

A c a d e m i c

Conduct Code

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

S A R G E N T

COLLEGE *of* HEALTH AND
REHABILITATION SCIENCES

Academic Conduct Code

Sargent College of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences is committed to creating an intellectual community in which both faculty and students participate in the free and uncompromising pursuit of learning. This is possible only in an atmosphere of mutual trust where the discovery and communication of truth are marked by scrupulous, unqualified honesty. The College expects all students to adhere strictly to the accepted norms of intellectual honesty in their academic and clinical work. Any form of cheating, plagiarism, or dishonesty, or collusion in another's dishonesty is a fundamental violation of these norms.

Academic Misconduct

Violations of this code are acts that constitute an attempt to be dishonest or deceptive in the performance of academic or clinical work in or out of the classroom, to alter academic records; or to collaborate with another student or students in an act of academic misconduct.

Violations include but are not limited to:

1. **Cheating.** The use or attempted use of unauthorized aids in any exam or other academic exercise submitted for evaluation. This includes data falsification, the fabrication of data, deceitful alteration of collected data included in a report, copying from another student's work, unauthorized cooperation in doing assignments or during an examination, the use of purchased essays, laboratory reports or term papers and dishonesty in requests for either extensions on papers or make-up examinations.
2. **Plagiarism.** Any attempt by a student to represent the work of another as his or her own. This includes copying the answers of another student on an examination or copying or substantially restating the work of another person or persons in any oral or written work without citing the appropriate source and collaborating with someone else in an academic endeavor without acknowledging his or her contribution.
3. **Theft of an examination.** Stealing or otherwise discovering and/or making known to others the contents of an examination that has not yet

been administered or which has not yet been released by an instructor.

4. Unauthorized conversation during examinations. Any unauthorized conversation may be considered prima facie evidence of cheating.

5. Alteration of graded examinations, grade lists or other official University records.

6. Submitting the same work in more than one course without the consent of the instructors involved.

7. Knowingly allowing another student to represent your work as his or her own.

8. Altering or destroying another student's work or records, altering records of any kind, removing materials from libraries or offices without consent, or in any way interfering with the work of others so as to impede their academic performance.

9. Misrepresentation of facts, withholding or concealing information, collusion.

10. Failure to comply with the sanctions imposed under the authority of this code.

Personal Integrity

It is expected that all students at the college promote and maintain high standards of personal and professional behavior. The code of ethics for each professional program at the college is available in department offices. Students should adhere to these standards. In addition to the above mentioned examples of academic dishonesty, other violations of the college's conduct code include misuse and misrepresentation of college records and/or application materials, forgery, unauthorized entry into college or individual offices, files or computer records, and theft or damage of university property. This list of violations is not meant to be a comprehensive one but rather an indication of the types of behaviors that will result in similar sanctions as those outlined above.

Violation of the Academic Conduct Code

Students may be penalized for academic conduct code violations in one of two ways: directly by the course instructor or through referral to the Sargent College Committee on Academic Policies and Procedures.

1. An instructor who determines that a student has committed an act of misconduct may directly sanction the student by lowering the student's grade in work that was involved and/or by lowering the student's grade in the entire course, including issuing a grade of "F" for the course.

The instructor must promptly notify the student, in writing, of the sanction and must also notify the Department Chairman of the misconduct and the sanction. The instructor must also inform the student of his/her right to appeal the case to the Committee.

2. In addition to or instead of imposing a sanction, an instructor may elect to refer the case to the Committee for action. Such referral must be made within two weeks after the instructor becomes aware of the alleged misconduct.

3. The student also has the right to appeal a case of alleged misconduct to the Committee within two weeks after notification by the instructor of the sanction(s) imposed. In the event the student appeals the case to the Committee, the sanctions imposed by the instructor will be suspended, pending disposition of the case.

If a student does not appeal the case to the Committee within two weeks of notification by the instructor, the sanctions imposed by the instructor will stand and may not be appealed, overturned or reviewed in any fashion.

4. It is the responsibility of all members of the Sargent College of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences community to maintain an atmosphere of integrity within the college and to take action in cases of alleged misconduct. Any persons, including students, faculty or employees of the college may make a referral to the College Committee, through the Associate Dean or Chairman of the Committee.

Composition of the Sargent College Committee on Academic Policies and Procedures

The College Committee on Academic Policies and Procedures is composed of five faculty members, one from each academic department, a student, a professional advisor from the Student Academic Support Services Office, and the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs who serves as *ex-officio*.

