine that **the evidence of an alleged violation is insufficient to warrant forwarding the case to the Board.** In this case, the Academic Integrity Monitor will notify the instructor/Department and student of his/her determination. The complete written record of the Academic Integrity Monitor's determination will be forwarded to the All, and a summary of the matter shall be provided to the AUAIB for its information.

i. If the Instructor, with the support of the Department/program chair/head/director, disagrees with the determination of the Academic Integrity Monitor, the instructor's position shall be reported to the AUAIB for consideration by the Board.

b. Alternatively, the Academic Integrity Monitor may determine **there is sufficient evidence of a violation to forward the matter to the Board for its consideration,** in which case the following may occur:

i. **The student accepts responsibility for the infraction:** In this case, the Academic Integrity Monitor shall inform the student of the potential consequences of the alleged violation(s). The Academic Integrity Monitor completes the file and recommends the appropriate sanction for consideration by the AUAIB consistent with the Sanction Rubric, makes a

record of the case that is forwarded to the All and AUAIB, and reports back to the Department/program and instructor.

ii. **The student contests responsibility for the infraction:** In this case, the Academic Integrity Monitor will forward the case together with the evidence to All and AUAIB. Within five working days from receipt of the Allegation Evidence Form (or as soon thereafter as practicable), a representative from All will contact the student and arrange a meeting during which the process and possible outcomes are explained to the student. As part of the complete written record, the student will be provided with an opportunity to submit a written statement responding to the allegations and explaining why he/she did not commit the alleged infraction. Ordinarily, the student will not provide a statement pertaining to intent, unless it materially affects the question of whether the student committed a violation of the Academic Integrity Policy.

iii. **The student contests the sanctions:** If the student 1) accepts responsibility but disagrees with the Academic Integrity Monitor's sanction recommendation, or 2) contests responsibility *and* sanctions, the student will be provided an opportunity to submit a written statement explaining the student's position on sanctions and proposing alternatives. If the proposed sanction is based on the sanction rubric, the statement must address how the rubric has been applied incorrectly in the student's case.

3. **Standard of Evidence.** The standard used in reviewing whether a violation of the Academic Integrity Policy has occurred under this policy shall be the preponderance of the evidence.

4. **Continued Participation.** To the extent practical, during the consideration of a case, the student's participation in the affected class should continue in order to minimize the impact on the student if he or she is determined to be not responsible for an alleged infraction. A student is allowed to drop the affected class only in the case of a Level 1 violation, the student does not have any previous academic integrity violations [and the drop occurs before the applicable class drop/withdrawal deadline for the semester].

B. Infractions Involving Work Outside a Course at the Undergraduate or Graduate Level

Cases of alleged academic misconduct occurring outside a course, as defined previously, may be subject to review under this policy as well as under the University's *Research and Scholarly Misconduct Policy*. Which policy applies to particular allegations is determined by the Research Integrity Officer and the student's dean. Except when a matter is determined to be properly considered under the *Research and Scholarly Misconduct Policy*, rather than this policy, when a supervising faculty member or other appropriate University official determines that a student may be responsible for academic dishonesty in a situation involving work outside a course, the procedures outlined in this policy shall be followed.

C. The All-University Academic Integrity Board

1. Based on the record filed, including the Allegation Evidence Form, the AUAIB shall determine responsibility (if necessary) and impose the appropriate sanction. In addition, with notice to the student, the Board may request additional evidence, require students, the instructor, or other appropriate University officials to be present at a hearing and/or refer the matter back to the Academic Integrity Monitor for further consideration. Ordinarily, a student will meet with the Board only if the Board so requests it, having already met with the Academic Integrity Monitor and provided his/her written statement for the Board. However, if the student is facing a possible sanction of suspension or expulsion, or loss of a scholarship because the conditions of the scholarship specify certain ethical conduct, he/she shall be permitted to meet with the

Board and present witnesses and evidence, if the student desires. If a student is not facing possible suspension, expulsion or loss of a scholarship, and the student requests a meeting, the Board shall designate one of its members to meet with the student prior to the Board's consideration of the case. If a member meets with the student, the member shall participate in the Board's consideration of the alleged infractions. Similarly, a faculty member who disagrees with the recommendation of the Academic Integrity Monitor may request a meeting with a member of the board. Again, that Board member shall participate in the Board's consideration of the alleged infractions.

