

THE HONOR SYSTEM

GRADUATE

California Institute of Technology
Pasadena, California

September 6, 2000

The Honor System

Graduate

This document can also be viewed on the web at
<http://www.its.caltech.edu/~grb/HonorSystem.pdf>

Published by
The Graduate Student Council
of the
California Institute of Technology, Inc.
A California non-profit public-benefit corporation

first edition: May 1979
second edition: August 1986
third edition: August 1993
fourth edition: July 2000

D. Diner, editor
D. James, editor
M. Malak, editor
M. Billen, editor

Funds for publication were provided by the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California, 91125, U.S.A.

Reproduction: Caltech Graphic Arts

First Printing: xxxxx 2000

To All Caltech Students

May 10, 1979

There is no greater evidence of the existence of a genuine community at Caltech than the effectiveness of the Caltech Honor System. It is a source of pride for all of us, but credit for it belongs to the students who use it and administer it entirely by themselves.

M. L. Goldberger
President; 1977-87

Contents

1	How to use this book	4
2	Introduction	5
3	Philosophy	7
4	Interpretation of the Honor System	8
5	Reporting a Suspected Violation	13
6	Operations	14
	Appendices	17
A	GSC Bylaws and the Honor System	17
B	Examples of Plagiarism	22
C	Suggestions to Instructors; 3rd Edition - October 1986	25
D	Grievance Committee Procedures	28

1 How to use this book

This handbook is intended to inform members of the Caltech community about the philosophy and operation of the Honor System as it pertains to graduate students. Some sections are necessary for first-time readers; others are important to persons who will actually be participating in an Honor System case. As a reader, your “need to know” will determine which sections of the booklet sustain your interest. Suggested guidelines for use of this handbook are listed below.

1. If you are a first-time reader, begin with the Introduction and read through to the end of *Reporting a Suspected Violation*. Then tackle *Appendix C*, as it is an essential introduction to the ground rules for homework, examinations, and papers.
2. If you are to write a term paper for any class here at Caltech, then add *Appendix B, Examples of Plagiarism*, to the list of recommended reading.
3. If you are a teaching assistant, carefully scrutinize *Appendix C*, and be aware that suspected *undergraduate* violations should be reported to the ASCIT Vice-President, who is Chairman of the Board of Control (`boc-chair@ugcs`). Report possible *graduate* violations to the Chairman of the Graduate Review Board (`grbchair@its`).
4. If you are a member of the Graduate Review Board, then you should thoroughly familiarize yourself with *Operations* and *Appendix A, GSC By-Laws*, in addition to the materials mentioned above.
5. If you are to participate in an Honor System case, as a witness, defendant, or GRB member, then be sure that you completely understand your rights, privileges, and obligations, as spelled out in *Operations* and *Appendix A*.
6. If you have a grievance against a Caltech individual or organization which does not fall under the authority of the GRB or the BOC, then read the first part of *Appendix D, Grievance Committee Procedures*, and ask the Institute Human Relations Advisor or the Vice-President for Student Affairs for assistance in resolving your complaint.
7. **When in doubt, ask yourself**, “Will my actions result in the taking of unfair advantage of any other member of the Caltech community?” Most of the time, the answer should be obvious. If you are unsure of the answer, then ask for assistance! Members of the Graduate Review Board are willing to serve as sources of information regarding the Honor System. We would rather prevent Honor System cases than try them.

2 Introduction

The Honor System at Caltech is distinguished by its success. Its operation allows an atmosphere of trust to exist on this campus which confers many freedoms as well as responsibilities on the members of the community. Included in the Caltech community are the students, staff, members of the faculty, and administrators. Administration of the Honor System, as it affects students, is primarily performed by two student bodies—the Graduate Review Board (GRB) (graduate students) and the Board of Control (BOC) (undergraduates).

This booklet has been prepared by the Graduate Review Board to acquaint graduate students with the benefits and obligations of the Honor System. Please read it. It is important for you to understand the philosophy and practice of the Honor System.

Key Points of the Caltech Honor System

1. The Honor System is based on the following principle: **Never take *unfair advantage* of any other member of the Caltech community.** To do so is a violation of the Honor System.
2. *The Honor System is binding on us all.* By enrolling at Caltech, you have agreed to abide by the Honor System. Nobody is *above* the Honor System.
3. *Ignorance* of the rules is *not an excuse.* You are responsible for learning about the principles and practices of the Honor System as it applies to you.
4. The Honor System covers all *academic* and a wide range of *non-academic* areas.
5. Nearly all benefits of the Honor System stem from the ability to *trust and be trusted* by others.
6. The *Graduate Review Board* (GRB) and the *Board of Control* (BOC) work together as two branches of the same Honor System.
7. The goal of the Honor Boards when reviewing suspected violations is to *reintegrate* the individuals into the Honor System and *not to punish them.*
8. *Strict confidentiality* is observed in all Honor System proceedings. Breaches of secrecy by other than the defendant are Honor System violations.
9. All individuals are *presumed innocent* until found guilty.
10. *Suspension or expulsion* are possible consequences of violations. They are only invoked in the *rare* case when one has *repeatedly* demonstrated an inability to live within the Honor System or has committed a particularly grave violation.
11. **To report a suspected violation:**

- (a) If the suspect is a graduate student, contact the GRB Chair by phone or by mail. The Chair name, mail code, and telephone extension can be obtained from the Techinque, the Caltech *Personnel Directory* under the heading **Honor System**, or from the Graduate Office. You can send e-mail to `grbchair@its`.
 - (b) If the suspected violator is an undergraduate, contact the BOC Chairman (the ASCIT Vice-President) at either the address shown under **Honor System** in the *Personnel Directory* or via the Dean's Office. You can send email to `boc-chair@ugcs`.
12. *Failure to report a suspected violation* may itself be a violation unless it can be shown that the best interests of the Honor System have been served.
13. **About master keys:**
- (a) Possession of a master key is not a violation of the Honor System. However, *unauthorized* entry into any room is considered a violation. Authorization consists of explicit permission from the proper person to enter that particular room at that time.
 - (b) Thefts and vandalism have occurred when Caltech master keys have come into the possession of thieves. Because of this, allowing a master key to fall into the hands of someone not associated with Caltech is a very grave action and will be treated severely.
14. There are several libraries on campus. Their regulations are not completely uniform. The variations exist to maximize the accessibility of information to the entire Caltech community. Failure to adhere to library use regulations results in the taking of unfair advantage of others and therefore is an Honor System violation.
15. Seek permission and proper instruction in the use of any computing, photocopying, or laboratory equipment. Failure to do so may result in loss of data critical to someone's thesis or publication and may constitute a violation of the Honor System.
16. Student interactions with *outside agencies* are not considered to be within the jurisdiction of the Honor System. Neither the GRB nor the Institute will intercede on behalf of any graduate student against whom legal action has been brought by such external agencies.

