

# SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Revised August 4, 2008

Syracuse University has adopted the following academic integrity policies and procedures, effective July 1, 2006. This document is organized in five sections:

[Educational Strategies](#), which describes ongoing and varied efforts that are made to educate Syracuse University students, instructors, staff, and administrators of the importance of academic integrity;

[Policy](#), which articulates key objectives and establishes expectations;

[Procedures](#), which sets forth methods for addressing suspected academic dishonesty;

[Communication and Records](#), which explains record-keeping and record-disclosure practices; and

[Academic Integrity Office](#) (AIO), which establishes an office in the Division of Academic Affairs to support, implement, and coordinate these policies and procedures.

The Syracuse University Senate adopted a motion supporting the framework of these policies and procedures in February 2006. The specific policy and procedural provisions are subject to the approval of and may be modified by the Vice Chancellor and Provost.

The Senate Committee on Instruction is charged to review periodic assessment reports generated by the AIO and receive input from the University community regarding University and school and college academic integrity-related policies and procedures, making recommendations for modification to the Vice Chancellor and Provost when needed.

**SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY  
ACADEMIC INTEGRITY EDUCATIONAL STRATEGIES**

**I. Objectives and Audiences**

A. A University-wide education strategy will address the following objectives for the identified audiences:

1. All Syracuse University **students** will:

- a. Appreciate the value of academic integrity
- b. Understand the academic integrity policy and procedures
- c. Recognize the importance of reporting suspected incidents of academic dishonesty
- d. Be aware of how to obtain procedural advice and support
- e. Implement strategies for performing in an academically honest fashion
- f. Access resources to ensure academic honesty in writing and researching
- g. Acknowledge the importance of confidentiality in matters associated with academic dishonesty

2. All Syracuse University **instructors** will:

- a. Appreciate the value of academic integrity
- b. Understand the academic integrity policy and procedures
- c. Recognize the importance of reporting suspected incidents of academic dishonesty
- d. Be aware of how to obtain procedural advice and support
- e. Access resources for investigating potential cases of academic dishonesty
- f. Implement pedagogical strategies for creating an environment that promotes academic honesty and have access to resources for necessary assistance
- g. Direct students to resources for assistance in ensuring academic honesty in their writing and researching
- h. Acknowledge the importance of confidentiality in matters associated with academic dishonesty

3. All Syracuse University **administrators and staff** will:

- a. Appreciate the value of academic integrity
- b. Promote academic integrity
- c. Recognize the importance of reporting suspected incidents of academic dishonesty
- d. Support strategies for the implementation of academic integrity

- e. Acknowledge the importance of confidentiality in matters associated with academic dishonesty
4. All Syracuse University **teaching assistants and other student assistants** will:
- a. Focus upon all student educational objectives when they are taking a class or conducting research (see section I.A.1)
  - b. Focus upon all instructor educational objectives when they are the instructor of record for the course (see section I.A.2)
  - c. Appreciate the value of academic integrity
  - d. Understand the academic integrity policy and procedures
  - e. Recognize the importance of reporting suspected incidents of academic dishonesty to the instructor of record
  - f. Understand that the instructor of record is ultimately responsible for promoting and monitoring responsible and ethical behavior and work with the instructor of record to promote academic integrity
  - g. Consult with departmental leadership and, if needed, the dean of the school or college for advice when there are concerns with the instructor of record regarding academic dishonesty
  - h. Be aware of how to obtain procedural advice and support
  - i. Access resources for investigating potential cases of academic dishonesty
  - j. Implement pedagogical strategies for creating an environment that promotes academic honesty and have access to resources for necessary assistance
  - k. Direct students to resources for assistance in ensuring academic honesty in their writing and researching
  - l. Acknowledge the importance of confidentiality in matters associated with academic dishonesty

## **II. Methodology**

- A. The methodology by which the objectives for students, instructors, teaching assistants and other student assistants, administrators, and staff will be attained will be diverse in scope, multiple in approach, and frequent in occurrence. This reflects the presence of subpopulations within each of the identified groups. For example, students can be subdivided into undergraduate, graduate, international, nontraditional, first-year, and upperclassmen. Additionally, methodology for instructors must reach traditional faculty, as well as adjuncts, teaching assistants, other student assistants, lab assistants, and graders. Although the collective needs of the sub-populations of a specific audience are similar, as outlined above, the methodology or approach used to reach all the individuals must reflect this diversity. Furthermore, methodology must also address students and instructors who are involved in distance education courses and international programs.

- B. Methods for attaining the objectives of the identified audiences include:
1. Written and multi-media materials linking to multiple resources
  2. Web-based tutorials
  3. Institutional license for an online plagiarism detection service such as Turnitin.com
  4. Institutional license for a citation management system such as RefWorks
  5. Online materials (academic integrity website)
  6. Presentations (live, online)
  7. Discussions/Workshops/Seminars for instructors, teaching assistants and other student assistants, administrators and staff, and students
  8. Displays and kiosks
  9. Campus media
- C. An additional educational strategy reaches across the campus community in celebration of academic integrity.

### **III. Assessment**

Strategies will be assessed to determine the extent to which each audience (i.e., students, instructors, teaching assistants and other student assistants, staff and administrators) has achieved the defined objectives. Assessment methods may include tests to measure knowledge of the academic integrity policy and procedures or specific topics (e.g., plagiarism) and surveys or focus groups to determine change in attitude/appreciation towards the value of academic integrity. Formative evaluation methods will be utilized during the development of any new strategies (e.g., pilot testing of workshops, tutorials) in order to test instruction on smaller audiences and revise for larger populations.

# SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

## I. Preamble

At Syracuse University, academic integrity is expected of every community member in all endeavors. Academic integrity includes a commitment to the values of honesty, trustworthiness, fairness, and respect. These values are essential to the overall success of an academic society. In addition, each member of the University community has a right to expect adherence to academic integrity from all other community members.

An individual's academic dishonesty threatens and undermines the central mission of the University. It is unfair to other community members who do not cheat, because it devalues efforts to learn, to teach, and to conduct research. Academic dishonesty interferes with moral and intellectual development, and poisons the atmosphere of open and trusting intellectual discourse.

While the policies and procedures in this document pertain in the main to students, it is also the policy of Syracuse University that all instructors, administrators, and staff shall adhere to academic integrity standards expected of academic professionals.

This policy applies in all schools and colleges at Syracuse University, except as provided in section A, below. Syracuse University schools and colleges utilize a uniform approach to academic integrity to promote communication and awareness of policies and fairness and consistency in their application. There may be instances, however, in which it is legitimate for the faculty of a school or college to adopt a policy augmentation. Such an augmentation will be consistent with the University-wide approach. A discipline-specific rationale for the augmentation is especially appropriate. A copy of any policy augmentation will be provided to the University's Academic Integrity Office (AIO) and published as an appendix to the University's academic integrity policies and procedures wherever they are published by the University and/or the schools/colleges.

- A. The College of Law may choose to adopt an alternative policy establishing the academic integrity expectations applicable to students enrolled in the College of Law when taking courses offered by the College of Law. A copy of any policy so adopted will be provided to the AIO and published as an appendix to the University's academic integrity policy wherever the University policy is otherwise published by the University and/or the schools/colleges. The AIO, upon request of any party, will determine whether the University policy or the College of Law policy applies to a particular suspected violation.

## II. Academic Integrity Expectations

Academic integrity is violated by any dishonest act which is committed in an academic context including, but not restricted to the following:

## A. Use of Sources

1. Plagiarism is the use of someone else's language, ideas, information, or original material without acknowledging the source.
  - a. Examples of plagiarism:
    - i. Paper is downloaded from an Internet source and/or obtained from a paper mill.
    - ii. Paper contains part or all of the writings of another person (including another student), without citation.
    - iii. Paper contains passages that were cut and pasted from an Internet source, without citation.
2. While students are responsible for knowing how to quote from, paraphrase, and cite sources correctly, the ability to apply that information in all writing situations is an advanced literacy skill acquired over time through repeated practice.

