

ACADEMIC ETHICS CODE

Code of Academic Ethics

Last Revision: June 30, 2018

POLICY

The faculty and students of the Bloomberg School of Public Health (the "School") have joint responsibility for maintaining academic integrity in the academic conduct and endeavors of the School.

An ethical code is based upon the support of both faculty and students who are charged with the responsibility to live honorably and to take action when necessary to safeguard the academic integrity of this University. Students enrolled in the School assume an obligation to conduct themselves in a manner appropriate to the Johns Hopkins University's mission as an institution of higher education. A student is obligated to refrain from academic misconduct, as defined below in the Academic Ethics Code. Allegations of academic misconduct will be addressed as set forth in the Academic Ethics Code.

PROCEDURES

Students and faculty should become familiar with the Academic Ethics Code, copies of which are provided in student and faculty publications and materials, posted on the website of the School, and can be obtained from the Director of the Office of Academic Integrity.

Students who enroll in courses at the Bloomberg School of Public Health, but whose home Division is elsewhere within the Johns Hopkins University, will be governed by the applicable Ethics Code of their home Division. For example, Johns Hopkins undergraduate students enrolled at the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences, who engage in an alleged violation of academic ethics while completing a Bloomberg School of Public Health course or activity, will be governed by the appropriate Ethics Code at the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences. BSPH students may enroll in courses in one or more other University divisions or schools. BSPH students are subject to this policy not only when enrolled in BSPH schools, but also when enrolled in courses in other University divisions or schools.

Academic misconduct in the context of those 'outside' courses will be subject to and resolved under this policy.

Research Misconduct

Research misconduct is defined as fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results. For a complete definition, refer to The Johns Hopkins University Research Integrity Policy ("Policy") (https://www.jhu.edu/assets/uploads/2017/08/university_research_integrity_policy.pdf). The Policy applies to all University faculty, trainees, students, and staff engaged in the proposing, performing, reviewing, or reporting of research, regardless of funding source. Allegations of research misconduct regarding a student should be referred to the Research Integrity Officer for assessment under that Policy, but may also be directed to the department chair or Dean of the responsible unit where the alleged research misconduct occurred.

Non-Academic Misconduct

All issues of non-academic student misconduct will be subject to the University-wide Student Conduct Code. For more on this policy, please refer to <http://studentaffairs.jhu.edu/policies/student-code/>. (<http://studentaffairs.jhu.edu/policies/student-code/>)

Academic Ethics Code

PREAMBLE

It is the joint responsibility of faculty and students of the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health to maintain the academic integrity of the School. An ethical code helps ensure high standards of conduct and integrity prevail in the School community.

An ethical code is based upon the support of the academic community, students, and faculty alike, who are charged with two kinds of responsibility: Each member must live honorably and must also take action when necessary to report known or suspected academic misconduct.

The School has the responsibility to provide students with access to this Code. Electronic access on the School's website or paper copies available in the School's Office of Student Affairs are acceptable means of providing the code. Students have the responsibility to read the Academic Ethics Code, become familiar with its provisions, and complete any required academic ethics training in the time frame specified by the School. Thus, all students will be presumed to have knowledge of the provisions of this code as a consequence of enrollment in the Bloomberg School of Public Health. Lack of familiarity with the provisions of this code will not serve as a defense to any academic misconduct as defined by the code.

ARTICLE ONE. VIOLATIONS OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

A student is obligated to refrain from academic misconduct, as defined in this Code.

Academic misconduct is any action or attempted action that may result in creating an unfair academic advantage for oneself or an unfair academic advantage or disadvantage for any other member or members of the academic community. This includes a wide variety of behaviors such as altering academic documents or transcripts, gaining access to materials before they are meant to be available, and helping another individual to gain an unfair academic advantage. Nonexclusive examples of academic misconduct are listed below.

Violations of academic integrity include, but are not limited to: cheating, plagiarism, altering academic documents or transcripts, gaining access to materials before they are meant to be available, and helping another individual to gain an unfair academic advantage. Nonexclusive examples of academic misconduct are listed below.

ARTICLE TWO. DEFINITIONS

Section One.

