ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

Updated June 2025

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT SUMMARY

The summary below highlights the key features of the Academic Misconduct Policy.

The purpose of the Academic Misconduct Policy is to provide clear guidelines and expectations for participants, faculty, and staff on what constitutes academic misconduct.

Academic integrity is positively demonstrated through values including:
- Responsibility
- Honesty
- Trust
- Respect
- Fairness
- Courage
- Accountability

Academic misconduct manifests in many ways and is the basis of potential disciplinary action. Violations of the Academic Misconduct Policy include, but are not limited to, the following:
- Cheating
- Collaboration/Collusion
- Non-permitted use of AI or other non-permitted resources
- Plagiarism
- Fabrication
- Facilitating Academic Misconduct
- Copyright Infringement

Participants are responsible for completing their own work and encouraging their peers to act with academic integrity. This includes reading and understanding this policy and seeking clarity from professors if there are concerns or questions regarding how to act with academic integrity.

Faculty are responsible for creating an educational environment where academic misconduct is defined and understood, academic integrity is modelled and reinforced, and the consequences are clear, actionable, and support learning and development. Faculty have the authority to determine course and subject-specific expectations and may modify policies to be more restrictive than those outlined below.

Table of Contents

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

Overview

The purpose of the Academic Misconduct Policy is to provide clear guidelines and expectations for participants, faculty, and staff on what behaviors demonstrate academic integrity and what behaviors are considered academic misconduct. The policy outlines the process for addressing academic misconduct issues.

Verto Education partners with its Academic Provider, the University of New Haven (UNewHaven), to create an academic community based on the principles of honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility. Academic integrity is a core educational value that ensures respect for the academic community, including its participants, faculty and staff, the learning community, and the host community in which Verto Education programs operate.

It is expected that all participants will learn in an environment where they work independently in the pursuit of knowledge, conduct themselves in an honest and ethical manner, and respect the intellectual work of others. Each member of the community has a responsibility to be familiar with and adhere to the Academic Misconduct Policy.

The policies outlined in this document apply to all participants admitted by the University of New Haven to study abroad at Verto Education program locations around the world. Violations of this policy will result in Code of Responsibility adjudication and consequences ranging from earning a zero on an assignment/exam, up to course or program dismissal.

Academic Integrity

Academic integrity sets standards for academic achievement, mitigates unfair advantages, allows for the creation and exchange of ideas, and helps ensure everyone in the learning community has a fair and equitable opportunity for success.

Academic integrity is positively demonstrated through values including:
- Responsibility
- Honesty
- Trust
- Respect
- Fairness
- Courage
- Accountability

Academic misconduct manifests in many ways and is the basis of potential disciplinary action. Violations of the Academic Misconduct Policy include, but are not limited to, the following:
- Cheating
- Collaboration/Collusion
- Plagiarism
- Fabrication

- Facilitating Academic Misconduct
- Copyright Infringement
- Non-permitted use of AI and Other Non-permitted Resources

Types of Academic Misconduct

Each of the listed types of academic misconduct is explained below. They provide examples of the listed types of academic misconduct and more information to ensure participants understand the expectations and what constitutes violations of Academic Misconduct.

Cheating

Cheating is "Using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in any academic exercise."[1] Cheating includes, but is not limited to:

1. Having unauthorized notes during an exam or quiz, or communication of information by any means concerning the content of an examination during or after the testing period to anyone who has not yet taken the examination. The only materials permitted during an exam are those that the faculty explicitly instructs participants they may use.
2. Copying the work of another during a test or quiz.
3. Use of translation software such as Google Translate without faculty permission.
4. Use of generative artificial intelligence (AI) without faculty permission and/or passing off generative or editorial AI work as one's own without explicit acknowledgement.
5. Obtaining or providing unauthorized prior knowledge of exam or quiz content.
6. Using another participant's work for a homework or lab assignment, or presenting the work of another as one's own.
7. Using unauthorized materials or information from others for a take-home exam. It is expected that participants do independent work for exams, whether they are take-home or in class. Participants are expected to comply with the guidelines set by the faculty.
8. Seeking, receiving, or giving aid during examinations through electronic means (*e.g.,* use of AI, web browsers/web search, cell/smart phone, smart watch or other devices, email, instant/direct/text messaging or chats, Bluetooth communications, earphones/AirPods, etc.)
9. Paying others to do homework that is passed off as one's own work; purchasing, downloading, or otherwise securing papers, research, reports, generative artificial intelligence content, etc. from commercial services, generative artificial intelligence chatbots, or other sources for use in any manner other than research for which the source of information is appropriately referenced in the participant's work.

