MCC Academic Integrity and Academic Honesty Policy

Policy Overview and Purpose

Manchester Community College considers integrity and honesty to be essential to learning. Academic integrity and honesty are values that we expect members of the MCC community to apply in their academic work and in their lives beyond college. Violations harm the learning experience and negate the expectations and values that the MCC community embraces. We expect all members of the MCC academic community to conduct themselves and their work ethically and honestly.

Responsibilities

Students are responsible for:

- Submitting work that is their own and demonstrating that it represents their original ideas and/or efforts.
- Learning and following the MCC Academic Integrity and Honesty policies, including consequences for violations.
- Taking ownership of their learning process and utilizing available resources to meet course objectives.
- Following the instructor's guidelines for all assignments.

Faculty are responsible for:

- Role modeling academic integrity**.**
- Making expectations clear (syllabus and assignment instructions)**.**
- Practicing due diligence and utilizing existing tools to check student work.
- Knowing the MCC Academic Integrity and Academic Honesty policies and follow the process.

Overview of Definitions

A minor violation is a case of academic dishonesty which the instructor deems unintentional or an oversight on the part of the student. Minor violations can include first-time oversights such as failure to cite properly, omitting a reference or Works Cited page, and/or improper use of paraphrasing. The instructor determines that the violation is not a flagrant breach of the Academic Integrity Policy or the instructor's policies as detailed in the course syllabus and is best resolved through an individual meeting with the student. If this is a first-time incident of omission or unintended plagiarism, the instructor is encouraged to issue a warning and further instruction. Repeated incidences in the same course may result in a major violation for the student.

A major violation is a breach of academic honesty or integrity that is determined by the instructor to rise to a level that warrants a significant response. These offenses typically involve intentional or repeated infractions, rather than unintentional mistakes. These infractions may include but are not limited to; purchasing material and presenting it as original work, copying another person's work, recycling one's own work and presenting it as original, presenting unauthorized AI-generated content as original work,

or violating the instructor's exam guidelines. The instructor will follow the process outlined in the Academic Integrity Policy.

Detailed Definitions

Cheating: Cheating is the intentional use or attempted misuse of unauthorized materials, devices, sources, communications, or practices in an academic exercise or assignment. Instances of cheating include, but are not limited to:

- Copying answers, ideas, or words from another student or source without proper attribution;
- Aiding another in getting credit for their dishonest work;
- Using a calculator or other unauthorized devices per the instructor;
- Collaborating on an academic exercise with another student without the consent of the instructor;
- Violating the rules governing the administration of exams, including communicating with other students;
- Allowing other students or sources to do part or all of an assignment for them, including using commercial paper- and exam answer-purchasing services and/or artificial intelligence.

Intellectual Property: Any creation(s) of the human mind protected by law from unauthorized use.

Major violations: Generally, include intentional or recurring infractions of the Academic Integrity policy.

Minor violations: Generally, include unintentional infractions of the Academic Integrity Policy. Once identified, they are corrected.

Misrepresentation: Providing false or misleading information or hiding valid information with the intent to deceive.

Plagiarizing:

- Using (in writing, speaking, or any other academic exercise) the ideas or words of others without appropriate citation that acknowledges the source(s). This includes using peer or instructor ideas or responses and presenting them as one's own.
- Presenting a paraphrased version of the opinions, work, or ideas of others without giving credit to the original source.
- Copying exact words, phrases, or sentences without using proper quotations and providing source information.
- The appropriation of all or part of someone else's work and presenting it as one's own.

Other Forms of Plagiarism:

- "Self-Plagiarism": Reusing and/or resubmitting one's own work, in whole or in part, without acknowledgement, and permission from all instructors involved.
- Copying all or part of an assignment from another person or source and presenting it as one's own work.
- Purchasing or acquiring an assignment and submitting it as one's own work.
- Falsifying or inventing information, data, or research material.
- Listing sources that were not consulted.

Recurring Offense: A second or subsequent violation of an approved policy (intentional or not) after a first violation has been identified and addressed.

Self-plagiarism: Reusing and/or resubmitting one's own work, in whole or in part, without acknowledgement, and permission from all instructors involved.

Violation: A behavior or action that goes against an approved policy (whether intentional or not).

