CECS Honor Principle and Academic Code of Conduct

Regulations, Procedures, and Penalties

Honor Principle and Academic Code of Conduct

The Dean of Graduate Studies has established standards of behavior that form the Graduate Honor Principle and Conduct Code and are listed below. Questions from CECS students concerning the Honor Principle and Conduct Code should be addressed first to the Office of Educational Programs at CECS and then to the Dean of Graduate Studies.

The life and work of a graduate student are based upon a high standard of ethical behavior. Both in and outside the classroom the student is expected to embody the principles of honor and responsible behavior.

Fundamental to the principle of independent learning is the requirement of honesty and integrity in all academic activities, and an obligation to promote an atmosphere in which honest and creative academic work can flourish.

Each student accepts this honor principle and code of conduct upon registering as a CECS graduate student. A student found in violation of the Honor Principle or Conduct Code jeopardizes his/her right to continue in the program.

Student Responsibilities

Submission of an examination by a student carries with it the implicit statement that the work in his or her own. All work submitted which contains specific material from an outside source (written or verbal) must properly acknowledge the source.

In those areas where collaborative efforts are acceptable, the student submitting the work will indicate other sources and the names of those with whom he or she collaborated.

In the presence of an undoubted violation of the Honor Principle, to stand by and do nothing is to threaten the spirit and effectiveness of the principle. No student may infringe upon the right of others to have fair and equal access to school resources and to study in an environment conducive to learning and creative research.

Plagiarism, harassment, coercion, disruption, violence, destruction, concealment or misappropriation of property are examples of unacceptable behavior. When on Dartmouth College property, graduate students are subject to all honor principles and conduct codes of the College.

CECS students are expected to preserve the Honor Principle by taking action whenever the Honor Principle is compromised. The CECS Director of Education or the Academic Programs Administrator should be contacted for advice about appropriate and equitable action regarding both honor and conduct violations.

Refer to the Sources guidebook, given to every Dartmouth student, for assistance with citing sources and avoiding plagiarism. Information can also be found at www.dartmouth.edu/~sources.

CECS Honor Principle for exams and assignments:
On my honor, I have neither given nor received help on this assignment nor have I witnessed such behavior.
Faculty Responsibilities
At the beginning of every course, the faculty member will explain how the Honor Principle relates to the course. The statements should cover such areas as the faculty member’s expectations and policies with respect to student responsibilities, e.g., collaboration permitted prior to independent write-up and submission of work; acceptable procedures on group projects.

An instructor who suspects a student may have violated the Honor Principle should observe the following recommendations and guidelines for action:

- The instructor may want to discuss the suspected violation with the student(s) in order to determine that there has been no misunderstanding between the instructor and the student(s).
- The instructor is strongly encouraged to test the validity of his/her suspicion by consulting a colleague.
- If, after consultation, the instructor believes that the suspicion is valid, the instructor should bring the matter to the attention of the CECS Director of Education or Academic Programs Administrator. Under no circumstances should the instructor who suspects a violation of the Honor Principle attempt to resolve the matter independently or in collaboration with the student(s) in question.

Administrative Responsibilities
In the case of a suspected Honor Principle or conduct violation, the CECS Director of Education and/or Academic Programs Administrator will consult with the parties concerned and determine what further action is appropriate. If there is reasonable indication of an Honors violation, the matter will be brought to Hearing with the CECS Director of Education. In the case of a conduct violation, the Director may elect to resolve the matter without a hearing. If agreement is not reached by all parties, the Director will schedule a hearing.

Hearing Procedures
a) Notification of the charges against a student shall be in writing and shall contain a concise statement of the alleged facts which constitute the violation.

b) A student shall have a reasonable time to prepare the case after receiving the charge.

c) A student may choose to admit to the charges as stated. In such cases, the CECS Director of Education may elect to hold an abbreviated hearing for the purposes of determining the appropriate penalty.

d) A student may choose an advisor (with the exception of the CECS Director of Education) to assist in the defense against the charge. The student may elect to have a private hearing or an open hearing, but the Director may limit the number of persons at an open hearing, and may, if a disturbance occurs, order the hearing to be conducted in private. In cases where the need to protect privacy is, in the judgment of the Director, important, the Director may close the hearing over the objection of the charged student(s).

