



**STUDENT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY  
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

**2014**

# Declaration of University Community Principles

## Preamble

Community, civility, and the search for knowledge and truth are the essence of University life. A community is a group of people who hold something fundamental in common. A University is a community whose common purpose is the creation, preservation and sharing of knowledge and understanding. The search for knowledge and truth requires a rational discourse. This, in turn, requires honesty and civility. Civility springs from the concept of respecting the rights of individuals. The community helps to protect the rights of the individual. Thus, the community promotes the civility necessary to engage in the pursuit of truth. The three are, thus, connected.

The primary participants of this community are administrators, students, faculty and staff, who themselves come from a variety of external communities. Before becoming a part of the community of scholars that is Missouri State University, whether as a member of the student body, faculty, administration or staff, one should understand the full nature of that choice. The community derives its strength from each individual. Each individual derives strength from his/her association with the community. The individual must sustain the community in order for the community to protect and sustain the individual. In order for this interaction to take place, the principles stated in this document are the foundation for the community of scholars. Behaving civilly implies acting in a manner consistent with these principles, and encouraging these behaviors in others. Adherence to the principles is voluntary and cannot be compelled. Choosing to accept the direction of the principles strengthens both the individual and the community, but only when the choice is not forced. Discovering the natural benefit of these principles is a virtue. These principles are of little use in themselves; they must be practiced.

## Principles

The community of scholars that is Missouri State University is committed to developing educated persons. It is believed that educated persons will accept responsibility to act in accordance with the following principles:

- Practicing personal and academic integrity
- Being a full participant in the educational process, and respecting the right of all to contribute to the “Marketplace of Ideas”
- Treating all persons with civility, while understanding that tolerating an idea is not the same as supporting it
- Being a steward of the shared resources of the community of scholars

Choosing to accept these principles suggests that each participant of the community refrains from and discourages behavior that threatens the freedom and respect each member deserves.

# STUDENT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Approved by the Board of Governors February 18, 2000

Effective Fall 2000

Revised Spring 2004, Fall 2007, Fall 2012, and Spring 2014

Available online at

[http://www.missouristate.edu/policy/Op3\\_01\\_AcademicIntegrityStudents.htm](http://www.missouristate.edu/policy/Op3_01_AcademicIntegrityStudents.htm)

## INTRODUCTION

The community of scholars that is Missouri State University is committed to developing educated persons. Educated persons accept the responsibility to practice personal and academic integrity. Each participant of the university community refrains from and discourages behavior that threatens the freedom and respect each member deserves (see University Community Principles). The following policies and procedures specifically address student academic integrity, but recognize that student academic integrity is only part of the entirety of academic integrity in a community of scholars, and that all members of the community share the responsibility for fostering academic integrity.

The Missouri State University *Faculty Handbook* states that course policy statements must include a statement of the instructor's policies concerning academic dishonesty, including consequences. An instructor's policies on academic integrity issues, while they may reflect the instructor's personal views, and will be more specific about what is and is not allowed in class, should also be consistent with this university policy on student academic integrity.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Definitions	1
Reporting Academic Dishonesty	2
Academic Dishonesty Not Associated with Enrollment in a Course	3
Addressing Alleged Academic Dishonesty and Notifying the AIC of an Alleged Incident	3
Teacher Sanctions	4
Student Request for an Academic Integrity Hearing	5
Teacher Request for an Academic Integrity Hearing	5
Hearings Initiated by the Academic Integrity Council	6
Academic Integrity Hearing	6
Academic Integrity Council Sanctions/Recommendations	9
Review and Appeal Processes	10
Additional Sanctions Associated with Academic Programs	11
Revoking a Grade/Degree	11
Academic Integrity Records	12
Summary and Credits	13

## DEFINITIONS

**ACADEMIC DISHONESTY:** The actions/behaviors that are acceptable in one class may not be acceptable in another class, and both teachers and students share the responsibility for communicating these limits for a particular class. While the specifics will vary among classes, the following fundamental definitions describe acts that constitute academic dishonesty:

