

Student Honor Code

A. The Honor Code

Students embarking on careers in medicine and dental medicine are expected to maintain high standards of personal and professional integrity. These standards involve such basic concepts as intellectual honesty and respect for the rights and well-being of others. Matriculation in the School of Medicine or Dental Medicine constitutes an obligation for students to act in a manner consistent with such standards. The primary source of these standards shall be this Honor Code and its application to the conduct of medical and dental students. The primary mechanism for the application and enforcement of these standards shall be the Academic Integrity Board (AIB). The Honor Code of the University of Connecticut Schools of Medicine and Dental Medicine comprises the following items:

- Prohibition of any act of intellectual dishonesty. Examples of intellectual dishonesty include (but are not limited to): cheating; plagiarism, copying, or any misrepresentation of work other than one's own; fraud in research; dishonesty in clinical care or documentation; and willful failure to comply with examination and evaluation policies.
- Prohibition of violations of the rights or well-being of members of the UConn Health community. Examples of such violations range from (but are not limited to): failure to comply with library regulations or intentional interference that denies other students access to educational materials, the willful mistreatment of colleagues, and stealing.
- Requirement of students, staff, and faculty to take positive action when there is a reason to believe that a breach of this Honor Code has taken place.

At the beginning of their careers at UConn Health and at the beginning of every subsequent academic year, all medical and dental students shall be required to sign an attestation of the principles contained in this Honor Code. The attestation shall be in writing and shall express the student's commitment to act in a manner consistent with the standards of personal and professional integrity represented by this Honor Code.

B. Implementing the Honor Code: The Honor Code Policy Committee

The Honor Code Policy Committee's main responsibilities are to provide interpretations of the Honor Code and to develop guidelines for the application of the general principles embodied in the Honor Code and as they apply to our students.

The Honor Code Policy Committee shall consist of all current and alternate members of the Honor Board and six faculty members appointed by the Deans/designee of the Schools of Medicine and Dental Medicine: three basic science faculty and three clinical faculty. The Deans/designee shall appoint one faculty member to serve as chairperson of the Committee. From time to time, the Honor Code Policy Committee may appoint other non-voting members to participate in committee discussions.

The Committee also participates in the selection process for the Faculty Advisor of the Academic Integrity Board (described in detail in Section N of this policy, below).

C. The Academic Integrity Board

Purpose

The primary purpose of the Academic Integrity Board is to consider allegations that the Honor Code has been violated, appropriately triage such allegations, and when indicated to conduct formal investigations into such allegations and to make the decision whether a breach of the Code took place. In cases in which a breach of the Code has been determined, the Academic Integrity Board may choose to make recommendations as to what consequences should result, but such recommendations are non-binding.

The Academic Integrity Board may also work in partnership with Schools to promote professionalism among all students.

The length of any Academic Integrity Board investigation will vary based on the nature of the case. Coming to a valid conclusion (i.e. conducting a thorough investigation) is the primary goal. The Academic Integrity Board recognizes the stress that investigations will place on accused students and will strive to conduct its investigations in a time-efficient manner.

If and when the provisions of this Honor Code differ from those of any policy approved by the School of Dental Medicine Faculty Senate or the School of Medicine Education Council, the provision of the Honor Code will control.

Membership

The membership of the Academic Integrity Board shall consist of eight primary members (one medical student and one dental student from each class) and eight alternate members who may attend and participate in each meeting and who may be designated to vote in the place of an absent primary member using the procedure described in the "Meetings" section below. Each primary member and alternate shall serve a two-year term for a maximum of two terms as long as they remain a member in good standing in their respective school. If and when a student leaves the Academic Integrity Board, the vacancy will be filled by a special election to take place within one month. If the vacancy is a primary member, the alternate member for that school and class will become the primary member and the election will be for the vacancy in the alternate member position. If a student is on leave for a length of time that would cause them to not graduate at the same time as the medical or dental class that elected them, then they will be removed from the Board. The Academic Integrity Board is responsible for conducting the election of Academic Integrity Board members according to the following schedule.