When a student has attempted to acknowledge sources but has not done so fully or completely, the instructor may determine that the issue is misuse of sources or bad writing, rather than plagiarism. Factors that may be relevant to the determination between misuse of sources and plagiarism include prior academic integrity education at Syracuse University and the program level of the student. Instructors are responsible for communicating their expectations regarding the use and citation of sources.

## B. Course Work and Research

1. The use or attempted use of unauthorized aids in examinations or other academic exercises submitted for evaluation;
2. Fabrication, falsification, or misrepresentation of data, results, sources for papers or reports; in clinical practice, as in reporting experiments, measurements, statistical analyses, tests, or other studies never performed; manipulating or altering data or other manifestations of research to achieve a desired result; selective reporting, including the deliberate suppression of conflicting or unwanted data;
3. Copying from another student's work;
4. Actions that destroy or alter the work of another student;
5. Unauthorized cooperation in completing assignments or examinations;
6. Submission of the same written work in more than one course without prior written approval from both instructors.

C. Communications

1. Violating the confidentiality of an academic integrity investigation, resolution, or documentation;
2. Making a false report of academic dishonesty;
3. Dishonesty in requests for make-up exams, for extensions of deadlines for submitting papers, or in any other matter relating to a course.

D. Representations and Materials Misuse

1. Falsification of records, reports, or documents associated with the educational process;
2. Misrepresentation of one's own or another's identity in an academic context;
3. Misrepresentation of material facts or circumstances in relation to examinations, papers, or other academic activities;
4. Sale of papers, essays, or research for fraudulent use;
5. Alteration or falsification of University records;
6. Unauthorized use of University academic facilities or equipment, including computer accounts and files;
7. Unauthorized recording, sale, purchase, or use of academic lectures, academic computer software, or other instructional materials;
8. Expropriation or abuse of ideas and preliminary data obtained during the process of editorial or peer review of work submitted to journals, or in proposals for funding by agency panels or by internal University committees;
9. Expropriation and/or inappropriate dissemination of personally-identifying human subject data;
10. Unauthorized removal, mutilation, or deliberate concealment of materials in University libraries, media, laboratories, or academic resource centers.

**III. Course-Specific Expectations**

- A. The instructor of record is responsible for determining and communicating course-specific academic integrity expectations. Instructors of record are responsible for stating course-specific expectations in writing, particularly those regarding use of sources and collaboration.

- B. Students are responsible for consulting their instructors for any clarification needed on academic integrity standards, including those set forth in this policy and those that are course-specific.
- C. Collusion is assisting or attempting to assist another in an act of academic dishonesty. Collusion is distinct from collaborative learning, which may be a valuable component of scholarly development. Acceptable levels of collaboration vary in different courses, and students are expected to consult with their instructor if they are uncertain whether their cooperative activities are acceptable.

*Portions of this policy are adapted from the following sources, with permission:*

*Council of Writing Program Administrators. "Defining and Avoiding Plagiarism: WPA Statement on Best Policies." Council of Writing Program Administrators, January 2003.*

*<<http://www.wpacouncil.org/positions/index.html>>.*

*Howard, Rebecca Moore. "A Plagiarism Pentimento." Journal of Teaching Writing (Summer 1993). 233-245.*

*Portions of this policy are based on the academic integrity policies of Boston College, Cornell University, Duke University, Georgetown University, the University of Maryland, and former policies of Syracuse University's School of Architecture, College of Arts and Sciences, L.C. Smith College of Engineering and Computer Science, School of Education, College of Human Services and Health Professions, School of Information Studies, Whitman School of Management, and College of Visual and Performing Arts.*

## SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC INTEGRITY PROCEDURES

### I. **Applicability**

- A. These procedures will be followed by all schools and colleges at Syracuse University, except as provided in section B.1., below.
  
- B. Syracuse University schools and colleges utilize a uniform approach to academic integrity to promote communication and awareness of procedures and fairness and consistency in their application. There may be instances, however, in which it is legitimate for the faculty of a school or college to adopt a procedural augmentation. Such an augmentation will be consistent with the University-wide approach. A discipline-specific rationale for the augmentation is especially appropriate. A copy of any procedural augmentation will be provided to the University's Academic Integrity Office (AIO) and published as an appendix to the University's academic integrity policies and procedures wherever they are otherwise published by the University and/or the schools/colleges.
  - 1. The College of Law may choose to adopt alternative procedures appropriate to its educational mission or needs after submitting proposed procedures to the AIO for review and comment. Any alternative procedures adopted by the College of Law will apply only to:
    - a. A student who was enrolled in the College of Law at the time of the alleged violation; and
    - b. A violation that is alleged to have occurred:
      - i. in an application for admission to the College of Law,
      - ii. in an application for employment where the violation concerned the student's standing or performance in or any other relationship to, the College of Law,
      - iii. in a situation to which the College of Law Academic Expectations Policy is applicable,
      - iv. in a College of Law building, or
      - v. at a College of Law event.
    - c. All other charges against College of Law students, or against non-College of Law students attending classes in or offered by the College of Law, shall be governed by the University procedures.
    - d. A copy of any alternative procedures adopted by the College of Law will be provided to the AIO and published as an appendix to the University's academic integrity procedures wherever the University procedures are published by the University and/or the schools/colleges.

- e. The AIO, upon request of any party, will determine whether the University procedures or the College of Law procedures apply to a particular suspected violation.
- C. These procedures will be primarily implemented by the home school/college of the instructor of record for the course in which an alleged violation of the University's Academic Integrity Policy (Policy) occurred.
- 1. The dean of each school and college will appoint an academic integrity coordinator who will be responsible for implementing academic integrity policies and procedures for the school or college.
    - a. The school/college academic integrity coordinator will be supported by the AIO.
- D. Teaching assistants and other student assistants are strongly encouraged to follow the procedures set forth by the instructor of record, and to discuss suspected violations with the instructor of record prior to reporting suspected violations.
- E. Although most instances of academic dishonesty will be course-related, the University has the authority and responsibility to respond to academic dishonesty that occurs in any context in which there is a risk to the academic integrity of the University.

## **II. Action to Address Suspected Student Academic Dishonesty**

- A. All members of the University community are strongly encouraged to report all suspected violations of the policy.
- B. It is strongly recommended that the instructor include a discussion of the matter with the student in his/her exploration of a suspected violation.
- C. Options Available to the Instructor of Record (Instructor).
- 1. Every action taken by an instructor against a student in response to a suspected policy violation will be reported according to this section.
  - 2. Instructor Resolution: An instructor may respond to a violation of the policy by imposing a course-related sanction, up to and including course failure. The instructor may require additional or alternative work in substitution for rejected work, but has no obligation to do so.
    - a. An instructor who chooses the instructor resolution approach will send a memorandum describing the circumstances and disposition of the matter to the school/college academic integrity coordinator within five business days of its disposition.
      - i. A template will be provided for these memoranda.

b. A student has the right to appeal the charge, the sanction, or both elements of an instructor resolution by notifying the school/college academic integrity coordinator at the school or college where the violation occurred within seven business days after notification of the instructor resolution from the AIO. Appeals from instructor resolutions will be heard by the school/college hearing panel.

3. Hearing Panel Resolution: An instructor may refer a suspected policy violation to the school/college hearing panel by sending a memorandum describing the circumstances to the school/college academic integrity coordinator within five business days after determining that there is a violation.

a. A template will be provided for these memoranda.

D. Reports by persons other than instructor of record: A member of the University community other than the instructor who suspects that a student has violated the policy is strongly encouraged to discuss his/her concerns with the instructor, if the alleged violation was course-related.

1. A member of the University community other than the instructor who suspects that a student has violated the policy may report his/her concerns to the school/college academic integrity coordinator or AIO.

a. At the request of the member of the University community, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled, unless the matter has been resolved by the instructor of record in accordance with section II.C.2.

2. Any member of the University community may confidentially consult with the AIO regarding a suspected act of academic dishonesty.

### **III. Response to Report of Suspected Academic Dishonesty**

A. The school/college academic integrity coordinator will inform the AIO of his/her receipt of an instructor memorandum reporting his/her resolution or requesting a hearing, or a hearing request by a person other than the instructor of record within three business days.

