

ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
2018-2019 Summary Report
Submitted by Deeanna Button, Chair
May 2018

Committee Members: Deeanna Button (Chair), Robin Hernandez-Mekonnen (Vice-Chair), Chris DiSanto, Leo Previti, Ron Tinsley, Geoffrey Gust, Carla Enriquez, Michael Hayes, Carole-Rae Reed, Eric Jeitner, Kelly Keenan, Jeni Forestal, Tom Grites (Ex Officio), Amy Beth Glass (Ex Officio), Jenny Wagner (Ex Officio)

Five Meeting Dates: September 18, November 6, December 4, January 23, March 20

Charges:

1. Academic Honesty Procedure
2. Course Audit Procedure
3. Auditing Fee Remission for Low-Income Senior Citizens
4. Attendance Procedure and Course Release Time for Student Athletes
5. Intellectual Property Policy
6. Discrimination Policy and Procedures
7. Policy on Double Majoring
8. Language for Statements on Syllabi

1. Academic Honesty Procedure

a. Background:

- i. The [Academic Honesty Procedure](#) was modified during the 2016-2017 with the approval of the APC and Faculty Senate (4/18/2017). The modification included changing the practice of invoking a suspension for a second offense, without transcript notation to invoking a suspension for a third offense, with transcript notation. In its current version, the policy does not explicitly address procedure for second offenses, although it does note that a student may face suspension for egregious first or second offenses.
- ii. The APC was asked to again review the current Procedure in consideration of several concerns raised at the Spring 2017 Faculty Senate retreat.

b. Discussion: During the AY 18-19 year, the APC move forward with recommendations from the AY 17-18 sub-committee.

c. Recommendations:

- i. The committee recommends that the university adopt use of the **academic dishonesty form** for reporting cases of academic dishonesty.
Motion made by Robin; seconded by Geoff
In favor: 9, Opposed: 0, Abstained: 0
- ii. The committee recommends that university make the **academic honesty sanctioning rubric** available for faculty and adjuncts to use in cases of academic dishonesty.

Motion made by Robin; seconded by Leo

In favor: 9, Opposed: 0, Abstained: 0

- iii. The committee recommends that the university use the new second offense procedure and language in the Academic Honesty Procedure.

Motion made by Geoff; seconded by Deeanna

In favor: 9, Opposed: 0, Abstained: 0

- iv. The committee recommends that the university use the edited version of the **prevention training** recommendations.

Motion made by Robin; seconded by Chris

In favor: 9, Opposed: 0, Abstained: 0

- v. The committee recommends that the university **adopt the edits and additions to the Academic Honesty Procedure.**

Online Motion made by Deeanna; seconded by Robin

In favor: 11, Opposed: 0, Abstained: 0

2. Course Audit Procedure

- a. **Background:** The committee reviewed the course audit policy and procedure to make course auditing more accessible and affordable.
- b. **Discussion:** There is general support for reducing the cost of course audit requests to a flat fee of \$100 per credit.
 - i. This would be consistent with the fee for dual credit for high school students.
 - ii. This fee would be for all types of students, including older adults from the community. There is a state statute that regulates tuition waivers for senior citizens; there is not a need to address the older adult population at the institutional level.
 - iii. The \$100 flat rate fee should apply to both undergraduate and graduate courses.
- c. **Recommendations:**
 - i. Auditing students may only audit up to two courses per semester.
 - ii. Auditing students may register after drop/add is complete so that seats remain open for matriculated students taking courses from credit.
 - iii. Auditing students may participate in classes with open seats and may not audit over-enrolled courses.
 - iv. Auditing students must obtain a permit/permission of instructor before enrolling in the course.
 - v. Auditing students must complete pre-requisites before enrolling. Students should be able to provide documentation of completed courses, if deemed necessary by the instructor of the course.
 - vi. Faculty retain the right to deny a request to audit, with no questions asked. Programs may also deny requests to audit.
 - vii. Auditing students should have access to the same resources (library, campus center, labs, etc.) as matriculated students.
 - viii. The committee did not take a formal vote. Tom will modify a draft of the policy for the committee to vote on.

3. Auditing Fee Remission for Low-Income Senior Citizens

- a. **Background:** Currently, tuition is waived for all senior citizens in for-credit classes. Under another item, the APC recommended (9/18/19) that there be a flat \$100 per credit course audit fee that applies to all auditing students. Diane proposed waiving fees associated with course-auditing for low income seniors.
 - i. Low income seniors would be defined as those who qualify for Medicaid, live in low-income housing, or use SNAP.
 - ii. The recommendation would be cost neutral. There are not any low-income seniors auditing course, so there is not lost revenue by changing the policy. Low-income seniors would only audit classes that would run, so there is not lost revenue moving forward.
 - iii. It would strengthen public relations with the senior citizen community and surrounding organizations that serve the elderly population.
- b. **Discussion:** The committee reviewed the policy on tuition waiver for senior citizens, but recognized that the review should focus on the course auditing policy that was reviewed in previously (9.18/19).
- c. **Recommendations:** Submit a draft a new course auditing policy. The policy update should include the recommendations set forth in the 9/18/19 meeting.
- d. **Notes:** This discussion is put on hold due to the larger discussion about changing how students are billed tuition and fees, which would have implications for the review of this item.

4. Attendance Procedure and Course Release Time for Student Athletes

- a. **Background:**
 - i. The committee reviewed the attendance procedure which states:
“At the discretion of the instructor, an absence from a class meeting or from required participation in an online course may be excused with supporting documentation for approved University functions (participation in activities or organizations which represent the University).”
 - ii. Current practice includes students providing written documentation to instructors. Kevin McHugh, from Athletics, requested that students who need to miss class for a competition (not practices) may verbally notify the instructor, and then the instructor may verify the students’ athletic status and game date with an excel sheet that was circulated to faculty.
- b. **Discussion:** It was determined that the procedure does not need to be modified because Kevin is proposing a change to the practice, not the policy or procedure.
- c. **Recommendations:**
 - i. Use a hybrid approach, where faculty may decide if they need written documentation or if they are comfortable with verbal notification, which may be verified with the excel sheets.
 - ii. Develop a practice that includes students emailing faculty, with a roster and game date link, to notify them of their absence. Committee members recommended a one-click link for each individual team roster that also includes game information.

