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1. The Faculty Senate and the Provost established the Graduate Honor Council (GHC) consisting of half faculty and half graduate students to consider all cases of possible violation of the Honor Code by graduate students. Postdoctoral appointees do not fall under this policy.

2. The GHC adopts the spirit of the constitution, by-laws, and procedures of the Honor Council except as modified by GHC Policies and Procedures. GHC and Honor Council may communicate as the Honor Council considers its by-laws and procedures. Where GHC communicates with the Honor Council, Student Judicial Programs and the Associate Dean of Undergraduates will be copied.

3. An alleged violation by a graduate student shall be reported by faculty or students to the Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Students (DGPS), who shall maintain permanent and confidential records of outcomes for each student and such additional case records as DGPS deems desirable. Student Judicial Programs shall maintain the complete case records, including all correspondence, concerning all alleged allegations by graduate students. Students have a duty under the Honor Code to report possible violations. This duty does not require that a student must directly report an allegation to DGPS, although direct reporting is preferred and encouraged. While a student may initially report the alleged violation to a faculty member, university administrator, Honor Council, or GHC for transmission to DGPS, the student normally must be identified and serve as a witness if called. The intermediary must report to DGPS, and confirm back to the student in writing that the case has been reported and where. DGPS or GHC may decide that an exception concerning student witnesses exists, for example, in instances of alleged plagiarism, when the fact of plagiarism can be determined directly from documents such that a student witness is not required to testify.

4. An alleged violation by a graduate student shall be handled under one and only one of three categories: course work, research integrity, or advanced degree requirement violation. Standards for defining each category are provided below. As the first step in all investigations, a triage committee consisting of the DGPS and a representative from the Research Integrity Office (RIO) will vet all cases to determine if the possible violation is a research violation or an advanced degree requirement violation. The DGPS will report in writing all determinations to the Chair GHC. If the Chair GHC disagrees with the determination, then the Chair GHC will discuss the determination with the DGPS. Non-resolvable disagreements will be referred to the Faculty Senate Speaker and the Provost. GHC will communicate all decisions to DGPS and Student Judicial Programs. RIO and department chairs will communicate all decisions to DGPS, who will inform GHC and Student Judicial Programs of outcomes.
a. The GHC shall handle all allegations involving course work violations, instances in which a graduate student knew of a violation of the Honor Code and did not report such violation as required under the Honor Code, and instances in which a graduate student made a false accusation knowingly. Examples of course work violations are cheating on homework, exams, or other written assignments submitted for course credit; and plagiarism in any written work submitted for course credit and not intended for publication. Plagiarism in any written work intended for publication, whether submitted for course credit or not, falls under jurisdiction of the Research Integrity Office (RIO) (see 4-b). Where a violation is determined to have occurred, GHC shall determine course work penalty and RIO shall determine publication plagiarism penalty in instances in which the same written work was submitted for course credit and for publication. Such an instance involves two separate violations of the Honor Code. GHC and RIO will inform the other body of any information uncovered during investigation suggesting a second violation. When a plagiarism allegation arises in a course credit submission and subsequently also appears to involve intended publication, GHC may determine whether it should retain jurisdiction of the course credit matter or forward the entire matter to RIO. Course work excludes thesis or dissertation registration and research project registration. Any legal matters arising under GHC jurisdiction will be referred to the Provost.

b. The Research Integrity Office (RIO) shall handle all cases involving research integrity violations whether occurring in a specific course or not. Such violations include plagiarism (other than in strictly course credit submissions not intended for publication), multiple submissions of research articles, false citations, and false or fabricated data in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results, especially where such activity is aimed at publication or is affected by funding regulations. Plagiarism in documents submitted for course credit and not intended for publication falls under jurisdiction of GHC (see 4-a).

c. In accord with Article III, Section 3, of the Honor Council Constitution, other than research integrity violations, "Any violation involving advanced degree requirements other than course work (i.e., language exams, theses, [dissertations], etc.) will be referred to the proper department chair." In interdisciplinary programs, the “department chair” shall be the substitute governance entity.

5. Size of GHC may depend on volume of violations. GHC initially shall consist of four tenured faculty members and four graduate students as specified in sub-paragraphs a, b, and c.

a. Faculty Senate will select the faculty members. One shall be from the Jones Graduate School of Business, one from either Engineering or Natural Sciences, and one from Humanities, Social Sciences, Architecture or Music. The fourth shall be from a school not already represented on the GHC. Each member shall be appointed for a two-year term, which can be repeated to a maximum of three terms.
b. One graduate student shall be an MBA or PhD in Management candidate in the Jones School
designated by the Jones Student Association (JSA). Two graduate students shall be doctoral
candidates designated by the Graduate Student Association (GSA). The fourth graduate student
shall be at the discretion of GSA. Beyond the initial two graduate students, the GSA
representation may expand by adding master’s or doctoral students. Graduate students shall be
appointed for a one-year term, which can be repeated to a maximum of three terms so long as the
appointee remains a graduate student in good standing and is not currently under investigation by
GHC (see 21).

c. Any future expansion of GHC recommended by GHC due to increased volume of cases shall,
upon approval by the Faculty Senate and Provost, proceed by adding one faculty member and
one graduate student at a time so that composition remains balanced between faculty and
graduate students. An additional faculty member shall come from a school not already
represented on the GHC. In expansion, once all schools are represented, the initial composition
(defined in 5a) will be repeated. For expansion, the fifth student will be from the Jones School
and the sixth and seventh students from the GSA, this structure to be repeated during any
expansion.

