Faculty Senate Minutes
November 10th, 2026

The regular business meeting of the Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, November 10, 2026, at 3:30 p.m. The Senate President was in the chair and the Secretary was present. The minutes of the Oct. 27, 2026, meeting were approved as written.

SU President Carolyn Lepre made announcements and answered questions.

Interim Associate Provost Chrys Egan made announcements and answered questions.

The Senate President made announcements.

The Academic Integrity Policy amendment was brought up for debate.

This amendment was still under debate when the meeting ended and will be carried to the next meeting as unfinished business.

> **MOTION**:
> The Faculty Senate approves the Academic Integrity Policy (see below), which will replace SU's existing Student Academic Misconduct Policy.

Academic Integrity Policy

Academic integrity is the commitment to and demonstration of ethical behaviors that ensure learning is authentic, so students acquire the knowledge, competencies, and responsibilities that the University strives to teach. This, along with personal integrity, is one of the commitments students make in the Salisbury University Promise, essential to sustaining a community where mutual trust allows ideas to be freely exchanged and genuine, transformative learning can be achieved. The processes by which integrity is upheld assume clear communication of the University's expectations, standards and policies.

All members of the University community - students, faculty, and staff—are expected to be guided by such principles of integrity. The general rule is that "your work must be your own," observing fundamental values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility and courage (see the International Center for Academic Integrity's description). Learning how to apply these during academic work is an aspect of Ethical Reasoning, one of the Student Learning Outcomes that form the core curriculum of the University, which prepares students to perform well in professional settings.

In cases where it appears academic integrity may have been violated, that is considered a potential case of academic misconduct. Such cases will be handled as described in the Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedures below.

RESPONSIBILITIES FOR ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

A. Faculty and Staff

Faculty and staff members are responsible for attending to whether students carry out their academic work with integrity. Where students do not perform in accordance with our community standards and commit academic misconduct, faculty and staff have a further responsibility to take appropriate action in accordance with the procedures set out below.

Faculty are responsible for teaching Ethical Reasoning, one of our General Education Student Learning Outcomes. They are to instruct students in the ethical standards and academic practices that foster integrity appropriate to their courses. Faculty should make all reasonable efforts to prevent misconduct through careful design and administration of assignments and assessments; they should also ensure the security of such materials and regularly evaluate the procedures used for assessment to identify vulnerabilities that ought to be addressed.

Where students fail to meet the required standards, as in other academic endeavors, faculty are expected to work with them to improve their performance through additional instruction or referral to appropriate support services. Faculty are also responsible for determining appropriate sanctions for misconduct. While the sanction imposed is the purview of the faculty member reporting the incident, students should only be removed from a course for the most egregious misconduct or where there is reason to believe the student's continued presence compromises the safety or integrity of the instructional environment.

B. Students

Students share responsibility with faculty and staff for academic integrity. They are to make all reasonable efforts to avoid academic misconduct and encourage academic integrity in others by their own example. When a student suspects academic misconduct has occurred, they have the responsibility and right to bring this to the attention of the instructor of the course or other appropriate authority (see **Section III.B** below).

To avoid committing misconduct, students are responsible for carefully attending to course policies and procedures designed to ensure academic integrity and following them to the best of their ability. If a student has a question or is unclear about whether something is misconduct, they should ask their instructor for clarification before submitting the work in question.

Should a student be charged with academic misconduct, they are expected to work with their instructor to identify and correct the behavior that led to the incident. Students are responsible for ensuring that, if they do violate our community standards for academic

integrity, they learn how to avoid future incidents. Multiple incidents of academic misconduct on a student's record may lead to suspension or expulsion from the University.

Academic Misconduct Policies and Procedures

I. PURPOSE

The following policies and procedures provide clear courses of action for faculty as well as students in situations where academic integrity is in question. When such events occur, touching on the fundamental moral principles of our community, breaches of standards can provoke strong reactions in any individual involved. These procedures have therefore been crafted to provide time for reflection and communication between the parties involved as well as additional oversight for disputed cases, which should foster efforts to model and teach Ethical Responsibility.

These policies and procedures apply to all students, graduate as well as undergraduate. They apply to course work carried out remotely or through digital platforms; in laboratory, studio, performance, or field settings; or during professional placement, as well as in more traditional classroom settings. Policies related to faculty misconduct in scholarly work are found in Chapter 7 of the Faculty Handbook.

II. DEFINITIONS

When a student has not followed the principles of academic integrity at Salisbury University, this is considered an instance of academic misconduct. Most fundamentally, a student may not submit as their own any work that has been prepared by others since, in such cases, the student's own learning cannot be meaningfully assessed. Receiving appropriate or instructor-approved assistance from others, such as librarians, tutors, or members of a course work group, does not constitute misconduct.

The commoner forms of academic misconduct, such as cheating and plagiarism, are defined below, but these are not the only ways academic integrity can be violated. For instance, students may not submit work they have done in another course, even if it is a course they are taking again, without the explicit permission of all course instructors. Other actions that can be seen as violating the principles of academic integrity may also be grounds for a charge of academic misconduct.

A. Cheating: fraud, deceit or dishonesty in any academic course or exercise; or using unauthorized or undisclosed materials or information; this may include generative AI-produced content. Examples of cheating include, but are not limited to: receiving unauthorized aid from another person on assessments such as quizzes, tests, or projects; using or consulting unauthorized materials, methods, software tools, or devices; and/or working on assessments outside of specified time constraints.

B. Plagiarism: presenting information or ideas from another source as one's own or without appropriate attribution, whether done intentionally or

unintentionally, as well as other acts generally recognized as using another's work without giving them due credit. Misrepresenting AI-generated content as one's own original work, by failing to disclose and properly document the tool used, may be considered plagiarism.

C. Fabrication: the falsification or invention of information in any course or academic exercise; for example, making up or manipulating data to support a research hypothesis. This may also include the use of AI-generated content that is demonstrably untrue or "hallucinated."

D. Misappropriation of Course-Based Intellectual Property: course-based intellectual property includes any materials instructors create and distribute to their students, including lectures and assessment materials such as tests. Such items are protected by Federal copyright law. Misappropriation is the act of intentionally taking an instructor's intellectual property and using it, without the express consent or permission of the instructor, for personal gain. This may be through the sale, exchange, or distribution of class notes and assessment materials for commercial purposes, either directly or through a third party such as a website.

E. Facilitating Academic Misconduct: intentionally helping or attempting to help another commit academic misconduct.

It is also important to understand the timing of events in the following procedures. Certain actions are expected to take place within a certain time frame. If, however, there are extenuating circumstances, minor deviations from the set schedule should not constitute a procedural irregularity.

F. Working Day: weekdays when the University is open for business, usually Monday through Friday.

III. PROCEDURES

The following procedures are designed to assure fundamental fairness and due process, and to protect students from inadequately considered, arbitrary, or capricious disciplinary action.

A. Confidentiality

Charges of academic misconduct must be treated as confidential, in accordance with FERPA. If an individual feels they need advice on how to handle an incident, they should reach out to their department chair or program director; a member of the Academic Policies Committee (APC); and/or the Associate Vice-President of Academic Affairs and Student Success. Where possible, it is best to discuss prospective cases without identifying the specific student involved.

Do not discuss the case with other students, not even as a cautionary tale. The only exception is when misconduct involves collusion between or the participation of multiple students, who are already aware of the identities of their co-conspirators. Even in these

cases, a separate Incident Report should be filed for each student, and the other students being charged should not be specifically named in the report or supporting documentation.