- **Cheating:** The term “cheating” refers to using or attempting to use unauthorized technology, materials, information, or study aids in any academic exercise (whether intentional or not) or taking any action designed to obtain unearned credit (points) in the class. When in doubt about what is authorized, students should consult their teachers.
- **Fabrication or other misconduct in research:** The term “fabrication” refers to unauthorized falsification or invention of any information (including research data) or any citation in any academic exercise; “misconduct in research” refers to any violation of ethical guidelines for attributing credit and authorship in research endeavors, non-compliance with established research policies, or other violations of ethical research practice.
- **Plagiarism:** The term “plagiarism” includes, but is not limited to, the use, by paraphrase or direct quotation, of the published or unpublished work or sections of a work of another person without full and clear acknowledgement (whether intentional or not). This includes any material copied directly or paraphrased from the Internet. The unacknowledged use of materials prepared by another person or agency engaged in the selling of term papers or other academic materials, including material taken from or ordered through the Internet, also constitutes plagiarism.
- **Facilitating academic dishonesty:** Assisting or attempting to assist another to violate any provision of this Academic Integrity Policy, whether or not that action is associated with any particular course, is considered academic dishonesty.

**ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COUNCIL (AIC)** The 24-member Academic Integrity Council (AIC) consists of:

- ten voting student members, seven undergraduate and three graduate;
- ten voting ranked faculty members;
- the Provost (or designee), who is the non-voting Chair of the Council;
- the Dean of Students (or designee), *ex officio* (without voting privileges);
- the Student Government Association Legislative Director for Academic Affairs (or designee), *ex officio* (without voting privileges);
- an academic college Dean (or designee), *ex officio* (without voting privileges).

Faculty members must not hold administrative appointments during the time of service on the Council. At least five faculty members must hold graduate faculty status. The Council is charged with overseeing Academic Integrity Hearings, and the Council may convene an Academic Integrity Hearing at its discretion. The Council may also undertake limited investigations to verify claims made in the documentation or testimony

associated with an academic integrity case. It may also initiate other activities intended to educate the campus community or to generally foster academic integrity.

Voting members of the Academic Integrity Council are selected from nominations submitted by the campus community. Also, students and faculty who are interested in serving on the Council may self-nominate. All nominations should be submitted in writing (by memo or e-mail) to the Chair of the AIC, in care of the Office of the Provost. Nominations are accepted at any time.

Terms: Student members of the council are appointed for one-year terms, and may be reappointed for subsequent one-year term(s). Faculty members are appointed for staggered two-year terms, and may be reappointed for subsequent terms.

Charge: The Academic Integrity Council is charged by the Provost to:

- (1) enforce the Missouri State University academic integrity policy, following the procedures stated herein;
- (2) subject to approval of substantive changes by the Provost, Faculty Senate, and Board of Governors, periodically review and amend these policies and procedures, with input from the Student Government Association;
- (3) organize/conduct campus activities designed to educate members of the campus community on matters of academic integrity and the academic integrity policy, and promote a campus-wide climate of academic integrity.

**ACADEMIC INTEGRITY HEARING:** An Academic Integrity Hearing is conducted by an Academic Integrity Council panel. The purpose of a hearing is to explore and investigate allegations of student academic dishonesty and to reach informed conclusions as to whether or not academic dishonesty is likely to have occurred. An Academic Integrity Hearing is an academic process unique to a community of scholars that is intended to be educational. It is not in the character of a criminal or civil legal hearing.

**ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COUNCIL PANEL (AIP):** An Academic Integrity Panel consists of six members: five voting panelists drawn from the membership of the AIC, plus the Chair of the AIC, who is a non-voting member of the panel and responsible for assembling the panel and conducting the hearing. Five voting panelists constitute a quorum for a hearing, and at least two but no more than three panelists must be students. If the allegation(s) involves academic dishonesty purportedly committed by a graduate student, then at least one member of the panel must be a graduate student.

## REPORTING ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

All members of the University community share the responsibility and authority to challenge and make known acts of apparent academic dishonesty. Any student, faculty member, or staff person who has witnessed an apparent act of student academic dishonesty, or has information that reasonably leads to the conclusion that such an act has occurred or has been attempted, shall report this act, so that multiple acts of academic dishonesty by the same student in different courses may be more easily detected. A form to facilitate this reporting is available at (see below). Confronting and reporting academic dishonesty can be done in a variety of ways, and people should choose the