Cheating is broadly defined as using or attempting to use someone else's work or ideas in a context where you are expected to provide your own. Absent instruction by the faculty member in charge of the course to the contrary, examples of cheating include but are not limited to:

- Fraud, deceit, or dishonesty in an academic assignment, test or examination.
- Use or consultation of unauthorized or inappropriate materials (e.g., notes, books, etc.) on assignments, tests, or examinations.
- Unauthorized discussion of a test or exam during its administration.
- Copying content on an assignment, test or examination from another individual.
- Obtaining a test or examination or the answers to a test or examination before administration of the test or examination.

- Studying from an old test or examination whose circulation is prohibited by the faculty member.
- Use or consultation of unauthorized electronic devices or software (e.g., calculators, cellular phones, computers, tablets, etc.) in connection with assignments or during tests or examinations.
- Use of paper writing services or paper databases.
- Unauthorized collaboration with another individual on assignments, tests or examinations.
- Submission of an assignment, test or examination for a regrade after modifying the original content submitted.
- Penning another individual to contribute to or complete an assignment, or to contribute to or take a test or examination on the student's behalf.
- Unauthorized submission of the same or substantially similar work, assignment, test or exam to fulfill the requirements of more than one course or different requirements within the same course.
- Tampering with, disabling, or damaging equipment for testing or evaluation.
- Furnishing false information to any agent of the university for inclusion in the academic record.
- Violation of the rights and welfare of animal or human subjects in research.

Section Two.

Plagiarism is broadly defined as taking for one's own use the words, ideas, concepts or data of another without proper attribution. Plagiarism includes both direct use or paraphrasing of the words, thoughts, or concepts of another without proper attribution. Proper attribution includes: (1) use of quotation marks or single-spacing and indentation for words or phrases directly taken from another source, accompanied by proper reference to that source and (2) proper reference to any source from which ideas, concepts, or data are taken even if the exact words are not reproduced.

Examples of plagiarism include, but are not limited to:

- Use of material produced by another person without acknowledging its source and proper attribution.
- Use of another person's ideas or words without proper attribution.
- Submission of the same or substantially similar work of another person (e.g., an author, a classmate, etc.).
- Use of the results of another individual's work (e.g., another individual's paper, exam, homework, computer code, lab report, etc.) while representing it as your own.
- Use of paraphrased passages taken from published or unpublished sources without proper attribution.
- Wholesale copying of passages from works of others into homework, essays, term papers, dissertation or other assignment without proper attribution.
- Paraphrasing of another person's characteristic or original phraseology, metaphor, or other literary device without proper attribution.

Section Three.

Other forms of academic misconduct include, without limitation: forgery/falsification/lying, facilitating academic dishonesty, unfair competition, and failing to follow applicable policies, procedures, or rules. Examples of these forms of academic misconduct include, without limitation:

Forgery/Falsification/Lying. The following are nonexclusive examples of forgery, falsification and lying:

- Falsification or fabrication of data/information for an assignment, on a test or exam, or in an experiment.
- Citation of nonexistent sources or creation of false information in an assignment.
- Attributing to a source ideas or information that is not included in the source.
- Forgery of university or other official documents (e.g., letters, transcripts, etc.).
- Impersonating a faculty or staff member.
- Request for special consideration from faculty members or university officials based upon false information or deception.
- Fabrication of a reason (e.g., medical emergency, etc.) for needing an extension on or for missing an assignment, test or examination.
- Claiming falsely to have completed and/or turned in an assignment, test, or examination.
- Falsely reporting an academic ethics violation by another student.
- Failing to identify oneself honestly in the context of an academic obligation.
- Providing false or misleading information to an instructor or any other university official.

Facilitating Academic Dishonesty. The following are nonexclusive examples of facilitating academic dishonesty:

- Intentionally or knowingly aiding another student to commit an academic ethics violation.
- Allowing another student to copy from one's own assignment, test, or examination.
- Making available copies of course materials whose circulation is prohibited (e.g., old assignments, texts or examinations, etc.).
- Completing an assignment or taking a test or examination for another student.
- Sharing paper mill/answer bank websites or information with other students.

Unfair Competition. The following are nonexclusive examples of unfair competition:

- Intentionally damaging the academic efforts of another student.
- Stealing another student's academic materials (e.g., books, notes, assignments, etc.).
- Denying university resources needed by another student (e.g., hiding library materials, stealing lab equipment, etc.).