The first year class

1. Elections for one primary member and one alternate will be held for both the medical and dental school classes. These elections should be conducted sometime in the Fall semester, to align best with other student leadership elections. These students shall serve until June 30th of their second year. The protocol for this election is as follows:
 - a. Each student may cast one vote for members in their respective schools. The medical student receiving the highest number of votes and the dental student receiving the highest number of votes will be primary Academic Integrity Board Members.

The medical student receiving the second highest number of votes and the dental student receiving the second highest number of votes will both serve as alternates for the first and second years.

The second year class

In April, but by no later than the second week of June, the medical and dental school classes shall elect Academic Integrity Board members to begin serving on July 1st of their third year. They shall complete their term upon graduation. Students may serve a maximum of two, two-year terms. If a student delays graduation they may not continue for a third year. The protocol for this election is as follows:

- Each student may cast one vote for members in their respective schools. The medical student receiving the highest number of votes and the dental student receiving the highest number of votes will be primary Academic Integrity Board Members.
- The medical student receiving the second highest number of votes and the dental student receiving the second highest number of votes will both serve as alternates for the third and fourth years.

Chairperson

The Academic Integrity Board shall elect a chairperson (chair) annually. To be eligible, the chair must have served on the Academic Integrity Board previously for at least one academic year. The chair can be a voting or an alternate member. At the discretion of the Board, co-chairpersons, one from each school, may be selected by a simple majority. If the chair (or co-chairs) cannot attend a meeting of the Academic Integrity Board, the chair (or co-chairs) may appoint a temporary chair for that meeting. If the chair (or co-chairs) is recused from participating in a case, the Academic Integrity Board shall elect a temporary chair to handle that case. This vote may occur by email.

Secretary

The chairperson/co-chairs shall designate a secretary at each meeting to write minutes documenting all proceedings regarding a case, or potential case, including Initial Meetings, Case

Review Meetings, and Evidentiary Hearings. The designated secretary will then email the meeting minutes to the co-chairs within 24 hours of the meeting.

Meetings

The Academic Integrity Board, including alternates, shall meet as often as necessary to conduct the business of the Board. Meetings are characterized as those related to ‘cases’ as well as those held for administrative purposes. If a primary member cannot be at a meeting, an alternate member will be selected for that meeting and will have the ability to vote at that meeting. Selection of such an alternate will be made in this order of priority:

- (1) The alternate from the same class & school;
- (2) Then the alternate from the same class but the other school;
- (3) Then an alternate from the same school but a different class (priority given to more senior class);
- (4) Then an alternate from the other school in a different class (priority given to more senior class).

Case officers and co-case officers (described below) may be primary or alternate members and may not vote on any case they are assigned to. If these officers are primary Board members, an alternate will be assigned the ability to vote using the selection process described above. This assignment will apply to all votes regarding this case unless this alternate cannot be present for that meeting the process described above will be followed.

A quorum must be present for all meetings. Quorum is defined as 5 voting members, which may be primary or alternate members who were designated as a voting member for that meeting.

The Faculty Advisor must be present at all meetings related to a case.

D. Reporting Concerns/Alleged Violations

Anyone affiliated with UConn Health, including but not limited to: students, faculty, staff, residents, and attendings, who has a concern regarding a breach of the Honor Code has a duty to take positive action. Positive actions include, but are not limited to:

1. Direct discussion with the person whose conduct is questioned and if, after such discussion, the breach is still suspected, the person with the concern must engage in informal discussions with a member of the Academic Integrity Board (as described in paragraph D.2 below) or submit a Formal Report to the Academic Integrity Board;
2. Informal consultation with a member of the Academic Integrity Board by any member of the UConn Health community who thinks that a breach of the Honor Code may have occurred but is unsure. Upon initial consultation, an Academic Integrity Board member must notify the chair of the Academic Integrity Board before making a recommendation or taking any action in relation to the report. The chair who received the report must

consult the Faculty Advisor and may consult members and/or alternates regarding how to proceed;

3. Direct submission of a Formal Report to the Academic Integrity Board;
 - a. Formal Reports may be submitted as one of the following:
 - i. Totally anonymous: the name of the reporter will not be known to the accused or by the members of the Academic Integrity Board.
 - ii. Partially anonymous: the name of the reporter will not be known by the accused, but will be known by the members of the Academic Integrity Board
 - iii. Non-anonymous: the name of the reporter will be known to both the accused and the members of the Academic Integrity Board.
 - b. Anonymous and partially anonymous complaints are accepted but may not be triaged into a formal investigation unless the complaint contains sufficient information to justify an investigation. The Board will vote as to whether or not they believe that an anonymous submission can be effectively investigated (see the description of “Initial meetings” below.).
 - c. Findings of breach cannot be based solely on anonymous information contained in the initial anonymous complaint. Partially anonymous reporters may serve as a witness and in that capacity their name may be disclosed to the accused.

