



Academic Integrity Violation Process 2016-2017 Smeal MBA and Executive MBA Programs

Smeal Honor Code: “We, the Smeal College of Business community, aspire to the highest ethical standards and will hold each other accountable to them. We will not engage in any action that is improper or that creates the appearance of impropriety in our academic lives, and we intend to hold this standard in our future careers.”

The Academic Integrity (AI) Violation process has been designed as a student-driven complement to the Penn State University AI process. With this process, we seek to uphold and represent the Smeal Honor Code, particularly with respect to holding ourselves accountable and the perception of impropriety. The actions of each community member affects and represents the whole. We also aspire to represent our Penn State Values: Integrity, Respect, Responsibility, Discovery, Excellence, and Community.

Definition of Terms

Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) – The AIC will comprise the Academic Integrity Officer, an elected student representative (MBAA VP of Academic Affairs and Student Relations), the MBA Managing Director, and students who have volunteered to be engaged in promoting academic integrity and participating in Review and Appeal Boards. While all MBA students will be trained in academic integrity and the AI violation process during Orientation, service on the AIC and an AI Board will be encouraged but not required. Additional Review and Appeal Board training will be conducted as needed. AIC student membership will be refreshed each semester by the elected student official. The AI Officer will work with faculty to aid on the AIC and for selecting AI Board members.

Academic Integrity Officer – The Faculty Director or a person appointed by the Dean to aid in the promotion of academic integrity and the implementation of the Honor Code.

Advisor – Any person whom the Respondent wishes to have assist in preparing his/her case for the Review or Appeal Board.

Alleged Violation Report – An Alleged Violation Report is a formal report submitted to the Academic Integrity Officer of a potential Infraction against the Honor Code and/or the University’s Code of Conduct.

Boards:

- *Review Board* – A Review Board is a panel of members from the student Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) and faculty appointed by the Academic Integrity Officer to investigate an Alleged Violation Report, decide on the merits of the Alleged Violation Report, determine responsibility for

Infractions outlined in the Alleged Violation Report, and choose the Sanction(s), if any, to be applied. A Review Board consists of two students and one faculty member. A Review Board is chaired by the Academic Integrity Officer, who is a non-voting member. In addition, a professional staff member of the College will serve as the secretary of each Board. S/he will record minutes of the proceedings and request any needed clarity specificity required for executing the Sanction(s).

- *Appeal Board* – An Appeal Board is a panel of members from the student Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) and faculty appointed by the Academic Integrity Officer to hear the appeal of a Respondent who is contesting an Academic Charge or Sanction(s) determined by a Review Board. An Appeal Board consists of three students and two faculty members. An Appeal Board is chaired by the Academic Integrity Officer, who is a non-voting member. In addition, a professional staff member of the College will serve as the secretary of each Board and will record minutes of the proceedings.

Charge – A Charge is the official description of the Academic Integrity Violation to be listed on the University Academic Integrity Form.

Complainant – The Complainant is the person who submits an Alleged Violation Report; there may be more than one person who provides a complaint.

Hearing – A Hearing is a formal review of the merits of the Infraction alleged in an Alleged Violation Report. Hearings held by the Review and Appeal Boards are formal hearings under the procedures defined herein, but are not legal proceedings. A Hearing will result in a decision by the Board about the responsibility of the Respondent for an Infraction and the determination of an Academic and/or Programmatic Sanction(s). The Review Board or Appeal Board may, in addition to Academic or Programmatic sanctions, recommend that the Office of Student Conduct consider Conduct sanctions.

Infraction – Infractions are academic integrity violations of the Honor Code and/or the Code of Conduct. Additionally, any student who has knowledge of an academic integrity violation of the Honor Code, but who does not report the violation, has committed an Infraction.

Respondent – A Respondent is a student who is formally accused of committing an academic integrity violation of the Honor Code.

