

# Rutgers University Interim Academic Integrity Policy<sup>1</sup>

## I. Academic Integrity

Academic integrity is essential to the success of the educational enterprise and breaches of academic integrity constitute serious offenses against the academic community. Every member of that community bears a responsibility for ensuring that the highest standards of academic integrity are upheld. Only through a genuine partnership among students, faculty, staff, and administrators will the University be able to maintain the necessary commitment to academic integrity.

The University administration is responsible for making academic integrity an institutional priority and for providing students and faculty with effective educational programs and support services to help them fully understand and address issues of academic integrity. The administration is also responsible for working with other members of the academic community to establish equitable and effective procedures to deal with violations of academic integrity.

The faculty shares the responsibility for educating students about the importance and principles of academic integrity. Individual faculty members<sup>2</sup> are also responsible for informing students of the particular expectations regarding academic integrity within individual courses, including permissible limits of student collaboration and, where relevant, acceptable citation format. Finally, all members of the faculty should report all violations of academic integrity they encounter.

Students are responsible for understanding the principles of academic integrity fully and abiding by them in all their work at the University. Students are also encouraged to report alleged violations of academic integrity to the faculty member teaching the course in which the violation is alleged to have occurred.

## II. Violations of Academic Integrity

Various ways in which academic integrity can be violated are described below. The comments and examples within each section provide explanations and illustrative material, but do not exhaust the scope of possible violations. For context and specific details, the *University Code of Student Conduct* as well as the Student Judicial Affairs website (<http://judicialaffairs.rutgers.edu>) should be consulted.

---

<sup>1</sup> This interim academic integrity policy was approved by the Rutgers University Senate for adoption for a period of two years. After the two-year period, the policy will cease to be in force unless reapproved by the Senate for an additional period.

<sup>2</sup> For purposes of the Academic Integrity Policy, the term faculty member includes not only tenured, tenure-track, and nontenure-track faculty members, but also part-time lecturers, TAs, staff members, and administrators who are serving as the instructor of record in a course; i.e., the instructor responsible for assigning final course grades.

### **A. Cheating**

Cheating is the use of impermissible and/or unacknowledged materials, information, or study aids in any academic activity. Using books, notes, calculators, conversations with others, etc. when their use is restricted or forbidden, constitutes cheating. Similarly, students may not request others (including commercial term paper companies) to conduct research or prepare any work for them. Students may not submit identical work, or portions thereof, for credit or honors more than once without prior approval of the instructor to whom the work is being submitted for the second or subsequent time.

### **B. Fabrication**

Fabrication is the falsification or invention of any information or citation in an academic work. "Invented" information may not be used in any laboratory report or other academic work without authorization from the instructor. It is improper, for example, to analyze one sample in an experiment and "invent" data based on that single experiment for several more required analyses. Students must also acknowledge the actual source from which cited information was obtained. A student should not, for example, reproduce a quotation from a book review and claim that the quotation was obtained from the book itself.

### **C. Plagiarism**

Plagiarism is the representation of the words or ideas of another as one's own in any academic work. To avoid plagiarism, every direct quotation must be identified by quotation marks, or by appropriate indentation, and must be cited properly according to the accepted format for the particular discipline. Acknowledgment is also required when material from any source is paraphrased or summarized in whole or in part in one's own words. To acknowledge a paraphrase properly, one might state: to paraphrase Plato's comment... and conclude with a footnote or appropriate citation to identify the exact reference. A footnote acknowledging only a directly quoted statement does not suffice to notify the reader of any preceding or succeeding paraphrased material. Information that is common knowledge, such as names of leaders of prominent nations, basic scientific laws, etc, need not be cited; however, the sources of all facts or information obtained in reading or research that are not common knowledge among students in the course must be acknowledged. In addition to materials specifically cited in the text, other materials that contribute to one's general understanding of the subject may be acknowledged in the bibliography.

Sometimes, plagiarism can be a subtle issue. Students should be encouraged to discuss any questions about what constitutes plagiarism with the faculty member teaching the course.

#### **D. Denying Others Access to Information or Material**

It is a violation of academic integrity to deny others access to scholarly resources or to deliberately impede the progress of another student or scholar. Examples of violations of this type include giving other students false or misleading information; making library material unavailable to others by stealing or defacing books or journals; deliberately misplacing or destroying reserve materials; and altering someone else's computer files.