To maintain confidentiality, any and all written communications regarding academic misconduct **must** be conveyed through official Salisbury University email messages or a secure, University-specified digital platform (such as Canvas/MyClasses or Maxient). Face-to-face conversations should be held privately; if an additional witness is desired, the chair/director is recommended. In-person conversations must be documented by sending an e-mail summary of the conversation to the student shortly afterwards; such messages should be part of the supporting documentation included with an Incident Report.

B. Who May File an Academic Misconduct Incident Report

All members of the Salisbury University community have the responsibility to make incidents of academic misconduct known. In cases where misconduct is observed or otherwise comes to the attention of students, staff, or faculty who are not the instructor of the course involved, they should communicate their concerns and information to the instructor of the course. If they don't know who the instructor is, they should communicate with the Associate Vice-President of Academic Affairs and Student Success or the Dean of Students, who will then determine who should file a report.

Any University employee in an instructional relationship with a student (hereafter "Reporting Person") may file an Incident Report. This includes, but is not limited to, course instructors, field directors, field supervisors, program directors, program chairs, school directors, department chairs, and deans.

Students or staff who report academic misconduct need to understand that anonymity cannot be guaranteed if a case progresses to an appeal. Those accused of misconduct have a right to know what evidence supports the charge against them. The Reporting Person should explain this to their informant and, whenever possible, provide evidence from their own observations and/or the assessments in question to support the charge. Reach out to the Associate Vice-President of Academic Affairs and Student Success for advice if informant testimony and anonymity are considered crucial to the case.

C. Reporting Cases of Academic Misconduct

When a Reporting Person suspects that a student has committed an act of academic misconduct, they shall carry out the following actions, in the order listed.

1. Reporting Person Advises the Student of the Charge

a. The Reporting Person will advise the student in person or via a secure messaging platform (see **Section III.A** above) of the accusation within ten (10) working days of the discovery of the misconduct.

b. If the student is informed in person, the accusation must also be documented in writing to the student (via secure University e-mail or MyClasses).

c. After the Reporting Person has advised the student of the accusation, the Reporting Person must allow the student five (5) working days to respond to the charge.

Reporting Persons **must** consider the student's response to the allegations or wait five full working days **before** submitting an Incident Report. If, however, the Reporting Person directly observes misconduct with clearly specified course-based sanctions—for instance, they see a student using a phone to cheat during an exam, for which the sanction is a grade of zero—they may accuse the student immediately, even if other students are present, and inform them that the sanction will be applied. The accusation should still be documented in writing as described above, and the student given time to make a considered response before an Incident Report is submitted.

2. Reporting Person Submits Academic Misconduct Incident Report

If, **after** the process described above, the Reporting Person concludes that a student has committed academic misconduct, they are expected to submit an Incident Report via the Maxient platform using this online form. The Incident Report should be submitted no later than ten (10) working days after the student was first notified of the accusation.

Unless there is a course policy communicated through the syllabus that clearly sets out how minor sanctions (less than an F for the assignment) for academic misconduct considered "teachable moments" will be determined and applied, any time an instructor finds that a student has committed academic misconduct and decides to apply a sanction, they must submit an Incident Report. Because of the confidentiality required for such charges, Incident Reports are the only way we can identify students who repeatedly violate our standards of academic integrity. This provides opportunities for additional intervention and/or sanctions, to ensure that our community's ethical standards are understood and practiced.

The Academic Misconduct Incident Report form requires, in addition to identification of the Reporting Person, the student, the course where the misconduct took place, and the date of the misconduct, the following information:

a. **a brief description** of the incident;

b. **the sanction imposed**. The options include:

i. **Warning**;

ii. **Reduction in the grade** recorded for the assignment, test, quiz, etc.;

iii. Issuance of **an "F" on the assignment**, test, quiz, etc.;

iv. Issuance of **an "F" in the course and removal** from the course (see **Section III.E.1** below for a description of the further consequences of this sanction); or

v. **Other**: these should be detailed at the end of the description of the incident and may include a recommendation to the student's program director or chair that the student be suspended or dismissed from an accredited program (see **Section III.E.2** below); and

c. **whether** the misconduct is considered **a minor violation**.

Determining appropriate sanctions for academic misconduct is one of the responsibilities of Reporting Persons, and where discussion with more experienced faculty (see **Section III.A** above) may be helpful. Consideration should be given to the scale and severity of the specific form of misconduct committed, and the extent to which it might have influenced the student's grade for the course. Standards in the course's discipline and where a student is in their educational career may also be taken into account. While faculty should strive to apply sanctions equitably, it is not necessarily inappropriate to give significantly different sanctions to, for instance, a first-semester freshman plagiarizing in ENGL 103 and a junior English major plagiarizing in a professional writing course. Once the Academic Misconduct Incident Report has been filed, the Reporting Person cannot increase the sanction imposed, but they may choose to reduce it. They may also choose to withdraw the Incident Report altogether if new evidence warrants doing so.

The Reporting Person may adjust the student's grade to reflect the sanction chosen after submitting the Incident Report, with the understanding that if the student appeals the charge (see **Section III.D** below) and their appeal is upheld, their grade is to be recalculated to remove the sanction. If an Incident Report is submitted near the end of the academic term and the student appeals the charge, the Reporting Person should consider how to post the student's final grade for the course, should that be due before the appeal process can be completed. If the final grade for the course included the sanction and the student's appeal is upheld, the final course grade may need to be changed in GullNet. Alternately, the student may be given an Incomplete and that changed to a grade once it is known whether the sanction is upheld.

It is recommended that a designation of "minor" be aligned with less serious sanctions, such as a reduction in grade for the assignment. Designating misconduct as "minor" does not alter the University's internal procedures for such incidents. Multiple charges, even if minor, will be referred to the APC (see **Section III.F** below) for consideration of additional sanctions. It will, however, restrict external reporting (say, to a potential employer or graduate program) of the misconduct to one calendar year from the date of the Incident Report. This cannot, of course, overturn any release of information required by federal law or subpoena.

The Incident Report should be accompanied by **supporting materials** that document pertinent details of the case. These allow the APC to expeditiously consider appeals and cases where students have been charged more than once, sometimes years apart. At a minimum, the supporting documents should include:

d. **the course syllabus**: this should include some description of the assignment where the misconduct occurred and an academic integrity policy;

e. **evidence of the misconduct**: this might include written testimony, images, or video of observed illicit behavior or objects; Turnitin reports or other documentation illustrating unauthorized copying of another's work or falsification; and/or other kinds of information that justify the charge; and

f. **copies of all correspondence** with the student regarding the incident, including the written accusation (see **Section III.C.1.b** above). It is advisable to send the student written summations of any other in-person conversations shortly after they take place and provide these as well.

Copies of all documentation will be shared with the student digitally after the Incident Report has been received. There is no need for the Reporting Person to provide the student with printed copies, which can create risks to confidentiality.

If the supporting documentation contains items that should not be freely available to the student, such as assessment materials or correspondence naming individuals (such as student informants) whose anonymity must be protected, the Reporting Person should check the relevant box on the digital form. Someone from the Office of Academic Affairs will reach out to identify the material that should not be shared and advise on what protections are possible.