The Honor System comprises far more than this list. The remainder of this booklet, members of the GRB, and the Dean of Graduate Studies are excellent sources of information about the Honor System. We urge you to consult any of these sources of information should you have questions about your conduct or the conduct of others under the Honor System.

3 Philosophy

The performance of creative work requires that one be free to think, closely examine and critically evaluate one's ideas, and communicate and exchange these ideas with others. Creativity flourishes in an atmosphere of trust and respect and is inhibited by suspicion and disdain. As the Caltech community believes that the former is the best environment for education and research, we have all agreed to accept the Honor System.

The Honor System is an agreement among all members of the community to live and work together honorably, trusting implicitly in the honesty, sincerity, fairness, and consideration of others. As we believe that all individuals are capable of properly managing their freedom, we do not consider that the Honor System imposes unreasonable burdens on us. However, it is recognized that some individuals may be unable to understand or unwilling to accept these responsibilities.

It is the premise of our Honor System that any action which results in the taking of unfair advantage of any other member of the community violates the Honor System. Academic pressures, selfishness, lack of forethought, and ignorance are the usual causes of Honor System violations. However, the diversity of experience, cultural backgrounds, and outlooks of our members which enriches our lives here at Caltech may also lead to conflicts with the Honor System. Consequently, bodies must exist to counsel, advise, and otherwise assist us all to live within the Honor System and to protect the majority from those few individuals who are unable to conduct themselves responsibly in an atmosphere of trust.

In recognition of the integrity and thoughtfulness of Caltech students, these tasks have been entrusted primarily to student boards by the administration. Interpretations of the Honor Code and details of current GRB operations as part of the Honor System are discussed in the pages to follow.

4 Interpretation of the Honor System

A student's conduct in all areas of academic life is governed by the Honor System. Among other things, this applies to examinations, homework, research, teaching, and the use of the libraries. The Honor System also extends into non-academic areas. The essence of the system is embodied in the phrase:

**Never take unfair advantage of any other
member of the Caltech community.**

It is clear that the domain of the Honor System includes our relations and interactions with every member of the community. Honesty, fairness and consideration, and respect for the privacy, property, safety, and other rights of those who are part of the Institute are expected of all of us. Each individual has an obligation to exercise his or her personal freedom in a manner which is at all times consistent with the spirit of the Honor System.

Academic Areas

A. Cheating and Plagiarism

The most obvious Honor System violations involve cheating. In particular, a student working on a take-home examination should not consult students or sources other than those permitted by the instructor. This includes questioning another student about the exam he or she has already taken, or "stacking" one's own course notes with photocopies of other references when it is known that the instructor allows only course notes during exams. If an exam is given a time limit, any work done after the time limit should be clearly designated as such. This is done by drawing a line beneath the work completed before the end of the time allowed, labeling this line, and then continuing with the test. Some professors will give credit for this work.

Plagiarism is just as serious as cheating but is often of a more subtle nature. The following definition is taken from Harvard University's *The Handbook of General Education*:

The academic counterpart of the bank embezzler and of the manufacturer who mislabels his product is the plagiarist, the student or scholar who leads his reader to believe that what he is reading is the original work of the writer when it is not. If it could be assumed that the distinction between plagiarism and honest use of sources is perfectly clear in everyone's mind, there would be no need for the explanation which follows; merely the warning with which this definition concludes would be enough. But it is apparent that sometimes men of goodwill draw the suspicion of guilt upon themselves (and indeed, are guilty) simply because they are not aware of the illegitimacy of certain kinds of "borrowing" and of the procedures for correct identification of materials other than those gained through independent research and reflection.

The spectrum is a wide one. At one end there is word-for-word copying of another's writing without enclosing the copied passage in quotation marks and identifying it in a footnote, *both* of which are necessary. (This includes, of course, the copying of all or any part of another *student's* paper.) It hardly seems possible that anyone of college age or more could do that without clear intent to deceive. At the other end there is the almost casual slipping in of a particularly apt term which you have come across in reading and which so admirably expresses your opinion that you are tempted to make it personal property. Between these poles there are degrees and degrees, but they may be roughly placed in two groups. Close to outright and blatant deceit but more the result, perhaps, of laziness than of bad intent is the patching together of random jottings made in the course of reading, generally without careful identification of their source, and then woven into the text, so that the result is a mosaic of other people's ideas and words, the writer's sole contribution having been the cement to hold the pieces together. Indicative of more effort, and for that reason somewhat closer to honesty, though still dishonest, is the paraphrase, an abbreviated (and often skillfully prepared) restatement of someone else's analysis or conclusion without acknowledgement that another person's text has been the basis for the recapitulation.

Specific examples of the dishonest use of source materials which are drawn from The Handbook of General Education may be found in Appendix B of this booklet.

B. Homework and Laboratory Assignments

The degree of allowed collaboration on homework assignments varies from class to class. The course instructor usually will clearly state his or her policy at the beginning of a term. If the class policy seems to be ambiguous, seek clarification from the instructor. One should note that although collaboration on some assignments may be unrestricted, there is a fine line between exchange of ideas and some forms of plagiarism. You must decide whether or not you are taking

unfair advantage of another's knowledge.

In general, both student and instructor share responsibility to clarify any rules governing a particular course. When in doubt, a student should consult the instructor, teaching assistant, and/or a GRB member before proceeding. As a last resort, one should write a short note to the instructor indicating the problem and what action was taken.

These principles also apply to laboratory course work and research. Falsification or theft of results are serious acts of intellectual dishonesty, as is claiming undue credit for another's work or ideas.

A list of suggestions for instructors may be found in Appendix C. It is worthwhile reading for any Caltech student, as it lists guidelines for both student and teacher to follow when undertaking a course of instruction.

C. Teaching

In their duties as teaching assistants, graduate students should deal with students in a fair manner consistent with the spirit of the Honor System. Moreover, they are responsible for interpreting course rules in the same way as any instructor.

D. Library Usage

When using an institute library, it is the student's responsibility to know and follow all the rules regarding that library's operation. Some department libraries do not allow their books to be checked out. In this case, removing a book without first consulting someone in charge would be an Honor System violation. Likewise, a student who keeps a reserved book beyond the allotted time or ignores overdue notices for an unreasonable length of time is taking unfair advantage of others.

Non-Academic Areas

A. Some Examples

Examples of actions which violate the Honor Code are listed below. This list is not meant to be complete, but rather illustrative of conduct which is not consonant with the essential principle of our Honor System:

1. Theft;
2. Unauthorized entry into areas traditionally private, (e.g. faculty offices, students' rooms) or those declared closed to one's use (see Section B below for further discussion);
3. Defacing or abusing property not solely one's own;
4. Performance of research with careless disregard for the experiments or personal safety of others;

5. Removal of shared software or someone else's personal data from Institute computing facilities without prior consent;
6. Use of research or departmental accounts on Institute photocopy machines (Kodak, Xerox, IBM) for personal business;
7. Use of false or misleading statements to obtain financial assistance from the Institute, thereby obtaining an unfair advantage over those who report their need honestly.

