

Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine Academic Integrity Policy

Introduction and Purpose

For the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine to maintain its standards of excellence and academic integrity, it is important to hold students accountable to the highest standards of ethical behavior.

Scope

This policy applies to all graduate students (i.e., PhD and Masters students) and medical students (in pursuit of the MD degree) in the School of Medicine.

Cross-Divisional Enrollments

Students in the School of Medicine may enroll in courses in one or more other University divisions or schools. School of Medicine students are subject to this policy not only when enrolled in School of Medicine courses, but also when enrolled in courses in other University divisions or schools. Academic misconduct in the context of those "outside" courses will be subject to and resolved under this policy.

Policy Violations

The following conduct is prohibited by this policy:

Academic misconduct is prohibited by this policy. Academic misconduct is any action or attempted action that may result in creating an unfair academic advantage for oneself or an unfair academic advantage or disadvantage for another member or members of the academic community. This includes a wide variety of behaviors such as cheating, plagiarism, altering academic documents or transcripts, gaining access to materials before they are meant to be available, helping another individual to gain an unfair academic advantage, and research misconduct. Note also that students are required to report known or suspected academic misconduct. Nonexclusive examples of academic misconduct are listed below.

Cheating. The following are nonexclusive examples of cheating:

- fraud, deceit, or dishonesty in an academic assignment, test or examination
- use or consultation of unauthorized or inappropriate materials (e.g., notes, books, etc.) on assignments, tests, or examinations.
- unauthorized discussion of a test or exam during its administration.
- unauthorized use of cell phones or internet connection during the administration of an examination.
- copying content on an assignment, test or examination from another individual.

- obtaining a test or examination or the answers to a test or examination before administration of the test or examination.
- studying from an old test or examination whose circulation is prohibited by the faculty member.
- use or consultation of unauthorized electronic devices (e.g., calculators, cellular phones, computers, tablets, etc.) or software in connection with assignments, tests or examinations.
- use of paper writing services or paper databases.
- unauthorized collaboration with another individual on assignments, tests or examinations.
- submission of an assignment, test or examination for a regrade after modifying the original content submitted.
- permitting another individual to contribute to or complete an assignment, or to contribute to or take a test or examination on the student's behalf.
- tampering with, disabling or damaging equipment for testing or evaluation

Plagiarism. The following are nonexclusive examples of plagiarism:

- use of material produced by another person without acknowledging its source
- use of another person's ideas or words without giving appropriate credit
- submission of the same or substantially similar work of another person (e.g., an author, a classmate, etc.)
- use of the results of another individual's work (e.g., another individual's paper, exam, homework, computer code, lab report, etc.) while representing it as your own
- use and/or reproduction of another individual's documentation in the electronic medical record while representing it as your own
- improper documentation or acknowledgment of quotations, words, ideas, or paraphrased passages taken from published or unpublished sources
- wholesale copying of passages, without appropriate acknowledgment, from works of others into homework, essays, term papers, dissertations or other work the student represents as his or her own
- taking credit for another person's characteristic or original phraseology, metaphor or other literary device without acknowledgment

Reuse of Assignments or Exams

- unauthorized submission of the same or substantially similar assignment or exam (e.g., a paper, etc.) to fulfill the requirements of more than one course

Forgery/Falsification/Lying. The following are nonexclusive examples of forgery, falsification and lying:

- falsification or invention of data for an assignment or in an experiment

- falsification of data or misrepresentation of information in the medical record
- citation of nonexistent sources or creation of false information in an assignment
- forgery of university or other official documents (e.g., letters, transcripts, etc.)
- impersonating a faculty member or licensed professional
- forgery of the signature of a resident, faculty member or other licensed professional
- request for special consideration from faculty members or university officials based upon false information or deception
- fabrication of a reason (e.g., medical emergency, etc.) for needing an extension on or for missing an assignment, test or examination
- claiming falsely to have completed and/or turned in an assignment, test or examination
- falsely reporting an academic ethics violation by another student
- falsely identifying one's position, role, title or academic rank in the context of an academic obligation
- providing false or misleading information to an instructor or any other University official