e) A student may refuse to make any statement, or refuse to testify. Such refusal shall not be considered as evidence against the student.

f) The student shall have the right to hear and question all witnesses and to examine all other evidence introduced at the hearing. The student has the right to testify and present evidence and witnesses in his/her own behalf.

g) The Director shall base his or her decisions on matters of fact, and solely upon evidence introduced at the hearing.

h) Formal rules of evidence shall not apply. The Director may consider any testimony or evidence unduly repetitious or immaterial, or to have been improperly obtained.
i) The student will be informed, in writing, of the Director’s decision within a reasonable time (no more than one week after the hearing).

j) If the results of a disciplinary hearing are to become apart of a student’s record, either temporarily or permanently, notice shall be given to the student concerned.

k) The student may appeal the Director’s decision (see Appeals Board on Standing and Conduct for Graduate Students in Arts and Sciences Programs in the Graduate Student Handbook) within a reasonable time (no more than 2 weeks after notification of the Director’s decision).

l) Decisions by the Director may be revealed to the authorized College personnel, to the charged student, and, in appropriate circumstances, to the charged student’s parents or guardian and the victim/complainant.

m) The Director hearing a case may choose to comment publicly, in writing or otherwise, regarding the decision reached if, in the judgment of the Director, the best interest of the community would be served by such disclosure. If possible and appropriate, the anonymity of the student(s) involved will be protected.

Non-Discrimination Policy
Dartmouth College is committed to a policy of non-discrimination to assure that its educational programs and activities are available to all students without regard to sex, race, color, religion, handicap, or national or ethnic origin. The College grievance procedure outlined below provides a means to assure prompt due process to any graduate student who believes that she or he has been discriminated against on the basis of sex, race, color, religion, handicap, or national or ethnic origin.

Association with Dartmouth College involves participation of a free and open community where all students are recognized and rewarded on the basis of individual performance, rather than on any particular personal convictions or preferences, including sexual or affectional orientation. Any graduate student who feels discriminated against for these reasons may also use this grievance procedure.

Resolution by Informal Negotiation
Any graduate student who believes he or she has been discriminated against should first seek a resolution of the problem through informal discussion. Initially, the student should attempt to discuss the problem with the faculty member, administrative officer, staff person or student directly concerned. If a resolution is not reached through discussion, the student should then bring the problem to the attention of the CECS Director of Education or Academic Programs Administrator.

In cases where a student is uncomfortable about discussing the problem with the party directly concerned or is uncertain whether to initiate a grievance, he or she may seek, in confidence, the advice of the Affirmative Action Officer or the Dean of Graduate Studies who, with the student’s permission, will seek to resolve the problem through discussion with the involved parties.

Procedure
If a resolution has not been achieved within ten working days from the time the grievance was first raised, the student should prepare a written statement of the allegations and submit it to the CECS Director of Education. The Director, or the Director’s designee, will have ten days to: (1) achieve a settlement by negotiating with the parties identified in the complaint; or (2) submit the case for consideration to the Dean of Graduate Studies.

In regard to written complaints involving academic matters, the Dean of Graduate Studies, or designee, will have two weeks to: (1) achieve a settlement by negotiating with the parties involved; or (2) submit the case for consideration by the Provost. The Provost shall consult with appropriate faculty members involved and shall also meet with the student bringing the complaint before making a final decision with regard to the matter. The decision of the Provost on the complaint shall be forwarded to the President for his review and disposition as outlined in the Presidential Review section of this document.
Committee on Student Grievances
The Grievance Committee shall be a committee appointed by the Dean of Graduate Studies and composed of two students from a slate nominated by the graduate student representatives and two members of the faculty or administration. At least one of the members will be female and one a minority with the further constraint that both will not be students. The Affirmative Action Officer shall serve as an advisor to the Committee. The Chair of the Committee shall be the Chairperson of the Council on Graduate Studies of his/her designee.

