

# Rutgers University Senate

## Academic Standards, Regulations, and Admissions Committee

### Response to Charge S-1609 on Academic Integrity Policies

**S-1609 Revisions to Rutgers University Academic Integrity Policy:** Consider and make recommendations on how the Rutgers University Academic Integrity Policy should be revised in light of the merger with units of the former UMDNJ. Should there be a single academic integrity policy applicable to all Rutgers schools and colleges? Should the procedures for adjudicating alleged violations of academic integrity be different for different types of schools? As part of the deliberations, consider the draft academic integrity policy tentatively endorsed by the 2013 ad hoc committee charged with reconciling the Rutgers Code of Student conduct and Academic Integrity Policy with the UMDNJ document Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Disciplinary Procedures.

#### I. Background

The current Rutgers Academic Integrity Policy was developed by an *ad hoc* committee of faculty, staff, and students from Rutgers Camden, Rutgers Newark, and Rutgers New Brunswick, with extensive input from the larger University community. It first went into effect in September 2011.

There was not enough time in the run-up to the 2013 merger of most units of the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey (UMDNJ) into Rutgers to reconcile the legacy Rutgers and legacy UMDNJ codes of student conduct and academic integrity policies, so the following statement was added to the Rutgers Academic Integrity Policy as a footnote on page 1:

This policy applies to all Schools and Colleges of Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, including the Ernest Mario School of Pharmacy and the Rutgers College of Nursing. However, at this time, this policy will not apply to the Robert Wood Johnson Medical School, School of Health Related Professions, Rutgers School of Dental Medicine, New Jersey Medical School, Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences, School of Public Health, and School of Nursing (former UMDNJ School of Nursing), whose students will adhere to the RBHS policy titled “Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Disciplinary Procedures” found at <http://academicaffairs.rutgers.edu/student-rights><sup>1</sup>

This change was clearly intended to be a stopgap measure.

The legacy UMDNJ document *Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Disciplinary Procedures* was first adopted in 1995 and has been revised several times since then; the most recent substantive revision dates from 2010. This document serves as both a code of student conduct and an academic integrity policy and presents the procedures for adjudicating alleged disciplinary violations of all types. It gives some flexibility, however, to the individual schools to customize the procedures to their particular needs. In addition, each school has an Honor Code/Code of Professional Conduct that sets forth the expectations for ethical and professional behavior for the particular profession.

In fall 2013, a predominantly staff *ad hoc* committee was formed and charged with reconciling the Rutgers and legacy UMDNJ codes of student conduct and academic integrity policies. The committee, hereafter called the reconciliation committee, was chaired by Associate Dean James Hill of the Rutgers New Jersey Medical School. Among its members were Anne Newman, the then Rutgers Director of Student Conduct, Freda Zackin, the then RBHS Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Associate Legal Counsel Barbara Turen, and deans or their representatives from each of the legacy UMDNJ schools and from several legacy Rutgers schools. In addition, there were a small number of faculty and student members. Among the faculty members was Martha Cotter, co-chair of

---

<sup>1</sup> This link is no longer active. *Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Disciplinary Procedures* can now be found at [http://academicaffairs.rutgers.edu/sites/academicaffairs/files/RBHS%20Chancellor%20Policy\\_Students%20Rights%20Responsibilities%20and%20Disciplinary%20Procedures%20\\_6.19.13.pdf](http://academicaffairs.rutgers.edu/sites/academicaffairs/files/RBHS%20Chancellor%20Policy_Students%20Rights%20Responsibilities%20and%20Disciplinary%20Procedures%20_6.19.13.pdf)

the University Senate Academic Standards, Regulations, and Admissions Committee, who also chaired the committee that wrote the 2011 Rutgers Academic Integrity Policy. This *ad hoc* committee met once in the fall 2013 semester and twice in the spring 2014 semester.