Sanctions:

- *Academic Sanction* – An Academic Sanction is a classroom-related, usually grading, action imposed by the Review Board for an academic integrity violation of the Honor Code. No Academic Sanction will be imposed without a Hearing.
- *Programmatic Sanction* – A Programmatic Sanction is an action determined by the Review Board for an academic integrity violation of the Honor Code. It relates to consequences outside of the classroom, for example scholarships/GAs/Fellowships, or other programmatic services or privileges. Example sanctions are listed in the [Academic Integrity Violation Sanction Options](#) section.
- *Conduct Sanction* – A Conduct Sanction is an additional action determined by and handed down only by the Penn State University Office of Student Conduct under the University's Code of Conduct (<http://studentaffairs.psu.edu/conduct/>).

Violation Disclosure Notice – All Infractions heard by Review and Appeal Boards will be reported to the Smeal College community through an AI Violation Disclosure. Violation Disclosures will report in writing the general nature of any Hearing and the outcome of the Hearing. To protect the rights of the Respondent, the Respondent will not be identified nor will there be sufficient information to allow other parties to identify the Respondent. Disclosure notices will be sent within 24 hours of each case's resolution. Violation Disclosure release dates, however, may vary due to case specific details and appeal

procedures. The notices should seek to maintain all students' confidentiality, show consequences for violations, and help the community learn from one another. At the end of each semester, a summary notice may be sent including both violation summaries as well as positive examples of integrity within the program.

Witness – A Witness is any individual who can provide information about an Alleged Violation Report.

Academic Integrity Violation Process (AI)

Nature of the Faculty-Student Relationship

The primary relationship in education is that between the faculty member teaching a course and the student taking the course. The AI process is not intended to diminish this relationship in any way. Faculty members are expected to meet with students about potential academic integrity violations. Faculty members are then asked to report all potential violations to the appropriate Academic Integrity Officer. This reporting will ensure both consistency in the administration of sanctions and transparency in the reporting of violations. When a faculty member believes a violation has occurred, he or she will share with both the student and the Academic Integrity Officer the level of Academic Sanction he or she believes is appropriate.

Submission of Alleged Violation Reports

The academic integrity process begins with the submission of an Alleged Violation Report to the Academic Integrity Officer. Any party (student, faculty, staff, or administrator) who observes a perceived Academic Integrity Infraction against the Honor Code may make such a submission. Additionally, students may self-report Infractions. When a faculty member observes a potential violation in his/her course, s/he will speak with the respondent before filing a formal Alleged Violation Report.

Students witnessing or aware of an Academic Integrity Infraction by another student (or students) are encouraged, but not required, to discuss the concern directly with their classmate(s) or hold a confidential meeting with the Academic Integrity Officer or elected student official with academic integrity responsibility (MBAA VP of Academic Affairs and Student Relations) before filing a formal Alleged Violation Report. Any student determined to have knowledge of an Academic Integrity Infraction who does not report it is in violation of the Honor Code.

Review of Alleged Violation Reports

The Academic Integrity Officer will review the Alleged Violation Report with the elected student who shares responsibility for the academic integrity process in a program (MBAA VP of Academic Affairs and Student Relations) and the MBA/EMBA Managing Director. Together they will determine if evidence reasonably supports moving forward to a Review Board. In general, if evidence is sufficient, convening a Review Board is the default position, rather than trying to resolve without a Hearing.

Review Board Hearing

Within one week of receipt of the Alleged Violation Report, the Academic Integrity Officer will appoint a Review Board and conduct a hearing within one additional week. Academic Integrity Officer will chair the Review Board, and Program Office staff will schedule the time and place of the Review Board Hearing.

All Review and Appeal Board members will be provided copies of the [Academic Integrity Violation Sanction Options](#) (for Academic and Programmatic Sanctions) and the [Penn State Sanctioning Guidelines](#) prior to Hearings, and they will agree to review these documents to aid interpretation and decision making. All individuals are expected to keep confidential all discussions and proceedings.