manner most appropriate for the circumstances. Acts of apparent academic dishonesty that occur in the classroom may be reported directly to the course teacher of record, the course teacher's Department Head, or the teacher's direct supervisor. Incidents of apparent academic dishonesty, whether associated with a particular course or not, may also be reported directly to the Academic Integrity Council by contacting the Chair of the Council (the Provost or designee) in the Office of the Provost. The Academic Integrity Council will not accept or act upon anonymous reports but will hold in strict confidence the identity of any person reporting a suspected instance of academic dishonesty, unless that person consents to having his/her identity revealed. If the act of academic dishonesty that is reported to the AIC is alleged to have occurred in a particular course, the AIC Chair will notify the course teacher of record about the allegation. If the teacher elects not to pursue the matter, or if the reported allegation is not associated with any particular course, the AIC Chair may convene an Academic Integrity Panel to conduct an Academic Integrity Hearing to explore the allegation, provided that at least one person making an allegation is willing to be identified and to participate in the hearing.

### **ACADEMIC DISHONESTY NOT ASSOCIATED WITH ENROLLMENT IN A COURSE**

Any incident of alleged academic dishonesty by a student not enrolled in a particular course but sitting in the course for a student duly enrolled (for example, taking a test for a duly-enrolled student) shall be reported directly to the AIC, which will convene a panel to address the alleged incident. Similarly, other incidents of alleged academic dishonesty committed by any student at Missouri State University outside the context of enrollment in any particular course should be reported directly to the AIC, which will convene a panel to address the alleged incident. When the alleged violation involves a degree requirement, not tied to a course, the Department Head or program director shall respond in a manner similar to what has been prescribed for the teacher of record.

### **ADDRESSING ALLEGED ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND NOTIFYING THE AIC OF AN ALLEGED INCIDENT**

Ideally, an allegation of cheating, plagiarism or other form of academic dishonesty committed within the context of a particular course will first be addressed in a personal meeting between the teacher of the course in which the alleged violation occurred and the student involved in the alleged act. The student is allowed to present an explanation and relevant evidence at this meeting. If the allegation is dropped, no further actions are taken.

If the allegation is not dropped, the teacher of record will provide a written description of the incident and the proposed sanction(s) imposed (as described below) to the student, the Department Head, and the Chair of the AIC using the Policy Violation Report Form on the Documents & Forms page of the [AIC website](#). The report is maintained as part of AIC records, so that repeat offenders may be more easily detected.

If the student accepts the teacher's decision, with or without admitting a violation of the policy, the teacher shall then impose the sanction(s). If the student wishes to appeal the teacher's finding of academic dishonesty, the appeal process is described below in

this section. In this case, a sanction will not be imposed until the appeal process is exhausted. The sanction of the teacher can not be appealed.

When a report of academic dishonesty is received by the AIC, the AIC Chair sends the student a letter informing the student that the AIC has received notice from the teacher of the alleged incident. The student is informed that the notice will be kept on file in the Office of the Provost, and, by itself, will have no impact on the student's academic standing and progress at Missouri State. These letters are not part of the student's academic record, and are only available to those with a legitimate need to know (see "Records" section). The student is also informed that should he or she ever be charged with another act of academic dishonesty, the previous notice may be taken into consideration.

Within 5 academic days of receiving the teacher's Academic Integrity Policy Violation Report Form, the student who wishes to appeal the allegation must submit to the Department Head his/her own written summary of the grounds for appeal or review using the Student Appeal to the Department Head form which can be found on the [AIC website](#). If the teacher of record is also an administrator, the student must be advised on the Report Form that the appeal is to be directed to the teacher's direct supervisor. Before rendering a decision, the Department Head (or direct supervisor) will review the documentation and meet separately with the teacher and the student who initiated the appeal. The Department Head (or direct supervisor) must advise the teacher and the student using the Department Head Decision Form (<http://www.missouristate.edu/academicintegrity/>) of his/her decision within 5 academic days of meeting with the student, and must also inform the teacher and the student that either has the right to appeal the Department Head's decision to the AIC. The Department Head (or direct supervisor) must also send a copy of this Decision Form along with pertinent documents to the Academic Integrity Council, in care of the Office of the Provost. The Academic Integrity Council will maintain confidential files related to student academic dishonesty, and the Chair of the AIC will convene a panel to address repeated allegations of academic dishonesty that may accumulate against a particular student.

A teacher must allow a student who is appealing an allegation of academic dishonesty to continue attending the class until the right of appeal has been exhausted. If the student drops the class in which academic dishonesty is alleged to have occurred, either prior to or after the alleged dishonesty is detected (and an appeal is not granted), sanctions of "F" or "XF" will still be imposed.

