Vice Chancellor and Provost’s Committee on Academic Integrity

Syracuse University
School/College Policies and Practices
Syracuse University Schools and Colleges

The academic integrity policies of the eleven schools/colleges at Syracuse University were researched according to processes and practices.

The review of the schools/colleges’ policy focused around the following questions:

- Does the academic policy define plagiarism? Other dishonest behaviors?
- Is an academic integrity hearing available to the accused?
- What is the composition of the hearing panel?
- What, if any, role does legal counsel have in academic integrity hearings?
- What is the range of available sanctions?
- Is an appeal process available?
- How and where are cases of academic dishonesty recorded? What are the channels of communication between academic units?
- Are academic dishonesty cases shared with the community?
- Does the academic integrity policy apply to both undergraduate and graduate students?
- Does the school/college have a policy addressing faculty academic integrity?
- What academic integrity educational strategies are implemented?
- Are specific staff members within the school/college designated to address academic integrity?

The following report is based on reviews of written policies and interviews with the academic integrity point persons as designated by the deans of each school/college. It reflects only information the school/college chose to include in their policies and share in their discussions. In instances where information communicated in an interview appeared to contradict a written policy, the policy’s approach is reported here.

This report includes an analysis of the school/college data collectively, with the specific data for each school/college included in the section beginning on page 6.
Does the academic policy define plagiarism? Other dishonest behaviors?

Nine of the eleven schools/colleges provided explicit definitions and examples of academic dishonesty, as well as plagiarism. Education defines violations of academic integrity in a broad sense. University College does not provide definitions, but clearly states that policies and definitions of each affected school are followed in cases of suspected violation.

The majority of schools/colleges provide specific examples of academic dishonesty in the following areas: preparation of coursework, examination behavior, communications, use of libraries and library materials, and use of computer facilities. Three schools/colleges (i.e., Education, Engineering and Computer Science, and Management) also provide examples of academic integrity as they relate to hardware, software, networks, and the internet.

Two colleges (i.e., Engineering and Computer Science and Law) base their policies and definitions on the demands and expectations of profession organizations, Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology and American Bar Association, respectively.

Seven of the schools/colleges reference Syracuse University Academic Rules and Regulation section I, 1.0 as guiding their definition of academic dishonesty and plagiarism (i.e., Architecture, Arts and Sciences, Education, Human Services and Health Professions, Information Studies, University College, Visual and Performing Arts). This section defines plagiarism as “the representation of another’s words, ideas, programs, formulae, opinions, or other products of work as one’s own either overtly or by failing to attribute them to their true source.”

Is an academic integrity hearing available to the accused?

All schools/colleges have provisions for hearings related to academic integrity. Most schools/colleges encourage instructors to try to resolve the matter within the confines of their classroom. Five school/college policies (i.e., Arts and Sciences, Education, Engineering and Computer Sciences, Management and Visual and Performing Arts) express the student’s explicit right to request his or her case be referred to the judicial panel provided all process and procedures are followed, (i.e., filing appropriate paperwork) in the given time allotted. Three schools/colleges (i.e., Law, Newhouse, and University College) automatically convene the hearing board when allegations are presented.

While confidentiality is presumed by all schools/colleges, the Engineering and Computer Science policy stresses that complete confidentiality must be maintained throughout the entire process.
**What is the composition of the hearing panel?**

All schools/colleges have a formal body for hearing cases of academic dishonesty. Seven schools/colleges indicate the composition of the board/committee/panel in their policy (i.e., Architecture, Education, Human Services and Health Professions, Law, Management, University College, and Visual and Performing Arts). Each hearing board is unique in its composition in terms of size, with membership ranging from five and eight individuals. The source of appointment, representation and duration of service varies. Five boards contain students and faculty and/or administrators (i.e., Architecture, Law, Management, University College, and Visual and Performing Arts), while the others contain faculty and administration.

Four schools/colleges do not describe board/committee composition in their policy (i.e., Arts and Sciences, Engineering and Computer Science, Information Studies, and Newhouse).

