Academic Integrity Violation Process
Smeal MBA, EMBA, OMBA, & MOL

Smeal Honor Code: "We, the Smeal College of Business community, aspire to the highest ethical standards and will hold each other accountable to them. We will not engage in any action that is improper or that creates the appearance of impropriety in our academic lives, and we intend to hold this standard in our future careers."

The Academic Integrity (AI) Violation process is utilized for Smeal's professional graduate programs that are MBA and MBA derivatives. It has been designed as a student-focused complement to the Penn State University AI process. With this process, we seek to uphold and represent the Smeal Honor Code, particularly with respect to holding ourselves accountable and the perception of impropriety. The actions of each community member affects and represents the whole. We also aspire to represent our Penn State Values: Integrity, Respect, Responsibility, Discovery, Excellence, and Community.

Definition of Terms

Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) – The AIC will comprise the program's Academic Integrity Officer, an elected or appointed student representative for each program (ex. MBAA VP of Academic Affairs and Student Relations), the program's Managing Director, and students who have volunteered to be engaged in promoting academic integrity and participating in Review and Appeal Boards. While all program students will be provided an orientation to academic integrity and the AI violation process, service on the AIC and an AI Board will be encouraged but not required. Additional Review and Appeal Board training will be conducted as needed. AIC student membership will be refreshed each semester by the elected student official or AI Officer. The AI Officer will work with faculty to aid on the AIC and for selecting AI Board members.

Academic Integrity Officer (AIO) – The Faculty Director or a person appointed by the Dean to aid in the promotion of academic integrity and the implementation of the Honor Code for each program. The AIO may appoint a delegate to for process facilitation if a need arises.

Advisor – Any person whom the Respondent wishes to have assist in preparing his/her case for the Review or Appeal Board.

Alleged Violation Report – An Alleged Violation Report is a formal report submitted to the Academic Integrity Officer of a potential Infraction against the Honor Code and/or the University's Code of Conduct.

Boards:

- *Review Board* – A Review Board is a panel of members from the program's student Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) and faculty appointed by the Academic Integrity Officer to investigate an Alleged Violation Report, decide on the merits of the Alleged Violation Report, determine

responsibility for Infractions outlined in the Alleged Violation Report, and choose the Sanction(s), if any, to be applied. A Review Board consists of two students and one faculty member. A Review Board is chaired by the Academic Integrity Officer, who is a non-voting member. In addition, a professional staff member from the Smeal Professional Graduate Programs (PGP) office will serve as the secretary of each Board. S/he will record minutes of the proceedings and request any needed clarity specificity required for executing the Sanction(s).

- *Appeal Board* – An Appeal Board is a panel of members from the respective program's student Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) and faculty appointed by the Academic Integrity Officer to hear the appeal of a Respondent who is contesting an Academic Charge or Sanction(s) determined by a Review Board. An Appeal Board consists of three students and two faculty members. An Appeal Board is chaired by the Academic Integrity Officer, who is a non-voting member. In addition, a professional staff member from the Smeal Professional Graduate Programs (PGP) office will serve as the secretary of each Board and will record minutes of the proceedings.

Charge – A Charge is the official description of the Academic Integrity Violation to be listed on the University Academic Integrity Form.

Complainant – The Complainant is the person who submits an Alleged Violation Report; there may be more than one person who provides a complaint.

Hearing – A Hearing is a formal review of the merits of the Infraction alleged in an Alleged Violation Report. Hearings held by the Review and Appeal Boards are formal hearings under the procedures defined herein, but are not legal proceedings. A Hearing will result in a decision by the Board about the responsibility of the Respondent for an Infraction and the determination of an Academic and/or Programmatic Sanction(s). The Review Board or Appeal Board may, in addition to Academic or Programmatic sanctions, recommend that the Office of Student Conduct consider Conduct sanctions. Hearings are conducted in person or in hybrid or virtual format as appropriate to the program.