Although the GRB is not interested in interfering with the daily lives of graduate students, the Board will act when informed of the deliberate actions of a graduate student which *repeatedly* abridge the rights of others in the community. Such behavior is certainly not in accordance with the spirit of the Honor System. Examples of such actions would include the following:

1. Parking in another's reserved parking space without their permission or permitting one's guest to do so;
2. Continuing to subject others to loud or disturbing noises despite their repeated objections and requests to quiet down;
3. Removing common articles from a community room or use of community or departmental food and beverages without payment, thus depriving others of their use.

B. Unauthorized Entry

It is generally well known that many unauthorized individuals possess master keys to campus buildings. Possession of these keys is not in itself a violation of the Honor System because their mere possession is not proof of their use to gain unfair advantage over another. However, by having a master key, one assumes responsibility for its proper use not only by oneself, but also by others. Selling, giving, or loaning these keys or *any building keys* to persons not associated with Caltech is an extremely irresponsible action which jeopardizes the security and property of the community. Consequently, such cases are dealt with in the harshest possible manner.

When entering areas which, at the time, are closed to you or are generally considered to be private, one risks violating the Honor System unless prior, proper permission has been secured. Ignorance is no excuse. Therefore, you are urged to acquaint yourselves with the rules and regulations pertaining to the buildings which you enter prior to doing so.

C. Outside Companies

As the outside companies on campus have not agreed to abide by the Honor System themselves, the GRB believes that dishonest or illegal actions committed by graduate students against these firms do not fall within the jurisdiction of

the Honor System. Consequently, the Board will not hear cases arising from incidents involving these companies. However, the Board neither encourages nor condones the actions of those seeking to take unfair advantage of these firms. These persons are warned that neither the Institute nor the GRB will intervene on their behalf in the event that the company which they allegedly defrauded decides to bring legal action against them. In fact, the Board strongly urges anyone with information concerning such an incident to report it to the company in question.

5 Reporting a Suspected Violation

Every graduate student has a responsibility to preserve the Honor System. This requires more than conducting oneself in an honorable manner. It is to the advantage of all concerned to report strong suspicions, as it is far better that an innocent person be acquitted of wrongdoing than remain under suspicion.¹ If violations are allowed to go unreported, the effectiveness of the Honor System will be impaired, and other members of the Caltech community may suffer. Therefore, willful failure to report a violation may itself be a violation unless it can be shown that the best interests of the Honor System have been served.

The primary goal of the GRB is to help graduate students live within the Honor System. Consequently, the Board does not seek to punish violators, but to reinstate them in the Honor System. Only rarely, when a violator has either shown a total inability to live within the Honor System or committed an act so serious that no other action could be taken, would the Board recommend suspension or expulsion.

If you are unsure as to whether or not to report your suspicions, remember that a mistaken report hurts no one. The matter will be thoroughly investigated in *complete secrecy* by the GRB Chair and Secretary, and only if there is good reason to believe that a violation has been committed will there be a hearing. If a suspect is not found guilty, the records of the proceedings are destroyed and all those involved in the hearing (except the suspect) are bound to secrecy. Consequently, the suspect's reputation and future are not jeopardized. If you need advice about reporting an incident, enlist the help of the GRB Chair by discussing the matter in *abstract terms*. The Chair should be able to give you a preliminary reading on the validity of your suspicions.

A suspected graduate violation may be reported to the GRB Chair either in person, by phone, by e-mail to `grbchair@its`, or through the campus mail. If the suspected violator is an undergraduate the matter should be reported to the Chairman of the Board of Control (`boc-chair@ugcs`), who is also the Vice-President of ASCIT. The names, mail codes, and extension numbers of the present GRB and BOC Chairpersons may be found in the current edition of the Caltech *Personnel Directory* under the heading **Honor System**. Because new officers are chosen in Spring Quarter, you are advised to check with the Dean's Office (BOC) or the Graduate Office (GRB) to make sure that the information in the *Personnel Directory* is correct.

¹See *Suspected Violations in Appendix C*

6 Operations

The composition and operations of the GRB are governed by the Third Article of the By-Laws of the Graduate Student Council (Appendix A).

The Graduate Review Board consists of a Chair and Secretary, both elected by the GSC from among its members, and the graduate student representatives elected by the graduate student body. The GRB representatives are elected in the same way as are the GSC representatives. Neither the Chair nor Secretary can be a GRB representative, and neither has a vote on GRB panels.

A suspected violation is reported to the Chair who with the Secretary then conducts a preliminary investigation by collecting any material evidence and talking to the suspected violator, any witnesses, the persons who made the report, and anyone else having relevant information. If, in the opinion of the Chair and Secretary, no violation has been committed, or the incident does not fall within the bounds of the Honor System, the matter is dropped. However, if reasonable suspicion exists, the Chair and the Secretary select a GRB panel. The panel consists of the Chair, the Secretary, and at least eight voting members chosen from the GRB representatives as prescribed by the GSC By-Laws.

During the preliminary hearing, the name of the suspected violator remains confidential, and no witnesses are called. The Chair describes the suspected violation, summarizes all evidence, and recommends that the panel either formally consider or formally dismiss the case. If a simple majority of the panel votes to consider the case, a formal hearing will be convened at a later date. Otherwise, the Chair dismisses the case, all records are destroyed, and the case can be reopened only if there is new and substantial evidence and a new report has been made.

As soon as the panel votes to consider a case, the Chair and the defendant jointly appoint a member of the panel as counselor. The counselor's purposes are to explain procedures to the defendant and to keep him informed of the panel's deliberations when he is not present. However, the counselor does not serve as an advocate, and any information given to or questions asked of him are not privileged. The counselor remains a voting member of the GRB panel. The defendant may waive this right.

During a formal hearing, the defendant's name is disclosed, all evidence concerning the current suspected violation is examined, and witnesses may be called. Any voting or non-voting member of the panel may question the witnesses or the defendant. The defendant is entitled to require witnesses to appear on his or her behalf, to be accompanied by a person associated with Caltech of her or his choosing (not an attorney) to assist him, and to examine the evidence. The defendant may request that he and his representative be present during all aspects of the hearing except the panel's private deliberations. Witnesses may be present only during their questioning. No one else may be present during the hearing. The defendant or his representative are permitted to submit questions to the panel on information presented by witnesses and on documents considered by the panel. The defendant or his representative may also ask questions when authorized by the Chair. The Chair will not ! permit formal cross-examination

and will control the extent and manner of questioning. After all evidence and testimony have been presented, the panel votes on the case and informs the defendant of the result. If fewer than 3/4 of the panel members return guilty votes, the defendant is declared innocent, the minutes are destroyed, and no further hearing of the GRB will be held for this report. If 3/4 or more of the panel vote for guilt, the defendant is found guilty. At this point, the files pertaining to any prior convictions currently under probation are read to the panel by the Chair. The panel then decides by a 3/4 vote on an action to be recommended to the Dean of Graduate Studies, and this recommendation is read to the convicted violator. The panel may recommend probation, formal censure, or any other actions it considers appropriate.