At the third meeting of the reconciliation committee, on April 3, 2014, the group discussed a draft revision of the Rutgers Academic Integrity Policy, meant to apply to all Rutgers students including those in RBHS schools. The draft policy, prepared by Martha Cotter, defined academic integrity and presented its basic tenets, discussed various ways academic integrity can be violated, and presented a list of possible sanctions for such violations. It did not, however, prescribe procedures for adjudicating alleged academic integrity violations, but rather referenced separate procedural documents for RBHS and for the rest of Rutgers. It was envisioned that the RBHS procedural document would be a revised version of *Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Disciplinary Procedures*, while the non-RBHS procedural document would present a somewhat revised version of the procedures in the appendices of the 2013 Rutgers Academic Integrity Policy. Those members present tentatively approved the draft policy subject to some minor changes.

At the end of the meeting, Martha Cotter was charged with making the agreed upon changes to the draft Academic Integrity Policy and James Hill was charged with drafting a revised version of *Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Disciplinary Procedures* incorporating the changes members of the committee had agreed upon. Both revised documents were to be discussed at the next committee meeting. The “next meeting” never occurred, however, for reasons that are not completely clear, although the retirement of Freda Zackin was probably a major factor. Nothing has been done since then to continue the reconciliation process despite some prodding by the Office of Student Conduct and the University Senate. The Rutgers Academic Integrity Policy and the now RBHS document *Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Disciplinary Procedures* thus remain as they were in fall 2013.

According to the Rutgers Academic Integrity Policy, major changes to the policy must be approved by the University Senate and by the four Chancellors “in consultation with their deans.” Minor changes to the policy must be approved by ASRAC. After the *ad hoc* reconciliation committee was formed in 2013, therefore, ASRAC received the two-fold charge to (i) provide input to the reconciliation committee and (ii) consider any proposals from that committee to change the Rutgers Academic Integrity Policy. ASRAC did provide input to the reconciliation committee through Co-chair Cotter. The charge was put on hold during the 2014-2015 academic year while ASRAC waited for a hoped for resumption of the reconciliation efforts. When it became clear that the efforts were not going to resume, ASRAC began to discuss how and by whom the Rutgers Academic Integrity Policy should be changed to meet the needs of the RBHS professional schools.

## **II. Committee Considerations and Conclusions**

ASRAC discussed possible changes to the Rutgers Academic Integrity Policy and disciplinary procedures, among other matters, at every committee meeting during the 2015-16 academic year. A set of recommendations was agreed upon by consensus and Co-chair Cotter was charged with preparing a draft report and resolution over the summer. The draft report and resolution were then discussed, revised, and approved by the 2016-17 ASRAC.

Active participants in the ASRAC discussions included members from Arts and Sciences (SAS, NCAS, and CCAS), School of Environmental and Biological Sciences, School of Business Camden, Rutgers Business School, Newark & New Brunswick, School of Engineering, School of

Communication and Information, School of Social Work (including its Dean), RWJ Medical School, NJ Medical School, School of Dental Medicine (including its Dean), School of Health Related Professions, and School of Nursing. In addition, ASRAC Co-chair Cotter, together with Senate Chair Ann Gould, spoke on November 25, 2015 with RBHS Chancellor Brian Strom about the failure of the prior reconciliation efforts and the need to move forward. Co-chair Cotter also consulted retired RBHS Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Freda Zackin and former Director of Student Conduct (now Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs) Anne Newman over the summer.

Early in the discussions, ASRAC members reached consensus on the following two points:

1. The current (2013) version of the Rutgers Academic Integrity Policy is unacceptable at this point and needs to be revised as soon as possible. The footnote on page 1 is out-of-date and confusing. Moreover, the fact that what was clearly a stopgap fix to the policy is still in place three years after the merger is embarrassing and inconsistent with the high priority the University places on academic integrity.
2. There should be a single Rutgers Academic Integrity Policy applicable to all Rutgers schools and colleges, including those in RBHS. This policy should present the basic tenets and standards of academic integrity, describe common academic integrity violations, and discuss possible sanctions for such violations, but should leave the detailed procedures for adjudication of academic integrity violations to separate procedural documents, which may be somewhat different for different types of schools.

ASRAC then considered the draft Academic Integrity Policy tentatively endorsed by the 2013 reconciliation committee. Assuming that legacy Rutgers and legacy UMDNJ disciplinary procedures will be reconciled satisfactorily, ASRAC had only one serious problem with the draft policy: a substantial majority of committee members objected to the elimination of the distinction between separable and nonseparable violations of academic integrity for undergraduates in schools outside RBHS. The discussion of levels of violations from the current Rutgers Academic Integrity Policy was therefore put into the draft policy, but with a clear statement that the formal division into separable and nonseparable violations does not apply to in any Rutgers school that was formerly part of UMDNJ. The resulting revised draft is given in the Appendix.