Failing to Follow Applicable Policies, Procedures, Rules

- Failing to follow applicable JHU, divisional/school, program, course, and/or faculty policies, procedures, rules regarding academic ethics.

ARTICLE THREE. RESPONSIBILITIES OF STUDENTS AND FACULTY

Section One.

All members of the academic community are responsible for the academic integrity of the University. Students and faculty alike must work together to minimize the possibility of violations of academic integrity.

Section Two.

The faculty is responsible for the conduct of examinations, for announcing the ground rules for all work in a course at the beginning of the quarter in which the course is offered, and for the security of examination papers and teaching laboratories. Proctoring is at the discretion of the instructor.

Section Three.

A student with knowledge or suspicion of any academic misconduct governed by this Academic Ethics Code is strongly encouraged to promptly report such violation, including the identity of the alleged violator(s), to the appropriate faculty member or to the Director of the Office of Academic Integrity. A student may not make a formal charge directly to the Academic Ethics Board. Formal charges to the Academic Ethics Board must be brought by the appropriate faculty member or by one of the deans responsible for student affairs.

ARTICLE FOUR. THE ACADEMIC ETHICS BOARD**Section One.**

The Academic Ethics Board (the "Board") consists of six students selected by the Student Assembly, four faculty members appointed by the Dean, the Director of the School's Office of Academic Integrity, and, under extraordinary circumstances, ad hoc members appointed by the Dean in accordance with Article Six, Section Three. The terms of service of members of the Board shall be determined by the Dean. The Dean may replace members of the Board that were appointed by him/her at his/her discretion. Reasonable efforts should be made to select students and faculty from diverse disciplines, departments, and, in the case of students, academic programs. At least one member of the Board shall be a full professor.

Section Two.

The Board shall elect a chairman from among its members, and shall select other officers and staff as provided in its Bylaws.

Section Three.

The Board, acting through the Director of the Office of Academic Integrity, is responsible for the maintenance of the academic integrity in the Bloomberg School of Public Health for all matters concerning adherence to the ethics code, including, but not limited to: (1) receiving reports of suspected violations, (2) consulting with members of the University community on ways to reduce possible violations, (3) appointing hearing panels, (4) maintaining confidential records, (5) orienting new students to the philosophy and terms of the ethics code, and (6) informing faculty and students of its activities.

Section Four.

The Board shall find and use effective means to inform faculty and students of its activities on an annual basis.

Section Five.

The Board, acting through the Director of the Office of Academic Integrity, shall submit to the office of one of the deans responsible for student affairs a written annual report, which shall not identify by name the individuals involved in its proceedings. The Committee shall disseminate this report to the Dean, faculty, and the Student Assembly.

ARTICLE FIVE. PROCEDURES FOR HANDLING SUSPECTED ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT**Section One.**

When evidence is found of suspected academic misconduct, the faculty member in charge of the course or activity may review the facts of the case with the student and attempt to resolve the case directly with the

student to their mutual satisfaction. Proposed resolutions shall include only those sanctions specifically enumerated in Article Seven, Section One parts (a) - (i). Prior to a proposed resolution, the faculty member in charge of the course or activity has the responsibility to consult with the Director of the Office of Academic Integrity to determine if the student was part of an earlier resolution with a member of the faculty, or if the student was previously the subject of an academic misconduct hearing by a panel of the Academic Ethics Board. If it is determined that the student was part of a previous direct resolution with a faculty member or academic misconduct hearing and the present allegation is unrelated to the earlier allegation, the faculty member must forward the case directly to the Academic Ethics Board. A second or subsequent allegation against a student may not be resolved directly between the faculty member and the student and must be forwarded directly to the Academic Ethics Board.

If both the faculty member and the student agree upon a proposed resolution in accordance with this code, no further action regarding the academic misconduct in question shall be undertaken beyond the agreed upon sanctions. If such an agreement is reached, the resolution shall be communicated to the Director of the Office of Academic Integrity. The student's advisor and the student's academic program director or department chair shall also be notified unless the faculty member chooses not to make this part of the proposed resolution. The faculty member and student may co-sign a memo or other document that the case was resolved to the mutual satisfaction of each party. This resolution will not be placed in the student's permanent academic record unless that was part of the resolution.

