

Procedures for Adjudicating Alleged Academic Integrity Violations

I. Definitions

Academic Integrity Facilitators (AIFs) are trained administrators, staff members, or faculty members appointed by the dean of each school, or their designee, to investigate and adjudicate alleged academic integrity violations and serve as a resource for their department or unit about academic integrity policies.

An **Accused Student** is a student who is accused of committing an academic integrity violation.

Chief Academic Integrity Officers (CAIOs) are academic administrators who are responsible for administering the Academic Integrity Policy, including by hearing final appeals in cases when the student faces a sanction of an XF grade, suspension, or expulsion. The CAIO ensures that the dean of each school, or their designee, appoints AIFs for their academic units.

Campus Advisors are members of the University community trained to aid complainants and accused students navigating the academic integrity process.

Campus Appeals Committees are committees of students, faculty, and staff members on each of the Rutgers campuses who consider student appeals of findings and sanctions and requests for the removal of an XF grade.

A **Complainant** is any individual who reports an alleged violation of academic integrity by a Rutgers student.

A **Faculty Member** is any member of the University community serving as the instructor of record in a course.

A **Graduate Student** is any post-baccalaureate student pursuing an advanced degree of any type or enrolled in a graduate course or courses. The term also includes a student in the advanced stages of a professional program that leads to a master's or doctoral degree without the conferral of a baccalaureate degree.

The **Office of Student Conduct or equivalent** is the primary partner of the CAIOs in administering the Academic Integrity Policy and educating students, faculty, and staff about academic integrity. The Office of Student Conduct or equivalent serves as a repository of student disciplinary records and provides training for Academic Integrity Facilitators, Campus Advisors, Presiding Officers, members of University Hearing Boards, and the Campus Appeals Committees.

A **Presiding Officer** is a trained member of the University community who leads a University Hearing.

A **Student** is any person for whom the University maintains educational records and who has not yet been awarded a degree from the University at the time of the alleged violation, as defined by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 and related regulations. The term "student" may also include any person who is a non-matriculating student at the time of the alleged violation.

A **University Hearing** is a disciplinary proceeding to adjudicate an allegation of academic dishonesty for which the accused student denies responsibility.

University Hearing Boards are the panels of students and faculty who adjudicate alleged violations of academic integrity at University Hearings.

A **Working Day** is any weekday that is not listed as a University holiday on the University Calendar, including days when classes are not in session, but the University is open for business.

An **XF Grade** is a disciplinary F grade that may be imposed as part of the sanction for a violation of academic integrity.

II. Reporting Alleged Violations

Any member of the University community who becomes aware of a possible academic integrity violation may initiate a formal complaint with the Office of Student Conduct or equivalent by completing the online reporting form available at academicintegrity.rutgers.edu.

Members of the University community other than faculty members may also report evidence of an academic integrity violation:

- (a) to the course instructor if the alleged violation occurred in a Rutgers course, or
- (b) to the faculty member supervising the accused student or the student's Department Chair or Graduate Director if the alleged violation occurred outside of a Rutgers course.

Any faculty member or academic administrator who becomes aware of a possible academic integrity violation must initiate a formal complaint with the Office of Student Conduct or equivalent by completing the online reporting form available at academicintegrity.rutgers.edu.

III. Initial Review of Alleged Violations

Upon receiving a report of an alleged academic integrity violation, the appropriate Academic Integrity Facilitator (AIF) will determine the initial level of the violation and verify whether the accused student:

- (a) has a previous history of academic integrity violations, and
- (b) is currently on disciplinary probation.

If the student has no significant previous violations, is not on probation, and the alleged behavior is a Level 1 or Level 2 violation, the faculty member may adjudicate the matter themselves or refer the matter to an AIF in the academic unit or college offering the

course. If the alleged violation did not occur in Rutgers course, the faculty member shall refer the matter to an AIF of the unit in which the student is enrolled.

If the student has a significant previous violation, is on probation, or stands accused of a Level 3 violation, only an AIF can adjudicate the case. If the appropriate AIF is the instructor of the course in which the alleged violation occurred, the case must be transferred to another AIF.

IV. Adjudicating Alleged Violations

A. Notification of the Accused Student

The faculty member or AIF deciding the case (the “adjudicator”) shall notify the accused student of the allegation in writing or by electronic communication within fifteen working days of the time the faculty member becomes aware of the alleged violation.

The notification shall inform the student:

- (a) that a complaint has been made against them,
- (b) about the disciplinary process,
- (c) of their rights throughout the adjudication process,
- (d) that Campus Advisors are available to assist the student, and
- (e) that they cannot withdraw from the course until the case is adjudicated without written permission from the dean.

The notification shall instruct the student to respond within five working days of its receipt to arrange a time to discuss the matter with the adjudicator. It shall also inform the student that if the student declines to respond, the process will continue without their participation.

B. Investigation and Finding

After the student has been notified, the adjudicator investigates the allegation. The investigation may include meetings with the responding party, the complainant, witnesses, and any other involved individuals.

The adjudicator will:

- (a) review all information about the complaint with the student,
- (b) allow the student to respond to the allegation,
- (c) meet with the complainant (if necessary), and
- (d) gather information from witnesses.

C. Resolution

The adjudicator will review all available information, including the student's response, and determine whether the student is responsible for the alleged violation.

The adjudicator shall inform the student in writing of the outcome of the investigation within 15 working days from the initial meeting with the student.

