

Policy Number: 05.034
Policy Title: Academic Honesty Policy
Policy Type: Academic
Responsible Parties: APRC; Registrar; VPAA
Governing Body: Faculty Assembly
Adoption Date: Fall 2011
Revision Date: August 28, 2016
Effective Date: August 28, 2016

Academic Honesty Policy

Antioch Honor Code

Antioch College is a community dedicated to the search for truth, the development of individual potential, and the pursuit of social justice. In order to fulfill our objectives, freedom must be matched by responsibility. As a member of the Antioch community, I affirm that I will be honest and respectful in all my relationships, and I will advance these standards of behavior in others. Community members should understand that academic dishonesty is harmful to the Antioch College community and its reputation. The College expects high standards of behavior and that all community members act responsibly and honestly.

Academic Dishonesty Defined

Antioch College values academic honesty by all members of the community. At Antioch College, all forms of cheating, plagiarism, and fabrication are considered academic fraud. Cheating occurs when students do not do their own work in an academic exercise or assignment. Plagiarism occurs when students appropriate the work or ideas of another without acknowledgement, or fail to correctly identify the source, whether it is done consciously or inadvertently. Examples include, but are not limited to, the following actions:

- Presenting and paraphrasing information and ideas from sources without credit to the source;
- Use of direct quotations without quotation marks and without credit to the source.
- Failure to provide adequate citations for material obtained through electronic research;
- Downloading and submitting work from electronic databases or websites as your own work or without citing sources;
- Participation in a group project that presents plagiarized materials;
- Submitting material created/written by someone else as your own, including purchased term/research papers, art, music, performance, etc;
- Copying from another student's examination;
- Allowing a student to copy from another student's examination;
- Using outside materials on an examination, assignment, etc. that are not authorized for use during the examination, assignment, etc;
- Collaborating on a project that was intended to be completed individually;
- Preparing or obtaining notes to take into a closed-book examination, for example, writing on the hand or desk, preparing a crib sheet, or storing information in any other format for use and retrieval during the examination;

- Using written notes or information, or electronic devices, such as a laptop computer, phone, or calculator in an unauthorized manner to store, share, and/or retrieve information during an examination;
- Falsifying citations, for example by citing information from a nonexistent reference;
- Listing sources in the bibliography that were not used in the academic exercise;
- Engaging another individual (whether a part of the College community or from outside of the College community) to complete the student's examination, to complete the student's academic exercise, or to write the student's paper;
- Self-Plagiarism, or "recycling" work, in which previously written or published work is presented as newly written;
- Duplicate submissions (submitting one assignment to two different courses without specific permission of both instructors), at any point during your academic career, regardless of when the work was created.

Defining "Common Knowledge"

Information that is found consistently in multiple sources (such as reference books or textbooks), is easily accessible, and is known to be true by a wide audience is generally assumed to be common knowledge and would not need to be documented. Information from sources not readily available to most people, which concentrates on a specific field or subject area, and contains jargon not commonly used and specific to a discipline or field of study, should be documented.

Students who are unsure whether or not specific information is considered to be common knowledge should consult their course instructor to avoid plagiarism.

In general, students' work must be their own. Violations of academic honesty are taken very seriously. Penalties for violations range from failing assignments or tests to dismissal from the College. These acts violate the Antioch College Honor Code and damage trust in one another. Community members, who witness or suspect violations of academic integrity, should report the suspected offender to the instructor.

Levels of Violation

There are two levels of violation: major and minor infractions.

- **Minor Infraction** – A violation that occurs either without clear evidence of the intention to deceive or with evidence that is insufficient to constitute proof. While a minor infraction is not a major infraction, a second minor infraction of the same nature will be treated as major infraction.
- **Major Infraction** – A violation with evidence that supports the student's intention to deceive and/ or a continued pattern of disregard for the conventions of academic integrity.

Conflict of interest in academic honesty cases

For cases of academic dishonesty, "conflict of interest" is defined in part on a person's role in the process, and in part on a person's relationships to the student(s) and instructor(s) directly involved in the alleged breach of academic integrity. No person who has brought an academic integrity case against the specific student, or who has a close personal relationship with the accused student, may serve in a *decision-making* role on the committee; however, said individuals may remain in non-decision making roles, such as advisor or support person.