1. The AIO and the school/college academic integrity coordinator will work together to support the interests of the student, the school/college, and the University.

2. First violation established by instructor resolution.

a. The AIO will provide to the student within three business days:

i. The instructor's memorandum;

ii. The University's academic integrity policy and procedures;

- iii. Contact information for one or more persons associated with the AIO who can provide information and procedural advice about the matter;
- iv. Contact information for one or more persons at the school/college, if any, who can provide information and procedural advice about the matter; and
- v. A letter that summarizes the outcome, encourages the student to meet with an advisor identified in the accompanying materials, and outlines the opportunity for appeal and the serious implications of further policy violations.
  - (a) A copy of this letter will be provided to the instructor; the school/college academic integrity coordinator; and the school/college academic integrity coordinator of the student's home school or college, when his or her home school/college is not the school/college in which the matter is being addressed.

3. Second violation established by instructor resolution.

- a. If the AIO determines, upon receipt of a memorandum summarizing an instructor resolution, that the student charged previously violated the policy, the matter will be referred within three business days to the school/college panel for a hearing.

4. Hearings by school/college panels.

- a. School/college panels will hold hearings in the following circumstances:
  - i. At the instructor of record's request (see II.C.3);
  - ii. At the request of a person other than the instructor of record (see II.D);
  - iii. At the request of a student appealing a charge, sanction, or both parts of an instructor resolution (see II.C.2.b); and
  - iv. When a student who has been the subject of an instructor resolution has a prior violation (see III.A.3.a).
- b. The following conditions apply when a hearing is held regarding a charge against a student who has previously violated the policy:
  - i. If the subsequent violation was established by an instructor resolution that the student accepts, the hearing panel will be informed of the prior violation and determine additional sanctions.

- ii. If the subsequent violation was established by an instructor resolution that the student appeals, the hearing panel will review the instructor resolution. If the instructor resolution is affirmed, the panel will be informed of the prior violation and determine additional sanctions.
  - iii. If the subsequent violation was referred directly for hearing and not established by instructor resolution, the hearing panel will determine whether the violation occurred; if so, the panel will be informed of the prior violation and determine additional sanctions.
- c. The hearing will normally be scheduled within thirty business days of the AIO's receipt of the request or discovery of a prior violation. The time periods set forth in these procedures may be extended by the mutual consent of the school/college academic integrity coordinator or the AIO and the student during breaks from classes during the academic year and during summer break.

No fewer than five business days before the hearing, the Academic Integrity Coordinator from the school or college where the hearing will be held will provide the following information to the student:

- i. A notice of hearing, including date, time, and location;
- ii. The instructor's memorandum or, when a hearing is requested by a member of the University community other than the instructor, a memorandum summarizing the charge;
- iii. The University's academic integrity policy and procedures;
- iv. Contact information for one or more persons associated with the AIO who can provide information and procedural advice about the matter;
- v. Contact information for one or more persons at the school/college, if any, who can provide information and procedural advice about the matter; and
- vi. A letter that encourages the student to meet with an advisor identified in the accompanying materials.
  - (a) A copy of this letter will be provided to the instructor; the school/college academic integrity coordinator; and the school/college academic integrity coordinator of the student's home school or college, when his or her home school/college is not the school/college in which the matter is being addressed.

- d. No fewer than five business days before the hearing, the Academic Integrity Coordinator from the school or college where the hearing will be held will provide the following information to the instructor or other member of the University community who has made the charge either by personally delivering it or by sending it via campus mail.
  - i. A notice of hearing, including date, time, and location;
  - ii. The University's academic integrity policy and procedures;
  - iii. Contact information for one or more persons associated with the AIO who can provide information and procedural advice about the matter; and
  - iv. Contact information for one or more persons at the school/college, if any, who can provide information and procedural advice about the matter.

#### **IV. School/College Hearings**

- A. The hearing panel will be comprised of an equal number of school/college instructors and students and at least one school/college administrator, all of whom will be selected by the school/college from a pool of individuals who have participated in training programs provided by the AIO.
  - 1. The students on the hearing panel will be matriculated at the program level, undergraduate or graduate, of the student charged.
  - 2. An odd number of panel members is recommended.
  - 3. The faculty of each school/college will determine the composition of its hearing panels, consistent with these standards.
  - 4. Care should be taken in selecting panel members to avoid the appearance of conflict of interest. For example, panel members should not be relatives of participants in the hearing.
- B. The hearing will be chaired by a University Academic Integrity Representative (UAIR), not associated with any involved school or college, who will provide procedural expertise and facilitate consistency in school/college hearings (see section VI.B regarding the UAIR's responsibilities in this regard).
- C. When a hearing is conducted by a school/college other than the home school/college of the student charged, the dean of the student's home school or college or his/her designee will designate a representative to participate in the hearing and deliberations as an additional voting member of the panel
- D. The AIO will provide the UAIR conducting the hearing with a sealed envelope. If the panel determines that the student violated the policy, the UAIR will open the envelope

to learn if there has been a previous violation. If there are previous violations, the current sanction must be reviewed and discussed. Additional sanctions are normally imposed.

## **V. University-Level Appeal and Review**

### **A. Appeal**

1. The student charged, or an instructor, administrator, or staff member who participated in the hearing as the complaining party, may appeal a school/college hearing panel decision to a University appeal and review panel (UARP). See section B.1., below.
2. Grounds for appeal:
  - a. New evidence not reasonably available at the time of the original hearing, the absence of which can be shown to have had a detrimental impact on the outcome of the hearing;
  - b. Procedural error that can be shown to have had a detrimental impact on the outcome of the hearing;
  - c. Errors in the interpretation of University policy so substantial as to deny either party a fair hearing;
  - d. Grossly inappropriate sanction having no reasonable relationship to the charge.
3. The UARP will determine whether one or more of the specified grounds for appeal has been satisfied.
  - a. If not, the appeal is denied.
  - b. If so, the matter, will be returned to the school /college in which it originated, with directions for further action.
    - i. The UARP may direct that further action be undertaken by the school/college hearing panel whose decision was appealed or by a new panel. The school/college panel may be directed to consider the case as if for the first time or to reconsider all or part of the matter.

### **B. Procedures applicable to appeal**

1. An appeal is initiated by delivering to the AIO a written statement explaining the grounds for appeal within seven business days after receiving the decision.
  - a. The UAARP hearing will be scheduled within twenty business days of the AIO's receipt of the written statement.

2. A UARP will be comprised of two instructors, two students who are matriculated at the same program level of the student charged (graduate or undergraduate), and one administrator.
  - a. None of the panel members will be from the school/college of the instructor in whose course the violation allegedly occurred or the home school/college of the student charged.
  - b. None of the panel members will have participated in the school/college hearing.
3. UARP hearings will be chaired by a UAIR not associated with any involved school or college, and not the UAIR who chaired the school/college hearing.
4. A UARP may be advised by a person associated with the AIO.
5. A UARP may request written input on issue(s) involved in the appeal from the parties, other persons, or both.
  - a. Appeal proceedings will usually be accomplished through an exchange of written materials.
6. Each school/college dean will designate a recipient of matters returned to the school/college by the UARP. The person designated may be the school/college academic integrity coordinator (see section I.C.1).
7. UARP decisions are final.
  - a. The student charged, or an instructor, administrator, or staff member who participated in the hearing as the complaining party, may appeal the school/college hearing panel decision in a returned matter using the procedures outlined in this section.

C. Review

1. When a hearing that resulted in a suspension or expulsion was conducted by a school/college that is not the student's home school/college, the student has the right to review by a UARP. See section D.1., below.
2. Ordinarily, the UARP should affirm the decision of the school/college hearing panel, unless it determines that the decision was unreasonable and/or one or more of the grounds for appeal specified in section V.A.2, above, has been satisfied.
  - a. If not, the decision is affirmed.

- b. If so, the UARP may modify or reverse the decision, rehear the matter in whole or in part, or return the matter to the school/college in which it originated, with directions for further action.

