



## Office of Community Standards Academic Misconduct Process

The Office of Community Standards' processes are not solely intended to be a punitive process for students. A student's attendance at the University obliges them to comply with University regulations. The Academic Misconduct Process is designed to preserve academic integrity by providing a student due process and the opportunity to have the claim(s) of academic misconduct reviewed by the course instructor, lead faculty, and, in cases of appeal, the Academic College Dean.

An essential and shared value in higher education is the core principle of learning. This is best achieved by presenting one's own words, concepts and ideas, while properly crediting the work of others. This principle obviously applies to more objective-based assignments and examinations as well. Any deviation of this principle may constitute a violation of the Academic Integrity Policy and may subsequently result in a formal charge of academic misconduct. Forms of academic misconduct include, but are not limited to:

**Plagiarism** — the submission, in whole or in part, of another person's work as their own, such as a written assignment, project or exam, for course credit. Examples of plagiarism include, but are not limited to:

- Copying extensive portions from external sources, websites, etc., and pasting into papers and online postings without properly citing the sources;
- Copying information from external sources, websites, etc., to complete assignment problems in whole or in part;
- The unauthorized use of artificial intelligence (AI) technology to produce academic work, in whole or in part, including papers, class postings, and research. *Please note: the use of generative AI tools is permitted only if specifically approved by Lead Faculty in advance. Without such approval, any use of generative AI to produce academic work is prohibited.*

*(Minor technical failures to follow APA formatting and isolated omissions of in-text citations are not generally considered to be suitable cases to pursue through formal academic misconduct channels and are best resolved informally with the course instructor via coaching and, if appropriate, reasonable point deductions.)*

**Recycling Assignments** — the re-submission, in whole or in part, of work previously submitted for an earlier course or section for credit, unless approved by the current course instructor;

**Exam Misconduct** — any actions constituting a violation of the Testing Center guidelines, including the use of unauthorized materials or online resources during an exam or quiz, any violation of proctored exam guidelines, attempting to obtain copies of, or answers to, an exam, or using a false identity to take an exam;

**Facilitating Academic Misconduct** — the willful act of directly or indirectly assisting another student to commit an act of academic misconduct. Examples may include supplying exam answers or sharing assignments for another student to copy (Note: sharing assignments is not necessarily a violation.);

**Fabrication** — the falsification or creation of inaccurate information, citations, or scientific data in any assignment or academic research.

## **The Academic Misconduct Process: Responsibilities of Faculty, Students and the Office of Community Standards (OCS)**

*Please note: the following procedures reflect the formal academic misconduct process for OCS and must be completed chronologically. Faculty are free to pursue informal resolutions with their students without filing formal reports to OCS, but in doing so any potential sanctions cannot be OCS-based (see below) and the grading of suspected work must be in accordance with the grading rubric of the course. Any discussions conducted outside of the below process are considered informal, and pursuing the formal process subsequent to informal means necessitates a new formal good faith discussion.*

### **Step 1: Faculty formally reports alleged academic misconduct violation to the Office of Community Standards.**

If a course instructor suspects that a student has violated the Academic Integrity Policy, they are to notify the Office of Community Standards (OCS) of the claim of academic misconduct immediately after discovery of the incident. The written report should include:

- course instructor name;
- lead faculty name;
- name and section of the class;
- name and student ID (or email) of the implicated student(s) and other participants/witnesses as necessary;
- date and location of the incident;
- name of the assignment(s)/exam(s) in question;
- a detailed account of the incident;
- all relevant documentation (submitted assignment, source material, Turnitin.com reports, emails, etc.)

All reports of academic misconduct should be sent to OCS. Course instructor are to use the Academic Misconduct Report Form, which can be found at [https://cm.maxient.com/reportingform.php?FranklinUniv&layout\\_id=1](https://cm.maxient.com/reportingform.php?FranklinUniv&layout_id=1). All relevant documentation should be attached to the form. In the unlikely event the webform is inaccessible, faculty may submit a report (including attachments) to [advocate@franklin.edu](mailto:advocate@franklin.edu).

### **Step 2: Office of Community Standards notifies student.**

When OCS receives a written report from the course instructor regarding a potential charge of academic misconduct, it will conduct a cursory review of the submitted material. If OCS has further questions or does not believe the submitted report reaches the level of academic misconduct, it will discuss this with the instructor and may request additional evidence, ask for an informal resolution, or may dismiss the case.

If the report moves forward as a formal case, OCS issues a letter to the implicated student, instructing them to contact the course instructor within five calendar days to initiate a good faith discussion (GFD) in order to discuss the details of the reported incident. When the student complies and contacts the course instructor, it is the instructor's responsibility to inform OCS that a meeting has been scheduled.

If the student does not initiate the GFD within five calendar days of notification letter, the instructor is asked to render a judgment based on available evidence using the judgment form (see Step 4).

### **Step 3: Good Faith Discussion occurs between student and course instructor.**

Though mandatory, the good faith discussion (GFD) provides the student with an opportunity to describe the situation from their perspective, to explain rationale, motivation and potentially mitigating circumstances, and to present applicable new evidence and/or documentation which may alter a judgment. When contacted by the student, the

course instructor should work with the student to schedule the meeting and determine which means of communication is most convenient to both sides.