A student who engages in a direct resolution forfeits the right to withdraw from the course in question, switch from a graded course to the pass/fail option, or petition for a grade change.

The faculty member shall notify the Academic Ethics Board when:

1. The faculty member cannot reach a resolution with the student;
2. The alleged misconduct is a second or subsequent offense;
3. The faculty member prefers to refer the case to the academic ethics board for resolution rather than attempt to resolve it directly with the student.

In addition to notifying the Board, the faculty member shall communicate the essential facts of the case in writing and all relevant documents to the Board. Reasonable efforts shall be made to make such statements within 30 days of the alleged academic misconduct, or within 30 days of reasonable knowledge.

Section Two.

Upon receipt by the Academic Ethics Board of a charge of alleged academic misconduct, the Director of the Office of Academic Integrity, acting on behalf of the Academic Ethics Board, shall provide prompt notice of the charge to the student by hand delivery, electronic communication, or by certified mail, return receipt requested. The notice shall contain:

1. A description of the alleged violation(s) of academic integrity including insofar as possible the time, date, and place of the alleged act(s);
2. Information about when and where the hearing that will take place and the names of the members of the hearing panel and a statement of the right of the student to request recusal of panel members due to conflict of interest or bias;

3. A statement informing the student of the right to inspect in advance of the hearing any documentary evidence intended for use at the hearing as well as the chance to provide documentary evidence intended for use at the hearing;
4. A copy of the academic ethics code and bylaws of the academic ethics board.

Section Three.

Upon receipt of a charge of a violation of academic integrity from a faculty member, the Academic Ethics Board, acting through the Director of Office of Academic Integrity, shall appoint a hearing panel, in accordance with

Section Six below, to consider the charge. The panel shall make a determination on whether academic misconduct occurred, in accordance with the procedures in Section Six below, and, if so, shall make a determination on appropriate sanctions in accordance with Article Seven.

Section Four.

In the event of a violation of academic integrity in which it is inappropriate for any one faculty member to act as the person bringing the charge, a designee of the Dean or one of the deans responsible for student affairs shall act as the person bringing the charge.

Section Five.

If the hearing panel finds that a student has engaged in academic misconduct, the student may appeal the decision of the hearing panel to the Dean of the Bloomberg School of Public Health, or to a designee of the Dean if the Dean was the faculty member making the initial charge of a violation of academic ethics, within 5 days of the decision of the hearing panel. Appeals are permitted only on one of the following grounds:

1. Procedural error that could have substantially affected the determination of responsibility;
2. New information that was not available at the time of the hearing and that could reasonably have affected the determination of responsibility.

The appeal must be in the form of a written statement setting forth the grounds for the appeal. All materials collected as part of the proceedings of the Academic Ethics Board hearing shall be provided to the Dean or designee to review in considering the appeal. A full written report of the disposition of each appeal shall be made by the Dean or designee within 14 days to the Academic Ethics Board. In the event that the Dean or designee does overrule the finding of the Hearing Panel, the Dean shall either ask the prior Hearing Panel to reconsider the matter or shall ask that a new Hearing Panel be convened and the alleged violation reexamined and a new hearing conducted. The Dean or designee shall not reverse a penalty imposed by the Academic Ethics Board, nor impose a different penalty.

The Registrar shall be notified immediately of an appeal to the Dean or designee. Transcripts are not to be furnished until resolution of the matter.

ARTICLE SIX. HEARING PANELS

Section One.

When required under the procedures of Article Five, the Academic Ethics Board, acting through the Director of the Office of Academic Integrity, shall appoint a hearing panel of disinterested persons from among its members to consider a case. Members of the hearing panel may not be from the same Department as the student subject to the hearing.

Hearing panel members shall disclose to the Director of the Office of Academic any factor which might reasonably make them unable to impartially decide either whether the student violated the Ethics Code or the appropriate penalty. Such members shall be excused from serving on the relevant hearing panel at the discretion of the Director of the Office of Academic Integrity.

Section Two.

A hearing panel shall consist of five persons and a nonvoting, presiding officer, all ordinarily chosen from the members of the Board, the ratio of faculty and students on the panel being the same as on the Academic Ethics Board (i.e., 3 students, 2 faculty, and non-voting student presiding officer). The Director of the Office of Academic Ethics shall not serve on a hearing panel but shall be available to resolve questions about procedure under this Code that arise during a hearing.

