



## 4.0.001 Student Integrity

---

<b>Effective date:</b>	September 1, 1989
<b>Last revision date:</b>	September 5, 2023 for the 2023-2024 academic year
<b>Approvals:</b>	Faculty Senate, Executive Educational Council (EEC)
<b>Responsible office:</b>	Academics
<b>Policy contact:</b>	Chair of Faculty Senate

---

### I. PURPOSE and SCOPE

This policy outlines expectations for student integrity in their coursework and explains the process when an allegation of academic misconduct is suspected and/or reported.

### II. RELATED POLICIES

Student Responsibility Statement, Student Code of Conduct, Grade Appeals, Student Complaints

### III. DEFINITIONS

**Plagiarism:** The knowing or negligent use of the ideas, expressions or work of another with intent to pass such materials off as one's own.

**Academic dishonesty or cheating:** The act of obtaining or attempting to obtain credit for academic work through the use of any dishonest, deceptive or fraudulent means.

**Generative artificial intelligence (AI):** Generative AI (including ChatGPT, Bard, and others) is a class of machine learning models that use optimization to learn from data, with the goal to use the things learned to produce content on demand. Types of content produced might include written prose in English or other natural languages, computer code, animated imagery, photo-realistic imagery, or moving imagery. Once constructed, a user can provide a generative AI with a prompt that guides content creation.

---

### IV. POLICY STATEMENT

As an institution of higher learning, MSOE is committed above all to the educational development of its students as responsible and principled human beings. As such, MSOE is accountable to all whom it serves and by whom it is scrutinized. The university has a priority interest in promoting personal integrity and in ensuring the authenticity of its graduates' credentials.

---

The university is similarly mindful that the professions, business, and industry are concerned with ethical behavior no less than the professional practice of their members and employees. Therefore, MSOE students preparing for professional careers and leadership roles that are founded on responsibility and trust, must observe and be guided by the highest standards of personal integrity both in and out of the classroom.

The expectations of the university with respect to academic and classroom integrity are reflected in, but not limited to, the following guidelines:

1. Each student must recognize that even a poorly developed piece of work that represents his or her best efforts is far more worthwhile than the most outstanding piece of work taken from someone else.
2. Students must observe the rules established by a faculty member for a particular course.
3. Assignments prepared outside of class must include appropriate documentation of all borrowed ideas and expressions. The absence of such documentation constitutes "plagiarism," which is the knowing or negligent use of the ideas, expressions, or work of another with intent to pass such materials off as one's own. It is an act of plagiarism if a student purchases a paper or submits a paper, computer program, or drawing claiming it to be his/hers when he/she did not write it.
4. Each student should consistently prepare for examinations so as to reduce temptation toward dishonesty.
5. A student may not share examination answers with others for the purpose of cheating, nor should he or she, intentionally or through carelessness, give them an opportunity to obtain the same.
6. Academic dishonesty or cheating includes the act of obtaining or attempting to obtain credit for academic work through the use of any dishonest, deceptive, or fraudulent means. Cheating at MSOE includes but is not limited to:
  - Copying, in part or in whole, from another's test or homework assignments, worksheets, lab reports, essays, summaries, quizzes, etc.
  - Copying examinations and quizzes, in whole or in part, unless approved by the instructor.
  - Submitting work previously graded in another course unless this has been approved by the course instructor or by departmental policy.
  - Submitting work simultaneously presented in two courses, unless this has been approved by both course instructors or by the department policies of both departments.
  - Communicating electronically (unless approved by the instructor) during examinations with the intent to seek or provide answers.
  - Attempting to present as the student's own work, materials or papers purchased or downloaded from the Internet.
  - Violating discipline specific health, safety, or ethical requirements to gain any unfair advantage in lab(s) or clinical assignments
  - Any other act committed that defrauds or misrepresents, including aiding or abetting in any of the actions defined above.
  - Claiming credit for a group project or paper when the individual student made little or no contribution to the group's product.

- Accessing reference documents during an exam or quiz unless approved by the course instructor.
7. A student of integrity will not support, encourage, or protect others who are involved in academic dishonesty in any way, and will furthermore attempt to dissuade another student from engaging in dishonest acts.
  8. Students should follow the course policies of individual instructors regarding the use of generative AI in coursework. In the absence of such a course policy, students should assume that its use is prohibited until seeking clarification from the instructor.
- Students should be aware that the use of generative AI to complete coursework, research, assignments, or exams may violate existing academic integrity policies, including policies on cheating and plagiarism. When in doubt, students should treat the use of generative AI in assisting or completing coursework as they would treat the use of another person's work for assisting or completing coursework (which is not to say that generative AI is literally an author or academic source).
  - Students should also be aware that, apart from academic integrity considerations, the use of generative AI in academic work may:
    - bypass the learning and development of cognitive skills they attend college to attain
    - introduce falsehoods, inaccuracies, or misleading information into their work
    - compromise the quality of their work, if it obscures a teacher's assessment of whether the work demonstrates the students' own understanding and effort.
  - If they are permitted to use generative AI in some capacity by an instructor, students are expected to:
    - disclose how, where, and from what software program they used generative AI in their work
    - assume responsibility for any errors or inaccuracies generated by their use of generative AI.
  - Students have the right to opt-out of providing personal data or academic work to generative AI programs that are not FERPA-compliant, and faculty are expected to provide alternative activities or assignments in such cases.