**What, if any, role does legal counsel have in academic integrity hearings?**

Five of the eleven schools/colleges allow a lawyer to be present as an advisor and observer to the accused during a hearing (i.e., Education, Engineering and Computer Science, Law, Management, and Visual and Performing Arts). Only the College of Law allows a lawyer to have an active role in the hearing. Four schools/colleges make no mention of student representation or support by other individuals, including legal counsel (i.e., Arts and Sciences, Human Services and Health Professions, Information Studies, and University College). The policies of two schools/colleges allow an advisor at the hearing, but do not specifically mention a lawyer (i.e., Architecture and Newhouse).

**What is the range of available sanctions?**

Nine of the eleven schools/colleges provide examples of specific sanctions that may be levied. All schools/colleges give the hearing panel the power to determine sanctions, with the exception of Arts and Sciences where the hearing panel makes recommendations to the dean. Sanctions are punitive in nature, with only Human Services and Health Professions, Education, and Visual and Performing Arts mentioning the possibility of educational sanctions for rehabilitation purposes. Sanctions generally include failure of the assignment in question, failure of the course, administrative withdrawal from the course, reprimand, probation, suspension and expulsion. Architecture and University College do not address sanctions in their policies.

**Is an appeal process available?**

Ten schools/colleges’ policies explicitly describe the terms and process for a student to file an appeal. Information Studies provides students the right to appeal, however information on appeals is not included in the academic integrity policy. Six schools/colleges (i.e., Architecture, Arts and Sciences, Education, Engineering and
Computer Science, Human Services and Health Professions, Management) grant an appeal under the following circumstances: new evidence not reasonably available at the time of the original hearing; procedural error that can be shown to have had a detrimental impact on the outcome of the hearing; errors in the interpretation of University policy so substantial as to deny either party a fair hearing; and grossly inappropriate sanction having no reasonable relationship to the charges.

Three schools/colleges (i.e., Newhouse, University College, and Visual and Performing Arts) provide students the right to request an appeal, but do not supply guidelines in their policies for the granting of such an appeal.

The majority of policies require that a student submit a petition for appeal in writing within five to seven days of notification of the board/committee/panel’s decision. The only exception is the Law School, which allows the student fourteen days to submit paperwork. Appeal submissions are made to various individuals or groups across the schools/colleges.

**How and where are cases of academic dishonesty recorded? What are the channels of communication between academic units?**

Nine of the eleven schools/colleges described various processes for maintaining student records of academic integrity policy infractions. Seven of the schools/colleges place notations directly in the student’s permanent files (i.e., Architecture, Arts and Sciences, Education, Engineering and Computer Science, Human Service and Health Professions, Law, and Management). One school/college specifically states that records of student infractions are maintained by the dean (i.e., Information Studies), while another (i.e., Newhouse) insinuates that records are maintained but does not provide specific details. Two schools/colleges (i.e., University College, Visual and Performing Arts) have no mention of record keeping in their policy.

**Are academic dishonesty cases shared with the community?**

Two schools/colleges (i.e., Arts and Sciences, and Law) make reference to sharing or publishing public reports of cases of academic dishonesty.

Five schools/colleges (i.e., Architecture, Engineering and Computer Sciences, Human Services and Health Professions, Management, and Visual and Performing Arts) notify the student’s home school/college of allegations prior to the hearing. Four schools/colleges (i.e., Architecture, Human Services and Health Professions, Management, and Visual and Performing Arts) request a representative from the student’s home school/college to participate in the hearing. Another three schools/colleges (i.e., Arts and Sciences, Education, and Information Studies) notify the student’s home school/college of proven violations and imposed sanctions.
Does the academic integrity policy apply to both undergraduate and graduate students?
All schools/colleges have one policy that addresses issues of academic dishonesty for all students. There is no distinction made between undergraduate students and graduate students other than Maxwell.

Does the school/college have a policy addressing faculty academic integrity?
Two schools/colleges specifically direct their academic integrity policy to include faculty as well as students (i.e., Education and Visual and Performing Arts).

What academic integrity educational strategies are implemented?
Most schools/colleges rely on the students reading the academic integrity policy, which is generally provided when a student enrolls in the school or college. Management requires all students to sign a contract asserting that the school’s policy has been read, understood and will be complied with. Five schools/colleges (i.e., Arts and Sciences, Law, Management, Newhouse, and University College) hold formal sessions with students during orientation. Engineering and Computer Science requires faculty to review academic integrity at the beginning of each course and to have students sign a statement of responsibility to adhere to the policy. The associate dean of Newhouse reviews school rules including academic integrity with the freshman class.

