



University of
New Haven

CEA ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

*Adapted from the University of New Haven Academic Integrity Policy with permission.
Updated May 2015*

This policy pertains to courses taken at CEA Study Centers ONLY. All courses taken at a partner institution are subject to and at the discretion of the partner institution

I. Philosophy

CEA is an academic community based on the principles of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility. Academic integrity is a core value that insures respect for the academic reputation of CEA, its students, faculty and staff.

CEA expects that students will learn in an environment where they work independently in the pursuit of knowledge, conduct themselves in an honest and ethical manner and respect the intellectual work of others. Students, faculty and staff have a responsibility to be familiar with, and adhere to CEA's Academic Integrity Policy.

II. Policy

Violations of the Academic Integrity Policy include, but are not limited to, the following examples:

A. Cheating – “Intentionally using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in any academic exercise.”¹ Cheating includes, but is not limited to:

- a. Having unauthorized notes during an exam or quiz, or communication of information by any means concerning the content of an examination during or after the testing period to anyone who has not yet taken the examination. The only materials permitted during an exam are those that an instructor explicitly instructs students they may use.
- b. Copying the work of another during a test or quiz.
- c. Obtaining or providing unauthorized prior knowledge of exam or quiz content.
- d. Using another student’s work for a homework or lab assignment or presenting the work of another as one’s own.
- e. Using unauthorized materials or information from others for a take-home exam. It is expected that students do independent work for exams whether they are take-home or in-class. Students are expected to comply with the guidelines set by the instructor. Clarification of the instructor’s guidelines should be sought at the time the assignment is made.
- f. Seeking, receiving, or giving aid during examinations through electronic means (e.g., cell phone, email, text messaging).

- g. Purchasing papers, research, reports, etc. from commercial services or other individuals.

B. Collaboration/Collusion – Collaboration/Collusion includes but is not limited to:

- a. Non-permitted Collaboration. In some instances, instructors may indicate permitted forms of collaboration with other students. If the instructor does not indicate that collaboration is permitted, it should be understood that none is permitted. Students are encouraged to seek clarification from their instructors regarding the acceptable parameters for collaboration should they be in doubt regarding assignments that require group work. Instructors are encouraged to make their policy regarding collaboration explicit both orally to the class and in writing with each assignment. Acknowledgement of collaboration is required when presenting authorship of student work.
- b. Study Groups and Tutoring. Academic integrity standards do not prohibit students from studying together or from tutoring each other if done in conformance with other provisions of this policy and according to the instructor's guidelines.

C. Plagiarism – “Intentionally and knowingly representing the words or ideas of another as one’s own in any academic exercise or resubmitting one’s own work under false pretenses.”^I Plagiarism includes but is not limited to:

- a. Copying from another student’s paper(s) partially or entirely or from any source without proper citation such as a book, article, notebook, video, or other source material, whether published or unpublished.
- b. Purchasing or securing a paper from any source, to include term-paper vendors and internet sources, and submitting that paper or specific portions of the paper as one’s own work.
- c. Inserting a passage from the internet or any computer source into one’s paper without proper citation.
- d. Copying data from another source without proper citation.
- e. Appropriating another person’s computer programming work for submission as an assignment.
- f. Failing to attribute material that comes from other media sources or failing to obtain proper permission for the use of such material when creating a web page, film, or musical composition as a course assignment.
- g. Any other appropriation of another’s intellectual property without proper attribution.
- h. Submitting an assignment that was written during a prior semester or submitting the same assignment for more than one class simultaneously to include resubmitting substantial portions of previously written work for a current assignment, unless instructors in multiple courses are informed of and approve of the submission. Students should consult their instructors if unsure of what work of their own, prepared for another course, they may use in preparing an assignment.
- i. Citing sources improperly, which includes, but is not limited to, failure to use quotation marks or other appropriate notation for direct quotes or for an author’s distinctive phrases, and following an author’s structure of writing and ideas, but

rephrasing the sentences partially to give the impression that the whole passage reflects the student's structure and ideas.

- j. Guidance on proper citation may be found below:

Resources on Proper Citation of Sources:

American Psychological Association. (2010) *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, D.C.: Author.

Chicago Manual of Style (16th ed.).(2010) Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gibaldi, J. (2009) *MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers*. (7th ed.), New York: Modern Language Association.