A student who acts without integrity in an academic setting shall be subject to sanctions. Sanctions are at the discretion of the instructor and may take one of many forms. Example sanctions include written reprimand, penalty on an assignment or exam, or "F" grade for the assignment, exam, or course. If the instructor assigns an "F" for the course, the student will not be allowed to drop the course. If the student believes the sanction was unwarranted, they have the right to appeal following established procedures. All breaches of academic integrity will be reported to the vice president of academics using the required form. Upon recommendation of the instructor or at his or her initiation, the vice president of academics may decide that repeated or extremely serious acts of dishonesty may be grounds for more

severe disciplinary action. Such cases will be referred to the dean of students per section 18 of the Student Conduct Code.

---

## **V. PROCEDURE**

### **A. Process for Adjudicating Isolated Breaches of Academic Integrity**

The student will be notified by the faculty member either within one week of the faculty member's awareness of the problem or at the next class session attended by the student. The faculty member will notify the student using the "Breach of Academic Integrity Reporting Form." The student will have three academic working days to communicate to the faculty member any disagreement of information reported in the notification. The faculty member may elect to make modifications to the form, or retract it, in response to this communication. The final version of the form will be sent to the chair of the academic department or school and the vice president of academics. The vice president of academics will retain all such reports in a file and may refer egregious behavior or repeated reports involving the same student to the dean of students as described in the Student Conduct Code. Any referral will only occur after the completion of the appeal process described in this section.

### **B. Process for Adjudicating Egregious, or Repeated, Breaches of Academic Integrity**

Upon receipt of report of egregious or repeated notifications for breaches of academic integrity that are upheld throughout the appeal process, the vice president of academics may elect to refer students to the dean of students for action under section 18 of the Student Conduct Code.

## **VI. APPEALS**

The following procedure will be used if a student wishes to appeal a faculty member's judgment that academic integrity was breached. Filing appeals in accordance with these provisions shall not suspend the sanction declared in the case by the faculty member. The student will remain in class during the entire appeal process.

- a. The student will have three academic working days after delivery of the written notification to initiate an appeal to the chairperson of the academic department or school in which the faculty member serves. The student will be deemed to have waived his/her right to appeal unless he/she files the appeal with the academic chair within these three academic working days. The statement of appeal must specify the reasons countering the faculty member's determination that the student acted without integrity.
- b. The academic chair will have three academic working days in which to review the appeal. The purpose of the academic chair's review is to determine if sufficient evidence exists that the student did not act with integrity. The chairperson must inform the student and faculty member of his/her judgment within those three

academic working days. If the academic chair finds in favor of the student, the sanction and the Breach of Academic Integrity Reporting Form filed with the vice president of academics will be retracted, unless an additional appeal is made by the faculty member.

- c. The student or faculty member may further appeal, in writing to the vice president of academics, the decision of the academic chair. This appeal must occur within three academic working days.
- d. The vice president of academics has the final say in determining if a student did not act with integrity. To aid in this process, the vice president of academics will convene an academic review board, to include at least three faculty members, to hear the appeal. The academic review board will consider the written appeal and shall allow both the student and faculty member to appear in person before the committee. The academic review board is expected to provide an opinion to the vice president of academics within three academic working days from the commencement of its proceedings. If the final determination is that academic integrity was not breached, all forms will be retracted.
- e. The student may bring a representative to any meeting established under this procedure. The faculty member may also have representation at any meeting.

## **VII. APPENDICES**

- A. Breach of Academic Integrity Reporting Form

## **VIII. ASSOCIATED ACCREDITATION STANDARD**

Higher Learning Commission Core Component 2.E.3

---

This section to be completed by the Records Manager:

### **Due date for review**

Annually with catalog update

### **Public Location**

MSOE Policy Library, undergraduate and graduate catalogs, link in Canvas template

### **Version History**

- **2023-24 academic year: 2023, September 5 (EEC):** Added artificial intelligence (AI) addendum. No changes to original policy
- **2023-24 academic year: 2023, June 20 (EEC):** Changed notification timeframe for faculty from 3 days to one week
- **2023-24 academic year: 2022, August 8 (Senate), September 26 (EEC):** Changed “may convene an academic review board” to “will convene an academic review board...to include 3 faculty members.”
- **2019, March 12:** Policy Library template, no changes

- **2018-19 academic year, March 22 (Senate), March 26 (CAP), April 16, 2018:** Broadened definition of “academic dishonesty,” broadened circumstances for appeals, increased penalty options, clarified role of committee and VPA, clarified connection to Code of Conduct
- **2008, June 18:** Purpose added, minor editorial changes
- **2008, April 18:** Examples of different types of cheating added
- **2003:** Initial approval as “Student Integrity” similar to the original policy but with a lengthy introduction added that describes the manners of cheating.
- **1989, September:** Initial approval as “Academic Dishonesty Procedures and Appeals Process”

### **Records Manager**

Assistant VP of Curriculum & Knowledge Management