Infraction – Infractions are academic integrity violations of the Honor Code and/or the Code of Conduct. Additionally, any student who has knowledge of an academic integrity violation of the Honor Code, but who does not report the violation, has committed an Infraction.

Respondent – A Respondent is a student who is formally accused of committing an academic integrity violation of the Honor Code.

Sanctions:

- *Academic Sanction* – An Academic Sanction is a classroom-related, usually grading, action imposed by the Review Board for an academic integrity violation of the Honor Code. No Academic Sanction will be imposed without a Hearing.
- *Programmatic Sanction* – A Programmatic Sanction is an action determined by the Review Board for an academic integrity violation of the Honor Code. It relates to consequences outside of the classroom, for example scholarships/fellowships, or other programmatic services or privileges. Example sanctions are listed in the *Academic Integrity Violation Sanction Options* section.
- *Conduct Sanction* – A Conduct Sanction is an additional action determined by and handed down only by the Penn State University Office of Student Conduct under the University's Code of Conduct (http://studentaffairs.psu.edu/conduct/).

Student Representative – Each year a student representative for each program is elected or appointed, for example the MBAA VP of Academic Affairs and Student Relations. This student leads the student Academic Integrity Committee (AIC), reviews Alleged Violation Reports with the managing director and AIO to assess whether to hold a Hearing, and helps the AIO fill Review/Appeal Boards. If this

student is sanctioned for an AI Violation, the program administration will decide whether a new representative should be elected or appointed.

Violation Disclosure Notices – In order to foster a transparent environment of continuous learning, outcomes of our AI violation experiences will be shared with the internal Smeal community. The AI Officer for each program will send individual AI Violation Disclosures to their program students, staff, and faculty as well as the other PGP managing directors and faculty directors within 24 hours of each case's resolution as signified by the respondent signing the AI Violation Form with Sanctions. These notices will include the general nature of any Hearing, the outcome of the Hearing, and lessons learned. To protect the rights of the Respondent, the Respondent will not be identified nor will there be sufficient information to allow other parties to identify the Respondent. The notices should seek to maintain all students' confidentiality, show consequences for violations, and help the community learn from one another. Individual Violation Disclosure release dates may vary due to case specific details and appeal procedures, but the intent is to communicate as quickly as possible following each case's resolution.

Witness – A Witness is any individual who can provide information about an Alleged Violation Report.

Academic Integrity Violation Process (AI)

Nature of the Faculty-Student Relationship

The primary relationship in education is that between the faculty member teaching a course and the student taking the course. The AI process is not intended to diminish this relationship in any way. Faculty members are expected to meet with students about potential academic integrity violations. Faculty members are then asked to report all potential violations to the appropriate Academic Integrity Officer. This reporting will ensure both consistency in the administration of sanctions and transparency in the reporting of violations. When a faculty member believes a violation has occurred, he or she will share with both the student and the Academic Integrity Officer the level of Academic Sanction he or she views as appropriate. The Review/Appeal board will consider this in its Sanctioning decision.

Submission of Alleged Violation Reports

The academic integrity process begins with the submission of an Alleged Violation Report to the Academic Integrity Officer. Any party (student, faculty, staff, or administrator) who observes a perceived Academic Integrity Infraction against the Honor Code may make such a submission. Additionally, students may self-report Infractions. When a faculty member observes a potential violation in his/her course, s/he will speak with the respondent before filing a formal Alleged Violation Report.

Students witnessing or aware of an Academic Integrity Infraction by another student (or students) are encouraged, but not required, to discuss the concern directly with their classmate(s) or hold a confidential meeting with the Academic Integrity Officer or elected/appointed student official with academic integrity responsibility (ex. MBAA VP of Academic Affairs and Student Relations) before filing a formal Alleged Violation Report. Any student determined to have knowledge of an Academic Integrity Infraction who does not report it is in violation of the Honor Code.

