University of Colorado Denver

Campus Administrative Policy

Policy Title: **Academic Integrity**

Policy Number: 7050 Functional Area: Student Affairs

Effective:	January 1, 2020
Date Last Amended/Reviewed:	August 13, 2019
Date Scheduled for Review:	July 1, 2027
Supersedes:	N/A—New Policy
Approved by:	Dorothy A. Horrell Chancellor, University of Colorado Denver
Prepared by:	Academic Integrity Task Force
Reviewing Office:	Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs
Responsible Officer:	Interim Vice Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor for Student Success
Applies to:	CU Denver

A. INTRODUCTION

This policy defines academic misconduct and sets forth a uniform process for handling allegations of student academic misconduct at the University of Colorado Denver (CU Denver). This policy is the product of collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs and involved representation from the deans' offices of all CU Denver's schools and colleges.

B. TABLE OF CONTENTS

C. POLICY STATEMENT

1. As members of the CU Denver community, students are expected to know, understand, and comply with the standards of the University and to "accept the responsibility to maintain the highest standards of intellectual honesty and ethical

conduct in completing all forms of academic work at the university" (CU Denver Catalog). In particular, students must refrain from academic misconduct, defined as (1) a student's use of unauthorized assistance with intent to deceive an instructor or other person who is assigned to evaluate the student's work in meeting course and degree requirements, or (2) actions that interfere with the ability of the instructor to fairly judge the work of the student or other students. This term is defined in more detail in the Definitions section (Section E.1) of this policy.

2. Academic integrity standards assist in promoting an academically sound, fair, and respectful community. CU Denver views the Academic Integrity process set forth in this policy as a learning experience that can result in growth and personal understanding of one's responsibilities and privileges within both the CU Denver community and the greater community. All students must adhere to these standards. Students who allegedly violate these standards and commit academic misconduct will be subject to the procedures described in this policy. These procedures have been designed with the following guiding principles in mind:
   - **Learning**: Providing means for students and faculty to learn about the importance of academic integrity is a top priority.
   - **Communication**: There must be open lines of communication that enable students and faculty to engage in meaningful conversations about academic integrity and the consequences of academic misconduct.
   - **Due process and burden of proof**: Students must have access to due process concerning allegations of academic misconduct made against them, and the burden of proof is on the faculty member or other reporting party to substantiate the allegations. The Academic Integrity Committee uses the preponderance of the evidence standard to make determinations about whether academic misconduct has occurred in any given case.
   - **Availability of internal resolution process within the academic unit**: Given the guiding values of learning and communication, faculty and students are encouraged to informally resolve issues related to academic integrity at the level of the academic unit in which the issue occurred.
   - **Timely resolution**: The requirement of due process must be balanced with the interests of both student and faculty in resolving the allegations of academic misconduct in a timely manner.
   - **Consistent and fair sanctions**: Sanctions for academic misconduct should be consistent across all schools and colleges and should reflect similar treatment of similar violations of the Academic Integrity Policy.
   - **Centralized record keeping**: Due to the diversity of courses required for CU Denver's Core Curriculum, students take courses across schools and colleges. Without a centralized system for records of academic misconduct, individual schools and colleges may not be aware of prior findings of academic misconduct and are not able to effectively sanction repeated occurrences of academic misconduct.
   - **Balancing academic authority with centralized oversight**: As an academic issue, ultimate authority over student and faculty integrity rests

with the Deans and the Provost. However, several crucial issues warrant the establishment of centralized procedure and oversight for academic misconduct, including: (1) consistency in practices, process and sanctions and, therefore, ensuring evenhandedness to all students regardless of academic unit; (2) the campus-wide nature of the educational mission concerning academic integrity; (3) centralized record keeping for tracking and communicating allegations that cross school/college boundaries and repeat findings of responsibility for academic misconduct; and (4) the efficacy of one faculty-student-staff adjudicating body, rather than seven. Therefore, this policy provides a faculty-governed but centralized process that balances academic authority with centralized oversight.