Failure to take positive action may itself be a violation of the Honor Code.

Self-reporting of unprofessional behavior will be viewed more favorably than otherwise and can serve as an opportunity for self-reflection and improvement.

How to Submit a Formal Report

Reports of a possible breach of the Honor Code shall be made in writing as soon as possible after the discovery of the alleged violation. To ensure the confidentiality of the investigatory process, it is recommended that such written report be delivered in a sealed envelope or via secure email to any member of the Academic Integrity Board. However, in order to encourage students, faculty, and staff to report concerns, other avenues of reporting are acceptable. If a report is made to a trusted school administrator/faculty/or any person(s) outside of the Academic Integrity Board, the recipient of this report is responsible for: (1) submitting the report to the Academic Integrity Board, to the SOM Professionalism Incident Report Triage Committee,¹ or to the appropriate committee within the SoDM;² and (2) maintaining strict confidentiality regarding the report and the alleged incident.

¹ When a concern regarding a violation of the Honor Code involves a medical student, the Chair of the Academic Integrity Board must complete a Professionalism Incident Report (PIR) and submit it to the PIR Triage Committee (PIRT). When possible, reporting of concerns regarding medical students should occur directly to PIRT to facilitate proceedings. Formal Reports concerning medical students may come to the Academic Integrity Board directly from PIRT.

² When a concern regarding violation of the Honor Code involves a dental student, reports may involve reporting within the School of Dental Medicine in addition to the Academic Integrity Board.

E. Initial Meeting(s)

Once a Formal Report is made to the Academic Integrity Board, an Initial Meeting is held per the following proceedings:

1. **Determination of Conflicts of Interest**

The name(s), only, of the accused will be disclosed to the Board members present. Any Board member with a possible conflict of interest will be given the opportunity to recuse themselves from all further proceedings regarding the case. Any Board member may identify another Board member as having a potential conflict of interest, in which case, the Board will vote on recusal of those individuals if the identified member(s) do/does not self-recuse. Recusal of a Board member by peer initiative requires a simple majority vote. If there are sufficient recusals such that the quorum is lost, the meeting will be suspended until a quorum is achieved.

2. **Disclosure of the Contents of the Formal Report**

The information provided in the Formal Report is disclosed and discussed.

3. **Triage**

The Academic Integrity Board will determine whether there is sufficient evidence to initiate an investigation and/or if the case must be transferred to another body for action. The Board need only find that it is more likely than not that the complaint (anonymous, partially anonymous, or non-anonymous) can be effectively investigated. The decision to launch a formal investigation following review of the Formal Report requires a simple majority vote of the quorum.

4. **Appointment of a Case Officer and/or Co-investigator**

All concerns deemed to fall within the purview of the Academic Integrity Board and worthy of investigation will be investigated by a Case Officer. All members who serve as Case Officers will receive basic training in conducting an investigation from the Office of General Counsel or other UConn Health resources. Case Officers will be responsible for the movement of the case through the process to final disposition. Case Officers can be either primary members or alternates and are selected in the following manner:

- a. Volunteer;
- b. If no member volunteers, a Case Officer is appointed by the chair/co-chairs. The chair/co-chair may elect to be a Case Officer if there are no volunteers, but then cannot preside as Chair for any subsequent meetings concerning the case;
- c. The Board may choose to appoint a Co-investigator to assist the Case Officer with investigatory duties.

