I. Academic Integrity Policy

Responsible Executive	Academic and Program Affairs Committee Co-Chairs
Responsible Party	Academic and Program Affairs Committee
Approval / Signature	AAC, 2020
Pertinent Dates	AAC Approval: February 2020; Review: End of Implementation year, 5 year cycle thereafter
Related Policies	Student Code of Conduct
Audience & Applicability	All current students engaged in courses, programs, learning contexts, and other academic activities of the institution.

ABSTRACT

Academic integrity is essential to the educational and social justice mission of SIT. The Academic Integrity Policy serves to foster a culture of academic integrity by: communicating clear standards of academic conduct; establishing guidelines for reporting suspected violations; setting forth procedures for addressing reported violations to ensure fair and timely application of standards; and facilitating the resolution of charges. All members of SIT's academic community are expected to understand and follow the standards of academic integrity. These standards apply to all work submitted or presented, regardless of stage of completion.

POLICY

I. **Purpose**

The International Center for Academic Integrity defines academic integrity as "a commitment, even in the face of adversity, to six fundamental values: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage" (Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity). These values underscore SIT's Academic Integrity practices and policies to foster a community that encourages the open exchange of ideas and ethical inquiry. Furthermore, this policy is designed to unify and centralize SIT's institutional approach to academic Integrity as it pertains to students across all divisions of academic programming. This policy supersedes disparate policies applying to SIT Graduate Institute, SIT Study Abroad, and IHP.

II. Policy Statement

A. Standards and Definitions of Academic Integrity

SIT establishes standards of academic integrity to instill in our community a foundation of ethical academic conduct. For students, these standards serve as explanations and expectations; students are expected to know and apply the standards in their academic endeavors as they develop as learners, researchers, and practitioners. SIT's standards of academic integrity are classified into four, broad categories:

- Representing yourself with integrity
- Representing others with integrity
- Representing research with integrity
- Supporting a culture of integrity

These categories provide a framework for understanding the relationship between standards and expected conduct. The descriptions of standards and conduct, including violations, are illustrative and representative; they are not exhaustive. Additional activities undertaken to gain an unfair advantage or encourage the unethical actions of others for their academic advantage are encompassed by this policy.

Standard: Representing Yourself with Integrity

This standard refers to truthful representations of the students' abilities, efforts, and circumstances through their actions and communications. To ensure that students represent themselves with integrity, they bear the responsibility of:

Acting Truthfully and Ethically: All students are required to be truthful in conducting and representing their scholarly, creative, and professional work. Between instructors and students is an implicit contract that all coursework will be the product of the student's original thought, research, and effort, reflecting their knowledge, skills, and abilities. Instructors have the right to set parameters on the use of external assistance, such as tutoring, editing, translation, and collaboration. Students are expected to comply with institutional and faculty policies on external assistance from individuals, software, or other learning aids.

Among the actions that are inconsistent with this standard are cheating, unauthorized collaboration, fraud, and falsification of academic records.

Cheating: Actions that violate SIT norms or instructor guidelines for the preparation and submission of assignments to gain an unfair advantage. Examples of cheating include, but are not limited to:

- Using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, devices, or other study aids during an examination, quiz, experiment, or homework assignment.
- Copying another student's work during an examination, quiz, or other academic exercise.

- Soliciting, accessing, or distributing examination materials, such as questions, answers, hints, or data.
- Violating exam, take-home test, and assignment procedures and restrictions established by the instructor.

Unauthorized Collaboration: Frequently, SIT instructors design assignments that require students to collaborate with peers, such as group projects, papers, or presentations. Similarly, instructors encourage peer review, workshops, and feedback. In the aforementioned instances, instructors authorized this collaboration by integrating collaboration into the course and/or assignment design. Collaboration that is not initiated by the instructor through course or assignment design or by granting specific permission is considered to be unauthorized. Obtaining assistance when it is not permitted gives the student an unfair advantage compared to peers who were working independently.

Students should not presume that authorization in one course from an instructor for a project applies beyond the scope of that project. If students are unclear whether collaboration is permitted, they should consult their syllabus or assignment sheet or ask their instructors for clarification or permission. Examples of unauthorized collaboration include, but are not limited to:

- Offering, accepting, or facilitating unauthorized assistance from peers.
- Offering, accepting, or facilitating unauthorized assistance from family. members, professionals, or other individuals on assignments.
- Splitting up and sharing among peers a homework assignment, take-home examination, case study, or other assignment that is intended to be completed individually.
- Using a peer's academic work as a reference for your own or allowing a peer access to your assignments for this purpose.

