



Office of Community Standards Academic Misconduct Process

This document is intended to serve as a guide for university faculty and staff to understand the policies and procedures of the Academic Misconduct Process as implemented by the Office of Community Standards as of January 4, 2016.

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'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;
- Submitting the work of past assignment answers, posting and papers, in whole or in part;

(Please note that small-scale 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, commensurate 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 course instructor;

Cheating — the act of obtaining or attempting to obtain copies of, or answers to, an exam; use of unauthorized materials or online resources during an exam or assignment, using a false identity to take an exam;

Facilitating Academic Misconduct — the 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 academic research, assignment, or exam.

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

Step 1: Faculty 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;
- 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;
- any relevant documentation, such as a copy of the submitted assignment, source material, Turnitin.com reports, emails, etc.

All reports of academic misconduct should be sent to OCS. It is recommended that the instructor use the Academic Misconduct Report Form, which can be found at https://cm.maxient.com/reportingform.php?FranklinUniv&layout_id=1. All relevant documentation should be attached to the form. Faculty may submit a report (including attachments) to advocate@franklin.edu, but only if the webform is otherwise inaccessible.

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 conducts a cursory review of the submitted material. If OCS has further questions or does not believe the report received reaches to the level of academic misconduct, it will discuss this with the instructor and may request additional evidence, or may dismiss the case.

If the report moves forward as a case, OCS issues a letter to the implicated student. The notification letter instructs the student to contact the course instructor within five calendar days to initiate a good faith discussion (GFD) in order to discuss the details of the potential charge. When the student complies and contacts the course instructor, it is the instructor's responsibility to inform OCS in order to prevent a second meeting request letter from being generated.

If the student does not initiate the GFD within five calendar days of notification letter, the instructor notifies OCS and the office issues a second request letter. If the student again does not initiate the GFD within five calendar days of the second notification, the case then proceeds without the student's input, and the course instructor will be asked to render a judgment based on currently available evidence.

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. An instructor may even ask their lead faculty or chair to take part in the discussion.

Live discussions are strongly encouraged and far preferred over written correspondence. Face-to-face discussions are

ideal, but phone, Zoom, Webex, Adobe Connect, Skype and similar technologies which facilitate live conversation are acceptable. Email is highly discouraged as an appropriate means to conduct a GFD for obvious reasons: written interactions provide the student with the opportunity to rehearse and even embellish 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 exist in live conversation, and such components often impact how an instructor may rule. For example, an instructor may determine the student is responsible for a particular violation, but a display of contrition and demonstration of a lesson learned may convince them to sanction less severely.

Throughout the GFD, all parties must conduct themselves in an honest, fair, and respectful manner in order to set the stage for an open discussion. The tone of a good faith discussion should be guided by the severity of the charge facing the student, but the potential should always exist for a teaching moment, an opportunity from which the student can build on going forward to avoid repeated behavior. Attention should be placed on investigating the student's intent and motivations for their actions, as this information may assist with determining the responsibility and sanctioning judgment. It is the opportunity for faculty to assess, but also the opportunity for the student to express their perspective and ask questions. It is also recommended that the instructor take notes during this interaction, not only for the student record but also to assist in future deliberations.

There may be instances when the opportunity for an informal discussion with the student presents itself before the course instructor has reported the incident to OCS. In such a case, OCS will request that the instructor conduct a brief follow-up discussion to serve the function of the formal GFD per policy before submitting their judgment. If the instructor wishes to handle the situation without OCS involvement, that is their prerogative, but if they choose to report to OCS officially, OCS is bound to follow all the steps of its procedures.

Please note: The GFD is an integral part of the academic misconduct process, and as such, the course instructor is strongly advised to reserve all judgment until the conclusion of this interaction. Even in cases which may appear to have an obvious conclusion prior to the discussion itself, judgment and sanctioning should never be conveyed to the student as a foregone conclusion, as it is likely to discourage the student's incentive to participate in the process. Following the GFD, the instructor is advised to thank the student for their time and inform them that the case information will be reviewed and that the student should expect an outcome letter from OCS soon.

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=CBFCIBAA3AAAABLbIqZhBNrP-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 letters 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 will be limited to an analysis of the evidence.

There exist four possible judgment outcomes for academic misconduct cases:

- Student is found not responsible;
- Student is found responsible; sanction is 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.

Upon receiving final judgment from the course instructor, OCS relays 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 full authority over judgment. 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.

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.

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 future course, or subsequent section of the same course, will automatically result in a failing grade in the course and a dismissal from the University.

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, contact the Office of Community Standards at advocate@franklin.edu, or contact us directly:

Christopher Tyner, Director of Student Life and Community Standards
christopher.tyner@franklin.edu
614-947-6781

John M. Moreno, Community Standards Coordinator
john.moreno@franklin.edu
614-947-6758