



Office of the Provost and  
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

Phone: (906) 487-2440  
Fax: (906) 487-2935

**TO:** Richard Koubek, President

**FROM:** Jacqueline E. Huntoon, Provost & Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

*Jacqueline E. Huntoon*

**DATE:** April 21, 2022

**SUBJECT:** Senate Proposal 48-22

Attached is Senate proposal 48-22, "Revisions to the Academic Integrity Policy," and a memo stating the Senate passed this proposal at their April 20, 2022 meeting. I have reviewed this memo and recommend approving this proposal.

I concur  do not concur  with the provost's recommendation as stated in this memo.

Richard Koubek, President

4/22/22

Date



**Michigan Tech**

*University Senate*

---

**DATE:** April 21, 2022  
**TO:** Richard Koubek, President  
**FROM:** Sam Sweitz  
University Senate President  
**SUBJECT:** Proposal 48-22  
**COPIES:** Jacqueline E. Huntoon, Provost & Senior VP for Academic Affairs

---

At its meeting on April 20, 2022, the University Senate approved Proposal 48-22, "Revisions to the Academic Integrity Policy". Feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

# The University Senate of Michigan Technological University

## Proposal 48-22

(Voting Units: All Senate)

### “Revisions to the Academic Integrity Policy”

Submitted by: The Academic Integrity and Policy Committee

#### I. Introduction

The Academic Integrity Policy was last revised ten years ago. During that time, there has been a significant growth in the outsourcing of students' academic work to third parties, or what the International Center for Academic Integrity has termed as “contract cheating.” There have also been a variety of changes in the procedures for interpreting and applying the academic integrity policy. As can be imagined, there has also been a substantial increase of reported academic misconduct. There have been recent discussions regarding creating and/or supporting a culture of academic integrity at Michigan Tech. To do so, a robust policy on academic integrity is paramount. Hence the need for a group of representatives to review and suggest revisions to the academic integrity policy.

#### II. Rationale

The Academic Integrity Policy is a policy of the University Senate. According to the policy, the procedures “will be developed and periodically reviewed by the Dean of Students Office in consultation with the Dean of the Graduate School and members of the Academic Integrity Committee appointed by the University Senate.”

Since the last revision of the policy (over ten years ago), a lot has changed regarding the procedures for interpreting and applying the academic integrity policy. Primarily, the Office of Academic and Community Conduct (OACC) was created by the Dean of Students to administer the procedures for addressing violations of the Academic Integrity Policy and the Student Code of Community Conduct.

In addition, the University Conduct Board (UCB) was created by the OACC. The University Senate had been charged to select six faculty to each serve on the Academic Integrity Committee for staggered three-year terms. The OACC currently trains the faculty and schedules the hearings on which the faculty sit as hearing officers. As a matter of internal practice, the OACC has also trained these faculty members to sit on student conduct hearings and appeal hearings. Instead of having three separate hearing panels, the three panels were combined to form the UCB.

The UCB is composed of a minimum of six faculty members, two student affairs professionals, five full-time undergraduate students, and five graduate students. The faculty are selected from the faculty at large by the Senate. The students and staff are selected by the OACC based on recommendation from the undergraduate and graduate student governments and the Division of Student Affairs.

This proposal is jointly submitted by representatives from faculty, professional staff, and students, including Rob Bishop, OACC, Will Cantrell, Graduate School, Michael Mauer, GSG representative, Jean Kampe, Provost Office, Jason Blough, ME-EM, Paul Charlesworth, UCB faculty, Danielle Meiorow, UCB staff, and Hunter Jeffreys, UCB undergraduate.

### **III. Proposal**

The Academic Integrity Policy is a Senate policy so revisions must be approved by the Senate. The representatives seek the review and approval of the University Senate for these revisions.

The following document tracks the requested changes to Senate Policy 109.1: Academic Integrity Policy.

## ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

[\(Proposal 28-04\)](#)

[\(Proposal 26-05\)](#)

**[\(Proposal 8-06\)](#)**

[\(Proposal 1-10\)](#)

### Senate Policy 109.1

#### [Coordinating Procedures 109.1.1](#)

[Academic integrity is the moral code and ethical policy of scholarly work. It requires the adoption of educational values and the maintenance of academic standards.](#) Academic integrity and honesty are central components of a student's education, and the ethical conduct maintained in an academic context will be taken eventually into a student's professional career. Academic integrity is essential in a community of scholars searching and learning to search for truth. Anything less than total commitment to integrity undermines the efforts of the entire academic community. Both students and faculty are responsible for insuring the academic integrity of the university.