Collaboration/Collusion

Collaborative work between participants is common and highly valued in education abroad. It enhances active learning experiences and supports peer-to-peer learning. In general, work in

---

[1] Pavela, G. (1997) Applying the power of association on campus: A model code of academic integrity. Journal of College and University Law, 24(1), pp 9 et seq. [journal online] available from http://www.jpo.umd.edu/docs/toomuch2_wrk.pdf; Internet; accessed 30 January 2007.]

small groups or partnerships is encouraged as an effective pedagogical practice. While important and enriching, faculty may also require individuals to work independently, during which group or partner work is considered **"non-permitted collaboration" or "collusion."** *Non-permitted collaboration, or collusion, means working together when not allowed or directed not to do so by the appropriate academic authority.*

Non-Permitted Collaboration/Collusion

Verto expects faculty to indicate permitted forms of collaboration with other participants or technology for assignments or assessments. If the faculty does *not* indicate that collaboration or use of specific technology is permitted, it should be understood that none is permitted.

Participants are encouraged to seek clarification from their faculty regarding the acceptable parameters for collaboration should they be in doubt regarding assignments that require group work. Acknowledgement of collaboration is required when presenting authorship of participant work - all submissions should include the names of all contributing group members or authors. Examples of non-permitted collaboration or collusion might include:

1. Completing a take-home test with a peer when collaboration is not permitted
2. Working in a group on assignments that were given individually
3. Using generative AI or large language models (ChatGPT, Claude.ai, Google Gemini, Microsoft CoPilot, etc.) without explicit permission.

Study Groups and Tutoring

Academic integrity standards do **not** prohibit participants from studying together or from tutoring each other, if done in conformance with other provisions of this policy and with faculty approval.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is "Representing the words or ideas of another as one's own in any academic exercise or resubmitting one's own work under false pretenses."[2] Plagiarism includes but is not limited to:

1. Copying without proper citation from another participant's paper(s), partially or entirely, or from any source, such as a book, article, notebook, video, or other source material, whether published or unpublished.
2. Purchasing or securing content from any source, to include term-paper vendors, generative artificial intelligence, and internet sources, and submitting that paper or specific portions of the paper as one's own work.
3. Inserting a passage from the Internet or any computer source into one's paper without proper citation.
4. Copying data from another source without a proper citation.

---

[2] Based on Pavela, page 11. Note that Pavela's qualifiers "intentionally and knowingly" have been dropped from the definition adopted for the UNewHaven policy.

5. Appropriating another person's computer programming work for submission as an assignment.
6. Failing to attribute material that comes from other media sources or failing to obtain proper permission for the use of such material when creating a web page, film, musical composition, or other forms of presentation or artistic expression as a course assignment.
7. Any other appropriation of another's intellectual property without proper attribution.
8. Self-Plagiarism/Failure to Produce Original Work: Submitting an assignment that was written during a prior semester or submitting the same assignment for more than one class simultaneously, including resubmitting all or substantial portions of previously written work for a current assignment, unless faculty in multiple courses are informed of and approve of the submission. Participants should consult their faculty if they are unsure of what work of their own they may use in preparing an assignment. The participant should assume that, unless the faculty specifically permits it, the use of work from one previous or simultaneous course to satisfy the expectations of another course will be perceived as deceptive, and in addition, the work so used fails to qualify as original work for the assignment.
9. Citing sources improperly, which includes, but is not limited to, failure to use quotation marks or other appropriate notation for direct quotes or an author's distinctive phrases, and following an author's structure of writing and ideas, but rephrasing the sentences partially to give the impression that the whole passage reflects the participant's structure and ideas.