3. Resolution of matters involving academic integrity has traditionally been the purview of faculty at each school and college. This policy continues the practice of encouraging the informal resolution of academic integrity matters at the level of the individual faculty member and the school or college. Additionally, this policy provides centralized hearing procedures for contested allegations or sanctions and repeat allegations of violations of this policy. These procedures are overseen by the Academic Integrity Committee ("AIC"), which consists of faculty and students representing all schools/colleges, and university staff.

4. The purpose of this policy is to detail an administrative process designed to resolve and prevent academic misconduct. The formal rules of process, procedure, or evidence as established and applied in the civil or criminal justice system do not apply to this policy.

D. PROCESS

1. The discovery of alleged academic misconduct by faculty, staff, university office, students and/or external parties ("reporting party") initiates the process by which allegations are raised, investigated and resolved according to the Procedures outlined in Appendix 1 of this policy.

2. An initial conversation between the reporting party and the accused student(s) may be held, which is recommended.

3. The reporting party must submit the allegation via an online form to Student Conduct and Community Standards (SCCC). This process ensures maintaining centralized records of all academic misconduct allegations and findings.

4. SCCC will review the form and records of prior findings to determine whether the allegation moves forward to an AIC hearing, or it may be resolved through an informal process between the faculty member and the student, in accordance with the Procedures.

5. A student may request an AIC hearing if the student denies responsibility for academic misconduct or disagrees with the sanction designated by the faculty.

6. If a hearing is held, the AIC Hearing Panel reaches a decision, which will be communicated by the AIC Chair, who will issue a written decision of the finding, any assigned sanction(s), and grounds for appeal within ten business days after completion of the hearing.

7. The decision of the AIC should generally be considered final. A student may petition for an appeal of the AIC hearing decision only if there is apparent bias and evidence to support this claim, a failure to follow designated procedures that significantly impacted the outcome of the hearing, and/or an assigned sanction that is largely disproportionate to the finding of responsibility for academic misconduct.

8. Appeals that meet the ground(s) for appeal (and are timely) will be decided by the Academic Integrity Appeal Body.

E. DEFINITIONS

1. **Academic misconduct**. Academic misconduct is defined as (1) a student's use of unauthorized assistance in attempt to deceive an instructor or other person who is assigned to evaluate the student's work in meeting course and degree requirements, or (2) actions that interfere with the ability of the instructor to fairly judge the work of the student or other students. Academic misconduct includes any of the following behaviors:

    a. **Plagiarism**: Plagiarism is the use of another person's distinctive ideas or words without acknowledgment. The incorporation of another person's work into one's own requires appropriate identification, regardless of the means of appropriation. Plagiarism includes but is not limited to the following, when the source is not disclosed:
        (1) Word-for-word copying of another person's ideas or words;
        (2) The mosaic (the interspersing of one's own words here and there while, in essence, copying another's work);
        (3) The paraphrase (the rewriting of another's work, yet still using their fundamental idea or theory);
        (4) Fabrication of references (inventing or counterfeiting sources);
        (5) Submission of another's work as one's own; or
        (6) Neglecting quotation marks on material that is otherwise acknowledged.

    b. **Cheating:** Cheating involves the possession, communication, or use of information, materials, notes, study aids, or other devices not authorized by the instructor in an academic exercise, or communication with another person during such exercise for the purpose of obtaining or providing unauthorized information or materials. "Authorization" is legitimate only if given by the faculty member responsible for the evaluation of the student's work. Examples of cheating include but are not limited to:

(1) Copying from another's work or receiving unauthorized assistance from another person during an academic exercise or in the submission of academic assignments;
(2) Using an electronic device when not permitted;
(3) Collaborating with another student during an academic exercise without the prior consent of the instructor.

c. Fabrication and falsification:
(1) Fabrication: inventing or counterfeiting information, such as creating results not obtained in a study or laboratory experiment.
(2) Falsification: deliberately altering or changing results to suit one's needs in an experiment, creative work or other academic or creative exercise.

d. **Multiple submissions:** The submission of academic work for which academic credit has already been earned, when such submission is made without instructor authorization.