## TEACHER SANCTIONS

The teacher of record can impose the following sanctions **only** if those sanctions are specified in the teacher's course policy statement, either by explicitly listing the sanctions or by a direct reference to the academic integrity policy, including directions for obtaining the policy on the Web or at the library. The maximum penalty an teacher can impose is a failing grade due to academic dishonesty (XF). Teacher sanctions that may be specified in course policy statements are:

- denying credit on an assignment and/or examination;



- requiring additional assignments and/or examinations;
- lowering the student's course grade;
- issuing a failing course grade ("F");
- issuing a failing course grade of "XF", which indicates that this failing grade was due to academic dishonesty. The grade "XF" shall be treated as an "F" grade for the purposes of grade point average, course repeatability, and determination of academic standing.

No grade-related sanction may be imposed until a student admits misconduct and/or forgoes appeal rights, or is found in violation after an AIC hearing. **If an academic integrity matter is pending at the end of a semester, the faculty member must assign an Incomplete ("I") for the course until the matter is resolved.**

To issue a course grade of "XF" the teacher of record must note this on the violation report form (<http://www.missouristate.edu/academicintegrity/>) and include the *recommended* time period before the student may petition for the "XF" grade to be replaced by an "F" grade (see "Appeal for Removal of 'XF' grade"). The teacher will indicate a grade of "F" on the grade roster, and provide a copy of the violation report form to the Office of the Provost, which will then notify the Office of the Registrar who will make the change to "XF".

## **STUDENT REQUEST FOR AN ACADEMIC INTEGRITY HEARING**

If the dispute is not resolved at the departmental level to the satisfaction of the student, the student may submit a Request for an AI Panel Hearing (<http://www.missouristate.edu/academicintegrity/>) to the Academic Integrity Council, in care of the Office of the Provost. Requests must be presented to the AIC within 15 academic days (days when classes are in session) from the date of the Department Head's decision. The AIC Chair or designee will solicit information on the teacher/student availability, and select the date, time and place for the Academic Integrity Hearing. The student, the teacher, and the teacher's Department Head will be notified in writing at least 4 days prior to the hearing, and will be provided with information about the hearing. In addition, anyone lodging a confidential allegation with the AIC will be notified of the date, time and place of a hearing to address that allegation.

## **TEACHER REQUEST FOR AN ACADEMIC INTEGRITY HEARING**

If a dispute is not resolved at the departmental level to the satisfaction of the teacher, or if the teacher believes a more severe sanction than those that can be imposed by teachers is warranted (for example, suspension or dismissal), then the teacher may submit a written request to the Academic Integrity Council, in care of the Office of the Provost, for an Academic Integrity Hearing. Requests must be presented to the AIC within 15 academic days (days when classes are in session) from the date of the teacher's imposition of sanction (if the teacher seeks additional sanctions), or from the date of the Department Head's decision (if the teacher is appealing that decision). The Chair of the

AIC will notify the student in writing of the teacher's request for a hearing. An Academic Integrity Hearing initiated by teacher request will take place in the same manner as one initiated by a student appeal.

## **HEARINGS INITIATED BY THE ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COUNCIL**

Under the following conditions, the Chair of the AIC, at his/her discretion, can convene a panel to conduct a hearing:

- A student is accused of a violation not associated with a class in which he/she is enrolled,
- Multiple violations are reported for the same student.
- A reported violation is particularly egregious, such to warrant consideration of suspension or dismissal.

## **ACADEMIC INTEGRITY HEARING**

An Academic Integrity Hearing is conducted by a five-member Academic Integrity Panel assembled by the Chair of the AIC for that purpose, plus an assistant to document the hearing (optional). The duty of all persons at an Academic Integrity Hearing is to assist in a thorough and honest examination of related facts. The role of the Chair is to exercise impartial control over the Academic Integrity Hearing in order to achieve an equitable, orderly, timely and efficient process. The Chair is authorized to make such decisions and rulings as are necessary and proper to achieve that end, including such decisions and rulings as pertain to scheduling and to the admissibility of documentation.

