



REVISED MEMORANDUM

To: Julio Frenk, President

From: Tomás A. Salerno (2019) REVISÉD BY: Linda L. Neider (2020)
Chair, Faculty Senate

Date: January 31, 2019 REVISÉD DATE: February 13, 2020

Subject: Faculty Senate Legislation #2018-41(B) – Revision of the Academic Integrity Policy Proposal (AIP) for Undergraduate Students, Academic Standards Committee

The Faculty Senate, at its January 30, 2019 meeting, voted by a majority and with a friendly amendment, to approve the revised Academic Integrity Policy (AIP) for Undergraduate Students, submitted by the Academic Standards Committee.

However, the legislation was returned with your remarks that it was “not approved because of concerns over processes involving input from the Academic Affairs Committee (current and past year), the undergraduate academic deans, the school/college deans, the school/college faculties and the Office of Student Affairs; all potential stakeholders were not sufficiently consulted.”

Following the return of the legislation, as outlined in the *Faculty Manual* Section A10.8, you formed a Joint Referral Committee, consisting of the Chair of the Senate (me), the Executive Vice President and Provost (Jeffrey Duerk), two academic deans (Laura Kohn-Wood, and Shelton Berg), and the two Senate Vice Chairs (JoNel Newman and Helen Bramlett), plus the Dean of Students (Ryan Holmes). After deliberation, the committee revised the policy as shown on the enclosure.


This legislation is now forwarded to you for action.

TAS/rh

Enclosure

cc: Jeffrey Duerk, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs
Patricia Whitely, Vice President, Student Affairs
All Undergraduate Deans
Ryan C. Holmes, Dean of Students

CAPSULE: Legislation #2018-41(B) – Revision of the Academic Integrity Policy Proposal (AIP)
for Undergraduate Students, Academic Standards Committee

APPROVED:  DATE: 02/21/20
(President's Signature)

OFFICE OR INDIVIDUAL TO IMPLEMENT: Jeffrey Duerk, Provost & EVP for Academic Affairs

EFFECTIVE DATE OF LEGISLATION: IMMEDIATELY
(pending any additional approval by the Board of Trustees)

NOT APPROVED AND REFERRED TO: _____

REMARKS (IF NOT APPROVED): _____

Version in

TRACK CHANGES format



Academic Integrity Proposal

FOR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Respectfully Submitted by:

Academic Standards Committee

~~Uzma Khan (Chair), Ricardo Bascuas, Mary Beth Calhoon, Anthony Joseph Hynes, Latoya Janelle Lewis-Pierre, Dennis Smith, Joseph B. Treaster, Jamie Walls, Xiangyang Zhou, Stephen Cantrell (Ex-officio), and William Scott Green (Ex-officio)~~

In consultation with:

~~President's Joint Referral Committee (Provost Jeffery Duerk; Faculty Senate Officers Linda Neider, JoNel Newman, Helen Bramlett; Deans Laura Kohn Wood, Shelton Berg, Ryan Holmes; Chair Academic Standards Committee Uzma Khan); Members of Undergraduate Academic Deans' ~~collaborative~~Collaborative (Gina Astorini, Education; Ann Olazábal, Business; Michelle Maldonado, ~~Assistant Provost~~), and students (Ali Shaikh, President of the Undergraduate Honor Council; Adrian Nuñez, President of the Undergraduate Student Government 2017-2018; Evan de Joya, President of the Undergraduate Student Government 2018-2019).~~

January 16 December 11, 2019

Table of Contents

- 1 Background
- 2 Key Findings
- 3 Goals
- 4 Recommendations and Guidance

Academic Integrity Policy

Preface

- ~~5~~I. Membership and Hearing Panel Structures
- 6 Examples of Violations by Class and Sanction Guidelines
- 7 Reporting and Adjudication Process
- ~~8~~ Process of Appealing to the Appeals Board
- ~~9~~ Sample Forms
- ~~10~~ Academic Integrity Reporting Form (example)
- II. Academic Integrity Resolution Form (example)

III.

IV.

V.

A.

B.

1. Background

The University of Miami community recognizes integrity as a core institutional value. The responsibility to uphold the University Honor Code and high academic standards is a shared value between faculty, students, and administrators. Faculty, in particular, have a vital role to play in this regard and need to be diligent in reporting violations.

Recognizing that learning objectives vary across courses, the University strongly encourages faculty to establish course-specific academic integrity expectations and sanctions. It is the responsibility of faculty to communicate, and of students to know, the academic integrity policies that are specific to their courses. In addition, the University has the responsibility and authority to address suspected violations that are not specified by the syllabus and that may threaten the academic integrity of the University.

The Faculty Senate's Academic Standards Committee reviewed the Undergraduate Honor Code and the academic integrity at the University, and met with representatives of Student Government; Undergraduate Honor Council, and the Office of Student Affairs to gather their views and recommendations. The committee also utilized recommendations made, at the request of the Academic Standards Committee, from the undergraduate academic deans, as well as considered the academic integrity practices and policies at peer institutions. This report presents the Academic Standard Committee's findings and recommendations.

2. Key Findings

1. The Honor Code at the University places responsibility for upholding the Code solely in the hands of undergraduate students. The Honor Council, which adjudicates cases of Honor Code violations, is a student body managed by the Office of the Dean of Students. Students investigate, prosecute, adjudicate, and penalize other students. Faculty are not involved, other than to serve as witnesses. The Honor Council also engages in student development activities and holds educational initiatives related to academic integrity.
2. The students on the Honor Council are principled leaders of the community and are of high integrity. The Honor Council as well as the Student Government representatives feel strongly about their role in enforcing high standards of academic integrity through adjudication and education. As key members of our academic community, we feel that they should be actively engaged in this process.
3. Under Title I.E.1 of the Honor Code, instructors retain complete discretion over the grade penalty irrespective of the outcome of the hearing processes. This can, however, potentially result in a lack of due process for students and possible inconsistent outcomes if an Honor Council panel and/or Appeals Board exonerates a student while the faculty member does not abide by the verdict.
4. The resolution of academic integrity violation cases may take a long time from allegation to adjudication (to possible appeal), especially for violations that occur at the end of a semester or over the summer due to limited availability of students during those periods.
5. Complete records about violations and sanctions are generally unavailable because faculty may not report Honor Code violations (only 74 cases, for example, were reported during 2016-2018).
6. Faculty, department, and school/college policies and/or practices are different regarding whether a student should be permitted (or alternatively, encouraged) to drop a course in which an academic integrity violation has been alleged.
7. Many peer institutions include both faculty and students in the academic integrity adjudication process and set clear guidelines for sanctions.