2. In the case where a student and the instructor or other University official reporting the alleged infraction are requested to appear at a Board hearing, each must have at least ten working days' notice of the hearing, unless both agree to waive this requirement. If any material is added to the Complete Written Record, the student shall have at least three business days prior to the Board hearing to review the information. The student, the instructor or other appropriate University official, and the Academic Integrity Monitor for the case, who will have primary responsibility to present the infractions, will attend the Board meeting. Generally these individuals will be the only persons in attendance, other than the Board and All staff. The Board may question any of these individuals. The instructor will not ordinarily be asked to make a statement, but may be asked questions by the Board. The Board shall review the complete record of the case to determine whether a preponderance of the evidence exists to find a violation of the Academic Integrity Policy and if so, impose a sanction consistent with the Rubric. Because the focus of the hearing is generally not on intent, other witnesses will typically not be called unless the Board determines that the witnesses can address whether the student committed the alleged infraction.

3. When sanctions are imposed, the letter outlining the sanctions will be signed by the Chair on behalf of the Board and by the Director of All and sent to the student and the instructor, with a copy to the Academic Integrity Monitor. The Board shall also require that the student undergo educational remediation.

- D. **Appeals.** Students (or the instructor, with the support of the Department Chair) may appeal a determination by the AUAIB to the Provost and Chancellor, but only when the appeals are based on the following grounds: (1) a procedural error occurred; (2) an objective assessment of the evidence under the preponderance of evidence standard does not support a finding of responsibility, (3) new and significant evidence has been identified after the Board hearing and the evidence was unavailable or could not have been obtained prior to the Board hearing; (4) the sanctions are inconsistent with the Sanction Rubric; or (5) that additional sanctions imposed are excessive. To effect an appeal, the student (or instructor/department), within five working days of transmittal of the decision of the AUAIB to the student (or instructor/department), shall request that the Provost and Chancellor review the case, using the "Appeal Form" found on the website of the All. The transmittal of the decision by the AUAIB shall expressly state that the student (or instructor/department) shall have five days to appeal the decision. The Provost and Chancellor shall attempt to review and resolve all appeals within thirty days or as soon as possible thereafter after receiving the Appeal Form. If the Provost and Chancellor determine that a procedural error occurred, that an objective assessment of the evidence does not support a finding of responsibility, that new evidence warrants a rehearing, that an inconsistency in the application of a sanction has occurred, or that additional sanctions are excessive in nature, the Provost and Chancellor may decide the matter or may refer the case back to the same or to another AUAIB for further action. If a new hearing is held, the case may be appealed to the Provost and Chancellor using the procedure outlined above, in which case their determination on the matter shall be final.
- E. **Procedural Changes.** Particular circumstances in an individual case may dictate variation from the procedures set out in this policy in order to ensure fair and efficient consideration of the

matter. Any change in the procedures must ensure fair treatment of the student. Any major deviations from the procedures described in this policy shall be made only with the written approval of the Provost.

DRAFT

University of Arkansas Sanction Rubric (DRAFT of Suggested Edits)

I. Violation Levels:

The following violation levels are assigned to specific types of violations of the University's Academic Integrity Policy; if a violation of academic integrity principles occurs which is not specifically provided for below, then any sanctions will be based on the most similar type of violation that exists in the rubric. A violation will be considered as a single violation up until the point that a student receives notice of that violation; additional infractions occurring after that point will be considered separately for purposes of this rubric. If assignment of a sanction requires the Board to interpret the sanction rubric, the Board shall provide a rationale for its determination and application of the particular sanction(s). General guidance on substantial issues of interpretation of the sanction rubric shall be provided by the Provost/Vice Chancellor.

A student receives the assigned number of sanction points for each violation for which he/she is found responsible. **Sanction points are cumulative over the length of the student's tenure at the University of Arkansas.**

Level Zero Violation – 0.0 sanction point

- For plagiarism/copying in work done for a course, if the plagiarized/copied material constitutes less than 10% of the assignment (first offense only).
- Collaboration on any assignment constituting less than 10% of the assignment when instructed to work independently (first offense only).
- Using or possessing any materials or resources that are not authorized by the instructor in completing any assignment having a value of less than 10% of the course grade (first offense only).