None of the schools/colleges mention having a formal training program for faculty or teaching assistants. Five schools/colleges’ policies do, however, mention academic integrity in terms of faculty prevention and detection (i.e., Arts and Sciences, Education, Information Science, Law, and Newhouse. The policies of two schools/colleges (i.e., Engineering and Computer Science and Management) provide faculty with strategies for reducing academic dishonesty. Arts and Sciences encourages faculty to discuss the academic integrity policy with students. Human Service and Health Professions, Management, and University College provide their new faculty with the academic integrity policy.

Two schools/colleges, Engineering and Computer Science and Information Studies, provide style guides for appropriate citation of materials. Information Studies encourages students to refer to writing style guides and suggests the *Chicago Manual of Style*.

Are specific staff members within the school/college designated to address academic integrity?
All eleven schools/colleges policies designate an administrator(s) to receive allegations of academic dishonesty.
School/College Practices

Data

School/college codes used in this section:

- School of Architecture: Arch
- College of Arts and Sciences: A&S
- School of Education: Educ
- College of Engineering and Computer Science: ECS
- College of Human Services and Health Professions: HSHP
- School of Information Studies: IST
- College of Law: Law
- Whitman School of Management: MGMT
- S.I. Newhouse School of Public Communications: NEW
- University College (Continuing Education): SUCE
- College of Visual and Performing Arts: VPA

- Definition of Plagiarism and Other Dishonest Behaviors

Arch: The school’s Student Handbook provides the following definition: Plagiarism, (i.e., the presentation as one’s own work of the words, drawings, ideas, and opinions of someone else), is a serious instance of academic dishonesty in the same context as cheating on examinations.

A&S: Plagiarism is the representation of another’s words, ideas, programs, formulae, opinions, or other products of work as one’s own either overtly or by failing to attribute them to their true source. Violations of academic integrity are defined as: giving or receiving aid in an exam or where otherwise prohibited, fraud, the falsification nor forgery of any record, or any other deceptive act in connection with academic work.

Educ: Plagiarism: copying words, concepts, or ideas from any source and submitting the material as one’s own without acknowledging the source by the use of footnotes, quotation marks, or otherwise indicating its origins. A violation of academic integrity consists of action whose effect or intent is to commit fraud within the scholarly community by falsely attributing credit or falsely claiming “intellectual ownership” to some academic “product.” Other behaviors discussed: preparation of course work, examination behavior, communications, use of computer facilities.

ECS: Plagiarism is defined as: The presentation as one’s own work (orally, in print, or other media) of someone else’s ideas, whether published in print or electronic media or other design/graphic media. Copying extensive passages (multiple sentences or more) from another’s work without appropriately citing the source is blatant plagiarism. Completely reworking someone else’s ideas
or using them as one’s own without source citation is also blatant plagiarism. Other behaviors discussed: examination behavior, academic dishonesty, university facilities and resources, multiple submissions, falsification, illicit collaboration, inappropriate disclosures and communications.

HSHP: Academic dishonesty shall include, but not be limited to, plagiarism, cheating and other forms of academic misconduct, for example misuse of academic resources or facilities; misuse of computer software, data equipment, or networks.

IST: Plagiarism consists of presenting the intellectual or creative work of other people (words, ideas, opinions, data, images, flowcharts, computer programs, etc.) as one’s own work. Academic dishonesty includes: plagiarism, cheating on examinations, unauthorized collaboration, multiple submission of work, misuse of resources for teaching and learning, falsifying information, forgery, bribery and any other acts that deceive others about one’s academic work or record.

Law: Plagiarism includes passing off the work of another as one’s own. Other behaviors identified in the policy include: cheating, stealing, illicit use of books or materials, tampering with library materials, misrepresentation of status regarding law school, and falsification.

MGMT: Plagiarism is the copying of words, concepts, or ideas from any source and submitting the material as one’s own without acknowledging the source by the use of footnotes, quotation marks, or both. Appendix B gives examples in other areas that constitute academic dishonesty: coursework preparation, examination behavior, communications, use of libraries and library materials, use of computer facilities.