Sources online (<http://library.newhaven.edu/ResearchGuides.html>)

Turabian, K.L. (2013) *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses and Dissertations* (8th ed.), Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

D. Fabrication – “Intentional and unauthorized falsification or invention of any information or citation in an academic exercise.”ⁱⁱⁱ This includes:

- a. Furnishing false information, distorting data or failing to provide all necessary required information to CEA instructional or administrative staff for any academically related purpose.
- b. Forging a signature to certify completion of a course assignment or a recommendation.
- c. Fabricating data in support of laboratory or field work.
- d. Intentionally misrepresenting one's academic accomplishments.
- e. Fabricating or falsifying a bibliography

E. Facilitating Academic Dishonesty – “Intentionally or knowingly helping or attempting to help another to violate any provision of this Policy.”^{iv} Examples include but are not limited to:

- a. Providing to other students one's own work or that of others with the reasonable expectation that these will be used for the purpose of cheating or plagiarism.
- b. Maintaining a file of exams or papers with the reasonable expectation that these will be used for the purpose of cheating or plagiarism.
- c. Unfairly advancing one's academic position by hoarding, stealing, or damaging library materials.
- d. Theft of other students' notes, papers, homework, or textbooks for academic gain.
- e. Placing another person's work on the internet without his or her permission for academic gain.
- f. The use of any electronic means to assist another without authorization is strictly prohibited.

- g. Copyright infringements shall be considered violations of the Academic Integrity Policy. More information on copyright issues and copyright law can be found at: <http://www.newhaven.edu/library/Services/Faculty/14211/>

III. Faculty and Student Responsibilities for Upholding the Academic Policy

- A. Faculty** - Faculty are responsible for creating an educational environment where academic integrity is defined and understood by:
- a. Referencing the CEA Academic Integrity Policy in their course syllabi and explaining, modeling and reinforcing expectations for academic integrity and the consequences for violations regularly during the semester.
 - b. Clearly explaining permitted collaborations in course syllabi and the behaviors and actions that constitute academic dishonesty, especially those that may be specific to the assignments of the course.
 - c. Instructors may choose to implement standards more stringent than those contained in this policy, provided they are clearly communicated to students and documented in course syllabi.
- B. Students** - Students are responsible for the completion of their own academic work and for encouraging their peers to act with integrity in all academic matters by:
- a. Acting with honesty and integrity in all their courses.
 - b. Learning the principles of ethical conduct, and being familiar with and abiding by the definitions contained in the Academic Integrity Policy and any other policies established by their instructors, CEA or their home campus.
 - c. Informing the instructor or onsite academic staff if they become aware that any form of academic dishonesty has occurred in a course.
 - d. Individual students may make a confidential report of a violation of academic integrity to the onsite academic administrative staff, who will forward the report to the appropriate instructor or his/her academic supervisor for investigation.

IV. Procedures for Hearing Cases of Academic Dishonesty

A. Instructor's First Steps

When an instructor suspects or receives an allegation that a student has engaged in an act of academic dishonesty, the following steps should be taken: *Note: The order in which an instructor follows actions a-e below may vary depending on the circumstances of each case.*

- a. The instructor will speak with the student, inform the student of the alleged violation and gather additional information, including the student's perspective on the alleged violation. This should happen at the time the alleged violation occurs or immediately thereafter upon learning of the violation. All accounts of the alleged violation, including additional relevant information, should be included in an instructor's written summary for subsequent review.
- b. The instructor will consult with his/her supervisor and the local Academic Director regarding the alleged violation and, based on the written summary, determine if a violation has occurred. If it is determined that a violation has occurred, an appropriate penalty will be agreed upon.

- c. The instructor and Academic Director will document the violation on the CEA Academic Integrity Incident Report.
- d. The instructor will notify the student of the violation in writing within five (5) business days of the incident and will request a meeting (with or without the Academic Director) with the student to discuss the incident and the penalty within five (5) business days of the notification. A copy of the notification will be sent to the Academic Director.
- e. The instructor, or instructor and the Academic Director will meet with the student to review the facts of the case and to discuss the violation and the recommended penalty.

Note: Withdrawal from the course, if within the withdrawal deadline, does not protect a student from receiving an F in the course or other penalties, or stop further academic dishonesty proceedings.

If the student takes responsibility:

- a. If the student takes responsibility for the violation, the instructor in consultation with the Academic Director, will apply the penalty, which may range from lowering the grade for the assignment or exam to failing the full assignment, exam, or failing the entire course.
- b. If a grade of "F" for the entire course is recommended, the instructor will consult with the Academic Director for advance approval prior to student notification.
- c. If the student accepts the instructor's penalty, the student will sign the CEA [Academic Integrity Incident Report & Resolution Form](#) available in CEA policies online. A copy of the Report and supporting documentation will be sent to the Academic Director and the case will be considered closed. CEA reserves the right to notify the student's home institution of all Academic Integrity cases.