D. Procedures applicable to review

1. A review is initiated by delivering to the AIO a written statement explaining the grounds for review within seven business days after receiving the decision.
  - a. The UARP hearing will be scheduled within twenty business days of the AIO's receipt of the written statement.
2. A UARP will be comprised of two instructors, two students matriculated at the program level of the student charged, and one administrator.
  - a. None of the panel members will be from the school/college of the instructor in whose course the violation allegedly occurred or the home school/college of the student charged.
  - b. None of the panel members will have participated in the school/college hearing.
  - c. In review proceedings, the dean of the student's home school or college or the dean's designee will designate a representative to serve as an additional member of the panel.
3. UARP hearings will be chaired by a UAIR not associated with any involved school or college, and not the UAIR who chaired the school/college hearing.
4. A UARP may be advised by a person associated with the AIO.
5. A UARP may request written input on issue(s) involved in the review from the parties, other persons, or both.
  - a. Review proceedings will usually be accomplished through an exchange of written materials.
6. Each school/college dean will designate a recipient of matters returned to the school/college by the UARP. The person designated may be the school/college academic integrity coordinator (see section I.C.1).
7. UARP decisions are final.
  - a. The student charged, or an instructor, administrator, or staff member who participated in the hearing as the complaining party, may appeal the school/college hearing panel decision in a returned matter using the procedures outlined in this section.

## **VI. Procedures Applicable to School/College Academic Integrity Hearings and University-Level Appeal and Review**

- A. School/college academic integrity hearings and University-level appeal and review are administrative proceedings. Formal rules of evidence will not apply; more flexible rules geared toward having a fair hearing and obtaining all relevant facts will be used.
- B. UAIRs chairing panels will:
  - 1. Conduct and participate in the proceeding and deliberations and advise the panel about procedural matters, but will not participate in the panel's vote.
  - 2. Determine the relevance of evidence.
  - 3. Determine procedural matters and resolve issues not directly addressed by these procedures.
- C. Charges must be proven by a preponderance of the evidence, which requires a demonstration that it is "more likely than not" that the student has violated the policy.
- D. Panel decisions will be determined by majority vote.
- E. School/college and University academic integrity hearings are confidential and closed to persons not involved in the matter. All parties, advisors, witnesses, and hearing board members are expected to maintain the confidentiality of academic integrity proceedings. In accordance with applicable law, hearing results are confidential.
  - 1. The University's academic integrity policy prohibits violating the confidentiality of any academic integrity proceeding.
- F. Parties who appear before a school/college or University academic integrity panel, including both the student charged and the instructor, administrator, or staff member who participated in the hearing as the complaining party, have the right to be accompanied by a person of their choice for support. Such persons, including legal counsel, may provide advice in a quiet, non-disruptive manner but may not participate in the hearing or deliberations.
- G. Hearing participants will respect the proceedings and the rights of all individuals involved. The UAIR chairing the hearing may excuse a participant, discontinue the hearing, or both when the conduct of any participant has detrimental impact on the hearing.
- H. When more than one student is charged with participation in a single infraction or with related multiple infractions, a consolidated hearing may be held if all parties to the proceeding request consolidation. By agreeing to consolidation, a party waives his/her right to appeal on this basis or allege a violation of privacy rights provided by law.

## **VII. Consequences of Violations**

- A. Education is the primary goal of the University's academic integrity policy and procedures.
  - 1. Every student found responsible for violating the policy for the first time, whether by instructor resolution or by a hearing panel, will be referred to academic integrity programming regularly provided by the AIO, unless s/he is separated from the University. Students who do not complete the programming will be adversely affected if they receive a second violation.
  - 2. Additional assignments, such as community service, research projects, and writing assignments, may also be required by a hearing panel.
- B. Possible sanctions include, but are not limited to:
  - 1. Reduction in grade or failure of a course or assignment;
  - 2. Suspension from the University;
  - 3. Expulsion from the University.
- C. Subsequent violations
  - 1. For the purposes of these procedures, a violation is established by the decision of a hearing panel that is not overturned on appeal or by the student's acceptance of an instructor resolution in any school/college.
  - 2. Sanctions in addition to those associated with the subsequent violation itself will normally be imposed for subsequent violations. Suspension and expulsion are not considered unusual sanctions for a second violation.

## **VIII. Additional Considerations [note: These apply to the entire procedures document.]**

- A. Students who are suspected of or charged with violating the policy and instructors and other members of the University community who suspect that academic dishonesty may have occurred will have access to advisors. Contact information is provided by the AIO.
  - 1. Schools and colleges are encouraged to identify persons who are also prepared to provide such advice.
  - 2. At both the University and school/college levels, care should be taken to avoid apparent conflicts of interest in providing advice. For example, it would be inappropriate for the same person to advise parties on both sides of an alleged policy violation.
- B. Pending the resolution of a charge filed under the policy, an accused student will not be allowed to drop or withdraw from the course and will not be given a grade for either a course or specific work that is the subject of the charge. In unusual circumstances

where the continued participation of the student in the course will interfere with the academic process, an instructor may petition the dean of the school or college to have the student withdrawn.

- C. A student who chooses to withdraw from the University rather than participate in this process will be classified as having been withdrawn for disciplinary reasons. This status will be noted on the student's transcript.
- D. All information required to be provided to a student under these procedures will be provided in hard copy form and mailed via USPS, return receipt requested, to the student's local address or personally delivered. It may also be provided via electronic mail or other means.
  - 1. If a hearing was held at the request of a University community member other than the instructor, s/he will be informed when the matter has been resolved.
- E. The procedures set forth in this document will also be used to address violations discovered after a student has been given a grade for the course in which the violation occurs. If a student is found responsible for a violation after graduation and the sanction imposed makes the student ineligible to earn his or her degree, the degree may be revoked.
- F. The time periods set forth in these procedures may be extended by the mutual consent of the school/college academic integrity coordinator or the AIO and the student during breaks from classes during the academic year and during summer break.

*Portions of these procedures are based on the academic integrity policies of Case Western Reserve University and former policies of Syracuse University's School of Architecture, College of Arts and Sciences, L.C. Smith College of Engineering and Computer Science, School of Education, College of Human Services and Health Professions, School of Information Studies, Whitman School of Management, and College of Visual and Performing Arts. Where appropriate, these procedures are consistent with those of Syracuse University's University Judicial System.*

**SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY  
ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COMMUNICATION AND RECORDS**

**I. General Considerations**

- A. These procedures will be followed by all schools and colleges of Syracuse University.
- B. Syracuse University schools and colleges utilize a uniform approach to academic integrity to promote communication and awareness of policies and fairness and consistency in their application. There may be instances, however, in which it is legitimate for the faculty of a school or college to adopt a policy augmentation. Such an augmentation will be consistent with the University-wide approach; it will supplement, rather than contradict, University policies. A discipline-specific rationale for the augmentation is especially appropriate. A copy of any policy augmentation will be provided to the University's Academic Integrity Office (AIO) and published as an appendix to the University's academic integrity policies and procedures wherever they are otherwise published by the University and/or the schools/colleges.
- C. Education is the primary goal of consequences imposed for established academic integrity violations. This goal must be balanced, however, against the threats posed to the University community by academic dishonesty, particularly by individuals who engage in multiple violations.
- D. Records of established academic integrity violations will be centrally maintained by the AIO.
  - 1. Every action taken by an instructor against a student in response to a suspected policy violation will be reported to the school/college academic integrity coordinator.
    - a. The school/college academic integrity coordinator will communicate this information to the AIO.

**II. Access to Centrally-Maintained Records by Members of the University Community**

- A. Strict confidentiality will be observed by the AIO regarding centrally-maintained records of established academic integrity violations and by persons and offices to whom the AIO provides such records.
  - 1. Records of established violations will be provided to school and college hearing panels only after a subsequent violation is established, either by the student's acceptance of an instructor resolution or the hearing panel's determination.
  - 2. Records of established violations will be provided, upon request, to school and college deans, or their designees, to inform decisions regarding intra-University transfers, membership on committees (such as a dean search committee or promotion and tenure committee), selection for honors (such as Remembrance

or University Scholars), and employment (such as teaching or research assistance or work-study in an academic department).