NEW: Academic dishonesty, including, but not limited to: plagiarism and cheating and other forms of academic misconduct, for example; misuse of academic resources, or facilities; misuse of computer, software, data, equipment, or networks.

VPA: Violations of academic integrity include giving or receiving aid in an exam or where otherwise prohibited, fraud, plagiarism, the falsification or forgery of any record, or any other deceptive act in connection with academic work. Plagiarism is the representation of another’s words, ideas, programs, formulae, opinions, or other products of work as one’s own, either overtly or by failing to attribute them to their true source.

Not mentioned in the policy:

SUCE
• **Academic Integrity Hearing Available**

**Arch:** Instances of academic dishonesty may be brought before the Student Standards Committee for review, or they may be handled by the faculty member directly. The Dean's Office will be involved in the resolution of all instances of alleged academic dishonesty. Any member of the School of Architecture may file charges of academic dishonesty directly to the committee. The student will be notified in writing within three working days of receipt of the allegation. The committee chair calls the hearing.

**A&S:** Students must report violations to the course instructor. Faculty are given discretion in how they wish to handle violations. Faculty members must inform the student right away of his/her rights. Students accused of academic dishonesty violations have the right to a hearing procedure outside and beyond the context of the course itself. Faculty must report all matters regardless of how they are handled to the Associate Dean for Student Services. A hearing can be requested in three ways: a) accused student(s) with continuing grievances after informal procedures and hearings have been exhausted; b) instructor(s) not satisfied with the disposition of the case to this point; and c) by the dean or associate dean of the college.

**Educ:** The School of Education encourages all parties to try to resolve the matter on an individual level. Instructors must inform the student of his/her rights. When a resolution cannot be achieved the instructor provides written notice to the dean who reviews and determines a resolution. If the matter still remains unresolved the student or the faculty member may request a hearing.

**ECS:** The instructor may choose how to handle allegations, but must promptly tell the student and indicate that informal and formal hearing procedures are available. Instructors are required to file reports to the dean at the end of each semester. Students accused of academic dishonesty have the right to hearing procedures outside the narrower context of the course itself.

**HSHP:** A faculty member charging a student has three options for proceeding: 1) informal discussion with the student and assignment of the sanction, with a report going to the college administrator; 2) a request by either a faculty member or student for mediation by the department chair, director or associate dean; or 3) a faculty member may choose to respond to the suspected violation by formally charging the student with academic dishonesty.

**IST:** Faculty may respond to evidence of academic dishonesty in the manner they deem appropriate. Instructors must notify the student promptly and indicate that formal and informal hearing procedures are available. The informal hearing is an initial meeting with the associate dean or chairperson of the school’s Judicial Board. Cases may also be brought before the Judicial Board in formal hearings by: a) accused student(s) with continuing grievance after all procedures above are exhausted; b) instructor(s) not satisfied with the disposition of the case to this point; c) the dean or associate dean of the school.
Law: Any person may file a complaint with the Prosecutor in writing. A copy of the complaint is sent to the accused within five days. A written response to the complaint must be submitted by the accused within 21 days. A complaint must be filed within six months of the discovery of the alleged violation. The prosecutor convenes a hearing panel.

MGMT: Instructors are encouraged to speak with the alleged student prior to taking any further action. The instructor may report the incident to the director or associate dean who will notify the student within five business days, or may refer the matter to the Academic Integrity Committee. A student’s right to have his or her instructor-resolved case referred to the Committee is absolute, provided that he/she personally delivers written notification of the referral, including a brief statement of the grounds for referral, to the appropriate director or associate dean within seven business days of the student’s receipt of the notification.

NEW: The Associate Dean for Student Affairs notifies the student of the charges along with the evidence submitted by the instructor. A hearing is automatic and the associate dean informs the student of the date and time of the hearing.

SUCE: Upon receipt of an allegation the appropriate program director notifies all affected parties and assigns a hearing date.

VPA: Faculty are encouraged to manage issues of academic dishonesty. If escalation is necessary the instructor informs the Assistant Dean for Undergraduate Student Services in writing. The assistant dean notifies the student of all charges and evidence. A student has seven days to respond in one of three manners: 1) do nothing; 2) go to mediation; or 3) ask for a formal hearing.