Fraud: Whereas all acts of academic misconduct are inherently fraudulent, certain actions intended to claim unjustifiable credit for accomplishments or qualities constitute fraud. Examples of fraud include, but are not limited to:

- Assuming or attempting to assume another individual's identity or allowing another person to do so for the purpose of fulfilling any academic requirement or in any way enhancing the student's grade or academic standing.
- Signing an attendance sheet for another student or having another student sign an attendance sheet on your behalf when attendance is a part of the course grade.
- Misrepresenting group projects as one's own work.
- Falsely claiming participation in collaborative work.
- Misrepresenting one's status or affiliation with SIT.
- Forging signatures of faculty, advisors, counselors, student affairs staff, or medical personnel.
- Falsifying timesheets or other records of internship or practicum hours.

Falsification of Records: Alteration, falsification, or fabrication of official records is equally unethical in the act or attempt. Examples of falsification of records include, but are not limited to:

- Tampering with any portion of a transcript or academic record, either before or after enrolling at SIT.
- Altering assignment or course grades via technology or other means.
- Falsifying information on an official document such as drop/add form, ID card, or other SIT documents.
- Forging documentation such as registration forms, change of grade forms, leave of absence forms, etc.
- Providing falsified documentation of a disability to receive unwarranted accommodations.

To ensure that students communicate with integrity, they bear the responsibility of:

Communicating Truthfully and Ethically: Representing yourself with integrity encompasses honest communications on matters pertaining to academic ability and performance. At all times, students are expected to be honest and ethical in their communications and interactions with faculty, advisors, administrators, fellow students, and the wider academic community.

Among the communications that are inconsistent with this standard are misrepresentation, bribery, and intimidation.

Misrepresentation: Deceptive speech or conduct intended to manipulate a situation to gain an unfair academic advantage. Examples of misrepresentation include, but are not limited to:

- Falsifying or fabricating a family or personal situation to receive an academic benefit, such as an extension on course assignments or degree requirements.
- Falsifying or fabricating academic accomplishments, awards, or credentials.
- Forging or attempting to forge letters of recommendation.
- Using SIT branding materials, such as letterhead, seal, or logos, for unofficial purposes or without authorization.

Bribery: Communications and conduct intended to facilitate the exchange of something valuable for academic favor. Examples of bribery include, but are not limited to:

- Offering incentives (e.g. remuneration, gifts, or favors) to any student or SIT representative in exchange for special consideration in grading or waiver of procedures.
- Soliciting or receiving incentives in exchange for special consideration in grading or waiver of procedures.
- Offering a classmate financial compensation for completing an assignment.

Intimidation: Speech or behavior intended to coerce preferential treatment. Examples of intimidation include, but are not limited to:

- Threatening bodily harm or property damage to any student or SIT representative for special consideration or waiver of procedures.
- Threatening to publicize true or false statements or reveal personal information unless certain demands for special consideration in grading or waiver of procedures are met.
- Conspiring with another to extort or blackmail another student or SIT representative to gain an unfair advantage.

Standard: Representing Others with Integrity

This standard refers to truthful representations of the contributions of others in work submitted by a student. All SIT students are responsible for acknowledging the work, ideas, language, data, methods, images, and graphics accessed through primary and secondary sources. Full, accurate, and specific attribution for the intellectual and creative property of others is expected whenever students incorporate it in their academic projects.

To ensure that the contributions of others is represented with integrity, students bear the responsibility of:

- Acknowledging and citing all information from sources that is not considered common knowledge. Common knowledge is defined as well-known, factual information that is easily verified. If five sources contain the same information, the information is considered to be common knowledge.
- Acknowledging, punctuating, and citing direct quotations from a source.
- Acknowledging and citing summaries and paraphrases of source material.
- Acknowledging and citing information derived from lectures, interviews, workshops, or presentations.
- Acknowledging and citing information from unpublished and/or informal sources, such as emails, text messages, social media posts, podcasts, videos, and other online sources.
- Demonstrating their mastery of the preferred documentation style of their academic discipline, such as APA, MLA, CMA, et al.

Among the actions that are inconsistent with this standard are plagiarism, misuse of sources, mosaic plagiarism, bibliographic dishonesty, and self-plagiarism.

Plagiarism: The Council of Writing Program Administrators defines plagiarism as the deliberate use of "someone else's language, ideas, or other original (not common knowledge) material without acknowledging its source" (Defining and Avoiding Plagiarism: The WPA Statement on Best Practices). Examples of intentional plagiarism include, but are not limited to:

- Purchasing a pre-written paper from a person, service, or paper mill.

