

What's Trending On Campus

Stop. Look. Learn. There Have Been Revisions—  
The Code of Student Life & Academic Integrity Policies

Words Worth Remembering

For Your Consideration:  
Rationalizations that Don't Work



Insight into the University of Arkansas' Code of Student Life

# code connection

compare>>>

On the rise? Population vs. Violations

Year	Student Population	Number of Violations
2007-2008	18,648	1,361
2008-2009	19,194	1,169
2009-2010	19,849	1,207
2010-2011	21,405	1,256
2011-2012	23,199	TBA

now>>>

By: Jessica Pope, Graduate Assistant

## What's "Trending" on Campus

Ask almost anyone familiar with the U of A campus and they'll confirm that campus and Fayetteville come back to life with the return of the school year. August brings students, football, and general excitement in the Razorback nation. Though every semester is different, some things generally persist for better or worse. Violations of the Code of Student Life are one such recurrence. The types of violations shift and the number of incidents fluctuate. The reporting year began on May 15, 2011 and will run through May 14, 2012. As of November 14, 2011, there have been **668** total violations.

**Reported Violations** *Note: These are the reported violations that occurred between May 15, 2011 and November 14, 2011. The numbers reflect the number of violations not the total number of students involved.*

Academic Integrity	147
Alcohol Related Violation <i>Including Possession, Use or Public Intoxication</i>	414
Damage	24
Disorderly Conduct	45
Drug Related Violations	86
Conduct that Encourages or Enables	149
Failure to Comply	44
Health & Safety Violations <i>Including Endangerment</i>	82
Misuse of an Official Document <i>Including Parking Permits and IDs</i>	4
Physical Abuse	24
Sexual Harassment	3
Sexual Misconduct	2
Theft	14
Tobacco	7



### STUDENT AFFAIRS

Created by the Office of Academic Integrity and Student Affairs (OAISC) <http://ethics.uark.edu>

Contributors: Rachel Eikenberry, Dr. Monica Holland, and Jessica Pope

Please direct questions, comments, or story ideas to Jessica Pope, Graduate Assistant, [jepope@uark.edu](mailto:jepope@uark.edu) • 479-575-5170

# STOP. LOOK. LEARN. THERE HAVE BEEN REVISIONS.

review>>>

## Connect (or reconnect) with the Code of Student Life

First things first, to follow the Code, you must know the Code. Let us address some of the most common, pertinent questions.

### *What is the Code of Student Life and its purpose?*

The Code of Student Life outlines student conduct and disciplinary policies pertaining to students and student organizations at the University of Arkansas. It is designed to provide information to students, faculty, and staff regarding the ideals that underlie our academic mission and the expectations of University regarding the conduct of students. The purpose of the policies outlined in the Code is to protect the rights of all members of the University Community and to maintain an atmosphere in the University community appropriate for an institution of higher education. Included within the Code are 40 items that pertain to non-academic and academic conduct matters.

### *Who does it apply to and where does it apply?*

The Code applies to all persons enrolled in courses offered by the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville. While procedures may vary, the conduct requirements of the Code of Student Life apply at all locations connected to the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, including locations in a foreign country or in another state, and to all University activities, regardless of location.

### *Where can I access the Code of Student Life?*

The University has made the Code available at <http://handbook.uark.edu>. It can also be accessed via a link on the OAISC website.

### *What's new to the 2011-2012 Code?*

The Code is reviewed annually and changes are made as necessary. For the 2011-2012 academic year, the Code contains three new violation items. Specifically, the use of tobacco (i.e. smoking, chewing, using electronic cigarettes) is a violation, as is failing to comply with sanctions rendered upon violation(s). The use of electronic devices to record a person without his or her knowledge where there is an expectation of privacy is also prohibited. Additional items were clarified or updated; for example, theft was further defined.

Further significant changes within the Code pertain to the rights of complainants in sexual assault matters and the student appeals process.

Complainants in a sexual assault matter are now afforded the following rights:

- 1) To have a pre-hearing meeting with the VPSA-DOS or designee, if desired by the complainant.
- 2) To have written notice of the charge(s) and an outline of rights prior to an administrative or AUCB hearing.
- 3) To review available information, documents, exhibits, and a list of witnesses relating to his or her complaint that are likely to be considered at the hearing.
 

NOTE: There may be information in the respondent student's disciplinary file, for example, regarding prior offenses, that would not be available to the complainant.
- 4) To propose information, documents, exhibits, and witnesses relating to her/his complaint to be considered at the hearing.
- 5) To attend and testify at the hearing, if the complainant desires.
- 6) To be accompanied by one advisor or support person.

Students or organizations who disagree with the outcome of a conduct matter heard by an Administrative Hearing Officer or the All-University Conduct Board and wish to appeal are afforded five business days to do so. The appeals process is facilitated by the Office of Academic Integrity and Student Conduct, the Vice Provost for Student Affairs/Dean of Students and the Chancellor. The function of the VPSA/DOS (or Chancellor, as applicable) in reviewing an appeal is to review the action of the AUCB or administrative hearing officer to determine if:

- 1) an alleged violation of the rights guaranteed the accused has occurred
- 2) the sanction is too severe for the violation
- 3) new and significant evidence that was not available at the time of the hearing has developed which has a bearing on the outcome
- 4) an objective assessment of the evidence under the preponderance of evidence standard does not support a finding of responsibility.