Formal Hearing
The Committee on Student Grievances will conduct a hearing as soon as is practical after full written notification of the grievance by the Chairperson. Both the student who initiated the grievance and the person against whom the grievance is lodged may make statements and bring evidence; either party will be allowed to bring witnesses and/or an adviser. Each party has the right to be represented by counsel or other representative. However, the College has no obligation to provide counsel for the complainant. The college will normally not be represented by legal counsel unless the complainant chooses to be represented by counsel. If any party intends to employ legal counsel, he/she shall inform the Dean’s Office of this fact no later than 72 hours prior to the hearing, and that Office shall provide such information to the other party and to the Chairperson of the Grievance Committee. Formal rules of evidence shall not be applicable to any hearing before the Grievance Committee, and any evidence or testimony which the Committee believes to be relevant to a fair determination of the complaint may be admitted. The Committee reserves the right to exclude incompetent, irrelevant, immaterial and unduly repetitious evidence. The Committee may seek additional information or testimony which it finds relevant to resolving the grievance, and may also, at its discretion, establish additional procedures for governing the hearing.

The Chairperson of the Grievance Committee shall rule on all matters of procedure and admissibility of evidence. Any member of the Committee not concurring in the ruling of the chair may request a private session of the Committee for debate on the point.

Upon either party’s request, a verbatim record shall be kept of all sessions in which testimony and evidence are present regarding the case, and all parties to the hearing may have access to this record. All findings, recommendations, and conclusion of the Grievance Committee shall be based solely on the evidence presented as part of the hearing. A majority vote of the Committee members present shall determine the final decision.

The time frames described above may, in extenuating circumstances, be adjusted by the Committee. The definition of “extenuating circumstances” will be determined by a majority vote of the Committee.

Decision
The Committee shall reach a decision within five working days after the termination of hearings. (In case the hearings have to be adjourned to gather more information, the total adjournment time should not exceed ten working days.) The Committee will forward its decision and recommendations to the President of the College.

Presidential Review
Within twenty working days, the President may accept the findings and recommendations; reject the findings and recommendations; request that the grievance be reheard, taking into account new information; propose alternative methods of rectifying the situation if discrimination has occurred and financial expenditures are involved; or take any other action the President deems appropriate. The final decision of the President is binding and shall not be subject to review under any other grievance procedure in force in the institution.

The above sections have been adapted from the Dartmouth College’s Honor Code and Academic Code of Conduct to reflect the revision in how grievances are reported and in order to standardize the language among various College policies and procedures.
DARTMOUTH COLLEGE GRADUATE STUDIES PROGRAM

APPEALS BOARD ON STANDING AND CONDUCT FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS IN ARTS AND SCIENCES PROGRAMS

1. **Membership.** The Appeals Board on Standing and Conduct for graduate students in Arts & Sciences programs shall consist of three students and three faculty members, plus a faculty chair. The chair will be chosen by all members selected to serve on the board. At least two of the faculty members (including the chair) must be from a graduate program or department.

2. **Election and Appointment.** When requested by the Dean, Faculty members on the Appeals Board will be selected by lot from members of the Council on Graduate Studies (excluding the Dean). The three student members will be selected by lot by the Council on graduate Studies. No student shall be eligible to succeed him or herself on the Board. The Chair will vote only in the case of a tie. In the event a member shall disqualify him or herself from the Board, a replacement shall be selected by lot from among all the remaining members of the group that individual represents on the Board.

3. **Jurisdiction.** The jurisdiction of the Appeals Board shall be appellate. It shall hear appeals by graduate students only after action has been taken by the Dean of Graduate Studies. In matters of conduct, its decisions will be final, though it must rehear a case if requested to do so by the President. In matters of academic standing, its findings will be advisory to the Dean of Graduate Studies and the department or program involved.

4. **Conduct of Business.** The Appeals Board may adopt by majority vote such rules and procedures as are necessary for the conduct of its business. Decisions of the Appeals Board shall be arrived at by majority of the Board.

5. **Confidentiality.** Decisions of the Appeals Board may be made public, but in no instance shall the name of the student concerned be divulged. Reports, records, and the deliberations of the Appeals Board are not to be examined by or revealed to any person or persons other than College personnel authorized by the Dean of the Faculty. Records and reports shall be destroyed immediately after they have lost any reasonable usefulness. The privacy of the student is to be protected.