- Outsourcing the writing of a paper to a third party (ghost writer, classmate, etc).
- Submitting someone else's unpublished work either with or without permission.
- Copying and pasting information from sources into papers and presentations without proper attribution.

Misuse of Sources: Imperfect attribution that results in the accidental appropriation of other's work. As the WPA Statement cautions, "students are not guilty of plagiarism when they try in good faith to acknowledge others' work but fail to do so accurately or fully." Rather than plagiarizing, these students have misused sources due to lack of understanding or inexperience in writing with and documenting sources. Examples of misuse of sources include, but are not limited to:

- Failing to cite or inadequately citing information from sources that is not common knowledge.
- Failing to cite or inadequately citing the source of information for all quotations, paraphrases, or summaries.
- Failing to indicate quoted material through punctuation or blocking exact words, even if cited.
- Failing to cite information from footnotes or endnotes.
- Failing to follow citation formats accurately, completely, or consistently.

Mosaic Plagiarism: Also known as patchwriting, mosaic plagiarism occurs when writers fail to paraphrase or summarize appropriately by replicating the language and structure of the original source. Even if the attempted paraphrase or summary is cited appropriately, the attempt is considered to be mosaic plagiarism because the student gave credit for the idea but appropriated the language. Examples of mosaic plagiarism include, but are not limited to:

- Making minor modifications to a quotation, such as exchanging synonyms or changing verb tenses, rather than expressing the idea in your own words.
- Following the exact sentence structure and incorporating the majority of the phrases of a quotation.
- Misrepresenting ideas, arguments, analyses, or processes conveyed in source material through inaccurate or incomplete paraphrases or summaries.

Bibliographic Dishonesty: This category includes a range of dishonest practices embedded in the references of the paper rather than the body of the paper. Examples of bibliographic dishonesty include, but are not limited to:

- Padding the bibliography by listing sources that were not used.
- Listing the titles of complete works as separate entries when only a single volume was used.
- Citing an entire article or work when only the abstract was used.
- Citing a cross-referenced or indirect source as a separate entry

- Falsifying any of the information in the bibliographic entry.
- Citing fabricated sources.

Self-Plagiarism: Submitting, without prior permission, any work submitted to fulfill another academic requirement. Examples of self-plagiarism include, but are not limited to:

- Submitting the same paper for two different classes without the expressed consent of both professors.
- Reusing data or lab results in another context without citing that it was used previously.

Standard: Representing Research with Integrity

This standard refers to truthful representations of research activity from inquiry to publication. All SIT students are expected to uphold the highest ethical standards in conducting and reporting research.

To ensure that research is represented with integrity, students bear the responsibility of:

- Demonstrating ethical thinking in research design, methods, and analysis.
- Reporting the results of a research study accurately and completely.
- Acknowledging the use of research materials that were obtained from an external source.

Among the actions that are inconsistent with this standard are fabrication, falsification of data, and theft.

Fabrication: Submitting contrived information in any academic exercise, such as a laboratory experiment, fieldwork, or other scholarly investigation. Fabrication most often occurs in the sciences and social sciences when students conduct primary research and carry out a research project they designed. Examples of fabrication include, but are not limited to:

- Inventing studies, procedures, data or results and recording or reporting them in the research record as though they were legitimate.
- Adding fictitious data to a data set collected from an actual experiment to enhance statistical validity.
- Completing a questionnaire, survey, or interview for a fictitious subject or a real subject who was never questioned, surveyed, or interviewed.

Falsification of Data: Misrepresenting, fudging, or altering key components (processes, equipment, data, etc.) of an experiment or study in a way that compromises the integrity of the research record. Examples of data falsification include, but are not limited to:

- Falsifying dates and experimental procedures in the study notes.
- Distorting results from statistical analysis.

- Misrepresenting the methods or materials of an experiment
- Falsifying data in a continuation application for externally supported research
- Presenting any false information in an academic proceeding or publication.

Theft: Stealing, or using without consent, proprietary research materials. Examples of theft include, but are not limited to:

- Utilizing instruments and measures created by another without permission, compensation, and/or acknowledgement.
- Appropriating data obtained by another researcher without permission, compensation, and/or acknowledgement.
- Representing research conclusions of another as one's own.

Standard: Supporting a Culture of Integrity

This standard refers to contributing to an academic community dedicated to ethical conduct. To ensure that students support a culture of academic integrity, they bear the responsibility of:

- Upholding the standards of academic integrity in their interactions, communications, and actions.
- Supporting community members in upholding the standards of academic integrity.
- Seeking clarification from appropriate faculty and administrators on questions concerning academic integrity standards and violations.