Faculty Role in Alleged Violation Reporting (in language for faculty)

If you observe a potential AI violation, or if one is reported to you, please talk to the student(s) involved and Contact the program's faculty director (AI Officer). Please do not try to resolve the issue on your own. The faculty director will respond and ask you to fill out a brief alleged violation report including relevant details and any sanctions you recommend if the student did commit the violation.

Please do not handle the situation on your own as you might in other programs. The process for our MBA programs and derivative programs is designed for higher student accountability and participation. The program's faculty director will ensure the issue is resolved through the process and consistent with past violations.

Review of Alleged Violation Reports

The Academic Integrity Officer will review the Alleged Violation Report with the program's Managing Director and the elected/appointed student who shares responsibility for the academic integrity process for that program (ex. MBAA VP of Academic Affairs and Student Relations). Together they will determine if evidence reasonably supports moving forward to a Review Board. In general, if evidence is sufficient, convening a Review Board is the default position rather than trying to resolve without a Hearing.

Review Board Hearing

Within one week of receipt of the Alleged Violation Report, the Academic Integrity Officer will appoint a Review Board. These individuals will be sent the AI Violation Process, the Academic Integrity Violation Sanction Options (for Academic and Programmatic Sanctions), and the Penn State Sanctioning Guidelines prior to the Hearing and are expected to be fully informed. The Hearing will be conducted within one additional week. Therefore, the process of Alleged Violation Report to resolution should take no more than two weeks.

Academic Integrity Officer will chair the Review Board, and Program Office staff will schedule the time and place of the Review Board Hearing. While timing may shift to accommodate exceptions, responsiveness is critical in this process. Hearings are conducted in person or in hybrid or virtual format as appropriate to the program. Hearings should not be recorded.

Prior to the Review Board Hearing, the AI Officer may conduct preliminary information gathering relevant to the case. This includes talking with the faculty member(s), Complainant(s), Respondent(s), or Witness(es). The AI Officer then prepares an information packet including the Alleged Violation Report and any additional materials. At the Hearing, Review Board members will be provided copies of the case preparation material. They will immediately review these documents and will return all materials to the AI Officer at the Hearing's conclusion. All individuals are expected to keep confidential all discussions and proceedings.

The Respondent(s) is expected to be "on call" either live or virtually during the Hearing in case the Review Board would like to question him/her or in order to give a statement to the Review Board. If the Review Board has questions for other individuals, the Review Board may adjourn temporarily and reconvene within 72 hours. This is not preferred, as it delays resolution and risks confidentiality. The AI Officer may gather the required information, or the requested individuals may come to the second Hearing. Any individuals invited into the Hearing may only be present during their own testimony.

During the Hearing, the Review Board will make a determination whether it is reasonable to believe that the Respondent(s) is responsible for the Alleged Violation based on the information gathered. In cases where the Respondent(s) admits responsibility, this determination is automatic.

Once a decision has been made about responsibility, the Review Board will consider Sanction(s). The Review Board will use the Academic Integrity Violation Sanction Options (for Academic and Programmatic Sanctions) and Penn State Sanctioning Guidelines lists to determine the Sanction(s). Once determined, the Review Board will receive information regarding the Respondent(s)'prior conduct history related to Violations of Academic Integrity. When appropriate, the recommended Sanction(s) may be modified to reflect the prior violation(s). A University Academic Integrity Form will then be completed by the AI Officer. The form will indicate the Academic Integrity Violation as well as the recommended Sanction(s).

Once the Review Board has determined the Charge and Sanction(s), the Academic Integrity Officer will meet with the Respondent as soon as possible to explain the decisions of the Review Board regarding responsibility and the possible sanctioning. The Respondent(s) will be provided with the Academic Integrity Form and will have five business days to make a decision. If the Respondent(s) accepts the decisions of the Review Board, the Respondent(s) will sign the form acknowledging acceptance; if the Respondent(s) disagrees with these decisions, the student may contest to an Appeal Board. If the Respondent(s) chooses not to respond in the five business day period, the process will continue as if the student accepted the Charge and Sanction(s). The AI Officer will send all documentation to the appropriate central repositories such as the Office of Student Conduct and/or World Campus AI Officer.