Case Officer Duties

- a. Conduct thorough investigation including but not limited to receiving all correspondence, statements, evidence and other materials related to the case, and maintain file and evidence folders;
- b. Review all case material;
- c. Present all case material to the Academic Integrity Board;
- d. Be present and participate in the discussion at all meetings regarding the case they are assigned;
- e. Contact witnesses and the accused in order to schedule an Evidentiary Hearing on the case, if necessary;
- f. Develop an agenda for the Case Review Meeting and Evidentiary Hearing and be responsible for the conduct of them;
- g. Help the chair/chairs compose a letter to the appropriate Dean/designee regarding the findings of the Academic Integrity Board.

5. Discussion on how the case might be investigated

F. Case Review Meeting(s)

Once the Case Officer has investigated the concern, then the Academic Integrity Board hears the Case Officer's findings in a Case Review Meeting. Case Review Meetings are conducted with only the members of the Academic Integrity Board and the Faculty Advisor present and proceed in the manner listed below. The Case Review meeting cannot be held until after the case officer(s) interview the accused at which time the accused will be provided a description of the issues that are being investigated, the names of the Academic Integrity Board members that have not already been recused, and the names of the witnesses interviewed so far in the investigation. At the time of this interview or within two calendar days, the accused may request that member(s) of the Academic Integrity Board be recused from this case and must provide a justification for each such request.

1. The Case Officer(s) will present any requests and justifications made by the accused to recuse Academic Integrity Board member(s) from the case. The Academic Integrity Board will discuss any such requests and by simple majority vote determine if any members will be recused. For each vote, the Academic Integrity Board member under consideration of recusal will not be eligible to vote.
2. The Case Officer and any Co-investigator present the evidence collected.
3. The committee discusses the evidence and then votes on one of the following three courses of action by means of a simple majority vote:
 - a. Send the case back to Case Officer for further investigation.
 - b. Determine that the presented evidence is insufficient to declare an Honor Code breach and that reasonable effort by the Academic Integrity Board would yield no further insight into the case. In such situations, appropriate reporting of this finding is performed, as per later section titled, "Notifications."

- c. Determine that the presented evidence is sufficient to proceed to an Evidentiary Hearing, by finding that it is more likely than not that the complaint (anonymous, partially anonymous, or non-anonymous) can be effectively investigated as per section E.3.

G. Evidentiary Hearings

Evidentiary hearings are scheduled in order to provide the accused an opportunity to be heard and for the Academic Integrity Board to clarify information that was presented at the Case Review Meeting. Evidentiary Hearings will be led by the Case Officer and are conducted in the following manner:

1. The Case Officer will present the evidence concerning the case. The Case Officer may choose to interview witnesses at this time and in such cases, the members of the Board may then question these witnesses.
 - a. Any identified witnesses are strongly encouraged to participate in interviews as it enables the Board to come to the most informed decision. However, witnesses have the right to decline involvement in the evidentiary hearing if they so choose.
2. The accused may choose to be in attendance during the Case Officer's presentation and will then have an opportunity to address the Academic Integrity Board and to present any witnesses, or evidence;
 - a. The accused may choose not to attend the Evidentiary Hearing by sending a written waiver to the Board at least 24 hours prior to the scheduled hearing. In such a case, the accused waives their right to present evidence or witnesses. The accused may submit a written statement to be read at the Evidentiary Hearing.
 - b. If the accused attends the Evidentiary Hearing, a personal representative (who may be an attorney) may attend. The accused must notify the Academic Integrity Board at least 24 hours prior to the scheduled hearing if a representative will be present. If the accused has an attorney present, UConn may also have an attorney present. The representative, if present, serves in a purely advisory capacity and is permitted to speak only to the accused. The Academic Integrity Board Chair(s) may dismiss the representative if, in their sole discretion, they disrupt the hearing proceedings;
 - c. The accused and any witnesses presented by the accused may be asked questions by the members of Board.
3. Following dismissal of the accused, any witnesses, and the personal representative of the accused, if any, the Board will discuss the case and then a motion will be made to vote, via simple majority decision, to either:
 - a. Return to the investigation phase of the case, but only if new information not known at the time of the Case Review Meeting was presented in the Evidentiary Hearing that indicated need for further investigation.
 - i. In this case, further investigation will be conducted by the Case Officer and Co-investigator, and a new Case Review Meeting and Evidentiary

Hearing will be scheduled and conducted, as described in Sections F and G, above.