**Live discussions are required.** Face-to-face discussions are ideal when feasible, but phone, Zoom, Teams, Webex, Adobe Connect, Skype and similar technologies which facilitate live conversation are acceptable. Discussions in written form are unacceptable for obvious reasons: written interactions provide the student with the opportunity to prepare and rehearse responses to faculty questions. Further, email interactions often fail to capture the tone of the interaction, reasons for the violation, level of potential contrition, and other nuances which generally only occur in a live conversation, and such factors often influence how an instructor may rule.

*Please note: adjunct instructors are required to communicate with their Lead Faculty or Program/Department Chair prior to moving forward to Step 4.*

#### **Step 4: Office of Community Standards is notified of judgment and issues an outcome letter to the student.**

Following the GFD, the course instructor is required to file a judgment report, including a written summary of the discussion and a final judgment in the case. This report can be found here:

[https://franklinu.na2.echosign.com/public/esignWidget?wid=CBFCIBAA3AAABLblqZhBNrP-kErp\\_z5A79VjhHd6U8BGuxXaPdBw5DcOUgHRebzE\\_KDwZj-nzYjbXc62MaqA\\*](https://franklinu.na2.echosign.com/public/esignWidget?wid=CBFCIBAA3AAABLblqZhBNrP-kErp_z5A79VjhHd6U8BGuxXaPdBw5DcOUgHRebzE_KDwZj-nzYjbXc62MaqA*). The judgment states the level of responsibility of the student, if any, and recommended sanction, if any.

As stated earlier, if the student does not respond to the letter issued by OCS instructing them to initiate a GFD with the course instructor, the instructor will then be asked to file the same judgment report, limiting their judgment to the current evidence in the case. Since a GFD did not occur, the summary should state that the student did not participate and the judgment will be limited to an analysis of the evidence.

**There exist four possible judgment outcomes for an academic misconduct case:**

- **Student is found not responsible;**
- **Student is found responsible; sanction is written warning with no formal charge;**
- **Student is found responsible; sanction is formal charge with a zero grade for the assignment/exam;**
- **Student is found responsible; sanction is formal charge and a failing grade in the class. (Note: this sanction should only be applied when significant aggravating circumstances are associated with the violation.)**

Any additional documentation created/obtained during the Good Faith Discussion should be included in the judgment report as attachments. Even if the instructor determines that academic misconduct did not occur, this too should be summarized in the judgment so that OCS may formally conclude the case.

*Please note: judgments in all academic misconduct cases must be rendered “in a vacuum” and should not be influenced by any former misconduct or personal issues unless they occurred in the same course; the goal is to focus only on the evidence and GFD related to the current case.*

Upon receiving final judgment from the course instructor, OCS communicates all judgments in the form of an outcome letter to the student. OCS may recommend alternate sanctioning as deemed appropriate, but generally prefers for faculty to maintain discretion over the judgment process. As part of the outcome letter, OCS will issue an additional sanction for all first-time offenders of academic misconduct: Franklin students must complete an online academic integrity workshop, which consists of a brief video, followed by a five-question quiz. Students must pass the quiz with a 100% grade to complete the workshop.

Applied formal charges of academic misconduct include a disciplinary notation for academic misconduct, which is entered on the student’s academic record.

### **Second Formal Charge of Academic Misconduct**

A second formal charge of academic misconduct in the same section of the same class will automatically result in a failing grade in the course. A second formal charge of academic misconduct in a subsequent course, or subsequent section of the same course, will result in a sanction ranging from a failure on the assignment up to a suspension from the University. Students that are suspended are required to meet with the Director of Community Standards or designee upon the conclusion of the suspension period should they choose to re-enroll at the Institution. The student will be required to meet specific conditions for re-enrollment (Examples include but not limited to attendance at an educational workshop focused on academic misconduct and/or meeting with a representative of the Institution regarding academic misconduct and future goal setting).

### **Third Formal Charge of Academic Misconduct**

A third formal charge of academic misconduct, upon the completion of a period of suspension from the Institution in a subsequent course, will result in a sanction ranging from a failure of the assignment up to a dismissal from the University.

### **Appeals**

A student may appeal any judgment rendered by the course instructor to OCS within 15 days of the issuance of the outcome letter. Appeals are reviewed and responded to by the corresponding College Dean (or Provost's designee), who have 15 calendar days to formally respond. When completed, an appeal review letter is then issued to the student. This decision is final and not eligible for further appeal.

*We hope this document is helpful in navigating the academic misconduct process. Our office's main priority is to facilitate the academic misconduct case process and to provide guidance and support to faculty in reaching an informed and timely resolution. For more detail on our policies and procedures, visit our webpage at [www.franklin.edu/community-standards](http://www.franklin.edu/community-standards), contact the Office of Community Standards at [advocate@franklin.edu](mailto:advocate@franklin.edu), or contact us directly:*

*Christopher Tyner  
Director of Student Life and Community Standards  
[christopher.tyner@franklin.edu](mailto:christopher.tyner@franklin.edu)  
614-947-6781*

*John M. Moreno  
Community Standards Coordinator  
[john.moreno@franklin.edu](mailto:john.moreno@franklin.edu)  
614-947-6758*