The minutes of the hearing are kept by the Secretary. The minutes will be maintained in a locked file by the Dean of Graduate Studies, and only the Dean (or his designee), the GRB Chair, and the GRB Secretary will have access to these files. A convicted violator may have access only to that part of the files that pertains to him.

The recommendation delivered to the Dean consists of the minutes, the panel's current recommended action, and copies of previous recommendations (if any exist) for this violation. No case will be considered completed until the Dean has approved and put into effect a complete and current GRB recommendation.

In extraordinary cases when the Dean and the GRB are unable to agree on a recommendation, or when the GRB cannot decide on a recommendation, the Dean submits the case to the Honor System Appeal Board. The Appeal Board consists of the Vice President for Student Affairs, two faculty members appointed by the Chairman of the Faculty (excluding anyone who might jeopardize the violator's right to complete his or her education in an unprejudiced atmosphere, such as the violator's advisor or department chairman), and two graduate students appointed by the GSC Chair (excluding anyone involved in the case under consideration). A majority vote of the Appeal Board will decide the final action taken.

Two important features of GRB operation should be noted. First, all proceedings or actions of the GRB which could lead to the discovery of a defendant's identity are secret. The entire GRB and any additional persons involved in a case hearing are bound to secrecy, and violations of this secrecy will be considered a violation of the Honor System. The exception to the rule of secrecy is that an individual defendant is free to make public as much about his or her case (but not that of any co-defendants) as he or she wishes. If a defendant makes information public, witnesses in the case and the accuser(s) are no longer bound to secrecy, and the GRB panel, by a three-fourths (3/4) vote of approval, may make public statements about the case. Second, in keeping with the primary goal of the GRB, each case is considered individually, and there are no pre-established penalties for specific violations. *Every effort is made to help a student remain in the Caltech Community.*

Policy statements are official statements by the GRB pertaining to the Honor System's coverage of specific areas, or to details of GRB operations not specified in the GSC By-Laws. Although policy decisions are made only after careful

deliberation, it is recognized that some latitude may be required in their application in order to be consistent with the spirit of the Honor System. The GRB may invite the Institute public to attend policy meetings which do not involve a suspected violation.

Appendices

A GSC Bylaws and the Honor System

Article I: The Honor System

Section 1. No one shall take unfair advantage of any member of the California Institute of Technology (“Caltech” or “the Institute”) community.

Section 2. The Honor System as stated in Section 1 shall be the fundamental principle of conduct of all members of the corporation. It shall apply to all scholastic activities as well as to relations with other members of the Caltech community.

Article II: The Graduate Review Board

Section 1. Purposes and Duties. The Graduate Review Board (“GRB”) shall review all cases of alleged violations of the Honor System by graduate students and shall make recommendations to the Dean of Graduate Studies for action in those cases in which a violation is deemed to have occurred. It shall be the duty of the Chair to see that the student body is informed of the policies of the Graduate Review Board. Violations of the Honor System may be brought to the attention of the Chair by any member of the Caltech community. The Chair shall conduct and control all aspects of GRB hearings.

Section 2. Membership. The GRB shall consist of a Chair and Secretary elected by the Graduate Student Council (“GSC”) Board of Directors from among their members, and representatives. The Chair and Secretary may not be GRB representatives.

- (a) The number of graduate option and at-large representatives authorized for the GRB shall be the same as those authorized for the GSC Board of Directors.
- (b) If the number of GRB representative nominees exceeds the number of available positions, an election in accord with GSC election rules shall be held.

- (c) In case of absence or disability of the Chair or Secretary, the GSC Board of Directors shall select a temporary replacement.
- (d) All details of holding office not specified above in this section shall follow the same procedures as for GSC directors.

Section 3. Quorum and Voting

- (a) Eight (8) GRB representatives shall constitute a quorum.
- (b) If the purpose of the quorum is to act as a panel in a hearing the following restrictions also apply:
 1. The panel must be selected by random draw by the GRB Chair from among the qualified representatives.
 2. The panel shall include at least one of the GRB members representing the suspected violators' option, provided that he or she has not been disqualified and provided that he or she was elected by the option.
 3. No panel may include more than four (4) GRB representatives from one graduate option, i.e., more representatives than the number that constitutes a simple majority of a quorum.
 4. Provided that enough GRB representatives remain to obtain a quorum, the suspected violator (violators) may dismiss up to four (4) panel members from his or her (their) case.
 5. If a panel member feels unable to render an unbiased judgment in a particular case, that member should disqualify himself or herself. Furthermore, no member of the GRB shall sit in judgment of his or her own case.
 6. If a panel member's objectivity is questioned, the Chair shall rule on the challenge.
- (c) The Chair, Secretary, and a quorum must be present at all hearings and meetings.
- (d) A simple majority vote of those representatives present shall be necessary for a decision of the GRB, except as stated below. The Chair and Secretary do not cast votes.

Section 4. Rules of Procedure

- (a) All persons appearing before the GRB at a hearing or a preliminary investigation will be informed of the reasons for their presence.
- (b) When a suspected violation of the Honor System is reported to the GRB Chair, the Chair and Secretary will conduct a preliminary investigation to examine all relevant facts. They may require any persons involved or thought to have pertinent information to discuss their knowledge of any information concerning the case.