#### **E. Facilitating Violations of Academic Integrity**

It is a violation of academic integrity for a student to aid others in violating academic integrity. A student who knowingly or negligently facilitates a violation of academic integrity is as culpable as the student who receives the impermissible aid, even if the former student does not benefit from the violation.

### **III. Academic Integrity Violations and Sanctions**

#### **A. Levels of Violations and Recommended Sanctions**

Any violation of academic integrity is a serious offense and is therefore subject to an appropriate penalty or sanction. Academic integrity violations at Rutgers University are classified into four levels according to the nature of the violation. For each level of violation a corresponding set of sanctions is recommended. Level Three and Level Four violations are called "separable," since the recommended sanctions are temporary or permanent separation from the University. Level One and Level Two violations are called "nonseparable" since separation from the University is not a possible sanction for first offenses at those levels. However, separation is a possible sanction for repeat violations at Level One or Level Two.

The recommended sanctions at each level are not binding, but are intended as general guidelines for the academic community. Moreover, due to mitigating circumstances, a recommended sanction is not always imposed, even when a student is found responsible for a given violation. Culpability may be assessed and sanctions imposed differentially for those with more or with less experience as members of the academic community. Therefore, violations of academic integrity by graduate and professional students<sup>3</sup> will normally be penalized more severely than violations by first-year undergraduate students.

Examples are cited below for each level of violation. These examples are meant to be illustrations and should not be considered all inclusive.

---

<sup>3</sup> In this policy, the term graduate and professional students refers to post-baccalaureate students pursuing Masters or Doctoral degrees of any type, as well as Law students. The term does not refer to students in the undergraduate phase of a joint undergraduate-graduate degree program.

### **Level One Violations**

Level One violations may occur because of inexperience or lack of knowledge of the principles of academic integrity and are often characterized by the absence of dishonest intent on the part of the student committing the violation. These violations generally are quite limited in extent, occur on a minor assignment, and represent a small fraction of the total course work. Examples include:

1. Working with another student on a minor laboratory exercise or homework assignment when such collaboration is prohibited.
2. Failure to footnote or give proper acknowledgment in a very limited section of an assignment.

Sanctions for Level One violations ordinarily include one or more of the following, although this list is not all inclusive:

1. Required participation in a noncredit workshop or seminar on ethics or academic integrity.
2. An assigned paper or research project related to ethics or academic integrity.
3. A make-up assignment that is more difficult than the original assignment.
4. No credit for the original assignment
5. Disciplinary warning.

### **Level Two Violations**

Level Two violations are breaches of academic integrity that are more serious or that affect a more significant aspect or portion of the course work compared with Level One violations. Examples include:

1. Quoting directly or paraphrasing, to a moderate extent, without acknowledging the source.
2. Submitting the same work, or major portions thereof, to satisfy the requirements of more than one course without permission from the instructor to whom the work is submitted for the second or subsequent time.
3. Using data or interpretative material for a laboratory report without acknowledging the sources or the collaborators. All contributors to the acquisition of data and/or to the writing of the report must be acknowledged.
4. Failure to acknowledge assistance from others, such as help with research, statistical analysis, computer programming, or field data collection, in a paper, examination, or project report.

Sanctions for Level Two violations ordinarily include one or more of the following, although this list is not all inclusive:

1. A failing grade on the assignment.
2. A failing grade for the course.
3. Disciplinary warning or probation.

### **Level Three Violations**

Level Three violations are breaches of academic integrity that are more serious in nature or that affect a more significant aspect or portion of the course work compared with Level Two violations. Examples include:

1. Repeat Level Two violations.
2. Presenting the work of another as one's own.
3. Copying work on hourly exams or final exams.
4. Plagiarizing major portions of a written assignment.
5. Acting to facilitate copying during an exam.
6. Using prohibited materials, such as books, notes, or calculators during an examination.
7. Conspiring before an exam to develop methods of illicitly exchanging information during the exam.
8. Altering examinations for the purposes of regrading.
9. Acquiring or distributing copies of an examination from an unauthorized source prior to the examination period.
10. Submitting purchased materials such as a term paper.
11. Removing or damaging posted or reserve material, or preventing other students from having access to the material.
12. Fabricating data by inventing or deliberately altering material. Fabrication includes citing "sources" that are not, in fact, sources.
13. Using unethical or improper means of acquiring data.