3. Goals

Based on the findings and substantial consideration, the Academic Standard Committee set out to achieve the following objectives with the proposed recommendations:

1. Increase reporting of academic integrity violations for better record-keeping purposes and for future development of data-driven policies and educational initiatives.
2. Bring greater consistency and transparency across schools and faculty in the sanctions imposed for the same violations.
3. Increase faculty involvement in the adjudication process.
4. Increase the role of schools and colleges in the adjudication process.
5. Provide more expedient and efficient due process to students.
6. Build a community of academic integrity and shared responsibility.

4. Recommendations and Guidance

Academic Standards Committee proposes several changes to the current structure of the academic integrity adjudication process:

1. Students should be required during orientation to read, and acknowledge reading, the Honor Code and what constitutes violations of academic integrity along with expected corresponding sanctions. It is further recommended that the Dean of Students considers creating a short online training module that may be incorporated in UMX 100.
2. Information on the University's Academic Integrity Policy and practice should be included during faculty and chairperson orientation.
3. Faculty ~~should~~shall immediately report all suspected cases of academic integrity violations to the Department Chair (or to the relevant administrator in non-departmentalized schools) along with submitting the online academic integrity violation form. The Department Chair ~~should~~shall immediately inform the Academic Dean for Undergraduate studies at their school/college (DoUG) of all reports so that accurate records can be maintained at the school level.
4. All academic integrity violations ~~should~~shall be finally reported to the Dean of Students for centralized record-keeping and to assess consistency of sanctions.
- ~~5. When a report of an alleged violation of academic integrity is received, the DoUG should immediately put a hold on the student's account to prevent the student from dropping or withdrawing from the course until the matter is resolved. If a student withdraws from the course before the case is adjudicated, the DoUG will re-enroll the student in the course until the matter is adjudicated.~~
5. The adjudication process will continue as outlined herein even if the student withdraws from the course. If the student is found responsible, the course where the violation occurred will reflect on the student's transcript with a failing grade (in addition to any other sanctions determined by the hearing panel).
6. The Dean of Students ~~should~~will oversee university-wide academic integrity matters, including advising the Honor Council, scheduling hearing panels, managing the academic integrity website and database, and promoting academic integrity through educational activities.
7. The Honor Council membership ~~should~~shall be changed as follows:
 - i. Two (2) faculty members from each school and college (18 in total).
 - ii. Up to thirty-one (31) students.

- iii. Two (2) faculty and two (2) students serve on any given hearing panel with voting rights for determining both responsibility and the sanction. Dean of Students will resolve any ties.
 - iv. For Class II and III violations, an appeal can be made to the Appeals Board if the Honor Council determination is not acceptable to the parties (i.e, the student suspected of academic dishonesty, and the faculty reporting the suspected behavior).
8. The Honor Council should meet at least once per semester to discuss academic integrity trends by school, issues, and initiatives.
 9. Each school/college should establish an Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) comprising of the following:
 - i. DoUG or designee (non-voting member).
 - ii. Six (6) faculty members.
 - iii. Two (2) hearing panels comprised of 3 faculty members each.
 - iv. The hearing panels will meet every 2 weeks on rotating basis (except when there are no cases).
 - v. AIC will hear first time alleged Class I and Class II violations.
 10. A website dedicated to Academic Integrity should be established and maintained by the Dean of Students. This site should host information on the Honor Code, Honor Council, types of violations (Class I, II, III violations), guidelines for potential sanctions, adjudication process, educational materials (e.g., information on plagiarism and writing best practices), and information on relevant activities around campus. Faculty should include a link to this website in their syllabi.
 11. The Dean of Students is responsible for submitting an annual academic integrity report to the Faculty Senate's Academic Standards Committee by September 1st of each academic year. The report should include (for the past academic year) the numbers and types of violations, the sanctions given, and a summary of activities undertaken to promote the culture and understanding of academic integrity at the University. The data should be broken down by schools to allow assessment of consistency of sanctions across the University.

~~These proposed recommendations acknowledge~~

Academic Integrity Policy

Preface

The University of Miami community recognizes integrity as a core institutional value. The responsibility to uphold the University Honor Code and high academic standards is a shared value between faculty, students, and administrators. It is each community member's responsibility to ensure that academic integrity is upheld. Faculty, in particular, have a vital role to play in this regard and should be diligent in reporting violations.

This policy acknowledges that the norms and the responsibility of academic integrity are to be jointly upheld by the faculty and student members of the University community. ~~The model also vests substantial~~ Substantial responsibility is vested in the several schools and colleges to manage first-time offenses and to coordinate their faculty's efforts.

5I. Membership and Hearing Panel Structures

School/College Academic Integrity Committee	
Adjudicates	Alleged Class I and Class II violations
Hearing Panel Structure	3 Faculty
Membership	6 Faculty*, DoUG (non-voting) *At the school’s discretion, committee membership may be altered to compose more than two hearing panels, or decreased to constitute one panel as long as the cases are adjudicated in a timely manner
Selection	Faculty appointed by the school council of the school/college for 2-year term

Honor Council	
Adjudicates	Alleged Class III violations and appeals for Class I and II violations
Membership	18 Faculty, up to 31 Students, Dean of Students (non-voting)
Hearing Panel Structure	2 Faculty, 2 Students (Dean of Students will resolve any ties) In exceptional cases when the Dean of Students is unable to find 2 students to serve on a hearing panel within 7 days, the parties** may agree to one of the following options for an expedited hearing: 1) A panel deviating from the regular number and structure of members. 2) An administrative hearing with the Dean of Students (or designee) and an Academic Dean (or faculty designee). <u>** Parties in the policy are defined as the student(s) suspected of academic dishonesty, and the faculty reporting the suspected behavior.</u>
Selection	Faculty: Appointed by the school council of each school/college for 2-year term Students: Multi-layered interview process