5. Intellectual Property Policy

- a. **Background:** Our university does not have a current policy to govern intellectual property proceeds.
- b. **Discussion:** The committee reviewed the practices, supplied by Brian, from other universities and the proposed policy for Stockton. It was later learned that the information provided is not useful in this discussion because they are not comparable NJ public institutions with Unions.
- c. **Recommendations:**
 - i. Review the Master Agreement with the Union and the Union's legal counsel so that any local policy is consistent with state level practices;
 - ii. More specificity throughout and examples to help clarify some aspects of the policy;
 - iii. Add an ad hoc appeals committee so that cases of dispute are not solely decided by the Provost;
 - iv. Allocate a greater share to the inventor up front;
 - v. Consult with a larger representation of faculty.
- d. **Notes:** Upon consulting with the Union, this agenda item is on hold. The Union will investigate and consult with the Senate about how to move forward.

6. Discrimination Policy and Procedures

- a. **Background:** The committee reviewed the Procedure for Internal Complaints Alleging Discrimination in the Workplace and heard from Bill Quain about his experiences with the discrimination procedure and the Office of Institutional Diversity and Equity.
- b. **Discussion:** The committee recognizes that this is an important and substantial issue that needs to be appropriately and thoroughly reviewed. The review is beyond the scope of the committee.
- c. **Recommendations:**
 - i. The APC recommends that a task force be formed;
 - ii. The committee recommends that the task force review:
 1. Procedures, policies, and practices from sister institutions should be reviewed;
 2. State policy and law be reviewed to determine what aspects of the policy are law, best practices, and/or modifiable at the institutional level;
 3. Best practices at other institutions, within the state and beyond, should be reviewed to determine how they align with or go beyond state policy;
 - iii. The committee also recommends that the task force consider:
 1. Developing a work place bullying procedure that goes beyond protected classes;

2. The structure of the Office of Institutional Diversity and Equity. It is particularly concerning that complaints are reviewed by one person only, rather than a committee;
3. Consulting with student senate leaders about the work they have done on discrimination, and the challenges they have had in making successful recommended changes to any student-based policies.

7. Policy on Double Majoring

- a. **Background:** A request was submitted by Rodger Jackson for the APC to deliberate support for allowing students to double major with both a BA and a BS. Currently double majors are restricted to two BA or two BS majors.
- b. **Discussion:** The committee reviewed the policy but was not able to make any formal recommendations because we are not informed enough. The committee was generally receptive to modifying the policy, but more information is needed.
- c. **Recommendations:**
 - i. The committee suggested that Rodger Jackson reach out to Peter Hagan to determine if it is logistically possible and to get information on what the credit allocation would look like for a student who majors in both BA and BS.
 - ii. The committee would also like information about how this change would impact the Double Major Procedure and if there would be any need to also reference/consider the Second Baccalaureate Degree Policy.
 - iii. The committee requests that specific language be proposed on how to modify the double major policy.

8. Language for Statements on Syllabi

- a. **Background:** The committee was asked to investigate Stockton's policies on requiring a description of university policies in syllabi. The university does not have a policy that mandates inclusion of policies, but it does strongly recommend that instructors include information. There are several versions of recommended language.
- b. **Discussion:** The committee does not support a policy that requires faculty to include statements in their syllabi, but does support that the University strongly recommend inclusion and provide suggested statements in a centralized location.
- c. **Recommendations:**
 - i. The committee recommends that centralized location be on the Blackboard home page, where the current confidential and non-confidential resources are located.
 - ii. Links for suggest statements should be provided for Title IX, The Clery Act, Accessibility, and Academic Dishonesty

Additional Notes

APC Request for Consideration Form

To expedite the review process, the APC requires a request for consideration form that asks users to provide contextual information about requests, the rationale for the

modification/addition, and any intended and unintended consequences that may result. The form can be found here: <https://goo.gl/forms/VcTpyDDXNaKOzPyE3>

Attendance

The APC is comprised of 17 members, 12 of which are faculty. The other 30% of the committee are non-voting ex officio and student members. Often times, faculty attendance is poor. The lack of faculty attendance compromises the collective voice. As Stockton continues to grow and change, our committee has an increasing number of charges, and these charges are becoming more substantive in nature. It is imperative that the APC be comprised of active and present members, so the committee is not dominated by members of the committee who are not faculty. To address this concern, the APC is attempting to move our meetings to outside of the regular 4:30pm meeting module in hopes that there will be less competition with other meetings and work-life balance. It would be helpful to discuss other possible solutions including elected alternate representatives and/or standing committee attendance policies.

ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE **2018-2019 Summary Report**

Submitted by Deeanna Button, Chair
May 17, 2019

STOCKTON



STOCKTON
UNIVERSITY

www.stockton.edu

Charges

1. Academic Honesty Procedure
2. Course Audit Procedure
3. Auditing Fee Remission for Low-Income Senior Citizens
4. Attendance Procedure and Course Release Time for Student Athletes
5. Intellectual Property Policy
6. Discrimination Policy and Procedures
7. Policy on Double Majoring
8. Language for Statements on Syllabi



1. Academic Honesty Procedure

- **Background:**
 - The [Academic Honesty Procedure](#) was modified 2016-2017 with approval of the APC and Senate (4/18/2017).
 - Change from suspension for a second offense, without transcript notation to suspension for a third offense, with transcript notation.
 - Does not explicitly address procedure for second offenses.]
 - APC was asked to review the current Procedure because of concerns raised at the Spring 2017 Faculty Senate retreat.
- **Discussion:** During the AY 18-19 year, the APC move forward with five recommendations from the AY 17-18 sub-committee.