Section Three.

Under extraordinary circumstances the Dean may appoint ad hoc members to the Hearing Panel from among full time faculty or full-time students from the Bloomberg School of Public Health who are not members of the Board. Such a circumstance might occur if a panel could not be constituted in a timely manner from among the members of the Board, if the workload of the Board was unusually heavy, or if enough students and faculty were excused under Section One (above).

Section Four.

Hearings of the panel shall be open to the person bringing charges, the student, any witness called by either party during the course of that witness' testimony, the Director of the Office of Academic Integrity, and not more than one representative of the student affiliated with the Bloomberg School of Public Health (faculty, staff, and students of the School). Attorneys representing the student are not permitted at the hearing. Hearings shall be closed to spectators and the press. In the case of related academic misconduct allegations against multiple students, the Director of the Office of Academic Integrity shall make a determination of the optimal methods to conduct the hearing consistent with this Code and its bylaws.

Section Five.

The accused shall be presumed not to have engaged in academic misconduct until found to have done so.

Section Six.

The decision of the hearing panel on whether academic misconduct occurred shall be based upon a preponderance of the evidence standard and shall be communicated promptly in writing to the Dean of the Bloomberg School of Public Health, the student, and the faculty member bringing the charge(s). A finding that academic misconduct occurred shall also be communicated to the student's advisor and to the student's department chair or academic program head.

A "preponderance of the evidence" standard is an evidentiary standard that means "more likely than not." This standard is met if the proposition is more likely to be true than not true.

Section Seven.

The vote of at least four of the five voting panel members is required for a finding that academic misconduct occurred.

Section Eight.

Hearings shall be conducted in accordance with this PPM, including the Hearing Panel Procedures below.

Section Nine.

If the student fails to appear for a hearing after having been duly provided with notice or withdraws from a hearing before its conclusion without the permission of the hearing panel, and if the hearing panel determines that such action is not excused (e.g., because of an unanticipated illness or other unexpected factor that prevents the student from attending), immediate suspension of the accused from the University may be imposed. Such a suspension shall continue until the hearing can be concluded with the student present.

ARTICLE SEVEN. PENALTIES**Section One.**

This section lists some of the sanctions that may be imposed upon students for violations of this Academic Ethics Code. The School reserves the right, in its discretion, to impose more stringent or different sanctions depending on the facts and circumstances of a particular case. Possible sanctions against students include, without limitation, one or more of the following:

An accused student found to engaged in academic misconduct may have, at the discretion of the Ethics Board, the following comment placed upon the academic transcript: ACADEMIC ETHICS CODE VIOLATION, DATE OF ETHICS BOARD MEETING.

1. Retake of the academic evaluation involved.
2. Score of zero in the academic evaluation involved.
3. Failure in the course.
4. Failure in the course with a notation on the transcript that the grade was for a violation of academic integrity.
5. Failure in the course with suspension from the University for at least one term as specified in the academic calendar.
6. Suspension from the University for at least one term as specified in the academic calendar with a notation on the transcript that the cause was a violation of academic integrity.
7. Failure in the course with suspension from the University for at least one term as specified in the academic calendar and notation on the transcript that the grade was for a violation of academic integrity.
8. Exclusion from a dissertation or thesis of all data collected under conditions that constitute a violation of the rights and welfare of animal or human subjects.
9. Suspension from the University for at least one term as specified in the academic calendar.
10. Expulsion from the University with a notation on the transcript that the cause was a violation of academic integrity.

If a finding has been made that misconduct occurred, before any sanction is imposed, the hearing panel shall determine by review of its confidential records by the Director of the Office of Academic Integrity whether the student has been found to have engaged in any prior violations of the academic ethics code.

A hearing panel shall make every effort to select a penalty appropriate to the severity of the offense, and may take into consideration any appropriate factors, including without limitation any mitigating or aggravating circumstances (such as inappropriate contact by the student with members of the Ethics Board during a Hearing brought to its attention), sanctions previously imposed upon other students for similar violations, as well as any record of or absence of prior academic misconduct. At least three of the five voting members of a hearing panel must vote for a particular sanction for that sanction to be imposed, with

the exception of expulsion from the University which requires all five out of five votes.

Section Two.

