

## Academic Honor Code<sup>1</sup>

**1. Applicability.** This code applies to all student-related academic aspects of the Ross School of Business (RSB) Statement of Community Values. It covers all student academic activities related to the School's various degree programs, whether these activities take place on or off campus. The code also applies to non-RSB students enrolled in RSB courses. (Note: RSB students are subject to the codes of other University units when they are enrolled in non-RSB courses.) This code does not cover disputes about grades or complaints about courses or instructors, which are dealt with in a separate document.<sup>2</sup>

**2. Examples of Academic Misconduct.** The following list of categories of academic misconduct and the examples for each category are intended to be illustrative, but not all-inclusive.<sup>3</sup>

- **Cheating** is any action or attempted action that may result in creating an unfair or improper advantage over other students in an academic setting, including courses and projects, regardless of motive. Examples of this form of dishonesty include (a) receiving assistance, giving assistance, or otherwise collaborating on an assignment or examination when such interaction is not permitted<sup>4</sup>; (b) seeking, receiving, or sharing information about an assignment or examination prior to its distribution or dissemination to all students in the course; (c) having another person prepare an assignment or take an examination on the student's behalf; (d) using assignment- or examination-related work written by others, such as prior examinations, term papers, or case-study teaching notes, whether or not purchased; (e) during an examination, viewing another student's answers or using an unauthorized source of information (including the Web); and (f) modifying an assignment or examination after it has been returned and then submitting it for re-grading. It is also improper to re-use work that was prepared for one course in another course without first getting permission from the second course's instructor to do so.
- **Plagiarism** is the misrepresentation of another person's ideas, writing, or analytical work as one's own. It includes not only text, exhibits, and appendices, but also nontextual materials such as drawings, photographs, diagrams, graphs, tables, spreadsheets, and computer programs. Plagiarism is not limited to hard-copy materials, but also includes Web content or content recorded on any form of media. The most obvious form of plagiarism is the verbatim presentation of another person's work without both quotation marks and a proper citation. Less-obvious forms of plagiarism include using definitions of words or historical information with no citation indicating the source, paraphrasing another's writing without proper citation, or presenting another person's ideas or work as one's own rather than including a proper citation. In one way or another, each of these constitutes stealing another person's ideas or

---

<sup>1</sup> Revised September 12, 2008.

<sup>2</sup> See "Student Disputes with Instructors" at <http://www.bus.umich.edu/pdf/StudentDisputesInstructors.pdf>.

<sup>3</sup> Other violations applicable to Rackham Graduate School students include any misconduct not covered herein that is described in Rackham's "Policy on Academic and Professional Integrity." See

[http://www.rackham.umich.edu/policies/academic\\_and\\_professional\\_integrity/statement\\_on\\_academic\\_integrity/#1](http://www.rackham.umich.edu/policies/academic_and_professional_integrity/statement_on_academic_integrity/#1). The wording of the cheating, plagiarism and information falsification misconduct examples and certain sanctions descriptions of this code was based in part on analogous paragraphs in Addenda A and B of that document.

<sup>4</sup> If an assignment or examination does not explicitly state that collaboration is permitted, then the "default" assumption should be that there is to be no interaction of any sort with any other person on that piece of work.

work. Of course, many assignments involve research to find relevant information needed to help fulfill the requirements of the assignment. Plagiarism can be avoided by providing enough information about the source of the work, whether a hard-copy document or information found on the Web, to enable the reader to locate the original source and see the cited material in the context in which it was written. (Reference sources about avoiding plagiarism and making proper citations can be found on the Community Values Committee (CVC) website, <http://www.bus.umich.edu/communityvalues.htm>)

- **Falsification of information** includes the fabrication of information or data and the falsification of research results, whether in writing or orally. This can occur in either course-related or project-related work, including in-class comments. In addition to the obvious case of outright fabrication, other examples include (a) improper revision of data; (b) selective reporting of information that supports a particular idea or premise in a deceptive way; and (c) the deceptive omission of information or data that would tend to refute such an idea or premise. Forging a signature on an academic document of any sort is also a violation of this clause. (Falsification not related to course or project work is covered under the Student Code of Conduct.)
- **Abuse of confidentiality** is the disclosure of ideas, information, or data that were shared with the student with the expectation or understanding that they would be kept confidential. Such abuse can take place whether or not a formal confidentiality agreement was signed.
- **Aiding or abetting misconduct** is assisting in any way an individual's violation of any provision of this code. This includes ignoring, condoning, or not reporting inappropriate conduct.
- **Attempted academic misconduct** may be treated as seriously as if the act of misconduct had actually been committed.
- **Obstructing a Community Values Committee investigation** includes (a) making dishonest or misleading statements, either orally or in written form, including e-mails; (b) other falsification of information; (c) altering, destroying, or deleting relevant documents, files, or e-mails; (d) any other act that hinders an investigation; and (e) failure to obey confidentiality requirements imposed by the CVC.