Fostering academic integrity is best achieved when people confront academic dishonesty openly; however, it is also recognized that doing so can create personal risk in some situations. Therefore, people alleging academic dishonesty against a particular student will be allowed to participate in the hearing by submitting written statements rather than appearing before the panel, under the condition that at least one person who has alleged academic dishonesty against a particular student is willing to reveal his/her identity to the student. When requested, other written statements may be confidential, and the identity of the person submitting a written statement known only to the AIC Chair. However, in order for any hearing to occur, at least one person (usually the course teacher) who has lodged an allegation of academic dishonesty against a student will participate in the hearing in order to ensure a fair examination of the allegation.

Witnesses approved by the AIC Chair who have been requested to appear but cannot be present at a hearing because of scheduling problems may submit written statements. Statements must be signed, dated, and received by the Office of the Provost at least 24 hours prior to the time the hearing is to commence. The contents of submitted written statements will be disclosed during the hearing and will enter into the deliberations of the panel. The AIP may at its discretion interview a person submitting a confidential written statement in a closed session, but will not be required to do so. A confidential written statement can be used to support other evidence of academic dishonesty, but cannot be used as the sole basis for a finding of dishonesty. A person wishing to maintain

confidentiality should recognize that confronting dishonesty openly and directly may have greater impact than a confidential written statement.

The sequence of an Academic Integrity Hearing is necessarily controlled by the nature of the incident to be investigated and the character of the information to be examined. It thus lies within the judgment of the Chair to fashion the most reasonable approach. The following steps, however, have been found to be efficient, and are generally recommended:

- Prior to the hearing, members of the AIP will review all materials submitted by both the teacher and the student, as well as documents presented by other interested parties. The panel may request additional material or the appearance of other persons at the hearing.
- At the discretion of the Chair, the materials to be reviewed by the AIP may also include information about any prior incident of academic dishonesty in which the student has been involved and which have been reported to the Academic Integrity Council if, in the judgment of the Chair, that information is relevant to the current allegation.
- Alternatively, the Chair may withhold from the AIP information about prior incidents until after the panel has reached a decision on the current allegation if, in the judgment of the Chair, the prior incident(s) is/are not directly relevant to the allegation at hand. However, if the current allegation is upheld and there are prior incidents of academic dishonesty that have been reported to the AIC, the details of the prior incident(s) will be revealed to the AIP at the conclusion of their deliberation. Now functioning as an AIC-initiated hearing, the panel may then be asked by the Chair to determine if it wishes to impose additional sanctions because of the repeated offenses.
- Witnesses who have direct knowledge related to the allegation (and who have been approved by the Academic Integrity Council Chair 48 hours prior to the hearing) may be requested by either the student or the teacher to appear at the hearing. Generally, no more than two witnesses will be approved for either side, and they must be able to provide relevant information/viewpoints. Each witness will be given a few minutes to provide testimony, and then must be willing to answer questions from the panel and others participating in the academic integrity hearing.
- The student against whom an allegation has been lodged may present relevant information or arguments before the panel. If a documented disability prevents the student from communicating effectively and this is an approved educational accommodation, a non-attorney spokesperson may speak on behalf of the student. This does not preclude the student from being directed to testify and to reply to questions directed to him/her. The AIC must be notified, with documentation, at least 48 hours prior to the hearing for a spokesperson to be recognized
- The student against whom an allegation has been lodged may be accompanied by an interpreter, pre-approved by the Chair of the AIC 48 hours prior to the hearing. It is the student's responsibility to arrange to have an interpreter present at the hearing. The student, not the interpreter, interacts with the panel members.
- Both the student against whom an allegation has been lodged and the teacher have the right to be assisted by an advisor they choose at their own expense. This