Among the actions that are inconsistent with this standard are sabotage, misusing academic materials, and facilitating academic misconduct, obstructing academic integrity proceedings.

Sabotage: Undermining or destroying the research investigation of another person. Examples of sabotage include, but are not limited to:

- Damaging, altering, deleting, or stealing the intellectual work of another person.
- Obstructing or interfering with another student's efforts in an academic exercise.
- Preventing another student from using authorized assistance, material, or study aids.

Misusing Academic Materials: Restricting access or distributing improperly materials for the purpose of gaining an unfair advantage. Examples of misusing academic materials include, but are not limited to:

- Destroying, removing, or making inaccessible library, software, or other academic resources.
- Duplicating copyrighted software without authorization or using such software on SIT computers or networks.

- Violating the rules governing fair use and copyright by improperly distributing proprietary materials and media.

Facilitating Academic Misconduct: Knowingly helping or attempting to help another violate any standard of academic integrity outlined in this policy. Examples of facilitating academic misconduct include, but are not limited to:

- Colluding with other students in planning or engaging in any form of academic misconduct outlined in this policy.
- Condoning the academic misconduct of others by failing to report violations.
- Engaging in any other misconduct undertaken to gain an unfair advantage not specifically stated in this policy.

Obstructing Academic Integrity Proceedings: Impeding, sabotaging, or abusing the process for reporting, investigating, or adjudicating academic integrity violations. Examples of obstructing academic integrity proceedings include, but are not limited to:

- Failing to be fully cooperative and truthful of direct knowledge of an alleged violation of academic integrity.
- Reporting an academic integrity violation known to be false.
- Destroying evidence important to an academic integrity proceeding.
- Violating the confidentiality of an academic integrity proceeding.

B. **Responsibilities**

All members of the SIT academic community share the responsibility for sustaining a culture of academic integrity.

It is the responsibility of all parties, including administrative officers, to take prompt action in order that charges can be resolved quickly and fairly.

Student Responsibilities: Students are accountable for reading and abiding by the Academic Integrity Policy. If students experience difficulty understanding or applying the standards in their academic work, they are obligated to seek clarification from their instructors and advisors and utilize available resources. Failure to read or understand the policy will not prevent negative consequences for violating the standards of academic integrity.

Faculty Responsibilities: All faculty members share the responsibility of establishing a climate that encourages honesty and enhances learning while emphasizing SIT's stance on the gravity of academic integrity violations. Faculty play a vital role in preventing academic integrity violations through instruction and support. At a minimum, faculty should refer to the policy in their course syllabus, explain their expectations for academic integrity to students, and respond to questions about

academic integrity. Faculty members also teach by example by modelling the standards of academic integrity in their own scholarly endeavors. When violations of academic integrity occur, faculty are required to address them in a timely and sensitive manner in accordance with the procedures set forth in this policy.

Administrator Responsibilities: Administrators contribute to fostering a culture of academic integrity on an institutional level. They share the responsibility with faculty to ensure that the policy and procedures for addressing academic integrity violations are clear, fair, and effective. They further assist with communications, adjudication, and recordkeeping.

III. **Procedures**

A. **Violations**

Suspected violations of the Academic Integrity Policy may be reported by any member of the SIT community to the supervising faculty member, program staff, or directly to SIT's Office of Student Affairs. In this initial stage, the suspected violation will be reviewed by the supervising faculty of record (e.g., SIT Study Abroad Academic Director, IHP Program Director, or Graduate Institute faculty member of record for a specific course). In all cases, faculty members who suspect violations are encouraged to consult with the chair of the Academic Integrity Council, who can provide guidance on the policy and its implementation.

In adjudicating academic integrity violations, SIT considers three factors: intentionality, severity, and frequency.

Intentionality: Not all instances of academic misconduct are equally malicious. Some violations are unintentional, resulting from inexperience or inattention with no perceivable attempt to gain an unfair advantage, (e.g. Mosaic Plagiarism). Other violations are intentional, resulting from deliberate misconduct to gain an unfair advantage (e.g. Falsification of Records).

Determining intentionality is at the discretion of the instructor. In cases where intentionality may not be clear cut, faculty should refer to the Academic Integrity Sanction Guidelines. Newer faculty and adjunct faculty are especially encouraged to seek the guidance of their program chair or dean.