- b. Proceed to a formal vote of “breach” vs “insufficient evidence of breach.”
4. Following the decision to proceed to a formal vote regarding breach status, the formal vote will be held via secret ballot. A verdict that a breach occurred must pass with a two-thirds majority of the members who are present and voting on that case.
5. Standard of proof for finding of breach of the Honor Code: A finding of breach of the Honor Code must be based on clear and convincing evidence of the breach. Each voting member determines whether, based on their weighing of the evidence presented, there was clear and convincing evidence that the accused breached the Honor Code. This standard is higher than a finding by a preponderance of the evidence but does not require a finding of breach “beyond a reasonable doubt.” The Academic Integrity Board shall provide or arrange for training for members on how to assess evidence in terms of the burden of proof.

H. The Appeal Process

Upon notification that the Academic Integrity Board has reached a verdict of breach, the accused will be given seven calendar days to request the appeal. Such an appeal must be made in writing and be provided to the chair of the Academic Integrity Board. The accused may provide a written waiver of an appeal in order to move more quickly to notifications.

Requests for an appeal will only be granted based on new evidence, which was not available to the Academic Integrity Board when they made their decision or claims that the Academic Integrity Board did not follow the appropriate processes. These two grounds for appeal are further defined below:

1. New evidence is evidence that: a) the accused could not reasonably have been expected to have obtained that could have been presented at the Evidentiary Hearing; and b) a reasonable person could conclude might have materially impacted the determination of breach or insufficient evidence of breach.
2. A claim that the Academic Integrity Board did not follow the appropriate process, as defined by this policy, must demonstrate that a reasonable person could conclude the failure might have materially impacted the determination of breach or insufficient evidence of breach.

If an appeal is requested, the Academic Integrity Board Chair/Co-chair will notify the members of the Appeal Board (see below) prior to the hearing.

Appeal Board

1. The Appeal Board shall consist of five voting members: two students and three faculty members appointed by the appropriate Academic Officer of either the School of Medicine or School of Dental Medicine. The Appeal Board will elect a Chair for the Appeal. All voting members must be present at any meeting of the Appeals Board. Each school is responsible for ensuring that students and faculty who serve on ad hoc Appeal Boards receives sufficient training in the schools' policies and procedures and the application of the concept of "materiality" in order to fairly apply them in each individual case (training can be provided by the Office of the General Counsel).
2. The Academic Integrity Board chair/co-chair will send the request for appeal submitted by the accused to the members of the Appeal Board by email. The Appeal Board will decide whether the appeal will be heard or not. If new evidence is presented in the appeal, the Academic Integrity Board will have an opportunity to comment on such evidence in terms of whether it should have been presented at the time of the Evidentiary Hearing and/or as to whether it is material to the determination made by the Academic Integrity Board of 'breach'/'insufficient evidence of breach.' The Academic Integrity Board has a total of 7 calendar days to make such comment through the following process: a) the decision to make such comment and the content of such comment are under the sole discretion of the chair/co-chairs; b) the chair/co-chairs must present the first draft of such comment to the members of the Academic Integrity Board in sufficient time so that they may make recommendations for revision (review and revisions can take place by email); and c) the final comment will be sent to the ad hoc appeal committee and to the members of the Academic Integrity Board.
3. If the Appeal Board decides to hear the case, either the Academic Integrity Board Chair/Co-Chair or the Faculty Advisor will then attend all sessions of the Appeal Board to observe and answer questions from the Appeal Board. The representative from the AIB will not serve as a voting member of the Appeal Board.
4. The Chair of the Appeal Board and its members will review the evidence presented in support of the appeal. Persons found to be in breach of the Honor Code will have the right to present their own case in front of the Appeal Board and, like the evidentiary hearing, can elect to bring a personal representative (including an attorney). The personal representative is there for support only and will not be allowed to speak in front of the Appeal Board. If the accused has an attorney present, UConn may also have an attorney present.
5. Grounds for overturning an Academic Integrity Board Decision: The ad hoc appeals committee can only overturn the Academic Integrity Board's decision where the error in procedure or discovery of new evidence could have materially impacted the Academic Integrity Board's original finding. Overturning the Honor Board's decision should not be based on a trivial process issue or new evidence that does not seriously undermine the Academic Integrity Board's finding. The members of the ad hoc appeals committee may

receive training in the meaning of “materiality” from the School and/or the Office of General Counsel.