If the adjudicator finds that the student has not violated the Academic Integrity Policy, the matter shall then be closed, and the adjudicator shall report the outcome by submitting the online academic integrity final reporting form. If the adjudicator finds that the student has violated the Academic Integrity Policy, the adjudicator will determine an appropriate sanction.

If the adjudicator recommends a sanction that does not include an XF (disciplinary F) grade, suspension, or expulsion, the outcome is reported to the Office of Student Conduct or equivalent. If the student disagrees with the finding or sanction, they can appeal either or both to the Campus Appeals Committee within ten working days.

If the adjudicator recommends a sanction that includes an XF grade, suspension, or expulsion, the matter is referred to the Office of Student Conduct or equivalent for a University Hearing.

V. University Hearings

A. In General

The Office of Student Conduct, or its equivalent on each campus, shall prepare complete procedures for the administration of University Hearings and publish these procedures in a publicly accessible format. University-wide access to these procedures will be at academicintegrity.rutgers.edu.

B. University Hearing Boards

University Hearing Boards are the formal bodies at the University charged with adjudicating alleged academic integrity violations that may result in an XF grade, suspension, or expulsion. The Hearing Board reviews all available information and makes an independent determination whether the accused student violated the Academic Integrity Policy. If the Board finds the student responsible, the Board assigns appropriate sanction(s). The Board has the authority to question witnesses, the accused student (if they choose to speak), and the complainant to determine the facts of the case.

C. Composition of University Hearing Boards

A University Hearing Board typically consists of at least three trained members: one faculty member and two students. If the accused student is a graduate student, one student member of the Hearing Board will normally be a graduate student. If the accused student is registered in RBHS, the composition of the Hearing Board is determined by the specific rules of the academic unit involved.

A trained University community member shall serve as the Presiding Officer and administer the hearing to ensure a fair process for all parties involved.

D. Hearing Procedures

During a University Hearing, the complainant, the accused student, and any witnesses have the opportunity to present information to and be questioned by the Hearing Board and Presiding Officer.

The accused student and the complainant may each be assisted by a Campus Advisor. Also, the accused student and the complainant may each have one support person present, who may not participate in or disrupt the hearing in any way.

At the end of the hearing, the Hearing Board shall deliberate in private. An accused student is initially presumed to be not responsible for the alleged violation(s). Responsibility must be established using the standard of preponderance of the evidence, which requires that the Hearing Board be persuaded that it is more likely than not that the allegation(s) against the student are true.

If the Hearing Board finds the student responsible, they will then allow the accused student, the complainant, and the investigator to discuss appropriate sanctions. The Board will then deliberate privately to determine appropriate sanctions. The Hearing Board will communicate the outcome to the accused student and complainant, including any sanction(s) and rationale.

VI. Appeals

A. In General

The Office of Student Conduct, or its equivalent on each campus, shall prepare complete procedures for the administration of appeals and publish these procedures in a publicly accessible format. University-wide access to these procedures will be at academicintegrity.rutgers.edu.

B. Campus Appeals Committee

The Campus Appeals Committee is the formal body of the University that considers appeals of initial academic integrity decisions and requests for the removal of XF grades.

C. Composition of the Campus Appeals Committee

The Campus Appeals Committee consists of three trained members: one faculty member and two students. If the accused student is a graduate student, one student member of the Campus Appeals Committee will normally be a graduate student. If the accused student is registered in RBHS, the composition of the Campus Appeals Committee is determined by the specific rules of the academic unit involved.

D. Appeal Procedures

The accused student has the right to appeal any finding(s), sanction(s), or both to the Campus Appeals Committee (CAC), subject to the provisions of this section. The student has the burden of proof for the appeal. The student has ten working days from when they receive the initial decision to file an appeal. Appeals must be submitted via the online appeal form available at academicintegrity.rutgers.edu.

An accused student may appeal on the following grounds:

- (a) **Unsupported conclusion:** The decision made by the faculty member, AIF, or University Hearing Board is not supported by the facts of the case.
- (b) **Procedural error:** The adjudication process did not conform with prescribed procedures. The error must have substantially impacted the outcome.
- (c) **Disproportionate sanction:** The sanction imposed on the student is grossly disproportionate to the severity of the violation.

- (d) **New information:** There is new information previously unavailable or unknown at the time of the initial decision. The new information must be sufficient to alter the outcome.

The Campus Appeals Committee decides appeals based on the record of the initial proceeding and any written submissions from any of the parties involved: the accused student, complainant, investigator, and, if applicable, the Presiding Officer of the original hearing. Consideration of an appeal does not include meetings with any of the parties.

The Campus Appeals Committee makes one of the following decisions:

- (a) The finding and sanction are both overturned, either in full or in part.
- (b) The finding is affirmed, but the sanction is modified.
- (c) The finding and sanction are both affirmed.
- (d) The case is remanded to be re-heard. This is limited to appeals based either on a substantial procedural error or new information that was previously unavailable or unknown at the time of the initial decision.

If the initial decision does not include a sanction of an XF grade, suspension, or expulsion, and the Campus Appeals Committee does not remand the case, the Committee's decision on the student's appeal is final. The student may appeal the new decision made after their case has been remanded to the University Hearing Board.

If the sanction affirmed by the Campus Appeals Committee includes an XF grade, suspension, or expulsion, the case must also be reviewed by the Chief Academic Integrity Officer, who determines the final sanction.

If the student does not appeal within ten working days, the initial decision is final.