The committee for hearing academic honesty cases

While all cases of breaches of academic integrity are heard by APRC, additional persons will join APRC for academic honesty hearings, as follows:

- 1) Student members: 2 (from a pool of up to 20)
 - a) At the beginning of each academic year, Community Council (ComCil) shall create a pool of up to twenty students, who have been at Antioch College for at least one full academic year
 - i) To maintain continuity, no more than ten members may be different than the previous academic year's pool
 - ii) All members of the pool must be trained appropriately, including in the procedures for hearing academic honesty cases, on how to maintain strict integrity and confidentiality, etc. The Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) and ComCil will jointly decide how the training is to be conducted.
 - iii) No student who has been found guilty of an infraction of academic honesty may be a member of the pool.
 - b) When an academic honesty case is to be heard, the Registrar will select two trained students from the pool, who have no conflict of interest with the case at hand
- 2) Faculty members: As needed (to maintain integrity)
 - a) OAA shall maintain a pool of faculty members, who have been at Antioch College for at least one full academic year, and who are not currently away from the college for extended periods (research term, leave of absence, etc.)
 - i) All members of the pool must be trained appropriately, including in the procedures for hearing academic honesty cases, on how to maintain strict integrity and confidentiality, etc. The Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) will decide how the training is to be conducted.
 - b) When an academic honesty case is to be heard, the Registrar will replace any faculty member of APRC who has a conflict of interest with the case at hand, with a faculty member from the pool.
 - i) If a faculty member who normally serves on APRC has an advisee come before the committee, the faculty member shall recuse themselves of their role as an APRC member (with replacement as above), but may remain as the student's advisor.
 - ii) If a faculty member who normally serves on APRC has brought the case of academic dishonesty against the accused student, the faculty member shall recuse themselves of their role as an APRC member (with replacement as above), but may remain as the complainant.
 - iii) No person who has brought an academic integrity case against the specific student may serve in a decision-making role on the committee.
- 3) Replacement of committee members in the case of conflict of interest
 - a) Any member of an academic honesty hearing case, who has a *decision-making role* on the committee, and who has a conflict of interest, must be replaced with another member of similar status, consistent with the composition of the committee.
 - i) While support persons for the student or faculty, and the student's advisor, may not have decision-making roles on the committee, they may still be present, as they have an accepted vested interest.
 - b) Students and faculty will be replaced, as noted above.

- c) Administrators from OAA with a conflict of interest will be replaced with another administrator of a similar type.
 - i) Instances of administrators with teaching and/or advising duties shall be handled similarly to the faculty cases above, except that another OAA administrator will fill their normal role on the committee

Support persons for students and faculty

At any step in the procedure, the student or the faculty member may invite another Antioch community member to accompany them to any of the meetings to assist with resolution, within certain limitations. It is of the utmost importance that any and all support persons maintain strict confidentiality and uphold the integrity of the process. The role of support persons is, as requested, to provide support, advice, or assistance to the student or faculty requesting their presence, and to advise the student or faculty in preparing for the hearing. Support persons may not have decision-making roles on the committee, given the inherent conflict of interest.

By default, the support persons for a student are their academic advisor, who will attend the hearing on behalf of the student, and possibly one additional community member, as described below. In the instance that the academic advisor is the person bringing the claim of academic dishonesty against the student, the advisor may not be a support person, and will instead attend the meeting as the person bringing the claim (the complainant); no additional support person will replace the advisor in this instance.

- 1) A student may select another student only from the approved pool of trained students created by ComCil. A student may only select a staff or faculty member who has worked at Antioch College for at least one full calendar year.
- 2) A faculty member may only select a staff or faculty member who has worked at Antioch College for at least one full calendar year.

Procedure

Faculty members are allowed to have their own additional course-specific policies for how academic dishonesty is handled, but are limited in the sanctions that may be imposed without a formal hearing. Instructors may choose to handle cases within their own course, and/or to proceed with formal action.

Individual faculty members are responsible for determining if the alleged violation should be:

- a. Handled by the instructor internally (within their course). Although the instructor may issue a failing grade for the assignment, project, exam, etc., the instructor may not issue a failing grade for the course. However, failure of the course may result due to the weight of the assignment, project, exam, etc.; or
- b. Referred to APRC with the recommendation that the violation be treated as a minor infraction; or
- c. Referred to APRC with the recommendation that the violation be treated as a major infraction.

The faculty member(s) should meet with the student to discuss the alleged act of academic dishonesty. During this meeting, the faculty member may request sources from the student or ask questions to determine the student's familiarity with the material in question. When

possible, the instructor should arrange to meet with the student within one calendar week of becoming aware of the alleged violation.

The faculty member(s) should gather the evidence that confirms academic dishonesty (e.g., make copies of the assignment; get citations for, or copies of, the sources that were plagiarized).

If a faculty member chooses to proceed with formal action, the student attends a meeting called by the Academic Policy and Review Committee (APRC) with the faculty member(s) and advisors to discuss the incident. In this meeting, the following should be addressed:

- a) Describe the evidence that confirms that academic dishonesty occurred.
- b) Listen to the student's response.
- c) Review what academic dishonesty is, how it violates the Honor Code, how it is unacceptable in a scholarly community and how to cite sources properly.
- d) Review the College's Academic Honesty Policy and procedures with the student.
- e) Inform student of what the consequences may be (see Resolutions of Academic Dishonesty Cases below).