Appeals Board	
Adjudicates	Appeals for Class II and Class III violations
Hearing Panel Structure	VP for Student Affairs DoUG of the school where the violation occurred U/G Student Government President Speaker of the Honor Council hearing panel (non-voting)

6II. Examples of Violation by Class and Sanction Guidelines

1. The University distinguishes between 1) first-time violations that are of low severity, 2) first-time violations that are more severe, and 3) repeat violations of any type and highly egregious offenses.
2. For greater consistency of sanctions for the same violation across the University, faculty are encouraged to consult the examples of violation classes and guidelines for potential sanctions suggested by the University. These guidelines may be used to set course specific policies and/or for recommending sanctions when course specific expectations are not clearly outlined in the syllabus.
3. When faculty have clearly outlined expectations and sanctions in their syllabus, those penalties will supersede the sanctions recommended by the University.
4. The suggested violation classes and corresponding recommended sanctions are only examples and do not provide an exhaustive list. The determination of the severity of a violation and the corresponding sanction will often fall on the faculty and the hearing boards.

6.1. Examples of Class I Violations and Sanctions Guidelines

First-time violations that need to be addressed, but offer an expedited process at the school level due to the low severity of the offence.

Alleged Violation*	Recommended Sanction(s)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Studying from someone else’s notes, when prohibited by the instructor. • Utilizing tutor or writing center in violation of the rules and guidelines set by the instructor. • Providing false or misleading information to be excused from class or delay taking a quiz, exam, or extending a deadline. • Plagiarism: Submitting an assignment where up to 25% of the assignment is not the work of the student and/or properly cited. • Copying homework or providing homework to another student to copy. • Signing in for another student for attendance purposes. • Working with a group (collusion) on an assignment, exam, or paper that should be done individually. • Submitting the same work for more than one course. • Any use of digital technologies prohibited by the instructor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum “F” on the assignment. • Maximum “F” in the course. • Educational sanction related to academic integrity. • Not a reportable disciplinary concern to graduate or professional schools, etc. <p>For an expedited process, student can accept faculty recommended sanction or the minimum sanction (“F” on the assignment) when faculty recommendation is not available.</p> <p>If a student wishes a hearing with the AIC, and is found responsible, the committee may recommend increasing or decreasing the sanction suggested by the faculty.</p> <p>The parties can appeal to the Honor Council as the final adjudicator.</p>

*** This is not an exhaustive or strict list. These examples are provided only as a guideline to determine severity of the violations and commensurate sanction(s).**

6.2. Examples of Class II Violations and Sanction Guidelines

First-time violations that are more egregious than Class I violations with higher penalties, but allow for an expedited process at the school level.

Alleged Violation*	Recommended Sanction(s)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Possession of or use of any materials prohibited by instructor.• Unauthorized use of term paper or exam (e.g., past exams or other source).• Giving exam to students in a later section.• Plagiarism: Submitting an assignment where 25% to 50% of the assignment is not the work of the student and/or properly cited.• Bringing a cheat sheet or unauthorized notes or formulas into the exam.• Facilitating the academic dishonesty of another student (e.g., texting or emailing exam answers to another student, <u>writing helping another student write</u> a paper <u>for someone else</u>).	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• At minimum, "F" in the course.• At maximum, dismissal from the University.• Educational sanction related to academic integrity. <p>The parties can appeal to the Appeals Board as the final adjudicator.</p>

*** This is not an exhaustive or strict list. These examples are provided only as a guideline to determine severity of the violations and commensurate sanction(s).**

6.3. Examples of Class III Violations and Sanction Guidelines

Repeated violations of any kind, or a violation so egregious it requires an Honor Council Hearing, with more severe sanction guidelines than Class II.

Alleged Violation*	Recommended Sanction(s)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any repeat alleged violation that the student has been found responsible for previously. • Falsifying or forging academic credentials or University documents including internship documentation and letters of recommendation. • Submission or use of falsified data. • Sabotage of someone else’s work. • Taking a test or writing a paper for someone else. • Plagiarism: Submitting an assignment where 50% or more of the assignment is not the work of the student and/or properly cited. • Obtaining/purchasing exam answers or term papers from someone else. • Unauthorized distribution of a quiz or exam. • Any other type of fraud. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At minimum, “XF” in the course. • At maximum, expulsion from the University. • Educational sanction related to academic integrity. <p>The parties can appeal to the Appeals Board as the final adjudicator.</p>

* This is not an exhaustive or strict list. These examples are provided only as a guideline to determine severity of the violations and commensurate sanction(s).



7III. Reporting and Adjudication Process

1. Any member of the University can confidentially report academic dishonesty to the faculty teaching the course or directly to the Dean of Students when there is strong evidence that an academic integrity violation has occurred.
- ~~2. Faculty should immediately report all cases of academic integrity violation as below:~~
- ~~1.2.~~ If no evidence is present or when suspicion is not strong, faculty may give the student a warning and close the matter.
- ~~1.3.~~ When faculty have a strong suspicion, or when evidence is present, faculty ~~should~~**shall** report the violation (~~following through~~ the process ~~outlined below~~)**described herein** and ~~should~~ have the authority to recommend a sanction.
- ~~4.~~ **Faculty must also report all cases of academic integrity violations in which they have taken an adverse action affecting a student's grade but have not invoked the adjudication process described herein.**
- ~~3.~~ **5.** Appropriate hearing board will adjudicate the case.

7.1. Process for Class I Violations

Recommended Sanction	Minimum "F" on the <u>Assignment</u> - Maximum "F" on the <u>Course</u>
-----------------------------	--

1. Faculty ~~should~~**must** immediately report the suspected violation to the Department Chair (or relevant administrator in the non-departmentalized schools) and complete the online Academic Integrity Reporting Form. The Department Chair will immediately inform the DoUG of the school.
2. The faculty may or may not recommend a sanction.
- ~~3.~~ ~~The DoUG or designee will immediately put a hold on the student's account to prevent the student from withdrawing from the course until the matter is resolved. If a student withdraws from the course before the case is adjudicated, the DoUG will re-enroll the student in the course and put a hold until the matter is adjudicated.~~
- ~~4.3.~~ The DoUG will determine the violation class and meet with the student within 5 academic days of receiving a report to present the charges (and potential sanctions) and go over the student's options as follows:
 - i. Admit responsibility and take faculty suggested sanction (Expedited Process).