The sanction for Level Three violations ordinarily is an F for the course and suspension for one or more semesters, depending on the seriousness of the violation.

### **Level Four Violations**

Level Four violations represent the most serious breaches of academic integrity. Examples include:

1. Committing a violation of academic integrity after returning from suspension for a previous violation of academic integrity.
2. Committing a violation of academic integrity that breaks the law or resembles criminal activity (such as forging a grade form, stealing an examination from a professor or from a university office, buying a stolen examination, falsifying a transcript to gain access to the University or its resources, or altering the record of work done at the University).
3. Having a substitute take an examination or taking an examination for someone else.
4. Fabricating evidence, falsifying data, quoting directly or paraphrasing without acknowledging the source, and/or presenting the ideas of another as one's own in a senior thesis, a master's thesis, a doctoral dissertation, a scholarly article submitted for publication, or any other work represented as his or her own by a graduate or professional student.

5. Sabotaging another student's work through actions designed to prevent the student from successfully completing an assignment.
6. Knowingly violating a canon of the ethical code of the profession for which a graduate or professional student is preparing.

The sanction for Level Four violations ordinarily is permanent expulsion from the University with a permanent notation of disciplinary expulsion on the student's Rutgers transcript.

### **Repeat Offenses**

As stated above, a repeat violation at Level Two will ordinarily be treated as a Level Three, and hence separable, violation. Likewise, any violation of academic integrity committed after returning from suspension for a Level Three violation will be treated as a Level Four violation. A repeat violation at Level One will ordinarily be treated as a Level Two violation, although it may, under certain circumstances, be treated as a Level Three violation.

### **B. Other Consequences of Violating the Academic Integrity Policy**

A student who commits a violation of academic integrity not only faces university censure and sanctions but also runs a serious risk of harming his or her future educational and employment opportunities. The notation of a specific sanction placed on the student's transcript remains for the term of the sanction. In all closed cases in which a grade of "F" is assigned for disciplinary reasons, the "F" shall remain on the student's transcript and be included in the GPA, even if the student retakes the course and achieves a passing grade. Moreover, prospective employers and other educational institutions frequently use recommendation forms that ask for judgment and comment on an individual's moral or ethical behavior. Since such forms are sent with the permission of the student, who thereby waives any right he or she may have under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act to keep disciplinary sanctions confidential, University faculty and administrators with knowledge of academic integrity violations are ethically bound to report such violations.

## **IV. Administration of the Academic Integrity Policy**

The Chief Academic Officers (CAOs) on each campus; i.e., the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs in New Brunswick/Piscataway and the Chancellor in Newark and in Camden, have the ultimate responsibility for implementing and overseeing the Academic Integrity Policy on their respective campuses. The CAO is responsible for deciding the sanction for students found responsible for separable violations of academic integrity on the campus. The CAO shall either exercise this responsibility personally or delegate it to one or more academic administrators called Campus Academic Integrity Designees (CAIDs). In addition, the CAO shall appoint an appropriate number of Academic Integrity Facilitators (see below) for each school, college, or group of schools/colleges on the campus, with the concurrence of the deans of the respective schools/colleges.

Academic Integrity Facilitators (AIFs) shall ordinarily be academic staff or faculty members. The AIFs shall help to educate students and faculty concerning academic integrity, shall advise faculty concerning academic integrity policies and procedures, and shall investigate and adjudicate allegations of nonseparable violations of academic integrity that faculty members do not wish to handle themselves. The AIF may also carry out the preliminary review of cases of alleged separable violations of the Academic Integrity Policy, as described in the *University Code of Student Conduct*. The work of the AIFs shall be overseen by the CAIDs to make sure that the Academic Integrity Policy is implemented consistently and fairly across all the University's schools and colleges.

The Office of Student Judicial Affairs handles cases of alleged separable violations of academic integrity under the *University Code of Student Conduct*. In addition, the Office of Student Judicial Affairs helps to educate students and faculty about academic integrity and provides training for the AIFs, together with the CAO or CAIDs.