The Review Board may also conclude that the Respondent(s) has committed an Infraction that could call for a Conduct Sanction. In such instances, the Review Board will refer the matter to the respective program office, who may use their Professional Integrity process, if applicable, and/or Penn State's Office of Student Conduct, which will handle the case under its own procedures for potential Conduct Sanctions. Any Academic or Programmatic Sanction imposed by the Review Board will take effect regardless of other actions by the program office or the Office of Student Conduct.

Review and Appeal Boards require a majority to recommend any Sanction(s). Sanctions available to the Review Board are Academic Sanctions, Programmatic Sanctions, and recommendations to the Office of Student Conduct to consider Conduct Sanctions. The Review Board may not impose Conduct Sanctions such as expulsion from Penn State University. A list of available Sanctions is available up to and including termination from the program. The Review Board should be as specific as possible about Sanction details and implementation when recommending Sanctions. The Academic Integrity Officer and program's Managing Director will implement any Sanctions with their best interpretation of the Board's intent.

Appeal Board

If a Respondent(s) does not accept the decisions of a Review Board, the Academic Integrity Officer will appoint and chair an Appeal Board. The PGP office will schedule the proceedings within one week. The Appeal Board will be given information provided to the Review Board and will have the opportunity to ask for additional information from the Review Board. With this information, the Appeal Board will follow the same Hearing procedures as a Review Board. The decision of the Appeal Board is final except when the recommended Sanction is termination from the program; in such cases the Respondent(s) may appeal to the Dean of the College whose decision about dismissal will be final.

Rights of a Respondent

Any Respondent will have the right to appear before a Review or Appeal Board. The Academic Integrity Officer will notify a Respondent of the composition of the Review Board before the Review Board

meets. The Respondent has the right to challenge any member of the Review Board based on perceived bias against the Respondent. The Academic Integrity Officer will make the decision on the merits of the challenge; this decision by the Academic Integrity Officer is final.

Each Respondent will be given the opportunity to see all information collected for a Review Board. The Respondent will be allowed to present his/her defense at the Review Board, including questioning the Complainant(s). However, the Review Board will closely monitor the questioning of a Complainant by a Respondent and may stop the questioning if it becomes inappropriate or irrelevant to the proceeding. A Respondent is allowed to bring an Adviser to a Hearing, but no additional parties will be allowed in a closed Hearing.

Faculty Involvement in Hearings

No faculty member in whose course an Alleged Infraction occurs may take part in the Review/Appeal Board of that Infraction. The faculty member to whose course the Alleged Violation Report relates will be asked to submit his/her recommendation as to appropriate Sanctioning should the Review Board find that the Respondent committed the Infraction.

If the faculty member to whose course the Alleged Violation Report relates is also the Academic Integrity Officer and if the Respondent(s) believes there is a conflict of interest, a substitute for the AI Officer should be found to conduct the proceedings.

Timing / AI Process Priority

Due to the critical nature of these proceedings, every effort will be made to prioritize and speed the process while ensuring it is fair and aligned with our Penn State Values. Timeframes indicated in the document may be adjusted due to semester breaks. Every effort should be made, however, to act within the given timeframes.
To aid scheduling, the PGP office has responsibility for scheduling Review Board and Appeal Board Hearings for all programs and any other associated meetings or activities.

Confidentiality

Review/Appeal Boards: All Review and Appeal Board members must keep their participation and proceedings confidential. This includes: participation on a Board, names of the Respondent(s), Complainant(s), Witness(es), any other associated parties, the nature of cases, and all other elements of Review or Appeal Board participation.
Respondent: A Respondent should not reveal his/her name, the names of students serving on Review/Appeal Boards, nor any information about an investigation or its proceedings.
Witness: A Witness should not reveal that s/he has reported an incident, nor information about the Respondent(s) or any proceedings.