- ii. Admit responsibility and take the minimum sanction when faculty recommendation is not available (Expedited Process).
- iii. Request a hearing with the AIC.

~~5-4.~~ The student will get 3 academic days to make a decision. If the student does not respond within the allowed time, faculty sanction (or the minimum sanction in case where faculty does not recommend a sanction) will hold and the student will waive the right to any further hearing.

~~6-5.~~ If the student accepts responsibility and agrees with the faculty sanction (or the minimum sanction in cases where faculty does not recommend a sanction), the DoUG will administer the Academic Integrity Resolution Form. No further action will be needed. The DoUG will report the case to the Dean of Students for record-keeping within 3 academic days of the resolution.

~~7-6.~~ If the student does not admit responsibility or does not agree with the sanction recommended by the faculty, the DoUG will refer the case to the AIC within 3 academic days of the student's decision. The AIC will meet within 2 weeks of receiving the DoUG's notice. AIC will listen to both parties and make a recommendation within 3 academic days of the hearing. AIC's recommendation may be more or less stringent than the faculty's recommended sanction.

~~8-7.~~ The parties will have 3 academic days to consider AIC's recommendation and make a decision. If the student fails to respond within the allotted time, the faculty sanction will hold and the student will waive the right to appeal. If the parties agree with AIC's recommended action, the DoUG will administer the Academic Integrity Resolution Form and will report the matter to the Dean of Students within 3 academic days for record-keeping.

~~9-8.~~ If either party does not agree with the AIC, an appeal can ~~to~~be made to the Honor Council. Such requests must be made in writing to the Office of Dean of Students within 3 academic days of communication of AIC's determination.

~~10-9.~~ The Dean of Students within 7 academic days of receiving the report of the alleged violation will establish the Honor Council hearing panel and will inform the parties.

~~11-10.~~ The Honor Council's decision will be binding for both parties.

11. The adjudication process will continue as outlined herein even if the student withdraws from the course. If the student is found responsible, the course where the violation occurred will reflect on the student's transcript with a failing grade (in addition to any other sanctions determined by the hearing panel).

12. When there is a prior record of violations that student has been found responsible for, the DoUG will forward the case to the Dean of Students to be adjudicated by the Honor Council and will inform the parties.
13. A student who wants to contest a grade affected due to academic integrity violation may request a hearing with AIC by reporting to the DoUG within 3 days of receiving the grade. DoUG will report the violation to the Dean of Students and will refer the case to AIC.

7.2. Process for Class II Violations

Recommended Sanction	Minimum "F" on the Course – Maximum Dismissal from the University
----------------------	---

These are first time violations that are deemed more severe than the Class I violations.

The reporting and hearing process for Class II violations will be the same as Class I violations except:

1. The minimum recommended sanction for Class II violations is "F" on the course.
2. Parties will have the right to appeal to the Appeals Board after Honor Council's determination in accordance with the grounds for appeal outlined in Section 8.2 for Class II violations.
3. The Appeals Board's decision will be binding for both parties.

7.3. Process for Class III Violations

Recommended Sanction	Minimum "XF" on the Course – Maximum Expulsion from the University
----------------------	--

The Honor Council will hear repeated violations of any kind, or a violation so egregious, it requires the Honor Council hearing with more severe sanctions.

1. Faculty reporting process would be the same as for Class I and II violations.
- ~~2. The DoUG (or designee) will immediately put a hold on the student's account upon receiving the report of alleged violation. If a student withdraws from the course before the case is adjudicated, the DoUG will re-enroll the student in the course and put a hold until the matter is adjudicated.~~
- ~~3.~~ 2. The DoUG will determine the violation class and meet with the student within 5 academic days of receiving a report to present the charges (and potential sanctions) and to inform

the student about next steps. DoUG will forward the case to the Dean of Students for adjudication by the Honor Council.

- ~~4.3.~~ The Dean of Students within 7 academic days of receiving the report of the alleged violation will establish the Honor Council hearing panel and will inform the parties.
- ~~5.4.~~ Parties will have the right to appeal to the Appeals Board after Honor Council's determination in accordance with the grounds for appeal outlined in Section 8.2 for Class III violations.
- ~~6.5.~~ The Appeals Board's decision will be binding for both parties.
- ~~6.~~ **8** The adjudication process will continue as outlined herein even if the student withdraws from the course. If the student is found responsible, the course where the violation occurred will reflect on the student's transcript with a failing grade (in addition to any other sanctions determined by the hearing panel).

IV. Process of Appealing to the Appeals Board

8.1. Class I Violations

1. After AIC's determination either party can appeal to the Honor Council within 3 academic days of communication of AIC's recommendation. The request should be made in writing and to the Office of the Dean of Students.
2. The Honor Council's decision will be binding for both parties and no further appeal will be allowed.

8.2. Class II and III Violations

1. After the Honor Council's determination, parties have the right to appeal to the Appeals board.
2. The decision of the Appeals Board will be binding for ~~other~~ both parties.
3. The only grounds for appeal to the Appeals Board are:
 - a. that the failure to follow the procedures established for adjudication of an academic integrity violation constituted an error
 - b. that the sanction(s) imposed was (were) not commensurate with the offense.
4. Allowable appeals must be made in writing and submitted to the Office of the Dean of Students within 3 academic days from the date the determination of the Honor Council is communicated to the student, stating with specificity the grounds for the appeal and facts upon which it is based.
5. The Dean of Students within 7 academic days from the date of receipt of an appeal, will establish the hearing panel.
6. A Upon establishment, the hearing panel will make a determination ~~will be made within 5 academic days~~ as to whether the appeal is timely and made on proper grounds. The Dean of Students will communicate that determination to the student within the next 3 academic days.
7. If the appeal is determined to be timely and made on proper grounds, the hearing panel will make a decision on the merits of the appeal within 10 academic days of its determination on the validity of the appeal. The Vice President of Student Affairs (or designee) will communicate the ~~decision of the appeal to the student within 7 academic days after the date the appeal is determined to be valid and that fact~~

~~communicated~~ [hearing panel's decision](#) to the student. [within 3 academic days of the determination.](#)

9.V. Sample Forms

A. Academic Integrity Reporting Form (example)

A form that would route to the appropriate Academic Dean for Undergraduate Studies and the Dean of Students.