Facilitating Academic Dishonesty. The following are nonexclusive examples of facilitating academic dishonesty:

- intentionally or knowingly aiding another student to commit an academic ethics violation
- allowing another student to copy from one's own assignment, test, or examination
- making available copies of course materials whose circulation is prohibited (e.g., old assignments, texts or examinations, etc.)
- completing an assignment or taking a test or examination for another student
- signing in for another student at an event when attendance is required and when that other student is not present for the majority of the event
- sharing paper mill or answer blank website or information with other students

Unfair Competition. The following are nonexclusive examples of unfair competition:

- intentionally damaging the academic efforts of another student
- stealing another student's academic materials (e.g., books, notes, assignments, etc.)
- denying another student needed University resources (e.g., hiding library materials, stealing lab equipment, etc.)

Failing to Report Alleged Violations

- failing to report any known or suspected violation of this policy to the course or clerkship director, relevant associate dean, or vice dean for education

Research Misconduct

Research misconduct is defined as falsification, fabrication or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research or in reporting research results. For a complete definition, refer to the University Research Integrity Policy, which is available at: https://www.jhu.edu/assets/uploads/2017/08/university_research_integrity_policy.pdf. The University Research Integrity Policy applies to all University faculty, trainees, students, and staff engaged in proposing, performing, reviewing, or reporting research, regardless of funding source. The University Research Integrity Policy, together with the School of Medicine Procedures for Dealing with Issues of Research Misconduct, is the exclusive mechanism governing review of research misconduct allegations. Allegations of research misconduct regarding a student should be referred to the Research Integrity Officer for assessment under this mechanism.

Findings of research misconduct may also constitute a violation of the Academic Integrity Policy. If, in the course of inquiring into or investigating allegations of research misconduct, a committee identifies a potential violation(s) of the Academic Integrity Policy, the committee(s) addressing research misconduct will refer the matter to the Vice Dean for Education for consideration under the Academic Integrity Policy. If a research misconduct investigation concludes that a student engaged in research misconduct, the committee that investigated the allegations shall also make recommendations to the Vice Dean for Education with regard to sanctions and/or corrective action. These recommendations will be provided to the Vice Dean for Education in a separate communication from its investigation report. Sanctions will be determined in accordance with Section 4 below.

First-Time Offenses

If a student is suspected of academic misconduct, the faculty member responsible for the course in which the misconduct allegedly occurred must, if feasible, review the facts of the case promptly with the student. If the faculty member believes that academic misconduct has occurred, the faculty member must first contact the relevant associate dean (the Associate Dean for Graduate Biomedical Education or the Associate Dean for Medical Student Affairs) to determine whether the offense is a first offense, or a second or subsequent offense. If a first offense, the faculty member may – in consultation with the relevant associate dean – choose to resolve the case directly with the student in accordance with this section (i.e., the faculty member and student may reach an agreement on the resolution of the alleged misconduct. Note, neither the faculty member nor the student is obligated to resolve an allegation of academic misconduct under this section). If such an agreement is reached, the faculty member must promptly provide the student with a letter outlining the resolution that includes the charges, a summary of the evidence, the findings, and the sanctions agreed upon, and must also simultaneously provide a copy of that letter to the relevant associate dean as noted above.

The faculty member may also decline this option and defer to the relevant associate dean. If the faculty member attempts to resolve the case directly but cannot reach an agreement with

the student (e.g., the student denies cheating or the student does not agree with the proposed sanction, etc.); if the offense is a second or subsequent offense; or if in the case of a first offense, the faculty member believes that the sanction warranted is more severe than failure in the course, the faculty member must promptly notify the relevant associate dean in writing of the alleged violations, evidence, including potential witnesses, and other pertinent details of the case. In such instances, the case will proceed to the next phase of resolution as outlined below.