3. Office of Academic Affairs Notifies Student of Charge and Appeal Options

The Office of Academic Affairs will, within five (5) working days after the Incident Report is submitted, send a letter via University e-mail to the student to inform them of the charge, the sanction, and their right to appeal. The letter will provide:

a. the date the Incident Report was submitted;

b. the name of the Reporting Person;

c. the type of academic misconduct they have been accused of;

d. the sanction imposed; and

e. digital copies of the supporting documentation submitted with the report (see **Section III.C.2.d–f** above), with the exception of secure assessment or other confidential materials (see **Section III.C.2, final paragraph** above).

Copies of the letter (without the Incident Report or supporting documentation) will be sent, also via University e-mail, to the Reporting Person; the Reporting Person's Chair or Director; the Chair or Director of the student's major department; the Registrar's Office; and the Dean of Students.

If the student has any prior academic misconduct violations, both the new charge and the documents related to their past cases will automatically be referred to the APC (see **Section III.F** below). The APC will determine whether additional sanctions are appropriate, given the repeated nature of the misconduct.

D. Appealing a Charge of Academic Misconduct

Students who have been charged with academic misconduct have the right to contest that charge when they can provide one or more of the following:

a. evidence suggesting that the charge of misconduct is false;

b. evidence of significant procedural irregularities in how the Reporting Person charged and/or reported them for misconduct; and/or

c. new information that has come to light since the Reporting Person submitted the report, which might have affected the decision to charge the student and/or the sanction imposed.

If a student does not appeal a charge of academic misconduct, the sanction stands and the documents related to the case will be held by the Office of Academic Affairs for five (5) years (see **Section J** below). After five years, the records of the charge will be deleted.

Students seeking advice and guidance about an appeal should contact their School Advising Coordinator. (To find the appropriate coordinator, visit the Academic Advising website and click on the title of your school on the left.) Students should **not** ask the Reporting Person for advice about their appeal.

When a student chooses to appeal, the following actions are to be carried out, in the order listed.

1. Student Appeals the Academic Misconduct Charge

Once the student receives the letter from the Office of Academic Affairs notifying them of the charge and sanction, they have five (5) working days to e-mail a written appeal of the charge to integrity@salisbury.edu. The appeal shall include the grounds for the appeal (a, b, and/or c above) and any other information the student feels is pertinent to the case.

We cannot recommend using generative AI, such as Chat-GPT or Claude, to write an appeal letter. **Students must be aware that if they provide their Academic Misconduct Report to a public-facing AI, the information in the report will be incorporated into its database, and others will then have access to that information**. University records of misconduct are deleted after five years; AI databases may continue to disclose that information decades later.

When the charge is related to an active course, the student should continue to participate fully in the course during the appeal process, even if the sanction imposed is issuance of an F and removal from the course. Should, however, the relevant department chair, program director, and/or dean have grounds to believe the student's continued presence compromises the safety or integrity of the instructional environment, they have the discretion to remove the student from the course for the duration of the appeals process. Confidentiality is to be preserved as far as is practicable in this eventuality, and the student provided a reasonable opportunity to attend an alternative section of the course or other options for making up any coursework missed during the appeal process.

2. Office of Academic Affairs Notifies Reporting Person of the Appeal

The Office of Academic Affairs will, within five (5) working days after appeal is submitted, notify the Reporting Person of the appeal.

3. Reporting Person Responds to the Appeal (optional)

The Reporting Person will then have five (5) working days to respond in writing to the student's appeal, if they wish, via an e-mail sent to integrity@salisbury.edu. A response should specifically address the grounds for appeal stated by the student, as well as any other relevant claims or countercharges made in the appeal. The response may include further information supporting the charge or sanction that was not included in the supporting documentation for the Incident Report.

4. Academic Policies Committee Considers the Appeal

The Office of Academic Affairs will, through a secure messaging platform, provide all the documents pertaining to the case to the APC. This will include documentation for the student's prior academic misconduct violations, if any.

The Chair of the APC will review these materials to ensure they are complete and notify the other committee members of the pending appeal. The committee will have fifteen (15) working days to review, discuss, and render a decision on an appeal, unless it chooses to pursue an investigation (see **Section III.D.4.b** below) or hold a hearing (see **Section III.D.4.c** below).

The APC normally meets biweekly during the Spring and Fall semesters; it also meets at other times as needed, including in January and over the summer, to ensure timely decisions for these cases. A quorum of voting members (at least 5 out of 9) must be present at a meeting to render a decision. In cases where a quorum cannot be assembled, the Chair of the APC and/or the Office of Academic Affairs may recruit ad hoc members (preferentially past or incoming members of the APC) to provide adequate representation and review.

Once documentation for a case has been reviewed, the APC takes one of the following actions.

a. **Issue a Written Decision**

When the information provided by the Reporting Person and student is adequate to judge the merits of a case, the APC will weigh the evidence and reach a decision through a majority vote. The evidentiary standard used is a preponderance of the evidence. It will then issue a written decision on the appeal no more than five (5) working days after the meeting where the vote was taken.

The Chair of the APC will send a letter via University e-mail to the student to inform them of the committee's decision. Copies of the letter will be sent, also by University e-mail, to the Reporting Person; the Reporting Person's Chair or Director; the Reporting Person's Dean; the Chair or Director of the student's major department; the Dean responsible for the major department; the Office of Academic Affairs; the Registrar's Office; and the Dean of Students. The Chair of the APC will share the letter with the APC through a secure messaging platform.

For student appeals of faculty-imposed sanctions, the decision of the APC regarding the appeal is final. If the student's appeal is denied, the Reporting Person's sanction is to be

imposed. If the student's appeal is upheld, the academic misconduct charge is removed from their record and the sanction is not to be imposed.

b. **Conduct an Investigation**

In some cases, the information provided by the Reporting Person and/or the student is not sufficient for the committee to render a decision. If this is the case, the Chair of APC will notify the student and the Reporting Person via University e-mail that the APC is opening an investigation into the case.

The Chair of the APC and/or other designated members of the committee will request and collect the additional information required; this may be through written requests and/or interviews with individuals connected to the case. The APC will make every effort to conclude its investigation within ten (10) working days of the notification sent to open it.

Once the investigation is complete, the APC will meet to consider the student's appeal in light of the additional information gathered. If it is able to reach a decision, it will then issue that decision through the procedure described in **Section III.D.4.a** above.

c. **Conduct a Hearing**

In cases where, even after an investigation, further information is required, such as when an individual has not responded to requests for materials or an interview; or when the case presents complexities that would benefit from a dialogue of testimony from the individuals involved, the APC may choose to conduct a hearing.

