The mission of the MBA Judicial Board is to instill a sense of ethical behavior through principled self-governance. Towards this end, the board will apply programmatic sanctions to Tippie MBA students who have committed academic misconduct. In addition, the Board will review and make recommendations as to the appropriateness of initial academic sanctions. The Judicial Board’s procedures are based on the fundamental principles of transparency, fairness, and efficiency. Student appeals to the Board’s decisions proceed first to the Assistant Dean and Associate Dean of the Tippie School of Management and second through the University Provost. To provide sufficient education and notice, the Board will make a presentation to each year’s incoming MBA class during IMPACT week.

Board Makeup
- Five student members with voting power for “jury-by-peers”
  - Three elected members
    - MBA Association President
    - Tippie Leadership Association President
    - Graduate Global Business Association President
  - Two members appointed by Tippie School of Management utilizing an application process
    - Three student alternates – Business for a Better World President, MBAA Vice-President, Tippie Leadership Association Vice-President
- Two non-voting faculty/staff members
  - One faculty member to be chosen by the Board and approved by the Senior Associate Dean of the Tippie College of Business
  - One Tippie School of Management staff member chosen by the Assistant Dean of the Tippie School of Management in consultation with the MBA Program Committee
- The Judicial Board, once assembled, will appoint a Board Chairman and Records Keeper from among themselves by a majority vote. If either of these appointees cannot hear a case due to a conflict of interest, the alternates along with the remaining board members will choose an ad hoc Chairman and Records keeper for that particular case.

Student Member
- The three elected student members serve one-year terms from January to January.
- The two appointed student members serve terms from September to May.
- At least one appointed member must be a second year MBA student. The second appointed member may be a first or second year student.
- Elections for organization officers will occur in November.
- The application process for the two Tippie School of Management selected members should be initiated early in the fall semester.
- Student members may not hear any case in which they are directly involved.

Faculty Member
- The Judicial Board will invite one primary faculty member and three alternate faculty members from a minimum of two academic departments to serve on the judicial board.
- The primary faculty member cannot hear cases in which he/she is directly involved or which involves a faculty member in his/her department (eg. Finance, Marketing, Accounting, etc.). If there is a conflict of interest in a specific case, the primary faculty member must relinquish his/her seat to a faculty alternate. The alternates may also substitute for the primary faculty member on an ad hoc basis at the request of the primary faculty member.
- Faculty member and alternates serve two-year terms that may be renewed to ensure continuity.
Staff Member
- The Assistant Dean of the Tippie School of Management, in consultation with the MBA Program Committee, will appoint a staff member to a two-year term that may be renewed.

Authority of Judicial Board
- A decision by the Judicial Board not to impose programmatic sanctions holds absolute authority and cannot be overturned.
- The accused may appeal Judicial Board sanctions to the Assistant and Associate Deans of the Tippie School of Management. If the deans overrule a guilty verdict, either to reduce the severity of the sanction or to absolve the student of any wrongdoing, the deans must provide a written statement to the Board explaining his/her decision.
- The Board will provide a written justification for its opinion and the vote count to the Tippie School of Management Assistant Dean and the accused student.

Removal of Board Member
- A Board member can be removed from the Board due to unprofessional behavior within the academic setting as well as breach of confidence. The removal will occur if a majority of the remaining board members vote to remove.
Explanatory Note

These guidelines provide a weighting system in which strikes are cumulative. There are three categories of offenses; minor, serious, and egregious. Each category of offense carries a different weight. When a student has accumulated three strikes the Judicial Board will recommend expulsion. For example, if a student receives three minor violations, the student has three strikes. Moreover, if a student has one minor violation and one serious violation, the student has three strikes. Finally, if a student has one egregious violation, the student has three strikes.

The severity of any given violation (minor, serious or egregious), and whether or not certain activities constitute violations will be determined based on precedent established by the Judicial Board.

**Category I (Minor Violations):** Category I violations typically result in a count of one strike and a written warning.

**Category II (Serious Violations):** Category II violations typically result in a count of two strikes, a written reprimand and probation.

**Category III (Egregious Violations):** Category III violations typically result in a count of three strikes and expulsion.

**Non-Exhaustive List of Punishable Offenses**

1. **Cheating** includes but is not limited to:
   - unauthorized use of notes, texts, or other aids during a test or quiz
   - copying the work of others and/or allowing others to view your answers or copy your work during a test, quiz or on homework
   - continuing to work on an exam after time is called
   - allowing other parties to assist in the completion of your test, quiz, homework, paper, or project when not permitted

2. **Plagiarism** includes but is not limited to:
   - presenting the work of others without proper acknowledgement
   - claiming the words and ideas of another as one’s own
   - failure to properly cite and specifically credit the source of both text and web materials in papers, projects, or other assignments
   - copying of source codes, graphs, programs, and spreadsheets
   - copying answer keys and solution manuals without the authorization of the course instructor

3. **Unauthorized Collaboration** includes but is not limited to:
   - working with other students on projects or assignments without authorization from the course instructor

   *Instructors are expected to specify in writing on the assignment or the syllabus the amount of collaboration that is allowed.*
4. Obtaining an Unfair Advantage includes but is not limited to:
   - stealing, reproducing, circulating, or otherwise gaining access to examination materials prior to the time authorized by an instructor
   - retaining, possessing, using or circulating previous given examination materials, when those materials are to be returned to the instructor
   - intentionally obstructing or interfering with another student’s academic work, or otherwise undertaking activity with the purpose of creating or obtaining an unfair academic advantage over students’ academic work

5. Forgery includes but is not limited to:
   - altering a score, grade, schedule change on an academic record
   - forging the signature of an instructor or another student without proper authorization

6. Facilitating Academic Dishonesty includes but is not limited to:
   - helping or attempting to help another individual commit an act of academic dishonesty

7. Resume Misrepresentation includes but is not limited to:
   - providing false information on your resume including work history, academic performance, or leadership activities

Failure to Report
A student’s failure to report, while strongly discouraged, in not a punishable offense under the guidelines. However, if, during the course of an investigation, it becomes obvious that an individual knew of cheating or a plan to cheat or plagiarize and did not report it, the judicial board may consider how that fact reflects on that individual’s credibility and/or character.

Factors that may justify upward or downward departures within the guidelines: The accused student’s intent; the accused student’s character; The social, academic, economic, or personal impact of the alleged offense.