During the Hearing, the Review Board will investigate the Alleged Violation to determine if the Respondent(s) may be responsible for the alleged Infraction(s), and, when appropriate, recommend an Academic or Programmatic Sanction(s). The investigation should begin with a thorough reading and understanding of the Alleged Violation Report. With the aid of the Academic Integrity Officer, the Review Board members may gather whatever information they need to determine the merits of the Alleged Violation Report, including questioning the Respondent(s), the Complainant(s), and any Witnesses. The Review Board may call any Witnesses necessary and may question such Witnesses about the alleged Infraction. Witnesses will not be allowed to sit in on the Hearing apart from the time in which they are giving their testimony. Should the Review Board have any additional questions of the Complainant(s), those questions will be presented following the questioning of Witnesses. The Review Board may also discuss the alleged Violation with the faculty member of the course in which the alleged Violation occurred to obtain any information the faculty member may have as well as the faculty member's recommendation of what Sanction(s) might be appropriate if the alleged Violation is found to have occurred.

On the basis of the information gathered, the Review Board will make a determination whether it is reasonable to believe that the Respondent(s) is responsible for the Alleged Violation. In cases where the Respondent(s) admits responsibility, this determination is automatic.

Once a decision has been made about responsibility, the Review Board will consider Sanction(s). The Review Board will use the [Academic Integrity Violation Sanction Options](#) (for Academic and Programmatic Sanctions) and [Penn State Sanctioning Guidelines](#) lists to determine the Sanction(s). Once determined, the Review Board will receive information regarding the Respondent(s)' prior conduct history related to Violations of Academic Integrity. When appropriate, the recommended Sanction(s) may be modified to reflect the prior violation(s). A University Academic Integrity Form will then be completed. The form will indicate the Academic Integrity Violation as well as the recommended Sanction(s). The Respondent(s) will be asked to review the form and decide if he/she wishes to accept or contest the Charge and/or the Sanction(s). If there is interest in contesting the Charge or Sanction(s), the case will be referred to an Appeal Board.

The Review Board may also conclude that the Respondent(s) has committed an Infraction that could call for a Conduct Sanction. In such instances, the Review Board will refer the matter to the Professional Integrity Process and/or Penn State's Office of Student Conduct, which will handle the case under its own procedures for potential Conduct Sanctions. Any Academic or Programmatic Sanction imposed by the Review Board will take effect regardless of other actions by the Program or the Office of Student Conduct.

Review and Appeal Boards require a majority to recommend any Sanction(s). Sanctions available to the Review Board are Academic Sanctions, Programmatic Sanctions, and recommendations to the Office of Student Conduct to consider Conduct Sanctions. The Review Board may not impose Conduct Sanctions such as expulsion from Penn State University. A list of available Sanctions is available up to and

including termination from the Penn State Smeal MBA/EMBA program. The Review Board should be as specific as possible about Sanction details and implementation when recommending Sanctions. The Academic Integrity Officer and Program Office will implement any Sanctions with their best interpretation of the Board's intent.

Once the Review Board has determined the Charge and Sanction(s), the Academic Integrity Officer will meet with the Respondent as soon as possible to explain the decisions of the Review Board regarding responsibility and the possible sanctioning. The Respondent(s) will be provided with the Academic Integrity Form and will have five business days to make a decision. If the Respondent(s) accepts the decisions of the Review Board, the Respondent(s) will sign the form acknowledging acceptance; if the Respondent(s) disagrees with these decisions, the student may contest to an Appeal Board. If the Respondent(s) chooses not to respond in the five business day period, the process will continue as if the student accepted the Charge and Sanction(s).

Appeal Board

If a Respondent(s) does not accept the decisions of a Review Board, the Academic Integrity Officer will appoint and chair an Appeal Board. The MBA Program office will schedule the proceedings within one week. The Appeal Board will be given information provided to the Review Board and will have the opportunity to ask for additional information from the Review Board. With this information, the Appeal Board will follow the same Hearing procedures as a Review Board. The decision of the Appeal Board is final except when the recommended Sanction is termination from the program; in such cases the Respondent(s) may appeal to the Dean of the College whose decision about dismissal will be final.