- (c) Any person asked to attend a preliminary investigation may be accompanied by any one GRB member of his or her choice. No one else may attend the preliminary investigation.
- (d) After completing their preliminary investigation, the Chair and Secretary, in consultation with the Dean of Graduate Studies, will decide whether the GRB will accept or refuse jurisdiction. Factors which may result in a determination to refuse jurisdiction include but are not limited to urgency of Institute resolution, safety, prolonged duration of hearings, extreme seriousness or complexity of the alleged violation, or insufficient interest of the Institute community. Following a determination to refuse jurisdiction the Chair will immediately refer the matter to the Dean of Graduate Studies for resolution as the Dean deems appropriate. If jurisdiction is retained by the GRB and if the Chair and Secretary determine that a reasonable suspicion exists, the Chair shall convene a panel to conduct a preliminary hearing.
- (e) The Chair shall describe to the panel the suspected violations and shall summarize all evidence pertaining thereto. The suspected violator's name remains confidential. Only the Chair, Secretary, and panel may be present at this hearing.
- (f) The panel votes whether to consider the case in a formal hearing. The panel may also, at their discretion, recommend that the case be referred to the Dean of Graduate Studies due to special circumstances. Failing such actions, the Chair will dismiss the case and no records will be kept. A dismissed case can be re-opened only if there is new evidence.
- (g) If there are two or more suspected violators, the panel will also decide which, if any, of the suspected violators' cases will be heard individually.
- (h) If the panel votes to consider the case in a formal hearing:
 1. The name(s) of the suspected violator(s) are disclosed to the panel.
 2. The Chair and suspected violator jointly appoint one member of the panel to act as "counselor" to the suspected violator(s). The counselor's purpose is not to act as an advocate but merely to explain the GRB's procedures to the suspected violator(s), answer any questions, and keep them informed of any proceeding for which they are not present. The Chair and the counselor will inform the suspected violator(s) that any information given and any questions asked of the counselor are not privileged and that the counselor will vote on the case.
 3. A summary of the evidence presented to the panel at the preliminary hearing; and any other appropriate information, at the Chair's discretion, shall be presented to the suspected violator(s).

4. (i) The panel will examine all evidence and witnesses may be called; any panel member may directly question a witness or the suspected violator(s). The suspected violator may submit questions to the panel on information presented by witnesses and on evidence considered by the panel. Each suspected violator may request of the Chair that witnesses be required to appear on his or her behalf.
- (j) A suspected violator attending a formal hearing may be accompanied by any one member of the Caltech community, of his or her choice, who may speak on behalf of the suspected violator with the panel's permission; this person may not be an attorney. The suspected violator and the member of the Caltech community may be present at all aspects of the hearing except the panel's private deliberations. Witnesses may be present only during their questioning. No one else may attend the hearing.
- (k) After all of the evidence has been presented and all of the witnesses heard, a three-fourths (3/4) vote of approval by the panel shall be required to determine that an honor system violation has been committed. If no violation is deemed to have been committed, the case is dismissed and the records are destroyed. If a violation is deemed to have been committed by only some of the suspected violators in a multiple suspected violator case heard together, only the violators names and cases will appear in the record except for the participation of suspected violators as witnesses.
- (l) If an Honor System violation is deemed to have been committed, the Chair shall inform the panel of any previous violations committed by the suspected violator and of any pertinent information provided by the Dean of Graduate Studies. Prior violations shall not be disclosed unless a violation is deemed to have occurred and not until after all suspected violations have been decided. The panel then shall decide what action to recommend to the Dean of Graduate Studies in order to:
 1. nullify the advantage that has been taken.
 2. protect the Caltech community. Any recommendation to the Dean must have the concurrence of three-fourths (3/4) of the panel. The panel may recommend any action it deems appropriate. The Chair and Secretary shall present to the Dean of Graduate Studies the recommendation of the panel and all of the records pertaining to the case. This recommendation is not binding upon the Dean.
- (m) Persons who feel that either they have been unfairly treated by any members of the GRB or that their personal rights have been violated may petition the Dean of Graduate Studies.
- (n) No decision of a previous panel shall be revoked, unless the panel is

convinced that new evidence or changed conditions change the status of the original case, or upon recommendation of the Dean of Graduate Studies.

- (o) Minutes of all proceedings of the GRB shall be recorded by the Secretary in a book of minutes of the Graduate Review Board maintained under lock and key by the Dean of Graduate Studies. Records of the proceedings shall include the names of all present, the names of witnesses, a record of the suspected violator's waiver or failure to take advantage of any important right, the decisions reached by the panel with corresponding vote tallies, a description of any previous violations, the concurring opinion, dissenting opinions, and a statement of the recommended action. No other recording of the proceedings shall be permitted. Only the GRB Chair, GRB Secretary, and the Dean of Graduate Studies, or his or her designee, may have access to these records; violators may access their portions of these records. When a matter is referred to the Dean of Graduate Studies, the Dean shall be requested to submit a short report for inclusion in the GRB records.
- (p) If jurisdiction is not retained by the GRB, the matter referred to the Dean of Graduate Studies shall not be considered further by the GRB except as requested by the Dean, nor shall actions taken by the Dean in such matters be considered actions of the GRB.
- (q) The GRB Chair and Secretary may consult with the Board of Control ("BOC") as necessary. If a suspected violation involves both undergraduate and graduate students, the GRB panel may invite the BOC to participate in their private deliberations.
- (r) All those appearing before the panel, and the panel itself, are expected to maintain absolute secrecy regarding hearings of the GRB. Divulgence of any of the proceedings shall be considered a violation of the Honor System. Should the suspected violator wish to discuss the issues involved in his or her case with others, after his or her case has been completed, the suspected violator may do so at any time, provided no portion of the case that concerns other suspected violators is made public without the permission of those persons. However, once the suspected violator initiates public discussion, witnesses in the case and the accuser(s) are no longer bound to secrecy and the GRB panel, by a three-fourths (3/4) vote of approval, may make public statements about the case.
- (s) When a suspected violation is reported to the GRB Chair by some member of the Caltech community, the Chair will inform this member that the case is being considered and the Dean of Graduate Studies will inform this member of the final disposition of the case.
- (t) The GRB may invite the Caltech community to attend policy meetings which do not involve a suspected violation.

B Examples of Plagiarism

The examples given below should make clear the distinction between dishonest and proper use of source material. If instances occur which these examples do not seem to cover, the student always has recourse to the instructor in his course or any other; very seldom, however, will anything more be needed than his or her own conscience. This material appears in the Harvard University *Handbook of General Education*.

THE SOURCE¹

The importance of the *Second Treatise of Government* printed in this volume is such that without it we should miss some of the familiar features of our own government. It is safe to assert that the much-criticized branch known as the Supreme Court obtained its being as a result of Locke's insistence upon the separation of powers; and that the combination of many powers in the hands of the executive under the New Deal has still to encounter opposition because it is contrary to the principles enunciated therein, the effect of which is not spent, though the relationship may not be consciously traced. Again we see the crystallizing force of Locke's writing. It renders explicit and adapts to the British politics of his day the trend and aim of writers from Languet and Bodin through Hooker and Grotius, to say nothing of the distant ancients Aristotle and the Stoic school of natural law. It sums up magistrally the arguments used through the ages to attack authority ! vested in a single individual, but it does so from the particular point of view engendered by the Revolution of 1688 and is in harmony with the British scene and mental climate of the growing bourgeoisie of that age. Montesquieu and Rousseau, the framers of our own Declaration of Independence, and the statesmen (or should we say merchants and speculators?) who drew up the Constitution have re-echoed its claims for human liberty, for the separation of powers, for the sanctity of private property. In the hands of these it has been the quarry of liberal doctrines; and that it has served the Socialist theory of property based on labor is final proof of its breadth of view.