- a. Schools and colleges are encouraged to request this information in the context of intra-University transfer decisions.
  - b. Schools and colleges who seek these records to inform an employment decision will obtain permission from the student.
3. Records of established violations will be provided, upon request by the school/college dean or his/her designee, to instructors for the purposes of graduate school, transfer, professional, or other recommendations.
  4. Records of established violations regarding students being considered for recognition, acceptance, or participation will be provided, upon request, to the Director of the René Crown Honors Program and the chairs of the University Scholar and Remembrance Scholar Selection Committees.
  5. Records of established violations by international students will be provided, upon request, to the Director of the Slutzker Center to inform advising regarding students' status.
  6. Records of established violations will be provided, upon request, to the Director of the University Judicial System.
  7. Records of established violations will be provided, upon request, to the University Registrar.
  8. Records of established violations will be provided, upon request, to the Department of Athletics.
  9. In accordance with National Collegiate Athletic Association Rule 10.1 and interpretations, records of established violations will be provided to the Director of Athletic Compliance.
  10. Records of established violations will **not** be made available to any member of the University community, including instructors and administrators, in relation to the exploration of suspected academic dishonesty.
  11. When records of established violations are released according to this policy, they will be disseminated as restrictively as possible (for example, only to the chair of a committee on which the student may serve, and not to all committee members).
  12. Only the Vice Chancellor and Provost and school and college deans may authorize access to records of established violations not discussed in these procedures.

### **III. Access to Centrally-Maintained Records by External Parties**

- A. Records of established violations will be released to external parties, including educational institutions and employers, only with the student's permission.
  - 1. It is the responsibility of the student and the party seeking the records to provide documentation of the student's permission for release.
- B. A copy of the transcript notations and record maintenance practices sections of this policy will be provided to any external party who requests records of established violations.

### **IV. Record Maintenance Practices**

- A. Records of established first violations will be maintained until the student graduates from the program in which s/he was matriculated at the time of the violation.
  - 1. Records of prior violations are relevant in instances where there is a subsequent violation. Sanctions, in addition to those associated with the subsequent violation itself, will normally be imposed for subsequent violations.
- B. Records of established subsequent violations will be maintained for seven years following the determination that the policy was violated.
- C. Records of suspension and expulsion will be permanently maintained.

### **V. Transcript Notations**

- A. The transcript will be marked with a flag, denoted as "(X)" when an "F" grade for course failure is imposed for an academic integrity violation.
  - 1. The failing grade is counted toward the GPA.
  - 2. If the "(X)" flag is applied for a first violation, it will be removed only upon the student's completion of an educational program and full compliance with all consequences associated with the violation.
    - a. After the "(X)" flag is removed, the student may petition to flag the failing grade.
  - 3. If the "(X)" is applied for a subsequent violation, the flag will be permanently retained on the transcript.
- B. The transcript will be marked with "violation of academic integrity policy" when an established violation results in separation from the University (i.e., suspension or expulsion).

1. This designation will be permanently retained on the transcript.
- C. A transcript notation may be made at the direction of a hearing panel in other cases.

## **VI. Additional Considerations**

- A. An “established violation” is a determination that a student has violated the academic integrity policy, either by instructor resolution or hearing. Violations will not be considered established while an appeal is pending.
- B. In reaching a determination whether to provide access to centrally-maintained records, the interest in avoiding a large number of ad hoc decisions will be balanced with the interest in providing relevant information under appropriate circumstances.
- C. Schools and colleges are encouraged to seek records of established academic integrity violations regarding external transfers into the University.
- D. Graduate programs are encouraged to seek records of established academic integrity violations regarding applicants for admission, including internal admits.
- E. A hearing panel may, as part of a sanction, modify these principles. For instance, a panel may modify the period of time that a record is maintained or remove the option to flag a failing grade imposed for an established violation.
1. Factors such as the seriousness of the established violation and the academic level of the student are relevant to such a modification.
- F. Confidentiality will be observed in implementing educational consequences associated with established academic integrity violations.

**SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY  
ACADEMIC INTEGRITY OFFICE (AIO)**

**I. Purpose**

- A. The University's Academic Integrity Office (AIO) provides resources and support for the schools and colleges and individual members of the University community and coordinates University-wide academic integrity initiatives.
- B. The AIO is established within the Division of Academic Affairs and reports to the Associate Provost, Academic Programs.

**II. Education**

- A. The AIO works with the schools and colleges and other campus units to coordinate and provide education about academic integrity for all members of the campus community, including, but not limited to:
  - 1. Programs for new and transferring undergraduate and graduate students;
  - 2. Programs for new instructors;
  - 3. Continuing education on academic integrity for all members of the University community through methodologies that are diverse in scope, multiple in approach, and frequent in occurrence;
  - 4. Support for instructors and staff, including advice and counseling to help prevent cheating, advice and counseling regarding specific situations, and options for resolution;
  - 5. Creating and maintaining a reference library of academic integrity best practices materials; and
  - 6. Developing and delivering academic integrity programming as prescribed elsewhere in this document. Such programs will include providing instruction for students who are found responsible for academic integrity violations.

**III. Training**

- A. The AIO is responsible for training hearing panel participants and chairs.
  - 1. The AIO will appoint, train, and provide support for University academic integrity representatives (UAIRs). UAIR appointments will be confirmed by the Vice Chancellor and Provost.
    - a. UAIRs will provide procedural expertise and facilitate consistency when they chair hearings of alleged academic dishonesty.

- b. UAIRs may be University instructors, staff, or administrators.
  - c. Matriculated students may not be UAIRs.
  - d. The AIO will solicit recommendations of UAIR candidates from school/college deans and the University community.
  - e. UAIRs will serve for a 2-year term, which may be renewed.
2. In consultation with the schools and colleges, the AIO will also provide training for and advise school and college hearing panel members.

#### **IV. Record Keeping**

- A. The AIO is responsible for coordinating and maintaining confidential records related to academic integrity procedures and violations, in accordance with the Communication and Records policy.
- 1. The AIO is responsible for providing information about previously-established violations to school/college hearing panels considering subsequent violations. This process is described in detail in the Procedures, section III.A.4.b.
  - 2. The AIO will compile and distribute a biannual report on the status of academic integrity on campus. This report will include information on violations resolved via instructor resolutions and hearings, with personally identifiable information removed, as well as training provided throughout the year.

The policies and procedures outlined above supersede all previous statements and policies of Syracuse University with respect to academic integrity as may appear in any Syracuse University publication. The University reserves the right to amend these policies and procedures from time to time. Effective: July 1, 2006

Revised August 4, 2008

**Below are the original policy sections with strikeouts and changes/additions in bold**

### **SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

Syracuse University has adopted the following academic integrity policies and procedures, effective July 1, 2006. This document is organized in five sections:

Procedures, which sets forth methods for addressing suspected academic dishonesty;

Communication and Records, which explains record-keeping and record-disclosure practices; and

## **SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC INTEGRITY PROCEDURES**

### **I. Applicability**

- A. These procedures will be followed by all schools and colleges at Syracuse University, except as provided in section B.1., below.
- B. Syracuse University schools and colleges utilize a uniform approach to academic integrity to promote communication and awareness of procedures and fairness and consistency in their application. There may be instances, however, in which it is legitimate for the faculty of a school or college to adopt a procedural augmentation. Such an augmentation will be consistent with the University-wide approach. A discipline-specific rationale for the augmentation is especially appropriate. A copy of any procedural augmentation will be provided to the University's Academic Integrity Office (AIO) and published as an appendix to the University's academic integrity policies and procedures wherever they are otherwise published by the University and/or the schools/colleges.
  - 1. The College of Law may choose to adopt alternative procedures appropriate to its educational mission or needs after submitting proposed procedures to the AIO for review and comment. Any alternative procedures adopted by the College of Law will apply only to:
    - a. A student who was enrolled in the College of Law at the time of the alleged violation; and
    - b. A violation that is alleged to have occurred:
      - i. in an application for admission to the College of Law,
      - vi. in an application for employment where the violation concerned the student's standing or performance in or any other relationship to, the College of Law,
      - vii. in a situation to which the College of Law Academic Expectations Policy is applicable,
      - viii. in a College of Law building, or
      - ix. at a College of Law event.
    - c. All other charges against College of Law students, or against non-College of Law students attending classes in or offered by the College of Law, shall be governed by the University procedures.
    - d. A copy of any alternative procedures adopted by the College of Law will be provided to the AIO and published as an appendix to the University's

academic integrity procedures wherever the University procedures are published by the University and/or the schools/colleges.