After this meeting, the faculty member(s), the student's advisors (if in attendance), and APRC will determine the consequences.

Before the consequences are determined, APRC will request that the registrar review the student's record to confirm if this is a first or second incident, etc., and then APRC completes the Academic Dishonesty Report form. If records indicate that this is not the student's first offense, the policy for the second (etc.) offense (see consequences of academic dishonesty below) will be put into effect. *Knowledge of a student's prior record should be used in determining penalties, but must not enter into the decision about the presence or nature of academic dishonesty.* All parties will retain copies of the report and its accompanying documentation after the hearing and a copy will be forwarded to the registrar to become a part of the student's academic record.

Resolutions of Academic Dishonesty Cases

Resolution of all formal cases of academic dishonesty minimally requires remediation. However, APRC may, at its discretion, include additional outcomes that are restorative, punitive, and/ or educative in nature.

Any offense: The student may be required to write a formal letter of apology to the course instructor(s). The student may be required to (re)take training regarding academic dishonesty. APRC may require additional measures. In all cases of violations except the third, APRC in consultation with the instructor in question will determine the appropriate level of sanction for each violation. Lesser violations should receive lesser penalties, whereas more serious violations should receive more serious consequences. In all instances, instructors and APRC are encouraged to enact restorative and educative justice practices in all appropriate cases.

Minor violation: Sanctions can include failure of the assignment (which may result in failure of the course due to the weight of the assignment), or failure of the course regardless of the weight of the assignment.

First major violation: Sanctions can include failure of the assignment (which may result in failure of the course due to the weight of the assignment), or failure of the course regardless of the weight of the assignment, or academic suspension.

Second major violation: Academic suspension or dismissal

Third major violation: Academic dismissal

The student is notified of the outcome of the Academic Honesty hearing in writing by the Chair of the Academic Policy Review Committee (APRC) via email to their Antioch College email address and hardcopy letter in their Antioch College mailbox.

Appeal: The decision and sanctions resulting from an Academic Honesty hearing by APRC may be appealed by the accused student in writing to the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA) at ACAA@antiochcollege.edu.

To receive consideration, an appeal must be full and complete upon submission, including in it the basis for appeal, the rationale for any claims or arguments to consider an appeal, and must be submitted by within three (3) business days of the date of the email and letter notification from APRC.

- A business day is defined as any day the College is open, whether or not classes are held, but does not include: weekend days, holidays observed by the College. or intersessions between the academic terms.
- A student's submission of an appeal suspends the imposition of sanctions until the appeal is decided.
- Until both the APRC hearing and appeal are concluded, a student receives an “M” grade indicator (Academic Integrity Indicator) on their transcript for the course in question. While this indicator does not affect GPA, it also does not indicate successful completion of the course, and thus the course in question cannot be used to satisfy degree requirements or to meet prerequisites, until the appeal is resolved. See the “Evaluation of Academic Performance: Grades” section in the Catalog, subsection “Other Grade Indicators in Use”

Basis for consideration of appeal may only be one of the following:

- **The Process was conducted unfairly.** The student argues that the procedural protections were not provided appropriately, the original hearing was not conducted fairly in light of the charges and information presented, or that there were violations of the procedures as laid out in the policy.
- **New information.** The student argues that the Provost and VPAA should consider new information sufficient to alter a decision or other relevant facts not available during the original hearing.
- **Inappropriate sanctions only in cases of suspension or dismissal.** The student argues that the sanction imposed was not fair and reasonable relative to the violation for which the student was found responsible.

The Provost and VPAA, or their designee, will notify the student within three (3) business days whether or not there is a basis for appeal, and, if so the form of the appeal.

At the discretion of the Provost and VPAA, or their designee, appeals may take the form of

Administrative Appeals considered by the Provost and VPAA, or their designee, or referred back to APRC for consideration based on the information provided in the appeal letter.

If an Administrative Appeal is granted the Provost and VPAA, or their designee, shall investigate the grounds for appeal, request information from all relevant parties, and request additional evidence or information in the decisions of the appeal. The Provost and VPAA, or their designee, further has the authority to uphold or modify the sanctions of APRC, which can include increasing or decreasing the original sanction(s). The recommendation of any designee will then be returned to the Provost and VPAA for consideration and acceptance.

The Provost and VPAA, or their designee, may also refer the matter back to APRC for reconsideration in light of the new information presented in the appeal and/or to reconsider the sanction(s). The recommendation of APRC will then be returned to the Provost and VPAA for consideration and acceptance.

The decision of the Provost and VPAA is final and will be communicated to both the student and the faculty member, and to the Registrar as the Chair of APRC. A student dismissed for academic dishonesty may petition the college for reinstatement after one calendar year (see Reinstatement Policy).