As explained more fully below, faculty members have the option of handling allegations of nonseparable violations of the Academic Integrity Policy under the guidelines provided in the Policy.

## **V. Adjudicating Alleged Violations of Academic Integrity**

Any member of the Rutgers University community may report an alleged violation of the Academic Integrity Policy to the faculty member teaching the course, to the Chair of the department offering the course, to the AIF of the school or college to which the department belongs, or to the Office of Student Judicial Affairs. Whatever the source of the allegation or the manner in which it is reported, the matter should be handled as specified in this Academic Integrity Policy.

Cases of alleged nonseparable violations of academic integrity by undergraduate students shall either be adjudicated by the faculty member teaching the course or referred for adjudication to the AIF of the school or college offering the course. Cases of alleged separable violations must be referred to the AIF of the school or college offering the course or to the Office of Student Judicial Affairs for adjudication under the procedures of the *University Code of Student Conduct*.

Since all violations of academic integrity by a graduate or professional student are potentially separable under the Academic Integrity Policy, faculty members should not adjudicate alleged academic integrity violations by graduate and professional students, but should refer such allegations to the appropriate AIF or to the Office of Student Judicial Affairs. The faculty member may recommend a sanction should the student be found responsible for the violation; this recommendation shall be given serious consideration.

Whatever the level of the violation and whoever adjudicates the allegation, it is essential for the integrity of the student judicial system that all instances of alleged violations of academic integrity be adjudicated in accordance with the Academic Integrity Policy. Neither faculty members, staff members, nor administrators may handle alleged violations of academic integrity other than according to the procedures specified in the Policy. The final disposition of all academic integrity cases should be reported to the Office of Student Judicial Affairs, which will serve as the central record-keeping agency for all violations of academic integrity.

As required by the University Records Management Policy, all judicial units must maintain judicial records, including records of academic integrity violations, in the Office of Student Judicial Affairs. Expulsion files are considered active permanently and shall be retained indefinitely. All other files are considered active until the student graduates and shall be retained for ten years after adjudication of the violation.

### **A. Adjudication of Alleged Nonseparable Violations**

A faculty member who has reason to believe that an undergraduate student has committed a nonseparable violation of academic integrity has two options under this Policy: (1) investigate and adjudicate the matter as described below; or (2) refer the matter for adjudication to the AIF of the school or college offering the course. A faculty member who chooses to adjudicate an alleged violation should consult informally with an AIF before meeting with the student, to verify that the alleged violation is indeed nonseparable and to obtain information about normal sanctions for such a violation.

Members of the university community other than faculty members should ordinarily report evidence of nonseparable violations of academic integrity to the instructor of record in the given course, to the Chair of the department offering the course, or to the AIF of the school or college to which the department belongs.

### **Faculty Adjudication of Allegations**

A faculty member who chooses to investigate and adjudicate an alleged nonseparable violation of academic integrity shall notify the student respondent<sup>4</sup> in writing of the allegation, by e-mail or hand delivery, and shall provide the student with an opportunity to respond. This notification shall take place within ten working days<sup>5</sup> of the time the faculty member identifies or is advised of an alleged nonseparable violation. The student shall then have 10 working days from the time of notification to respond. Once a student has been notified of the allegation, the student may not drop the course or withdraw from school until the adjudication process is completed.

---

<sup>4</sup>The respondent is the student who is alleged to have committed a violation of the Academic Integrity Policy.

<sup>5</sup> A working day is a day in which Rutgers offices are open for business.

The faculty member shall meet with the student<sup>6</sup>, review all available evidence, interview any material witnesses, and make a decision regarding the allegation. The faculty member shall then take one of the following actions:

1. If the faculty member determines that the student has not violated the Academic Integrity Policy, the faculty member shall notify the student in writing, by e-mail or hand delivery, within ten working days after meeting with the student. The matter shall then be closed.
2. If the faculty member determines that the student has committed a nonseparable violation of academic integrity, the faculty member shall notify the student in writing of this determination and of the recommended sanction, using a standard letter provided to all faculty members. The letter shall also notify the student of the opportunity to file a written appeal of either or both the finding of responsibility and the sanction to the Academic Integrity Review Committee (see below) within ten working days of the date of the notice to the student. This notification shall be provided to the student, by e-mail or in person, by the faculty member within ten working days after the meeting with the student.

