

Referred and Non-Referred Academic Integrity Violation Reports

Part Two of the Academic Integrity policy (effective May 2026) divides responsibility for investigating and resolving academic integrity violation reports between the reporting faculty member and the Office of Student Conduct. According to the policy, the Integrity Officer and the Student Conduct Officer will determine in Part Two which procedure is applicable in each case: that described in the Academic Integrity policy (handled by the faculty member) or the Code of Conduct (handled by Student Conduct).

This determination is made by considering the range of University sanctions that would apply if the student were to be found responsible. For those reported students facing the possibility of suspension or expulsion, the report is referred to Student Conduct in Part Two (these are known as referred reports); for all other cases, the Integrity Officer proceeds with the report under the jurisdiction of the reporting faculty member (non-referred reports).

The referral determination is made based on the severity of the misconduct described in the initial report and on the student's record of prior academic integrity violations, if any. What follows are the criteria the Integrity Officer and the Student Conduct Officer are to use in making that determination.

Referred violations will fall into one of four general categories: Severe Violations, Repeated Violations, Patterns of Misconduct, and Code of Conduct Violations.

Severe Violations

Only misconduct falling under the definition of “Severe Violations” as defined in the “Categories of Academic Integrity Violations” prepared by the Provost’s CAI and published on its website will qualify to refer an initial report on the part of the student.

“Severe violations” constitute a clear attempt to gain advantage by misrepresenting a student’s knowledge, preparation, or abilities that do not have a plausible explanation rooted in ignorance or misunderstanding. To qualify for referral, a severe violation should reflect an intentional effort to conceal the true nature of work submitted for an assignment; it should constitute a major part of that assignment; and the assignment should represent a significant share of the course grade.

Examples of severe violations:

- A student is found with a “cheat sheet” during an examination worth 10% or more of the course grade.
- A student submits a written assignment worth 10% or more of the course grade that is found to have been largely generated by GenAI or plagiarized from another source.
- A student hands in a lab report worth 10% or more of the course grade that is largely based on fabricated data.

Examples of similar violations not considered severe:

- A student submits a Moodle forum post, “exit ticket,” or reflective comment that is found to have been plagiarized or created by GenAI.
- A student is found looking at his or her phone during a five-minute reading comprehension quiz.
- A student fails to complete a lab assignment and fabricates data for the incomplete portion of his or her lab report.

Repeated Violations

A student who is found responsible in a nonreferred case and is then reported a second or subsequent time for similar misconduct will be referred on the basis of repeated violations. Having had the benefit of an educational sanction for the initial violation, the student can no longer plead ignorance or misunderstanding in a subsequent case.

Repeated violations must be similar enough that a student can be reasonably expected to have learned from the initial violation that misconduct of that kind will not be tolerated. Enough time must have passed for the student to complete an educational sanction in the first case before committing the misconduct described in the second.

Examples of repeated violations:

- A student is reported twice or more for submitting bibliographic material containing hallucinated sources.
- A student is reported twice or more for fabricating small amounts of data in lab reports.

Examples of subsequent offenses that would not necessarily be considered repeated violations:

- A student reported for failing to cite a source is later reported for hallucinated bibliographic material.
- A student reported for fabricating small amounts of data is later reported for falsifying an attendance sheet by signing for a friend.

Patterns of Misconduct

The types of subsequent offense that do not rise to the level of Repeated Violations may nonetheless indicate a “Pattern of Misconduct” when, taken together, they suggest a disregard for the norms of academic integrity and a failure to consider the consequences of misconduct.

Under the policy, a second violation is not always grounds for referral, but a third violation report is always sufficient to establish a pattern of misconduct.

The reported student’s conduct during the reporting process is relevant to the determination of whether misconduct constitutes a pattern. Lying, casting blame, and falsifying evidence serve to support the classification of repeated offenses as a Pattern of Misconduct.

Examples of a pattern of misconduct:

- A student is reported for two dissimilar violations in a short period, for example the course of a single academic year.
- A reported student lies in an attempt to evade responsibility and is reported for a second time.

Examples of subsequent offenses that may not be considered a pattern of misconduct:

- Second offenses that are not considered “Repeated Violations” and do not fall into the types of misconduct described above, for example dissimilar violation reports separated by two or more semesters, may not be considered a pattern of misconduct.

Academic Integrity Violations that are also Code of Conduct Violations

In rare cases, a student's academic misconduct may also constitute a violation of the Code of Conduct. Assuming that the suspected misconduct constitutes a single incident and that the suspected misconduct could be sanctioned with suspension or expulsion, these incidents will also be referred to the Office of Student Conduct, which investigates and adjudicates all Code violations.

The Code of Conduct and the Academic Integrity policy were written to describe and delineate different types of student misconduct, and therefore referrals for this reason will be very rare.

Examples of an integrity violation that is also a Code violation:

- A student steals another student's laptop to copy required work for a class.
- A student violates the terms of Adelphi's IT use policy, for example by using someone else's credentials to gain access to course materials the student was not permitted to access.

Examples of integrity violations that are associated with Code violations but would not be referred under these guidelines:

- A student borrows a friend's laptop and copies coursework from it without the friend's knowledge. When reported, the student steals the laptop to conceal evidence (these are separate incidents and would be considered two separate violations).
- A student gains unauthorized access to another student's Adelphi account, using it to read email and download coursework (these would be considered separate violations).
- A student threatens another student with knowledge of an integrity violation not to share that information with the University (this would be considered a Code violation separate from the integrity violation).