- advisor may be an attorney. The student/teacher is responsible for presenting his or her own information and, therefore, advisors are not permitted to speak or to participate directly in any hearing. It is the responsibility of the student/teacher to request AIC Chair approval for the advisor at least 48 hours prior to the hearing.
- In consideration of the limited role of advisors, and of the compelling interest of the University to expeditiously conclude the matter, the work of an AIP will not, as a general practice, be delayed due to the unavailability of an advisor,
  - If the student against whom an allegation has been lodged has been properly notified of the hearing, but fails to appear, the hearing may take place in his/her absence and the panel's decision will be binding. Only under exceptional circumstances (to be determined by the Chair of the Academic Integrity Council) will a new hearing be granted on the basis of absence. A student who is unable to attend because he or she is no longer residing in the area may arrange to participate in the hearing via videoconferencing or other long-distance communication techniques.
  - The teacher, the student, and all members of the AIP may question any person giving testimony.
  - The teacher, and then the student, may make summary statements of up to five minutes to close the hearing.
  - The presence of others at an Academic Integrity Hearing lies within the judgment of the Chair. An Academic Integrity Hearing is a confidential investigation. It requires a deliberative and candid atmosphere, free from distraction. Accordingly, it is not open to the public or other "interested" persons; however, at the student's request, the Chair may permit a student's parent(s) or legal guardian(s) and/or spouse to observe and may permit a limited number of additional observers. This request must be submitted to the Chair for approval 48 hours prior to the hearing. The Chair may cause to be removed from the Academic Integrity Hearing any person who disrupts or impedes the investigation, or who fails to adhere to the rulings of the Chair. The Chair can also require that witnesses remain outside the hearing room except for the time when they are testifying.
  - It is the responsibility of the person desiring the presence of a witness before an AIP to ensure that the witness appears. Because experience has demonstrated that the actual appearance of an individual is of greater value than a written statement, the latter is discouraged and should not be used unless the individual cannot or reasonably should not be expected to appear. The work of an AIP will not, as a general practice, be delayed due to the unavailability of a witness.
  - At the discretion of the AIC Chair, the hearing may be extended to allow for additional discussion and investigation. If new information is revealed as the result of further investigation, the student and/or teacher will be given the opportunity, as appropriate, to comment on it before the final vote of the panel.
  - After the hearing, the AIP may meet privately to discuss the case. The panel will reach a finding by a simple majority vote. The Chair is a non-voting member of the panel.
  - The AIP will determine a student has engaged in academic dishonesty only when such a conclusion is warranted by compelling, convincing evidence presented at

the hearing. If this is not the case, the AIP will dismiss the charge of academic dishonesty.

- If the charge is dismissed, the student will suffer no penalties for the alleged infraction, including any prior penalties imposed by the teacher or anyone else in regard to that alleged infraction.
- The AIC Chair shall provide the student, the teacher, the Department Head, the Dean of the college in which the student is enrolled, the teacher's college Dean; and, if the student's record is affected, the Office of the Registrar, a written report of the AIP's determination. A copy of the panel's report will be maintained in the Office of the Provost.
- If an allegation is upheld by an AIP, the Chair shall advise the student of his/her right to request a review of the panel's findings of responsibility and/or the sanction(s). (See "Review and Appeal Processes")
- If an allegation is upheld and the sanction is a grade of "XF", the AIP will make a recommendation on when the "X" part of the grade might be removed, if appealed by the student. The student will be notified of this recommendation.
- An Academic Integrity Hearing is not a trial. Formal rules of evidence commonly associated with a civil or criminal trial may be counterproductive in an academic investigation and hearing, and shall not be applied. The Chair will accept for consideration all matters that reasonable persons would accept as having probable value in the conduct of their affairs. Unduly repetitious, irrelevant, or personally abusive material will be excluded.

## **ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COUNCIL SANCTIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS**

In cases where an AI hearing is initiated by the AIC Chair, if the AIP finds it is more likely than not that an attempted or actual act of academic dishonesty was committed by the student, the panel may impose any of the following sanctions/ recommendations:

- lowering of grades
- "XF" grades;
- denial of privilege to hold office in any student organization;
- denial of privilege to represent the University in any intercollegiate activity;
- required service to the University and/or required service to the community;
- recommendation to the Provost for suspension or dismissal;
- recommendation to the Provost that a degree already granted be revoked, even if all degree requirements are met.

These sanctions may be in addition to sanctions imposed by the teacher, and will be based on materials presented at the hearing and the perceived intent on the part of the student. An "XF" grade imposed by the panel will supersede any grade sanction imposed by the teacher.

In addition, the panel may require a student to complete the eight-hour Multimedia Integrity Teaching Tool (MITT) administered by the Office of the Provost, or AI Tutorial available at [www.missouristate.edu/academicintegrity](http://www.missouristate.edu/academicintegrity).

When an “XF” grade is involved, the panel will also inform the student that he/she can appeal to have the “X” removed from the grade after a minimum of one year.

Generally, subsequent findings of academic dishonesty, premeditated dishonest acts, and falsification of papers or conspiring with others to commit any academic dishonesty, will merit more severe sanctions, including the possibility of suspension or dismissal from the University.