Timeline and Activity Checklist

Timeline	Activity
Clock Begins (0)	Faculty member submits Alleged AI Violation Form to AIO.
+ 7 Days (7)	Review with program's managing director, elected/appointed student representative, and AIO. If proceeding to a Hearing… AIO appoints Review Board and sends to the Respondent: 1. Review Board members' names (for possible contest) 2. Alleged Violation Report Respondent may contest Review Board members. AIO evaluates and changes members or proceeds. AIO finalizes Review Board & sends documents to the Board (excluding the Alleged Violation Report) 1. AI Violation Process 2. Academic Integrity Violation Sanction Options 3. Penn State Sanctioning Guidelines
+14 Days (7)	Hearing conducted
+19 (5)	Respondent signs form if violation/sanction or cleared
+21 (2)	AIO sends disclosure notice to program's students, faculty, and staff
+21 (7)	If Respondent contests, AIO appoints and schedules Appeal Board
+26 (5)	Respondent signs form
+28 (2)	AIO sends disclosure notice to program's students, faculty, and staff including: • Nature of the infraction(s) • Sanction outcomes • Lessons learned

Process Revisions

To continue evolving our understanding and implementation of the Honor Code, this process is intended to be updated every 3 years. Updates include:

June 2015 – Student, alumni, faculty, staff major update of process, timing, and sanctioning guidelines.

July 2016 – Minor update to include multiple Respondent scenarios.

March 2017 – Inclusion of all PGP MBA and MBA-derivative programs. Clarified student representative role. Detailed Hearing process. Added timeline and activity checklist.

Academic Integrity Violation Sanction Options

As your Review/Appeal board considers Sanctions, please keep the following principles in mind:

a. Intention matters. To the degree possible, consider a distinction in Sanctions between someone with intent to cheat versus someone who made a mistake. Consider the student's level of contrition and personal responsibility, opportunity for learning, and overall conduct.
b. Consider whether to include the assignment weight in the Sanction discussion. You may consider the severity of the violation itself, regardless of the weight of the assignment in which it was committed, or you may consider the assignment's weight as part of the violation.
c. Consider how you discuss equity norms:
    i. One principle of past Boards is the consideration that no one who cheated gets a higher grade than someone who didn't. Even if it is a minor offense, if the class' low grade is a B, should the Academic Sanction require being beneath it?
    ii. If a Violation involves multiple students (ex. collaboration) and you determine loss of scholarship/fellowship as one Sanction, consider allowing disparity in students. If only one student has a scholarship/fellowship, it is acceptable that this penalty apply to only this student as the financial award is a privilege requiring significant responsibility and accountability.
d. As you deliberate and finalize your decisions, consider the following summary question: "With these recommendations, are we acting consistent with our Penn State and Smeal values?" (Penn State Values: Integrity, Respect, Responsibility, Discovery, Excellence, Community)
e. Sanctioning Guidelines: Please use the following Penn State Guidelines and table:

Penn State Sanctioning Guidelines for Violations of Academic Integrity

http://undergrad.psu.edu/aappm/sanctioning-guidelines.html

General Sanction Descriptions

Academic Sanctions	Programmatic Sanctions
Can be determined by Review/Appeal Board (see PSU Sanctioning Guidelines)	Can be determined by Review/Appeal Board AI Officer and Program Office will implement with their best interpretation of the Board's intent.
• Warning • Redo assignment/exam • Reduced grade or 0 on assignment/ exam • 0 for participation • Reduced class grade • F in class • Program termination	• Fellowship or Scholarship revocation, immediate, without possible renewal • Required meeting(s) with faculty or managing director, or other relevant party for coaching and understanding of community repercussions • Written case study to aid future students who may face a similar situation • Community service time – working with Honor and Integrity Office or another relevant activity for specified hours/timeframe/deliverable • Restricted access to career or alumni services • Faculty requested not to give references for the student • Exclusion from case competition/conference funding opportunities • Exclusion from pre-commencement activities/ceremonies • Incident referred to the Office of Student Conduct as a Code of Conduct violation, leading to Conduct Sanctions such as: o Disciplinary warning, "XF" transcript notation, probation, suspension, expulsion, and indefinite expulsion