6. **Reports and Record Keeping.** The Secretary of the Council on Graduate Studies will be the recorder of the Appeals Board deliberations and will prepare reports at the request of College personnel authorized by the Dean of Faculty.
Dartmouth College Policy And Procedures For Safeguarding Integrity In Research, Training, And Other Related Activities

Overview. Dartmouth College recognizes that academic freedom, including freedom in conducting research, is fundamental to its educational and intellectual life and that misconduct in research, research training, and other related activities undermines the intellectual integrity of the College. Accordingly, this policy provides guidelines for dealing with cases of alleged misconduct in research, research training, and other related activities. Maintaining confidentiality is critical to the proceedings and inquiries conducted under this policy; the need for this should be recognized by all involved in the process.

Role Of The Council On Sponsored Activities. The Council on Sponsored Activities will function as the College's advisory body on both general and specific matters related to misconduct in research, research training, and other related activities. If, for example, there is a pattern of allegations of misconduct or some other general issue regarding misconduct at Dartmouth, and the Provost believes that a broader investigation of policies and procedures is needed, he or she may request that the Council on Sponsored Activities form a subcommittee to conduct an investigation and recommend an appropriate institutional response to the problem.

Scientific Misconduct Defined. Scientific misconduct is morally unacceptable behavior that, if widespread, would seriously damage the institution of science. It has three main subdivisions, as follows: (1) Deception or knowing misrepresentation in the proposing, performing, or reporting of research, including the fabrication of evidence, the falsification of data, and plagiarism. (2) Attempting to prevent the reporting of misconduct as well as attempting to prevent the reporting of mistakes. This includes harassment or retaliation against anyone who has made a legitimate allegation of misconduct. (3) Obstructing the scientific research of others. This includes making malicious allegations of misconduct. Scientific misconduct does not include honest error or genuine difference of opinion. Although scientific ideals encourage sharing, refusing to help further the research of others is not necessarily obstruction, and therefore not necessarily misconduct. The research enterprise is so complex that these categories may not adequately identify all cases of scientific misconduct and other ethically unacceptable practices. Further information on these and other examples of various forms of scientific misconduct and other ethically unacceptable behavior is available in the Office of Grants and Contracts. This information includes contributions by members of the Dartmouth scholarly and research community and will be updated periodically to reflect ongoing research activities.

Procedures For Processing Reports Of Misconduct.

Scientific Misconduct Procedures for Undergraduates. In cases involving alleged misconduct by undergraduates, the ordinary processes set forth in the "Undergraduate Student Handbook" will be followed. To the extent additional reports or proceedings are necessary for undergraduates, either to comply with federal rules or because of the involvement of undergraduates in cases involving graduate students, faculty, or employees, the Provost may direct such reports or proceedings on an ad hoc basis.

Procedure For Faculty, Research Scientists, Graduate Students And Staff. The following pages detail the procedures to be followed in cases where scientific misconduct has been alleged or is suspected. While rather detailed, they are provided here as part of this Handbook so that any reader who might find his or herself having to confront such an issue will have available to them information on how to proceed.

Step 1. Allegations of Scientific Misconduct: Institutional procedures for handling misconduct should maintain a common, formal, and easily available entry point for receiving all allegations of scientific misconduct. All allegations of scientific misconduct must be made in writing. It is also important to maintain many routes for connecting the designated misconduct administrator (Provost) with other institutional personnel to whom allegations are made initially, including faculty, laboratory directors, chairs, associate deans, etc. Henceforth individuals making allegations of scientific misconduct will be identified as the COMPLAINANT and those against whom allegations are made will be identified as the RESPONDENT.

Step one involving allegations of scientific misconduct is for the individual receiving the complaint to inform the Provost in writing. The individual writing to the Provost should state the nature of the complaint and provide all of the particulars to the Provost. The Provost at this point must inform the appropriate Dean that a complaint has been made and that a review will occur. Before consideration of a complaint, every effort should be made by the
appropriate parties to resolve complaints through an informal process of discussion and, where appropriate, through mediation. Every effort should be made to handle all complaints with sensitivity, discretion, and with due regard for the interests of both the complainant and the respondent. Anonymous reports of misconduct will be considered only if sufficient evidence is provided to warrant an objective investigation of misconduct.