Severity: Not all instances of academic misconduct are equally severe. While all allegations of misconduct are serious, violations vary in their impact on the individual, community, and institution. Some violations call into question an individual's academic integrity while other violations have the potential to damage the institution's reputation for integrity.

Severity is determined to a large extent within the description of the standards. In cases where severity is difficult to determine, faculty, especially junior and adjunct faculty, are encouraged to refer to the Academic Integrity Sanction Guidelines or seek guidance from their program chair or dean.

Frequency: Not all instances of academic misconduct are isolated. Prior bad actions have bearing on how allegations of misconduct are reported and addressed. Before initiating a charge of misconduct, faculty are directed to review the student's disciplinary history. After a first offence, all subsequent allegations, regardless of intentionality or severity, will be treated as disciplinary and subject to administrative jurisdiction.

Note: In determining the proper resolution to a charge of misconduct, neither faculty nor administration have the authority to involve the services of academic support specialists or offices, such as tutors or librarians. Academic services support learning and success; they are not a disciplinary penalty.

B. **Jurisdiction and Adjudication**

Depending on the degree of intentionality, severity, and frequency of the infraction, charges of academic misconduct can be resolved through instruction and sanction. Minor infractions may necessitate education and/or appropriate sanction and are subject to faculty jurisdiction. Repeat and major infractions may merit an academic penalty up to and including expulsion or revocation of degree and are subject to administrative jurisdiction.

Students participating in SIT undergraduate semester and summer programs, may face further investigation and sanctions from their home institution. For example, violations may also result in a hearing by sending school officials, which may impact scholarship and other funding the student received as part of her/his participation in the program.

Procedures for adjudication are based on the following premises:

- The presumption of innocence applies to all individuals accused of academic misconduct.
- The burden of proof is "clear and convincing," meaning that the evidence supports a firm conviction that the charge of misconduct is more probable to be true than not untrue.
- Decisions are rendered for responsibility, not guilt.
- Academic Misconduct cases may continue to evolve over several weeks and prolong the process of adjudication.
- Members of the SIT academic community are accountable for violations even if they lack intent to deceive or were unaware that their actions constituted a violation.
- Practicing lawyers are not permitted to participate in the Academic Integrity Process as a representative of the student or faculty.
- Parents/guardians are not permitted to participate in or be present during the adjudication of academic integrity policy violations, unless the involved student is under the age of 18. In those instances, the parent/guardian can observe the hearing process and give their child quiet counsel.
- For visiting students, violations of SIT's Academic Integrity Policy may also result in a hearing by their home institution, which may adversely impact scholarships and other funding the student received as part of their participation in an SIT program.
- In cases where a combination of violations of academic and nonacademic regulations is alleged, students are subject both to the Academic Integrity Policy and the Student Code of Conduct.

When charges of academic misconduct are in the process of being adjudicated, the following restrictions apply to faculty members and students:

- The instructor may not drop or suspend a student from the course.
- The instructor may not issue a grade for either the course or specific work that is the subject of the suspected violation.

- An accused student may not drop or withdraw from the course.
- An accused student may not initiate a leave of absence from SIT. Faculty and administrators will work with students facing medical, family or other personal emergencies on a case-by-case basis to facilitate resolution of their case.
- An accused student who takes an inappropriate leave of absence to avoid having their case heard will be classified as having been withdrawn from SIT for disciplinary reasons.
- If the violation cannot be resolved prior to final grade submission, the faculty member should assign an Incomplete (I) until the charge is adjudicated. Once concluded, a grade change form must be submitted to the Registrar's Office.

Faculty Jurisdiction: Minor Violations

Faculty can directly address minor violations on a case-by-case basis in two ways: Instructional Resolution or Disciplinary Resolution. Both options for resolution follow the same basic procedures: investigation, conference, resubmission and/or sanction, and documentation.

Instructional Resolution: This approach is designed for situations where instruction is the best course of action to resolve a minor academic integrity violation.

- **Investigation:** While there is no prescribed procedure for investigating allegations of academic misconduct, instructors are responsible for gathering sufficient evidence to levy a charge. For example, evidence of mosaic plagiarism would include side-by-side comparisons of the original source material and the student's academic work.
- **Notification:** The faculty member notifies the student of the infraction in writing/email or in person and schedules a conference to resolve the matter. Conferences can be held in person or via SIT's official web conferencing platforms.
- **Conference:** The purpose of the conference is to discuss the infraction, review the evidence, and engage in a constructive dialog about the student's actions and acceptable standards. If the student denies the allegations and provides sufficient evidence to the faculty member that no violation occurred, the incident shall be closed with no report. If the professor concludes that the student has violated the standards, then the infraction will be used as a case study for an instructional intervention and resubmission of the assignment. Conferences should be prompt, private, and educative, with a focus on student learning of appropriate academic conduct.
- **Resubmission:** To demonstrate their understanding of the standard, the student is given the opportunity to revise and resubmit the assignment or submit an alternate assignment for full credit. **Note:** If the resubmission is unsatisfactory in demonstrating the student's ability to apply the standard in their academic work, the faculty member should indicate so on the Academic Integrity Misconduct form and seek a Disciplinary Resolution.