6. The decision of the Appeal Board will be transmitted to the Academic Integrity Board by email within 1 calendar day.
7. If the Academic Integrity Board’s decision is sustained by the ad hoc Appeal Board, the Chair of the Appeal Board will notify the student involved orally and also by email within 1 calendar day.
8. If the Appeal Board overturns the decision of the Academic Integrity Board, in whole or in part, the Appeal Board will notify the student involved orally and also by email within 1 calendar day. The Appeal Board must provide a written justification for their decision to overturn the decision of the AIB to both the AIB and the Dean of their school within 7 calendar days. Any materials transmitted to the Dean at this point must have the names of the accused and the witnesses redacted.

I. Notifications by the Academic Integrity Board

1. At any stage in the process, when a finding of insufficient evidence to make a determination of breach is made and the case is not sent for further investigation, the chair of the Board will notify the accused orally and by formal written communication. If the accused is a medical student, this determination will also be sent to the PIRT co-chairs.
2. If a verdict of “breach” is reached at the Evidentiary Hearing, the accused will be notified of the result by the chairperson or designee both in-person and by formal written communication;
3. If the decision of “breach” made by the Academic Integrity Board is upheld by the Appeal Board, the Dean/designee of the appropriate school will be notified within seven calendar days and presented with a summary statement, inclusive of all information used to reach the decision.
4. When the Academic Integrity Board concludes its involvement in the case and all the appeals described above are completed, the person submitting the Formal Report will be informed that the Academic Integrity Board has concluded its proceedings.

J. Rights and Responsibilities of Accused and Witnesses

1. Notwithstanding the rights of the accused described earlier in this policy, both the accused and any witnesses (including students, faculty, or staff) must cooperate with the processes described above which includes, but is not limited to:
 - a. meeting with the case officer(s) in a timely manner to be interviewed.
 - b. providing honest and complete answers to the case officer(s) questions or questions raised by Academic Integrity Board members asked during Academic

- Integrity Board and/or appeals committee meetings/hearings. Such questions must be relevant to the investigation.
- c. maintaining confidentiality regarding the nature of the case, the nature of the questions being asked and/or the names of the accused or other witnesses being interviewed.
 - d. violations of article J.1 will be considered a breach of professionalism and subject to appropriate investigation and sanctions.
2. Both the accused and any witness have the option to decline any invitation to attend an Academic Integrity Board meeting/hearing. If testifying at such hearings, the witnesses have the right to present their testimony and be questioned by the Academic Integrity Board members without the accused being present.
 3. Prior to the evidentiary hearing, the accused has the right to be provided a list of their alleged breaches of the Honor Code, the names of the witnesses interviewed during the investigation, and the names of the members of the Academic Integrity Board who were not recused from the case. At the time the accused is first interviewed or two calendar days following that interview, the accused has the right to make a request that members of the Academic Integrity Board should be recused from the case and at that time must provide justification for such a request.
 4. The accused must make all reasonable efforts to obtain and present all evidence in support of their case at the Evidentiary Hearing rather than to obtain and present evidence after a Hearing in support of an appeal.
 5. Retaliation against the accused, accusers, witnesses, members of the Academic Integrity Board, or any other persons associated with an Academic Integrity Board action is prohibited. The University's policy on non-retaliation (<https://policy.uconn.edu/2011/05/24/non-retaliation-policy/>) applies.

K. Confidentiality and Document Retention

All specific charges, names, evidence, and testimony are treated as strictly confidential unless otherwise required by law. The integrity of an Honor System depends on confidentiality, and the disclosure of names or other confidential information concerning a report by any person shall itself be considered an Honor Code breach. This applies to all involved parties – including, but not limited to, the accused, witnesses, and Academic Integrity Board members. If the breach involves a protected statute, all efforts to maintain confidentiality will be critical but cannot be guaranteed. However, reports, including the individuals who report, may be part of a more extensive investigation involving the necessary authorities. Every effort to restrict the flow of information to only necessary parties will be of utmost priority and importance.