The Chair of the APC will notify the student, the Reporting Person, and other individuals whose presence at the hearing is required, via University e-mail, that the APC will conduct a hearing on the case. The Chair will also arrange the date, time, and location of the hearing in consultation with those individuals. The hearing should be held within ten (10) working days of notification of the intent to conduct the hearing.

i. The hearing shall be held at a reasonable time when all parties (to the extent possible) are available or have an opportunity to be present. The hearing may be held in-person or virtually (for instance, through Microsoft Teams).

ii. The hearing shall be closed, with attendance limited to individuals directly connected with the case as determined by the Chair of APC. If held virtually, the hearing may not be recorded by any attendees. Attendees will be informed of their responsibilities to maintain confidentiality in writing before the hearing; they must acknowledge and affirm these by their signature before attending.

iii. Students are permitted to seek the support of a non-legal advocate for assistance in the preparation of their case for the hearing. The advocate may counsel the grievant during the hearing but shall not officially speak or participate formally in the proceedings. In all cases, the

advocate must be a member of the University faculty, staff, or student body.

iv. Neither party may be represented by an attorney at the hearing, unless they are facing or are likely to face criminal charges relating to the academic misconduct. Under such circumstances University legal counsel must also be present. At no time may legal counsel give statements or participate in questioning.

v. The student or Reporting Person may request, via University e-mail to the Chair, that specified individuals be invited to appear at the hearing in order to testify on their behalf. Such requests should be made at least five (5) working days before the scheduled hearing.

vi. The Chair is responsible for conducting the hearing in an efficient and decorous manner and shall rule on any disputes related to the procedures used throughout the hearing. At any time, the Chair may seek the advice of University legal counsel.

vii. The student and Reporting Person shall be entitled to make opening and closing statements. The Chair may set reasonable limits on the length and nature of such statements and the evidence presented, which shall apply equally to both parties.

viii. The student and Reporting Person shall be entitled to present evidence through documents and/or witnesses, and to question witnesses. Direct questioning of witnesses by the opposing party may, at the discretion of the Chair, be disallowed. In such a case, the parties will be required to convey their questions to the Chair, who will then put them to witnesses.

ix. The evidence presented should be directly relevant to the academic misconduct charge. (Other grievances that a student may have with an instructor should be handled through the Student Grievance Policy.) If a question arises about the relevance, reasonableness, redundancy, or authenticity of any evidence, the Chair shall decide on its admissibility.

Once the hearing has concluded, the APC will deliberate and render a decision based on a preponderance of the evidence. That decision will be issued through the procedure described in **Section III.D.4.a** above.

E. Further Consequences of Academic Misconduct Sanctions

The Reporting Person's sanction for an incident of academic misconduct shall be applied to the student's grade for the course where the misconduct took place, unless the student appeals and that appeal is upheld by the APC. However, there can be consequences beyond that specific course for a charge of misconduct that is uncontested or upheld.

1. Issuance of an F for the Course and Removal from the Course

When a student has been found to have committed academic misconduct and the sanction imposed was issuance of an F for the course (an "academic misconduct F") and removal from the course, the following policies apply.

a. The student may not withdraw from the course where this sanction was imposed.

b. If the student takes the course again, both the academic misconduct F and the grade earned for later enrollments will be used to calculate the student's GPA.

c. A student with an academic misconduct F may not graduate with University Honors nor serve as a commencement speaker.

d. In most cases, nothing on a student's transcript will indicate that F was due to academic misconduct. However, where the misconduct was so egregious that a lasting record of the ethical breach is considered desirable, the APC may vote to have such a notation placed on the transcript, which can be recommended by a Reporting Person in the Incident Report through the "Other" sanction.

2. Dismissal or Other Sanctions from Accredited Programs

When a student whose major is an accredited program has been found to have committed academic misconduct, the program may impose additional sanctions on the student. In order to do so, the program must have clearly communicated policies and procedures for reviewing such cases and reaching a decision. These additional sanctions, up to and including dismissal from the program, can be recommended by a Reporting Person in the Incident Report through the "Other" sanction; or a review of the incident can be initiated by the accredited program's director or department chair once they have received a copy of the letter notifying the student of the charge (see **Section III.C** above) or of the letter notifying the student of the APC's decision on their appeal (see **Section III.D.4.a** above).

If a student is dismissed from a professional program, the student may appeal that decision by writing a letter of appeal to the Academic Affairs Office.

F. Multiple Recorded Charges of Academic Misconduct

When an academic misconduct Incident Report is submitted, the Office of Academic Affairs will consult its records to see whether the student has any other academic misconduct charges on their record. (Incident Reports that were successfully appealed are not considered.) If they do, the documents concerning the earlier cases will automatically be sent to the APC along with those for the new Incident Report.

When considering such cases, the APC will first deliberate and render a decision on the new misconduct charge (see **Section III.D.4** above). If the student's appeal on that charge is denied, then the APC will consider all the recorded incidents together and decide whether the student's repeated violation of our community's ethical standards warrants additional sanctions. Where it is felt that students are not taking their responsibility for learning and observing these standards seriously, sanctions may include suspension for a set period of

time or even expulsion from the University (see **Section G** below). The APC will then issue a written notification of its decision no more than five (5) working days after the meeting where the vote was taken.

The Chair of the APC will send a letter via University e-mail to the student to inform them of the committee's decision. If the most recent charge **was not** appealed, copies of the letter will be sent, also by University e-mail, to the Chair or Director of the student's major department; their Dean; the Office of Academic Affairs; the Registrar's Office; and the Dean of Students. If the most recent charge **was** appealed, copies of the letter will be sent to those individuals and also the Reporting Person for the most recent charge; that Reporting Person's Chair or Director; and that Reporting Person's Dean. The Chair of the APC will share the letter with the APC through a secure messaging platform.

G. Appealing Sanctions Imposed by the APC for Repeated Academic Misconduct

Students may appeal any sanction imposed by the APC for repeated academic misconduct. Once the student receives the letter from the Chair of the APC notifying them of the additional sanction(s), they have ten (10) working days to e-mail a written appeal of the sanction to PROVOST@salisbury.edu. The appeal should include a reasoned case for why the APC's sanction should be overturned; for instance, that additional evidence became available after the APC met on the case(s), or there were significant procedural irregularities in how they were handled.

The Provost will review the written appeal and documentation associated with the charge(s) and may take any action necessary to complete a comprehensive review of the case(s). The Provost's decision is final and binding on all parties.

The Provost's Office will send a letter via University e-mail to the student to inform them of the Provost's decision. Copies of the letter will be sent, also by University e-mail, to the most recent Reporting Person; that Reporting Person's Chair or Director; that Reporting Person's Dean; the Chair or Director of the student's major department; the Dean responsible for the major department; the Office of Academic Affairs; the Registrar's Office; the Dean of Students; and the Chair of the APC. The Chair of the APC will share the letter with the APC through a secure messaging platform.

H. Academic Misconduct Hold on Student Record

During the period in which a student academic misconduct case is pending a final decision or while a student has not completed sanctions imposed in a resolved case, the University may place a hold on the student's record that prevents the release of a transcript or the conferral of a degree. The student will be notified that a hold has been placed as well as the reasons it has been applied. This hold will be removed once the academic misconduct process has been resolved and/or the student's sanctions have been satisfied. The Registrar's Office is responsible for removing the hold in a timely manner.

I. Admission to other USM Institutions During Suspension or After Expulsion

In accordance with the University System of Maryland's Board of Regents Policy III-1.00, Section II.F, when students are suspended by any institution in the University System of Maryland because they have failed to follow the principles of academic integrity, they shall not be admitted to any other System institution during the period of the suspension. Students expelled for these same reasons by any institution in the University System of Maryland shall not be admitted to any other System institution for a period of at least one year from the effective date of expulsion.

J. Maintenance of Records Relating to Academic Misconduct

1. Office of Academic Affairs

The Office of Academic Affairs shall maintain all documentation relating to academic misconduct Incident Reports and subsequent appeals for five (5) years.

2. Academic Policies Committee

The APC does not hold documents related to academic misconduct charges for extended periods of time. The Office of Academic Affairs provides materials for a case to the APC (see **Section III.D.4** above) by posting them on a Canvas/MyClasses course restricted to the committee's current members and administrative support staff. The Chair of the APC is responsible for ensuring that only current committee members have access to this course and for deleting case files after final decisions have been reached.

AMMENDMENT:

It is proposed to amend the proposed Academic Integrity Policy with the following edits.