e. **Misuse of academic materials:** The misuse of academic material includes, but is not limited to, the following:
(1) Stealing or destroying library or reference materials or computer programs;
(2) Stealing or destroying another student's notes or materials, or having such materials in one's possession without the owner's permission;
(3) Receiving assistance in locating or using sources of information in an assignment when such assistance has not been authorized by the instructor;
(4) Possessing or using prior examinations or answer keys, unless authorized by the instructor;
(5) Altering, forging, copying and pasting, or falsifying academic materials;
(6) Selling or purchasing prior examinations, digital media, quantitative formulae, papers, or assignments.

f. **Complicity in academic misconduct:** Complicity involves knowingly allowing, or contributing to another's academic misconduct.

2. **AIC Hearing.** The AIC Hearing is the forum for investigating and resolving contested findings or repeated violations of the Academic Integrity Policy.

3. **Academic Unit Representative.** A person who has been delegated by the faculty member (or the academic program chair/director) to serve the role of the faculty member in academic misconduct cases.

4. **Chair.** Refers to the Academic Integrity Chair. This position is filled by the SCCS Director (or his/her designee).

5. **Confidentiality.** All AIC members are expected to abide by confidentiality policies as established by FERPA.

6. **Faculty Member.** Rostered CU Denver faculty.

7. **Preponderance of the Evidence.** This shall be the standard of proof used in all conduct proceedings under this Policy: information sufficient to demonstrate that it was more likely than not that the academic misconduct occurred.

8. **Retaliation.** Means any adverse action threatened or taken against a person in connection with an allegation of academic misconduct, including but not limited to direct and indirect intimidation, threats and harassment.

9. **Sanction.** The consequence assigned when a student is found responsible for academic misconduct. The sanction is generally designed to prevent the recurrence of violations of Academic Integrity Policy.

10. **Supporting Person.** For the purposes of this policy, a supporting person is an individual chosen by the student alleged to have violated the Academic Integrity Policy. This person may be present to support the student throughout the process but may not speak for or on behalf of the student at any point in the process.

Notes

1. Dates of official enactment and amendments:
   August 13, 2019: Adopted and Approved by CU Denver Chancellor

2. History:
   August 13, 2019: This policy continues the practice of encouraging the internal resolution of academic integrity matters at the level of the individual faculty member and the school or college. Additionally, this policy provides centralized hearing procedures for contested allegations or sanctions and repeat allegations of violations of this policy. These procedures are overseen by the Academic Integrity Committee, which consists of faculty and students representing all participating schools/colleges, and university staff.

3. Initial Policy Effective Date: January 1, 2020

4. Cross References/Appendix:
   - CU Denver Catalog

APPENDIX 1

Procedures

1. The discovery of alleged academic misconduct by faculty, staff, university office, students and/or external parties (referred to below as the "reporting party") initiates the process by which allegations are raised, investigated, and ruled on, according to these procedures. Some discoveries may lead directly to an initial conversation between the reporting party and the accused student(s). Regardless of whether or not this initial conversation takes place, all discoveries must follow the procedures detailed below.
2. When an individual discovers information, which indicates academic misconduct may have occurred, that individual (or another associated with the course) is encouraged to have an informational meeting with the student to inquire about the incident. Based on the information the inquiring individual may move the process forward or find there has been no academic misconduct and end the issue without reporting.
3. There are two methods by which allegations of academic misconduct proceed, depending on the position of the reporting party.
    a. Any faculty member who suspects that a student may have committed an act of academic misconduct shall fill out the Faculty Allegation Form online as the reporting party.
    b. Any other persons who observe or suspect alleged academic misconduct by a student should direct their concerns to the relevant faculty member(s). If concerns persist, these persons may submit the General Allegation Form online. In these cases, Student Conduct and Community Standards (SCCS) will review the allegation and consult with the appropriate authority, including faculty, department, school/college, and/or Academic Integrity Committee (AIC). In consultation with the appropriate faculty, the SCCS Director will determine if the allegation moves forward.
4. The Faculty Allegation Form initiates the academic misconduct process and ensures maintaining centralized records of all academic misconduct allegations and findings. When SCCS receives the completed form, SCCS will check for records of prior findings of responsibility for academic misconduct by the student. If any prior finding of responsibility exists, an AIC hearing is initiated. If an AIC hearing is initiated, SCCS will notify and provide instructions to the reporting party and the accused party, according to the AIC's process.
5. The Faculty Allegation Form is submitted via a secure database by a faculty member, verified as such by CU Denver ID number. The form is automatically sent it to SCCS for central record keeping. The Faculty Allegation Form includes the following:
    a. A detailed description of the allegation outlining the time, place, and manner of the alleged misconduct. This description should reference any evidence supporting the allegation of misconduct.
    b. The recommendation for the student to have a meeting with the faculty member with a proposed meeting date, time, and location, with a student option to