This policy applies to the academic conduct of all persons [who have ever matriculated](#) at Michigan Technological University ~~who have ever matriculated~~ at the University, whether or not the person is enrolled at the time an allegation of academic misconduct is made.

This policy addresses academic misconduct in course work. Allegations of misconduct in research or publication are addressed under Misconduct in Research, Scholarly and Creative Endeavors Policy ([Policy 204.1](#)).

Procedures to ensure fairness and due process for all parties involved in any apparent violation of the Academic Integrity Policy [have been developed, and will be reviewed every five years](#) ~~will be developed, and periodically reviewed,~~ by the [Office of Academic and Community Conduct](#) ~~Dean of Students Office~~ in consultation with the ~~Dean of the~~ Graduate School and members of the [University Conduct Board](#) ~~Academic Integrity Committee appointed by the University Senate~~.

#### I. Definition of Academic Misconduct.

[Michigan Tech defines academic misconduct as any attempt to create or assist in creating an unfair advantage for an individual or an unfair disadvantage for other members of the university community.](#)

#### II. Types of Academic Misconduct

*Plagiarism:* ~~Knowingly~~ Copying another's work or ideas and calling them one's own or not giving proper credit or citation. This includes but is not limited to reading or hearing another's work or ideas and using them as one's own; quoting, paraphrasing, or condensing another's work without giving proper credit; purchasing or receiving another's work and using, handling, or submitting it as one's own work.

*Cheating:* ~~Intentional, Un~~authorized use of any study aids, equipment, or another's work during an academic exercise. This includes but is not limited to unauthorized use of notes, study aids, electronic or other equipment during an examination; copying or looking at another individual's examination; taking or

passing information to another individual during an examination; taking an examination for another individual; allowing another individual to take one's examination; stealing examinations. Cheating also includes unauthorized collaboration. All graded academic exercises are expected to be performed on an individual basis unless otherwise stated by the instructor. An academic exercise may not be submitted by a student for course credit in more than one course without the permission of all instructors. [\[i.e. self-plagiarism\]](#).

[Contract Cheating: The outsourcing of student work to third parties \(Lancaster and Clarke, 2016, p.39\). Third parties may include but are not limited to family and friends; academic custom writing sites; legitimate learning sites \(e.g., file sharing, discussion, and micro-tutoring sites\); legitimate non-learning sites \(e.g., freelancing sites and online audio sites\); paid exam takers; and pre-written essay banks \(Ellis, Zucker, and Randall, 2018, p.2\). Most online help sites have honor codes and/or copyright policies. Students should ask their professors whether or not they \(students\) are authorized to use online help sites. Students should only upload content to these websites that they have made or are otherwise authorized to post.](#)

*Fabrication:* Intentional and/or unauthorized ~~falsification or~~ invention or alteration of any information or citation during an academic exercise. This includes but is not limited to the unauthorized changing or adding an answer on an examination and resubmitting it to change the grade; inventing data for a laboratory exercise or report.

*Facilitating Academic Misconduct:* ~~Knowingly or recklessly~~ Allowing or helping another individual to plagiarize, cheat, or fabricate information.

### III. Sanctions under the Academic Integrity Policy.

Sanctions under the Academic Integrity Policy will be applied according to the Academic Integrity Procedures.

II. Sanctions under the Academic Integrity Policy. These sanctions are listed in increasing order of severity.

*Academic Integrity Warning:* An official written warning that a student has inadvertently violated the academic integrity policy.

*Disciplinary Probation:* A written reprimand for violation of the Academic Integrity Policy. Probation is for a designated period of time not to exceed 18 months and includes the probability of more severe disciplinary sanctions if the student is found to violate any institutional regulation(s) during the probationary period.

*Suspension:* A sanction of Suspension terminates the person's status as an enrolled student for an indefinite period of time and prohibits the student from attending classes. Reinstatement and conditions for reinstatement, if any, shall depend upon an evaluation by the Dean of Students or Dean of the Graduate School following an application for reinstatement by the student.

*Expulsion:* A sanction of Expulsion terminates the person's status as an enrolled student with no opportunity for reinstatement. Expulsion which results from a violation of the Academic Integrity Policy is listed as such on the student's academic transcript.