Step 2. Decision-Making about Whether an Inquiry is Warranted: The Provost at this point must consult with at least one other individual at the College to determine whether to conclude the process or to proceed to the inquiry stage. Among those with whom the Provost may consult are the Dean of Graduate Studies, The Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Officer. The Provost will so inform in writing the complainant. The complainant has the opportunity to appeal the decision by stating in writing the reasons for the appeal and directing it to the Provost. A decision to conclude or move to the inquiry state must be made within 15 working days of the date that the Provost received the complaint. When a decision to inform the respondent that an allegation of scientific misconduct of deception or knowing misrepresentation has been made, the Provost and any other individual asked to assist in the process must immediately secure all relevant data. The data secured should include laboratory notebooks, primary data, specimens, samples, and anything else considered relevant. This is a critically important step because it protects both the complainant and the respondent as well as insuring the integrity of the process. When possible copies of notebooks or other intellectual property will be made available to the respondent upon request. Retention of research data is the responsibility of the institution. The data is generally the property of the institution, not of the principal investigator or the researcher producing the data. Certainly that is the case if the research was funded by a federal agency because the grant is made to the institution and not to the individual. Additionally, institutions are required by federal regulations to retain records for specific lengths of time and to provide records upon request to funding agencies as well as to other government agencies.

Step 3. Inquiry of Allegations: Once a decision is made to proceed to the inquiry stage, the Provost, with the assistance of the person consulted above as well as the assistance of the appropriate Dean, will appoint an Inquiry Panel. The Inquiry Panel will be given its charge, with as much detail as is required to conduct a thorough and fair review. The Panel also will be provided with the resources needed for the inquiry, as well as the time necessary to conduct the inquiry and gain access to legal council. Members of the panel will be indemnified by the College. At all stages of the process confidentiality is to be maintained as much as possible by any and all involved. Unwarranted breach of confidentiality may be subject to sanctions. The Provost will inform the complainant and respondent about the composition of the Panel, the process, the time schedule for completing the inquiry and any rights that they have in the process. The complainant and the respondent have the right to comment on the composition of the Inquiry Panel and may raise questions concerning the membership. The Panel will conduct the inquiry by reviewing the evidence and interviewing the parties involved, as well as any other relevant witnesses. The inquiry will conclude with a decision by the panel about whether a formal investigation is necessary. The decision will be rendered in a report to the Provost and may include recommendations for further actions. The decision must be rendered to the Provost within 60 days of the appointment of the panel. If the panel believes that the allegation appears substantial, the process will move to the investigation stage. If the allegation is unsubstantiated, the Provost will seal the record. If, after reviewing the record of the inquiry, either the Panel or the Provost believe that there may have been misconduct, they will notify the individual involved and will discuss the findings. If, after this discussion, either still believes that misconduct may have occurred, they will refer the case (within seven days) to one of the following for a detailed investigation:

- Committee Advisory to the President (for Arts & Sciences faculty and research scientists)
- Dartmouth Medical School Advisory Board (for Dartmouth Medical School faculty and research scientists)
- Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (for Tuck School faculty)
- Tenure Committee (for Thayer School faculty and research scientists)
- Dean of Graduate Studies (for Arts & Sciences graduate students)
- Academic Honor Committee (for Tuck School graduate students)
- Honor Committee (for Thayer School graduate engineering degree students)
- Committee on Student Performance (for Dartmouth Medical School graduate medical degree students)
- ad hoc Committee appointed by the Director of Human Resources (for College staff)
In addition, if misconduct occurred in the context of an externally funded program, the Director of Grants and Contracts must be informed (see Procedures For Reporting guidelines for additional guidance if PHS funding is involved). If there is an allegation of misconduct involving individuals from different categories of employees and/or students, the Provost will meet with the appropriate Deans, Committee Chairs or other responsible officers listed above to organize a single, coordinated detailed investigation.