If the student does not take responsibility:

In the event a student does not take responsibility for the violation or does not agree with the penalty imposed by the instructor, the student may be referred to the local Center Director to resolve the case, and is entitled to submit an appeal based on the instructor's decision following the Appeal Process outlined below.

V. Appeals

- a. *Right to Appeal.* The student may initially appeal his/her case to the Center Director and if the student does not agree with the Center Director's decision, the student has the right to appeal to CEA's independent Academic Review Board (ARB). Appeal requests must be presented to the Academic Director in writing on appropriate Forms and shall be delivered within five (5) business days of the date of receipt of the instructor's written decision. If no appeal is made within the prescribed time period, the original decision of the instructor shall be final and effective immediately.
- b. *Criteria for appeal.* As CEA fully invests its trust and authority in its faculty, CEA supports the determinations made by faculty. As such, the student must have a clear, documented and justified reason to appeal the original decision. In considering the admissibility of the appeal request, the local Director and ARB will determine admissibility of the appeal based on a review of the following factors:

- i. *Fair process.* To determine whether the review and determination was conducted fairly in light of the charges and information presented, and in conformity with prescribed procedures, giving the complaining party a reasonable opportunity to prepare and to present information that the Academic Integrity Policy was violated, and giving the accused student a reasonable opportunity to prepare and to present a response to those allegations. Deviations from designated procedures will not be a basis per se for sustaining an appeal unless CEA determines that significant prejudice resulted from such deviation.
- ii. *Factual basis.* To determine whether the decision reached regarding the accused student was based on substantial information, that is, whether there were facts in the case that, if believed by the reviewer, were sufficient to establish that a violation of the Academic Integrity Policy occurred.
- iii. *Appropriateness of penalty.* To determine whether the penalty(ies) imposed was/were appropriate for the violation of the Academic Integrity Policy the student was found to have committed.
- iv. *New evidence.* To consider new information, sufficient to alter a decision or other relevant facts not brought out in the original hearing, because such information and/or facts were not known or available to the person appealing at the time of the original determination.

Initial Appeal Process:

- a. If the Center Director determines that the criteria for an appeal have been met, he/she will hold separate and/or joint meetings with the instructor and the student within five (5) business days of the receipt of the initial appeal to discuss the case and determine a resolution.
- b. The Center Director will determine the appropriate penalty(ies) and communicate his/her decision to both the instructor and student within five (5) business days of the second meeting.

Escalated Appeal Process:

Students have the right to request a secondary, escalated appeal, which would refer the case to CEA's independent Academic Review Board (ARB).

Escalated Appeal Process:

- a. Student, faculty and local academic staff must first exercise all efforts to resolve the case onsite. In the event of no resolution;
- b. Student must notify the local Center Director in writing to request a secondary, escalated appeal by the Academic Review Board within five business days of receiving the initial Appeal decision.

A. CEA's Academic Review Board (ARB) Review Process

The ARB is comprised of staff members of CEA's Academic Affairs unit and includes three voting members and one alternate member designated as follows:

1. CEA's Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs & Initiatives (or designee) serving as chair;
2. CEA's Director of Academic Affairs (or designee);

3. The Academic Director at one of CEA's Study Centers appointed annually to the ARB.

An alternate member from any CEA Study Center location may be named to serve in the absence of the annually appointed Academic Director or in the case of an appeal originating from the Study Center of the annually appointed Academic Director.

More information about the Academic Review Board is available on CEA's website: <http://www.ceastudyabroad.com/educators/global-education/academic-team-for-educators.html>

ARB Review Process

- a. *Format.* A student's appeal of a charge of academic dishonesty and the resulting penalty may be brought to the ARB as indicated above when no resolution is reached onsite. The student appeal must be prepared in writing on the standard Academic Integrity Incident Report and Resolution Form along with any supporting documentation within five (5) business days of being notified of the initial appeal decision.
- b. *Content.* Complaints must contain (a) the name(s) of the individual(s) involved; (b) the circumstances of the initial charge; and (c) supporting documentation if available, including specific dates, times, and locations, and name(s) and address(es) of the person(s) filing the report.
- c. *Scope of review.* If the student admits to the violation but an agreement was not reached in the initial appeals process on the recommended penalty, subsequent review of the case by the Academic Review Board shall be limited to determining the appropriate penalty(ies). If the student does not admit to the violation, the ARB will review the full case to determine whether a violation has occurred.
- d. *Notification.* The student will be notified in writing that the appeal has been received by the Academic Review Board. The entire record of the charge of violation of academic integrity shall be shared with the student, the instructor, the local Academic Director, the local Center Director, and the members of the ARB. The ARB Chair shall set a date/time for an Academic Review Board hearing, not to exceed thirty (30) business days after the escalated appeal has been submitted. Maximum time limits for scheduling of Academic Review Board hearings may be extended at the discretion of CEA's Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Review process. Academic Review Board meetings shall be conducted according to the following guidelines:

1. *Confidentiality.* Academic Review Board meetings will be conducted independently and in private. Neither the accused student nor the instructor or local Academic Director may take part in the proceedings of the ARB.
2. *Multiple respondents.* In ARB cases involving more than one accused student, the *Academic Review Board* will determine whether the review for each student should be conducted separately or jointly.
3. *Evidence.* Pertinent records, exhibits, and written statements (including student statements) may be accepted as information for consideration at the discretion of the ARB.
4. *Rulings on review procedures.* All procedural questions are subject to the final decision of the Academic Review Board.

5. *Majority decision.* After the portion of the ARB review concludes during which all available pertinent information has been received, the Board shall determine by majority vote whether to uphold the decision regarding the initial appeal at the study center level or to overturn that decision. The ARB may overturn or revise the original decision. If an appeal is not granted the matter shall be considered closed and binding upon all involved.
6. *Standard of proof.* The ARB's determination shall be made on the basis of clear and convincing evidence that the accused student violated CEA's Academic Integrity Policy.
7. *Rules of evidence.* Formal rules of process, procedure, and/or technical rules of evidence, such as are applied in criminal or civil court, are not used in ARB proceedings.
 - e. *Record of hearing.* There shall be a single record, such as meeting notes of all Academic Review Board meetings. The record is the property of CEA and may be shared as determined appropriate by CEA.
 - f. *Determining penalties.* All determinations of responsibility will be based only on the information presented to the ARB, but previous actions taken against students for violations of academic integrity will be used in determining the appropriate penalty.
 - g. *Notice of decision.* The ARB Chair will send a written notification of the ARB decision and decision rationale to the student, the instructor and the local Academic Director within five (5) business days following the hearing. This notification shall be included as part of the student's disciplinary file and may be shared with the student's home institution.
 - h. *ARB decision is final.* The decision of the ARB is final and may not be appealed further.
 - i. *Student status during proceedings.* Students generally have the right to continue in their student status until the conclusion of academic integrity proceedings. Depending upon the severity of the violation, specific limitations may be imposed until the case has been reviewed by the Academic Review Board.

B. Penalties for Violations – Penalties for Violations are dependent on the seriousness of the violation and the student's record. Sanctions may include:

- a. *Receipt of a "zero" (F) for all or part of the assignment in question;*
- b. *Assignment of an F for the course;*
- c. *CEA disciplinary warning or academic probation and corresponding terms;*
- d. *Suspension from certain CEA activities;*
- e. *Dismissal from the CEA program.*

C. Penalties for subsequent violations – Students found responsible for a second or subsequent violation will receive a minimum sanction of an F in the course, with the maximum sanction being expulsion from the program.

- a. *Course grade penalties.* Students will receive a grade of INC while an academic integrity case is in process. If the ARB's penalty includes a grade of F for the course, the ARB will notify the instructor and CEA executive leadership of the penalty

- imposed. If, at the conclusion of the case, a grade of F is not recommended by the ARB, the instructor will be notified, and will determine the student's grade based on the work completed for the semester.
- b. *Additional penalties.* CEA reserves the right to report and inform a student's home institution about policy violations. Other penalties may be imposed by the student's home university in compliance with their respective institutional policies.
 - c. *Allegations following withdrawal.* Violations reported after a student departs or withdraws from the program or after a grade has been given for a course will result in the grade reverting to an Incomplete (INC). A notation will be placed on the student's academic record that an academic dishonesty case is pending.

D. Maintenance of Records

Records of academic dishonesty cases will be considered disciplinary records and will remain part of student's permanent academic records, maintained in CEA's Office of Academic Affairs.

Acknowledgments

*This policy has been adapted from the Code of Academic Integrity and Acknowledging the Work of Others, prepared by the Office of the Dean of Faculty, Cornell University, and used with permission; Academic Integrity Policies and Procedures at Sacred Heart University, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, William Paterson College and Applying the power of association on campus: A model code of academic integrity in **Journal of College and University Law** by Gary Pavela (1997) have also been consulted.*

i Pavela, G. (1997) Applying the power of association on campus: A model code of academic integrity. **Journal of College and University Law**, 24(1), pp 9 et seq. [journal online] available from http://www.jpo.umd.edu/docs/toomuch2_wrk.pdf; Internet; accessed 30 January 2007.]

ii-iv Pavela, page 10-11

v As defined in the Code of Conduct found in CEA's Student Handbook.