- e. The AIO, upon request of any party, will determine whether the University procedures or the College of Law procedures apply to a particular suspected violation.
- C. These procedures will be primarily implemented by the home school/college of the instructor of record for the course in which an alleged violation of the University's Academic Integrity Policy (Policy) occurred.
- 1. The dean of each school and college will appoint an academic integrity coordinator who will be responsible for implementing academic integrity policies and procedures for the school or college.
    - a. The school/college academic integrity coordinator will be supported by the AIO.
- D. Teaching assistants and other student assistants are strongly encouraged to follow the procedures set forth by the instructor of record, and to discuss suspected violations with the instructor of record prior to reporting suspected violations.
- E. Although most instances of academic dishonesty will be course-related, the University has the authority and responsibility to respond to academic dishonesty that occurs in any context in which there is a risk to the academic integrity of the University.

## **II. Action to Address Suspected Student Academic Dishonesty**

- A. All members of the University community are strongly encouraged to report all suspected violations of the policy.
- B. It is strongly recommended that the instructor include a discussion of the matter with the student in his/her exploration of a suspected violation.
- C. Options Available to the Instructor of Record (Instructor).
- 1. Every action taken by an instructor against a student in response to a suspected policy violation will be reported according to this section.
  - 2. Instructor Resolution: An instructor may respond to a violation of the policy by imposing a course-related sanction, up to and including course failure. The instructor may require additional or alternative work in substitution for rejected work, but has no obligation to do so.
    - a. An instructor who chooses the instructor resolution approach will send a memorandum describing the circumstances and disposition of the matter to the school/college academic integrity coordinator within five business days of its disposition.

- i. A template will be provided for these memoranda.
  - b. A student has the right to appeal the charge, the sanction, or both elements of an instructor resolution by notifying the school/college academic integrity coordinator at the school or college where the violation occurred within seven business days after notification of the instructor resolution from the AIO. Appeals from instructor resolutions will be heard by the school/college hearing panel.
- 3. Hearing Panel Resolution: An instructor may refer a suspected policy violation to the school/college hearing panel by sending a memorandum describing the circumstances to the school/college academic integrity coordinator within five business days after determining that there is a violation.
  - a. A template will be provided for these memoranda.
- D. Reports by persons other than instructor of record: A member of the University community other than the instructor who suspects that a student has violated the policy is strongly encouraged to discuss his/her concerns with the instructor, if the alleged violation was course-related.
  - 1. A member of the University community other than the instructor who suspects that a student has violated the policy may report his/her concerns to the school/college academic integrity coordinator or AIO.
    - a. At the request of the member of the University community, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled, unless the matter has been resolved by the instructor of record in accordance with section II.C.2.
  - 2. Any member of the University community may confidentially consult with the AIO regarding a suspected act of academic dishonesty.

### **III. Response to Report of Suspected Academic Dishonesty**

- A. The school/college academic integrity coordinator will inform the AIO of his/her receipt of an instructor memorandum reporting his/her resolution or requesting a hearing, or a hearing request by a person other than the instructor of record within three business days.
  - 1. The AIO and the school/college academic integrity coordinator will work together to support the interests of the student, the school/college, and the University.
  - 2. First violation established by instructor resolution.
    - a. The AIO will provide to the student within three business days:
      - i. The instructor's memorandum;

- ii. The University's academic integrity policy and procedures;
  - iii. Contact information for one or more persons associated with the AIO who can provide information and procedural advice about the matter;
  - iv. Contact information for one or more persons at the school/college, if any, who can provide information and procedural advice about the matter; and
  - v. A letter that summarizes the outcome, encourages the student to meet with an advisor identified in the accompanying materials, and outlines the opportunity for appeal and the serious implications of further policy violations.
    - (a) A copy of this letter will be provided to the instructor; the school/college academic integrity coordinator; and the school/college academic integrity coordinator of the student's home school or college, when his or her home school/college is not the school/college in which the matter is being addressed.
3. Second violation established by instructor resolution.
- a. If the AIO determines, upon receipt of a memorandum summarizing an instructor resolution, that the student charged previously violated the policy, the matter will be referred within three business days to the school/college panel for a hearing.
4. Hearings by school/college panels.
- a. School/college panels will hold hearings in the following circumstances:
    - i. At the instructor of record's request (see II.C.3);
    - ii. At the request of a person other than the instructor of record (see II.D);
    - iii. At the request of a student appealing a charge, sanction, or both parts of an instructor resolution (see II.C.2.b); and
    - iv. When a student who has been the subject of an instructor resolution has a prior violation (see III.A.3.a).
  - b. The following conditions apply when a hearing is held regarding a charge against a student who has previously violated the policy:

- i. If the subsequent violation was established by an instructor resolution that the student accepts, the hearing panel will be informed of the prior violation and determine additional sanctions.
  - ii. If the subsequent violation was established by an instructor resolution that the student appeals, the hearing panel will review the instructor resolution. If the instructor resolution is affirmed, the panel will be informed of the prior violation and determine additional sanctions.
  - iii. If the subsequent violation was referred directly for hearing and not established by instructor resolution, the hearing panel will determine whether the violation occurred; if so, the panel will be informed of the prior violation and determine additional sanctions.
- d. The hearing will **normally** be scheduled within ~~thirty~~ **thirty-five** business days of the AIO's receipt of the request or discovery of a prior violation. *The time periods set forth in these procedures may be extended by the mutual consent of the school/college academic integrity coordinator or the AIO and the student during breaks from classes during the academic year and during summer break.*

No **fewer** less than five business days before the hearing, the **Academic Integrity Coordinator from the school or college where the hearing will be held** AIO will provide the following information to the student:

- i. A notice of hearing, including date, time, and location;
- iv. The instructor's memorandum or, when a hearing is requested by a member of the University community other than the instructor, a memorandum summarizing the charge;
- v. The University's academic integrity policy and procedures;
- iv. Contact information for one or more persons associated with the AIO who can provide information and procedural advice about the matter;
- v. Contact information for one or more persons at the school/college, if any, who can provide information and procedural advice about the matter; and
- vi. A letter that encourages the student to meet with an advisor identified in the accompanying materials.
  - (a) A copy of this letter will be provided to the instructor; the school/college academic integrity coordinator; and the school/college academic integrity coordinator of the student's home school or college, when his or her home

school/college is not the school/college in which the matter is being addressed.

- d. **No fewer than five business days before the hearing, the Academic Integrity Coordinator from the school or college where the hearing will be held** AIO will provide the following information to the instructor or other member of the University community who has made the charge ~~no less than five days before the hearing~~, either by personally delivering it or by sending it via campus mail.
- i. A notice of hearing, including date, time, and location;
  - ii. The University's academic integrity policy and procedures;
  - iii. Contact information for one or more persons associated with the AIO who can provide information and procedural advice about the matter; and
  - iv. Contact information for one or more persons at the school/college, if any, who can provide information and procedural advice about the matter.