If the student accepts responsibility for the violation and agrees to the recommended sanction, the faculty member shall impose the sanction and shall report the disposition of the case to the Office of Student Judicial Affairs. If the student does not accept responsibility and the recommended sanction but fails to appeal to the Academic Integrity Review Committee within ten (10) working days of the date of notice to the student, the faculty member's determination shall be final. The recommended sanction shall be imposed and the disposition of the matter shall be reported to the Office of Student Judicial Affairs.

If, upon receipt of the report from the faculty member, the Office of Student Judicial Affairs determines that the student has previously committed an academic integrity violation and the cumulative record is sufficiently serious, the case shall be treated as a separable offense under the procedures of the *University Code of Student Conduct*. If the cumulative record does not rise to the level of a separable violation, the Office of Student Judicial Affairs may add disciplinary warning or disciplinary probation to the academic sanction imposed by the faculty member.

Faculty members may impose only educational sanctions for nonseparable violations, such as grade penalties for assignments or the course, make-up assignments of a more difficult nature, assignments pertaining to academic integrity, and required attendance at a noncredit workshop or seminar on academic integrity. Faculty members may also recommend to the Office of Student Judicial Affairs that the student be subject to disciplinary warning or probation.

---

<sup>6</sup> If the student does not respond to the allegation within the prescribed time limit or chooses not to meet with the faculty member, the faculty member shall reach a decision regarding responsibility based on all available evidence, including any written response from the student.

If the faculty member must submit a final course grade before the case is resolved, the student shall be given a temporary grade of Incomplete or TZ, which does not affect the student's GPA, until the adjudication process is completed.

### **Adjudication by an Academic Integrity Facilitator**

A faculty member who does not choose to adjudicate an allegation of a nonseparable violation of academic integrity shall refer the matter for adjudication to the AIF of the school or college offering the course. The faculty member shall report the allegation using a standard form provided to all faculty members and shall supply the AIF with all relevant evidence and information regarding the matter. The faculty member may recommend a sanction should the student be found responsible for the violation.

The faculty member shall also notify the student respondent in writing, by e-mail or hand delivery, of the alleged violation and of the fact that the matter has been referred to the AIF for adjudication. This notification shall take place within ten working days of the time the faculty member identifies or is advised of the alleged nonseparable violation. Once the student has been notified of the allegation, the student may not drop the course or withdraw from school until the adjudication process is completed.

Alleged violations of academic integrity may also be referred to an AIF for adjudication by a member of the University community who is not a faculty member as defined in this Policy. The procedure to be followed by the AIF in such instances shall be the same as that followed when the referring party is a faculty member with one exception. If the violation of academic integrity is alleged to have occurred in a Rutgers course, the AIF shall interview the instructor of record of the course at the outset of the investigation and shall notify the instructor of record of the outcome of the adjudication.

When an AIF receives a report of an alleged nonseparable violation of academic integrity, the AIF shall notify the student respondent of the allegation by e-mail and request the student to respond to the allegation by meeting with the AIF. This notification shall take place within five working days of receipt of the report of the allegation. The student shall then have 10 working days from the time of notification to respond. The AIF shall review the evidence submitted and interview the referring party and any material witnesses. The AIF shall meet with the student<sup>7</sup> and shall then determine whether a violation of academic integrity has occurred and, if so, at what level.

If the AIF determines that the student has not violated the Academic Integrity Policy, the AIF shall notify the student and the referring party in writing and the matter shall be closed. If the AIF determines that the student has committed a nonseparable violation of academic integrity, the AIF shall check with the Office of Student Judicial Affairs to determine if the student has previously committed a violation of academic integrity. If there has been a previous violation and the cumulative record is sufficiently serious, the

---

<sup>7</sup>If the student does not respond to the allegation within the prescribed time limit or chooses not to meet with the AIF, the AIF shall reach a decision regarding responsibility based on all available evidence, including any written response from the student.

case shall be treated as a separable offense under the procedures of the *University Code of Student Conduct*. Otherwise, the AIF shall recommend an appropriate sanction and notify the student and the referring party of the decision and recommended sanction in writing, using a standard letter. The letter shall also notify the student of the opportunity to file a written appeal of either or both the finding of responsibility and the sanction to the Academic Integrity Review Committee (see below) within ten working days of the date of the notice to the student. This written notification shall be provided to the student by e-mail within 15 working days after the AIF's meeting with the student.