1. Word-for-Word Plagiarizing

It is not hard to see the importance of the *Second Treatise of Government* to our own democracy. Without it we should miss some of the most familiar features of our own government. It is safe to assert that the much-criticized branch known as the Supreme Court obtained its being as a result of Locke's insistence upon the separation of powers; and that the combination of many powers in the hands of the executive under the New Deal has still to encounter opposition because it is contrary to the principles enunciated therein, the effect of which is not spent, though the relationship may not be consciously traced. The framers of our

¹Charles L. Sherman, **Introduction** to: John Locke, *Treatise of Civil Government and A Letter Concerning Toleration* (Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York; 1937), pp. xii-xiii.

Declaration of Independence and the statesmen who drew up the Constitution have re-echoed its claims for human liberty, for the separation of powers, for the sanctity of private property. All these are marks of the influence of Locke's *Second Treatise* on our own way of life.

In this example, after composing half of a first sentence, the writer copies exactly what is in the original text, leaving out the center section of the paragraph and omitting the names of Montesquieu and Rousseau where he takes up the text again. The last sentence is also the writer's own.

If the writer had enclosed all the copied text in quotation marks and had identified the source in a footnote, he would not have been liable to the charge of plagiarism; a reader might justifiably have felt that the writer's personal contribution to the discussion was not very significant, however.

2. The Mosaic

The crystallizing force of Locke's writing may be seen in the effect his *Second Treatise of Government* had in shaping some of the familiar features of our own government. That much-criticized branch known as the Supreme Court and the combination of many powers in the hands of the executive under the New Deal are modern examples. But even the foundations of our state—the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution—have re-echoed its claims for human liberty, for the separation of powers, and for the sanctity of private property. True, the influence of others is also marked in our Constitution—from the trend and aim of writers like Languet and Bodin, Hooker and Grotius, to say nothing of Aristotle and the Stoic school of natural law; but the fundamental influence is Locke's *Treatise*, the very quarry of liberal doctrines.

Note how the following phrases have been lifted out of the original text and moved into new patterns:

1. crystallizing force of Locke's writing
2. some of the familiar features of our own government
3. much-criticized branch known as the Supreme Court
4. combination of many powers in the hands of the executive under the New Deal
5. have re-echoed its claims for human liberty ... property
6. from the trend and aim ... Grotius
7. to say nothing of Aristotle and ... natural law
8. quarry of liberal doctrines

Unlike Example 1, there is really no way of legitimizing such a procedure. To put every stolen phrase within quotation marks would produce an almost unreadable, and quite worthless, text.

3. The Paraphrase

Paraphrase: Many fundamental aspects of our own government are
Original: Many familiar features of our own government are

apparent in the Second Treatise of Government. One can safely
apparent in the Second Treatise of Government. It is safe to assert

say that the oft-censured Supreme Court really owes its existence
that the much-criticized ... Court obtained its being as a

to the Lockean demand that powers in government be kept separate;
result of Locke's insistence upon the separation of powers;

equally one can say that the allocation of varied and widespread
and that the combination of many powers

authority to the President during the era of the New Deal has
in the hands of the executive under the New Deal has

still to encounter opposition because it is contrary to the principles
still to encounter opposition because it is contrary to the principles

enunciated therein ... Once more it is possible to note the way in
enunciated therein ... Again we see the crystal-

which Locke's writing clarified existing opinion.
izing force of Locke's writing.

The foregoing interlineal presentation shows clearly how the writer has simply traveled along with the original text, substituting approximately equivalent terms except where his understanding fails him, as it does with "crystallizing", or where the ambiguity of the original is too great a tax on his ingenuity for him to proceed, as it is with "to encounter opposition ... consciously traced" in the original.

Such a procedure as the one shown in this example has its uses; it is valuable for the student's own understanding of the passage, for one thing; and it may be valuable for the reader as well. How then, may it properly be used? The procedure is simple. The writer might begin the second sentence with: "As Sherman notes in the introduction to his edition of the Treatise, one can safely say..." and conclude the paraphrased passage with a footnote giving the additional identification necessary. Or he might indicate the exact nature of what he is doing directly in this fashion: "To paraphrase Sherman's comment..." and conclude that also with a footnote indicator.

In point of fact, the source used here does not particularly lend itself to the honest paraphrase, with the exception of that one sentence which the paraphraser

copied without change except for abridgement. The purpose of paraphrase should be to simplify or to throw a new and significant light on a text; it requires much skill if it is to be honestly used and should rarely be resorted to by the student except for the purpose, as was suggested above, of his personal enlightenment.

4. The “Apt” Term:

The *Second Treatise of Government* is a veritable quarry of liberal doctrines. In it the crystallizing force of Locke’s writing is markedly apparent. The cause of human liberty, the principle of separation of powers, and the inviolability of private property—all three major dogmas of American constitutionalism—owe their presence in our Constitution in large part to the remarkable *Treatise* which first appeared around 1685 and was destined to spark, within three years, a revolution in the land of the author’s birth, and ninety years later, another revolution against that land.

Here the writer has not been able to resist the appropriation of two striking terms—“quarry of liberal doctrines” and “crystallizing force”; a perfectly proper use of terms would have required only the addition of a phrase: The Second Treatise of Government is, to use Sherman’s suggestive expression, a “quarry of liberal doctrines.” In it the “crystallizing force”—the term again is Sherman’s—of Locke’s writing is markedly apparent.

Other phrases in the text above—“the cause of human liberty”, “the principle of the separation of powers”, “the inviolability of private property”—are clearly drawn directly from the original source but are so much matters of public domain, so to speak, that no one could reasonably object to their re-use in this fashion.

C Suggestions to Instructors; 3rd Edition - October 1986

A memorandum was issued jointly by the GRB and the BOC to the entire teaching staff early during Fall Quarter 1986. It was based on two previous documents; the first a November 1970 memorandum, “Suggestions to Instructors,” the second an update of the first, issued in Winter Quarter, 1977. The October 1986 memorandum is reproduced below in its entirety. It is based on the previous memoranda with several additions and changes which (it is hoped) clarify some ambiguities. The distribution included all faculty members, graduate students, and any other persons with instructional responsibilities.

Honor System cases have recently arisen when misunderstandings occurred between instructors and students over interpretation of course ground rules. We offer the following suggestions in an attempt to minimize future confusion. As a general guideline, instructors should *explicitly* state what activities are prohibited under their course rules. Students should seek clarification if any course ground rule seems vague or confusing.