**3. Reporting Procedure.** Any reasonable suspicion of an honor code violation observed by a student, faculty member, or staff member is required to be reported promptly to the Associate Dean for Degree Programs or the chair of the CVC or their designee(s).<sup>5</sup> Except in situations such as possible cheating observed during an examination, an instructor is not to confront the student, but rather is to report the possible violation directly to the associate dean or CVC chair as soon as practicable. Outsiders, such as project sponsors or corporate interviewers, also may report a suspected violation. The report should be in writing, preferably using the form on the CVC website designed for this purpose, unless circumstances warrant an immediate oral report, such as to the instructor or a proctor during an examination. An initial oral report should be followed as soon as practicable by a written one.

---

<sup>5</sup> As used herein, if applicable, "chair" may also mean "co-chair," and "student" or "witness" may mean either one or several individuals.

An instructor reporting a student violation may propose to the CVC a resolution of the case, including sanctions, but should take no disciplinary actions pending review of the case. Anyone not sure of whether a suspected violation should be reported should consult with the associate dean or CVC chair before making a decision not to report the suspicious behavior. Only if all suspected violations are reported can there be equity in application of the code across the entire student body.

**4. Hearing.** A hearing will be conducted by a Hearing Subcommittee appointed by the CVC chair and composed of at least two CVC faculty members, one CVC staff member, and one student from the same program as the accused student. The CVC chair will designate one of the faculty members as the head of the Subcommittee. The student will be selected from a group that includes the BBA and full-time MBA students who are elected as their sections' representatives, SGA Executive Board and Community Values and Ethics Committee members, and selected student volunteers representing their respective degree programs. The student shall be a non-voting member of the Subcommittee, but shall participate fully in the hearing and shall have the opportunity to ask questions of all participants and witnesses.

The Hearing Procedures are as follows:

- a. No later than five business days before the hearing, the accused student must submit to the Hearing Subcommittee, in writing, all documents that he or she would like the Hearing Subcommittee to consider and a list of all witnesses whom he or she would like to have submit testimony before the Hearing Subcommittee. If the accused student intends to have a personal advisor accompany him or her, as outlined in subparagraph (e) below, the accused student must submit the name of the advisor and must state whether the advisor is an attorney.
- b. In addition to hearing testimony from the witnesses identified by the student, the Hearing Subcommittee may, at its discretion, hear testimony from any other party whose testimony it deems relevant to the proceeding, including other witnesses and, even if not a witness, the instructor of the course. The Hearing Subcommittee may also review any other documents or evidence that it deems relevant to the proceeding.
- c. The accused student will have an opportunity to appear before the Hearing Subcommittee to present his or her case. The accused student may review all documents considered by the Hearing Subcommittee and may question witnesses who appear before the Hearing Subcommittee. The accused student may also present his or her own evidence and witnesses.
- d. The Hearing Subcommittee may limit any testimony based on redundancy or lack of relevance.
- e. The accused student may be accompanied at the hearing by a personal advisor, who may be an attorney. The advisor may not participate directly in the proceedings, but may only advise the accused student.

- f. The hearing will be closed to the public and will be recorded. A party to the proceeding may request a copy of the recording. The Hearing Subcommittee will deliberate in private.
- g. All recordings of the proceedings will be controlled by the RSB. No court reporters, stenographers, videographers, or similar professionals are permitted without the prior consent of the RSB.
- h. The head of the Hearing Subcommittee will prepare a written report containing factual findings. The vote of the majority of the members of the Subcommittee, including the head of the Subcommittee, will determine whether the student is found responsible or not responsible for the alleged violation. The Hearing Subcommittee will have the sole discretion to determine whether a student is responsible for an alleged violation. The Hearing Subcommittee's determination shall be based on the totality of the evidence and shall be based upon a clear and convincing standard of evidence. If the finding is that the student is responsible for the violation, the Hearing Subcommittee has the responsibility to determine and state the sanctions to be imposed. In the process of determining the sanctions, the Subcommittee should consult with the CVC chair to understand previous sanctions in similar cases.
- i. The Hearing Subcommittee's determination will be communicated in writing by the chair of the CVC to the student both by e-mail to the student's University e-mail account and the postal service to the local address on file in the RSB Registrar's office, with copies to the appropriate faculty member and the associate dean. This will complete the process unless the student appeals the decision.

**5. Possible Sanctions.** If the violation involves a course, the course instructor is not to impose any sanction, including a grade change, pending consideration of the case by the CVC. As noted above, the instructor may propose a resolution of the case, including sanctions, to the committee. However, imposing sanctions is the responsibility of the CVC. This reflects the intent of having sanctions be consistent over time and across the entire student body. The following list of sanctions is not necessarily intended to be all-inclusive. Also, a combination of sanctions may be imposed.<sup>6</sup> A record of any sanction(s) imposed will be kept in the CVC's files as discussed in Paragraph 8 below. Possible sanctions include:

- a. Warning:** Informing the student in writing that he or she has violated the code and that future violations will be dealt with more severely. No copy of the warning shall be put in the student's academic file.
- b. Grade change:** A lowering of the student's grade, possibly to "Fail."
- c. Formal reprimand:** A written reprimand to the student that she or he has violated the code and that any future violations will be dealt with more severely. A copy of the reprimand shall be put in the student's academic file.