reschedule at a mutually agreed upon date and time. This meeting will take place in person, if possible, or via telephone or web conference if the student is unavailable to meet in person.

c. The sanction that the faculty member intends to assign for the alleged violation of Academic Integrity Policy, subject to petition by the student (see Section 8.). If the student fails to respond to the request for this meeting and/or fails to attend the meeting, the determination of responsibility for academic misconduct and the assigned sanction detailed here will stand.

d. Student's rights include:

(1) to have a meeting with the faculty member to discuss the allegation, sanction, and/or process;

(2) to remain in the class, without prejudicial treatment or retaliation while the process is in progress;

(3) to invite the unit head or representative from the dean's office to the first or a subsequent meeting;

(4) to bring a single supporting person to any meeting(s), though only as non-speaking moral support;

(5) in cases of disagreement, to subsequently petition for a hearing with the AIC to resolve the allegation and/or the sanctions (see 8.c.).

e. Faculty member's rights include:

(1) to determine whether the student violated the policy;

(2) to assign an appropriate sanction, subject to petition by the student;

(3) to request a hearing before the AIC;

(4) to consult with, include, and/or delegate decision-making power to an academic unit representative in meetings with the student.

6. SCCS will automatically send a letter to the faculty and student notifying them of the reception of the allegations and the established meeting time.

7. The faculty member shall make a reasonable effort to meet or talk with the student, ideally in person, contingent upon the student's interest and cooperation. A meeting is not required but recommended. If a meeting does take place, it ideally should occur within five business days of the discovery of the alleged misconduct. The purpose of the faculty-student meeting is to provide the faculty member with an opportunity to explain the allegation of misconduct and to present supporting evidence to the student, and to allow the student an opportunity to explain the circumstances of the alleged misconduct. The faculty member and the student are encouraged but not required to reach consensus on the allegation and appropriate sanction.

8. Whether or not this meeting takes place, the faculty member, or academic unit representative, will determine whether the student is responsible for academic misconduct, and if so, assign a sanction.

Suggested academic sanctions for use by faculty include:
verbal or written warning, required additional assignments, reflection essay, academic integrity module review or seminar, other educational sanctions as assigned, grade reduction on assignment or test, grade of F on assignment or test, grade letter reduction in the course, or grade of F in the course.
The maximum sanction that may be assigned by the faculty member is an F grade in the course, although they may recommend to the AIC that the university consider a stronger sanction.

If the student is a graduate student, then the faculty person may choose to refer the case to the student's thesis or dissertation committee, which then has the prerogative to recommend the sanction. If the degree program is within the Graduate School, then the faculty person or committee should report the incident and its outcome to the graduate dean's office.