#### IV. School/College Hearings

- A. The hearing panel will be comprised of an equal number of school/college instructors and students and at least one school/college administrator, all of whom will be selected by the school/college from a pool of individuals who have participated in training programs provided by the AIO.
1. The students on the hearing panel will be matriculated at the program level, **undergraduate or graduate**, of the student charged.
  2. An odd number of panel members is recommended.
  3. The faculty of each school/college will determine the composition of its hearing panels, consistent with these standards.
  4. **Care should be taken in selecting panel members to avoid the appearance of conflict of interest. For example, panel members should not be relatives of participants in the hearing.**
- B. The hearing will be chaired by a University Academic Integrity Representative (UAIR), not associated with any involved school or college, who will provide procedural expertise and facilitate consistency in school/college hearings (see section VI.B regarding the UAIR's responsibilities in this regard).
- D. When a hearing is conducted by a school/college other than the home school/college of the student charged, the dean of the student's home school or college **or his/her**

**designee** designates will designate a representative to participate in the hearing and deliberations as an additional voting member of the panel

- D. The AIO will provide the UAIR conducting the hearing with a sealed envelope. If the panel determines that the student violated the policy, the UAIR will open the envelope to learn if there has been a previous violation. If there are previous violations, the current sanction must be reviewed and discussed. Additional sanctions are normally imposed.**

## **V. University-Level Appeal and Review**

### **A. Appeal**

1. The student charged, or an instructor, administrator, or staff member who participated in the hearing as the complaining party, may appeal a school/college hearing panel decision to a University appeal and review panel (UARP). See section B.1., below.
2. Grounds for appeal:
  - a. New evidence not reasonably available at the time of the original hearing, the absence of which can be shown to have had a detrimental impact on the outcome of the hearing;
  - b. Procedural error that can be shown to have had a detrimental impact on the outcome of the hearing;
  - c. Errors in the interpretation of University policy so substantial as to deny either party a fair hearing;
  - d. Grossly inappropriate sanction having no reasonable relationship to the charge.
3. The UARP will determine whether one or more of the specified grounds for appeal has been satisfied.
  - a. If not, the appeal is denied.
  - b. If so, the matter, will be returned to the school /college in which it originated, with directions for further action.
    - i. The UARP may direct that further action be undertaken by the school/college hearing panel whose decision was appealed or by a new panel. The school/college panel may be directed to consider the case as if for the first time or to reconsider all or part of the matter.

### **B. Procedures applicable to appeal**

1. An appeal is initiated by delivering to the AIO a written statement explaining the grounds for appeal within seven business days after receiving the decision.
  - a. The UAARP hearing will be scheduled within **twenty** ~~fifteen~~ business days of the AIO's receipt of the written statement.
2. A UARP will be comprised of two instructors, two students who are matriculated at the **same** program level of the student charged (**graduate or undergraduate**), and one administrator.
  - a. None of the panel members will be from the school/college of the instructor in whose course the violation allegedly occurred or the home school/college of the student charged.
  - b. None of the panel members will have participated in the school/college hearing.
3. UARP hearings will be chaired by a UAIR not associated with any involved school or college, and not the UAIR who chaired the school/college hearing.
4. A UARP may be advised by a person associated with the AIO ~~who has not previously been involved in the matter.~~
5. A UARP may request written input on issue(s) involved in the appeal from the parties, other persons, or both.
  - a. Appeal proceedings will usually be accomplished through an exchange of written materials.
6. Each school/college dean will designate a recipient of matters returned to the school/college by the UARP. The person designated may be the school/college academic integrity coordinator (see section I.C.1).
7. UARP decisions are final.
  - a. The student charged, or an instructor, administrator, or staff member who participated in the hearing as the complaining party, may appeal the school/college hearing panel decision in a returned matter using the procedures outlined in this section.

#### C. B- Review

1. When a hearing that resulted in a suspension or expulsion was conducted by a school/college that is not the student's home school/college, the student has the right to review by a UARP. See section D.1., below.
2. Ordinarily, the UARP should affirm the decision of the school/college hearing panel, unless it determines that the decision was unreasonable and/or one or

more of the grounds for appeal specified in section V.A.2, above, has been satisfied.

- a. If not, the decision is affirmed.
- b. If so, the UARP may modify or reverse the decision, rehear the matter in whole or in part, or return the matter to the school/college in which it originated, with directions for further action.

D. Procedures applicable to review

1. A review is initiated by delivering to the AIO a written statement explaining the grounds for review within seven business days after receiving the decision.
  - a. The UARP hearing will be scheduled within ~~twenty five~~ **twenty** business days of the AIO's receipt of the written statement.
2. A UARP will be comprised of two instructors, two students matriculated at the program level of the student charged, and one administrator.
  - a. None of the panel members will be from the school/college of the instructor in whose course the violation allegedly occurred or the home school/college of the student charged.
  - b. None of the panel members will have participated in the school/college hearing.
  - c. In review proceedings, the dean of the student's home school or college **or the dean's designee** will designate a representative to serve as an additional member of the panel.
3. UARP hearings will be chaired by a UAIR not associated with any involved school or college, and not the UAIR who chaired the school/college hearing.
4. A UARP may be advised by a person associated with the AIO ~~who has not previously been involved in the matter.~~
5. A UARP may request written input on issue(s) involved in the review from the parties, other persons, or both.
  - a. Review proceedings will usually be accomplished through an exchange of written materials.
6. Each school/college dean will designate a recipient of matters returned to the school/college by the UARP. The person designated may be the school/college academic integrity coordinator (see section I.C.1).
7. UARP decisions are final.

- a. The student charged, or an instructor, administrator, or staff member who participated in the hearing as the complaining party, may appeal the school/college hearing panel decision in a returned matter using the procedures outlined in this section.

## **VI. Procedures Applicable to School/College Academic Integrity Hearings and University-Level Appeal and Review**

- A. School/college academic integrity hearings and University-level appeal and review are administrative proceedings. Formal rules of evidence will not apply; more flexible rules geared toward having a fair hearing and obtaining all relevant facts will be used.
- B. UAIRs chairing panels will:
  1. Conduct and participate in the proceeding and deliberations and advise the panel about procedural matters, but will not participate in the panel's vote.
  2. Determine the relevance of evidence.
  3. Determine procedural matters and resolve issues not directly addressed by these procedures.
- C. Charges must be proven by a preponderance of the evidence, which requires a demonstration that it is "more likely than not" that the student has violated the policy.
- D. Panel decisions will be determined by majority vote.
- E. School/college and University academic integrity hearings are confidential and closed to persons not involved in the matter. All parties, advisors, witnesses, and hearing board members are expected to maintain the confidentiality of academic integrity proceedings. In accordance with applicable law, hearing results are confidential.
  1. The University's academic integrity policy prohibits violating the confidentiality of any academic integrity proceeding.
- F. Parties who appear before a school/college or University academic integrity panel, including both the student charged and the instructor, administrator, or staff member who participated in the hearing as the complaining party, have the right to be accompanied by a person of their choice for support. Such persons, including legal counsel, may provide advice in a quiet, non-disruptive manner but may not participate in the hearing or deliberations.
- G. Hearing participants will respect the proceedings and the rights of all individuals involved. The UAIR chairing the hearing may excuse a participant, discontinue the hearing, or both when the conduct of any participant has detrimental impact on the hearing.
- H. When more than one student is charged with participation in a single infraction or with related multiple infractions, a consolidated hearing may be held if all parties to the

proceeding request consolidation. By agreeing to consolidation, a party waives his/her right to appeal on this basis or allege a violation of privacy rights provided by law.

## VII. Consequences of Violations

- A. Education is the primary goal of the University's academic integrity policy and procedures.
3. Every student found responsible for violating the policy for the first time, whether by instructor resolution or by a hearing panel, will be referred to academic integrity programming regularly provided by the AIO, unless s/he is separated from the University. ***Students who do not complete the programming will be adversely affected if they receive a second violation.***
  4. Additional assignments, such as community service, research projects, and writing assignments, may also be required by a hearing panel.
- B. Possible sanctions include, but are not limited to:
4. Reduction in grade or failure of a course or assignment;
  5. Suspension from the University;
  6. Expulsion from the University.
- C. Subsequent violations
1. For the purposes of these procedures, a violation is established by the decision of a hearing panel that is not overturned on appeal or by the student's acceptance of an instructor resolution in any school/college.
  2. Sanctions in addition to those associated with the subsequent violation itself will normally be imposed for subsequent violations. Suspension and expulsion are not considered unusual sanctions for a second violation.