Academic Honesty Procedure

- **Recommendation 1:** Adopt use of the academic dishonesty form for reporting cases of academic dishonesty.
 - (In favor: 9, Opposed: 0, Abstained: 0)



Academic Honesty Procedure

- **Recommendation 2:** Make the academic honesty sanctioning rubric available for faculty and adjuncts to use in cases of academic dishonesty.
 - In favor: 9, Opposed: 0, Abstained: 0



Academic Sanctioning Rubric

This rubric is intended for recommendation purposes only. Faculty are not limited in classifying acts of academic dishonesty by these recommendations only, nor are faculty obligated to use any of the recommended sanctions.

Plagiarism Offenses

Minor	Improper/incorrect citation of sources or references
Minor/Moderate	Failure to paraphrase appropriately (not rephrased enough, word substitution)
Moderate	Paraphrasing a source without any citations
Moderate/Major	Few directly plagiarized sentences from another source without citation
	Several sentences or a paragraph directly plagiarized from another source without citations
Major	More than one paragraph of direct plagiarism from another source

Assignment Offenses

Moderate	Few directly plagiarized sentences from another student
	Unauthorized collaboration on one assignment that does not include direct copying (includes other students, tutoring help)
	Giving another student answers on an assignment, but not taking help
	Several sentences or a paragraph of direct plagiarism from another student
	Copying another student's assignment without their knowledge
Moderate/Major	Using an instructor's manual to complete the assignment
	Submitting your own work from a previous class
	Misrepresentation or falsification of documentation or documents
Major	More than one paragraph of direct plagiarism from another student
	Ongoing unauthorized collaboration on assignments (includes other students, tutoring help, use of instructor's manual)
	Ghosting an assignment (another person completes an assignment on the student's behalf)

Exam Offenses

Major	Use of notes, crib sheets, watches, phones, or other unauthorized study aids on an exam
	Sharing answers on an exam
	Copying another student's exam without their knowledge
	Giving another student answers to an exam, but not taking answers
	Ghosting an exam (another person completes the exam on the student's behalf)
	Stealing an exam

Academic Sanctions:

In general, the sanctioning level should align with the level of offense. However, the level of student (First-year vs. Senior), the weight of the assignment (low, medium, high stakes), and the intention of the act should also be considered when applying an academic sanction. Instances of academic dishonesty that may be considered a moderate for a first-year student who unintentionally engages in academic dishonesty may be considered major for a more advanced student.

Minor	Redo assignment without grade penalty
	Complete an additional, educational assignment with referencing requirements (reflection on why plagiarism is wrong)
Minor/Moderate	Redo assignment with grade penalty that is not automatic assignment failure
Moderate	Fail the assignment, with some awarded points
	Fail the assignment, with zero awarded points
	Reduction in class grade that is not automatic course failure (would have earned a B, as a result of dishonesty, will earn a C)
Major	Fail the course
	Dismissal from the program

Academic Honesty Procedure

- **Recommendation 3:** Use prevention training recommendations.
 - In favor: 9, Opposed: 0, Abstained: 0
- **FRST classes** (especially writing classes) and **First Year seminars** should include some instruction on academic honesty and plagiarism.
- All **W1** courses should include some instruction on plagiarism and paraphrasing.
- Programs, including undergraduate and graduate, are encouraged to consider implementing **ongoing training in appropriate, program-specific courses**.
- The training should be an **online, self-learning** course that includes assessment of learning goals.

Preventative Training Recommendations

- The content of the training should include **definitions and examples** of various types of plagiarism.
- Complete the online academic honesty training during **orientation** and **prior to registration** for their first semester at Stockton.
 - This includes new students, transfer students, graduate students, and NMAT students.
- Students who **do not complete** the academic honesty training by the end of their first semester will have a **hold placed on their account** preventing them from registering for any additional classes.
- The training should be a **university wide initiative that includes representatives** from education, science, business, arts, FRST, W1 faculty, the library, online education specialists, and information technology.

Academic Honesty Procedure

- **Recommendation 4:** Adopt the new second offense procedure and language in the Academic Honesty Procedure.
 - In favor: 9, Opposed: 0, Abstained: 0

In the case of a second charge of academic dishonesty prior to the student graduating from Stockton, the student **will be subject to an academic sanction** imposed by the course instructor **and a disciplinary sanction**, in accordance with the Code of Conduct, imposed by the Office of the Provost. **Another letter stating that the charge is upheld** will be placed in the student's permanent file in the Office of the Registrar and in the Office of the Provost. The student will be **mandated to recomplete the academic honesty training**. Second offenses **may constitute grounds for suspension or expulsion**; the period of time for such suspension shall be determined by the Provost or his/her designee. The suspension or expulsion will be recorded on the student's academic transcript, which makes a permanent record of the offense.

Academic Honesty Procedure

- **Recommendation 5:** Adopt the edits and additions to the Academic Honesty Procedure.
 - In favor: 11, Opposed: 0, Abstained: 0

STOCKTON



STOCKTON
UNIVERSITY

www.stockton.edu

2. Course Audit Procedure

- **Background:** The committee reviewed the course audit policy and procedure to make course auditing more accessible and affordable.
- **Discussion:** There is general support for reducing the cost of course audit requests to a flat fee of \$100 per credit.
 - Consistent with the fee for dual credit for high school students.
 - For all types of students.
 - Applies to both undergraduate and graduate courses.



Course Audit Procedure

- **Recommendations:**
 - Auditing students may only audit up to **two courses per semester**.
 - Auditing students may **register after drop/add is complete** so that seats remain open for matriculated students taking courses from credit.
 - Auditing students may participate in classes with open seats, and **may not audit over-enrolled courses**.
 - Auditing students must **obtain a permit/permission of instructor** before enrolling in the course.
 - Auditing students **must complete pre-requisites** before enrolling. Students should be able to provide documentation of completed courses, if deemed necessary by the instructor of the course.
 - Faculty retain the **right to deny a request to audit**, with no questions asked. Programs may also deny requests to audit.
 - Auditing students should have **access to the same resources** (library, campus center, labs, etc.) as matriculated students.
- **The committee will review and vote on a modified policy.**

3. Low-Income Senior Citizens Auditing Fee Remission

- **Background:**
 - State policy that tuition is waived for all senior citizens in for-credit classes.
 - APC recommended (9/18/19) that there be a flat \$100 per credit course audit fee that applies to all auditing students.
 - Proposal to waive fees associated with course-auditing for low income seniors (those who qualify for Medicaid, live in low-income housing, or use SNAP).
- **Discussion:** The committee reviewed the policy on tuition waiver for senior citizens, but recognized that the review should focus on the course auditing policy that was reviewed in previously (9/18/19).
- **Recommendations:** Submit a draft a new course auditing policy. The policy update should include the recommendations set forth in the 9/18/19 meeting.
- **Note:** Discussion put on hold due to changing nature of how students are billed.

