

LBC Honesty Policy

Intellectual integrity is the foundation of the scientific community. Good citizens in the scientific community respect and protect the integrity of the intellectual enterprise. To facilitate this, scientists have established formal scholarship guidelines in their academic institutions, in their professional associations, and at the levels of state, federal, and international governance. Such guidelines cover a wide array of scholarship concerns, such as potential conflicts of interest, protection of animals and human subjects, protection of intellectual property, appropriate dissemination of data, and safety and security measures for researchers and laboratories. Many of these guidelines can be found in Chapter VI ("Research and Creative Endeavor") in the MSU Faculty Handbook, and oversight is provided by, among others, the University Research Council, the Office of Intellectual Property, the Office of Regulatory Affairs, the Office of the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, and the Office of Radiation, Chemical, and Biological Safety.

The Briggs Community Council (containing faculty, staff, and student representatives) believes this Academic Honesty Policy is consistent with the general principles of those policies above, guiding the intellectual integrity of Lyman Briggs faculty. As such, this policy not only establishes due process for those cases of academic dishonesty, but-more importantly-this policy is a proactive instrument to help socialize Lyman Briggs students into a larger scientific community. To this effect, this policy is meant to encourage a responsible attitude toward learning and to support a sound academic morale by discouraging unethical behavior in student academic work.

1. Academic dishonesty includes (but is not limited to):

1.1. cheating: intentionally receiving, using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in any academic exercise, including written materials, verbal and non-verbal communication, and electronic communication; 1.2. fabrication: intentional falsification or invention of any information (including experimental and observational data) or citation in an academic exercise; 1.3. plagiarism: representing the words or ideas of another as one's own in any academic exercise (e.g., papers, computer programming assignments, class presentation, or laboratory reports); 1.4. submitting the same paper, or substantially similar papers, to meet the requirements of more than one course without the consent of all instructors concerned; 1.5. depriving another of necessary course materials or obstructing or sabotaging another's work; 1.6. unauthorized use of work generated by another student and misrepresentation of authorship by submitting as individual work materials that were a result of collaboration with others; 1.7. facilitating academic dishonesty-intentionally helping or attempting to help another to commit an act of academic dishonesty. 2. Instructors in Lyman Briggs are expected to take appropriate action in all instances of academic dishonesty. Instructors are also expected to clearly identify the range of consequences for academic dishonesty in the course

syllabus, making explicit reference to this policy for further information. In cases of academic dishonesty, an instructor may take action consistent with his/her syllabus, including giving a failing grade on the assignment, giving a lower or failing grade for the course, and/or recommending additional disciplinary action. Prior to imposing such grade penalties or recommending additional disciplinary action, the instructor must provide the student with a written explanation of the basis for the action to be taken.

3.If problems arise in the relationship between instructor and student, both should attempt to resolve them in informal, direct discussions. If the problem remains unresolved, either the student or professor may consult with the head administrator of Lyman Briggs and/or the Office of the Ombudsman.

4.With instances of academic dishonesty where the instructor feels that action other than, or in addition to, grading penalties is warranted, the instructor may report the case to the head administrator of Lyman Briggs. The head administrator will attempt to resolve the problem in informal, direct discussions with the student and the instructor. When penalties other than, or in addition to, a lowered or failing grade are warranted, the head administrator shall refer the case to the student's academic dean for further action in accordance with the procedures of the guidelines stated in "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University," available from the MSU Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs (www.vps.msu.edu).

5. Students have specific rights and recourses in cases that involve allegations of academic dishonesty. Following the policies of the "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University" report, a student may submit to the head administrator of Lyman Briggs a formal, written request for an academic grievance hearing within Lyman Briggs. The head administrator of Lyman Briggs shall initiate the following grievance process.

5.1. Student grievances must normally be initiated no later than mid-term of the semester following the one wherein the alleged violation occurred. If the involved instructor or student is absent from the University during the semester, or if other appropriate reasons exist, an exception to this provision shall be granted by the head administrator of Lyman Briggs. If the involved instructor is no longer employed by the University before the formal grievance procedure is completed, the grievance process may still proceed.

5.2. Following the guidelines provided by Article 2 Section 4 of the "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University," student grievances must be initiated at the lowest administrative level feasible. In this case, this is Lyman Briggs.

5.3. A Lyman Briggs hearing board shall be established by the Briggs Advisory Council in the following manner: Lyman Briggs Academic Honesty Policy

5.3.1. A hearing board shall consist of two (2) students, drawn by lot from the Lyman Briggs population, and three (3) Lyman Briggs faculty members, also drawn by lot. Both drawings shall be conducted by the Briggs Advisory Council or its designee(s) within five (5) class days of the

head administrator's receipt of the request for an academic grievance hearing. 5.3.1.1. Students or faculty unwilling or unable to serve may file a written request with the Briggs Advisory Council or its designee(s) to be excused. If the request is granted, replacement members shall be drawn pursuant to the process outlined above. 5.3.1.2. "Faculty members" consists of those teaching one or more courses in Lyman Briggs during the semester when the alleged incident of academic dishonesty occurred. 5.3.2. The head administrator shall notify each party of the names drawn for the hearing board and within ten (10) class days of the creation of the hearing board either party, student or instructor, shall challenge any member for cause in writing to the Briggs Advisory Council or its designee(s). In addition, each party shall have one peremptory challenge. Cause shall be determined by the Briggs Advisory Council or its designee(s). Challenged members shall be replaced pursuant to the procedures stated in 5.3.1. 5.4. The hearing board shall conduct a hearing according to the procedures stated below and according to guidelines in Article 2 of "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University." 5.4.1. A hearing shall commence within fourteen (14) class days of the establishment of the hearing board. 5.4.2. The head administrator of Lyman Briggs shall assemble the hearing board and shall supervise selection of the Presiding Officer from among the members of the hearing board. 5.4.3. The Presiding Officer shall apply the rules of procedure consistent with the guidelines stated in Article 2 of "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University." 5.4.3.1. Whenever a hearing board loses a member, the hearing shall be terminated and a new board selected. 5.4.3.2. The head administrator of Lyman Briggs shall transmit written grievances to the hearing board and to the instructor or other persons party to the matter. This shall be done before the board begins its hearings. 5.4.4. At least three (3) class days prior to a hearing, the student shall receive a written notification of the hearing, consistent with the guidelines in "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University." 5.4.5. The board shall ensure that a collegial atmosphere prevails in grievance hearings. Involvement of an advisor should normally not be required; when present, the advisor shall be limited to a member of the student body, faculty, or staff of the University. The advisor shall not address the board directly, unless approved by the Presiding Officer of the hearing board. 5.4.6. The hearing board shall prepare a written record of its findings, and forward copies to the parties involved, to the head administrator of Lyman Briggs, and to the Office of the Ombudsman. All recipients are expected to respect the confidentiality of this report. 5.4.7. When a hearing board finds that a violation of academic rights has occurred and that redress is possible, it shall direct that redress be provided. The head administrator of Lyman Briggs, with the advice of the hearing board and the Briggs Advisory Council, shall implement an appropriate remedy.

6. A record of the circumstances, sanctions, and any appeal regarding acts of academic dishonesty will be placed in the student's file (unless the alleged acts have been shown to be unsubstantiated or the case dismissed by the appropriate hearing authorities).

Approved by the Briggs Community Council on April 27, 2007