ASRAC also discussed the extent to which the legacy UMDNJ disciplinary procedures should be made more like those of the rest of Rutgers. Some committee members argued that legacy UMDNJ schools should follow the current Rutgers procedures, with slight modifications, as is currently done by Rutgers professional schools such as Pharmacy, Law, and Social Work. On the other hand, some committee members from RBHS argued that the procedures described in *Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Disciplinary Procedures* served UMDNJ very well over many years and making major changes to those procedures could have unfortunate unforeseen consequences. In particular, they argued that the legacy UMDNJ procedures were better suited than the current Rutgers procedures to the needs of the medical and dental schools, which run on a 12-month cycle and for which allegations of disciplinary violations must be resolved quickly to avoid an accused student's progress toward degree being seriously compromised even if the student is found not responsible for the alleged violation. ASRAC reached consensus on only one aspect of this issue; namely, members agreed that at least the following two changes must be made to the procedures specified in *Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Disciplinary Procedures* in order for ASRAC to be willing to approve those procedures.

1. The standard of proof in academic integrity cases must be changed from preponderance of evidence to clear and convincing evidence, which means that the person or group deciding the case must be convinced that there is a high probability that the accused student is responsible for the alleged violation.
2. Contrary to what is stated in subsection F.4.b of *Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Disciplinary Procedures*<sup>2</sup>, the Hearing Body deciding a case must not be informed of any prior violations for which the accused student was found responsible until after a decision on responsibility has been made (but before a suitable sanction is assigned).

ASRAC also discussed the fact that Rutgers needs to do a much better job of educating the University community about academic integrity and the procedures used to report and adjudicate alleged violations thereof. Many faculty members across the University do not know what to do when they observe or are apprised of a possible violation of academic integrity and many students are not aware of how the disciplinary systems work. There is a great deal of information about academic integrity and disciplinary procedures (for schools that were not part of UMDNJ) on the Academic Integrity website ([academic.integrity.rutgers.edu](http://academic.integrity.rutgers.edu)) but there is no link to this website or equivalent information on the Information for Faculty & Staff menu on the Camden, Newark, or New Brunswick websites. Nor are matters much better at RBHS, where accessing *Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Disciplinary Procedures* from the RBHS website requires clicking on Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences Policies on the Quick Links menu and then scrolling down to number 29 in a long alphabetical list of policies.

In the end, ASRAC concluded that a new (i.e., substantially revised) Rutgers Academic Integrity Policy and associated disciplinary procedures need to be developed but that ASRAC is not the appropriate group to draft the new policy and procedures. Instead, ASRAC members agreed to ask the University administration to appoint, in consultation with the University Senate, a new, broadly representative *ad hoc* academic integrity (AI) committee and charge it with developing a new academic integrity policy and associated procedures that will best serve the needs of all Rutgers schools, colleges, and students.

ASRAC members also agreed that the academic integrity *status quo* should not remain in effect while the new academic integrity policy and procedures are being drafted, discussed, approved, and implemented, which will probably take several years. We instead strongly recommend that the University adopt the draft policy given in the Appendix as an interim academic integrity policy. As noted previously, this policy is a somewhat revised version of the draft policy tentatively endorsed by the 2013-14 reconciliation committee.

ASRAC's formal recommendations are given as part of the following resolution.

---

<sup>2</sup> The education records referred to in this subsection contains a record of any prior academic integrity violations for which the accused student was found responsible. ASRAC therefore insists that the Hearing Body should have access to this record only after it has found the accused student responsible for the alleged violation.

## **Resolution**

*Whereas*, the Senate Academic Standards, Regulations, and Admissions Committee has carefully considered possible revisions to the Rutgers University Academic Integrity Policy in light of the merger with units of the former UMDNJ, and made a number of recommendations in this regard.