- Composition of Hearing Board

Arch: The committee has five members: Two third or fourth year students, two faculty members and the dean of the school. All members are appointed by the dean. The dean of the school serves as chairperson. All members serve for two years.

A&S: The Student Standards Committee holds hearings related to violations of academic integrity. Details of the hearing board composition are not provided in the policy.

Educ: The Committee on Policies, Standards and Scholarships may hear a case or appoint a panel. The committee consists of a minimum of six faculty members and appropriate professional staff as ex officio members. All committee members are appointed by the dean of the school. The chair and faculty serve on the committee for multiple years whenever possible.
ECS: The Committee on Academic Affairs holds hearings related to violations of academic integrity. Details of the hearing board composition are not provided in the policy.

HSHP: The committee has five faculty members and the associate dean. The chairperson is elected by faculty members who have served at least one year on the committee. All members serve two year, staggered terms.

IST: The Judicial Board holds hearings related to violations of academic integrity. Details of the hearing board composition are not provided in the policy.

Law: The hearing panel consists of three student panelist and three faculty panelists, randomly selected from the faculty pool. The pool of faculty panelists is appointed by the dean. Student panelists are elected by students. One student panelist presides over the hearing. Students serve for two years.

MGMT: Hearing panels are made up of two faculty and two students plus designated administrators. Students are appointed by the dean. The faculty panelists are elected by the faculty for two year terms. The chairperson is appointed by the dean and typically is an administrator.

NEW: The Academic Standards Committee holds hearings related to violations of academic integrity. Details of the hearing board composition are not provided in the policy.

SUCE: The grievance committee is comprised of elected department members, and faculty and student representatives in accordance with Bylaws of the Senate, or as required by regulations governing the specific program. Each member of the committee serves a term of one year. The policy does not mention the specific numbers of members on the committee.

VPA: There are eight members on the Grievance Board: one standing faculty member elected by the faculty for a term of one year; the Assistant Dean of Undergraduate Student Services (non-voting); two faculty members from academic disciplines other than the discipline involved; two faculty from the same discipline; and two students (one graduate and one undergraduate). The Assistant Dean of Undergraduate Student Services serves as the chairperson.

- Lawyer at Academic Integrity Hearings

Arch: A student has the right to have another person present to assist in presenting his/her case, subject to the constraints of a particular college.

A&S: Lawyers are not allowed to attend a hearing. The student may have an individual associated with Syracuse University attend the hearing with them. Many students select a law student.

Educ: The student’s right to have legal counsel in attendance is recognized. Legal counsel may not participate in the hearing, but can offer advice to the student. The student may bring a Student Affairs representative to the hearing to serve in an advisory capacity.
ECS: The student has the right to one observer of his/her choosing. The observer must be an undergraduate student, a graduate student, a faculty member or a staff member at Syracuse University. The observer may briefly confer with the accused, but not during active questioning, and may not address the Committee. Legal counsel may be the “observer” in these proceedings, but may not participate.

Law: The student has the right to legal counsel and may obtain legal counsel at his/her own expense.

MGMT: A student charged with an infraction under the policy who appears before the panel has the right to be accompanied by a person of his or her choice for support. Such an individual, including legal counsel, may advise the student charged, but may not participate in the hearing deliberations.

NEW: The student may bring an adviser to the hearing, as long as that person is a member of the SU community. The adviser cannot ask questions of the committee members or otherwise participate in the proceedings. He or she may confer only with the student.

VPA: The College maintains that the hearing is not a legal proceeding; therefore it is not appropriate for an attorney to be present. However, if the student feels more comfortable, the student may choose to have an attorney present. The attorney will be admitted for the purpose of supporting the student but may not directly address members of the board.

Not mentioned in the policy:

HSHP
IST
SUCE

• Academic Dishonesty Sanctions

A&S: The hearing panel may recommend sanctions that include, but are not limited to: formal reprimand and warning, administrative withdrawal from the course, disciplinary probation, suspension or expulsion from the College. Suspension and expulsion are considered normal for second offenses.

