

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

Updated June 2026

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
- Unauthorized Collaboration, Collusion, and/or Tool Use
- 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 SUMMARY.....	2
Table of Contents.....	3
ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT.....	4
Overview.....	4
Academic Integrity.....	4
Types of Academic Misconduct.....	5
Cheating.....	5
Unauthorized Collaboration, Collusion, and/or Tool Use.....	5
Faculty Authority to Define Unauthorized Collaboration, Collusion, and/or Tool Use..	6
Study Groups and Tutoring.....	7
Plagiarism.....	7
Fabrication.....	9
Facilitating Academic Misconduct.....	9
Copyright Infringement.....	9
Generative Artificial Intelligence.....	10
Principles for AI Use.....	10
How to Prompt Responsibly.....	10
Understand How AI Works.....	11
Understand Faculty Policy Regarding AI Use.....	11
Engage Your Human Capacity to Avoid Cognitive Offloading.....	11
Participant, Faculty, and Staff Responsibilities.....	12
Participants.....	12
Faculty.....	12
Staff.....	13
Academic Staff.....	13
Program Staff.....	13
Procedures for Addressing Academic Misconduct.....	13
Participant Status and Conduct During Proceedings.....	14
Procedure for Investigating and Resolving Accusations of Academic Misconduct.....	14
Maintenance of Records.....	16
Questions?.....	16

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
- Unauthorized Collaboration, Collusion, and/or Tool Use
- Plagiarism
- Fabrication

- Facilitating Academic Misconduct
- Copyright Infringement

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.

Unauthorized Collaboration, Collusion, and/or Tool Use

Collaborative work between participants is common and highly valued in education abroad, and many faculty members make use of and/or encourage participants to use tools to increase their interaction and understanding of course content. While collaboration and tools enhance active

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.]

learning experiences and support peer-to-peer learning, faculty may also require individuals to work independently, during which group work, partner work, or use of specific tools is not authorized. Participants who work together or use tools without permission from their faculty violate the academic misconduct policy.

At a minimum, unauthorized use of AI will be considered an “Unauthorized use of technology” violation. Depending on the amount of work generated through AI, the output may constitute further violations of this policy. Please see the section on Generative AI for additional information.

Faculty Authority to Define Unauthorized Collaboration, Collusion, and/or Tool Use

Faculty are responsible for indicating permitted forms of collaboration and tools that students may use when completing assignments and/or assessments. These expectations are most frequently outlined in the course syllabus, but faculty may also include modified guidance and instructions at the assignment level. Participants are encouraged to seek clarification from their faculty regarding the acceptable parameters for collaboration and tool use should they be in doubt regarding any assignment and/or assessment. Participants should assume that if the faculty does *not* indicate that collaboration or use of specific technology is permitted, it should be understood that none is permitted.

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 unauthorized collaboration (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

Examples of unauthorized tool use may include:

1. Using a calculator, camera, earphones/Airpods, smartphone, smartwatch, apps, notes, etc., not permitted by the professor or accommodations approved by UNewHaven
2. Use of AI for generative writing of a paper, project, or other class assignment or assessment without explicit faculty approval.
3. Use of AI for editorial purposes for a paper, project, or other class assignment or assessment without explicit faculty approval.
4. Use of AI for problem sets, laboratory work, or other Science, Technology, and Math work without explicit faculty approval.
5. When use of AI is permitted by the faculty, participants cite work with AI utilization as appropriate or specified.
6. 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.
7. 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.

8. 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.
9. Use of a camera, apps, or translation tools when not permitted by the faculty.
10. 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.

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, including 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.
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

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.

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 in this [LibGuide from the University of New Haven](#).

Generative Artificial Intelligence

Verto Education believes that Generative AI is an impressive and powerful tool that participants and faculty can use to further enhance their learning and capacity in the classroom. That said, it is still a tool, and the organization expects that participants and faculty will interact with it as such. Verto believes that participants can complete all of their assigned work without the assistance of generative AI and that they can decide how to best utilize it within the guidelines established by their professors. Regardless of participants' personal stance on generative AI, they must still be informed of its myriad impacts and have a general understanding of this developing technology.

Verto believes that when participants are allowed and choose to use generative AI in their courses, they must strive to prompt models responsibly and understand that they are ultimately responsible for machine outputs.

Disclaimer: Courses at Verto utilize digital tools and resources provided by Cengage. All materials provided through Cengage (including e-textbooks, MindTap, etc) are protected by copyright and licensing agreements. Verto Education and Cengage strictly prohibit participants from uploading or using any Cengage content, data, or text to text-mine or data-mine, develop or train any AI/LLM applications, software, code or data models such as ChatGPT, Claude, or similar platforms. Violations of these terms will result in breach of the Academic Misconduct policy.