*Whereas*, the university Senate has considered the Committee's recommendations and found them to be sound and in the best interests of Rutgers University,

*Therefore be it resolved* that the Rutgers University Senate endorses the recommendations below and asks the Rutgers Administration to implement them, and

*Be it further resolved that* the Senate asks the Administration to begin the implementation process expeditiously by (i) appointing, in consultation with the Senate, a new University-wide *ad-hoc* academic integrity committee charged with drafting a new academic integrity policy for all of Rutgers and (ii) beginning the approval process for the proposed interim academic integrity policy by sending the draft policy to the four chancellors for their consideration, in consultation with their deans..

## **Recommendations**

1. That Rutgers University develop a single academic integrity policy that will apply to all schools and colleges of the University, including the professional schools in RBHS and elsewhere.
2. That the Rutgers central administration, in consultation with the University Senate, appoint an *ad hoc* Rutgers-wide academic integrity committee to draft such an academic integrity policy for all of Rutgers and to determine the extent to which the associated disciplinary procedures should be different for different types of schools in order best to serve the needs of all Rutgers schools and colleges while ensuring that every Rutgers student accused of a violation of academic integrity receives the same fair and equitable treatment and is accorded the same level of due process.
3. That the new "AI Committee" consist primarily of faculty and students, with representation from the University Senate, the Chancellor's offices, the Office of Legal Counsel, and staff members charged with administering the academic integrity policy. In particular, two members of ASRAC should be appointed to this new AI Committee.
4. That the draft academic integrity policy given in the Appendix, which is very similar to the policy tentatively endorsed by the former reconciliation committee, be adopted as the Interim Rutgers Academic Integrity Policy, once the required approvals from the full University Senate and the four chancellors, in consultation with their deans, have been obtained<sup>3</sup> This interim policy would remain in effect until a new permanent academic integrity policy is implemented.
5. That under the Interim Rutgers Academic Integrity Policy, the disciplinary procedures to be followed in legacy UMDNJ schools will be those given in *Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Disciplinary Procedures* with the two changes given on pp. 3 and 4 above, while the procedures to be followed in schools that were not part of UMDNJ will be those given in the document *Procedures for Reporting and Adjudicating Alleged Violations of Academic Integrity*. The latter

---

<sup>3</sup>Any major changes to the draft policy requested by the Chancellors must be approved by the University Senate.

document combines the procedures from Appendices B and C of the current Rutgers Academic Integrity Policy into a single stand-alone document without making any substantive changes to those procedures.

6. That the Rutgers Administration launch a major campaign to educate faculty, students, and staff about the academic integrity policy and procedures, including prominently displaying a link to the Academic Integrity Policy and to the relevant disciplinary procedures on the Camden, Newark, New Brunswick, and RBHS home pages.

### **2016-2017 ASRAC Members**

<i>Martha Cotter, Co-Chair</i>	<i>At-Large New Brunswick</i>
<i>Matthew Winkler, Co-Chair</i>	<i>NB Staff</i>
<i>Tuna Artun</i>	<i>SAS-NB Faculty</i>
<i>Sanjib Bhuyan</i>	<i>SEBS, Faculty</i>
<i>Robert Boikess</i>	<i>SAS-NB, Faculty</i>
<i>Holly Chatham</i>	<i>Alumni Association</i>
<i>Mary Chayko</i>	<i>SCI, Faculty</i>
<i>Anthony Covington</i>	<i>Student Charter Trustee</i>
<i>Babu Dasari</i>	<i>CCAS, Faculty</i>
<i>Richard Drachtman</i>	<i>RWJMS, Faculty</i>
<i>Cecile Feldman</i>	<i>Dean, RSDM, Administration</i>
<i>Nathaniel Flores</i>	<i>GS-NB, Student</i>
<i>Chon Goh</i>	<i>SB-C, Faculty</i>
<i>Melike Gursoy</i>	<i>Engineering, Faculty</i>
<i>Phoebe Haddon</i>	<i>Camden Chancellor, Administration</i>
<i>Lynn Kuzma</i>	<i>Associate Dean, UC-N Dean Designee, Administration</i>
<i>Kriste Lindenmeyer</i>	<i>Dean, FAS-C, Administration</i>
<i>Josephine Marchetta</i>	<i>Alumni Association</i>
<i>Christopher Markosian</i>	<i>SAS-NB Student</i>
<i>Veenat Parmar</i>	<i>SPH, Student</i>
<i>Cathryn Potter</i>	<i>Dean, SSW, Administration</i>
<i>Susan Salmond</i>	<i>Nursing Dean, Administration</i>
<i>Asha Samant</i>	<i>RSDM, Faculty</i>
<i>Engelbert Santana</i>	<i>Newark Staff</i>
<i>Robert Schwartz</i>	<i>NJMS, Faculty</i>
<i>Sue Shapses</i>	<i>SEBS, Faculty</i>
<i>Gurpreet Singh</i>	<i>PTL-N, Faculty</i>
<i>Ted Szatrowski</i>	<i>At-Large Newark, Faculty</i>
<i>Suzanne Thornton</i>	<i>GS-NB Student</i>
<i>Karen Zurlo</i>	<i>SSW, Faculty</i>