9. The next step is dictated by the outcome of the informal process. There are four possible outcomes:
    a. The student accepts responsibility for academic misconduct and accepts the faculty member's sanction.
        (1) The faculty member need take no further action beyond that already reported in the Faculty Allegation Form.
        (2) SCCS will contact the faculty member to confirm the finding of responsibility for academic misconduct, the assigned sanction, and the resolution of the matter. After confirmation, this matter is closed.
    b. The faculty member determines, after meeting with the student, that the alleged misconduct was not substantiated. The student will be found not responsible for academic misconduct, and no further action will be taken against the student.
        (1) The faculty member is responsible for completing the online Resolution of Academic Misconduct (RAM) Form indicating that the allegation was not substantiated. This form automatically is sent to the student, SCCS, and the appropriate dean's office.
        (2) Records of the allegation will only be maintained internally by SCCS and will not be included in the student's educational record or shared with external parties. Records will eventually be expunged according to the SCCS Record Retention Procedures.
    c. The student denies responsibility for academic misconduct or disagrees with the assigned sanction.
        (1) The student electronically submits the AIC Hearing Request Form within five business days of the meeting with the faculty member. This form automatically is sent to the AIC, SCCS, and the appropriate dean's office.
        (2) The AIC will contact the faculty member and the student(s) to gather documentation to consider the alleged violation. This supporting evidence

will be distributed to all parties at least five business days in advance of the AIC hearing.

(3) The AIC Chair will schedule the hearing and notify all involved parties of the date, time, and location of the hearing.

(4) The determination of responsibility for academic misconduct and the assigned sanction are stayed until the completion of the hearing process. The accused student(s) must remain in the course in which the alleged violation occurred, and is not permitted to drop or withdraw from the course while the matter is pending.

(5) Faculty must continue to interact with the accused student in a fair and impartial manner without prejudicial treatment or retaliatory behavior of any kind.

d. Student fails to respond to the request for an informal meeting or fails to meet.

(1) The unexcused failure of a student to respond to and/or appear in the academic misconduct process does not prevent the University from proceeding with the academic misconduct process in the student's absence.

(2) If the student fails to attend the meeting without rescheduling, or fails to respond to the request for a meeting after reasonable attempts are made to schedule it, the faculty member's determination of responsibility for academic misconduct and assigned sanction as outlined in the Faculty Allegation Form will stand without the involvement of the student.

10. If the student denies responsibility for academic misconduct or disagrees with the assigned sanction (8.c.), the AIC will convene the AIC Hearing Panel with both the faculty member and the student present (preferably in person but via telephone or web conference if necessitated by the circumstances) in a timely manner. Ideally this should be within ten business days after the SCCS/AIC receives the AIC Hearing Request form. Reasonable delays may occur, as determined by the AIC, for example in the case of an intervening campus holiday or personal circumstances of the reporting party or the student.

11. Those present at the Hearing Panel must abide by the procedures outlined in the Academic Integrity Policy and AIC Bylaws and, if found in violation, may be removed from the Hearing at the discretion of the AIC Chair. Those present at the Academic Integrity Hearing include:

a. AIC Hearing Panel Chair;

b. representatives from the AIC with a minimum of five voting members as determined by the AIC Bylaws. The accused student will be notified with the names of the Hearing Panel members at least five days in advance and may petition for recusal of members according to AIC Bylaws 10. Recusal of Members;

c. reporting party;

d. student(s) being accused of academic misconduct;

e. one optional supporting person of the student's choosing to provide non-speaking moral support only.

12. The AIC Hearing consists of four parts, the first three of which may be recorded by any party:

    a. Part 1. Presentation of the evidence by the reporting party: The reporting party should present to the AIC the reasons for the allegation and the evidence of violation of the Policy. This may include written statements by others with knowledge relevant to the allegations (e.g., witnesses). AIC Hearing Panel members are permitted to ask questions of the reporting party concerning points of clarification only, reserving detailed and involved questioning for part 3 of the hearing. The student is not allowed to speak during this portion of the hearing. If the reporting party fails to attend the hearing, the hearing will continue in the reporting party's absence.

    b. Part 2. Defense of the student: The student accused of academic misconduct then has the opportunity to defend themself against the allegation of violation of the Policy made by the reporting party. This may also include written statements by others with knowledge relevant to the allegation (witnesses). AIC Hearing Panel members are permitted to ask questions of the student concerning points of clarification only, reserving detailed and involved questioning for part 3 of the hearing. The reporting party is not allowed to speak during this portion of the hearing. If the student fails to attend the hearing, the proceedings will continue in her/his absence.