HOMEWORK: Unless told otherwise, students may assume that collaboration on homework is permitted and *unrestricted*. This means that, for exam-

ple, students may divide the task of doing a problem set. Thus, a student will actually work only some of the problems and literally *copy* the rest from other students' papers. As this borders on plagiarism, it should be decided whether such collaboration is allowed. If totally or nearly independent work is expected, this fact and the degree of independence should be made explicit.

We strongly advise that collaboration policies be distributed to the students in writing and worded so as not to admit multiple interpretations. For example, the statement "No student shall turn in homework which he does not understand" might lead to different degrees of collaboration. Many students believe that they understand a problem if they can reconstruct it entirely on their own; others "understand" it if they can follow the solution line-by-line with no comprehension of the overall method and no ability to do it again on their own. An example of an unambiguous policy statement is "Students may discuss the problems *verbally*, but no student may look at another student's *written work*, whether the writing is the final paper ready to turn in, intermediate scratch work, or even a single equation. This restriction does not apply to written notes taken during lecture." An unambiguous policy permits students to help one another understand the course material and homework but prohibits the outright copying which can occur when no policy is stated.

TAKE-HOME TESTS: All take-home tests and quizzes should be stapled shut. Invariably, when a test is handed out unstapled, some students see the problems accidentally and gain an unfair advantage over the rest. Some examinations contain heavy line drawings which can easily be seen through the back, even when the exam is properly stapled. Such exams should have an extra blank page at the end to block the drawing, else students who hide the exam in a drawer before taking it might be at a disadvantage with respect to those who see the drawing before taking the test.

If an examination is closed-book, students should be so informed in writing via an item on the exam instruction sheet *which is visible when the exam is stapled*. For open-book exams, the instructor should consider whether all books, past tests, and others' notes are permissible aids and state *which* materials are acceptable. With regard to limited-time exams, it should be decided whether breaks are allowed. If so, the length, nature, spacing, and activity allowed during these breaks should be made known. As a reminder to students, it would be wise to briefly list any restrictions on the cover of the test.

Some professors give full or partial credit for work done after the time limit. Such work is usually separated from that done during the allotted time by a line and appropriate labelling. If this practice is to be allowed, it is essential that it be explained in detail, so that no student will be disadvantaged (especially those who may not be aware of the possibility of credit for overtime work).

IN-CLASS EXAMINATIONS: Proctoring is prohibited as described in Section 8, page 3 of the *Institute Faculty Handbook*. However, it is permissible for instructors or their assistants to appear occasionally and be generally available during an exam to answer questions, if necessary.

PAST ASSIGNMENTS AND TESTS: Most undergraduate houses maintain files of past tests, quizzes, and homework assignments in a given course.

The graduate houses do not maintain house files; however, individual students may have such papers in their possession. Students might also feel tempted to look at previous lab write-ups or essays belonging to their friends. *If the consultation of such materials is forbidden, this should be explicitly stated.* If their usage is permitted, any restrictions as to the extent of this usage, e.g., the outright copying of an old assignment, should be made clear.

GRADING TESTS AND ASSIGNMENTS: Students are not permitted to observe the grading of tests or assignments. To avoid any problems, please do not make these papers readily accessible during this time.

PLAGIARISM: Although students appreciate the meaning and gravity of plagiarism, they may be unsure as to what constitutes plagiarism in a given discipline, as those things which are considered part of the general body of knowledge differ. Most students understand that they must footnote a block of text lifted verbatim from another work; some may not know that other sources of information (e.g. a person's orally communicated ideas) must be cited. Consequently, instructors are encouraged to illustrate with examples any precautions they may give against plagiarism.

LAB REPORTS: Any restrictions as to where and when the work may be done should be clearly explained. After-hours work, working on the write-up at home, the extent of collaboration, if any, and the usage of computational aids, such as computers, should be considered.

TEACHING ASSISTANTS: *In order to be fair to all and avoid confusion, teaching assistants should interpret course rules and requirements in the same manner as the instructor.* Divergence in interpretation in the past has led to unfortunate results and has sometimes been unfair to students. Therefore, it is important that teaching assistants understand what is required of the students and are informed of any changes made in course rules or their interpretation.

SPECIAL POINTS: On occasion, it may be convenient for instructors to place other stipulations on the work done in their courses. (Example: "Students should avoid canned programs and write their own integration routines.") Any stipulations made with regard to course work become incorporated within the Honor System; a violation of these rules can be a violation of the Honor System, and become the concerns of the Board of Control and the Graduate Review Board. Often, too, it is good to remind students that such actions as removing reserve books early or keeping them late are not in keeping with the spirit of the Honor System.

SUSPECTED VIOLATIONS: Faculty, as well as students, share in the responsibility to protect the Honor System. It is to the advantage of all concerned to report strong suspicions. Even if suspicions might be misplaced, it is far better that an innocent person undergo investigation and be acquitted of wrongdoing than remain under a cloud. If a person is guilty, failure to report that person compromises the Honor System. *As the authority to administer the Honor System has been delegated to the student body, it is contrary to Institute policy for instructors to deal with suspected infractions unilaterally.* Examples of unacceptable actions include punitive grade changes or revealing the suspects' identities to any person other than the appropriate Honor Chairman. Such

actions only serve to undermine the Honor System and are detrimental to us all.

If you suspect someone of an Honor System violation, report your suspicions to the BOC Chair (undergraduates) or the GRB Chair (graduate students); take no other action.

The current Institute *Personnel Directory* contains the names and phone numbers of the BOC and GRB Chairs under the heading **Honor System**. Since new individuals take office Spring Quarter, the listings may sometimes be out of date. Consequently, you should contact the office of the Dean of Students to find the current BOC Chair, and the office of the Dean of Graduate Studies for assistance in locating the current GRB Chair.

D Grievance Committee Procedures

To resolve problems which do not fall within the jurisdiction of the Honor System, students are referred to the Grievance Procedure. For graduate students, grievances occasionally arise out of relationships with other persons or Institute organizations. Examples might include personal or interdepartmental conflicts which inhibit performance of research, or unresolved difficulties with a campus department (e.g. Student Accounting). To Caltech's credit, these problems seldom occur. The above list is a partial sampling of the possible rare instances when a student may need to seek assistance under the Grievance Procedure. In general, Grievance Procedure problems involve either a violation of the Honor Code by a member of the faculty or staff, or a complaint that is not about an unfair advantage.

If you have a grievance similar to those mentioned above, your first step should be to discuss the problem with either the Institute Human Relations Advisor or the Vice-President for Student Affairs.

Student Grievances

There are at Caltech a variety of routes, most of them informal, by which student complaints are brought to consideration and resolution. These routes normally depend on the nature of the complaint. In academic matters, for example, they begin with teacher-student conversations and extend to the Deans, the Division Chairmen, the Registrar, and various committees having faculty and student members. The Institute Human Relations Advisor acts as ombudsman for complaints involving interpersonal conflicts. Undergraduate housing matters relate primarily to the house government organizations, and to the Resident Associates and the Master of Student Houses. The Dean of Graduate Studies can be of assistance in graduate student matters. The Graduate Student Council and the Associated Students of Caltech may become responsibly involved in important complaints. Sometimes ad-hoc groups are formed to consider and make recommendations in particular areas.