Rights of a Respondent

Any Respondent will have the right to appear before a Review or Appeal Board. The Academic Integrity Officer will notify a Respondent of the composition of the Review Board before the Review Board meets. The Respondent has the right to challenge any member of the Review Board based on perceived bias against the Respondent. The Academic Integrity Officer will make the decision on the merits of the challenge; this decision by the Academic Integrity Officer is final.

Each Respondent will be given the opportunity to see all information collected for a Review Board. The Respondent will be allowed to present his/her defense at the Review Board, including questioning the Complainant(s). However, the Review Board will closely monitor the questioning of a Complainant by a Respondent and may stop the questioning if it becomes inappropriate or irrelevant to the proceeding. A Respondent is allowed to bring an Adviser to a Hearing, but no additional parties will be allowed in a closed Hearing.

Faculty Involvement in Hearings

No faculty member in whose course an Alleged Infraction occurs may take part in the Review/Appeal Board of that Infraction. The faculty member to whose course the Alleged Violation Report relates will be asked to submit his/her recommendation as to appropriate Sanctioning should the Review Board find that the Respondent committed the Infraction.

If the faculty member to whose course the Alleged Violation Report relates is also the Academic Integrity Officer and if the Respondent(s) believes there is a conflict of interest, a substitute for the AI Officer should be found to conduct the proceedings.

Disclosure of Outcomes

In order to foster a transparent environment in the Smeal College, outcomes of Review Board Hearings will be periodically disclosed. Such disclosures will generally take place within 24 hours of the Hearing's conclusion and will be written to provide information to the community without releasing information that identifies the people involved in the incident. Releasable information includes the nature of the Infraction, the results of the Review/Appeal Board about whether a violation was judged to have occurred, and any Sanction(s) given. An end-of-semester notice may be written to include a summary and include positive examples of integrity within the program.

Timing / AI Process Priority

Due to the critical nature of these proceedings, every effort will be made to prioritize and speed the process while ensuring it is fair and aligned with our Penn State Values. To aid scheduling, the MBA program office has responsibility for scheduling Review Board and Appeal Board Hearings and any other associated meetings or activities.

Confidentiality

Review/Appeal Boards: All Review and Appeal Board members must keep their participation and proceedings confidential. This includes: participation on a Board, names of the Respondent(s), Complainant(s), Witness(es), any other associated parties, the nature of cases, and all other elements of Review or Appeal Board participation.

Respondent: A Respondent should not reveal his/her name, the names of students serving on Review/Appeal Boards, nor any information about an investigation or its proceedings.

Witness: A Witness should not reveal that s/he has reported an incident, nor information about the Respondent(s) or any proceedings.

Process Revisions

To continue evolving our understanding and implementation of the Honor Code, this process is intended to be updated every 3 years. Updates include:

June 2015 – Student, alumni, faculty, staff major update of process, timing, and sanctioning guidelines.

July 2016 – Minor update to include multiple Respondent scenarios.

Penn State Resource Websites

Integrity at Smeal

<http://www.smeal.psu.edu/integrity>

Graduate University Bulletin - Conduct

<http://bulletins.psu.edu/graduate/appendices/>

Penn State Academic Integrity Policy

<http://www.psu.edu/oue/aappm/G-9-academic-integrity.html>

Penn State Code of Conduct

<http://studentaffairs.psu.edu/conduct/codeofconduct/>

Penn State Sanctioning Guidelines for Violations of Academic Integrity

<http://www.psu.edu/oue/aappm/G-9.pdf>

Penn State Values

<http://www.universityethics.psu.edu/universityethics/values/values.cfm>

University Faculty Senate Policies Section 49-20: Academic Integrity

<http://senate.psu.edu/policies-and-rules-for-undergraduate-students/47-00-48-00-and-49-00-grades/>

Academic Integrity Violation Sanction Options

As your Review/Appeal board considers Sanctions, please keep the following principles in mind:

- a. Intention matters. To the degree possible, consider a distinction in Sanctions between someone with intent to cheat versus someone who made a mistake. Consider the student’s level of contrition and personal responsibility, opportunity for learning, and overall conduct.
- b. Consider whether to include the assignment weight in the Sanction discussion. You may consider the severity of the violation itself, regardless of the weight of the assignment in which it was committed, or you may consider the assignment’s weight as part of the violation.
- c. Consider how you discuss equity norms:
 - i. One principle of past Boards is the consideration that no one who cheated gets a higher grade than someone who didn’t. Even if it is a minor offense, if the class’ low grade is a B, should the Academic Sanction require being beneath it?
 - ii. If a Violation involves multiple students (ex. collaboration) and you determine loss of GA/Fellowship as one Sanction, consider allowing disparity in students. If only one student has a GA/Fellowship, it is acceptable that this penalty apply to only this student as the GA/Fellowship is a privilege requiring significant responsibility and accountability.
- d. As you deliberate and finalize your decisions, consider the following summary question: “With these recommendations, are we acting consistent with our Penn State Smeal MBA values?” ([Penn State Values](#): Integrity, Respect, Responsibility, Discovery, Excellence, Community)

Academic Sanctions	Programmatic Sanctions
Can be determined by Review/Appeal Board (see PSU Sanctioning Guidelines)	Can be determined by Review/Appeal Board AI Officer and Program Office will implement with their best interpretation of the Board’s intent.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Warning • Redo assignment/exam • Reduced grade or 0 on assignment/ exam • 0 for participation • Reduced class grade • F in class • Program termination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GA/Fellowship or Scholarship revocation, immediate, without possible renewal • Required meeting(s) with faculty or managing director, or other relevant party for coaching and understanding of community repercussions • Written case study to aid future students who may face a similar situation • Community service time – working with Honor and Integrity Office or another relevant activity for specified hours/timeframe/deliverable • Restricted access to career or alumni services • Faculty requested not to give references for the student • Exclusion from case competition/conference funding opportunities • Exclusion from pre-commencement activities/ceremonies • Incident referred to the Office of Student Conduct as a Code of Conduct violation, leading to Conduct Sanctions such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Disciplinary warning, "XF" transcript notation, probation, suspension, expulsion, and indefinite expulsion

Academic Integrity Violation Sanction History

Reported Violations	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	Grand Total
Cheating	1				1		2
Plagiarism	1					1 team	2
Unauthorized Collaboration					2 teams		2
Grand Total	2	0	0	0	3	1	6

Sanctions Applied (includes multiple sanctions for the same violation)	
0 on Assignment	4
F in Course	2
Graduate Assistantship /Fellowship Revoked	1

MBA Academic Integrity Alleged Violation Report Student/Non-Instructor



PennState
Smeal College
of Business

Students witnessing or aware of an Academic Integrity Infraction by another student (or students) are encouraged, but not required, to discuss the concern directly with their classmate(s) or hold a confidential meeting with the Academic Integrity Officer or elected student official with academic integrity responsibility (MBAA VP of Academic Affairs and Student Relations) before filing a formal Alleged Violation Report. Any student determined to have knowledge of an Academic Integrity Infraction who does not report it is in violation of the Honor Code.

Today's Date:	
Complainant Name: <i>(person reporting the alleged violation)</i>	
Course Name, Section, and Instructor:	
Date of Alleged Violation:	
Respondent Name(s): <i>(student(s) who potentially committed the violation)</i>	
Have you spoken with the Respondent(s)? Y/N	
Have you spoken with the Instructor? Y/N	
Description of Alleged Violation: <i>(may include detailed violation description, detection, evidence, witnesses, assignment weight, assessment of intent/premeditation, respondent's response to violation discussion)</i>	

*This is preliminary information for consideration in the AI Violation Process.
If an AI violation is determined to have occurred, a Penn State Academic Integrity Form
will be completed by the Review/Appeal Board for final documentation.*

Please submit to MBA Faculty Director, Lou Gattis: gattis@psu.edu or MBA Managing Director, Carrie Marcinkevage: carriem@psu.edu,
or MBAA VP of Academic Affairs and Student Relations, Matt Hoerner: matt.hoerner@smeal.psu.edu