---

<sup>6</sup> In the case of Rackham students, sanctions f, g, and h can be imposed only by Rackham in consultation with the Ross School.

**d. Disciplinary probation:** Designation of a period of time during which the student will not be in good standing with the School. The terms of the probation may involve restrictions of student privileges and/or may delineate expectations of behavior. Consequences may also be spelled out if the student fails to meet the terms. A record of the probationary period will be included in the student's academic file.

**e. Transcript notation:** A notation on the student's transcript that a failing grade in a course was related to an academic honor code violation.

**f. Withholding a degree:** Withholding of the student's degree until stated sanction requirements have been met. There may be a deadline set for meeting the requirements which, if not met, will result in the student's loss of eligibility to receive the degree at any time in the future.

**g. Suspension:** Temporary removal of a student from the program for a specified or unspecified period, which will be permanently noted on the transcript. There can be stipulated conditions for re-admission to the student's program as well as a time limit for meeting those stipulations.

**h. Expulsion:** Permanent dismissal from the program, which will be permanently noted on the student's transcript, including the reason for expulsion.

**i. Rescinding a degree:** Annulment of a degree previously awarded by the Ross School of Business.<sup>7</sup>

**6. Appeals.** Within five business days of receiving the written notification of the committee's decision from the chair of the CVC, the student may submit a written appeal of the decision or sanction (or both) to the Associate Dean for Degree Programs. Appeals must be based on at least one of the following assertions:

- There were violations of procedure that seriously compromised the investigation and/or conclusions.
- The evidence clearly does not support the findings.
- The sanctions are excessive relative to the violation.
- There is significant new evidence not reasonably available at the time of the hearing.

In considering the appeal, the associate dean will read the report of the Hearing Subcommittee and then will consult with the CVC chair. If the associate dean then determines that all or part of the student's appeal is valid, the case will be referred back to the full CVC for reconsideration and final determination by the full CVC, excluding those members of the CVC that served on the Hearing Subcommittee. The associate dean will report his or her opinions on the appeal to the CVC in writing and may be asked to meet with the CVC. The determination of the full CVC on the appeal shall be final, and no further appeals are allowed.

---

<sup>7</sup> In the case of an alumnus/alumna who earned his/her PhD degree in a Ross School graduate program, the Ross School may request that the Rackham Graduate School rescind the PhD degree.

**7. Target Timetable for Procedures.** It is obviously in the best interests of all parties that any alleged violations be resolved as soon as practicable. It is possible that extenuating circumstances may cause procedures to take longer than is presumed in the following target timetable. Similarly, the urgency of resolving a case may necessitate scheduling special meetings to shorten the total length of the process. Early in the fall term, the CVC shall schedule monthly meetings throughout both terms plus a meeting in May. Every attempt will be made for the hearing to be completed within two weeks of referral of the matter to the committee or by the date of the next monthly meeting, whichever is later. However, the hearing may take longer than two weeks to schedule because of interview scheduling difficulties. In light of the heavy advanced scheduling of the associate dean's time, it is possible that the associate dean's opinion on an appeal will not be conveyed to the committee until as long as two weeks after the appeal was received. If the associate dean, based on his or her opinion, requests a reconsideration, the committee will reconsider the case and reach its final conclusions at the meeting following receipt of the associate dean's request, if practicable.

**8. Maintenance of Records.** For each accusation, a file shall be created in the CVC records. The CVC file of each student case in which there was a finding of a violation shall be maintained after that student's graduation as long as the student's file is maintained under current School policy. (See program Bulletins for student record retention policy.) This file shall contain (a) the written report of a suspected violation, (b) the report of the Hearing Subcommittee; (c) any tape or transcript made of proceedings before the Hearing Subcommittee; and (d) any documents related to any appeal that was submitted and considered. Any violation-related documents in the student's academic file shall remain there until such time as School policy allows destroying the file. A transcript notation shall be maintained on the student's transcript for whatever period has been determined by the CVC sanction, unless at some future point the dean, in consultation with the Associate Dean for Degree Programs and the CVC, supports a petition from the student that the notation be removed.

**9. Other CVC Responsibilities.** The CVC is responsible for ensuring that the provisions of this code are publicized throughout the School and that students, faculty and staff members are aware of and have easy access to the code's content via the School's website. Without compromising a student's confidentiality rights, the committee may at any time publicize its actions through e-mails, the student newspaper, or other means. At a minimum, once a year, the committee shall issue an annual report to the faculty summarizing its activities of the preceding academic year. This report shall incorporate information on CVC and Office of Student Life activities related to alleged violations of either the academic honor code or the code of student conduct.

**10. Effective Date.** The Effective Date of this Code is September 13, 2008. This Code shall apply to any violation with respect to which a report of a suspected violation within the meaning of Paragraph 3 is filed with the Associate Dean for Degree Programs or the chair of the CVC or their designee(s) on or after the Effective Date, regardless of when the alleged violation took place. Violations for which reports of suspected violations had been filed prior to the Effective Date shall be governed by, and subject to, the Code as in effect prior to the Effective Date.