

Rutgers University Senate
Academic Standards, Regulations, and Admissions Committee
Response to Charge S-1208
May 2013

Charge S-1208 Required Changes to the Academic Integrity Policy: Recommend changes to the Rutgers Academic Integrity Policy necessitated by the about-to-be-adopted revised University Code of Student Conduct, which states that procedures for adjudicating alleged violations of academic integrity are specified in the Academic Integrity Policy. Required changes to the Academic Integrity Policy therefore consist, at a minimum, of incorporation of the procedures for resolving alleged separable violations of academic integrity in the appendices to the Policy or in a companion document. Also recommend whether some of the revised and simplified procedures for handling alleged separable conduct violations in the new Code of Student Conduct should also be adopted for resolving alleged violations of academic integrity.

Background

The University Code of Student Conduct currently in force specifies the procedures for adjudicating alleged violations of academic integrity and any changes to those procedures have to be approved by the Committee on Student Conduct, a committee of mostly student-life staff that controls the Code of Student Conduct. On the other hand, the ultimate responsibility for implementing and overseeing the Academic Integrity Policy lies with the Chief Academic Officer (CAO) on each Rutgers Campus and major changes to the policy have to be approved by the CAOs and the University Senate. This divergence between those with authority over the Code of Student Conduct and those with authority over the Academic Integrity Policy has led to a situation in which the Committee on Student Conduct can make changes to the Code of Student Conduct that have a major impact on the implementation of the Academic Integrity Policy without approval from the CAOs or the University Senate.

In an attempt to remedy this problem, the Senate passed a [resolution](#) in October 2011 requesting that

1. changes to the Code of Student Conduct that would have a substantial impact on the Academic Integrity Policy and/or the procedures for adjudicating alleged violations of academic integrity require approval by the CAO on each Rutgers campus.
2. the membership of the Committee on Student Conduct include each year three faculty members from the University Senate, selected by the Senate Executive Committee, to provide enhanced academic input during the Committee's deliberations, as well as liaison with the University Senate.

In his [response](#) of December 14, 2011 to this resolution, President McCormick acknowledged the the issues raised but declined to follow the Senate's recommendations. Instead he suggested an alternative solution to the problem; i.e., he asked that "representatives from the University Senate work with representatives from the Office of the Executive Vice-President for Academic Affairs, the Chancellor's Offices in Newark and Camden, the Office of the Vice President for Undergraduate Education, the Office of Student Conduct, and the Office of Senior Vice President and General Counsel to develop due process procedures that conform to the needs of the Academic Integrity Policy." He further stated that the "process for approving the new procedures would be the same as that followed for major changes made to the Academic Integrity Policy-namely, approval by the University Senate and by the Campus Chief Academic Officers, in consultation with their deans".

ASRAC welcomed the President's alternative solution but decided that consideration of new procedures for adjudicating alleged violations of academic integrity should be put off for a while for two reasons:

1. At that time, the new Academic Integrity Policy and the revised procedures in the Code of Student Conduct for adjudicating alleged violations of academic integrity had been in effect for only one semester and we wanted to see how the new policy and procedures were working before considering changing the procedures.
2. We knew that a new Code of Student Conduct was being developed and wanted to see the new procedures for adjudicating alleged nonacademic conduct violations before deciding how to revise the procedures for adjudicating alleged academic integrity violations.

When it became clear last summer that the new Code of Student Conduct would not specify the procedures for adjudicating alleged separable violations of academic integrity and that those procedures would therefore have to be incorporated in the Academic Integrity Policy itself, ASRAC requested the issuance of charge S-1208.

ASRAC's response to this charge is the draft revised Academic Integrity Policy the Senate is being asked to approve. The policy was drafted by ASRAC Co-Chair Cotter with major help from Anne Newman, the Director of Student Conduct. The draft was discussed and modified by members of ASRAC at four committee meetings during the 2012-2013 academic year and given final approval by the committee on March 29, 2013. It has been reviewed by Anne Newman and Associate Director of Student Conduct Melissa Backus, by John Gunkel, the Newark Campus Academic Integrity Designee (CAID), by Mary Beth Daisey, the Camden CAID, by Interim Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education Gregory Jackson, and by a representative of the Vice President and General Counsel.

