

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