Note: The percentage of an assignment shall be based on the content in question's overall impact on the grade, or the content in question compared to the overall content submitted. This determination will be made in consultation with the instructor for the course, with consideration as to what would be most appropriate under the circumstances.

Note: A level zero violation is not available for a quiz or exam.

Level One Violation - 0.5 sanction point for each violation

- Copying from or viewing another student's work during a quiz/examination.
- Using or possessing any materials or resources that are not authorized by the instructor for use during a quiz or examination, or in completing any assignment having a value equal to or greater than 10% of the course grade.
- Collaborating during a quiz or examination with any other person by giving or receiving information without specific permission of the instructor.
- Attempting to, facilitating and/or aiding in any act of academic dishonesty.
- Submitting, without specific permission of the instructor, work that has been previously offered by the same student in another course or a previous offering of the same course.
- Falsification of attendance and/or participation.
- Submitting as one's own any theme, report, term paper, essay, computer program, speech, painting, drawing, sculpture, or other written or creative work or project of any nature prepared totally or in large measure by another /plagiarizing, in work completed for a class assignment,

when that copying/plagiarizing constitutes less than 10% of the assignment and is a second offense, or when that copying/plagiarizing constitutes 10% or more of the assignment. Submitting as one's own work or plagiarizing is the offering as one's own work, the words, ideas, or arguments of another person or using the work of another without appropriate attribution by quotation, reference, or footnote. Plagiarism occurs both when the words of another (in print, electronic, or any other medium) are reproduced without acknowledgement and when the ideas or arguments of another are paraphrased in such a way as to lead the reader to believe that they originated with the writer. It is not sufficient to provide a citation if the words of another have been reproduced – this also requires quotation marks. It is the responsibility of all University students to understand the methods of proper attribution and to apply those principles in all materials submitted.

- Providing false information, or withholding pertinent or applicable information, which could result in gaining an academic advantage.
- Substituting for another person or permitting any other person to substitute for oneself for a graded activity (i.e., attendance, quiz, or assignment), having a value of 10% or less of the course grade.
- Collaboration on any assignment constituting more than 10% of the assignment when instructed to work independently.

Level Two Violation - [1.0 sanction point](#) for each violation

- Buying, selling, obtaining, or providing information about an examination not yet administered (or attempting to do such).
- Substituting for another person or permitting any other person to substitute for oneself for a graded activity (i.e., examination or assignment) having a value of more than 10% of the course grade.
- Submitting as one's own any work prepared totally or in large measure by another OR plagiarizing, in work submitted for degree requirements other than course work (e.g. honors thesis, master's thesis, master's comprehensive exam, doctoral qualifying exam, doctoral candidacy exam, doctoral dissertation), that is, the offering as one's own work, the words, ideas, or arguments of another person or using the work of another without appropriate attribution by quotation, reference, or footnote. Plagiarism occurs both when the words of another (in print, electronic, or any other medium) are reproduced without acknowledgement and when the ideas or arguments of another are paraphrased in such a way as to lead the reader to believe that they originated with the writer. It is not sufficient to provide a citation if the words of another have been reproduced – this also requires quotation marks. It is the responsibility of all University students to understand the methods of proper attribution and to apply those principles in all materials submitted.
- Submitting altered or falsified data (in work completed for a class assignment).

Level Three Violation – 1.5 sanction points for each violation

- Buying, selling, obtaining or providing academic work to be used for the purpose of contract cheating, or participating in such behavior.

Level Four Violation - [3.0 sanction points](#) for each violation

- Altering grades or official records.
- Falsifying or signing another person's name on any academically-related University form or document.
- Sabotaging another student's work.
- Submitting altered or falsified data (for work submitted for requirements outside of the classroom (e.g. honor's thesis; master's thesis; doctoral dissertation; candidacy exam; qualifying exam; dissertation defense).

- Also applies to the third Level Two violation (would apply 3.0 sanction points instead of 2.0 sanction points).

II. Sanctions:

Sanction points = 0.0: For plagiarism/copying or unauthorized **collaboration on assignments**, if the suspect material constitutes less than 10% of the assignment, the student will be issued a Letter of Reprimand (first offense only). Regardless of whether the material constitutes less than or more than 10% of the assignment, the instructor must submit the case through the reporting process to the Academic Integrity Monitor, after which the normal process will ensue. There will be no grade sanction for a Level Zero offense.