Hearings

In the case of a first offense that is not resolved between the faculty member and student; a first offense where the sanction imposed would be more severe than failure in the course; or a second or subsequent offence, the relevant associate dean will be assigned to the case and gather information regarding the alleged academic misconduct to determine the appropriate means of resolution. This gathering of information may include without limitation meetings with or requests for statements from the respondent and witnesses, and review of any related information. The relevant associate dean may dismiss a case for a lack of sufficient information or if the alleged conduct does not fall within conduct prohibited by this policy. Absent these circumstances, the case will be resolved as explained below.

Types of Conduct Proceedings

There are two types of conduct proceedings – an administrative hearing and a panel hearing. The relevant associate dean will, after the initial inquiry, decide whether a case will be resolved through an administrative hearing or a panel hearing. In making this decision, the relevant associate dean will consider the nature of the alleged misconduct and potential sanctions, the complexity of the facts, the prior academic misconduct history of the respondent, and other relevant information and factors.

Administrative Hearing

An administrative hearing involves a meeting between the relevant associate dean and the respondent. The relevant associate dean may also meet with witnesses and others involved and obtain and review relevant evidence. The associate dean will review the allegations and evidence with the respondent and give the respondent an opportunity to respond. The associate dean will determine based on preponderance of the evidence whether the respondent is responsible for the alleged policy violation(s), and, if so, issue (an) appropriate sanction(s).

Panel Hearings

The panel is comprised of trained University faculty and staff appointed on an ad hoc basis by the relevant associate dean to hear alleged violations of this policy. The panel, comprised of 3-4 faculty and staff, is charged with determining based on a preponderance of the evidence

whether a respondent's actions constitute a violation of this policy and, if so, determining (an) appropriate sanction(s). The panel will be chaired by the relevant associate dean. The associate dean may delegate chair responsibilities to a senior faculty member at the associate dean's discretion or if the associate dean is unavailable. The chair will be a non-voting member of the panel except when the panel is equally divided on a question. The associate dean or designee will instruct the panel on the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine Academic Integrity Policy. The associate dean or designee will discuss with the panel any potential mitigating or aggravating factors related to the alleged policy violation. The associate dean will also discuss with the panel any previous cases that may be relevant to the matter under discussion. The panel shall make its determination of responsibility and sanctions by majority vote, except that unanimity is required for a sanction of expulsion. The hearing is a closed proceeding, meaning that no one other than the panel members and necessary University personnel may be present, except as follows. The exception to this is that the student is encouraged to have a faculty advisor accompany the student throughout the hearing, and, if they should wish to do so, to make a statement. The respondent may also be accompanied by a student peer. The respondent, the faculty member and/or peer accompanying the respondent if applicable, and any witnesses called to the hearing will be present in the hearing room only when making a statement or being questioned by the panel. The hearing is recorded, but the deliberations of the panel are not recorded. Following the hearing, the panel and the respondent may listen to the recording upon request, however all copies of the recording will remain in the University's possession.

In general, hearings will proceed as follows, although the panel has discretion to alter the order or manner in which it hears or receives evidence, and to impose time limits on any stage of the process:

- introductions
- opening statement from the reporter, if applicable
- opening statement from the respondent
- questioning of the reporter by the panel, if applicable
- questioning of the respondent by the panel
- questioning of the witnesses, if any, by the panel
- closing statement from the reporter, if applicable
- closing statement from respondent

Witnesses

The panel may request the presence of any witness with relevant information about a case. The respondent may request the panel to hear from witnesses with relevant information. Absent exceptional circumstances, the respondent must inform the relevant associate dean (or designee) in writing at least three (3) days in advance of any meeting or hearing of the names of the witnesses and to what they will attest. The panel may determine whether and the extent to

which witnesses will be permitted to participate or be questioned in any meeting or hearing, including whether their testimony is relevant.