# Appendix: Draft Rutgers Interim Academic Integrity Policy

## I. Introduction

As an academic community dedicated to the creation, dissemination, and application of knowledge, Rutgers University is committed to fostering an intellectual and ethical environment based on the principles of academic integrity. Academic integrity is essential to the success of the University's educational, research, and clinical missions, and violations of academic integrity constitute serious offenses against the entire academic community.

The principles of academic integrity require that a student:

- properly acknowledge and cite all use of the ideas, results, or words of others.
- properly acknowledge all contributors to a given piece of work.
- make sure that all work submitted as his or her own in a course or other academic activity is produced without the aid of impermissible materials or impermissible collaboration.
- obtain all data or results by ethical means and report them accurately without suppressing any results inconsistent with his or her interpretation or conclusions.
- treat all other students in an ethical manner, respecting their integrity and right to pursue their educational goals without interference. This requires that a student neither facilitate academic dishonesty by others nor obstruct their academic progress.
- uphold the ethical standards of the profession for which he or she is preparing.

Adherence to these principles is necessary in order to ensure that

- everyone is given proper credit for his or her ideas, words, results, and other scholarly accomplishments.
- all student work is fairly evaluated and no student has an inappropriate advantage over others.
- the academic and ethical development of all students is fostered.
- the reputation of the University for integrity is maintained and enhanced.

Failure to uphold these principles of academic integrity threatens both the reputation of the University and the value of the degrees awarded to its students. Every member of the University community therefore bears a responsibility for ensuring that the highest standards of academic integrity are upheld.

The University administration is responsible for working with faculty<sup>1</sup> and students to foster a strong institutional culture of academic integrity, for providing effective educational programs that create an understanding of and commitment to academic integrity, and for establishing equitable and effective procedures to deal with allegations of violations of academic integrity. The faculty shares with the administration the responsibility for educating students about the importance and principles of academic integrity. Faculty members are expected to inform students of the particular requirements regarding academic integrity within their specific courses, to make reasonable efforts to minimize academic dishonesty, and to respond appropriately to violations of academic integrity. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to provide a statement concerning academic integrity and a link to the Academic Integrity Policy on their course syllabi.

---

<sup>1</sup> For purposes of the Academic Integrity Policy, the term faculty member includes not only tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty members, but also part-time lecturers, coadjutants, TAs, staff members, and administrators who are serving as the instructor of record in a course (i.e., the instructor responsible for assigning final course grades) or supervising and evaluating the performance of a Rutgers student.

Students are responsible for understanding the principles of academic integrity and abiding by them in all aspects of their work at the University. Students are also encouraged to help educate fellow students about academic integrity and to bring all alleged violations of academic integrity they encounter to the attention of the appropriate authorities.

To promote a strong culture of academic integrity, Rutgers has adopted the following honor pledge: ***On my honor, I have neither received nor given any unauthorized assistance on this examination (assignment)***. Undergraduate students are asked to write and sign this pledge on examinations and major assignments submitted for grading and are required to take an online tutorial and pass an online examination on academic integrity in their first semester at Rutgers and to affirm that they understand the Rutgers Academic Integrity Policy and will abide by it in all their academic work. In addition, some professional schools have honor codes which imposed additional requirements such as requiring students to report observed violations of academic integrity by others and to self-report such violations.