The most common form of plagiarism is often unintentional - failure to properly cite sources.

Guidance on proper citation may be found below or through other designated academic resources as referenced in course syllabi or learning management systems (Canvas).

Official Resources on Proper Citation of Sources:

- APA - American Psychological Association. (2020) *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (*7th ed). Washington, D.C.: Author.
- *CMOS - Chicago Manual of Style* (17th ed). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2017. https://doi.org/10.7208/cmos17
- *MLA - MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers.* (9th ed.), New York: Modern Language Association, 2021
- Strunk, W. & White, E.B. (2000). *The Elements of Style* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Turabian, K.L. (2013) *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses and Dissertations* (8th ed.), Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- UNewHaven Research Tools: **http://www.newhaven.edu/library/research-tools.php/**

Fabrication

Fabrication is the "unauthorized falsification or invention of any information or citation in an academic exercise."[3] Fabrication includes:

1. Furnishing false information, distorting data, or failing to provide all necessary required information to the University's advisor, registrar, admissions counselor, faculty, etc., for any academically related purpose.
2. Forging a signature to certify completion of a course assignment or academic work or grades; providing a false recommendation or misrepresenting academic staff or faculty to another school or employers, internship sponsors, or other sponsors of academic engagements.
3. Fabricating data in support of laboratory or fieldwork, whether for course-related assignments or non-course-related, internally- or externally-funded, extracurricular, or co-curricular projects.
4. Misrepresenting one's academic accomplishments.
5. Fabricating or falsifying a bibliography or other academic sources.

Facilitating Academic Misconduct

When a participant knowingly helps or attempts to help another to violate any provision of this policy, or otherwise **facilitates academic misconduct.** Assisting each other in person or using electronic means without authorization is strictly prohibited. Examples include but are not limited to:

1. Providing to other participants one's own work or that of others with the reasonable expectation that these could/will be used for the purpose of cheating or plagiarism.
2. Maintaining a copy or file of any quizzes, exams, assignments, or papers with the reasonable expectation that these will be used for the purpose of cheating or plagiarism.
3. Unfairly advancing one's academic position by hoarding, stealing, or damaging library materials.
4. Theft or unauthorized use of other participants' notes, papers, homework, or textbooks for academic gain.
5. Selling or sharing one's work to others with a reasonable expectation that it could/will be used for the purpose of cheating or plagiarism.
6. Placing one's own or another person's work on the Internet without his or her permission for academic or monetary gain.
7. Providing answers / answer keys to other participants from quizzes or exams.
8. The use of any electronic means to assist another without authorization is strictly prohibited.

Copyright Infringement

Copyright infringements shall be considered violations of the academic integrity

---

[3] Pavela, page 10. Note that the qualifier "intentionally" has been dropped from the definition adopted for the UNewHaven policy.

policy. More information on copyright issues and copyright law can be found at: http://www.newhaven.edu/library/services/faculty/copyright.php.

Non-Permitted Use of Artificial Intelligence and Other Non-Permitted Resources

When a participant knowingly uses artificial intelligence (AI) or other non-permitted resources, such as a calculator, smartphone/watch/device, camera, apps, notes, etc., on a graded exam without appropriate approval, documentation, or citation, this is in violation of the non-permitted use of AI or other non-permitted resources. Examples include but are not limited to:

1. Use of AI for generative writing of a paper, project, or other class assignment or assessment without explicit faculty approval.
2. Use of AI for editorial purposes for a paper, project, or other class assignment or assessment without explicit faculty approval.
3. Use of AI for problem sets, laboratory work, or other Science, Technology, and Math work without explicit faculty approval.
4. When use of AI is permitted by the faculty, participants cite work with AI utilization as appropriate or specified.
5. Use of a calculator (including specialty calculators or otherwise) for assignments, quizzes, exams, or other forms of assessment that explicitly prohibit use of a calculator.
6. Use of information such as notes, answer keys, or faculty copy of quizzes/tests that were not provided directly by the faculty, that are clearly in violation of any of the above policies.
7. Use of browser extensions, apps, or other tools that automate AI utilization in Canvas LMS for the purpose of completing online quizzes, tests, participating in course discussion boards, etc.
8. Use of a camera, apps, or translation tools when not permitted by the faculty.
9. Use of a smart device (phone, tablet, watch, etc.) that is not permitted by the faculty during assignments, quizzes, exams, or other forms of assessment.