A finding of guilt in the first academic ethics hearing for a student who has previously not engaged in a direct resolution of an academic ethics violation shall result in the penalties selected from among (a) thru (j) or other appropriate penalty as determined by the hearing panel.

A finding of guilt in the first academic ethics hearing held for a student who has previously engaged in an academic ethics violation shall result in the penalties selected from among (b) thru (j) or other appropriate penalty as determined by the hearing panel. A notation on the student's transcript that academic misconduct has occurred must be placed on the transcript for a student who had previously been found to have engaged in academic misconduct in an earlier hearing.

Section Three.

A student found to have engaged in academic misconduct in a course forfeits the right to withdraw from the course or to change a graded course to pass/fail, or to petition for a grade change, and any withdrawal from that course or change effected prior to the finding of academic misconduct shall be voided.

ARTICLE EIGHT. RECORDS**Section One.**

The Academic Ethics Board shall maintain among its records a list of names of students found to be guilty of violations of academic integrity. It is this list that is consulted to determine whether an offense is a first offense or is a second or subsequent offense.

Section Two.

The records of the Academic Ethics Board shall be held in a locked file in the Dean's Office.

Section Three.

Access to the records of the Academic Ethics Board shall be limited to the Dean of the Bloomberg School of Public Health, to the deans responsible for student affairs, the Director of the Office of Academic Integrity, and to members of the Board.

Section Four.

A case file concerning a student (including all relevant documents, recording(s) of the hearing, documentary evidence introduced at hearings, etc.) shall be retained in the Office of the Dean for seven years after the student's last enrollment as a student or after the student otherwise leaves the University and shall then be destroyed.

Section Five.

The Director of the Office of Academic Integrity shall maintain a central file of direct settlements of allegations of academic ethics code violations. Records of direct settlements shall be retained for seven years after completion of the case and kept in a central location accessible only to the Director of the Office of Academic Integrity and the deans responsible for student affairs.

ARTICLE NINE. BYLAWS AND AMENDMENTS**Section One.**

The Academic Ethics Board shall adopt Bylaws to govern its operation.

Section Two.

Amendments to this Academic Ethics Code shall take effect when they are adopted in identical language by the General Counsel's Office of the University and the Advisory Board of the School.

HEARING PANEL PROCEDURES**Selection of Hearing Panel and Presiding Official**

A hearing panel shall be convened from among the members of the Academic Ethics Board by the Director of the Office of Academic Integrity. Members of the Academic Ethics Board shall be informed of the name of the student and the person bringing the charge(s), and must disqualify themselves if for any reason they believe their ability to consider the charges in an impartial fashion will be affected. One faculty alternate and one student alternate shall be chosen in the same way. Any student or faculty member having the same departmental affiliation as either the accused or the accuser(s) is ineligible from participating on the hearing panel.

All members of the Academic Ethics Board, except the Director of the Office of Academic Integrity, are eligible to serve unless there is potential conflict of interest or bias with respect to the student or the person bringing the charge such as to call into question their ability to make an unbiased determination about the academic misconduct. The presiding official of the hearing panel shall be a student member who is agreed upon by consensus by the members of the hearing panel.

The document "Procedural Conduct of an Academic Ethics Hearing" was developed as a guide for the presiding official, and to acquaint all parties involved as to the procedures that may be reasonably expected during a hearing. A copy may be obtained from the Director of the Office of Academic Integrity or one of the deans responsible for student affairs.

Rights and Responsibilities of Individuals Before a Hearing**Section One.**

The student shall be notified in writing of a charge of a violation of academic integrity as provided in Article Five, Section Two of the Ethics Board Constitution. Written notice shall be provided to the student either by personal delivery, sent electronically, or sent to the student at the address appearing on University records. The names of hearing panel members, of the presiding official, and of the alternate members of the panel shall be included in the letter of notification. The student has the right to request that a member or members of the hearing panel be excused from service if the student believes the hearing panel member has a conflict of interest or bias that would prevent the panel member from impartially serving. The student shall state his or her reasons to the Director of the Office of Academic Integrity who shall make the final determination of the panel member's eligibility to serve.

Section Two.

The person(s) bringing the charge and the student shall deposit with the Director of the Office of Academic Integrity any documentary evidence to be used at the hearing before the times given in Section Three of this Article.