If the student accepts responsibility and agrees to the sanction, the AIF shall impose the sanction and report the disposition of the case to the Office of Student Judicial Affairs. If the student does not accept responsibility and agree to the sanction, but fails to appeal to the Academic Integrity Review Committee within ten (10) working days of the date of the notice to the student, the AIF's determination shall be final. The recommended sanction shall be imposed and the disposition of the case reported to the Office of Student Judicial Affairs.

If the instructor of record in the course must submit a final course grade before the case is resolved, the student respondent shall be given a temporary grade of Incomplete or TZ, which does not affect the student's GPA, until the adjudication process is completed.

### **Review by the Academic Integrity Review Committee**

The Academic Integrity Review Committee (AIRC) shall be a standing committee of trained faculty members, students, and staff members appointed by the CAO on each campus. The AIRC shall only consider student appeals of a determination of responsibility and/or recommended sanction for nonseparable violations of academic integrity. All such student appeals shall be referred to the AIRC.

AIRC reviews shall be conducted by a four-person panel consisting of one faculty member from the AIRC, two student members from the AIRC, and a nonvoting staff member from the AIRC called the staff investigator.<sup>8</sup> Prior to the AIRC review, the staff investigator shall gather information pertaining to the allegation as necessary to permit the AIRC panel to make an informed decision. The panel shall review the appeal on the basis of the written information presented through the staff investigator and shall not take direct testimony. Voting members of a panel may not abstain and simple majority vote shall determine the outcome on all matters before the panel.

The decision of an AIRC panel on an appeal of a finding of responsibility shall be final. The decision of a panel on an appeal of a sanction shall constitute a recommendation to the appropriate CAO or CAID, whose decision regarding sanction in cases of nonseparable violations shall be final. The AIRC panel shall change the finding of responsibility only if it finds that the decision of the faculty member or AIF is inconsistent with the evidence or if new significant and material evidence is presented to

---

<sup>8</sup> When the student respondent requesting review is a graduate or professional student, at least one student member of the AIRC panel should be a graduate or professional student from the respondent's school.

the AIRC. The panel shall recommend changing the sanction recommended by the faculty member or AIF only if the faculty member's or AIF's recommended sanction falls well outside the range of sanctions ordinarily imposed for similar offenses.

The investigation by the staff investigator shall ordinarily include meeting with the faculty member or AIF who adjudicated the case and with the student respondent, as well as a review of other relevant information. When the staff investigator has concluded the fact-finding process, he or she shall prepare a preliminary written report that shall be shared with the faculty member or AIF and the student respondent. The fact-finding shall be completed and the preliminary report provided within 15 working days of the receipt of the student's appeal. The faculty member or AIF and the student respondent may submit written responses to the preliminary report within five working days of its receipt. The staff investigator shall consider the responses received and then submit a final report to the voting members of the AIRC panel within five working days. Any written responses to the preliminary report shall also be provided to the panel.

The AIRC panel shall meet to consider an appeal within ten working days of receipt of the final report of the staff investigator. If the panel needs more information in order to reach a decision, the staff investigator shall continue fact-finding and a decision shall be deferred for up to ten working days. When it makes a decision the AIRC shall notify the faculty member or AIF and the student respondent within five working days. If the panel does not overturn the finding of responsibility, it will transmit its recommendation concerning sanction to the CAO or CAID. The CAO or CAID shall make the final decision regarding sanction, impose the sanction, and report the disposition of the case to the Office of Student Judicial Affairs.