Principles for AI Use

Verto applies the following principles when using AI and evaluating AI outputs:

- Generative AI is incapable of human capacities like critical thinking, reasoning, and feeling.
- Users apply their human capacities to design responsible prompts and evaluate their outputs.
- AI models produce outputs that are an average of the **most likely, not necessarily the most correct results** in response to a prompt.
- Users are responsible for validating outputs produced in response to their prompt.
- Failure to prompt responsibly or validate outputs is a violation of academic integrity, and unauthorized use of AI is an academic misconduct violation.

How to Prompt Responsibly

Prompting responsibly means constructing queries that leverage AI capabilities while preserving your own intellectual engagement with the material. Effective prompts direct AI as a thinking tool rather than a task-completion service. The quality of any AI output is directly proportional to the specificity and analytical grounding of the prompt; vague or open-ended requests produce generic responses that require little critical engagement from the participant. Participants are expected to design prompts that reflect their own analysis and understanding, and to evaluate all outputs against established standards of accuracy, attribution, and academic integrity.

Understand How AI Works

Large language models generate text by predicting the most statistically probable sequence of words in response to a given input. This process is fundamentally different from human reasoning: the model does not understand the content it produces, reason from principles, or independently verify the accuracy of its outputs. It generates language that is likely to appear plausible — not language that is necessarily correct. AI systems are also refined through processes designed to maximize user satisfaction ratings, creating a tendency toward sycophancy — producing responses that sound authoritative and agreeable rather than maximally accurate. As a result, AI outputs can be simultaneously confident, fluent, and factually wrong. Participants must engage their critical judgment when evaluating AI-generated content, and must not treat an output's tone or coherence as evidence of its accuracy.

Understand Faculty Policy Regarding AI Use

Per the Academic Misconduct policy, faculty are the final authority when it comes to determining appropriate AI use in their classroom. In order to ensure participants understand these requirements, faculty are required to include an AI policy in their syllabus and are encouraged to include guidelines about appropriate use at the assignment-level. **Absence of written directions does not mean absence of expectations.** If a syllabus or assignment does not include AI guidelines, the participant should ask the faculty what their expectations are regarding appropriate use. If participants use AI, they must disclose its use and submit an AI log.

Engage Your Human Capacity to Avoid Cognitive Offloading

Cognitive offloading occurs when individuals transfer cognitive tasks — such as analysis, synthesis, memorization, or argumentation — to external systems rather than engaging in those processes themselves. While some forms of cognitive offloading are appropriate (for example, using a calculator for arithmetic in a statistics course), excessive reliance on AI tools undermines the learning process and the development of the skills a Verto education is designed to build.

Before submitting AI-assisted work, participants should reflect honestly on their mode of engagement with the tool:

- A **passive ghostwriter model of use** — in which the participant provides a minimal prompt and submits the result with little independent analysis — constitutes cognitive offloading. This model is a violation of academic integrity when undisclosed, and undermines the participant's own learning regardless of disclosure status.
- An **active collaborator model** — in which the participant uses AI to brainstorm, receive feedback on a draft, check reasoning, or explore alternative framings while retaining authorship and analytical responsibility — is a legitimate and encouraged form of AI-assisted academic work.

Before using AI on any assignment, participants should ask: What skill is this assignment intended to build? Does my use of AI support or shortcut the development of that skill? If AI uses shortcuts to the learning objective, it should be avoided regardless of whether a faculty member has explicitly prohibited it.

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 violate written policies

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 by the faculty 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 after a consultation with an academic staff member.

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 Vice President 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 program⁴ likewise will not prevent the disciplinary proceedings or entry of violations in the participant's disciplinary record.

Following action by a faculty member 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 member 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. Submit an Academic Misconduct concern via Dropout Detective and request a meeting with the Academic Director to discuss their concern.

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.

- 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 the Academic Director or Manager (ADAM) 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 their ADAM before making their decision, but the final sanction and penalties are at the discretion of the faculty.
 - b. Student Success staff responsible for maintaining participant records and managing participant disputes notify relevant academic staff when a misconduct concern has been submitted. Student Success staff will provide any relevant context to the faculty and onsite academic staff in advance of their meeting.
 - c. If faculty and ADAM or the Accountability Board 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 in absentia. 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 student success staff attend to help mediate the conversation.
 - ii. Once the conversation is completed, the faculty (or staff in attendance) will record a summary of the meeting with notes. If staff are not present, the faculty will email the summary to student success staff who will upload it to the participant's record.
 - 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, and the student waives their right to an appeal.
 - 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 Accountability Board will open an investigation to review the available documentation and meet with the participant to understand their refusal.
2. Program directors or the Accountability Board 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 or the Accountability Board 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 disciplinary 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 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.