Background Information

Reporter's Name:
Reporter's Title/Role: (student, Professor of Biology, etc.)
Reporter's phone number:
Reporter's email:
Reporter's campus address:
Date of incident:
Course Name and Number:
Course School/College:

Student(s) Involved

Student's Name:
Student's C#:
Student's Email Address:

Incident Details

Alleged violation (check all that apply) Descriptions of all violations available at Miami.edu/academicintegrity.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cheating | <input type="checkbox"/> Academic Sabotage |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fabrication | <input type="checkbox"/> Violation of Research or Professional Ethics |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Facilitating Academic Dishonesty | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |

Description of Incident

Percentage of the final grade this assignment is worth:

How would you like to be contacted for follow up information about this report?

- Email
 Phone

Supporting Documentation

Attach photos, videos, emails, and any other supporting documents.

Recommended sanction (if the reporter is the faculty teaching the class)

Action Taken

- Discussed the matter with the student.
- Informed the student about the recommended sanction.
- The student accepts guilt and the recommended sanction.
- The student does not accept responsibility and/or the sanction.
- No action taken.

**B. ~~10.~~ Academic Integrity Resolution Form
(example)**

This form is for Class I and Class II violations wherein the student chooses between a hearing with the AIC or the expedited process with the sanction imposed by the faculty (or the minimum sanction when faculty recommendation is not provided). This form can be executed by the Academic Dean for Undergraduate Studies or their designee.

Charge presented on (date and time): _____

Sanction

- Faculty Recommendation: _____
- Minimum sanction (in case of no faculty recommendation): = _____

Student's Decision

- I accept the charge and the sanction(s) indicated by the faculty.
- I accept the charge but request a hearing to challenge the sanction(s) indicated by the faculty.
- I accept the charge and the minimum sanction.
- I plead not responsible for the charge and request a hearing with Academic Integrity Committee.

Student's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Sanction



Please note that Academic Integrity Committee may ~~recommend~~ decide a higher or lower sanction than what is recommend by the faculty. As a result, the faculty ~~may increase or lower the current sanction after~~ are to adhere to the decision of the AIC ~~recommendation~~.

You have the right to request a hearing with the Honor Council if you do not accept the sanction imposed at this stage.

Please note that you are not able to drop the course.

Version with TRACK

CHANGES accepted



Academic Integrity Proposal

FOR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Respectfully Submitted by:
Academic Standards Committee

In consultation with:

President's Joint Referral Committee (Provost Jeffery Duerk; Faculty Senate Officers Linda Neider, JoNel Newman, Helen Bramlett; Deans Laura Kohn Wood, Shelton Berg, Ryan Holmes; Chair Academic Standards Committee Uzma Khan); Members of Undergraduate Academic Deans' Collaborative (Gina Astorini, Education; Ann Olazábal, Business; Michelle Maldonado), and students (Ali Shaikh, President of the Undergraduate Honor Council; Adrian Nuñez, President of the Undergraduate Student Government 2017-2018; Evan de Joya, President of the Undergraduate Student Government 2018-2019).

December 11, 2019

Table of Contents

- 1** Background
 - 2** Key Findings
 - 3** Goals
 - 4** Recommendations and Guidance
- Academic Integrity Policy
- Preface
- I.** Membership and Hearing Panel Structures
 - II.** Examples of Violations by Class and Sanction Guidelines
 - III.** Reporting and Adjudication Process
 - IV.** Process of Appealing to the Appeals Board
 - V.** Sample Forms
 - A.** Academic Integrity Reporting Form (example)
 - B.** Academic Integrity Resolution Form (example)

1. Background

The University of Miami community recognizes integrity as a core institutional value. The responsibility to uphold the University Honor Code and high academic standards is a shared value between faculty, students, and administrators. Faculty, in particular, have a vital role to play in this regard and need to be diligent in reporting violations.

Recognizing that learning objectives vary across courses, the University strongly encourages faculty to establish course-specific academic integrity expectations and sanctions. It is the responsibility of faculty to communicate, and of students to know, the academic integrity policies that are specific to their courses. In addition, the University has the responsibility and authority to address suspected violations that are not specified by the syllabus and that may threaten the academic integrity of the University.

The Faculty Senate's Academic Standards Committee reviewed the Undergraduate Honor Code and the academic integrity at the University, and met with representatives of Student Government, Undergraduate Honor Council, and the Office of Student Affairs to gather their views and recommendations. The committee also utilized recommendations made, at the request of the Academic Standards Committee, from the undergraduate academic deans, as well as considered the academic integrity practices and policies at peer institutions. This report presents the Academic Standard Committee's findings and recommendations.

2. Key Findings

1. The Honor Code at the University places responsibility for upholding the Code solely in the hands of undergraduate students. The Honor Council, which adjudicates cases of Honor Code violations, is a student body managed by the Office of the Dean of Students. Students investigate, prosecute, adjudicate, and penalize other students. Faculty are not involved, other than to serve as witnesses. The Honor Council also engages in student development activities and holds educational initiatives related to academic integrity.
2. The students on the Honor Council are principled leaders of the community and are of high integrity. The Honor Council as well as the Student Government representatives feel strongly about their role in enforcing high standards of academic integrity through adjudication and education. As key members of our academic community, we feel that they should be actively engaged in this process.
3. Under Title I.E.1 of the Honor Code, instructors retain complete discretion over the grade penalty irrespective of the outcome of the hearing processes. This can, however, potentially result in a lack of due process for students and possible inconsistent outcomes if an Honor Council panel and/or Appeals Board exonerates a student while the faculty member does not abide by the verdict.
4. The resolution of academic integrity violation cases may take a long time from allegation to adjudication (to possible appeal), especially for violations that occur at the end of a semester or over the summer due to limited availability of students during those periods.
5. Complete records about violations and sanctions are generally unavailable because faculty may not report Honor Code violations (only 74 cases, for example, were reported during 2016-2018).
6. Faculty, department, and school/college policies and/or practices are different regarding whether a student should be permitted (or alternatively, encouraged) to drop a course in which an academic integrity violation has been alleged.
7. Many peer institutions include both faculty and students in the academic integrity adjudication process and set clear guidelines for sanctions.