## REVIEW AND APPEAL PROCESSES

**REQUEST FOR IMMEDIATE REVIEW:** The student, the person reporting a violation, or an AIC Chair may request review of the panel’s decision relating to whether an act of academic dishonesty occurred, and/or the sanction(s) the panel imposed. (For recommendations of suspension or dismissal, see above).

- A written request must be received within 15 academic days (days when classes are in session) after the AIC’s written decision is sent to the student.
- The AIC will notify the teacher/student (or other person lodging an allegation), and Department Head of the request for review.
- The teacher/student will be provided a reasonable opportunity to make a written response to be considered in the review process.
- Five voting members of the AIC not on the initial panel will review the original panel’s decision. Only AIC members and the Chair will be present at this review panel.
- Evidence considered in this review will include the record of the original hearing and the written information submitted by the student and other parties having relevant information.
- Sanctions imposed by the teacher may not be reduced.
- Sanctions imposed by the first panel may be reduced only if found to be grossly disproportionate to the offense.
- Review decisions will be by majority vote.

**SECOND AIP HEARINGS:** A review panel may overturn the decision of the original AIP and call for a second AIP hearing.

- Cases may be referred to a new AIP hearing by the review panel if:
  - Bias or procedural errors were so substantial as to effectively deny the accused student or person reporting the violation a fair hearing, or
  - if new and significant documentation has become available that could not have been discovered before or during the original hearing.
- The new AIP will consist of five voting members of the AIC who did not participate in either the original AIP or the review panel.
- No indication or record of the initial AIP hearing will be introduced or provided to the members of the new AIP, except at the discretion of the Chair of the AIC.

If the recommended sanction to suspend or dismiss a student is approved by the Provost, a notation will be made on the student’s transcript that the suspension or dismissal was for reasons of academic dishonesty. The student may submit a written appeal to the President within 10 academic days (days when classes are in session) of

notification of the sanction. Regardless of whether an appeal is filed, dismissal requires approval by the President of the University.

**PETITION FOR REMOVAL OF “XF” GRADE:** After a period of one year has elapsed since the grade of “XF” was imposed, a person who has received a grade of “XF” (whether or not currently enrolled as a student at Missouri State University) may file a written petition (form) to the AIC to have the grade of “XF” removed from the transcript and permanently replaced with the grade of “F”. The petition should reflect on the effect this experience has had, including but not limited to any changes in behavior, attitude about personal integrity, and/or level of remorse. Three letters of reference must be submitted along with the petition. These letters should be from unrelated individuals who are in a position to evaluate the character of the student, any changes in the student’s attitude about academic integrity, and/or the level of remorse. After submission of all required materials, the petitioner shall meet with a representative of the Academic Integrity Council (in person or by phone) to discuss the grounds for the petition.

The decision to remove the grade of “XF” and replace it with an “F” shall rest in the judgment of a majority of the Academic Integrity Council, which will review the case. This review will include consideration of any recommendation indicated by the AIP that originally considered the case (if applicable) and/or any recommendation indicated by the teacher. The AIC will also attempt to certify that to the best of its knowledge the student has not been found responsible for any other act of academic dishonesty or similar disciplinary offense at Missouri State University or another institution. If this is the case, the AIC will consider how the student has been changed by, and learned from, the experience. Generally, unless a compelling case for removal is made, the grade of “XF” is not to be removed for acts of academic dishonesty requiring significant planning, involving repeated offenses, or accompanied by threatening or disruptive behavior. The decision of the AIC at initial review shall not be subject to subsequent AIC review for four years, unless the AIC specifies an earlier date on which the petition may be reconsidered. AIC determinations pertaining to the removal of the “XF” grade penalty may be appealed to the Provost.

### **ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH ACADEMIC PROGRAMS**

If the student is an undergraduate student who has declared a major, or a degree-seeking graduate student, and the alleged academic dishonesty reported to the AIC is associated with a course in a different department, the AIC will notify the Department Head or program director of the student’s major or program of a sanction accepted by the student or upheld by the appeal process. In addition to the sanctions available to teachers and to the AIC, the academic program in which the student is enrolled may have published policies regarding sanctions for academic dishonesty, up to and including dismissal from that program.