Changes from the Current Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures

1. The major change to the Academic Integrity Policy is the addition of Appendix C, which specifies the procedures for adjudicating allegations of separable violations of academic integrity. The procedures in Appendix C, however, are only slightly changed from those specified for academic integrity violations in the current Code of Student Conduct. The most significant, but still relatively minor, change is a simplification of appeals procedures. The revised procedures can be summarized as follows:
 - Any finding of responsibility or assigned sanction for a separable violation can be appealed one time only to the Campus Appeals Committee of the campus on which the student is enrolled.
 - Appeals Committee decisions are recommendations to the appropriate CAID, who makes the final decision on the student's appeal.
 - If a student fails to appeal a finding of responsibility and/or sanction within the specified time period, the finding/sanction is final and the case is concluded unless the assigned sanction includes suspension or expulsion. All sanctions including suspension or expulsion must be sent to the appropriate CAID for review even if the student does not appeal.
 - A student can no longer request the President of the University to review a finding of responsibility and/or sanction.

2. The new Appendix B contains nothing of substance that is new: it is just the old companion document entitled “Procedures for Adjudicating Alleged Nonseparable Violations of Academic Integrity” reformatted in the style of the Code of Student Conduct and the University Policy Library. It replaces the old Appendix B, which gave a brief overview of the procedures for adjudicating both separable and nonseparable violations of academic integrity and referred the reader to the Code of Student Conduct or the companion document on nonseparable violations for the details.
3. Appendix A, the glossary of terms, has a few changes required by the addition of Appendix C and the changes in the titles of several staff members and administrators involved in the administration of the Academic Integrity Policy.
4. Changes to the body of the Policy are minor:
 - The only change in sections I and II is the replacement of the sanction of disciplinary probation by the new sanction restrictive probation as a possible penalty for separable offenses.
 - There are a few changes in sections III and IV to make them consistent with Appendix C.
 - There are a number of small changes necessitated by the decision to treat the new grouping of health-related schools and centers called Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences as a fourth Rutgers campus.
 - Subsections E and F have been added to section IV to refer the reader to the parts of the Code of Student Conduct on the rights of accused students and complaint initiators and on the policies regarding disciplinary files, respectively.

Recommendation: ASRAC strongly recommends that the Senate approve the revised Academic Integrity Policy and urges the Rutgers Administration to implement it as of September 1, 2013.

Academic Standards, Regulations and Admissions Committee

Cotter, Martha, GS-NB (F), Co-chair – *Executive Committee Liaison*

Schantz, Daniel, Newark Staff, Co-chair

Ansari, Jalal, SAS-NB (S)

Avakame, Edem, SCJ (F)

Balog, Katalin, FAS-N (F)

Bhuyan, Sanjib, SEBS (F)

Boikess, Robert, SAS-NB (F)

Covington, Anthony, SAS-NB (S)

Evans, Samuel, CCAS (S)

Falk, Richard, SAS-NB Acting Executive Dean (A) - *Administrative Liaison*

Fernandez, Katherine, SAS-NB (S)

Grabosky, Jason, GS-NB (F)

Haibach, Michael, GS-NB (S)

Jackson, Gregory, Interim Vice President for Undergraduate Education (*Non-Senator*)

Jaloudi, Ali, Law-N (S)

Khakh, Jagpreet, SAS-NB (S)

Katz, Harriet, Law-C (F)

Lindenmeyer, Kriste, FAS-C Dean (A)

Naus, Joseph, SAS-NB (F)

Pottick, Kathleen, SSW Acting Dean (A)

Sanchez, Jose, Engineering (S)

Schrire, Carmel, SAS-NB (F)

Sihamshair, Saad, SAS-NB (S)
Szatrowski, Ted, At-Large N (F)
Takhistov, Paul, SEBS (F)
Van de Walle, Gretchen, Acting Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education, NCAS (A)
Vander Hoff, James, At-Large N (F)
Vodak, Mark, SEBS (F)
Wang, Yuchung, GS-C (F)
Winkler, Matthew, NB Staff