3. Goals

Based on the findings and substantial consideration, the Academic Standard Committee set out to achieve the following objectives with the proposed recommendations:

1. Increase reporting of academic integrity violations for better record-keeping purposes and for future development of data-driven policies and educational initiatives.
2. Bring greater consistency and transparency across schools and faculty in the sanctions imposed for the same violations.
3. Increase faculty involvement in the adjudication process.
4. Increase the role of schools and colleges in the adjudication process.
5. Provide more expedient and efficient due process to students.
6. Build a community of academic integrity and shared responsibility.

4. Recommendations and Guidance

Academic Standards Committee proposes several changes to the current structure of the academic integrity adjudication process:

1. Students should be required during orientation to read, and acknowledge reading, the Honor Code and what constitutes violations of academic integrity along with expected corresponding sanctions. It is further recommended that the Dean of Students considers creating a short online training module that may be incorporated in UMX 100.
2. Information on the University's Academic Integrity Policy and practice should be included during faculty and chairperson orientation.
3. Faculty shall immediately report all suspected cases of academic integrity violations to the Department Chair (or to the relevant administrator in non-departmentalized schools) along with submitting the online academic integrity violation form. The Department Chair shall immediately inform the Academic Dean for Undergraduate studies at their school/college (DoUG) of all reports so that accurate records can be maintained at the school level.
4. All academic integrity violations shall be finally reported to the Dean of Students for centralized record-keeping and to assess consistency of sanctions.
5. The adjudication process will continue as outlined herein even if the student withdraws from the course. If the student is found responsible, the course where the violation occurred will reflect on the student's transcript with a failing grade (in addition to any other sanctions determined by the hearing panel).
6. The Dean of Students will oversee university-wide academic integrity matters, including advising the Honor Council, scheduling hearing panels, managing the academic integrity website and database, and promoting academic integrity through educational activities.
7. The Honor Council membership shall be changed as follows:
 - i. Two (2) faculty members from each school and college (18 in total).
 - ii. Up to thirty-one (31) students.
 - iii. Two (2) faculty and two (2) students serve on any given hearing panel with voting rights for determining both responsibility and the sanction. Dean of Students will resolve any ties.
 - iv. For Class II and III violations, an appeal can be made to the Appeals Board if the Honor Council determination is not acceptable to the parties (i.e, the student suspected of academic dishonesty, and the faculty reporting the suspected behavior).

8. The Honor Council should meet at least once per semester to discuss academic integrity trends by school, issues, and initiatives.
9. Each school/college should establish an Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) comprising of the following:
 - i. DoUG or designee (non-voting member).
 - ii. Six (6) faculty members.
 - iii. Two (2) hearing panels comprised of 3 faculty members each.
 - iv. The hearing panels will meet every 2 weeks on rotating basis (except when there are no cases).
 - v. AIC will hear first time alleged Class I and Class II violations.
10. A website dedicated to Academic Integrity should be established and maintained by the Dean of Students. This site should host information on the Honor Code, Honor Council, types of violations (Class I, II, III violations), guidelines for potential sanctions, adjudication process, educational materials (e.g., information on plagiarism and writing best practices), and information on relevant activities around campus. Faculty should include a link to this website in their syllabi.
11. The Dean of Students is responsible for submitting an annual academic integrity report to the Faculty Senate's Academic Standards Committee by September 1st of each academic year. The report should include (for the past academic year) the numbers and types of violations, the sanctions given, and a summary of activities undertaken to promote the culture and understanding of academic integrity at the University. The data should be broken down by schools to allow assessment of consistency of sanctions across the University.

Academic Integrity Policy

Preface

The University of Miami community recognizes integrity as a core institutional value. The responsibility to uphold the University Honor Code and high academic standards is a shared value between faculty, students, and administrators. It is each community member's responsibility to ensure that academic integrity is upheld. Faculty, in particular, have a vital role to play in this regard and should be diligent in reporting violations.

This policy acknowledges that the norms and the responsibility of academic integrity are to be jointly upheld by the faculty and student members of the University community. Substantial responsibility is vested in the several schools and colleges to manage first-time offenses and to coordinate their faculty's efforts.

I. Membership and Hearing Panel Structures

School/College Academic Integrity Committee	
Adjudicates	Alleged Class I and Class II violations
Hearing Panel Structure	3 Faculty
Membership	6 Faculty*, DoUG (non-voting) *At the school's discretion, committee membership may be altered to compose more than two hearing panels, or decreased to constitute one panel as long as the cases are adjudicated in a timely manner
Selection	Faculty appointed by the school council of the school/college for 2-year term

Honor Council	
Adjudicates	Alleged Class III violations and appeals for Class I and II violations
Membership	18 Faculty, up to 31 Students, Dean of Students (non-voting)
Hearing Panel Structure	2 Faculty, 2 Students (Dean of Students will resolve any ties) In exceptional cases when the Dean of Students is unable to find 2 students to serve on a hearing panel within 7 days, the parties** may agree to one of the following options for an expedited hearing: 1) A panel deviating from the regular number and structure of members. 2) An administrative hearing with the Dean of Students (or designee) and an Academic Dean (or faculty designee). ** Parties in the policy are defined as the student(s) suspected of academic dishonesty, and the faculty reporting the suspected behavior.
Selection	Faculty: Appointed by the school council of each school/college for 2-year term Students: Multi-layered interview process

Appeals Board	
Adjudicates	Appeals for Class II and Class III violations
Hearing Panel Structure	VP for Student Affairs DoUG of the school where the violation occurred U/G Student Government President Speaker of the Honor Council hearing panel (non-voting)

II. Examples of Violation by Class and Sanction Guidelines

1. The University distinguishes between 1) first-time violations that are of low severity, 2) first-time violations that are more severe, and 3) repeat violations of any type and highly egregious offenses.
2. For greater consistency of sanctions for the same violation across the University, faculty are encouraged to consult the examples of violation classes and guidelines for potential sanctions suggested by the University. These guidelines may be used to set course specific policies and/or for recommending sanctions when course specific expectations are not clearly outlined in the syllabus.
3. When faculty have clearly outlined expectations and sanctions in their syllabus, those penalties will supersede the sanctions recommended by the University.
4. The suggested violation classes and corresponding recommended sanctions are only examples and do not provide an exhaustive list. The determination of the severity of a violation and the corresponding sanction will often fall on the faculty and the hearing boards.