Section Three.

The student may select one person affiliated with the Bloomberg School of Public Health (faculty, staff, or student) to be his/her representative at the hearing (who may not be an attorney). The student may inspect all documentary evidence and, if practicable, will be furnished with copies of the evidence prior to the hearing. The person bringing the charge(s) may also inspect all documentary evidence provided by the student. If

the Bloomberg School of Public Health is in session, inspection shall be permitted at least two days, excluding weekends and brief vacations, before the hearing. If the Bloomberg School of Public Health is not in session, inspection shall be permitted at least one week before the hearing.

Section Four.

Security of the documentary evidence is to be maintained by the Director of the Office of Academic Integrity and may be inspected only in the presence of the Director of the Office of Academic Integrity. The evidence shall be deposited in the office of the Dean of the Bloomberg School of Public Health.

Section Five.

The hearing panel members shall not be informed of details of the charge before the hearing is convened and shall scrupulously avoid discussing the pending hearing either with the parties concerned, possible witnesses, or any other persons. Panel members shall not discuss the merits of the charges with each other prior to entering into a determination of the charges.

Section Six.

The student, the representative of the student, and the person(s) bringing the charge may discuss procedures with the presiding official or Director of the Office of Academic Integrity but may not approach members of the panel concerning any matter directly or indirectly related to the hearing, nor should any member of the hearing panel approach the student or the person(s) bringing the charge for any matter directly or indirectly related to the hearing.

Section Seven.

The Dean shall designate a member of his or her staff in consultation with the presiding official to provide administrative support to the Hearing Panel and Board. This designee shall be free of conflict of interest or bias with respect to the case.

Joinder of Charges

Students charged with misconduct arising from a single incident or occurrence may have their hearings joined at the instance of the Director of the Office of Academic Integrity. Each student shall receive an individual finding on academic misconduct, even if multiple students are accused and are participants in a single hearing.

Charges of academic misconduct against a single student arising from two or more incidents or occurrences may be heard at one hearing at the instance of the Director of the Office of Academic Integrity. When such joinder of charges is made, the hearing panel shall make separate findings on academic misconduct as to each charge and make separate determinations of penalties for each charge. With respect to the determination of penalty under Article Seven, Section Two, the charge which occurs latest in time shall be considered the second or subsequent finding of guilt.

Individuals Present at Hearing**Section One.**

The presiding official, who shall act as a recorder, the Director of the Office of Academic Integrity, and members of the hearing panel shall be in attendance throughout the hearing.

Section Two.

The student and the person bringing the charge(s) shall be present throughout the student's plea, statement, the presentation of evidence, and questioning.

The student may choose to have his or her representative (the representative is selected in accordance with Section Three above and may not be an attorney) present at the hearing throughout the student's plea, statement, the presentation of evidence, and questioning.

Section Three.

The student and person bringing the charge(s) may call witnesses for the purposes of providing evidence or corroboration of evidence. Witnesses shall be present at the hearing only for the purpose of giving testimony and answering questions and only during the duration of their testimony and answering of questions. After testifying, witnesses shall remain available and shall inform the presiding official of their whereabouts and how they may be reached. The responsibility for informing witnesses about the hearing rests with the student and/or the person bringing the charge(s). Witnesses must uphold the confidential nature of the hearing process.

Hearing Procedure**Section One.**

Record. A full and complete record shall be made of the proceedings by a tape recording or other suitable device. The student shall be furnished a copy of the tape recording at his or her request for the purpose of preparing an appeal. No record of the panel deliberations shall be made. The hearing panel may, however, prepare a brief written report detailing the reasons for its findings on academic misconduct and for any sanctions imposed. Such reports, maintained by the Director of the Office of Academic Integrity, shall be used only to help establish uniformity of verdicts and penalties and shall be written so as not to divulge, directly or indirectly, the identity of individuals.

Section Two.

Plea. After calling the hearing to order and introducing the panel, the presiding official shall read the charge(s) and ask the student to state whether he or she did or did not engage in academic misconduct.

In the case of more than one charge heard by the panel at a single hearing, if the accused pleads guilty as to any of the charges, the presiding member shall excuse the accuser(s), accused, and the accused's representative. The hearing panel shall then proceed directly to the determination of guilt or innocence for each charge on which a guilty plea has been entered.