### **Time Limits**

The time limits or deadlines specified on actions by faculty members, AIFs, the AIRC, and student respondents in cases of alleged nonseparable violations of academic integrity are designed to ensure that the adjudication process proceeds in a timely and efficient manner for the benefit of all concerned. Any of the deadlines may be extended by mutual consent of the parties concerned. The consequences of failure by a student respondent to meet the relevant deadlines are made clear above. When a faculty member, an AIF, or the AIRC fails to meet a deadline, the student respondent may file a complaint with the campus CAO or appropriate CAID. The CAO or CAID shall consider the complaint and act, if necessary, to bring the adjudication process to completion as rapidly as possible.

### **B. Adjudication of Alleged Separable Offenses**

Allegations of separable academic integrity violations; i.e., violations at Level Three or Level Four, must be adjudicated according to the procedures of the *University Code of Student Conduct*. Allegations of separable violations may not be adjudicated by a faculty member but must be referred either to the appropriate AIF or to the Office of

Student Judicial Affairs. A faculty member may recommend a sanction should the student respondent be found responsible for the violation. The faculty member's recommendation shall be given serious consideration.<sup>9</sup>

The procedures for handling allegations of separable academic integrity violations are the same as the procedures for handling allegations of other types of student conduct falling within the separable category with the following exceptions:

1. The administrator responsible for making the decision with regard to the sanction<sup>10</sup> to be imposed when the respondent has been found responsible for a separable academic integrity violation shall be either the CAO or one of the CAIDs to whom the CAO delegates this responsibility. For violations by New Brunswick undergraduates, the CAID shall be the Vice President for Undergraduate Education. For violations by New Brunswick graduate and professional students, the CAID shall be the Vice President for Research and Graduate and Professional Education. The Chancellor shall select the appropriate CAIDs for all students in Newark and Camden.
2. When an alleged separable academic integrity violation is referred to an Academic Integrity Facilitator, the AIF may carry out the preliminary review, as described in the *University Code of Student Conduct*. If the student respondent admits responsibility for the violation or does not contest the charge, the AIF may recommend an appropriate sanction to the CAO or CAID.

### Acknowledgments

This academic integrity policy was developed by three partially overlapping groups of faculty, students, staff, and administrators from all three Rutgers campuses: an Ad Hoc Academic Integrity Committee chaired by Professor Donald McCabe (McCabe Committee); the Academic Standards, Regulations, and Admissions Committee of the University Senate (ASRAC); and an ad hoc academic integrity working group (AIWG) consisting of members of the McCabe Committee, members of ASRAC, and representatives of several constituencies not represented on the McCabe Committee. The AIWG was appointed by Executive Vice President Furmanski after the McCabe Committee and ASRAC failed to reach agreement on major aspects of a proposed new academic integrity policy. The AIWG reached consensus on a number of recommended changes to the Rutgers University Academic Integrity Policy. This interim policy incorporates those changes but leaves unchanged aspects of the previous academic integrity policy on which there was no broad consensus for change. The policy was drafted by members of the AIWG and revised by members of ASRAC.

---

<sup>9</sup> The faculty member must refer the alleged violation for adjudication as a separable offense even if he or she recommends that the student not be suspended or expelled if found responsible for the violation.

<sup>10</sup> The decision of the CAO or CAID with regard to sanction may be appealed to the Appeals Committee on the campus where the respondent is registered and ultimately to the President of the University.

This interim academic integrity policy is designed to make a number of improvements to the way in which violations of academic integrity are adjudicated and reported, particularly nonseparable violations, for which temporary or permanent separation from the University is not a possible sanction. It largely leaves unchanged the procedures for handling separable violations of academic integrity under the ***University Code of Student Conduct***. The interim policy has been approved for a period of two years, during which time a new and more comprehensive “permanent” academic integrity policy will be developed with extensive input from students, faculty, staff, and administrators.

Two of the major new provisions of this policy, the provision for faculty adjudication of alleged nonseparable violations of academic integrity and the provision of an Academic Integrity Review Committee to consider appeals from students found responsible for such violations, were taken from the draft academic integrity policy proposed by the McCabe Committee, with minor modifications by the AIWG and ASRAC. Parts of this document were taken nearly *verbatim* from the McCabe Committee proposal. As was acknowledged by the McCabe Committee, the new procedures for handling nonseparable academic integrity violations are based on elements of the academic integrity policies of Pennsylvania State University and the University of Maryland at College Park. The guidance obtained from those policies is gratefully acknowledged.