Academic Integrity Policy

Academic integrity is the commitment to and demonstration of ethical behaviors that ensure learning is authentic, so students acquire the knowledge, competencies, and responsibilities that the University strives to teach. This, along with personal integrity, is one of the commitments students make in the Salisbury University Promise, essential to sustaining a community where mutual trust allows ideas to be freely exchanged and genuine, transformative learning can be achieved. The processes by which integrity is upheld assume clear communication of the University's expectations, standards and policies.

All members of the University community—students, faculty, and staff—are expected to be guided by such principles of integrity. The general rule is that "your work must be your own," observing fundamental values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility and courage (see the International Center for Academic Integrity's description). Learning how to apply these during academic work is an aspect of Ethical Reasoning, one of the Student Learning Outcomes that form the core curriculum of the University, which prepares students to perform well in professional settings.

In cases where it appears academic integrity may have been violated, that is considered a potential case of academic misconduct. Such cases will be handled as described in the Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedures below.

RESPONSIBILITIES FOR ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

A. Faculty and Staff

Faculty and staff members are responsible for attending to whether students carry out their academic work with integrity. Where students do not perform in accordance with our community standards and commit academic misconduct, faculty and staff have a further responsibility to take appropriate action in accordance with the procedures set out below.

One of our General Education Student Learning Outcomes is Ethical Reasoning. In our general education program, faculty are responsible for teaching Ethical Reasoning Faculty should make their academic integrity expectations (including the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI)) clear, and make reasonable ethical standards that foster integrity appropriate to their courses. Where students fail to meet the required standards, as in other academic endeavors, faculty are responsible for determining appropriate sanctions for misconduct.

B. Students

Students share responsibility with faculty and staff for academic integrity. They are to make all reasonable efforts to avoid academic misconduct and encourage academic integrity in others by their own example. When a student suspects academic misconduct has occurred, they have the responsibility and right to bring this to the attention of the instructor of the course or other appropriate authority (see **Section III.B** below).

To avoid committing misconduct, students are responsible for carefully attending to course policies and procedures designed to ensure academic integrity and following them to the best of their ability. If a student has a question or is unclear about whether something is misconduct, they should ask their instructor for clarification.

Students are responsible for ensuring that, if they do violate our community standards for academic integrity, they improve their understanding of appropriate conduct and act accordingly. Multiple incidents of academic misconduct on a student's record may lead to suspension or expulsion from the University.

Academic Misconduct Policies and Procedures

I. PURPOSE

The following policies and procedures provide clear courses of action for faculty as well as students in situations where academic integrity is in question. When such events occur, touching on the fundamental moral principles of our community, breaches of standards can provoke strong reactions in any individual involved. These procedures have therefore been crafted to provide time for reflection and communication between the parties

involved as well as additional oversight for disputed cases, which should foster efforts to model and teach Ethical Responsibility.

These policies and procedures apply to all students, graduate as well as undergraduate. They apply to course work carried out remotely or through digital platforms; in laboratory, studio, performance, or field settings; or during professional placement, as well as in more traditional classroom settings. Policies related to faculty misconduct in scholarly work are found in Chapter 7 of the Faculty Handbook.

II. DEFINITIONS

When a student has not followed the principles of academic integrity at Salisbury University, this is considered an instance of academic misconduct. Most fundamentally, a student may not submit as their own any work that has been prepared by others since, in such cases, the student's own learning cannot be meaningfully assessed. Receiving appropriate or instructor-approved assistance from others, such as librarians, tutors, or members of a course work group, does not constitute misconduct.

The commoner forms of academic misconduct, such as cheating and plagiarism, are defined below, but these are not the only ways academic integrity can be violated. For instance, students may not submit work they have done in another course, even if it is a course they are taking again, without the explicit permission of all course instructors. Other actions that can be seen as violating the principles of academic integrity may also be grounds for a charge of academic misconduct.

A. Cheating: fraud, deceit or dishonesty in any academic course or exercise; or using unauthorized or undisclosed materials or information; this may include generative AI-produced content. Examples of cheating include, but are not limited to: receiving unauthorized aid from another person on assessments such as quizzes, tests, or projects; using or consulting unauthorized materials, methods, software tools, or devices; and/or working on assessments outside of specified time constraints.

B. Plagiarism: presenting information or ideas from another source as one's own or without appropriate attribution, whether done intentionally or unintentionally, as well as other acts generally recognized as using another's work without giving them due credit. Misrepresenting AI-generated content as one's own original work, by failing to disclose and properly document the tool used, may be considered plagiarism.

C. Fabrication: the falsification or invention of information in any course or academic exercise; for example, making up or manipulating data to support a research hypothesis. This may also include the use of AI-generated content that is demonstrably untrue or "hallucinated."

D. Misappropriation of Course-Based Intellectual Property: course-based intellectual property includes any materials instructors create and distribute

to their students, including lectures and assessment materials such as tests. Such items are protected by Federal copyright law. Misappropriation is the act of intentionally taking an instructor's intellectual property and using it, without the express consent or permission of the instructor, for personal gain. This may be through the sale, exchange, or distribution of class notes and assessment materials for commercial purposes, either directly or through a third party such as a website.

E. Facilitating Academic Misconduct: intentionally helping or attempting to help another commit academic misconduct.

It is also important to understand the timing of events in the following procedures. Certain actions are expected to take place within a certain time frame. If, however, there are extenuating circumstances, minor deviations from the set schedule should not constitute a procedural irregularity.

F. Working Day: weekdays when the University is open for business, usually Monday through Friday.

III. PROCEDURES

The following procedures are designed to assure fundamental fairness and due process, and to protect students from inadequately considered, arbitrary, or capricious disciplinary action.

A. Confidentiality

Charges of academic misconduct must be treated as confidential, in accordance with FERPA. If an individual feels they need advice on how to handle an incident, they should reach out to their department chair or program director; a member of the Academic Policies Committee (APC); and/or the Associate Vice-President of Academic Affairs and Student Success. Where possible, it is best to discuss prospective cases without identifying the specific student involved.

Do not discuss the case with other students, not even as a cautionary tale. The only exception is when misconduct involves collusion between or the participation of multiple students, who are already aware of the identities of their co-conspirators. Even in these cases, a separate Incident Report should be filed for each student, and the other students being charged should not be specifically named in the report or supporting documentation.

To maintain confidentiality, any and all written communications regarding academic misconduct **must** be conveyed through official Salisbury University email messages or a secure, University-specified digital platform (such as Canvas/MyClasses or Maxient). Face-to-face conversations should be held privately; if an additional witness is desired, the chair/director is recommended. In-person conversations must be documented by sending an e-mail summary of the conversation to the student shortly afterwards; such messages should be part of the supporting documentation included with an Incident Report.

B. Who May File an Academic Misconduct Incident Report

All members of the Salisbury University community have the responsibility to make incidents of academic misconduct known. In cases where misconduct is observed or otherwise comes to the attention of students, staff, or faculty who are not the instructor of the course involved, they should communicate their concerns and information to the instructor of the course. If they don't know who the instructor is, they should communicate with the Associate Vice-President of Academic Affairs and Student Success or the Dean of Students, who will then share the concerns and information with the appropriate instructor(s).

Any University employee in an instructional relationship with a student (hereafter "Reporting Person") may file an Incident Report. This includes, but is not limited to, course instructors, field directors, field supervisors, program directors, program chairs, school directors, department chairs, and deans.