Educ: Sanctions include, but are not limited to: educational assignments relevant to the infraction, to be developed and supervised by designated members of the committee; loss of credit for the course component to which the offense was related with a chance to make up the component and no reduction in the grade; loss of credit for the course component to which the offense was related with a chance to make up the component but with reduction in the resulting course grade; automatic failure in the course with a chance to repeat the course; automatic failure in the course with no chance to repeat the course; suspension from the School of Education for a specified period of time, with the recommendation to other schools and colleges within SU to suspend also;
expulsion from the School of Education with no chance of readmissions, and a recommendation to other schools and colleges within SU to do the same.

ECS: Sanctions range from grade change for the course to expulsion from the University.

HSHP: Sanctions include, but are not limited to the following and may occur in various combinations: educational/remedial; warning; reduction of a course or assignment grade; assignment of a grade of “F” for the course or assignment; disciplinary reprimand; disciplinary probation; suspension; and expulsion. In cases where the committee recommends interim suspension, suspension from the university, indefinite suspension or expulsion the committee must ensure its recommendations are consistent with University policies.

IST: Sanctions imposed by the instructor include, but are not limited to the following: requiring students to reproduce work under the supervision of a proctor; rejecting the student work that was dishonestly created and giving the student a zero or failing grade for that work; lowering the course grade; giving a failing grade in the course. School sanctions include the following: formal reprimand and warning; disciplinary probation; administrative withdrawal from the course; suspension from the University; and expulsion from the University.

Law: Hearing panel may take the following actions: admonition; written censure; suspension for one or more terms; and/or expulsion.

MGMT: Penalties include, but are not limited to: reduction in a course or assignment grade; assignment of a grade of “F” to the course or assignment; letter of reprimand; disciplinary probation; suspension from the University; and/or expulsion from the University.

NEW: A faculty member may levy a sanction against the accused student, which may be upheld by the committee. The committee has the right to impose greater sanctions including rehabilitation, suspension, or expulsion.

VPA: The Board may impose sanctions up to and including suspension or expulsion from the College, and may design sanctions that are educational and/or remedial.

Not mentioned in the policy:

Arch
SUCE
• Appeal Process Available

Arch: Conditions for appeal: procedural error, new evidence (“new” shall be construed to mean evidence that was not available to the person accused at the time of the hearing rather than evidence that was not presented at the original hearing), and interests of justice (i.e., sanctions imposed unduly harsh). Timeframe for applying for an appeal is one week of notification of hearing decision. Appeals must be submitted to the Students Standards Committee. Other information: the provision for an appeal may not be available if the college decides that the hearing in itself was an appellate process.

A&S: Conditions for appeal: procedural error having a detrimental impact on the outcome, new evidence (i.e., evidence not available rather than not presented at the time of the hearing), and the sanctions imposed were unduly harsh. Timeframe for applying for an appeal is within five University working days of the delivery of results from the hearing. Appeals must be submitted to the Associate Dean.

Educ: Conditions for appeal: procedural error, new evidence (“new” shall be construed to mean evidence that was not available to the person accused at the time of the hearing rather than evidence that was not presented at the original hearing), and interests of justice (i.e., sanctions imposed unduly harsh). Timeframe for applying for an appeal is within five business days from when the decision is announced. Appeals must be submitted to the Dean of the School of Education.

ECS: Conditions for appeal: procedural error having a detrimental impact on the outcome, new evidence (i.e., evidence not available rather than not presented at the time of the hearing), and the sanctions imposed were unduly harsh. Timeframe for applying for an appeal within five working days of notification of the results from the formal hearing. Appeals must be submitted to the Associate Dean.

HSHP: Conditions for appeal: new evidence not reasonably available at the time of the original hearing; procedural error that can be shown to have had a detrimental impact on the outcome of the hearing; errors in the interpretation of the University policy so substantial as to deny either party a fair hearing; and grossly inappropriate sanction having no reasonable relationship to the charges. Timeframe for applying for an appeal is five business days after a written decision is given to the student. Appeals must be submitted to the Dean of the College of Human Services and Health Professions.

Law: Conditions for appeal: substantial evidence to overturn the panel’s decision must be presented. Timeframe for applying for an appeal is within fourteen days of the decision of the hearing panel. Appeals must be submitted to the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs.