Sanction points = 0.5: For work for a course, the instructor shall give the test or an assignment an immediate zero (0) which shall then be averaged into the course grade. If the violation occurred on work outside of a course, the faculty member will require that the work be redone. If that involves missing a stated deadline, the stated late penalty will apply.

Sanction points = 1.0: The student will receive a course grade of XF for work done for a course; for work outside a course, the student will receive a failure on the project (e.g., on the candidacy exam).

For infractions involving point levels of 1.5 and above, the course grade/project failure sanction (XF) will apply in addition to suspension or expulsion. In the event of a suspension, the student will be allowed to complete the current semester of enrollment.

Sanction points = 1.5: The student will be suspended from the university for one major semester (Spring or Fall) and all contiguous summer and intersessions from the close of the term which resulted in the suspension.

Sanction points = 2.0: The student will be suspended from the university for two major semesters and all contiguous summer and intersessions from the close of the term which resulted in the suspension.

Sanction points = 2.5: The student will be suspended from the university for three major semesters and all contiguous summer and intersessions from the close of the term which resulted in the suspension.

Sanction points = 3.0 or more: The student will be immediately and permanently expelled.

Note: For offenses not specifically mentioned in this rubric, faculty members may confer with the Academic Integrity Monitor and propose a description of the offense and the level of sanction to be included in the faculty member's syllabus. The proposed description and sanctions will be forwarded to the Academic Integrity Monitor to review the proposed offense and sanction for consistency with existing offenses and sanctions. If a faculty member and Academic Integrity Monitor disagree over a particular offense or sanction, the matter may be discussed with the relevant dean and /or the AUAIB, but must be reported to the AUAIB. In the event of a conflict between a syllabus and the Academic Integrity Policy or this rubric, the policy and rubric shall take precedence.

Note: For Level One and Two violations the AUAIB shall impose additional educational sanctions appropriate to the infraction, including, but not limited to, requiring the student to complete additional learning activities regarding academic dishonesty, withdrawal of transcripts or publications, or taking other steps to remedy violations. On appeal, the Provost and Chancellor may also impose additional educational sanctions.

III. Grade Forgiveness Opportunities and Removal of the “X”:

After two semesters of acceptable performance at the University following the imposition of a penalty, with no student conduct or academic dishonesty infractions, the undergraduate student may request grade forgiveness by [petition to Academic Initiatives and Integrity](#), for a first offense of any Level One or Level Two violation, or a second offense of a Level One violation. However, retaking a class does not remove the X on the transcript which indicates that a student was found responsible of a violation of academic integrity for that class.

To remove the X on the transcript, the student may request that the X be removed by submitting a written [petition to the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs](#). This written petition must provide evidence that the student now understands ethical standards (e.g. GPA following the infraction; lack of subsequent infractions [academic and conduct]; proactive activities that the student has engaged in to learn about appropriate techniques for citation, etc.), and it may not be considered earlier than a year after the date of the board hearing in which the XF penalty was imposed or earlier than a period of suspension, dependent on which has the longest duration. The option to remove an X from the transcript is not available to graduate students. Expulsion from the University of Arkansas for academic dishonesty will be permanently noted on the student’s transcript.

IV. Degrees, Honors & Awards:

The University reserves the right to withhold or withdraw degrees, honors, or awards, due to violations of the Academic Integrity Policy.

V. Suspension and Expulsion:

Suspension involves withdrawal of enrollment privileges for a specified period of time and ordinarily carries with it conditions which must be met for re-enrollment. Suspended students are not permitted to live or board in University facilities or approved student organization housing (i.e., facilities owned by the University and leased to a student organization.) Re-enrollment after a suspension requires that the student apply to the Executive Director for Academic Initiatives and Integrity, or designee, at the close of the imposed period for a determination of whether they have met the conditions of their re-enrollment. Students suspended may not receive credit for University work completed by **distance** or in residence at another university without prior permission from the Provost or designee. Records of suspension are maintained indefinitely.

Expulsion is a permanent dismissal from the University. These records are maintained indefinitely.