*Grading Sanctions:* In addition to the sanctions described above, the decision maker (Academic Integrity Committee or hearing officer) may also assign a grading sanction of "F\*", "E\*" or "U\*" in the course as a disciplinary measure. In such cases, the faculty member responsible for teaching the course will submit an F, E or U in the course for the student and the decision maker will require the student to complete an educational assignment on ethics and integrity. F\*. If the student has not completed an educational assignment within the time specified in the disciplinary decision, the decision maker will instruct the Registrar's Office to add an "\*" to the F grade and the transcript reads "failure due to academic misconduct". Students with an F\* remaining on their transcripts may not serve as an officer of any recognized student organization, nor represent the university in events external to the university, including varsity sports, student contests and competitions, and similar events. E\* and U\*. A student receives a grade of E\* for pass/fail courses or U\* for audited courses. These grades will be administered in the same manner as a grade of F\*. If a grading sanction of "F\*", "E\*" or "U\*" is not assigned, the decision maker may make other recommendations to the instructor regarding grading including lowering the grade by one whole letter, but such recommendations are not required to be adopted by the instructor. Grades may also be lowered at the discretion of the instructor in any case where the decision maker finds a violation of academic integrity.

*Educational Conditions:* All students receiving sanctions ranging from Academic Integrity Warning to Suspension will also be required to complete an educational assignment on ethics and integrity assigned in the disciplinary decision letter.

---

[1] "Censure" is used only in unusual cases where a student not enrolled in a course facilitates the academic dishonesty of a student enrolled in a course. Since a grading sanction doesn't apply to the non-enrolled student, without the "censure" option the only sanctions would be either a warning or suspension. Under the proposed revisions, "censure" would no longer be required as the non-enrolled student could receive a probation status.

**Proposal 28-04:  
Adopted by Senate: 7 April 2004  
Approved by President: 22 April 2004**

**Proposal 26-05:**  
**20 April 2005: Adopted by the Senate**

**Proposal 8-06:**  
**Introduced in Senate: 18 January 2006**  
**Revised: 1 February 2006 and 15 February 2006**



**Adopted by the Senate: 15 February 2006**  
**Approved by Administration: 6 April 2006**

**Proposal 1-10:**

**Introduced to Senate: 09 September 2009**

**Tabled and returned to committee: 23 September 2009**

**Approved by Senate: 07 October 2009**

**Approved by Administration: 19 October 2009**

# The University Senate of Michigan Technological University

## Proposal 48-22

(Voting Units: All Senate)

### “Revisions to the Academic Integrity Policy”

Submitted by: The Academic Integrity and Policy Committee

#### I. Introduction

The Academic Integrity Policy was last revised ten years ago. During that time, there has been a significant growth in the outsourcing of students' academic work to third parties, or what the International Center for Academic Integrity has termed as “contract cheating.” There have also been a variety of changes in the procedures for interpreting and applying the academic integrity policy. As can be imagined, there has also been a substantial increase of reported academic misconduct. There have been recent discussions regarding creating and/or supporting a culture of academic integrity at Michigan Tech. To do so, a robust policy on academic integrity is paramount. Hence the need for a group of representatives to review and suggest revisions to the academic integrity policy.

#### II. Rationale

The Academic Integrity Policy is a policy of the University Senate. According to the policy, the procedures “will be developed and periodically reviewed by the Dean of Students Office in consultation with the Dean of the Graduate School and members of the Academic Integrity Committee appointed by the University Senate.”

Since the last revision of the policy (over ten years ago), a lot has changed regarding the procedures for interpreting and applying the academic integrity policy. Primarily, the Office of Academic and Community Conduct (OACC) was created by the Dean of Students to administer the procedures for addressing violations of the Academic Integrity Policy and the Student Code of Community Conduct.

In addition, the University Conduct Board (UCB) was created by the OACC. The University Senate had been charged to select six faculty to each serve on the Academic Integrity Committee for staggered three-year terms. The OACC currently trains the faculty and schedules the hearings on which the faculty sit as hearing officers. As a matter of internal practice, the OACC has also trained these faculty members to sit on student conduct hearings and appeal hearings. Instead of having three separate hearing panels, the three panels were combined to form the UCB.

The UCB is composed of a minimum of six faculty members, two student affairs professionals, five full-time undergraduate students, and five graduate students. The faculty are selected from the faculty at large by the Senate. The students and staff are selected by the OACC based on recommendation from the undergraduate and graduate student governments and the Division of Student Affairs.

This proposal is jointly submitted by representatives from faculty, professional staff, and students, including Rob Bishop, OACC, Will Cantrell, Graduate School, Michael Mauer, GSG representative, Jean Kampe, Provost Office, Jason Blough, ME-EM, Paul Charlesworth, UCB faculty, Danielle Meirow, UCB staff, and Hunter Jeffreys, UCB undergraduate.