## VIII. Additional Considerations [note: These apply to the entire procedures document.]

- A. Students who are suspected of or charged with violating the policy and instructors and other members of the University community who suspect that academic dishonesty may have occurred will have access to advisors. ~~provided by the AIO.~~ ***Contact information is provided by the AIO.***
1. Schools and colleges are encouraged to identify persons who are also prepared to provide such advice.
  2. At both the University and school/college levels, care should be taken to avoid apparent conflicts of interest in providing advice. For example, it would be

inappropriate for the same person to advise parties on both sides of an alleged policy violation.

- B. Pending the resolution of a charge filed under the policy, an accused student will not be allowed to drop or withdraw from the course and will not be given a grade for either a course or specific work that is the subject of the charge. In unusual circumstances where the continued participation of the student in the course will interfere with the academic process, an instructor may petition the dean of the school or college to have the student withdrawn.
- C. A student who chooses to withdraw from the University rather than participate in this process will be classified as having been withdrawn for disciplinary reasons. This status will be noted on the student's transcript.
- D. All information required to be provided to a student under these procedures will be provided in hard copy form and mailed via USPS, return receipt requested, to the student's local address or personally delivered. It may also be provided via electronic mail or other means.
  - 1. If a hearing was held at the request of a University community member other than the instructor, s/he will be informed when the matter has been resolved.
- E. The procedures set forth in this document will also be used to address violations discovered after a student has been given a grade for the course in which the violation occurs. If a student is found responsible for a violation after graduation and the sanction imposed makes the student ineligible to earn his or her degree, the degree may be revoked.
- F. The time periods set forth in these procedures may be extended by the mutual consent of the school/college academic integrity coordinator or the AIO and the student during breaks from classes during the academic year and during summer break.

*Portions of these procedures are based on the academic integrity policies of Case Western Reserve University and former policies of Syracuse University's School of Architecture, College of Arts and Sciences, L.C. Smith College of Engineering and Computer Science, School of Education, College of Human Services and Health Professions, School of Information Studies, Whitman School of Management, and College of Visual and Performing Arts. Where appropriate, these procedures are consistent with those of Syracuse University's University Judicial System.*

**SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY  
ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COMMUNICATION AND RECORDS**

**I. General Considerations**

- A. These procedures will be followed by all schools and colleges of Syracuse University.
- B. Syracuse University schools and colleges utilize a uniform approach to academic integrity to promote communication and awareness of policies and fairness and consistency in their application. There may be instances, however, in which it is legitimate for the faculty of a school or college to adopt a policy augmentation. Such an augmentation will be consistent with the University-wide approach; it will supplement, rather than contradict, University policies. A discipline-specific rationale for the augmentation is especially appropriate. A copy of any policy augmentation will be provided to the University's Academic Integrity Office (AIO) and published as an appendix to the University's academic integrity policies and procedures wherever they are otherwise published by the University and/or the schools/colleges.
- C. Education is the primary goal of consequences imposed for established academic integrity violations. This goal must be balanced, however, against the threats posed to the University community by academic dishonesty, particularly by individuals who engage in multiple violations.
- D. Records of established academic integrity violations will be centrally maintained by the AIO.
  - 1. Every action taken by an instructor against a student in response to a suspected policy violation will be reported to the school/college academic integrity coordinator.
    - b. The school/college academic integrity coordinator will communicate this information to the AIO.

**II. Access to Centrally-Maintained Records by Members of the University Community**

- A. Strict confidentiality will be observed by the AIO regarding centrally-maintained records of established academic integrity violations and by persons and offices to whom the AIO provides such records.
  - 1. Records of established violations will be provided to school and college hearing panels only after a subsequent violation is established, either by the student's acceptance of an instructor resolution or the hearing panel's determination.
  - 2. Records of established violations will be provided, upon request, to school and college deans, or their **designees** designates, to inform decisions regarding intra-University transfers, membership on committees (such as a dean search committee or promotion and tenure committee), selection for honors (such as

Remembrance or University Scholars), and employment (such as teaching or research assistance or work-study in an academic department).

- c. Schools and colleges are encouraged to request this information in the context of intra-University transfer decisions.
  - d. Schools and colleges who seek these records to inform an employment decision will obtain permission from the student.
3. Records of established violations will be provided, upon request by the school/college dean or his/her **designee designate**, to instructors for the purposes of graduate school, transfer, professional, or other recommendations.
  4. Records of established violations regarding students being considered for recognition, acceptance, or participation will be provided, upon request, to the Director of the René Crown Honors Program and the chairs of the University Scholar and Remembrance Scholar Selection Committees.
  5. Records of established violations by international students will be provided, upon request, to the Director of the Slutzker Center to inform advising regarding students' status.
  6. Records of established violations will be provided, upon request, to the Director of the University Judicial System.
  7. Records of established violations will be provided, upon request, to the University Registrar.
  8. Records of established violations will be provided, upon request, to the Department of Athletics.
  9. In accordance with National Collegiate Athletic Association Rule 10.1 and interpretations, records of established violations will be provided to the Director of Athletic Compliance.
  10. Records of established violations will **not** be made available to any member of the University community, including instructors and administrators, in relation to the exploration of suspected academic dishonesty.
  11. When records of established violations are released according to this policy, they will be disseminated as restrictively as possible (for example, only to the chair of a committee on which the student may serve, and not to all committee members).
  12. Only the Vice Chancellor and Provost and school and college deans may authorize access to records of established violations not discussed in these procedures.

### **III. Access to Centrally-Maintained Records by External Parties**

- A. Records of established violations will be released to external parties, including educational institutions and employers, only with the student's permission.
  - 1. It is the responsibility of the student and the party seeking the records to provide documentation of the student's permission for release.
- B. A copy of the transcript notations and record maintenance practices sections of this policy will be provided to any external party who requests records of established violations.

### **IV. Record Maintenance Practices**

- A. Records of established first violations will be maintained until the student graduates from the program in which s/he was matriculated at the time of the violation.
  - 1. Records of prior violations are relevant in instances where there is a subsequent violation. Sanctions, in addition to those associated with the subsequent violation itself, will normally be imposed for subsequent violations.
- B. Records of established subsequent violations will be maintained for seven years following the determination that the policy was violated.
- C. Records of suspension and expulsion will be permanently maintained.

### **V. Transcript Notations**

- C. The transcript will be marked with a flag, denoted as "(X)" when an "F" grade for course failure is imposed for an academic integrity violation.
  - 1. The failing grade is counted toward the GPA.
  - 2. If the "(X)" flag is applied for a first violation, it will be removed **only** upon the student's completion of an educational program and full compliance with all consequences associated with the violation.
    - a. After the "(X)" flag is removed, the student may petition to flag the failing grade.
  - 3. If the "(X)" is applied for a subsequent violation, the flag will be permanently retained on the transcript.
- D. The transcript will be marked with "violation of academic integrity policy" when an established violation results in separation from the University (i.e., suspension or expulsion).

1. This designation will be permanently retained on the transcript.
- C. A transcript notation may be made at the direction of a hearing panel in other cases.

**VI. Additional Considerations**

- A. An “established violation” is a determination that a student has violated the academic integrity policy, either by instructor resolution or hearing. Violations will not be considered established while an appeal is pending.
- B. In reaching a determination whether to provide access to centrally-maintained records, the interest in avoiding a large number of ad hoc decisions will be balanced with the interest in providing relevant information under appropriate circumstances.
- C. Schools and colleges are encouraged to seek records of established academic integrity violations regarding external transfers into the University.
- D. Graduate programs are encouraged to seek records of established academic integrity violations regarding applicants for admission, including internal admits.
- E. A hearing panel may, as part of a sanction, modify these principles. For instance, a panel may modify the period of time that a record is maintained or remove the option to flag a failing grade imposed for an established violation.
1. Factors such as the seriousness of the established violation and the academic level of the student are relevant to such a modification.
- F. Confidentiality will be observed in implementing educational consequences associated with established academic integrity violations.