If a student elects to appeal an allegation to the AIC, no program sanctions should be imposed until the appeal process is concluded. An appeal for sanctions imposed by programs is addressed first to the program director; subsequent appeals would be addressed to the Department Head, then to the college Dean, and then to the Dean of the

Graduate College and/or the Provost. Sanctions imposed by academic programs are not subject to appeal to the AIC.

## **REVOKING A GRADE/DEGREE**

If a teacher discovers academic dishonesty after final grades have been assigned (including “W”) and wishes to retroactively impose an “F” or “XF” grade for the course as a sanction for academic dishonesty, the teacher must submit a Violation Report to the Chair of the Academic Integrity Council, with copy to the teacher’s Department Head and Dean, and in the case of a graduate student, with copy to the Dean of the Graduate College. In order for an teacher to be able to impose a sanction, the Report must be received by the Academic Integrity Council within five calendar years of the last class meeting day of the class in which the alleged academic dishonesty took place. In the case of an act of alleged academic dishonesty not associated with enrollment in a class, written notification must be received by the Academic Integrity Council within five years of the date of the alleged act. After five years, an teacher can no longer impose any direct sanction for an alleged infraction; however, alleged academic dishonesty may be reported to the AIC regardless of how much time has passed since the alleged act.

The Violation Report from a teacher shall include a detailed description of the alleged academic dishonesty and the intended sanction. The Chair of the Academic Integrity Council will notify the student of the allegation by certified letter with return receipt. The student will be allowed full appeal rights as outlined in the following sections of this policy: “Addressing Alleged Academic Dishonesty and Notifying the AIC of an Alleged Incident” and “Student Request for an Academic Integrity Hearing.” When the appeal process has been concluded, if the allegation is upheld and if it was brought forward within the five-year time limit, the teacher’s recommended sanction (“F” or “XF”) will replace the original grade. If the revocation of a course grade affects the student’s graduation status because the course was necessary for graduation, a degree that has been granted will be revoked.

The Academic Integrity Council can at any time and at its discretion recommend to the Provost that a degree be revoked even if all degree requirements have been met, in cases where the academic dishonesty, including misconduct in research, is egregious and/or occurred multiple times. A recommendation to revoke a degree, even if all degree requirements were met, requires an affirmative vote of at least 14 of the 20 voting members of the Council. The Provost’s decision to revoke a degree requires consultation with the Dean of the college which awarded the degree and, in the case of a graduate degree, consultation with the Dean of the Graduate College. The Provost’s decision to revoke a degree requires the approval of the President of the University. The decision to revoke a degree can be appealed by the student to the Board of Governors, which may or may not consider the appeal.

## **ACADEMIC INTEGRITY RECORDS**

Academic integrity records are subject to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and the Missouri State University Policy Regarding Personally Identifiable



Student Records. Academic integrity records are maintained by the Office of the Provost.

Academic integrity records are records related to a particular student, including but not limited to: allegations and findings of academic integrity violations; appeals by the student or an teacher, and the outcomes of those appeals; confidential statements; reports of Academic Integrity Panel determinations; and notifications of outcomes as described in the *Student Academic Integrity Policies and Procedures*.

Academic integrity records that include the sanctions of an “XF” grade, suspension, or dismissal shall be permanently maintained by the Office of the Provost. Academic integrity records that include lesser sanctions shall be maintained for seven years from the date the sanction was imposed or the student graduated from/left the University, whichever is later.

## SUMMARY AND CREDITS

Consistent with the public affairs mission of Missouri State University, these student academic integrity policies and procedures are intended to foster academic integrity at this university. The Academic Integrity Council includes both student and faculty representation, and is responsible for addressing allegations of student academic dishonesty that are not dismissed after a meeting of the teacher and the student, and those allegations not resolved upon appeal to the Department Head, or that involve dishonesty occurring outside the context of enrollment in a particular course. The Council may also undertake other activities to promote a climate of academic integrity at Missouri State University.

The introduction to this document is based on *Missouri State University Declaration of University Community Principles*, and on the Missouri State University *Faculty Handbook*. The document also includes selected material from the *University of Maryland Code of Academic Integrity*, used with permission from the Office of Academic Affairs, University of Maryland. Also included are concepts from *Synthesis: Law and Policy in Higher Education*, Vol. 9, Number 1, Summer 1997.

### **Line of Authority:**

Responsible administrator and office:	Provost
Contact person in that office:	Associate Dean of Graduate College
Approved by President:	July 28, 2014