The Faculty Advisor shall be responsible for securely storing a copy of all documents that are material to the case, including but not limited to the case officer's notes, and minutes of meetings, as well as the physical evidence. These documents will be retained as long as required by state record retention laws and/or other prevailing laws.

It is imperative for all members of UConn Health to be aware that any report of concern regarding a “protected statute” including but not limited to sexual harassment, domestic violence, elder abuse, child abuse, and threats of self-harm cannot be treated confidentially and must be directed immediately to the Academic Integrity Board Faculty Advisor who can refer it to the appropriate authority.

L. Disciplinary Action

The Academic Integrity Board is concerned only with judging a person(s) as having committed a breach or not of the Honor Code and is not responsible for taking disciplinary action against the person(s) who has breached the Honor Code. Such actions shall be taken by the appropriate Dean/designee. Whether a disciplinary action results from a breach in the Honor Code is up to the respective policies and procedures of the schools of Medicine and Dental Medicine. Reports of a breach of the Honor Code are forwarded to the Deans’ designees for the student’s school, who will refer the report to the Academic Advancement Committee (SOM) or the Academic Performance Committee (SoDM) for possible disciplinary action. Not all breaches in the Honor Code result in disciplinary action. Sometimes the process of being investigated by the Academic Integrity Board is the only corrective action and, in itself, can be viewed as an opportunity for professional growth.

M. Reports to the Academic Community

The Academic Integrity Board and the Faculty Advisor shall be responsible for maintaining a record of the number and types of complaints brought to the Academic Integrity Board each year (and year to year), regardless of whether a breach of the Honor Code was found. These reports shall not contain any identifiable information about the accuser, the accused, or the specifics of the event that would facilitate identification.

At least once each academic year, the Academic Integrity Board shall report on its activities to Education Council (for the School of Medicine) and Dental Senate (for the School of Dental Medicine) and to the medical and dental classes. These reports shall discuss, in general terms, the activities of the Board during the year.

N. Process for Selecting the Academic Integrity Board Faculty Advisor

The process is divided into 3 steps, namely:

- Nomination
- Preliminary review and vetting
- Final selection

Descriptions of the individual steps are as follows:

Nomination

The nomination process should be open with nominations being accepted from students and faculty. Students will be invited to nominate faculty. Faculty will be free to either self-nominate or put forward the names of colleagues. The process will begin with a nominations process similar to all nomination processes utilized by both schools. Applicants will be asked to submit a

one-page personal statement explaining their interest and describing any relevant experience. Nominations go directly to an administrator.

Preliminary Review, Vetting, and Interview

The Dean's Designee in SOM and that in SoDM will review and vet the nominations with their teams and the Deans. Either administration may veto individual candidates who are unacceptable. The vetting process should remove the fewest candidates possible from consideration. The Honor Code Policy Advisory Committee will be told the total number of nominees but will only be sent a list of acceptable nominees. Ideally, the list will include at least 2-3 candidates. The Honor Code Policy Advisory Committee reviews the applicants, conducts interviews, and narrows the list of candidates to at least 2.

In the event that there is only 1 candidate deemed suitable then the Honor Code Policy Advisory Committee will meet to discuss and determine if that candidate is acceptable. A unanimous consent is required. If unanimous consent is not possible, the nomination process begins again.

Final Selection

After reviewing the materials submitted by the candidates chosen by the Honor Code Policy Advisory Committee, the students of the Academic Integrity Board will make the final selection by a simple majority of the quorum.

Term of Appointment

The term of service for the faculty advisor to the Academic Integrity Board will be five years with an opportunity to renew for one additional term. The opportunity to renew will be contingent on the approval of the Honor Code Policy Advisory Committee and the Deans' Designees of the Schools.

Salary Support

To promote the effectiveness of the faculty advisor to the Academic Integrity Board, salary support for educational effort will be decided by the respective Dean's designees. Additionally, the faculty advisor to the Academic Integrity Board may not serve on any other committees where a conflict of interest might occur (e.g. promotions or disciplinary committees in the SOM or the SoDM).

Approvals for this policy

- **06/05/19 Honor Code Policy Committee**
- **07/11/19 SOM Committee on Undergraduate Education**
- **07/18/19 SOM Education Council**
- **08/12/19 SoDM Education Council**
- **09/03/19 SoDM Faculty Senate**