Generative Artificial Intelligence

The use of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) can constitute multiple violations of the Academic Misconduct Policy at once. Verto does not ban the use of GenAI, but expects participants will use the tool responsibly, ethically, and in line with expectations set out by their faculty for Acceptable Use of Technology in the classroom. Unless given explicit permission by the faculty, prohibited GenAI use includes, but is not limited to:

1. Generating writing, whole or in part, for a paper, project, or other class assignment or assessment
2. Editing a paper, project, or other class assignment or assessment
3. Completing problem sets, laboratory work, or other Science, Technology, and Math work

4. Translating assignments, materials, etc, in or for foreign language courses
5. Installing and using browser extensions that automate the use of GenAI in Verto's learning management platforms (Canvas, Cengage, et al.) for the purpose of completing online quizzes, tests, discussion boards, etc.

Responsibility for Documenting Use and Correcting Outputs

Faculty who authorize the use of GenAI are responsible for outlining AI acceptable use cases and expectations for how participants document their use of the tool. These expectations may include, but are not limited to, requirements for participants such as:

1. Disclosing AI use for assigned work;
2. Properly citing the creation and use of AI materials in accordance with the course's citation format;
3. Providing a download of prompts and outputs along with submitted assignments.

It is important for participants to understand that GenAI is a tool. It does not think, but instead produces an average of the most likely results in response to a query. The tool does not critically evaluate the information it uses to create its outputs, and as a result, is prone to errors. Participants are ultimately responsible for the outputs of their tools and for following the outlined class policies and directions for acceptable use.

Participant, Faculty, and Staff Responsibilities

Participants

Participants are responsible for the completion of their own academic work and for encouraging their peers to act with integrity in all academic matters by:

1. Acting with honesty and integrity in all academic matters.
2. Learning the principles of ethical conduct and being familiar with and abiding by the definitions contained in the Academic Misconduct Policy and any other policies established and communicated by faculty.
3. Informing the faculty, local academic or program staff, and/or the Dean of Students if they become aware that any form of academic misconduct has occurred.
4. Clarifying with the faculty what their expectations are regarding proper conduct in the completion of assignments (e.g., collaboration, citations, use of study aids on examinations, etc.).
5. Request clarification from faculty regarding permitted or non-permitted use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) or other academic resources relevant to an assignment or course.
6. Respond honestly and professionally to inquiries related to academic misconduct, providing information for faculty or staff upon request.
7. Take accountability and responsibility for violations and accept consequences when a violation has occurred, whether intentional or not, and use this as a learning experience.

Individual participants may report an academic misconduct violation to onsite staff or the Dean of Students, who will forward the report to the appropriate faculty or academic department for investigation.

Faculty

Faculty are responsible for creating and maintaining an educational environment where:
- Academic misconduct is defined and understood,
- Acceptable use of technology is communicated and enforced,
- Academic integrity is modelled and reinforced, and
- Consequences are clear, educational when/if participants do not act with integrity and violations occur.

Faculty accomplish this by defining relevant policies on academic misconduct and integrity in course syllabi and explaining, modeling, and enforcing expectations for academic performance and consequences for violations.

Faculty have the responsibility to articulate their expectations regarding course-specific policies of acceptable use of technology and acceptable use of artificial intelligence (AI) tools at the beginning of the course and throughout the semester. Policies may apply to the class as a whole or to specific assignments, and faculty will communicate expectations to participants in a variety of ways, including course syllabi, Canvas, course discussions, activities, assignments, exams, etc. Clearly communicating expectations early and often helps promote academic integrity and prevent confusion.

Faculty may choose to implement standards more stringent than those contained in this policy, provided they are clearly communicated to participants.