4. Athletes Attendance Procedure and Course Release Time

- **Background:**

- The committee reviewed the attendance procedure which states:

“At the discretion of the instructor, an absence from a class meeting or from required participation in an online course may be excused with supporting documentation for approved University functions (participation in activities or organizations which represent the University).”

- Current practice includes students providing written documentation to instructors.
- Request that students may verbally notify the instructor, with instructor verification of students’ athletic status and game date with an excel sheet

Athletes Attendance Procedure and Course Release Time

- **Discussion:** Procedure does not need to be modified because it is a change to the practice, not the policy or procedure.
- **Recommendations:**
 - Use a hybrid approach—written documentation or verbal notification with excel confirmation
 - Develop a practice that includes students emailing faculty, with a roster and one-click game date link, to notify them of their absence.

5. Intellectual Property Policy

- **Background:** Our university does not have a current policy to govern intellectual property proceeds.
- **Discussion:** The committee reviewed the practices supplied by legal Counsel. Information was not relevant.
- **Recommendations:** Upon consulting with the Union, this agenda item is on hold. The Union will investigate and consult with the Senate about how to move forward.

6. Discrimination Policy and Procedures

- **Background:** The committee reviewed the Procedure for Internal Complaints Alleging Discrimination in the Workplace.
- **Discussion:** The committee recognizes that this is an important and substantial issue that needs to be appropriately and thoroughly reviewed. The review is beyond the scope of the committee.



Discrimination Policy and Procedures

- **Recommendations:**

- The APC recommends that a task force be formed; the committee recommends that the task force review:
 - Sister institutions
 - Review state policy to determine what aspects of the policy are law, best practices, and/or modifiable at the institutional level;
 - Best practices at other institutions, within the state and beyond
- Developing a work place bullying procedure that goes beyond protected classes;
- Review the structure of the Office of Institutional Diversity and Equity.
 - Complaints are reviewed by one person only, rather than a committee;
- Consulting with student senate leaders

7. Policy on Double Majoring

- **Background:** Consider allowing students to double major with both a BA and a BS. Currently double majors are restricted to two BA or two BS majors.
- **Discussion:** The committee was generally receptive to modifying the policy, but more information is needed.
- **Recommendations:**
 - Determine if it is logistically possible and to get information on what the credit allocation would look like for a student who majors in both BA and BS.
 - Get information about how this change would impact the Double Major Procedure and if there would be any need to also reference/consider the Second Baccalaureate Degree Policy.
 - Develop and submit specific language to be reviewed.

8. Language for Statements on Syllabi

- **Background:** The university does not have a policy that mandates inclusion of policies, but it does strongly recommend that instructors include information. There are several versions of recommended language.
- **Discussion:** The committee does not support a policy that requires faculty to include statements in their syllabi, but does support that the University strongly recommend inclusion and provide suggested statements in a centralized location.
- **Recommendations:** Develop a centralized location on the Blackboard home page for statements on Title IX, The Clery Act, Accessibility, and Academic Dishonesty

Additional Notes

- **APC Request for Consideration Form**
 - <https://goo.gl/forms/VcTpyDDXNaKOzPyE3>
- **Attendance**
 - Difficulties with faculty attendance and compromised collective voice.
 - Move our meetings to outside of the regular 4:30pm meeting module
 - Other possible solutions?
 - Elected alternate representatives
 - Standing committee attendance policies.

Academic Integrity Form Stockton University

To be completed by instructor:

1. Student name & email address:	2. Student ID number:
3. Instructor name & email address:	4. Course, section & semester of incident:
5. Type of offense <i>(select one)</i> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block; margin-left: 100px;">Plagiarism <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></div>	6. Level of offense <i>(select one)</i> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block; margin-left: 100px;">Minor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></div>
7. Please describe alleged violation & attach supporting documents: <div style="background-color: #e0e0ff; height: 100px; margin-top: 5px;"></div>	
8. The following type(s) of supporting documentation are attached: Student Essay/Other Work <input type="checkbox"/> Copy of Plagiarized Materials, etc. (original source) <input type="checkbox"/> Course Syllabus <input type="checkbox"/> Copy of Any Other Materials in Question (student's work) <input type="checkbox"/>	
9. Proposed academic sanction(s): 	
10. Recommended disciplinary action(s)? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> (If yes, indicate suggested disciplinary action) 	
11. Read and sign: I have discussed, either orally or in writing, the allegation(s) & sanctions and related evidence with the student. <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 20px;"> <div style="width: 45%; border-top: 1px solid black; padding-top: 2px;">Instructor's Signature</div> <div style="width: 45%; border-top: 1px solid black; padding-top: 2px;">Date</div> </div>	

To be completed by student:

Please select and initial one of the following statements:	
I <u>accept</u> the allegation(s) and sanction(s). _____	I <u>contest</u> the allegation(s) and sanction(s). _____
_____ Student's signature	_____ Date
Instructor: check here if student has refused to sign: <input type="checkbox"/>	

Academic Sanctioning Rubric

This rubric is intended for recommendation purposes only. Faculty are not limited in classifying acts of academic dishonesty by these recommendations only, nor are faculty obligated to use any of the recommended sanctions.