Students or staff who report academic misconduct need to understand that anonymity cannot be guaranteed if a case progresses to an appeal. Those accused of misconduct have a right to know what evidence supports the charge against them. The Reporting Person should explain this to their informant and, whenever possible, provide evidence from their own observations and/or the assessments in question to support the charge. If informant testimony and anonymity are considered crucial to the case, the Reporting Person should contact the Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs and Student Success to develop plans for future communication and process.

C. Reporting Cases of Academic Misconduct

When a Reporting Person suspects that a student has committed an act of academic misconduct, they shall carry out the following actions, in the order listed.

1. Reporting Person Advises the Student of the Charge

a. The Reporting Person will advise the student in person or via a secure messaging platform (see **Section III.A** above) of the accusation within ten (10) working days of the discovery of the misconduct.

Note: The Reporting Person may choose to inform the student in person, but the accusation must also be documented in writing to the student (via secure University e-mail or MyClasses).

b. After the Reporting Person has advised the student of the accusation, the Reporting Person must allow the student five (5) working days to respond to the charge.

Reporting Persons **must** wait five full working days after informing the student of the accusation **before** submitting an Incident Report, and they may consider a student's response to the allegation, if a response is received. If, however, the Reporting Person

directly observes misconduct with clearly specified course-based sanctions—for instance, they see a student using a phone to cheat during an exam, for which the sanction is a grade of zero—they may accuse the student immediately, even if other students are present, and inform them that the sanction will be applied. The accusation should still be documented in writing as described above, and the student given the five days to make a considered response before an Incident Report is submitted.

2. Reporting Person Submits Academic Misconduct Incident Report

If, **after** the process described above, the Reporting Person concludes that a student has committed academic misconduct, they are expected to submit an Incident Report via the Maxient platform using this online form. The Incident Report should be submitted no later than ten (10) working days after the student was first notified of the accusation.

Unless there is a course policy communicated through the syllabus that clearly sets out how minor sanctions (less than an F for the assignment) for academic misconduct considered "teachable moments" will be determined and applied, any time an instructor finds that a student has committed academic misconduct and decides to apply a sanction, they must submit an Incident Report. Because of the confidentiality required for such charges, Incident Reports are the only way we can identify students who repeatedly violate our standards of academic integrity. This provides opportunities for additional intervention and/or sanctions, to ensure that our community's ethical standards are understood and practiced.

The Academic Misconduct Incident Report form requires, in addition to identification of the Reporting Person, the student, the course where the misconduct took place, and the date of the misconduct, the following information:

a. **a brief description** of the incident;

b. **the sanction imposed**. The options include:

i. **Warning**;

ii. **Reduction in the grade** recorded for the assignment, test, quiz, etc.;

iii. Issuance of **an "F" on the assignment**, test, quiz, etc.;

iv. Issuance of **an "F" in the course and removal** from the course (see **Section III.E.1** below for a description of the further consequences of this sanction); or

v. **Other**: these should be detailed at the end of the description of the incident and may include a recommendation to the student's program director or chair that the student be suspended or dismissed from an accredited program (see **Section III.E.2** below); and

c. **whether** the misconduct is considered **a minor violation**.

Determining appropriate sanctions for academic misconduct is one of the responsibilities of Reporting Persons, and where discussion with more experienced faculty (see **Section III.A** above) may be helpful. Consideration should be given to the scale and severity of the

Commented [AB1]: Can a faculty member apply multiple sanctions from this list - such as, you earn a zero on this section of the exam and you are ineligible to complete redos of this and future exams? I am not sure this statement indicates that is ok

Commented [AB2R1]: Since I posted this, I asked a few other faculty if they thought they could impose more than one sanction, and some said that if I found out the answer to that, I should let them know because they were not sure based on how the policy was worded.

Commented [AB3]: Is that only your chair? Actually my chair is less experienced than I am… I thought it was not a violation of FERPA to talk in general with your colleagues about how to handle a situation - but somewhere else the policy seems to indicate only your chair for discussions, so I am concerned this could be confusing - and problematic in terms of whether a faculty member violated the policy.

specific form of misconduct committed, and the extent to which it might have influenced the student's grade for the course. Standards in the course's discipline and where a student is in their educational career may also be taken into account. While faculty should strive to apply sanctions equitably, it is not necessarily inappropriate to give significantly different sanctions to, for instance, a first-semester freshman plagiarizing in ENGL 103 and a junior English major plagiarizing in a professional writing course. Once the Academic Misconduct Incident Report has been filed, the Reporting Person cannot increase the sanction imposed, but they may choose to reduce it. They may also choose to withdraw the Incident Report altogether if new evidence warrants doing so.

Commented [AB4]: Could this become a logistical nightmare?

The Reporting Person may adjust the student's grade to reflect the sanction chosen after submitting the Incident Report, with the understanding that if the student appeals the charge (see **Section III.D** below) and their appeal is upheld, their grade is to be recalculated to remove the sanction. If an allegation of misconduct occurs near the end of the academic term, the Reporting Person should consider how to post the student's final grade for the course, should that be due before the report may be filed or before the appeal process can be completed. The final grade should not include the sanction prior to the submission of the Incident Report. If final grades are required after the accusation and before reporting, an Incomplete should be given. If the student appeals the charge and the final grade for the course included the sanction and the student's appeal is upheld, the final course grade may need to be changed in GullNet. In these situations, the student may be given an Incomplete that is changed to a grade after the Incident Report is filed and/or it is known whether the sanction is upheld.

Formatted: Font: Calibri, Underline

It is recommended that a designation of a sanction as "minor" be aligned with less serious sanctions, such as a reduction in grade for the assignment. Designating misconduct as "minor" does not alter the University's internal procedures for such incidents. Multiple charges, even if minor, will be referred to the APC (see **Section III.F** below) for consideration of additional sanctions. It will, however, restrict external reporting (say, to a potential employer or graduate program) of the misconduct to one calendar year from the date of the Incident Report. This cannot, of course, overturn any release of information required by federal law or subpoena.

The Incident Report should be accompanied by **supporting materials** that document pertinent details of the case. These allow the APC to expeditiously consider appeals and cases where students have been charged more than once, sometimes years apart. At a minimum, the supporting documents should include:

d. **the course syllabus**: this should include some description of the assignment where the misconduct occurred and an academic integrity policy;

e. **evidence of the misconduct**: this might include written testimony, images, or video of observed illicit behavior or objects; Turnitin reports or other documentation illustrating unauthorized copying of another's work or

falsification; and/or other kinds of information that justify the charge; and

f. **copies of all correspondence** with the student regarding the incident, including the written accusation (see **Section III.C.1.b** above). It is advisable to send the student written summations of any other in-person conversations shortly after they take place and provide these as well.

Copies of all documentation will be shared with the student digitally after the Incident Report has been received. There is no need for the Reporting Person to provide the student with printed copies, which can create risks to confidentiality.

If the supporting documentation contains items that should not be freely available to the student, such as assessment materials or correspondence naming individuals (such as student informants) whose anonymity must be protected, the Reporting Person should not include the material that needs to remain secure with the report and check the relevant box on the digital form. Someone from the Office of Academic Affairs will reach out to identify the material that should not be shared and ~~advise on what protections are possible~~ work with the instructor to determine the plan for availability of this material.