Faculty are expected to directly address and document concerns of Academic Misconduct with participants in a timely manner. Faculty are also requested to escalate egregious or repeated violations to onsite Academic staff for additional support following participant Success Actions. Faculty have the authority to determine grades and sanctions relative to graded classroom assignments, and may determine appropriate consequences, which may include grade deductions/failing grades, issuing a retake or alternative assignment, or faculty may choose the appropriate sanction that responds to the violation.

Staff

Staff are responsible for supporting and helping enforce policies that create an educational environment where academic integrity and academic misconduct are defined and understood. Staff play a key role in explaining, modeling, and reinforcing expectations for academic integrity and the consequences for academic misconduct violations.

Academic Staff

Academic leaders provide faculty with resources to support syllabi and course development in alignment with policies, and faculty may request additional guidance if there are concerns that are raised for specific courses or assignments. Academic staff review escalated cases and assess actions or sanctions in consultation with Verto Academic Affairs HQ.

Program Staff

Program staff support faculty by responding to escalated cases of academic misconduct, following specific participant Success Actions. Staff provide participants and faculty with opportunities to ensure perspectives are shared and information is gathered to inform decision-making. Staff may provide guidance or mediation between faculty and participants when necessary. Staff are required to document issues of academic misconduct in Verto's case management tool and create participant Success Actions or improvement plans to support participant learning. Staff should consult with local academic leaders and Verto HQ when needed to determine a resolution for academic misconduct concerns or cases involving academic misconduct.

Procedures For Addressing Academic Misconduct

The term "faculty" refers to the designated faculty member for the course in which the violation took place. Any reference to a University official (e.g., Academic Manager, Program Director) is interpreted to include "or designee" such that the policy or procedure being described may be applied to or carried out by the official's designee.

The procedures below outline the process for adjudicating academic misconduct violations only and are unique to this process. Violations not related to academic misconduct, as outlined in this policy, follow the procedures outlined in the Code of Responsibility. A subsequent violation of the Academic Misconduct Policy is any violation of the policy that occurs after the first violation has been adjudicated under these procedures.

Participant Status and Conduct During Proceedings

Upon identification of academic misconduct, the case is reviewed to assess the severity, impact, and resulting consequences or actions. Typically, for a first-time policy violation, participants have the opportunity to address the issue directly with their faculty, who will determine an appropriate resolution.

For subsequent violations, participants may continue in their current status until the conclusion of academic misconduct review and proceedings, defined as the final notification of sanctions or the outcome of the participant's appeal. Judgments regarding a participant's permission to remain enrolled, to continue registration for subsequent terms, or other elements of a participant's academic status are made by the VP of Academic Affairs, Dean of Students, Program or Academic Director, the reporting faculty, or other designees, as appropriate.

Withdrawal from a course in which a participant has been accused of an academic misconduct violation does not protect a participant from receiving an F in the course or from other sanctions, nor will a withdrawal stop further academic misconduct proceedings. Withdrawal from a Verto program[4] likewise will not prevent the disciplinary proceedings or entry of violations in the participant's disciplinary record.

---

[4] Withdrawal from a Verto program constitutes a withdrawal from our Academic Provider the University of New Haven. Please refer to the Academic Status policy for more information.

Following action by a faculty to report an alleged academic misconduct violation(s) participants must not harass, threaten, or intimidate the faculty, nor may participants disparage the faculty's reputation. Such an action is considered "Retaliation" as defined by Verto's Code of Responsibility and will be adjudicated under the policies and procedures outlined.

If a participant does not take responsibility for violating the Academic Misconduct Policy and/or does not accept the sanctions, Verto's Dean of Students will escalate the issue to the University of New Haven's Student Conduct Administrator, who will review the case and make decisions in consultation with the Provost. Cases may be referred to the Academic Misconduct Board for review.

