# Academic Dishonesty Procedure

Academic Dishonesty at UCLA Extension includes, but is not limited to, the following definitions:

* Cheating
	+ Cheating includes, but is not limited to, the use of unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in any academic exercise; the alteration of any answers on a graded document before submitting it for re-grading; or the failure to observe the expressed procedures or instructions of an academic exercise (e.g., examination instructions regarding alternate seating or conversation during an examination).
* Fabrication
	+ Fabrication includes, but is not limited to, falsification or invention of any information or citation in an academic exercise, including Fabrication or Falsification of Research.
	+ Fabrication of Research is making up data or results and recording or reporting them.
	+ Falsification of Research is manipulating research materials, equipment or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record.
* Plagiarism
* Plagiarism includes, but is not limited to, the use of another person’s work (including words, ideas, designs, or data) without giving appropriate attribution or citation. This includes, but is not limited to, representing, with or without the intent to deceive, part or all of an entire work obtained by purchase or otherwise, as the Student’s original work; the omission of or failure to acknowledge the true source of the work; or representing an altered but identifiable work of another person or the Student’s own previous work as if it were the Student’s original or new work.
* Unless otherwise specified by the faculty member, all submissions, whether in draft or final form, to meet course requirements (including a paper, project, exam, computer program, oral presentation, or other work) must either be the Student’s own work, or must clearly acknowledge the source.
* Facilitated Academic Dishonesty
	+ Facilitating academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to, knowingly helping another student commit an act of academic dishonesty.
* Multiple Submissions
	+ Multiple submissions includes, but is not limited to, the resubmission in identical or similar form by a student of any work which has been previously submitted for credit, whether at UCLA or any other school, college, or university in one course to fulfill the requirements of a second course, without the informed permission/consent of the instructor of the second course; or the submission for credit of work submitted for credit, in identical or similar form, in concurrent courses, without the permission/consent of the instructors of both courses.
* Coercion
* Threatening personal or professional repercussions or discipline against an instructor to coerce the instructor to change a grade or otherwise evaluate the Student’s work by criteria not directly reflective of coursework.
* Unauthorized Collaboration
	+ Unauthorized collaboration means working with others without the expressed permission of the instructor on any submission, whether in draft or final form, to meet course requirements (including a paper, project, take-home exam, computer program, oral presentation, or other work). Collaboration between students will be considered unauthorized unless expressly part of the assignment in question, or expressly permitted by the instructor.

Extension Policy currently allows instructors the choice to handle low-level academic dishonesty matters, or to refer them to the SRRC for adjudication. Regardless of method, the student must be given procedural and substantive due process. This includes: 1) adequate notice of the charges and evidence, 2) the opportunity to be heard, and 3) adjudication by an objective decision-maker, using a fair and impartial process. The processes are outlined as follows:

## Instructor Adjudication

\*File an Incident Report and attach Instructor Disposition Form

1. Compile all evidence to support the instructor’s determination of an academic dishonesty violation
2. Request a private one-on-one meeting with the student(s) in writing. Include the qualification that if the student fails to meet with the instructor within 3 business days, the matter will automatically be referred to the SRRC
3. Meet with the student to discuss the allegation and the evidence, and to hear the student’s side of the story
4. Based upon the outcome, present the student with the proposed remedy, in writing, within ten business days (retake assignment, receive half-credit, zero credit, etc.).
5. Inform the student they will have three business days to respond to the letter, in writing, either accepting or denying responsibility for the charges. If a student accepts the instructor’s proposed remedy, the matter will be considered resolved.
6. If the student fails to respond within three days, or disputes the charges, the matter should be referred to the SRRC (SRRC@unex.ucla.edu). Please include:
	1. Student’s name/ID
	2. Class name, number, and section
	3. Grounds for allegation
	4. The assignment/exam on which the allegation is suspected and any other evidence
	5. Student grade on the assignment in question as if the misconduct *did not* occur
	6. Student grade on the assignment in question as if the misconduct *did* occur
	7. Student’s grade for the course prior to the alleged misconduct
	8. Student’s grade for the course if the misconduct did occur (note: only the assignment in question may receive a grade of F/zero, should the student be found responsible for academic dishonesty. A student cannot be failed from an entire course based on a single incident.

## SRRC Adjudication

Instructors may report an instance of academic misconduct by Filing an Incident Reporting Form *without* including the Instructor Disposition Form. While an investigation is pending, the instructor must report the final grade of “DR” (deferred report) by calling their academic program contact. In cases of alleged academic misconduct and prior to any preliminary meeting, the instructor should review Extension’s procedure for addressing cases of academic dishonesty. Designated staff in SRRC will obtain from the instructor the grade for the exercise or course *as if the academic misconduct had not occurred*; and will advise the instructor that only the tainted portion of a course can be assigned the grade of “F” should the student admit to or be found culpable for the cheat. (cf. UCLA Divisional Senate Regulation A-306, Section C.)

During the preliminary meeting, the student will be advised of the process and any sanction that could be imposed if the student were to admit to the misconduct prior to hearing; and that doing so would waive the right to a formal hearing and to appeal. The student will be advised of the notations on transcript that accompany a sanction, and the implications of these notations. The student will be advised that records of disciplinary proceedings where sanctions are imposed are sealed then held for four years from the date sanctions are lifted, then destroyed. *Only after these factors are disclosed will a student be asked to respond to the question of culpability for the allegation.*

Cases where the accused claims innocence in the preliminary meeting will be held over for formal hearing.

The SRRC will inform the instructor of the high-level outcome of the investigation and which grade to assign, based on the instructor’s initial report. Due to privacy laws, the instructor will not be informed of the factual outcomes of the investigation.

The SRRC does not adjudicate academic disputes related to grades. The Center’s remedies for conduct violations are limited to disciplinary sanctions as defined in UCLA Extension’s Student Conduct Policy (SA501).