Step 4. Detailed Investigation: The body or person assigned to conduct the detailed investigation must initiate the investigation within 30 calendar days of receiving the Inquiry Panel's report from the Provost. The detailed investigation will consist of an examination of all relevant documentation, e.g., research data, correspondence, grant proposals, and publications, and interviews with all concerned, including the individual who made the original allegation of misconduct, the person alleged to have committed the misconduct, and any others who might have pertinent information. Complete summaries of these interviews will be prepared and made available to the interviewees for comment and revision, and then made part of the investigation's supporting documentation. The detailed investigation should be completed within the period set by appropriate college guidelines and/or the Federal Government, and a final written report that either supports or rejects the Inquiry Panel's report shall be submitted to the appropriate Dean and the Provost. If it is concluded that misconduct occurred, disciplinary actions will be initiated in accordance with applicable College policies for faculty, staff, and students.

The guidelines outlining this process are contained in the Organization of the Faculty of Dartmouth College (faculty), the graduate Student Handbook (Arts & Sciences graduate students), the appropriate handbook for professional schools (graduate students in the professional programs), and the AP I and AP II handbooks.

According to applicable Dartmouth College policy, individuals found to have committed misconduct may be: 1) removed from a particular project; 2) given a letter of reprimand; 3) monitored in performance of work; 4) placed on probation; 5) reduced in rank; 6) suspended for a fixed period of time; 7) terminated. If the detailed investigation concludes that misconduct did not take place, efforts will be made: 1) to ensure that the reputation of the person alleged to have committed misconduct is not damaged; and 2) to ensure that no retaliatory action be taken against the individual who made the original allegation, unless there is a determination that the allegation was maliciously motivated, in which case disciplinary action should be taken.

Regardless of the conclusion, copies of the final report will be provided to the Provost, the appropriate Dean, the Chair of the Council on Sponsored Activities, the individual against whom the allegation of misconduct was made, the Inquiry Panel, and the Director of Grants and Contracts (if extramural funding was involved). A copy of the complete investigation record must be kept in the Provost's office and in the Dean's office.

Conclusion. Misconduct as defined in section 3 violates College policy and undermines the integrity of scholarly endeavors within the larger academic community. Dartmouth College encourages serious and well-intentioned efforts to expose misconduct and will take appropriate action against individuals found to have committed such actions.

Procedures For Reporting Guidelines When Public Health Service (PHS) Funding Is Involved

If the Dean of the appropriate school believes that an inquiry of allegations of the alleged misconduct is warranted (see Step 3), he or she must provide an initial written notice to the Director of the Office of Scientific Integrity (OSI) at PHS on or before the date the investigation begins. This notice will include the name of the individual against whom the allegation of misconduct has been made, the general nature of the alleged misconduct, and the PHS proposal and grants numbers involved. If either the initial inquiry or the detailed investigation is terminated before completion for any reason, the Provost must provide OSI with a written explanation for terminating the proceedings. The detailed investigation's final report will be completed within 120 calendar days after initiation of the investigation. This includes conducting the investigation, preparing the final report, circulating the report to appropriate individuals, and submitting the report to OSI. The final written report to OSI will include: 1) a description of the detailed investigation; 2) how and from whom supporting documentation relevant to the investigation was received; 3) the investigation's conclusion and the basis for it; 4) the response of the individual alleged to have committed the misconduct; and 5) if misconduct is found to have taken place, the actions taken against the individual involved. If available, the name of the individual who made the original allegation of misconduct should be included in this final report. In addition, if any of the following conditions exists at any point in either the initial inquiry or the detailed investigation the Dean will notify the Provost, who in turn should notify OSI and the
Director of Grants and Contracts:

1. there is an immediate health hazard;
2. there is an immediate need to protect Federal funds or equipment;
3. there is an immediate need to protect the interests of the individual who made the original allegation of misconduct and his or her colleagues;
4. it is probable that the alleged incident will be reported publicly; or
5. there is a reasonable indication of possible criminal violations (in this case, the Provost must inform OSI with 24 hours of obtaining such information).

In addition, the Provost will submit an annual written assurance to OSI that Dartmouth has an established administrative process to review allegations of misconduct and report any investigation of misconduct that seems substantial to the Secretary of HHS. The Provost will also submit aggregate information on allegations of misconduct and subsequent initial and detailed investigations upon request to the Secretary of HHS.