3. Office of Academic Affairs Notifies Student of Charge and Appeal Options

The Office of Academic Affairs will, within five (5) working days after the Incident Report is submitted, send a letter via University e-mail to the student to inform them of the charge, the sanction, and their right to appeal. The letter will provide:
a. the date the Incident Report was submitted;

b. the name of the Reporting Person;

c. the type of academic misconduct they have been accused of;

d. the sanction imposed; and

e. digital copies of the supporting documentation submitted with the report (see **Section III.C.2.d–f** above), with the exception of secure assessment or other confidential materials (see **Section III.C.2, final paragraph** above).

Copies of the letter (without the Incident Report or supporting documentation) will be sent, also via University e-mail, to the Reporting Person; the Reporting Person's Chair or Director; the Chair or Director of the student's major department; the Registrar's Office; and the Dean of Students.

If the student has any prior academic misconduct violations, both the new charge and the documents related to their past cases will automatically be referred to the APC (see **Section III.F** below). The APC will determine whether additional sanctions are appropriate, given the repeated nature of the misconduct.

D. Appealing a Charge of Academic Misconduct

Students who have been charged with academic misconduct have the right to contest that charge when they can provide one or more of the following:

a. evidence suggesting that the charge of misconduct is false;

b. evidence of significant procedural irregularities in how the Reporting Person charged and/or reported them for misconduct; and/or

c. new information that has come to light since the Reporting Person submitted the report, which might have affected the decision to charge the student and/or the sanction imposed.

If a student does not appeal a charge of academic misconduct, the sanction stands and the documents related to the case will be held by the Office of Academic Affairs for five (5) years (see **Section H** below). After five years, the records of the charge will be deleted.

Students seeking advice and guidance about an appeal should contact their School Advising Coordinator. (To find the appropriate coordinator, visit the Academic Advising website and click on the title of your school on the left.) Students should **not** ask the Reporting Person for advice about their appeal.

When a student chooses to appeal, the following actions are to be carried out, in the order listed.

1. Student Appeals the Academic Misconduct Charge

Once the student receives the letter from the Office of Academic Affairs notifying them of the charge and sanction, they have five (5) working days to e-mail a written appeal of the charge to integrity@salisbury.edu. The appeal shall include the grounds for the appeal (a, b, and/or c above) and any other information the student feels is pertinent to the case.

We cannot recommend using generative AI, such as Chat-GPT or Claude, to write an appeal letter. **Students must be aware that if they provide their Academic Misconduct Report to a public-facing AI, the information in the report will be incorporated into its database, and others will then have access to that information**. University records of misconduct are deleted after five years; AI databases may continue to disclose that information decades later.

When the charge is related to an active course, the student should continue to participate fully in the course during the appeal process, even if the sanction imposed is issuance of an F and removal from the course. Should, however, the relevant department chair, program director, and/or dean have grounds to believe the student's continued presence compromises the safety or integrity of the instructional environment, they have the discretion to remove the student from the course for the duration of the appeals process. Confidentiality is to be preserved as far as is practicable in this eventuality, and the student provided a reasonable opportunity to attend an alternative section of the course or other options for making up any coursework missed during the appeal process.

2. Office of Academic Affairs Notifies Reporting Person of the Appeal

The Office of Academic Affairs will, within five (5) working days after appeal is submitted, notify the Reporting Person of the appeal.

3. Reporting Person Responds to the Appeal (optional)

The Reporting Person will then have five (5) working days to respond in writing to the student's appeal, if they wish, via an e-mail sent to integrity@salisbury.edu. A response should specifically address the grounds for appeal stated by the student, as well as any other relevant claims or countercharges made in the appeal. The response may include further information supporting the charge or sanction that was not included in the supporting documentation for the Incident Report.

4. Academic Policies Committee Considers the Appeal

The Office of Academic Affairs will, through a secure messaging platform, provide all the documents pertaining to the case to the APC. This will include documentation for the student's prior academic misconduct violations, if any.

The Chair of the APC will review these materials to ensure they are complete and notify the other committee members of the pending appeal. The committee will have fifteen (15) working days to review, discuss, and render a decision on an appeal, unless it chooses to pursue an investigation (see **Section III.D.4.b** below) or hold a hearing (see **Section III.D.4.c** below).

The APC normally meets biweekly during the Spring and Fall semesters; it also meets at other times as needed, including in January and over the summer, to ensure timely decisions for these cases. A quorum of voting members (at least 5 out of 9) must be present at a meeting to render a decision. In cases where a quorum cannot be assembled, the Chair of the APC and/or the Office of Academic Affairs may recruit ad hoc members (preferentially past or incoming members of the APC) to provide adequate representation and review.

Once documentation for a case has been reviewed, the APC takes one of the following actions.

a. **Issue a Written Decision**

When the information provided by the Reporting Person and student is adequate to judge the merits of a case, the APC will weigh the evidence and reach a decision through a majority vote. The evidentiary standard used is a preponderance of the evidence. It will then issue a written decision on the appeal no more than five (5) working days after the meeting where the vote was taken.

The Chair of the APC will send a letter via University e-mail to the student to inform them of the committee's decision. Copies of the letter will be sent, also by University e-mail, to the Reporting Person; the Reporting Person's Chair or Director; the Reporting Person's Dean; the Chair or Director of the student's major department; the Dean responsible for the major department; the Office of Academic Affairs; the Registrar's Office; and the Dean

of Students. The Chair of the APC will share the letter with the APC through a secure messaging platform.

For student appeals of faculty-imposed sanctions, the decision of the APC regarding the appeal is final. If the student's appeal is denied, the Reporting Person's sanction is to be imposed. If the student's appeal is upheld, the academic misconduct charge is removed from their record and the sanction is not to be imposed.

b. **Conduct an Investigation**

In some cases, the information provided by the Reporting Person and/or the student is not sufficient for the committee to render a decision. If this is the case, the Chair of APC will notify the student and the Reporting Person via University e-mail that the APC is opening an investigation into the case.

The Chair of the APC and/or other designated members of the committee will request and collect the additional information required; this may be through written requests and/or interviews with individuals connected to the case. The APC will make every effort to conclude its investigation within ten (10) working days of the notification sent to open it.

Once the investigation is complete, the APC will meet to consider the student's appeal in light of the additional information gathered. If it is able to reach a decision, it will then issue that decision through the procedure described in **Section III.D.4.a** above.

c. **Conduct a Hearing**

In cases where, even after an investigation, further information is required, such as when an individual has not responded to requests for materials or an interview; or when the case presents complexities that would benefit from a dialogue of testimony from the individuals involved, the APC may choose to conduct a hearing.