1. Examples of Class I Violations and Sanctions Guidelines

First-time violations that need to be addressed, but offer an expedited process at the school level due to the low severity of the offence.

Alleged Violation*	Recommended Sanction(s)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Studying from someone else’s notes, when prohibited by the instructor. • Utilizing tutor or writing center in violation of the rules and guidelines set by the instructor. • Providing false or misleading information to be excused from class or delay taking a quiz, exam, or extending a deadline. • Plagiarism: Submitting an assignment where up to 25% of the assignment is not the work of the student and/or properly cited. • Copying homework or providing homework to another student to copy. • Signing in for another student for attendance purposes. • Working with a group (collusion) on an assignment, exam, or paper that should be done individually. • Submitting the same work for more than one course. • Any use of digital technologies prohibited by the instructor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum “F” on the assignment. • Maximum “F” in the course. • Educational sanction related to academic integrity. • Not a reportable disciplinary concern to graduate or professional schools, etc. <p>For an expedited process, student can accept faculty recommended sanction or the minimum sanction (“F” on the assignment) when faculty recommendation is not available.</p> <p>If a student wishes a hearing with the AIC, and is found responsible, the committee may recommend increasing or decreasing the sanction suggested by the faculty.</p> <p>The parties can appeal to the Honor Council as the final adjudicator.</p>

*** This is not an exhaustive or strict list. These examples are provided only as a guideline to determine severity of the violations and commensurate sanction(s).**

2. Examples of Class II Violations and Sanction Guidelines

First-time violations that are more egregious than Class I violations with higher penalties, but allow for an expedited process at the school level.

Alleged Violation*	Recommended Sanction(s)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Possession of or use of any materials prohibited by instructor.• Unauthorized use of term paper or exam (e.g., past exams or other source).• Giving exam to students in a later section.• Plagiarism: Submitting an assignment where 25% to 50% of the assignment is not the work of the student and/or properly cited.• Bringing a cheat sheet or unauthorized notes or formulas into the exam.• Facilitating the academic dishonesty of another student (e.g., texting or emailing exam answers to another student, helping another student write a paper).	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• At minimum, "F" in the course.• At maximum, dismissal from the University.• Educational sanction related to academic integrity. <p>The parties can appeal to the Appeals Board as the final adjudicator.</p>

* This is not an exhaustive or strict list. These examples are provided only as a guideline to determine severity of the violations and commensurate sanction(s).

3. Examples of Class III Violations and Sanction Guidelines

Repeated violations of any kind, or a violation so egregious it requires an Honor Council Hearing, with more severe sanction guidelines than Class II.

Alleged Violation*	Recommended Sanction(s)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Any repeat alleged violation that the student has been found responsible for previously.• Falsifying or forging academic credentials or University documents including internship documentation and letters of recommendation.• Submission or use of falsified data.• Sabotage of someone else's work.• Taking a test or writing a paper for someone else.• Plagiarism: Submitting an assignment where 50% or more of the assignment is not the work of the student and/or properly cited.• Obtaining/purchasing exam answers or term papers from someone else.• Unauthorized distribution of a quiz or exam.• Any other type of fraud.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• At minimum, "XF" in the course.• At maximum, expulsion from the University.• Educational sanction related to academic integrity. <p>The parties can appeal to the Appeals Board as the final adjudicator.</p>

* This is not an exhaustive or strict list. These examples are provided only as a guideline to determine severity of the violations and commensurate sanction(s).



III. Reporting and Adjudication Process

1. Any member of the University can confidentially report academic dishonesty to the faculty teaching the course or directly to the Dean of Students when there is strong evidence that an academic integrity violation has occurred.
2. If no evidence is present or when suspicion is not strong, faculty may give the student a warning and close the matter.
3. When faculty have a strong suspicion, or when evidence is present, faculty shall report the violation through the process described herein and have the authority to recommend a sanction.
4. Faculty must also report all cases of academic integrity violations in which they have taken an adverse action affecting a student's grade but have not invoked the adjudication process described herein.
5. Appropriate hearing board will adjudicate the case.

1. Process for Class I Violations

Recommended Sanction	Minimum "F" on the <u>Assignment</u> - Maximum "F" on the <u>Course</u>
-----------------------------	--

1. Faculty must immediately report the suspected violation to the Department Chair (or relevant administrator in the non-departmentalized schools) and complete the online Academic Integrity Reporting Form. The Department Chair will immediately inform the DoUG of the school.
2. The faculty may or may not recommend a sanction.
3. The DoUG will determine the violation class and meet with the student within 5 academic days of receiving a report to present the charges (and potential sanctions) and go over the student's options as follows:
 - i. Admit responsibility and take faculty suggested sanction (Expedited Process).
 - ii. Admit responsibility and take the minimum sanction when faculty recommendation is not available (Expedited Process).
 - iii. Request a hearing with the AIC.
4. The student will get 3 academic days to make a decision. If the student does not respond within the allowed time, faculty sanction (or the minimum sanction in case where faculty

does not recommend a sanction) will hold and the student will waive the right to any further hearing.

5. If the student accepts responsibility and agrees with the faculty sanction (or the minimum sanction in cases where faculty does not recommend a sanction), the DoUG will administer the Academic Integrity Resolution Form. No further action will be needed. The DoUG will report the case to the Dean of Students for record-keeping within 3 academic days of the resolution.
6. If the student does not admit responsibility or does not agree with the sanction recommended by the faculty, the DoUG will refer the case to the AIC within 3 academic days of the student's decision. The AIC will meet within 2 weeks of receiving the DoUG's notice. AIC will listen to both parties and make a recommendation within 3 academic days of the hearing. AIC's recommendation may be more or less stringent than the faculty's recommended sanction.
7. The parties will have 3 academic days to consider AIC's recommendation and make a decision. If the student fails to respond within the allotted time, the faculty sanction will hold and the student will waive the right to appeal. If the parties agree with AIC's recommended action, the DoUG will administer the Academic Integrity Resolution Form and will report the matter to the Dean of Students within 3 academic days for record-keeping.
8. If either party does not agree with the AIC, an appeal can be made to the Honor Council. Such requests must be made in writing to the Office of Dean of Students within 3 academic days of communication of AIC's determination.
9. The Dean of Students within 7 academic days of receiving the report of the alleged violation will establish the Honor Council hearing panel and will inform the parties.
10. The Honor Council's decision will be binding for both parties.
11. The adjudication process will continue as outlined herein even if the student withdraws from the course. If the student is found responsible, the course where the violation occurred will reflect on the student's transcript with a failing grade (in addition to any other sanctions determined by the hearing panel).
12. When there is a prior record of violations that student has been found responsible for, the DoUG will forward the case to the Dean of Students to be adjudicated by the Honor Council and will inform the parties.
13. A student who wants to contest a grade affected due to academic integrity violation may request a hearing with AIC by reporting to the DoUG within 3 days of receiving the grade. DoUG will report the violation to the Dean of Students and will refer the case to AIC.