Protocol for Potential Violations of the Academic Integrity Policy

Minor Violation(s)

1. The instructor addresses the incident with the student.

   If everything is resolved the process ends here.

   If everything is not resolved:
2. Depending on the outcome of the meeting with the student, the instructor may opt to forward the information to their Department Chair. The nature of the violation may also influence that decision.
3. The Department Chair assesses the incident and may meet with the student and/or instructor.
4. The Department Chair renders a decision on the consequence(s) for the violation(s).
5. The Department Chair documents the incident and decision by entering it into Navigate (or a designated system).

Major Violation(s)

1. The instructor notifies the student of the potential violation of the academic policy and that the Department Chair will be notified.
2. The instructor reports the incident to the Department Chair.
3. The instructor informs the student that the Department Chair has been notified and will be in contact to set up a meeting.
4. The Department Chair checks Navigate (or a designated system) for any documentation related to prior incidents with the involved student.
5. The Department Chair assesses the incident and meets with the student and/or instructor.
6. The Department Chair renders a decision on the consequence(s) for the violation(s) or may defer to the Judiciary Committee.
7. The Department Chair documents the incident and decision by entering it into Navigate (or a designated system).
8. The student is notified of the decision and informed of the appeal process.
9. The student may appeal the decision to the Judiciary Review Board by filling out the proper appeal form. The appeal form, rationale, and supportive evidence must be received (in writing) by the Department Chair within 7 days of the initial meeting.
10. The Department Chair initiates the appeal process with the Judiciary Committee.

The above processes must be completed within 2 weeks exclusive of vacation weeks.

In the case of repeated major violations, the Department Chair will check Navigate (or designated system) for any documentation related to prior incidents with the involved student. The Department Chair assesses the incident and meets with the student and/or instructor. The case will be referred to the Academic Judiciary Review Board for review.

Appeals Process

Students have the right to appeal decisions rendered by either instructors or Department Chairs on minor or major violations as defined in this policy. All appeals have to be submitted in writing and provide the rationale for the appeal and supporting material/evidence.

Minor Violation Appeal Process

- An appeal must be submitted within one week of receipt of the decision of a minor violation rendered by an instructor. The appeal needs to be submitted to the Chair of the Department offering the course.
- The Department Chair reviews the case and collects additional evidence/material as deemed necessary.
- A decision should be made within two weeks of the submission of the appeal.

Major Violation Appeal Process

- An appeal should be submitted within one week of receipt of the decision of a major violation rendered by the Department Chair.
- Appeals must be submitted to the Academic Judiciary Committee, which will review the case in its entirety.
- The Academic Judiciary Review Board should render a decision within four weeks of submission of the appeal.
- The decision of the Review Board is final, pending approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

Recurring Violations of Academic Integrity and Honesty

Repeat Major Violations and/or Direct Referral Process

- Documentation of the major violation and/or violation history must be submitted by the Department Chair to the Academic Judiciary Review Board within one week.
- The Academic Judiciary Review Board will review the case in its entirety.
- The Academic Judiciary Review Board should render a decision within four weeks of submission of the case.
- The decision of the Review Board is final, pending approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

Composition of the Academic Judiciary Committee

The Academic Judiciary Review Board shall be composed of four faculty members, one staff member, and one delegate from Academic Affairs (the Vice President of Academic Affairs or the Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs).

- The Academic Judiciary Review Board can hear a case and make a decision with a minimum of three members present.
- The Academic Affairs delegate will act as a consultant and observer to the hearing, but will be a non-voting member unless there is a tie. In the event of a tie, the VPAA or their Academic Affairs delegate has the deciding vote.
- Alternates: If someone is unavailable for the ad hoc meeting and/or there are potential conflicts of interest, an alternate may be brought on for the case. The Department Chair and/or faculty of the presented case cannot be a voting member in that instance. An alternate will be used instead.

Appointment process and timeline

- Review Board members can serve for 2 years, with staggered appointments.
- The first installation of the Academic Judiciary Review Board will have 2- and 3- year membership. After the first round of appointments, Review Board membership will be restricted to two years.
- Department Chairs are eligible to join and can nominate full-time faculty and/or adjunct faculty.
- Review Board chair(s) coordinates membership with Academic Affairs to make the final decision on appointments.
- Review Board chair(s) will coordinate Academic Judiciary Review Board composition in the event of conflicts of interest.