or sentences from any source; (2) summarizing without proper documentation (usually a citation) ideas from another source (unless such information is recognized as common knowledge); (3) borrowing facts, statistics, graphs, pictorial representations, or phrases without acknowledging the source (unless such information is recognized as common knowledge); (4) collaborating on a graded assignment without the instructor’s approval; and (5) submitting work, either in whole or partially created by a professional service or used without attribution (e.g., paper, speech, bibliography, or photograph).

SECTION 10.5 EXAMPLES OF OTHER TYPES OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY. Specific examples of other types of academic dishonesty include, but are not limited to: (1) providing or receiving unauthorized information during an examination or academic assignment, or the possession and/or use of unauthorized materials during an examination or academic assignment; (2) providing or receiving unauthorized assistance in connection with laboratory work, field work, scholarship, or another academic assignment; (3) falsifying, fabricating, or misrepresenting data, laboratory results, research results, citations, or other information in connection with an academic assignment; (4) serving as, or enlisting the assistance of, a substitute for a student in the taking of an examination or the performance of an academic assignment; (5) altering grades, answers, or marks in an effort to change the earned grade or credit; (6) submitting without authorization the same assignment for credit in more than one course; (7) forging the signature of another or allowing forgery by another on any class or University-related document such as a class roll or drop/add sheet; (8) gaining an objectively unfair academic advantage by failing to observe the expressed procedures or instructions relating to an exam or academic assignment; and (9) engaging in an activity that unfairly places another student at a disadvantage, such as taking, hiding, or altering resource material, or manipulating a grading system.

SECTION 10.6 RESPONSIBILITIES ASSOCIATED WITH THE HONOR STATEMENT. All members of the University community have responsibilities associated with the Honor Statement. These responsibilities are unique to each sector of the University community. Each student is responsible for their own personal integrity in academic life. Each student is responsible for knowing and adhering to the terms and conditions of the Honor Statement and may acknowledge their adherence to the Honor Statement by writing, “Pledged,” and signing on a graded class assignment or examination. Although there is no affirmative duty to report the academic dishonesty of another, each student, given the dictates of their own conscience, may choose to report any violation of the Honor Statement to a faculty member or to SCCS. The prevention of academic dishonesty, and the response to academic dishonesty, is the immediate responsibility of the instructor. However, students are not excused from complying with the Honor Statement because of an instructor’s failure to prevent or discourage academic dishonesty.

SECTION 10.7 ACADEMIC DISHONESTY—RESOLUTION BY THE ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT.

Section 10.7.1 Notice of Academic Dishonesty and Informal Opportunity to Respond to Allegations. When an act of alleged academic dishonesty is discovered by, or brought to the attention of an instructor, the instructor shall notify the student about the alleged academic dishonesty, describe the information supporting the allegation, and give the student an informal opportunity to respond to the allegation(s) and information. The instructor may proceed with imposing an academic penalty for academic dishonesty if the student has not responded to the instructor’s notice to the student concerning the alleged academic dishonesty within five (5) business days of the notice. The instructor does not have the authority under the Code to impose a sanction identified in Section 9.2 or Section 9.3. An academic penalty shall not take effect until after the deadline for an appeal has passed under Section 10.7.3, or, if the student appeals the penalty, the student conduct process has concluded and the penalty has been upheld, whichever is later.

Section 10.7.2 Decision Whether to Impose an Academic Penalty. After giving the student notice and an informal opportunity to respond, if the instructor concludes that the student engaged in academic dishonesty, then the instructor may impose an academic penalty of a failing or reduced grade in the academic exercise, assignment, examination, and/or course; loss of credit for the work involved; an assignment to repeat the work, to be graded on its merits; and/or an oral or written reprimand. An instructor may impose more than one (1) academic penalty. If the instructor decides to impose an academic penalty, then the instructor shall transmit a notice to the student of the allegations, information, findings, academic penalty imposed, and information on the student’s options to appeal the findings and/or penalties under Section 10.7.3. The notice should be countersigned by the department head. Copies of the notice to the student shall be submitted to SCCS, the dean or other chief administrative head of the instructor’s academic unit, and, where different,
the dean or other chief administrative head of the academic unit in which the student is enrolled. The instructor is not required to notify a student that a complaint has been made to SCCS.

