

Introduction to the Draft Academic Integrity Policy

Martha A. Cotter, Chair
Academic Integrity Committee
October 2, 2009

A Little History

- Previous policy written in late 1980's.
- Widely considered to be too complex, legalistic, opaque, and out-of-date.
- Most recent attempt at revision started in 2004 with the appointment of the McCabe Committee and a parallel charge to the University Senate's Academic Standards, Regulations, and Admissions Committee. (ASRAC).

A Little More History

- Lack of agreement between the McCabe Committee and ASRAC led to the adoption of the Interim Academic Integrity Policy in May 2008 and the formation of the current Ad-hoc Academic Integrity Committee (AIC).
- The AIC has been working since early 2009 and has now produced a rough first draft.

The Draft Policy

- Goals are to create a policy and procedures that
 - are more transparent, less legalistic, less onerous for faculty, and fairer to students.
 - give students a substantially increased role in and responsibility for the academic integrity "system."
- Policy borrows major features from the policies of Maryland and Penn State.

The Draft Policy

- Draft is rough and incomplete; meant only to start a lively university-wide discussion among students, faculty, staff, and administrators.
- Primarily focused on violations by undergraduates. More needs to be done to adapt it to meet the needs of graduate and professional schools.

What is different from the previous Academic Integrity Policy?

- Definitions of levels of violations and suggested sanctions.
- Introduction of an honor pledge and Honor Council.
- Revised procedures for University Hearings and Disciplinary Conferences.
- Procedures for handling allegations of non-separable offenses retained from Interim Policy.

Violations and Sanctions

- Only two levels of violations: separable and non-separable.
- Expanded list of suggested sanctions for separable violations.
- Rough quantitative guidelines for distinguishing between levels of violations.
- Greatly expanded list of examples, arranged by type and level of violation.

The Proposed Honor Council

- Would be an organization of students from all three regional campuses dedicated to promoting academic integrity.
- Would play a key role in educating students and other members of the University community about academic integrity.
- Members of the Council would play a number of roles in the administration of the AI Policy.

Honor Council Roles Cont'd

- Members would serve on University Hearing Boards, Appeals Committees, and the Academic Integrity Review Committee.
- **Community Advocates** would serve as the complainant at a University Hearing; i.e., present the case against the respondent, when the community member who filed the complaint did not wish to do so.
- **Student Advocates** would provide information, advice, and assistance to students accused of violating the Academic Integrity Policy.

Revised Hearing Procedures

- A faculty member who initiates a complaint would not be required to serve as the complainant at a Hearing, but would normally have two options:
 - Present the case himself or herself, with the aid of a Campus Advisor if desired.
 - Choose to have the case presented by a Community Advocate from the Honor Council.
- If the faculty member is unwilling or unable to serve as the complainant and no suitable Community Advocate is available, a member of the decanal staff of the respondent's school or college may serve as the complainant.

Revised Hearing Procedures

- The respondent would be assisted, if desired, at the Hearing by a Student Advocate from the Honor Council or by a Campus Adviser and would be permitted to have one additional support person present, who could be an attorney. The role of the latter would be strictly advisory.
- The same would be true for the respondent at a Disciplinary Conference.

Revised Hearing Procedures

- The Hearing Officer would have to be a member of the Rutgers community, normally a staff or faculty member. Persons from outside the University, whether attorneys or not, would not be eligible to serve.

Note: these proposals require changes to the University Code of Student Conduct.

Procedures for Handling Non-Separable Violations

- Procedures retained from the Interim Policy, under which:
 - Allegations of non-separable violations must be handled either by the faculty member teaching the course or by an Academic Integrity Facilitator (AIF) from the school or college offering the course.
 - Students may appeal a finding of responsibility and/or sanction to the Academic Integrity Review Committee.