Plagiarism Offenses

Minor	Improper/incorrect citation of sources or references
Minor/Moderate	Failure to paraphrase appropriately (not rephrased enough, word substitution)
Moderate	Paraphrasing a source without any citations
Moderate/Major	Few directly plagiarized sentences from another source without citation
	Several sentences or a paragraph directly plagiarized from another source without citations
Major	More than one paragraph of direct plagiarism from another source

Assignment Offenses

Moderate	Few directly plagiarized sentences from another student
	Unauthorized collaboration on one assignment that does not include direct copying (includes other students, tutoring help)
	Giving another student answers on an assignment, but not taking help
	Several sentences or a paragraph of direct plagiarism from another student
	Copying another student's assignment without their knowledge
Moderate/Major	Using an instructor's manual to complete the assignment
	Submitting your own work from a previous class
	Misrepresentation or falsification of documentation or documents
Major	More than one paragraph of direct plagiarism from another student
	Ongoing unauthorized collaboration on assignments (includes other students, tutoring help, use of instructor's manual)
	Ghosting an assignment (another person completes an assignment on the student's behalf)

Exam Offenses

Major	Use of notes, crib sheets, watches, phones, or other unauthorized study aids on an exam
	Sharing answers on an exam
	Copying another student's exam without their knowledge
	Giving another student answers to an exam, but not taking answers
	Ghosting an exam (another person completes the exam on the student's behalf)
	Stealing an exam

Academic Sanctions:

In general, the sanctioning level should align with the level of offense. However, the level of student (First-year vs. Senior), the weight of the assignment (low, medium, high stakes), and the intention of the act should also be considered when applying an academic sanction. Instances of academic dishonesty that may be considered a moderate for a first-year student who unintentionally engages in academic dishonesty may be considered major for a more advanced student.

Minor	Redo assignment without grade penalty
	Complete an additional, educational assignment with referencing requirements (reflection on why plagiarism is wrong)
Minor/Moderate	Redo assignment with grade penalty that is not automatic assignment failure
Moderate	Fail the assignment, with some awarded points
	Fail the assignment, with zero awarded points
	Reduction in class grade that is not automatic course failure (would have earned a B, as a result of dishonesty, will earn a C)
Major	Fail the course
	Dismissal from the program

Preventative Training Recommendations

1. FRST classes (especially writing classes) and Freshman seminars should include some instruction on academic honesty and plagiarism.
2. All W1 courses should include some instruction on plagiarism and paraphrasing.
3. Programs, including undergraduate and graduate, are encouraged to consider implementing ongoing training in appropriate, program-specific courses.
4. The training should be an online, self-learning course that includes assessment of learning goals.
5. The content of the training should include definitions and examples of various types of plagiarism. These include, but are not limited to: failure to cite sources, improper paraphrasing, paraphrasing without citing source, failure to cite as quotation when taken verbatim from source, submitting work written by others as one's own, failure to cite online sources, or sources of graphs, tables, photographs, diagrams, films or other media.
6. Students should complete the online academic honesty training as part of the orientation process and prior to registration during their first semester at Stockton. This includes new students, transfer students, graduate students, and NMAT students.
7. Students who do not complete the academic honesty training by the end of their first semester will have a hold placed on their account preventing them from registering for any additional classes.
8. The training should be a university wide initiative that includes representatives from education, science, business, arts, FRST, W1 faculty, the library, online education specialists, and information technology.

STOCKTON UNIVERSITY PROCEDURE



Student Academic Honesty Procedure

Procedure Administrator: Provost
Authority: N.J.S.A. 18A:64-6 and 64-8
Effective Date: October 1, 1990; July 1, 2010; June 5, 2014; May 7, 2015
Index Cross-References:
Procedure File Number: 2005
Approved By:

INTRODUCTION

As an academic institution of merit and integrity, Stockton University affirms its commitment to the honesty and excellence of all academic work conducted by students of the Stockton academic community. The University makes two primary demands of its students in the area of academic honesty:

1. That each individual exercise the utmost care in planning and preparing the work presented for academic consideration, and
2. Members of the academic community conscientiously ensure the validity and protect the integrity of academic work and the grades earned for such work.

Types of Academic Dishonesty

Academic dishonesty is a serious violation of academic procedure and the Campus Code of Conduct and is subject to severe **academic and disciplinary** sanctions, including suspension and expulsion. The range of sanctions that may be given will be contingent on several factors, including:

- The decision of the faculty member making the charge;
- The extent and nature of the offense; and
- Whether it is the student's first offense or a subsequent offense.

Academic dishonesty manifests in a number of irregularities including, but not limited to, plagiarism and dishonest conduct in the completion of course work. Examples of dishonest conduct include, but are not limited to:

- Unintentional or intentional plagiarism or failure to appropriately paraphrase and/or cite sources
- Cheating on assignments by copying another student's work or collaborating with another student on course work when not specifically authorized by the faculty member
- Cheating on an exam by using inappropriate or unauthorized notes, an unauthorized electronic device, or giving or receiving help **to or from another student or any other person or resource**
- Misrepresenting or falsifying documents

Each faculty member is charged with the responsibility of defining additional criteria governing course requirements/assignments in his/her course, such as "in-class," "open book," and "take-home" examinations, laboratory experiments and reports, oral presentations, internships, clinical assignments, etc. Whenever collaboration between two or more students is authorized, the results and presentation of the collaborative effort are understood to be the achievement of each individual student.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the most common form of academic dishonesty, particularly with the proliferation of Internet resources on college-level subjects. Stockton defines plagiarism as the appropriation or imitation of the language, ideas or thoughts of another person, and the representation of them as one's original work. Any materials submitted to a member of the faculty by a student are understood to be the product of that student's own research and effort. All sources must be properly acknowledged and cited in the preparation of student assignments. Plagiarism from any published or unpublished source is a violation of the academic honesty procedure.

The following are examples of plagiarism:

- Neglecting to cite verbatim text;
- Neglecting to place verbatim text in quotation marks;
- Summarizing without citing the original source; and
- Paraphrasing without citing the original source.

An Example of Paraphrasing

Paraphrasing without giving credit to the original author is plagiarism and typically the most common type of plagiarism. The following example from Purdue OWL (<https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/619/1/>) illustrates how to paraphrase correctly and how paraphrasing is considered plagiarism.