Procedure for Investigating and Resolving Accusations of Academic Misconduct

When a faculty suspects, or receives an allegation, that a participant has engaged in academic misconduct, they will use the following procedure (referred to as "Investigating Academic Misconduct") in all cases:

1. Notify the participant via email, submit an Academic Misconduct concern, and request a meeting with onsite academic staff to discuss their concern.
   a. Faculty may issue a temporary penalty (non-credit, failing grade, INC, etc.) until they meet with onsite academic leadership and the participant.
2. Meet with onsite academic and/or program staff to discuss evidence of misconduct, clarify procedural questions, and determine appropriate sanctions relative to the type, severity, and impact of the violation.
   a. Faculty may request additional review or input from onsite academic and/or program staff before making their decision, but the final sanction and penalties are at the discretion of the faculty.
   b. Programming staff responsible for maintaining participant records and managing participant disputes notify relevant academic staff when a misconduct concern has been submitted. Programming staff will provide any relevant context to the faculty and onsite academic staff in advance of their meeting.
   c. If faculty and onsite academic staff determine that no violation has occurred, then the faculty will notify the participant, modify any temporary penalties as appropriate, and submit an academic misconduct resolution form.
3. Request a meeting with the participant to discuss the potential misconduct and hear their perspective.
   a. If the participant is unavailable to provide their statement or testimony,
      i. The faculty will email the participant their decision. The participant will have three days to respond, indicating whether they accept responsibility and/or the sanctions.
      ii. Participants who do not respond to the communication by the deadline accept the charge and sanctions by default. Faculty close the case by submitting the academic misconduct resolution form.
   b. If the participant agrees to meet and discuss or provide testimony,
      i. The meetings may be 1x1, but participants and/or faculty may request that onsite academic staff and/or onsite programming staff attend to help mediate the conversation.

        ii.   Once the conversation is completed, the faculty or staff will record a summary of the meeting with notes attached to the case.

        iii.   The faculty decides whether to modify penalties and sanctions based on the participant's testimony.

4. Notify participants of the decision.

    a. If participants attended a meeting to provide testimony, the faculty will email the participant within two business days notifying them of their final decision. Depending on the participant's response, the case may or may not require additional escalation.

        i.   The participant accepts responsibility and sanctions

            1.   The participant indicates they accept responsibility by replying to the email and/or filling out any associated documentation sent by program staff. Sanctions and penalties are applied as agreed to.

        ii.   The participant does not accept responsibility OR accepts responsibility but does not accept the sanctions

            1.   If the participant does not accept responsibility OR accepts responsibility but does not accept the sanctions, the Program Director, or designee, will open an investigation to review the available documentation and meet with the participant to understand their refusal.

            2.   Program directors must meet with the faculty if they plan to recommend changes to the sanctions and penalties and receive the faculty's consent to make any adjustments.

            3.   Once the investigation is concluded, the Program Director will send the faculty and participant a summary of the case, findings, and decision as to whether the participant is found in violation of the policy or not in writing within ten business days.

        iii. The participant does not respond.

            1.   Participants who do not respond are subject to the procedure outlined in 3a.

5. Consider whether this is the participant's first academic misconduct accusation and/or if it is a subsequent violation

    a. If this is the participant's first academic misconduct violation,

        i.   Participants will earn an academic penalty and receive a written warning.

    b. If the participant has multiple and/or subsequent violations

        i.   Program directors will consult participant records and brief relevant stakeholders as outlined in 2b

        ii.   Participants found at fault for multiple/subsequent violations will have the violation recorded to their conduct record.

        iii. Participants are subject to additional actions as outlined by the Code of Responsibility. These actions include, but are not limited to:

            1.   Meeting with the Program Director to discuss the violation(s)

            2.   Potential removal from the program

Maintenance of Records

Records of academic misconduct cases will be considered disciplinary (conduct) records after the first documented incident and will be maintained in the Office of the Dean of Students. All academic misconduct records will be kept on file for a minimum period of seven (7) years from

the date the participant leaves the University. Records of suspension or expulsion shall be retained indefinitely.

Questions?

Contact the local Academic Director/Manager or registrar@vertoeducation.org to connect with Academic Affairs Headquarters staff with questions about the Academic Misconduct policy.

Report academic misconduct concerns to DeanofStudents@vertoeducation.org.

This policy has been modified from Verto Education's Academic Provider, the University of New Haven, and adapted to ensure participants comply with local immigration regulations.