MGMT: Conditions for appeal: new evidence not reasonably available at the time of the original hearing; procedural error that can be shown to have had a detrimental impact on the outcome of the hearing; errors in the interpretation
of the University policy so substantial as to deny either party a fair hearing; and grossly inappropriate sanction having no reasonable relationship to the charges. Timeframe for applying for an appeal is within five days after written decision is delivered to the student. Appeals must be submitted to the Dean of the School of Management.

NEW: Conditions for appeal are not specified in the policy. Timeframe for applying for an appeal is within two weeks of receiving the committee’s sanction. Appeals must be submitted to the Faculty Council.

SUCE: Conditions for an appeal and the timeframe for applying for an appeal are not specified in the policy. Appeals must be submitted to the Grievance Committee and the assistant or associate dean of the college.

VPA: Conditions for an appeal and the timeframe for applying for an appeal are not specified in the policy. Appeals must be submitted to the Dean of the College of Visual and Performing Arts.

Not mentioned in the policy:

IST

- Academic Dishonesty Record Keeping and Communication

  Arch: A copy of notification of the committee’s decision will be placed in the accused student’s permanent file if he/she is found guilty.

  A&S: All violations of academic integrity must be reported to the Associate Dean of Student Services, regardless of whether the matter is handled by the instructor or the committee. All records of academic dishonesty are destroyed one year after the student’s graduation, unless otherwise specified by the dean of the college.

  Educ: The committee recommends whether or not the written notice will be part of the student’s file.

  ECS: The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs keeps records of all infractions of rules and regulations for five years. This includes infractions resolved by the instructor.

  HSHP: A record of an academic integrity violation is placed in the student’s file. It may be removed from the student’s file when the student graduates or after a specified period of time. How students would clear their records is not explained.

  IST: All confirmed cases of academic dishonesty are recorded in a confidential file in the dean’s office to be reviewed in the event of a second offense. Files are destroyed upon graduation.

  Law: A copy of the panel’s decision (opinion) is placed in the student’s permanent file.
MGMT: A record of disciplinary action is normally retained in the student’s permanent file. The committee may recommend that such a record be removed from a student’s file upon the occurrence of a named event, such as the student’s graduation, or upon the passage of a specified period of time.

NEW: There is no specific provision for recordkeeping in the policy; however there is reference to the committee having access to information regarding any prior offenses and sanctions.

Not mentioned in the policy:
SUCE
VPA

Intra-University Communication of Academic Dishonesty Cases

Arch: In the event that the student(s) charged is from a school/college other than that hosting the hearing, a representative from the student(s) home school/college shall be invited to participate.

A&S: In cases involving students from another college, the Committee’s recommendations shall go to the associate dean of the other college by way of the Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences if sanctions beyond an F in the course (e.g., suspension or expulsion) are being recommended.

Keeping rules of confidentiality in mind, the committee may regularly report recommendations made or actions taken to the larger University community. Additionally, the committee annually reports its activities to the faculty of the college.

Educ: If a student enrolled in another school/college violates the School’s policy, a letter is sent to the home school, which includes the sanction.

ECS: In all cases involving non-ECS students, a copy of such notification (allegations) shall be sent to the dean of the school/college in which the student is enrolled.

HSHP: If a student charged with an infraction is not from the College of Human Services and Health Professions, the chair shall request the dean of the student’s home school/college to designate a representative to participate as a member of the panel. HSHP does not notify the home college of the sanction nor in cases of intra-university transfers.

IST: If the student involved is not matriculated in the School of Information Studies, documentation of the instance of academic dishonesty will be forwarded to the dean’s office of the student’s home college, with a request for resolution.

MGMT: The dean of the student’s home school/college is notified and invited to send a representative to the hearing. A copy of the resolution memo is sent to the dean of the student’s school/college of enrollment.
An annual report of cases is published, with personally identifiable information deleted.

Law: A report of findings with all names removed is posted on the Law Student Senate Bulletin Board and placed in a file book on reserve at the Law Library.

VPA: In the event that the student involved is from a school or college other than VPA, one representative from the student’s home school/college is invited to participate in the hearing board.