The Human Relations Advisor and Vice-President for Student Affairs act as ombudsmen for student grievances and can often refer a student to the right part of the Caltech bureaucracy for prompt, informal resolution of a problem. If the student is dissatisfied with the results of the informal routes, then the formal Grievance Procedure, which requires convening a Grievance Committee, is invoked. The Grievance Procedure is intended to deal with complaints for which reasonable efforts by the available informal routes have not resolved the problem to your satisfaction.

Student Grievance Procedure for the California Institute of Technology

It is the policy of the Institute to establish and maintain the necessary atmosphere for a sound relationship with its students. As a vital part of this program, students must have the opportunity to submit grievances arising from this relationship. The Institute provides a Grievance Procedure designed to give matters that the student cannot informally resolve careful consideration and bring them to a fair and speedy resolution.

Note: The following rules have not been revised since 1979. You are advised to check with either the Human Relations Advisor or the Vice-President for Student Affairs for an updated Procedure if your case goes to a formal hearing.

1. General

- a. The Grievance Committee shall consist of two members from each of the following four categories: undergraduates, graduate students, faculty, and administration. They are to be appointed (together with at least two alternates from each category) respectively by the ASCIT Board of Directors, the Graduate Student Council, the Chairman of the Faculty, and the President of the Institute.
- b. The President of the Institute shall also appoint a chairperson, who shall be non-voting except in the case of a tie, from among persons recommended by the Committee.
- c. No member shall sit in judgement on a case in which the member was in any way personally involved.
- d. The grievant is entitled to challenge one or more members of the Committee with respect to impartiality. The Chairperson will rule on such challenges. In addition, the grievant shall be entitled to challenge any one member peremptorily.
- e. Members who are removed or disqualified, or are unable to serve, will be replaced by the next alternate in the same category. No member of the Committee shall be removed or replaced once Committee proceedings have begun.
- f. The Chairperson of the Board of Control, the Chairperson of the Graduate Review Board, the Deans of Students and Graduate Studies, and

the Institute General Counsel shall be available for consultation by the Committee unless otherwise disqualified.

- g. All proceedings of the Committee shall be conducted in private and kept confidential, unless the grievant chooses to make any portion of the case public. In this event, the Chairperson of the Committee is entitled, upon consultation with the members of the Committee and, if a final decision has been made, with the President, to respond to statements made by the grievant. Such a reply would come only from the entire official body; Committee members, witnesses, consultants and all others involved in the proceedings would still be expected to respect the confidentiality of the proceedings.
- h. A quorum for a meeting and for voting shall consist of six voting members, including at least one member from each category. All votes shall be determined by a majority of those present and voting.
- i. Unless the Committee decides otherwise, no tape recordings or detailed transcripts will be made of Committee meetings. However, a brief summary will be made for the record.
- j. A grievant's waiver or failure to take advantage of any important right (such as the right to be present and participate in a hearing) under the Grievance Procedure shall be recorded.
- k. The Grievance Committee will not hear cases which fall under the jurisdiction of the Honor System, unless specifically requested to do so by the President of the Institute. In other words, the grievant may not normally bring a case to the Grievance Committee which should be considered by the Board of Control or the Graduate Review Board.

2. Grievance Procedure

- a. Step One; Determining Need for the Grievance Procedure:
 - i. The Vice President for Student Affairs will act as ombudsman for student grievances, except in the case when the grievance is against the Vice President. In such cases, the Chairperson of the Grievance Committee will act as ombudsman.
 - ii. Grievances should be submitted to the ombudsman promptly. Unless there are extenuating circumstances, grievances shall be submitted within 14 calendar days after the student knew, or by reasonable diligence should have known, of the condition on which the grievance is based.
 - iii. The ombudsman shall refer the grievant to the appropriate person within the administration. In the case of graduate students, referral can be to the Dean of Graduate Studies or the Divisional offices.

- iv. The ombudsman shall request the person to whom the case is referred to submit a written report on the grievance and its resolution, if any, to the ombudsman within 10 calendar days after the matter is referred.
 - v. If the ombudsman is not satisfied with the resolution of the case, the ombudsman may refer the matter to other appropriate persons in a like manner until satisfied with the resolution of the case or until he or she determines that it can not be resolved short of referral to the Grievance Committee. When either of these situations occurs, and in any event within 30 days after the grievance is submitted, the ombudsman will notify the grievant of the results in writing.
- b. Step Two; Operations of Grievance Committee:
- i. If the grievant is dissatisfied with the results of the ombudsman's efforts to resolve the matter, the grievant may appeal the case to the Grievance Committee by filing a written notice of appeal with the ombudsman within seven calendar days after having received the ombudsman's written notice of the disposition of the grievance. The ombudsman will promptly submit the notice of appeal and all other relevant written documents to the Chairperson of the Committee.
 - ii. The Chairperson of the Committee will then provide copies of the appeal and such relevant documents to each member of the Committee.
 - iii. The Committee will convene at a time agreeable to the student within seven calendar days after the Committee receives the notice of appeal.
 - iv. The student may request the presence of a fellow student or Institute faculty or staff member (who is not an attorney) to assist in the presentation of the appeal.
 - v. The student and others directly involved in the grievance have the right to hear all information presented orally to the Committee and receive all relevant documents considered by the Committee. Before the hearing, the student and the others directly involved all shall have
 - (a) the opportunity to read the documents or papers which will be submitted and to review a list of the witnesses who may be called upon to present facts and
 - (b) the right to review any written statements of witnesses which may be presented concerning the evidence.
 - vi. The student is permitted to present information and relevant documents subject to the control of the Chairperson as to reasonableness of the method and length of the presentation.

- vii. The student is also allowed to request the Chairperson to call other persons to present information or to call for other papers and documents that the Chairperson considers relevant as long as such requests will not unnecessarily prolong the hearing or pose an undue burden.
- viii. Both the student and the others directly involved are permitted to submit written questions to the Committee on information presented by witnesses and on documents considered by the Committee. Both the student and the others involved may also ask questions when authorized by the Chairperson. The Chairperson will not permit formal cross-examination and will control the extent and manner of the questioning.
- ix. The Committee, upon reaching a conclusion, shall present a summary of the issues, conclusions, and recommendations for action to the President of the Institute for final decision.
- x. The grievant is entitled to submit a written statement or report on the Committee proceedings for inclusion in the file of the case.
- xi. The decision of the President shall be final. The Chairperson of the Committee shall inform all parties of the action taken.