The procedural steps an appeal follows is based on its level (Level One or Level Two) which is determined by the resulting disciplinary standing. Level One Violations are for appeals resulting from University Reprimand, University Censure, and Educational Sanctions. These appeals are heard by the Vice Provost for Student Affairs/Dean of Students. Level Two Violations are for appeals resulting from sanctions of Conduct Probation, Suspension, and Expulsion.

It is the responsibility of the student to adhere to the appeals process. To be permissible, an appeal must be submitted within the designated time frame and contain a detailed discussion of the student's evidence and reasoning based on the permissible grounds for appeal.

For more in information, visit <http://handbook.uark.edu/appealprocedures.php>.



Find out more at [handbook.uark.edu](http://handbook.uark.edu)

## Academic Integrity at the YOU of A

The fall semester was ushered in with a new, comprehensive academic integrity policy. The new policy went into effect August 15, 2011 and aims to handle incidents in a more efficient and consistent manner.

The overhaul of existing policy began over a year ago with administrators and faculty meeting frequently. Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Sharon Gaber was a champion of the review and changes. In an *Arkansas Democrat Gazette* article, Gaber was quoted as saying "What we had was a policy that seemed to lead to faculty frustration and student frustration...The process didn't seem to be working" (Branam, 2011, 5B). So, with a focus on fairness, the review and editing began.

The new policy now includes a sanction rubric which identifies three levels of violations and corresponding sanctions. Additional changes have created a more streamlined appeals process and the use of Academic Integrity Monitors within each college.

The levels of violations are tiered on severity.

- Level One pertains to actions such as using unauthorized resources or materials on an exam or plagiarism as an undergraduate. A single incident at this level, for which a student is found responsible, will result in a zero on the assignment or exam, which is then averaged in to the total course grade.
- Level Two includes falsifying data as an undergraduate, plagiarism as a graduate

student, or buying, selling, or otherwise obtaining information about a test not yet administered. Being found responsible for a Level Two violation will earn an "XF" in the course which signifies failing with academic dishonesty.

- Level Three violations are the most egregious. These are actions such as altering grades or official records or sabotaging another student's work. A violation at this level results in expulsion.

These levels have assigned sanction points ranging from 0.5-3.0. If more than one violation occurs, the sanction points do accumulate and sanctions such as suspension for one or more semesters are given.

The process is initiated when a faculty member or instructor reports a suspected violation to the Academic Integrity Monitor (AIM). The AIM then investigates the incident and meets with the parties involved. Based on the investigation, the AIM determines the student's responsibility, or lack thereof, in the issue and makes a recommendation to the All-University Academic Integrity Board (AUAIB). The AUAIB is comprised of faculty and students.

Dr. Ro DiBrezza, Interim Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, emphasizes the significance of the review process and the new policy. She commented in the earlier quoted *Gazette* article that it is not often that universities and faculties pull back and look at their policies to this extent. Doing so really enabled the committee to craft something intentional and

*"It is better to  
deserve honors and  
not have them than  
to have them and  
not deserve them."*

-- Mark Twain

Beneficial for the students and the faculty.

In 2010-11, there were 179 incidents of academic integrity violations. It is expected the total number of cases will rise during this academic year. The increase will likely be attributed to the new policy's campus wide implementation and the ease of reporting.

Ultimately, the policy was created as a means to protect the value of students' learning experiences, the degrees earned, and the reputation of the University of Arkansas.

Branam, C. (2011, October 30). UA updates cheating ban, gains praise. *Arkansas Democrat Gazette*, p. 5A.



## consider>>>

By: Jessica Pope, Graduate Assistant

### *Rationalizations that just don't work. Don't fall for these common myths.*

As a general rule, human beings are logical people who feel compelled to rationalize our actions and decisions. In matters of academic dishonesty, these rationalizations have transformed into myths, which cloud students' judgment. Here are a few rationalizations to watch for:

- **Everyone cheats. It can't be wrong if everyone does it.** This is not a matter of safety in numbers. While many people may be making the poor decision to cheat, you should not. It's a matter of character.
- **The nice guys always lose while cheaters get ahead.** While the cheaters may prosper in the short-term, they are damaging their reputation and jeopardizing their credibility with colleagues, friends, and future employers.
- **Cheating is necessary for my success. My parents and my future depend on it.** Cheaters are really short-changing themselves and those who believe in them. Is cheating worth the disappointment and loss? If you are honest and do your own work, you gain knowledge and experience you will need to succeed in your desired career as well as preserve relationships you care about.
- **My class is so large I probably won't get caught.** While not everyone gets caught, you just might. Plus, you will know you are completing work in a dishonest fashion.
- **It's a small assignment. Only big papers and important tests matter.** Scale is not important. Cheating is cheating.

*Would you want your heart surgeon or a pilot flying your plane to rationalize cheating his or her way through his or her education?*