For each charge in which the accused enters a plea of innocence, the hearing panel shall proceed with the presentation of the evidence.

Section Three.***Presentation of Evidence.***

1. If the student asserts that he or she did not engage in academic misconduct, the person bringing the charge(s) shall present testimony and evidence in support of the charges. After the testimony of each witness, the student, the representative of the accused, the members of the panel, and the presiding official may ask questions.
2. The student and the representative of the student may then present testimony and evidence in support of the student's innocence. After the testimony of each witness, the person bringing the charge(s), the panel, and the presiding official may ask questions. Any evidence or

testimony relevant to the charge(s) specified in the notice may be admitted into evidence and heard and reviewed by the panel.

3. After the presentations of the student and the person bringing the charge(s), any person in attendance, other than witnesses, may recall witnesses for further questioning.
4. At the conclusion of all the evidence and testimony, the student and the person bringing the charge(s) shall each have the opportunity to make a closing statement.
5. Following the closing statements, all individuals except the presiding official and members of the panel are excused. The student and the person bringing the charge(s) shall remain available and shall inform the presiding official of their whereabouts and how they may be reached.

Section Four.

Findings. Each member of the panel will be asked to give a preliminary opinion concerning whether academic misconduct occurred for each charge. The case will then be discussed by the panel until each member is ready to vote. In the course of the deliberations the panel may review the documentary evidence or listen to the recording of the hearing or to any parts of the hearing. A single secret ballot will be taken on each charge. At least four votes (out of five) are required for a finding that academic misconduct occurred. The presiding official will count the ballots, maintain an orderly discussion, but will not express an opinion on the merits of the case or vote. The Director of the Office of Academic Integrity may answer questions of procedure based on the Academic Ethics Code but will not express an opinion on the merits of the case or vote. Once a determination has been made, the student, the student's representative, and the person bringing the charge(s) will be asked to return and the finding will be announced.

Section Five.

Determination of Penalty. If a determination is made that the student engaged in academic misconduct, he or she and the student's representative may present any mitigating circumstances to the panel. Corroborating witnesses of the mitigating circumstances may be called by the student.

If the hearing panel deems it necessary, it may obtain additional testimony from the person bringing the charge(s) or the student. In the course of the deliberations the panel may review the documentary evidence or listen to the recording of the hearing or to any parts of the hearing. After the presiding official and the panel members have no further questions, the student and the student's representative will be excused; and the panel will discuss the possible sanctions until a secret ballot results in a majority vote for a penalty. The presiding official may not vote or express an opinion. The student will be recalled to the hearing and the sanction(s) will be announced.

If the finding is that the student engaged in academic misconduct, the Director of the Office of Academic Integrity will communicate the finding and associated sanction to the student's advisor to the student's academic program head or department chair.

Recesses of the Panel

The presiding official may recess the hearing when it is deemed necessary. During a recess of the hearing no discussion of the case by panel members will be permitted.

ACADEMIC ETHICS BOARD BYLAWS

1. The presiding official on each Hearing Panel shall prepare a synopsis of the case heard by the Panel. Such synopsis shall specify the

nature of the charge, the course in which the alleged violation took place, the determination of the hearing panel and penalty imposed, and the outcome of any appeal. The identity of the student and the individual bringing the charge shall not be included in the summary.

2. A breach of confidentiality of a case shall cause the removal of an Academic Ethics Board member by a majority of the Academic Ethics Board.
3. The Ethics Code Hearing Panel Procedures and Bylaws may be amended by the approval of three of the four faculty members and four of the six student members at a meeting of the Ethics Board for which notice has been given at least one week prior to the meeting. The wording of the proposed amendment shall be included with the notice of the meeting.
4. The Academic Ethics Board shall elect officers as needed. Officers shall be elected by a vote of three of the four faculty members and four of the six student members. The term of each office shall expire at the end of each academic year.
5. A member of the Board a Hearing Panel can be removed at any time by a majority vote of the Board.
6. The Director of the Office of Academic Integrity shall maintain a summary of previous Academic Ethics Board cases.
7. The Director of the Office of Academic Integrity shall, as needed, provide an annual orientation for the members of the Board to their duties and responsibilities, the Ethics Code, and the conduct of a hearing.