2. Process for Class II Violations

Recommended Sanction	Minimum "F" on the Course – Maximum Dismissal from the University
-----------------------------	--

These are first time violations that are deemed more severe than the Class I violations.

The reporting and hearing process for Class II violations will be the same as Class I violations **except:**

1. The minimum recommended sanction for Class II violations is "F" on the course.
2. Parties will have the right to appeal to the Appeals Board after Honor Council's determination in accordance with the grounds for appeal outlined in Section 8.2 for Class II violations.
3. The Appeals Board's decision will be binding for both parties.

3. Process for Class III Violations

Recommended Sanction	Minimum "XF" on the Course – Maximum Expulsion from the University
-----------------------------	---

The Honor Council will hear repeated violations of any kind, or a violation so egregious, it requires the Honor Council hearing with more severe sanctions.

1. Faculty reporting process would be the same as for Class I and II violations.
2. The DoUG will determine the violation class and meet with the student within 5 academic days of receiving a report to present the charges (and potential sanctions) and to inform the student about next steps. DoUG will forward the case to the Dean of Students for adjudication by the Honor Council.
3. The Dean of Students within 7 academic days of receiving the report of the alleged violation will establish the Honor Council hearing panel and will inform the parties.
4. Parties will have the right to appeal to the Appeals Board after Honor Council's determination in accordance with the grounds for appeal outlined in Section 8.2 for Class III violations.
5. The Appeals Board's decision will be binding for both parties.

6. The adjudication process will continue as outlined herein even if the student withdraws from the course. If the student is found responsible, the course where the violation occurred will reflect on the student's transcript with a failing grade (in addition to any other sanctions determined by the hearing panel).

IV. Process of Appealing to the Appeals Board

1. Class I Violations

1. After AIC's determination either party can appeal to the Honor Council within 3 academic days of communication of AIC's recommendation. The request should be made in writing and to the Office of the Dean of Students.
2. The Honor Council's decision will be binding for both parties and no further appeal will be allowed.

2. Class II and III Violations

1. After the Honor Council's determination, parties have the right to appeal to the Appeals board.
2. The decision of the Appeals Board will be binding for both parties.
3. The only grounds for appeal to the Appeals Board are:
 - a. that the failure to follow the procedures established for adjudication of an academic integrity violation constituted an error
 - b. that the sanction(s) imposed was (were) not commensurate with the offense.
4. Allowable appeals must be made in writing and submitted to the Office of the Dean of Students within 3 academic days from the date the determination of the Honor Council is communicated to the student, stating with specificity the grounds for the appeal and facts upon which it is based.
5. The Dean of Students within 7 academic days from the date of receipt of an appeal, will establish the hearing panel.
6. Upon establishment, the hearing panel will make a determination within 5 academic days as to whether the appeal is timely and made on proper grounds. The Dean of Students will communicate that determination to the student within the next 3 academic days.
7. If the appeal is determined to be timely and made on proper grounds, the hearing panel will make a decision on the merits of the appeal within 10 academic days of its determination on the validity of the appeal. The Vice President of Student Affairs (or designee) will communicate the hearing panel's decision to the student within 3 academic days of the determination.

V. Sample Forms

A. Academic Integrity Reporting Form (example)

A form that would route to the appropriate Academic Dean for Undergraduate Studies and the Dean of Students.

Background Information

Reporter's Name:

Reporter's Title/Role: (student, Professor of Biology, etc.)

Reporter's phone number:

Reporter's email:

Reporter's campus address:

Date of incident:

Course Name and Number:

Course School/College:

Student(s) Involved

Student's Name:

Student's C#:

Student's Email Address:

Incident Details

Alleged violation (check all that apply) Descriptions of all violations available at Miami.edu/academicintegrity.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cheating | <input type="checkbox"/> Academic Sabotage |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fabrication | <input type="checkbox"/> Violation of Research or Professional Ethics |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Facilitating Academic Dishonesty | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |

Description of Incident

Percentage of the final grade this assignment is worth:

How would you like to be contacted for follow up information about this report?

- Email
 Phone

Supporting Documentation

Attach photos, videos, emails, and any other supporting documents.

Recommended sanction (if the reporter is the faculty teaching the class)

Action Taken

- Discussed the matter with the student.
 Informed the student about the recommended sanction.
 The student accepts guilt and the recommended sanction.
 The student does not accept responsibility and/or the sanction.

- No action taken.

B. Academic Integrity Resolution Form (example)

This form is for Class I and Class II violations wherein the student chooses between a hearing with the AIC or the expedited process with the sanction imposed by the faculty (or the minimum sanction when faculty recommendation is not provided). This form can be executed by the Academic Dean for Undergraduate Studies or their designee.

Charge presented on (date and time): _____

Sanction

- Faculty Recommendation: _____
- Minimum sanction (in case of no faculty recommendation): _____

Student's Decision

- I accept the charge and the sanction(s) indicated by the faculty.
- I accept the charge but request a hearing to challenge the sanction(s) indicated by the faculty.
- I accept the charge and the minimum sanction.
- I plead not responsible for the charge and request a hearing with Academic Integrity Committee.

Student's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Sanction

Please note that Academic Integrity Committee may decide a higher or lower sanction than what is recommend by the faculty. As a result, the faculty are to adhere to the decision of the AIC.

You have the right to request a hearing with the Honor Council if you do not accept the sanction imposed at this stage.