- **Documentation:** If the resubmission is satisfactory, the faculty member documents the successful resolution of the charge through completing the Instructional Resolution section of the Academic Integrity Misconduct form. This documentation must be signed by the faculty member and the student. This form constitutes a formal warning and will be kept on file with the Academic Integrity Council until the student completes their course of study at SIT. This record is kept confidential unless a subsequent charge of misconduct is filed. In this instance, the student will be subject to Administrative Jurisdiction.

Disciplinary Resolution: This approach is designed for situations where sanction is warranted to reinforce the importance of maintaining the standards of academic integrity.

- **Investigation:** While there is no prescribed procedure for investigating allegations of academic misconduct, instructors are responsible for gathering sufficient evidence to levy a charge. For example, evidence of mosaic plagiarism would include side-by-side comparisons of the original source material and the student's academic work.

- **Notification:** The faculty member notifies the student of the infraction in writing or in person and schedules a conference to resolve the matter. Conferences can be held in person or via SIT's official web conferencing platforms.

- **Conference:** The purpose of the conference is to discuss the infraction and review the evidence. If the student denies the allegations and provides sufficient evidence to the faculty member that no violation occurred, the incident shall be closed with no report. If the instructor concludes that the student is responsible for academic misconduct, the instructor will impose a sanction. The conference should be prompt, private, and educative, with an emphasis on resolving the violation appropriately.

- **Sanction:** In determining the appropriate sanction, instructors follow the Academic Integrity Sanction Guidelines. To resolve the violation through sanction, the student does not contest the charge of misconduct and accepts responsibility for the infraction by agreeing to the recommended sanction. The sanction may consist of academic penalty alone, such as failing an assignment, or combine penalty with resubmission for reduced credit.

- **Documentation:** The faculty member documents the successful resolution of the charge through completing the Disciplinary Resolution section of the Academic Integrity Misconduct form. This documentation must be signed by the faculty member and the student. The form will be kept on file with the Academic Integrity Council until the student completes their course of study at SIT. This record is kept confidential unless a subsequent charge of misconduct is filed. In this instance, the student will be subject to Administrative Jurisdiction. **Note:** If the student contests the charge and sanction, the faculty member should indicate so on the Academic Integrity Misconduct form and seek a Disciplinary Review.

Administrative Jurisdiction: Major and Repeat Violations

For major and repeat violations that cannot be resolved through faculty jurisdiction, instructors complete the Administrative Jurisdiction section of the Academic Integrity Misconduct form. The form should be submitted within 10 business days from the date of discovery and supported by appropriate documentation. Upon receipt, the Chair of the Academic Integrity Council will determine the appropriate resolution: Disciplinary Review or Disciplinary Hearing.

Disciplinary Review: This approach is designed to resolve repeat violations and contested violations that could not be resolved through Disciplinary Resolution.

- **Notification:** The Chair of the Academic Integrity Council notifies the student of the charge of academic misconduct and outlines the Disciplinary Review process. A copy of this notification is shared with the faculty member involved. For visiting students, a copy may be shared with a representative from their home institution.

- **Investigation:** The Chair of the Academic Integrity Council requests a written statement from all parties involved and copies of an any corroborating evidence. Statements from faculty should include a description of the alleged misconduct, a factual narrative of circumstances, and an overview of the evidence. Statements from the accused should include a refutation of the allegations, a factual narrative of the circumstances, and a response to the evidence in the case.

- **Review:** Once all case materials are gathered, the Chair convenes a 3-person panel comprised of members of the Council to review the charges and evidence.

- **Decision:** Based on their review, the Panel renders a Decision. The Panel may choose to uphold, revise, or reverse the decision of the Disciplinary Resolution. For repeat offenses, the Panel may render a Decision on responsibility. Should the Panel conclude the accused responsible for academic misconduct, they can impose a penalty according to the Academic Integrity Sanction Guidelines.