1. General Procedures

In connection with the resolution of alleged policy violations, a respondent shall:

- be notified in writing of the allegations in advance of any meeting or hearing;
- be notified in writing of the charges, and the date, time and location of the hearing, and identity of the hearing administrator or panel members in advance of the hearing;
- have the opportunity to review in advance of any meeting or hearing in which the respondent is a participant any information to be considered by any faculty member, administrator or panel for the meeting consistent with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, as amended ("FERPA") and applicable laws and policies;
- be notified in writing of the outcome of any hearing, namely the findings, determination of responsibility, and any sanctions; and
- be notified in writing of the outcome of any appeal.

A respondent may raise to the relevant associate dean or the vice dean for education, the potential for conflict of interest, bias, or both of any University personnel participating in the resolution process. A respondent may also decline to participate in the resolution process. The University may however continue the process without the respondent's participation.

Communications under this policy will primarily be conducted with students through their official University email address, and students are expected check their official University email on a regular basis.

2. Evidentiary Standard

A "preponderance of the evidence" standard will be used to determine responsibility for alleged violations of this policy. A "preponderance of the evidence" standard is an evidentiary standard that means "more likely than not." This standard is met if the proposition is more likely to be true than not true.

3. Appeals

Except in the case of a resolution for first time offenses with a faculty member, the respondent may appeal an administrator or panel's finding of responsibility and/or sanction(s). A respondent must file any appeal within five (5) days of the date of the notice of outcome on one or more of the following grounds:

- procedural error that could have materially affected the determination of responsibility or sanction(s);

- new information that was not available at the time of the hearing and that could reasonably have affected the determination of responsibility or sanction(s); and
- excessiveness of the sanction(s).

Any appeal must be filed in writing with the vice dean for education. An appeal will involve a review of the file; the appeal does not involve another hearing. On review of the appeal, the vice dean for education may:

- enter a revised determination of responsibility and/or revise sanction(s); or
- remand the matter to the administrator or panel to reconsider the determination of responsibility and/or sanction(s)
- request the appointment of a new panel to hear the charge;
- uphold the original decision

The vice dean for education will simultaneously send the appeal determination, with the reasons therefore, to the administrator or panel, as appropriate, and to the respondent. The decision of the vice dean for education is final. No further appeals are permitted.

4. Sanctions

The following factors may be considered in the sanctioning process:

- the specific academic misconduct at issue;
- the student's academic misconduct history; and
- other appropriate factors.

This section lists some of the sanctions that may be imposed upon students for violations of this policy. The School of Medicine reserves the right, in its discretion, to impose more stringent or different sanctions than those listed below depending on the facts and circumstances of a particular case. Sanctions for academic misconduct under policy are generally cumulative in nature.

The following is a non-exhaustive list of possible sanctions and what these sanctions typically mean. The specific conditions imposed under each sanction (e.g., the terms of a suspension, etc.) will depend on the specific facts and circumstances of each case.

Formal Warning

The student is notified in writing that his or her actions constitute a violation of this policy, and may be subject to other actions (e.g., re-taking an exam or failure in a course).

Probation

The student is notified that further violations of this policy within the probationary period will result in the student being considered for immediate suspension or other appropriate disciplinary action. If at the end of the specified time period no further violations have occurred, the student is removed from probationary status.

Suspension

The student is notified that the student is separated from the University for a specified period of time. The student must leave campus and vacate campus residence halls, if applicable, within the time prescribed and is prohibited from being enrolled at the University, attending classes, or being present on University property or at University events. The conferring of an academic degree may be deferred for the duration of the suspension. A student must receive written permission from the University prior to re-enrollment or re-application. Academic work completed at another institution while on suspension will not be recognized for credit transfer.

Expulsion

Expulsion means the permanent removal of the student from the University. Expulsion includes a forfeiture of all rights and degrees not actually conferred at the time of the expulsion, permanent notation of the expulsion on the student's University records and academic transcript, withdrawal from all courses according to divisional policies, and the forfeiture of tuition and fees already paid. Any student expelled from the University is prohibited from future reapplication to the University.

5. Records

A case file concerning a student will be retained for seven (7) years from the date that the student graduates or otherwise leaves the university.