Not mentioned in the policy:
NEW
SUCE

- Same Academic Integrity Policy Applies to Undergraduate and Graduate Students

No distinction made in policy:
Arch
A&S
Edu
ECS
HSHP
IST
Law
MGMT
NEW
SUCE
VPA

Undergraduate students taking Maxwell courses matriculate in another school or college. For purposes of Maxwell undergraduate courses, academic integrity matters are handled by A&S. Academic integrity for Maxwell graduate students is handled within each department.
• Faculty Academic Integrity Policy

Educ: “Students, faculty, staff and administrators observe and apply academic integrity in their work and are alert advocates for its preservation.” The School of Education specifically outlines the procedures for faculty allegations.

MGMT: The policy outlines faculty expectations in appendix A.

VPA: “All members of the College academic community are expected to avoid dishonesty in the submission of work for academic evaluation, teaching and research.”

Not mentioned in the policy:
Arch
A&S
ECS
HSHP
IST
Law
NEW
SUCE

• Academic Integrity Educational Strategies

Educational Strategies – Students

Arch: Every student receives The White Book, which contains the school’s rules and regulations, including those pertaining to academic integrity.

A&S: New students are introduced to the academic integrity policy and student expectations during Opening Weekend. Each peer advisor meets with about 15-20 new students on the Saturday morning of that weekend and discusses a number of issues, one of which is academic integrity. Department chairs encourage faculty to discuss the academic integrity policy, and the specific applications for their course, with their students at the beginning of each semester.

Educ: Students are referred to the handbook, which contains the academic integrity policy.

ECS: At the beginning of each course faculty review policies with students and ask them to sign a document acknowledging that they understand and accept their obligations under the policy for academic integrity. Students are also referred to the college website where the full policy is available.

HSHP: Students receive the policy in a packet at orientation. The policy is also on the website.
IST: The faculty discuss academic integrity matters in their syllabi. All syllabi are emailed to each student prior to the beginning of class. The policy is on the website.

Law: The policy is publicized at orientation for first year students.

MGMT: All students taking management courses, whether or not they are management students, are required to sign a statement certifying that they have read, understand, and agree to comply with the WSM policy. The policy is disseminated to freshman students during Opening Weekend in peer advisor meetings. Policy is presented at the Gateway course for freshmen. MBA level students are introduced to the policy during the week-long orientation. The faculty includes standardized language on all syllabi. The policy and procedures are also posted on the WSM website.

NEW: Students receive a Newhouse Fact Book, which includes the rules and touches on academic dishonesty. The associate dean holds meetings with freshman classes to review school rules.

SUCE: A “Code of Student Conduct” is included in the Student Planner for part time students, which is provided to all new and continuing students each year. Academic integrity is reviewed at orientation. The English Language Institute, which teaches many international students, focuses heavily on proper forms of citation and ways to avoid plagiarism.

VPA: All first year students receive the college’s undergraduate handbook, which contains the academic integrity policy. The policy is also on the college website.

**Educational Strategies – Faculty**

**ECS:** Appendix A of the policy contains specific recommendations as to how faculty can reduce the incidence of cheating in their classes.

**HSHP:** The faculty receive the academic integrity policy when they are hired, with updates provided each year.

**Law:** Faculty are strongly encouraged to use software that reviews documents for plagiarism.

**MGMT:** Appendix A of the policy lists faculty responsibilities for enforcing academic integrity. Chair of Academic Integrity Committee presents policy to all new and adjunct faculty members; document on strategies to reduce violations of academic integrity distributed to all faculty, as are occasional updates on new trends noted in academic integrity cases. If issues arise, the dean or associate dean provide further education and support to the faculty member.

**NEW:** As part of training faculty advisors, academic integrity rules are reviewed.

**SUCE:** Academic integrity policy is reviewed at new faculty orientation.
Not mentioned in the policy:
Arch: Faculty
A&S: Faculty
Educ: Faculty
IST: Faculty
VPA: Faculty

- Academic Staff
Arch: Dean of the School of Architecture
A&S: Associate Dean for Student Services
Educ: Academic Dean (undergraduate/graduate)
ECS: Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Department/Program Chair
HSHP: Department Chair, Director or Associate Dean of Academic Affairs
IST: Associate Dean
Law: Student Prosecutor
MGMT: Director or Associate Dean
NEW: Associate Dean for Student Affairs
SUCE: Associate Dean of Syracuse University Continuing Education
VPA: Assistant Dean for Undergraduate Student Service