The Chair of the APC will notify the student, the Reporting Person, and other individuals whose presence at the hearing is required, via University e-mail, that the APC will conduct a hearing on the case. The Chair will also arrange the date, time, and location of the hearing in consultation with those individuals. The hearing should be held within ten (10) working days of notification of the intent to conduct the hearing.

i. The hearing shall be held at a reasonable time when all parties (to the extent possible) are available or have an opportunity to be present. The hearing may be held in-person or virtually (for instance, through Microsoft Teams).

ii. The hearing shall be closed, with attendance limited to individuals directly connected with the case as determined by the Chair of APC. If held virtually, the hearing may not be recorded by any attendees. Attendees will be informed of their responsibilities to maintain confidentiality in writing before the hearing; they must acknowledge and affirm these by their signature before attending.

iii. Students are permitted to seek the support of a non-legal advocate for assistance in the preparation of their case for the hearing. The advocate may counsel the grievant during the hearing but shall not officially speak or participate formally in the proceedings. In all cases, the advocate must be a member of the University faculty, staff, or student body.

iv. Neither party may be represented by an attorney at the hearing, unless they are facing or are likely to face criminal charges relating to the academic misconduct. Under such circumstances University legal counsel must also be present. At no time may legal counsel give statements or participate in questioning.

v. The student or Reporting Person may request, via University e-mail to the Chair, that specified individuals be invited to appear at the hearing in order to testify on their behalf. Such requests should be made at least five (5) working days before the scheduled hearing.

vi. The Chair is responsible for conducting the hearing in an efficient and decorous manner and shall rule on any disputes related to the procedures used throughout the hearing. At any time, the Chair may seek the advice of University legal counsel.

vii. The student and Reporting Person shall be entitled to make opening and closing statements. The Chair may set reasonable limits on the length and nature of such statements and the evidence presented, which shall apply equally to both parties.

viii. The student and Reporting Person shall be entitled to present evidence through documents and/or witnesses, and to question witnesses. Direct questioning of witnesses by the opposing party may, at the discretion of the Chair, be disallowed. In such a case, the parties will be required to convey their questions to the Chair, who will then put them to witnesses.

ix. The evidence presented should be directly relevant to the academic misconduct charge. (Other grievances that a student may have with an instructor should be handled through the Student Grievance Policy.) If a question arises about the relevance, reasonableness, redundancy, or authenticity of any evidence, the Chair shall decide on its admissibility.

Once the hearing has concluded, the APC will deliberate and render a decision based on a preponderance of the evidence. That decision will be issued through the procedure described in **Section III.D.4.a** above.

E. Further Consequences of Academic Misconduct Sanctions

The Reporting Person's sanction for an incident of academic misconduct shall be applied to the student's grade for the course where the misconduct took place, unless the student appeals and that appeal is upheld by the APC. However, there can be consequences beyond that specific course for a charge of misconduct that is uncontested or upheld.

1. Issuance of an F for the Course and Removal from the Course

When a student has been found to have committed academic misconduct and the sanction imposed was issuance of an F for the course (an "academic misconduct F") and removal from the course, the following policies apply.

a. The student may not withdraw from the course where this sanction was imposed.

b. If the student takes the course again, both the academic misconduct F and the grade earned for later enrollments will be used to calculate the student's GPA.

c. A student with an academic misconduct F may not graduate with University Honors nor serve as a commencement speaker.

d. In most cases, nothing on a student's transcript will indicate that F was due to academic misconduct. However, where the misconduct was so egregious that a lasting record of the ethical breach is considered desirable, the APC may vote to have such a notation placed on the transcript, which can be recommended by a Reporting Person in the Incident Report through the "Other" sanction.

2. Dismissal or Other Sanctions from Accredited Programs

When a student whose major is an accredited program has been found to have committed academic misconduct, the program may impose additional sanctions on the student. In order to do so, the program must have clearly communicated policies and procedures for reviewing such cases and reaching a decision. These additional sanctions, up to and including dismissal from the program, can be recommended by a Reporting Person in the Incident Report through the "Other" sanction; or a review of the incident can be initiated by the accredited program's director or department chair once they have received a copy of the letter notifying the student of the charge (see **Section III.C** above) or of the letter notifying the student of the APC's decision on their appeal (see **Section III.D.4.a** above).

If a student is dismissed from a professional program, the student may appeal that decision by writing a letter of appeal to the Academic Affairs Office.

F. Multiple Recorded Charges of Academic Misconduct

When an academic misconduct Incident Report is submitted, the Office of Academic Affairs will consult its records to see whether the student has any other academic misconduct charges on their record. (Incident Reports that were successfully appealed are not considered.) If they do, the documents concerning the earlier cases will automatically be sent to the APC along with those for the new Incident Report.

When considering such cases, the APC will first deliberate and render a decision on the new misconduct charge (see **Section III.D.4** above). If the student's appeal on that charge is

denied, then the APC will consider all the recorded incidents together and decide whether the student's repeated violation of our community's ethical standards warrants additional sanctions. Where it is felt that students are not taking their responsibility for learning and observing these standards seriously, sanctions may include suspension for a set period of time or even expulsion from the University (see **Section G** below). The APC will then issue a written notification of its decision no more than five (5) working days after the meeting where the vote was taken.

The Chair of the APC will send a letter via University e-mail to the student to inform them of the committee's decision. If the most recent charge **was not** appealed, copies of the letter will be sent, also by University e-mail, to the Chair or Director of the student's major department; their Dean; the Office of Academic Affairs; the Registrar's Office; and the Dean of Students. If the most recent charge **was** appealed, copies of the letter will be sent to those individuals and also the Reporting Person for the most recent charge; that Reporting Person's Chair or Director; and that Reporting Person's Dean. The Chair of the APC will share the letter with the APC through a secure messaging platform.

G. Appealing Sanctions Imposed by the APC for Repeated Academic Misconduct

Students may appeal any sanction imposed by the APC for repeated academic misconduct. Once the student receives the letter from the Chair of the APC notifying them of the additional sanction(s), they have ten (10) working days to e-mail a written appeal of the sanction to PROVOST@salisbury.edu. The appeal should include a reasoned case for why the APC's sanction should be overturned; for instance, that additional evidence became available after the APC met on the case(s), or there were significant procedural irregularities in how they were handled.

The Provost will review the written appeal and documentation associated with the charge(s) and may take any action necessary to complete a comprehensive review of the case(s). The Provost's decision is final and binding on all parties.

The Provost's Office will send a letter via University e-mail to the student to inform them of the Provost's decision. Copies of the letter will be sent, also by University e-mail, to the most recent Reporting Person; that Reporting Person's Chair or Director; that Reporting Person's Dean; the Chair or Director of the student's major department; the Dean responsible for the major department; the Office of Academic Affairs; the Registrar's Office; the Dean of Students; and the Chair of the APC. The Chair of the APC will share the letter with the APC through a secure messaging platform.

H. Academic Misconduct Hold on Student Record

During the period in which a student academic misconduct case is pending a final decision or while a student has not completed sanctions imposed in a resolved case, the University may place a hold on the student's record that prevents the release of a transcript or the conferral of a degree. The student will be notified that a hold has been placed as well as the reasons it has been applied. This hold will be removed once the academic misconduct

process has been resolved and/or the student's sanctions have been satisfied. The Registrar's Office is responsible for removing the hold in a timely manner.

I. Admission to other USM Institutions During Suspension or After Expulsion

In accordance with the University System of Maryland's Board of Regents Policy III-1.00, Section II.F, when students are suspended by any institution in the University System of Maryland because they have failed to follow the principles of academic integrity, they shall not be admitted to any other System institution during the period of the suspension. Students expelled for these same reasons by any institution in the University System of Maryland shall not be admitted to any other System institution for a period of at least one year from the effective date of expulsion.

J. Maintenance of Records Relating to Academic Misconduct

1. Office of Academic Affairs

The Office of Academic Affairs shall maintain all documentation relating to academic misconduct Incident Reports and subsequent appeals for five (5) years.

2. Academic Policies Committee

The APC does not hold documents related to academic misconduct charges for extended periods of time. The Office of Academic Affairs provides materials for a case to the APC (see **Section III.D.4** above) by posting them on a Canvas/MyClasses course restricted to the committee's current members and administrative support staff. The Chair of the APC is responsible for ensuring that only current committee members have access to this course and for deleting case files after final decisions have been reached.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Matt Bailey, Secretary