The Original Passage:

Students frequently overuse direct quotation in taking notes, and as a result they overuse quotations in the final [research] paper. Probably only about 10% of your final manuscript should appear as directly quoted matter. Therefore, you should strive to limit the amount of exact transcribing of source materials while taking notes. Lester, James D. Writing Research Papers. 2nd ed. (1976): 46-47.

A Legitimate Paraphrase:

In research papers students often quote excessively, failing to keep quoted material down to a desirable level. Since the problem usually originates during note taking, it is essential to minimize the material recorded verbatim (Lester46-47).

An Acceptable Summary:

Students should take just a few notes in direct quotation from sources to help minimize the amount of quoted material in a research paper (Lester46-47).

A Plagiarized Version:

Students often use too many direct quotations when they take notes, resulting into many of them in the final research paper. In fact, probably only about 10% of the final copy should consist of directly quoted material. So it is important to limit the amount of source material copied while taking notes.

Reducing Plagiarism

In addition to the required academic honesty training that all registered students must complete, faculty should adopt strategies to minimize the probability of students committing plagiarism both intentionally and unintentionally. Examples of such strategies are as follows:

- Spend class time explaining plagiarism and how to avoid it;
- Provide a copy of or the web link to the University's procedure on plagiarism in the course syllabus; and
- Consistently implement the University's academic honesty procedure.

The Issue of Intent in Academic Honesty

At times, students may be careless in or ignorant of the proper procedures for the acknowledgment of sources. Knowing *when* to cite sources is as important as knowing *how* to cite them. It is not always possible for a faculty member to distinguish a student's conscious attempt at plagiarism or cheating from a clumsily documented, but well-intended paper or assignment. Therefore, the University requires every student to understand the rationale for, and application of, bibliographic methods and documentation. Each student has the responsibility to learn the fundamentals of citation and what constitutes plagiarism. *Unintentional academic dishonesty may carry the same penalty as intentional academic dishonesty.* To assure an accurate understanding of plagiarism, each student, including graduate and non-matriculated students, must undergo required academic honesty training prior to registering for classes their first semester at Stockton and is responsible for having read and consulted appropriate style guidelines for citations. Style Guidelines for citations are available on the Stockton Library website: <http://library.stockton.edu/researchtools/styleguides>.

PROCEDURES FOR ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

In cases involving charges of academic dishonesty, the following steps will be taken:

Step 1: The Determination of Academic Dishonesty

Determining Academic Dishonesty

Upon suspicion and personal corroboration of any form of academic dishonesty, including that which may be unintentional, the faculty member may determine the appropriate way of dealing with the student. Personal corroboration might include:

- Proof of the copying of another's answers on an oral or written examination;
- Review of materials by faculty readers;
- Searches of materials such as books, magazines, or blog posts to detect originality of the submitted work;
- Use of other electronic tools to detect plagiarism; or
- Other appropriate academic judgments

Faculty Responsibilities Upon Determining Academic Dishonesty

Once a faculty member is aware that a student has engaged in academic dishonesty, she/he has a responsibility to take action. First, the faculty member must inform the student of the charge and share the evidence supporting the allegation. The faculty member and the student are encouraged to communicate by phone, email, or in-person at the faculty member's discretion regarding the charge, particularly because the objective is to educate the student with regard to the nature of the alleged academic dishonesty. Whether or not an academic sanction is applied, the faculty member should instruct the student to **recomplete the required academic honesty training**, seek instruction by Writing Center staff and/or Library instructional staff, or use some other means in an attempt to prevent future charges of academic dishonesty.

Second, and concurrently, the faculty member must **file a report with the Office of the Provost using the Academic Dishonesty Report Form**. The report must be submitted within five (5) business days of personal corroboration of academic dishonesty. Personal corroboration takes place after the faculty member has suspected dishonesty *and* confirmed that suspicion through appropriate research; it is not when the faculty member first suspects that academic dishonesty has occurred. Note that a faculty member may not submit a report of academic dishonesty more than five (5) business days after the student's final grade has been submitted to the Office of the Registrar.

The Academic Dishonesty Report Form includes the:

- Student's name;
- Course in which the student is charged;
- A memorandum explaining the pertinent details of the infraction;
- Student's essay or other work;
- The course syllabus;
- A copy of the original source of the plagiarized material, etc.;
- A copy of any of the materials in question; and
- The specific academic penalty assessed or sought; a grade reduction based on not meeting the specified requirements of the assignment is not considered an academic penalty. **Faculty are encouraged to review the Academic Honesty Sanctioning Rubric for suggestions on appropriate academic sanctions by type of academic dishonesty.**

Special Circumstances in Filing Charges

Cases in which the student's successful completion of the course is required by semester's end (i.e., the student is a graduating senior or is taking a course that is a prerequisite for a course the following semester), need to be resolved expediently. In these cases, particularly those in which the student is scheduled to graduate, the faculty member must be willing to work closely with the Office of the Provost to expedite the process immediately upon suspicion of academic dishonesty. To further expedite the process, the Provost will be given the materials relevant to the case prior to a hearing, if an appeal is filed, and will discuss his/her inclinations regarding the case, in total confidentiality, with the convener of the Academic Honesty Appeals Board.

Step 2: Notification of Charge to Student

After receipt of the Academic Dishonesty Report Form and the materials from the faculty member, the Office of the Provost shall notify the student of the charge of dishonesty by sending a letter to the student's go.stockton.edu email account, with an electronic copy sent to the charging faculty member and a hard copy sent via the United States Postal Service (USPS) to the student's permanent and/or current address on file, within five (5) business days of having received the report. The letter will indicate the charge and notify the student that he/she has a maximum of ten (10) business days to respond in writing, if so desired. The letter will include all relevant documentation provided to the Office of the Provost by the faculty member bringing the charge. The student's response will be considered an appeal of the academic dishonesty charge and/or sanction. A written appeal from the charge will result in an Academic Honesty Appeals Board hearing. The student is encouraged to discuss the charge by meeting with the Provost's designee prior to responding in writing.