## II. Applicability of the Policy

This Academic Integrity Policy applies to all schools and colleges of Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey. In addition, most professional schools have codes of professional conduct that students are required to follow. The code of professional conduct for a particular professional school can be found in the student handbook or equivalent document of that school. Each professional school has the responsibility to educate its students about its code of professional conduct and the penalties for violations thereof. Students are responsible for understanding and following the requirements of the code of professional conduct for the particular professional school in which they are enrolled.

## III. Violations of Academic Integrity

### A. Types of Violations

This section describes various ways in which the principles of academic integrity can be violated. Examples of each type of violation are given but neither the types of violations nor the lists of examples are exhaustive.

***Plagiarism:*** Plagiarism is the use of another person's words, ideas, or results without giving that person appropriate credit. To avoid plagiarism, every direct quotation must be identified by quotation marks or appropriate indentation and both direct quotation and paraphrasing must be cited properly according to the accepted format for the particular discipline or as required by the instructor in a course. Some common examples of plagiarism are:

- Copying word for word (i.e. quoting directly) from an oral, printed, or electronic source without proper attribution.
- Paraphrasing without proper attribution, i.e., presenting in one's own words another person's written words or ideas as if they were one's own.
- Submitting a purchased or downloaded term paper or other materials to satisfy a course requirement.
- Incorporating into one's work graphs, drawings, photographs, diagrams, tables, spreadsheets, computer programs, or other nontextual material from other sources without proper attribution.

***Cheating:*** Cheating is the use of inappropriate or prohibited materials, information, sources, or aids in any academic exercise. Cheating also includes submitting papers, research results and reports, analyses, etc. as one's own work when they were, in fact, prepared by others. Some common examples are:

- Receiving research, programming, data collection, or analytical assistance from others or working with another student on an assignment where such help is not permitted.
- Copying another student's work or answers on a quiz or examination.
- Using or possessing books, notes, calculators, cell phones, or other prohibited devices or materials during a quiz or examination.
- Submitting the same work or major portions thereof to satisfy the requirements of more than one course without the permission of the instructors involved.
- Preprogramming a calculator or other device to contain answers, formulas, or other unauthorized information for use during a quiz or examination.
- Acquiring a copy of an examination from an unauthorized source prior to the examination.
- Having a substitute take an examination in one's place.
- Submitting as one's own work a term paper or other assignment prepared, in whole or in part, by someone else.

***Fabrication:*** Fabrication is the invention or falsification of sources, citations, data, or results, and recording or reporting them in any academic exercise. Some examples are:

- Citing a source that does not exist.
- Making up or falsifying evidence or data or other source materials.
- Falsifying papers, reports, or other documents by selectively omitting or altering data that do not support one's conclusions or claimed experimental precision.

***Facilitation of Dishonesty:*** Facilitation of dishonesty is knowingly or negligently allowing one's work to be used by other students without prior approval of the instructor or otherwise aiding others in committing violations of academic integrity. A student who intentionally facilitates a violation of academic integrity can be considered to be as culpable as the student who receives the impermissible assistance, even if the facilitator does not benefit personally from the violation. Some examples are:

- Collaborating before a quiz or examination to develop methods of exchanging information.
- Knowingly allowing others to copy answers to work on a quiz or examination or assisting others to do so.
- Distributing an examination from an unauthorized source prior to the examination.
- Distributing or selling a term paper to other students.
- Taking an examination for another student.

***Academic Sabotage:*** Academic sabotage is deliberately impeding the academic progress of others. Some examples are:

- Intentionally destroying or obstructing another student's work.
- Stealing or defacing books, journals, or other library or University materials.
- Altering computer files that contain data, reports or assignments belonging to another student.
- Removing posted or reserve material or otherwise preventing other students' access to it.

***Violation of Research or Professional Ethics:*** Violations in this category include both violations of the code of ethics specific to a particular profession and violations of more generally applicable ethical requirements for the acquisition, analysis, and reporting of research data and the preparation and submission of scholarly work for publication. Some examples are:

- Violating a canon of the ethical code of the profession for which a student is preparing.
- Using unethical or improper means of acquiring, analyzing, or reporting data in a course research project, a senior thesis project, a master's or doctoral research project, grant-funded research, or research submitted for publication.