Section 10.7.3 Appeals of Academic Penalties. Within five (5) business days of the transmittal of the notice to the student described in Section 10.7.2, the student may appeal the academic penalty imposed by the instructor by submitting a written Notice of Appeal of Academic Penalty to SCCS, using a form approved by SCCS. The SCB hears appeals of academic penalties. If SCCS does not issue a Notice of Allegations, then the instructor shall serve as the Conduct Officer in the SCB Hearing. The decision of the SCB, or the Appellate Board if the decision is appealed, shall be the final decision of the University concerning the academic penalty. For example, if the SCB’s decision, if not appealed to the Appellate Board, is to reverse a grade of “F” for the course, then SCCS will inform the University’s Registrar of the SCB’s decision and request the Registrar to enter the grade for the course that the student would have received if the student had not been accused of academic dishonesty. If there is a question about what grade the student would have received if the student had not been accused of academic dishonesty, the question will be referred to the Provost for resolution.

SECTION 10.8 ACADEMIC DISHONESTY—RESOLUTION THROUGH THE STUDENT CONDUCT PROCESS. After receiving notice from the instructor under Section 10.7.2, SCCS may proceed with the student conduct process and determine of whether to issue a Notice of Allegations for violating Section 4.1. A decision by SCCS not to issue a Notice of Allegations shall not be used by the student to support an appeal of an academic penalty imposed by the student’s instructor. In addition, SCCS may issue a Notice of Allegations for violating Section 4.1 regardless of the response of the instructor to the alleged academic dishonesty. If an instructor alleges that a student engaged in academic dishonesty and the student wants to appeal the academic penalty and/or SCCS issues a Notice of Allegations containing an allegation of a violation of Section 4.1, then the allegations against the student and the issue of the appropriate academic penalty shall be resolved through a Resolution Agreement, a Formal Hearing, or an Alternative Resolution Process.

SECTION 10.9 COLLEGE OF LAW. The University of Tennessee College of Law has adopted and promulgated its own Code of Academic Conduct, Chapter 1720-04-09. Chapter 1720-04-09 shall control in the event of a conflict between this Chapter and Chapter 1720-04-09.

SECTION 10.10 RESEARCH MISCONDUCT. Notwithstanding anything in this Code to the contrary, allegations of research misconduct shall be reported, assessed, inquired into, investigated, and resolved consistently with the University’s Policy on Misconduct in Research and Service.

XI. POLICY ON AMNESTY FOR INDIVIDUAL GOOD SAMARITANS AND STUDENTS IN NEED OF EMERGENCY MEDICAL ATTENTION.

SECTION 11.1 BACKGROUND. The University of Tennessee holds paramount the health, safety, and welfare of students. Accordingly, all University students are expected to alert appropriate officials in the event of a health, safety, or welfare emergency including, without limitation, a situation involving the abuse of alcohol or other drugs.

SECTION 11.2 EXPECTATIONS. When individual students know or reasonably should have known that other individual students are in need of emergency medical attention, the individual students are expected to: (1) contact appropriate people to report the incident and request assistance (e.g., University staff members, law enforcement), and provide those people with the names and contact information for the individual students reporting the incident and the impaired individual students; and (2) demonstrate cooperation and care by remaining with the impaired individual students and providing reasonable assistance during and after the incident. Individual students who take all of the steps described in this Section 11.2 will be referred to as a “Good Samaritan” under the Code. The individual students in need of emergency medical attention will be referred to as an “impaired individual student” under the Code.

SECTION 11.3 AMNESTY FOR INDIVIDUAL GOOD SAMARITANS. Unless individual Good Samaritans have engaged in a repeated or serious violation of the Standards of Conduct (e.g., physical or sexual assault, property destruction, disorderly behavior, theft, second incident of misconduct involving alcohol or drugs), individual Good Samaritans will not be subject to formal University disciplinary action for misconduct discovered by the University as a result of the Good Samaritan’s report. While no formal University disciplinary action may be taken, the individual students who acted as a Good Samaritan may be required to meet with a University staff member to discuss the individual Good Samaritan’s misconduct and adhere to appropriate remedial and/or educational recommendations.