Step 3: The Student's Response to the Charge of Academic Dishonesty

The Student's Response

If a student charged with academic dishonesty chooses to respond to/appeal the charge and/or the academic sanction imposed by the faculty member, he/she will be encouraged to discuss the charge and/or the sanction with the Provost's designee. If there is no resolution, the student can write a letter of appeal to the Office of the Provost at academic.appeals@stockton.edu. The student must provide a clear explanation as to the reason(s) for the appeal, and, if appropriate, include supporting documentation.

The student's letter to the Office of the Provost must be received within ten (10) business days from the date which the charge of academic dishonesty was sent to the student's go.stockton.edu email address. The appeal must not mention by name, or identify in any manner, third parties not relevant to the appeal. Once an appeal is filed, the matter will move forward to be heard by the Academic Honesty Appeals Board.

Students who are charged with plagiarism in which there is clear and compelling evidence of plagiarism as defined by the University, including "cut and paste" copying from the Internet, will have difficulty formulating a convincing appeal.

It is not necessary for the student to respond to/appeal a report of academic dishonesty. If there

is no appeal, the charge and the sanction are upheld and a letter so stating will be sent electronically to the Registrar with copies sent to the student and faculty member. That letter shall remain in the student's permanent file in the Office of the Registrar and in the Office of the Provost. If there is no subsequent charge of academic dishonesty, this charge of dishonesty shall be removed from the student's permanent file upon the student's graduation.

The Academic Honesty Appeals Board

When an appeal is heard by the Academic Honesty Appeals Board, the Board makes a recommendation on the charge and/or the sanction to the Provost. Faculty members representing each of the schools, and two to four students, typically make up the Academic Honesty Appeals Board. Faculty selected to the Academic Honesty Appeals Board by their school adhere to the same term lengths as all other committees on campus. The selection process for faculty members of the Academic Honesty Appeals Board is conducted in the same manner as the other standing committee elections held by their respective schools. The student representatives are appointed by the Student Senate and the Graduate Student Council to a term of one year.

For any given hearing, at least three members of the Board will be selected to hear that particular case. Composition of the Board hearing an appeal typically, but not always, will include:

- One faculty member from within the school in which the course is taught, but not from the student's major(s);
- Two faculty members from outside the school, but not from the student's major(s); and
- One student.

A member of the Board hearing the case will be selected as chair and will then be charged with writing the recommendation of the Board to the Provost. All deliberations and discussions of the Board are confidential. Typically, the Assistant Provost and/or other designees of the Provost act as non-voting members and conveners of the Board.

Step 4a: The Sanction (If Charge and/or Sanction are Not Appealed)

Any charge of academic dishonesty prior to the student graduating from Stockton that is either uncontested or in which the

First Offense

If there is no appeal, the charge and the academic sanction are upheld. **The student will be mandated to recomplete the academic honesty training** and a letter stating that the charge is upheld will be sent electronically to the Registrar with copies sent to the student and faculty member. That letter shall remain in the student's permanent file in the Office of the Registrar and in the Office of the Provost. If there is no subsequent charge of academic dishonesty, this charge of dishonesty shall be removed from the student's permanent file upon the student's graduation. First offenses may constitute grounds for suspension or expulsion; the period of time for such suspension shall be determined by the Provost or his/her designee. The suspension or expulsion will be recorded on the student's academic transcript, which makes a permanent record of the offense.

Second Offense

In the case of a second charge of academic dishonesty prior to the student graduating from Stockton, the student will be subject to an academic sanction imposed by the course instructor and a disciplinary sanction, in accordance with the Code of Conduct, imposed by the Office of the Provost. Another letter stating that the charge is upheld will be placed in the student's permanent file in the Office of the Registrar and in the Office of the Provost. The student will be mandated to recomplete the academic honesty training. Second offenses may constitute grounds for suspension or expulsion; the period of time for such suspension shall be determined by the Provost or his/her designee. The suspension or expulsion will be recorded on the student's academic transcript, which makes a permanent record of the offense.

Third Offense

A third charge of academic dishonesty prior to the student graduating from Stockton, that is either uncontested or in which the offense has been demonstrated, shall constitute grounds for suspension or expulsion; the period of time for such suspension shall be determined by the Provost or his/her designee. The suspension or expulsion will be recorded on the student's academic transcript, which makes a permanent record of the offense.

Withdrawal from the Course if One is Charged with Academic Dishonesty

A student charged with academic dishonesty as described above and for whom a faculty member has imposed an academic sanction of failure for the course is not permitted to withdraw from the course. If the student withdraws from the course prior to a formal charge of academic dishonesty being received by the Office of the Provost, the withdrawal will be reversed and replaced by the earned grade for the course. If the student appeals the charge and/or the sanction and is subsequently exonerated, he/she will be allowed to replace the grade with a withdrawal from the course.

Step 4b: The Hearing (If Charge and/or Sanction are Appealed)

Hearing the Case

A student whose appeal has been forwarded to the Academic Honesty Appeals Board for a hearing may submit additional evidence or documentation to support his/her case within ten (10) business days from the date which the charge of academic dishonesty was sent to the student's go.stockton.edu email address. The case is reviewed by members of the Academic Honesty Appeals Board prior to the hearing. The hearing will be conducted in a non-adversarial manner in which the student and the faculty member, if they choose to be present, are each called in separately to be questioned by the Board. The faculty and/or the student may choose to let their written materials represent their case, and not testify in person at the hearing, and doing so is the prerogative of each student and faculty member involved in the appeal. Additionally, testimony of both the student and the faculty member will be recorded at the hearing.

Representation of the Student or Faculty Member

If an attorney or other individual acting as counsel representing any of the involved parties chooses to be present at the hearing, he/she may not address the Board or respond in any way to anyone but his/her client. The attorney/counsel's presence at a hearing is strictly to advise his/her client. It is important to note that the hearing is not a legal proceeding, and the

rules of evidence applied in the civil and criminal court system do not apply to these hearings.