    c. Part 3. Discussion and questions by the AIC Hearing Panel (with both parties present): During this part of the hearing, the Chair opens discussion to the AIC Hearing Panel members. They may ask more detailed questions of the reporting party or the student. The Chair will make every attempt to ensure that the reporting party and student each have the opportunity to defend or challenge any new information that results from this discussion.

    d. Part 4. Discussion of the allegation by the AIC Hearing Panel (with only AIC Hearing Panel members present) and rendering of the decision of the finding and sanction. After the reporting party and the student leave, the AIC Hearing Panel discusses the information presented during the hearing. No new evidence is introduced at this time. If the AIC determines that additional evidence is required, the final determination is postponed until all evidence is reviewed. The AIC Hearing Panel reaches a determination on the finding based upon on a preponderance of evidence and must be reached by a majority vote of the Hearing Panel. Those members of the Hearing Panel who do not concur with the majority decision may append a minority opinion to the decision**.**

13. The possible outcomes determined by majority vote of the AIC Hearing Panel are:

    a. Uphold the faculty finding of academic misconduct and sanction as is: the AIC Hearing Panel decides that the student is responsible for academic misconduct and the sanction(s) assigned by the faculty member is appropriate.

b. Uphold the faculty finding of academic misconduct and increase the sanction: the AIC Hearing Panel decides that the student is responsible for academic misconduct; however, the sanction(s) assigned by the faculty member is not appropriate or is inconsistent with similar findings of academic misconduct, and the Academic Integrity Hearing Panel can choose to increase the sanction(s).

c. Uphold the faculty finding of academic misconduct but lower the sanction: the AIC Hearing Panel decides that the student is responsible for academic misconduct; however, the sanction(s) assigned by the faculty member is not appropriate or is inconsistent with similar cases findings, and the AIC can choose to decrease the sanction(s).

d. Reverse the faculty finding of responsibility for academic misconduct and reverse the sanction: the AIC Hearing Panel decides that the student is not responsible for academic misconduct. If the decision is to reverse the finding, a record of the allegation and all documentation is maintained internally by SCCS and will not be included in the student's educational record or shared with external parties. Records will eventually be expunged according to the SCCS Record Retention Procedures.

14. Notification: The AIC Chair will issue a written decision of the finding, any assigned sanction(s), and grounds for appeal within ten business days after completion of the hearing. The AIC Chair will send electronic copies of the decision to the student, the faculty member, and the appropriate deans' office AIC liaisons (dean of the student's school/college major, dean of the school/college offering the course in which the alleged academic misconduct occurred, and, for graduate students, dean of the Graduate School).

15. Appeal: The decision of the AIC generally should be considered final. A student may petition for an appeal of the AIC Hearing Panel decision only if there is sufficient evidence of bias, a failure to follow designated procedures that significantly impacted the outcome of the hearing, and/or an assigned sanction that is largely disproportionate to the finding of responsibility for academic misconduct. To petition for an appeal, the student must complete the online AIC Decision Appeal Form and provide it to SCCS within five business days from the day that the AIC hearing decision was sent electronically to the student. The AIC Decision Appeal Form should include the grounds on which the student is appealing and any supporting documentation or written statement. The Dean of Students will determine whether one or more of the grounds for appeal are met. Minor deviations from designated procedures will not be a basis for sustaining an appeal unless there is a demonstrable adverse effect on the outcome of the AIC Hearing.

16. If the request for appeal is received within the time limit and the ground(s) for appeal are met, SCCS will forward the appeal and all materials related to the case to the Academic Integrity Appeal Body. The appeal body consists of the Dean of Students, the VC for Faculty Affairs (or his/her designee), and either the dean of the school or college offering the course (if the sanction pertains only to the course itself) or the dean of the student's school or college (if the sanction pertains to more than the course itself, e.g., suspension or dismissal from a school or college, or suspension or expulsion from the university). If the student is a graduate student, the dean of the Graduate School also will be included. Any/all of the deans may nominate a designee.