### **III. Proposal**

The Academic Integrity Policy is a Senate policy so revisions must be approved by the Senate. The representatives seek the review and approval of the University Senate for these revisions.

The following document tracks the requested changes to Senate Policy 109.1: Academic Integrity Policy.

## ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

[\(Proposal 28-04\)](#)

[\(Proposal 26-05\)](#)

**[\(Proposal 8-06\)](#)**

[\(Proposal 1-10\)](#)

### Senate Policy 109.1

#### [Coordinating Procedures 109.1.1](#)

Academic integrity is the moral code and ethical policy of scholarly work. It requires the adoption of educational values and the maintenance of academic standards. Academic integrity and honesty are central components of a student's education, and the ethical conduct maintained in an academic context will be taken eventually into a student's professional career. Academic integrity is essential in a community of scholars searching and learning to search for truth. Anything less than total commitment to integrity undermines the efforts of the entire academic community. Both students and faculty are responsible for insuring the academic integrity of the university.

This policy applies to the academic conduct of all persons who have ever matriculated at Michigan Technological University at the University, whether or not the person is enrolled at the time an allegation of academic misconduct is made.

This policy addresses academic misconduct in course work. Allegations of misconduct in research or publication are addressed under Misconduct in Research, Scholarly and Creative Endeavors Policy ([Policy 204.1](#)).

Procedures to ensure fairness and due process for all parties involved in any apparent violation of the Academic Integrity Policy have been developed, and will be reviewed every five years by the Office of Academic and Community Conduct in consultation with the Graduate School and members of the University Conduct Board.

#### I. Definition of Academic Misconduct.

Michigan Tech defines academic misconduct as any attempt to create or assist in creating an unfair advantage for an individual or an unfair disadvantage for other members of the university community.

#### II. Types of Academic Misconduct

*Plagiarism:* Copying another's work or ideas and calling them one's own or not giving proper credit or citation. This includes but is not limited to reading or hearing another's work or ideas and using them as one's own; quoting, paraphrasing, or condensing another's work without giving proper credit; purchasing or receiving another's work and using, handling, or submitting it as one's own work.

*Cheating:* Unauthorized use of any study aids, equipment, or another's work during an academic exercise. This includes but is not limited to unauthorized use of notes, study aids, electronic or other equipment during an examination; copying or looking at another individual's examination; taking or passing information to another individual during an examination; taking an examination for another individual; allowing another individual to take one's examination; stealing examinations. Cheating also includes unauthorized

collaboration. All graded academic exercises are expected to be performed on an individual basis unless otherwise stated by the instructor. An academic exercise may not be submitted by a student for course credit in more than one course without the permission of all instructors.[i.e. self-plagiarism].

*Contract Cheating:* The outsourcing of student work to third parties (Lancaster and Clarke, 2016, p.39). Third parties may include but are not limited to family and friends; academic custom writing sites; legitimate learning sites (e.g., file sharing, discussion, and micro-tutoring sites); legitimate non-learning sites (e.g., freelancing sites and online audio sites); paid exam takers; and pre-written essay banks (Ellis, Zucker, and Randall, 2018, p.2). Most online help sites have honor codes and/or copyright policies. Students should ask their professors whether or not they (students) are authorized to use online help sites. Students should only upload content to these websites that they have made or are otherwise authorized to post.

*Fabrication:* Intentional and/or unauthorized invention or alteration of any information or citation during an academic exercise. This includes but is not limited to the unauthorized changing or adding an answer on an examination and resubmitting it to change the grade; inventing data for a laboratory exercise or report.

*Facilitating Academic Misconduct:* Allowing or helping another individual to plagiarize, cheat, or fabricate information.

### III. Sanctions under the Academic Integrity Policy.

Sanctions under the Academic Integrity Policy will be applied according to the Academic Integrity Procedures.

**Proposal 28-04:**  
**Adopted by Senate: 7 April 2004**  
**Approved by President: 22 April 2004**

**Proposal 26-05:**  
**20 April 2005: Adopted by the Senate**

**Proposal 8-06:**  
**Introduced in Senate: 18 January 2006**  
**Revised: 1 February 2006 and 15 February 2006**

**Adopted by the Senate: 15 February 2006**  
**Approved by Administration: 6 April 2006**

**Proposal 1-10:**

**Introduced to Senate: 09 September 2009**

**Tabled and returned to committee: 23 September 2009**

**Approved by Senate: 07 October 2009**

**Approved by Administration: 19 October 2009**