Testimony

The Board chair may limit the number of witnesses heard or the amount of time spent on repetitious testimony.

Conflict of Interest

Board members use their own discretion in cases in which a conflict of interest may affect or call into question their ability to make an impartial decision.

Failure of Faculty Member to File a Report of Academic Dishonesty

In cases where the faculty member invokes an academic sanction, but fails to file a charge of academic dishonesty with the Office of the Provost, the student will be eligible to execute an expedited grade appeal. In these cases, the grade appeal process will defer to step four of the University's grade appeal process, and move directly to the Office of the Provost. The process for a grade appeal is outlined in the University's Advisory Board on Grades and Standing Procedure.

Step 5: The Recommendation of the Academic Honesty Appeals Board

The Vote

After hearing all available and relevant information, the Board determines whether or not to find the student responsible for the alleged academic dishonesty based upon all of the evidence presented. The majority opinion prevails and the chair of the Academic Honesty Appeals Board must provide the Provost's designee with a written recommendation within three (3) business days of the hearing. A minority opinion also may be conveyed to the Provost's designee in writing within three (3) business days of the hearing.

The Recommendation

The recommendation of the Academic Honesty Appeals Board is forwarded to the Provost, who makes the final decision. At this point, the case generally is resolved within thirty (30) days or less, depending on whether the Provost requires consideration of additional evidence.

The Charge and/or Sanction are Upheld by the Academic Honesty Appeals Board

The Provost considers the evidence presented in the case and the recommendation of the Academic Honesty Appeals Board. The Provost's decision is the final determination of the University. **See Step 4a for additional procedures for first, second, or third offenses.**

The Charge and/or Sanction are Overturned by the Academic Honesty Appeals Board

If the recommendation of the Academic Honesty Appeals Board is to overturn the faculty member's charge of and/or the sanction for academic dishonesty and the Provost agrees, he/she will direct the faculty member involved to effect a change consistent with his/her findings.

In cases in which the Provost is in disagreement with the recommendation of the Board, it is the Office of the Provost's responsibility to reconvene the Board to discuss any disagreement prior to the Provost rendering his/her final decision.

In cases of "special circumstances in filing charges" (as described above in Step 1) in which the Provost is in disagreement with the recommendation of the Academic Honesty Appeals Board, the Provost will reconvene the Board at once to discuss the case and the Provost will render a final decision.

Step 5a: Graduate Programs with an Academic Integrity Committee

The Academic Integrity Committee

The Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) is a program-level committee. The purpose of an AIC is to review the charge of academic dishonesty to determine if it is appropriate to render program-level sanctions based on the program's policies and procedures which may take into account federal, state, or certifying organization requirements.

Notifying the Academic Integrity Committee

In the case of graduate programs that have an AIC, a copy of the letter that is sent out as described in Step 2: Notification of Charge to Student will be sent by the Office of the Provost to the appropriate Graduate Program Coordinator and the respective Dean of the School where the program resides.

Graduate-Level Cases of Non-Appealed Charges/Sanctions

In cases where the student has chosen not to appeal the charge and/or the faculty member's sanction, the AIC may convene a hearing within five (5) business days of the Program Coordinator's receipt of the letter sent to the Office of the Registrar indicating that the charge and/or the sanction was automatically sustained. The AIC will determine if program level sanctions are appropriate. The student receives a copy of the letter sent to the Office of the Registrar via email.

Graduate-Level Cases with Appealed Charges/Sanctions

In cases where the graduate student has chosen to appeal the charge and/or the faculty member's sanction to the Academic Honesty Appeals Board and whose program has an AIC, as specified in the **Handbook** of the student's program or in the area of course work for non-matriculated students, will have the right to have an Academic Honesty Hearing as set out above. Once the Academic Honesty Appeals Board submits its findings and recommendations to the Provost, the Office of the Provost will send the findings and recommendations to the appropriate Graduate Program Coordinator and the student via email and mail within five (5) business days of receipt from the Academic Honesty Appeals Board. Within five (5) business days of the Program Coordinator's receipt of the Academic Honesty Appeals Board's findings and recommendations, the AIC will convene a hearing as governed in the AIC Procedures **noted in the program's Handbook**. The Office of the Provost will provide the Program Coordinator, for use by the AIC, with all materials presented to the Academic Honesty Appeals Board at the Academic Honesty Hearing regarding the charge of academic dishonesty and/or the sanction. The student may also submit additional materials to the Office of

the Provost prior to the AIC hearing and the Office of the Provost will provide the additional materials to the Program Coordinator for use by the AIC during its hearing.

The Recommendation

In all cases, whether or not the student appeals to the Academic Honesty Appeals Board, the AIC will convey its findings and recommendations to the Office of the Provost within three (3) business days of the AIC hearing. The Office of the Provost will send the findings and recommendations of the AIC to the student’s go.stockton.edu email address with a copy sent via the USPS to a permanent and/or current address on record within five (5) business days of receipt from the AIC. The student will then have five (5) business days to submit any additional documentation to the Provost for consideration.

The Provost will then render the University’s final determination on the charge and/or sanction for academic dishonesty brought by the faculty member, the final determination regarding any program level sanctions presented in the AIC’s findings and recommendations, **and the final determination of any disciplinary sanctions at the university-level.** The Provost will render a decision within fifteen (15) business days as to the course and program-level sanctions by sending the final determination to the student via email and the USPS with a copy sent to the appropriate Graduate Program Coordinator, the charging faculty member, the respective Dean, and the Registrar.

As outlined in Step 4 above, the final determination will be placed in the student’s permanent file in the Office of the Registrar and in the Office of the Provost **and the student will be mandated to recomplete the academic honesty training.** The letter will be removed from the student’s permanent file upon graduation if the student is not suspended or expelled from the University for committing a subsequent act of academic dishonesty. Where a charge results in suspension or expulsion, the sanction will be recorded on the student’s academic transcript, marking a permanent record of the offense.

Approval History:

	Date
Faculty Senate	5/25/17
Provost	5/30/17
President	6/4/17