- **Documentation:** The Chair documents successful resolution of the charge in a decision letter that is shared with the student and faculty member. A copy of the letter is kept on file with the Academic Integrity Council and the Registrar's office. For visiting students, the decision letter is shared with the relevant official from their home institution, such as the study abroad director.

Disciplinary Hearing: This approach is intended to resolve the most complicated cases and most egregious violations of academic misconduct. In situations involving multiple students, the Chair may permit hearings concerning each student to be conducted separately or simultaneously.

- **Notification:** The Chair of the Academic Integrity Council notifies the student of the charge of academic misconduct and outlines the Disciplinary Hearing process. The notification also contains the date, time, and location (physical or digital) of the hearing. A copy of this notification is shared with the faculty member involved. For visiting students, a copy may be shared with a representative from their home institution.

- **Hearing:** The Chair of the Academic Integrity Council convenes a hearing and oversees the proceedings. During the hearing, the individual initiating the charge of academic misconduct and the individual charged of misconduct will have the opportunity to speak and present evidence. The Council will have the opportunity to ask questions after each speaker concludes their explanations. Following questions, all participants will be dismissed and the Academic Integrity Council will consider the information and evidence presented, and determine responsibility for the charges by simple majority. **Note:** Graduate students may be accompanied to the hearing by their advisor. Undergraduate students may be accompanied by an official representative from their home institution. In either scenario, advisors and representatives may offer support and advice but they have no official voice in the hearing.

- **Decision:** Based on the hearing, the Council renders a decision on responsibility. If the Council determines that the allegation of a breach of student academic integrity is not substantiated, the instructor will reevaluate the grade consistent with the instructor's grading policies and procedures as stated in the course syllabus. If the student is found responsible of violating the policy, the Council will recommend a sanction in accordance to the Academic Integrity Sanction Guidelines.

- **Documentation:** The Chair documents the resolution of the charge in a decision letter that is shared with the student and faculty member. A copy of the letter is kept on file with the Academic Integrity Council and the Registrar's office. The Registrar's full and complete copy constitutes the official institutional record of the case. For visiting students, the decision letter is shared with the relevant official from their home institution, such as the study abroad director.

C. **Sanctions**

SIT's Academic Integrity Sanction Guidelines presents a range of sanctions for breaches of academic integrity, from a written warning to expulsion. Sanctions are assigned with the intent of maintaining consistency and fairness. The degree of sanction is primarily correlated with the gravity of the violation.

D. **Appeals**

Decisions of the Academic Integrity Council may be appealed on the basis of substantial new evidence or sufficient grounds for good cause. Substantial new evidence refers to evidence that was not available at the original hearing that has a direct bearing on the charge. Sufficient grounds for good cause refers to an infringement on the rights of the student caused by any irregularities in the way the Academic Integrity Council conducted their proceedings. Whether the appeal is based on substantial new evidence or sufficient grounds for good cause, the student bears the responsibility to demonstrate that a decision and sanction should be reconsidered.

Appeals to the decisions of the Academic Integrity Council are administered through SIT's Council of Deans.

- **Notification:** To appeal a decision, students must complete an AIC Decision Appeal Form, indicate the basis of the appeal, and submit all materials to the Council of Deans via email within 10 working days of the initial notification of the Academic Integrity Council's decision. Included with the form is a narrative explanation of the basis of the appeal. If an appeal is not submitted within the allotted time, the decision of the Academic Integrity Council will stand.

- **Investigation:** The Chair of the Council of Deans, or designee, requests a copy of the documents on file with the Academic Integrity Council and Registrar's office. The Chair or designee may also request additional statements from all parties involved and copies of an any corroborating evidence.

- **Review:** The Council of Deans will review the case history, consisting of the documents on file with the Academic Integrity Council and Registrar's office regarding the matter under appeal, and additional materials gathered during the investigation stage of the appeal process.

- **Decision:** Based on the review, the Council of Deans will render a decision on the appeal. The Council may uphold or reverse the decision of the Academic Integrity Council or uphold the decision and reduce the sanction. In no case will a more severe sanction be imposed.

- **Documentation:** The Council of Deans documents the resolution of the appeal in a decision letter that is shared with the student, faculty member, and Chair of the Academic Integrity Council. A copy of the letter is kept on file with the Council of Deans, Academic Integrity Council and the Registrar's office. The Registrar's full and complete copy constitutes the official institutional record of the case. For visiting students, the decision letter is shared with the relevant official from their home institution, such as the study abroad director.

IV. Exceptions

There are no exceptions to this policy.