Academic Integrity Violation Sanction History

**All infractions from 2010-2016 are for the residential MBA program. Statistics beginning in 2017-2018 reflect all PGP MBA and MBA-Derivative programs, currently including residential MBA, EMBA, OMBA, and MOL.*

Reported Violations	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	Grand Total
Cheating				1			2
Plagiarism					1 team	1 team 2 indiv.	4
Unauthorized Collaboration				2 teams			2
Grand Total	0	0	0	3	1	3	6

Sanctions Applied (includes multiple sanctions for the same violation)	
Warning	1 team
0 on Assignment	6
F in Course	2
Graduate Assistantship /Fellowship Revoked	1

Penn State Resource Websites

Integrity at Smeal
http://www.smeal.psu.edu/integrity
Graduate University Bulletin - Conduct
http://bulletins.psu.edu/graduate/appendices/
Penn State Academic Integrity Policy
http://undergrad.psu.edu/aappm/G-9-academic-integrity.html
Penn State Code of Conduct
http://studentaffairs.psu.edu/conduct/codeofconduct/
Penn State Sanctioning Guidelines for Violations of Academic Integrity
http://undergrad.psu.edu/aappm/sanctioning-guidelines.html
Penn State Values
http://www.universityethics.psu.edu/universityethics/values/values.cfm
University Faculty Senate Policies Section 49-20: Academic Integrity
http://senate.psu.edu/policies-and-rules-for-undergraduate-students/47-00-48-00-and-49-00-grades/

MBA Academic Integrity Alleged Violation Report: Student/Non-Instructor

PennState Smeal College of Business

Students witnessing or aware of an Academic Integrity Infraction by another student (or students) are encouraged, but not required, to discuss the concern directly with their classmate(s) or hold a confidential meeting with the Academic Integrity Officer or elected/appointed student official with academic integrity responsibility (ex. MBAA VP of Academic Affairs and Student Relations) before filing a formal Alleged Violation Report. Any student determined to have knowledge of an Academic Integrity Infraction who does not report it is in violation of the Honor Code.

Today's Date:	
Complainant Name: *(person reporting the alleged violation)*	
Course Name, Section, and Instructor:	
Date of Alleged Violation:	
Respondent Name(s): *(student(s) who potentially committed the violation)*	
Have you spoken with the Respondent(s)? Y/N	
Have you spoken with the Instructor? Y/N	
Description of Alleged Violation: *(may include detailed violation description, detection, evidence, witnesses, assignment weight, assessment of intent/premeditation, respondent's response to violation discussion)*	

This is preliminary information for consideration in the AI Violation Process.
If an AI violation is determined to have occurred, a Penn State Academic Integrity Form will be completed by the Review/Appeal Board for final documentation.

Please submit this form to your program Faculty Director, Managing Director, or elected/appointed student representative.

MBA Academic Integrity Alleged Violation Report: Instructor

PennState Smeal College of Business

To be completed by instructor after discussion with student(s) and submitted to the program Faculty Director / Academic Integrity Officer. Please note that the student(s) will see a copy of this report.

Today's Date:	
Instructor Name:	
Course Name & Section:	
Date of Alleged Violation:	
Student Name(s): *(who potentially committed the violation)*	
Has the student(s) admitted responsibility?	
Description of Violation: *(may include detailed violation description, detection, evidence, witnesses, assignment weight, assessment of intent/premeditation, student response to accusation)*	
OPTIONAL **Sanction(s) Recommendation to Review Board:**	*(Sanctions may include Warning, Assignment/Exam resubmission, "0" assignment and/or participation grade, Reduced Course Grade, "F" Course Grade, Program Termination).*

This is preliminary information for consideration in the AI Violation Process. If an AI violation is determined to have occurred, a Penn State Academic Integrity Form will be completed by the Review/Appeal Board for final documentation.