6. A GHC member shall not be recused or challenged on grounds of acquaintance with an
accused or by being a member of the same school, department, or program. A GHC faculty
member or graduate student member who is the complaining party in a case shall be recused. If
Chair GHC is the complaining party, the Deputy Chair GHC shall handle the case.

7. Unless the Faculty Senate opts to appoint a Chair, GHC shall annually elect a Chair and a
Deputy Chair from among the faculty members. The Chair shall conduct hearings, except in the
instance of a recusal.

8. Conviction shall require a unanimous vote of the GHC hearing panel assigned by the GHC
Chair. A GHC hearing panel shall consist of three faculty members and three graduate students,
who are members of the GHC. A hearing panel is a subset of GHC. Hearing panels may vary by
case. The standard for conviction shall be preponderance of evidence, as under the Honor
Council. GHC determines its own internal procedures for hearing panels. Consistent with
Honor Council practices, after hearing evidence, a hearing panel with only GHC members
present generally will discuss the evidence, take a straw poll, discuss the evidence further, and
take a final vote. In case of conviction, the hearing panel will then consider and vote on penalty.
The Working Group recommended this hearing panel procedure as best practice. However,
GHC could develop its own practices for hearing panels that would require review and approval
by the Faculty Senate and Provost. Upon completion of a GHC case, all GHC records, including
correspondence, will be transferred to Student Judicial Programs. Any copies maintained by
GHC should normally be destroyed after 10 years.
9. For course work convictions, GHC shall review the annual consensus penalties adopted by the Honor Council. GHC may modify these penalties for graduate students.

   a. GHC may determine by unanimous vote that special circumstances of egregious violation of course work requirements justify recommending to the Provost permanent expulsion or indefinite suspension.

   b. Penalties for research integrity violations handled by RIO and advanced degree requirements handled by department chairs are set by the relevant administrative officials, who shall in all instances inform Chair GHC of the outcome of an alleged violation.

10. Where a graduate student and an undergraduate student are alleged to have been involved in the same violation, the graduate student is subject to GHC Policies and Procedures. The Chair GHC shall communicate with Honor Council concerning the case for purposes of information exchange and coordination. Separate investigations may be conducted.

11. Only anonymous summaries of cases shall be published. The Chair GHC will prepare such summaries of violations under GHC jurisdiction for the Honor Council to post at its website.

12. Once it is determined under 4 that an alleged violation falls under jurisdiction of GHC, investigation shall be conducted by a GHC faculty member designated by the Chair GHC. The Chair GHC shall try to designate an investigator not in the same school as the accused, but this procedure is not mandatory when not feasible. The investigator shall prepare a written report of findings and recommendations. The investigator and Chair GHC (or Deputy Chair GHC in an instance of recusal of the Chair GHC) shall consult and concur on whether the investigation results warrant taking the alleged violation to a GHC hearing panel. The Chair GHC shall report all findings to GHC. GHC will determine by majority vote whether to establish a hearing panel on the basis of the report of the investigator and Chair GHC.

13. The Honor Council will provide a pool of graduate student ombuds annually. The appointments of graduate students to this pool require concurrence of the Chair GHC. An accused may request that the ombuds be from the administrative staff of the DPGS. Specific assignments of student ombuds or DPGS staff ombuds to accused students are matters for the Honor Council or DPGS respectively, and not subject to concurrence of the GHC in order to assure ombuds independence. GHC will raise any resulting issues with the Honor Council or DPGS.

14. The GHC Policies and Procedures apply only to a graduate student in process of working toward a degree. Once the relevant university degree has been awarded at Commencement, any allegation concerning course work, non course work degree requirements, and research integrity is a university administration concern.
15. All GHC meetings are closed, except by invitation extended by a majority vote. Typically such invitation will be restricted to relevant university officials.

16. Only the accused, the assigned or invited ombuds, and GHC members may attend a hearing to determine whether a violation has occurred. No other individual, including attorneys, are permitted to attend.

17. Only GHC members may attend a post-hearing meeting to determine guilt or penalty. A majority vote may invite the ombuds, the Associate Dean for Students, and/or university counsel for particular advice and information. No other individual, including attorneys for the accused, are permitted to attend.

18. In accord with Honor Council procedure, a graduate student may not avoid determination of violation and penalty by withdrawal, refusal to cooperate with GHC, or failure to attend a scheduled GHC hearing. GHC will record its decision in all cases.

19. Any required budget, storage, or website requirements, as recommended by GHC, will be referred to the Provost and Speaker of the Faculty Senate for action.

20. Appeals shall be handled as under the Honor Council Constitution. Student Judicial Programs will coordinate appeals to the Faculty Appeal Panel and then the President. Appeal decisions should be sent to the student, GHC, DPGS, and Student Judicial Programs.

21. A graduate student remains in good standing until final outcome of an allegation, including appeal.

22. GHC Policies and Procedures are in effect July 1, 2015, for violations occurring during Fall 2015 and subsequently.

23. This document can be modified by approval of the Faculty Senate, or the Senate Executive Committee at the Senate’s discretion, and the Provost upon proposal of the GHC.

24. This Policies and Procedures document does not address any matters concerning submission of book manuscripts to presses for their consideration, including multiple submissions. Such submissions are regulated by press contracts, and any matters arising in this regard for the university will reside with the Provost.