The Committee Chairman will be a faculty member selected by the faculty of the college for a two-year term. In the absence of the Chairman at a meeting or hearing, another member of the Committee will assume the role of the Chairman.

In cases involving international students, a member of the International Students and Scholars Office will be invited to attend the hearing but will not vote. For non-SAR students, a representative from their home school will be invited to attend but will not vote.

Procedure

The Committee Chairman will notify the student of a hearing by telephone or by written correspondence as soon as the hearing is scheduled. Prior to the hearing the student and instructor will submit all pertinent information to the Committee for review. The student has the right to present his/her case in person at the hearing. The Committee may request that other individuals with pertinent information attend the hearing. Formulation and notification of the judgment and penalty must be completed within 48 hours of the hearing.

Appeals

Within two weeks of the receipt of the Committee's decision the student may appeal the judgment and/or penalty to the Dean of the College. Appeals must be in writing, setting forth the basis of the appeal and may include new evidence not presented at the hearing. Once a decision is made the Dean will notify the student, the Chairman of the Committee on Academic Policies and Procedures and the Department Chairman. In

all cases the student has the right to appeal the decision to the Provost of the University. Appeals to the Provost must be made in writing within two weeks of the receipt of denial by the Dean.

Penalties

If a Sargent College student is found to have committed a violation of the Academic Conduct Code, one or more of the following actions may be taken:

1. Verbal warning for very minor violations that do not warrant a sanction.
2. Reprimand for violations of a minor nature or mitigated by extenuating circumstances. A copy of the reprimand will be placed in the student's file but will not be recorded on the permanent academic record. Past reprimands may be considered in imposing sanctions for further offences. Reprimands will not be made public and do not impose restrictions on the student's participation in academic or non-academic activities.
3. Disciplinary Probation for violations deemed serious enough to warrant some abridgment of the student's rights and privileges. Disciplinary probation is given for a specific amount of time and is recorded on the student's permanent internal record. Probation prohibits the student from being an officer in any recognized all-University or College student organization and from participating in intercollegiate activities during the specified probation period.
4. Suspension for violations deemed serious enough to warrant separation of the student from the University community for a limited time but not serious enough to warrant expulsion. Suspension is given for a period from one to three semesters and is recorded on the student's permanent record. Suspension also prohibits the transfer of any coursework while suspended.
5. Expulsion is used for extremely serious academic misconduct, is recorded on the student's academic record and is permanent.
6. Other sanctions may be imposed by the Committee such as denial of

credit or honors earned, denial of graduation diploma or degree, revocation and withdrawal of credit, grade honors, diploma or degree previously awarded.

If a non-Sargent College student is found to have committed a violation in a SAR course, the Committee Chairman will forward the Committee's recommendations to the Dean of Sargent College who will, in turn, forward those recommendations to the Dean of the student's home school.

Dissemination of information

Dissemination of information is governed by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, copies of which are available in the Dean of Student's Office. Notice of probation, suspension or expulsion is sent to the parent or guardian of dependent students and may be reported to graduate and professional schools to which a student applies or to a student's present or future employer.

Efforts will be made to ensure that students receive a copy of the Academic Conduct Code at their first registration in the college. Copies of the code are available in the Student Academic Support Services Office and the Dean's Office at Sargent College.

5/30/97

Portions of this document were taken directly from the School for the Arts and College of Arts and Sciences Academic Conduct codes and are used with permission.

APPENDIX

This appendix is taken verbatim from the College of Arts and Sciences Academic Conduct Code and is used with permission.

A DEFINITION OF PLAGIARISM

"The academic counterpart of the bank embezzler and of the manufacturer who mislabels products is the plagiarist, the student or scholar who leads readers to believe that what they are reading is the original work of the writer when it is not. If it could be assumed that the distinction between plagiarism and honest use of sources is perfectly clear in everyone's mind, there would be no need for the explanation that follows; merely the warning with which this definition concludes would be enough. But it is apparent that sometimes people of goodwill draw the suspicion of guilt upon themselves (and, indeed, are guilty) simply because they are not aware of the illegitimacy of certain kinds of "borrowing" and of the procedures for correct identification of materials other than those gained through independent research and reflection."