***Violations Involving Potentially Criminal Activity:*** Violations in this category include theft, fraud, forgery, or distribution of ill-gotten materials committed as part of an act of academic dishonesty. Some examples are:

- Stealing an examination from a faculty member's or University office or from electronic files.
- Selling or distributing a stolen examination.
- Forging a change-of-grade form.
- Falsifying a University transcript.

## **B. Levels of Violations**

In Rutgers schools and colleges that were not part of UMDNJ, violations of academic integrity are divided into two categories: nonseparable and separable. Nonseparable violations are less severe violations for which the possible sanctions for a first-time offense do not include suspension or expulsion from the University; separable violations are more severe violations for which the sanctions may, but need not, include suspension or expulsion. The procedures for adjudicating alleged violations of academic integrity are also different for separable and nonseparable violations. The distinction between separable and nonseparable is primarily made for violations by undergraduate students; all violations of academic integrity by a graduate student<sup>2</sup> are treated as potentially separable.

The formal division of violations on the basis of possible sanctions and disciplinary procedures does not apply to students in any school that was part of UMDNJ...

### ***Nonseparable Violations***

Nonseparable violations are less serious violations of academic integrity. They may occur because of inexperience or lack of understanding of the principles of academic integrity and are often characterized by a relatively low degree of premeditation or planning on the part of the student committing the violation. These violations are generally quite limited in extent, occur on a minor assignment or quiz or constitute a small portion of a major assignment and/or represent a small percentage of the total course work. Below are a few examples of violations that are most often considered nonseparable, at least when committed by an undergraduate student as a first-time offense. This list is not exhaustive and classification of a given violation as separable or nonseparable is always heavily dependent on the specific facts and circumstances of the violation.

- Improper citation without dishonest intent.

---

<sup>2</sup> In this policy, the term graduate student refers to post-baccalaureate students pursuing advanced degrees of any type or enrolled in a graduate course or courses. The term also includes students in the advanced stages of a professional program that leads to a masters or doctoral degree without conferral of a baccalaureate degree.

- Plagiarism on a minor assignment or a very limited portion of a major assignment.
- Unpremeditated cheating on a quiz or minor examination.
- Unauthorized collaboration with another student on a homework assignment.
- Citing a source that does not exist or that one hasn't read on a minor assignment.
- Signing in for another student via attendance sheet or clicker in a course in which attendance counts toward the grade.

### ***Separable Violations***

Separable violations are very serious violations of academic integrity that affect a more significant portion of the course work compared to nonseparable violations. Separable violations are often characterized by substantial premeditation or planning and clearly dishonest or malicious intent on the part of the student committing the violation. Below are some examples of violations that are most often considered separable. Again, the list is certainly not exhaustive and classification of a given violation as separable or nonseparable is always heavily dependent on the exact facts and circumstances of the violation.

- A second nonseparable violation.
- Substantial plagiarism on a major assignment.
- Copying or using unauthorized materials, devices, or collaboration on a major exam.
- Having a substitute take an examination.
- Making up or falsifying evidence or data or other source materials for a major assignment, including falsification by selectively omitting or altering data that do not support one's claims or conclusions.
- Facilitating dishonesty by another student on a major exam or assignment.
- Intentionally destroying or obstructing another student's work.
- Any violation involving potentially criminal activity.

## **IV. Sanctions**

Any violation of academic integrity is a serious offense and is subject to an appropriate sanction or penalty. Sanctions for violations of academic integrity are of two types: educational sanctions and disciplinary sanctions.

### ***Educational Sanctions***

Educational sanctions for violations of academic integrity include, but are not limited to, one or more of the following:

- An assigned paper or research project related to ethics or academic integrity.
- A make-up assignment that may be more difficult than the original assignment.
- No credit for the original assignment.
- A failing grade on the assignment.
- A failing grade for the course.

