

(The Senate and Senate Committees should use the following form for officially communicating recommendations to the Provost. Such committees would include: UCC, UPC and Executive Committee of the Senate along with any other committees which provide recommendations directly to the Provost.)

---

### Senate Recommendation to the Provost

Originating Body **Academic Policies Committee** Originator **Denise Rotondo, Chair**

Date submitted **June 10, 2003** Requested Effective date **Fall, 2003 Student Handbook**

**Recommendation** The APC, upon the request of the University Counsel, Anne Donahue, revised and approved changes to the language in the Academic Integrity Policy. The changes are editorial in nature rather than substantive. The current and the revised policy were reviewed by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, and it was concluded the changes did not alter the policy previously approved in 2001, thus a full Senate vote on this revised version is not warranted. The revisions were approved by the APC on June 4, 2003.

The intent of the revisions was to make clear the roles and responsibilities of all parties involved in sanctions or appeals from academic integrity violations. The nature of permissible faculty sanctions and the process for imposing sanctions was clarified. All references to Hearing Boards were extracted at the request of Dr. Tom Jones, Dean of the Henson School, because the Henson Hearing Board did not exist in a practical and real sense. The appeal process and mechanisms to ensure due process were clarified.

---

Attach any supporting documentation. The revised policy is attached.

---

Action Taken by Provost:

Date

6/10/03



Recommendation Accepted

☐ Recommendation Not Accepted

☐ Recommendation returned to Originating Body for further review (see attached)

Disposition for Approved Recommendation:

☐

President

☐

Faculty Senate Chair

☐

Forum Chair

☐

Webmaster

☒

Catalogue Editor

☒

VP Student Affairs

☐

VP Finance

☐

School Deans

☐

Graduate Council

☐

Provost Council

*Sent 6/11/03*

X Student Handbook Editor  
       Faculty Handbook Editor

X Other: Sandra Cohen-Weibel  
Denise Rotondo

Signature: D. H. B.

provost/scw/121802

the procedures used throughout the proceedings. Reasonable limits may be set on the length and nature of the opening and closing statements, the evidence presented and on the duration of the hearing. At any time, the chair (or administrator hearing the case) may seek the advice of legal counsel.

10. The party that has imposed or recommended sanctions under this policy has the burden to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that a violation of this policy did occur.
11. Since the University lacks full judicial authority, such as the power to subpoena or place witnesses under oath, a student's due process rights cannot be coextensive with or identical to the rights afforded the accused in a civil or criminal legal proceeding. The procedures outlined are designed, however, to assure fundamental fairness and to protect students from arbitrary or capricious disciplinary action. Deviations from these procedures shall not necessarily invalidate a hearing or the results of a hearing unless significant prejudice results.

**Findings** – After it has completed its review, the Academic Policies Committee shall issue written findings of fact and conclusions, and shall provide a copy of the findings along with the sanction to be imposed to the student, faculty member, and judicial administrator.

**Appeals from the Academic Policies Committee Findings** – For sanctions of written warning, imposition of an F and/or dismissal from a course, the decision of the Committee is final and no further appeal will be allowed. For more severe sanctions, an additional appeal of the Committee's findings will be allowed. Appeals must be filed within five working days of receiving notice of the Committee's decision. The written appeal must be filed with the Provost and should set forth all of the reasons that support reversal of the Committee's findings. It will be handled as follows: (1) When the Committee recommends the sanction of dismissal from a major or program, the Provost will review the written appeal and the documentation associated with the case. The Provost has the discretion to take any action necessary to thoroughly complete a review, and then will issue a decision, which will be binding and final. (2) When the Committee recommends the sanction of suspension or expulsion from the University, the University President will review the appeal, take all necessary action, and make the final, binding decision. In all cases, the decision will be conveyed in writing to the student, the faculty member, the Judicial Administrator, and the Academic Policies Committee.

**Academic Policies Committee** – Under this policy the Academic Policies Committee serves to review appeals of faculty imposed sanctions and to hear cases referred by faculty members where the sanction may include dismissal from a major or program, suspension, or expulsion from the University.

**University Judicial Administrator** – The role of the University judicial administrator is outlined under Judicial System Policies and Procedures.

**University System of Maryland Policy** – In accordance with Board of Regents policy, students expelled or suspended for reasons of academic dishonesty by any institution in the University System of Maryland shall not be admissible to any other System institution if expelled, or during any period of suspension.

**Revisions Approved by the Academic Policies Committee, June 4, 2003**  
**Approved by the Faculty Senate, March 13, 2001**