"The spectrum is a wide one. At one end there is a word-for-word copying of another's writing without enclosing the copied passage in quotation marks and identifying it in a footnote, both of which are necessary. (This includes, of course, the copying of all or any part of another student's paper.) It hardly seems possible that anyone of college age or more could do that without clear intent to deceive. At the other end there is the almost casual slipping in of a particularly apt term which one has come across in reading and which so admirably expresses one's opinion that one is tempted to make it personal property. Between these poles there are degrees and degrees, but they may be roughly placed in two groups. Close to outright and blatant deceit - but more the result, perhaps, of laziness than of bad intent - is the patching together of random jottings made in the course of reading, generally without careful identification of their source, and then woven into the text, so that the result is a mosaic of other people's ideas and words, the writer's sole contribution being the cement to hold the pieces together. Indicative of more effort and, for that reason, somewhat closer to honest, though still dishonest, it is the paraphrase, an abbreviated (and often skillfully

prepared) restatement of someone else's analysis or conclusion, without acknowledgment that another person's text has been the basis for the recapitulation."

(The two paragraphs above are from H. Martin and R. Ohmann, *The Logic and Rhetoric of Exposition, Revised Edition*. Copyright 1963, Holt, Rinehart & Winston.)

EXAMPLES OF PLAGIARISM

The examples given below should make clear the dishonest and the proper use of source material. If instances occur which these examples do not seem to cover, conscience will in all likelihood be prepared to supply advice.

THE SOURCE

"The importance of the *Second Treatise of Government* printed in this volume is such that without it we would miss some of the familiar features of our own government. It is safe to assert that the much criticized branch known as the Supreme Court obtained its being as a result of Locke's insistence upon the separation of powers; and that the combination of many powers in the hands of the executive under the New Deal has still to encounter opposition because it is contract to the principles enunciated therein, the effect of which is not spent, though the relationship may not be consciously traced. Again we see the crystallizing force of Locke's writing. It renders explicit and adapts to the British politics of this day that trend and aim of writers from Languet and Bodin through Hooker and Grotius, to say nothing of the distant ancients, Aristotle and the Stoic School of natural law. It sums up magistrally the arguments used through the ages to attack authority vested in a single individual, but it does so from the particular point of view engendered by the Revolution of 1688 and is in harmony with the British scene and mental climate of the growing bourgeoisie of that age. Montesquieu and Rousseau, the framers of our own Declaration of Independence, and the statesmen (or should we say merchants and speculators?) who drew up the Constitution have re-echoed its claims for human liberty, the separation of powers, for the sanctity of private property. In the hands of these

it has been the quarry of liberal doctrines; and that it has served the Socialist theory of property based on labor is final proof of its breadth of view."

Charles L. Sherman, "Introduction" to John Locke,
*Treatise of Civil Government and A Letter
Concerning Toleration*

1. WORD-FOR-WORD PLAGIARIZING

"It is hard to see the importance of the *Second Treatise of Government* to our own democracy. Without it we would miss some of the most familiar features of our own government. It is safe to assert that the much criticized branch known as the Supreme Court obtained its being as a result of Locke's insistence upon the separation of powers; and that the combination of many powers in the hands of the executive is contrary to the principles enunciated therein, the effect of which is not spent, though the relationship may not be consciously traced. The framers of our own Declaration of Independence and the statesman who drew up the Constitution have re-echoed its claims for human liberty, for the separation of powers, for the sanctity of private property. All these are marks of influence of Locke's *Second Treatise* on our own way to life."

In this example, after composing half of the first sentence, the writer copies exactly which is in the original text, leaving out the center section of the paragraph and omitting the names of Montesquieu and Rousseau where he takes up the text again. The last sentence is also the writer's own.

If the writer had enclosed all the copied text in quotation marks and had identified the source in a footnote, he would not have been liable to the charge of plagiarism; a reader might justifiably have felt, however, that the writer's personal contribution to the discussion was not very significant.

2. THE MOSAIC

"The crystallizing force of Locke's writing may be seen in the effect his *Second Treatise of Government* had in shaping some of the familiar

features of our own government. That much criticized branch known as the Supreme Court and the combination of many powers in the hands of the executive under the New Deal are modern examples. But even the foundation of our state - the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution - have re-echoed its claims for human liberty, for the separation of powers, for the sanctity of private property. True, the influence of others is also marked in our Constitution - from the trend and aim of writers like Languet and Bodin, Hooker and Grotius to say nothing of Aristotle and the Stoic school of natural law; but the fundamental influence is Locke's *Treatise*, the very quarry of liberal doctrines."

Note how the following phrases have been lifted out of the original text and moved into new patterns:

"crystallizing force of Locke's writing"

"some of the familiar features of our own government"

"much criticized branch known as the Supreme Court"

"combination of many powers in the hands of the executive under the New Deal"

"have re-echoed its claims for human liberty...property"

"from the trend and aim...Grotius"

"to say nothing of Aristotle and...natural law"

"quarry of liberal doctrines"

As in the first example, there is really no way of legitimizing such a procedure. To put every stolen phrase within quotation marks would produce an almost unreadable, and quite worthless, text.