### ***Disciplinary Sanctions***

Disciplinary sanctions for violations of academic integrity include, but are not limited to, one or more of the following:

- Disciplinary warning
- Disciplinary probation
- Required participation in a noncredit workshop or seminar on ethics or academic integrity.
- Restrictive probation<sup>3</sup>.
- A grade of XF (disciplinary F) for the course.
- Dismissal from a departmental or school honors program.
- Denial of access to internships or research programs.
- Loss of appointment to academically-based positions.
- Loss of departmental/graduate program/school endorsements for internal and external fellowship support and employment opportunities.
- Removal of fellowship or assistantship support.
- Suspension for one or more semesters.
- Requiring a delay in the completion of a professional program.
- Dismissal from a graduate or professional program.
- Expulsion from the University with a permanent notation of disciplinary expulsion on the student's transcript.

As noted above, the permissible sanctions for nonseparable violations do not include suspension or expulsions. Nor do they include assignment of a grade of XF.

## **V. Policies for Addressing Alleged Violations of Academic Integrity**

### **A. Reporting and Adjudicating Alleged Violations**

The procedures for reporting and adjudication<sup>4</sup> of alleged violations of academic integrity in Rutgers schools that were formerly part of UMDNJ, hereafter referred to as legacy UMDNJ schools, are different in certain respects from the procedures followed in the rest of Rutgers University<sup>5</sup>. The respective procedures are specified in the two documents

- Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Disciplinary Procedures (legacy UMDNJ schools)
- Procedures for Reporting and Adjudicating Alleged Violations of Academic Integrity (other Rutgers schools and colleges)

If a student from a legacy UMDNJ school is accused of committing a violation of academic integrity in a course offered by a school that was not a part of UMDNJ, the procedures specified in *Procedures for Reporting and Adjudicating Alleged Violations of Academic Integrity* shall be used to determine if the student is responsible for the alleged violation. If the student is found responsible,

---

<sup>3</sup> See section IX.C.4 of the *University Code of Student Conduct* for a definition of this sanction.

<sup>4</sup> In the disciplinary process for alleged violations of academic integrity, the terms adjudication or adjudicating mean investigating the allegation, determining whether the accused student is responsible or not responsible for the alleged violation, and assigning an appropriate sanction if the student is found responsible.

<sup>5</sup> This includes the Ernest Mario School of Pharmacy, the only school in Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences (RBHS) that was not formerly a part of UMDNJ.

the Director of Student Conduct or other appropriate student conduct officer shall notify the Dean of the student's school of matriculation of the violation and the finding of responsibility and may also make a recommendation regarding sanction. The sanction shall then be selected and imposed using the procedures specified in *Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Disciplinary Procedures*

On the other hand, if a student from a school that was not part of UMDNJ is accused of a violation of academic integrity in a course offered by a legacy UMDNJ school, the procedures specified in *Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Disciplinary Procedure* shall be used to determine if the student is responsible for the alleged violation. If the student is found responsible, the appropriate legacy UMDNJ student conduct officer or dean shall notify the Office of Student Conduct (New Brunswick) or the Dean of Students Office (Newark and Camden) of the violation and the finding of responsibility and may also make a recommendation regarding sanction. The sanction shall then be selected and imposed using the procedures specified in *Procedures for Reporting and Adjudicating Alleged Violations of Academic Integrity*.

### **B. Standard of Proof**

The standard of proof in academic integrity cases is clear and convincing evidence, which means that the person or group deciding the case must be convinced that there is a high probability that the accused student is responsible for the alleged violation.

### **C. Withdrawal and Assignment of Grades During the Disciplinary Process**

Once a student has been notified of an alleged violation of academic integrity, he or she may not drop the course or withdraw from school until the disciplinary process is completed unless he or she obtains permission to do so from the dean of his or her school. The student may, however, file a petition with the Office of Student Conduct or Chancellor's Designee and the dean of his or her school of matriculation, requesting permission to withdraw retroactively from the course if and only if he or she is found not responsible for the alleged violation.

If a faculty member must submit a final course grade before the disciplinary process for an alleged violation of academic integrity is completed, the accused student shall be given a temporary grade, which does not affect the student's GPA, until the disciplinary process is completed.

## **VI. Amendments**

Minor changes to this Academic Integrity Policy must be approved by the Academic Standards, Regulations, and Admissions Committee of the University Senate. Major changes must also be approved by the full University Senate and by the four Chancellors, in consultation with their deans.