V. Forms

A. Academic Integrity Misconduct Form

B. AIC Decision Appeal Form

VI. Contact Information

A. Academic Affairs Committee: aac@sit.edu

VII. Appendix

A. Academic Integrity Sanction Guidelines

B. Student Guide to the Academic Integrity Policy

C. Faculty Guide to the Academic Integrity Policy

Academic Integrity Policy Addendum: Policy **on Generative Artificial Intelligence and Academic Programs**

Responsible Executive	Provost
Responsible Party	Council for Academic Affairs
Approval / Signature	AAC, 2025
Pertinent Dates	Drafted: Fall 2023, Revised Spring 2024, Revised Spring 2025 Approved: Summer 2025
Related Policies	SIT Academic Integrity Policy Code of Student Conduct World Learning Policy for Using Generative Artificial Intelligence
Audience & Applicability	All current students engaged in courses, programs, learning contexts, and other academic activities of the institution.

ABSTRACT

This addendum to the Academic Integrity Policy serves to outline acceptable uses of generative artificial intelligence (AI) in SIT academic programs. These standards apply to all work submitted or presented, regardless of the stage of completion.

POLICY

I. **Purpose**

To articulate SIT's position on the emergence of generative artificial intelligence in higher education and provide further guidance to faculty and students on its usage in student work.

II. **Policy Statement**

SIT recognizes the affordances and constraints of generative artificial intelligence and the consequent ethical issues surrounding its usage by students, faculty, and staff. SIT also recognizes the value in the development of cognitive and social skills through experiential learning, fieldwork, and independent thinking. However, rather than condemn or condone the use of generative AI across the board, SIT supports faculty in determining whether it is appropriate for students to utilize generative AI in coursework and graded assignments. For faculty and staff usage, SIT adheres to World Learning's Policy for Using Generative Artificial Intelligence.

Faculty are directed to communicate their position on generative AI during orientation and all syllabi, assignment sheets, and academic materials, specifying the parameters of acceptable use. If faculty authorize the usage of generative AI, students are responsible for citing all AI-generated content following the conventions of the style guide designated for the course.

The following examples of syllabus statements are adapted from Cornell University's resource on AI & Academic Integrity:

Sample statement prohibiting use of generative AI

To ensure academic integrity and equitable evaluation of student performance, the use of generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools is prohibited. If you are unsure whether or not a tool is considered generative AI, consult your faculty or instructor *prior to* using the technology or completing your assignment.

Sample statement permitting use of generative AI with attribution

If generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools are used in producing an assignment, students should cite directly quoted text to the creator of the generative AI tool used (e.g., cite OpenAI when directly quoting ChatGPT). This citation should be used for both in-text citations and the reference list.

Example: When prompted with, "Is it ethical to use generative AI without proper attribution?" ChatGPT indicated, "Using generative AI without proper attribution can be considered ethically problematic, as it raises issues related to intellectual property, transparency, and honesty" (OpenAI, 2023).

Reference

OpenAI. (2023). ChatGPT (Aug 10 GPT-3.5 version) [Large language model]. https://chat.openai.com

When using AI generated content for course materials or in assignments that students submit, transparency is key, and these instances should be properly referenced. Faculty may want to select citation guidelines and share them with their students using APA style. Guidance given to students must align with SIT academic policies.

That said, SIT also recognizes concerns about security and sensitive information. SIT is committed to protecting the privacy and data security of individuals and communities and adhering to relevant data protection laws and best practices. For this reason, we caution against entering any confidential information, including personally identifiable information, into an AI platform. ChatGPT and other generative AI platforms can reuse the content generated by queries, thus there is no confidentiality or data protection around any content entered into the system.

All non-approved usage of generative AI is considered a violation of academic integrity as the SIT Academic Integrity Policy states that "Students are expected to comply with institutional and faculty policies on external assistance from individuals, software, or other learning aids." Generative AI falls under the category of "other learning aids." Students who engage in the unauthorized use of generative AI are therefore subject to sanctions according to the SIT Academic Integrity Policy.

III. Definitions

Artificial Intelligence (AI): Computer programs and machines engineered to perform tasks that normally require problem-solving and decision-making abilities associated with human intelligence.

Generative Artificial Intelligence: A form of artificial intelligence that utilizes deep-learning to create content (text, images, code, etc.) in response to prompts.

Plagiarism: The deliberate use of "someone else's language, ideas, or other original (not common knowledge) material without acknowledging its source" (Council of Writing Program Administrators, 2003).

Sensitive Information: Data that must be protected from unauthorized access to safeguard the privacy or security of an individual or organization.

IV. Exceptions

There are no exceptions to this policy.

V. Forms

NA