3. THE PARAPHRASE

Paraphrase	Original
"Many fundamental aspects of our own government are apparent in the <i>Second Treatise of</i>	"Many familiar features of our own government are apparent in the <i>Second Treatise of Govern-</i>

Government. One can safely say that the oft-censured Supreme Court really owes its existence to the Lockean demand that powers in government be kept separate; equally one can say that the allocation of varied and widespread authority to the President during the era of the New Deal has still to encounter opposition because it is contrary to the principles enunciated therein... Once more it is possible to note the way in which Locke's writing clarified existing opinion."

ment. It is safe to assert that the much criticized... Court obtained its existence to upon separation of powers; and that the combination of many powers in the hands of the executive under the New Deal has still to encounter opposition because it is contrary to the principles enunciated therein... Again we see the crystallizing force of Locke's writing."

The foregoing comparison shows how the writer has simply traveled along with the original text, substituting approximately equivalent terms except where his or her understanding falters, as it does with crystallizing, or where the ambiguity of the original requires too much ingenuity to decipher, as it apparently does as in "to encounter opposition... consciously traced" in the original.

Such a procedure as the one shown in this example has its uses; for one thing, it is valuable for the reader as well. How, then, may it properly be used? The procedure is simple. The writer might begin the second sentence with "As Sherman notes in the introduction to his edition of the Treatise, one can safely say.." and conclude the paraphrase passage with a footnote giving the additional identification necessary. Or he or she might indicate directly the exact nature of what is being done, in this fashion: "To paraphrase Sherman's comment..." and conclude that also with a footnote indicator.

In point of fact, this course does not particularly lend itself to honest paraphrase, with the exception of that one sentence which the paraphraser above copied without change except for abridgment. The purpose of paraphrase would be to simplify or to throw new and signifi-

cant light on a text; it requires much skill if it is to be used honestly, and should be used rarely by the student except for the purpose, as suggested above, of personal enlightenment.

4. THE "APT" TERM

"The *Second Treatise of Government* is a veritable quarry of liberal doctrines. In it the crystallizing force of Locke's writing is markedly apparent. The cause of human liberty, the principle of separation of powers and the inviolability of private property - all three major dogmas of American constitutionalism - owe their presence in our Constitution in large part to the remarkable *Treatise* which first appeared around 1685 and was destined to spark within three years a revolution in the land of its author's birth and, ninety years later, another revolution against that land."

Here the writer has not been able to resist the appropriation of two striking terms - "quarry of liberal doctrines" and "crystallizing force"; a perfectly proper use of the terms would have required only the addition of a phrase: "The *Second Treatise of Government* is, to use Sherman's suggestive expression, a "quarry of liberal doctrines." In it the "crystallizing force" - the term again is Sherman's - of Locke's writing is markedly apparent."

Other phrases in the text above - "the cause of human liberty", "the principle of the separation of powers," "the inviolability of private property" - are clearly drawn directly from the original source but are so much matters in the public domain, so to speak, that no one could reasonably object to their reuse in this fashion.

Since one of the principal aims of a college education is the development of intellectual honesty, it is obvious that plagiarism is a particularly serious offence, and the punishment for it is commensurately severe. What a penalized student suffers can never really be known by anyone but that student; what the student who plagiarized and "gets away with it" suffers is less public and probably less acute, but the corruptness of the act, the disloyalty and baseness it entails, must inevitably leave a mark on him or her as well as on the institution.

5. MAKING A BIBLIOGRAPHY: USING FOOTNOTES

Essays written for college courses generally require the use of sources: books, periodicals, and other documents containing information relevant to the topic of the essay to be written. The citation of such sources occurs in one or both of two places: footnotes and a bibliography appended to the essay.

Very simply, a bibliography lists the books, periodicals, and other documents actually used in the preparation of the essay; a footnote indicates very precisely the source of a quotation or specific statement occurring in the text of the essay. For both, a more-or-less standardized system has been developed so that readers anywhere can turn quickly from the footnote or the bibliographical listing to the proper source and be sure that they have at hand the cited work.

Just as honesty requires quotation marks around any statement copied directly from a written source, it requires a footnote to indicate the place from which information has been gathered, or from which paraphrased reconstructions are woven into the text.

A fine bibliography and careful footnoting, no matter how ably prepared, will not make up for the deficiency in reasoning, style, and substance of the essay proper, but they do enhance the value of good scholarly writing because they act as auxiliary agents in the process of communication.
