

PART ONE: MATTERS OF CONDUCT AND ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

I. Code of General Conduct

All students of Biomedical Graduate Studies (BGS) must conduct themselves at all times in a mature and responsible manner. The rights and property of all persons are to be respected regardless of time or place. For dual degree students (MD-PhD, VMD-PhD), or graduate students who conduct research in a clinical venue, this also includes compliance with rules, procedures and accepted practices in the clinical setting.

In addition, BGS students must comply with the University's code of general conduct and other University policies related to student conduct that appear in The Penn Book, Policies and Procedures Handbook of the University of Pennsylvania. These policies include, but are not limited to, policies on sexual harassment, acquaintance rape and sexual violence, open expression, drug and alcohol usage, and the drug-free workplace. The judicial charter contained within that document is not applicable to BGS students. Rather, Part Two of this document contains the Charter of Biomedical Graduate Studies Student Judicial System which is applicable to graduate and dual degree students within BGS.

II. Code of Academic Integrity

The most fundamental value of any academic community is intellectual honesty; accordingly, all academic communities rely upon the integrity of each and every member. Students are responsible not only for adhering to the highest standards of truth and honesty but also for upholding the principles and spirit of the following Code.

Violations of this Code include but are not limited to the following acts:

- A. Cheating:* using or attempting to use unauthorized assistance, material or study aids in examinations or any other academic work, or preventing, or attempting to prevent another from using authorized assistance, material, or study aids.
- B. Plagiarism:* using the ideas, data or language of another without specific and proper acknowledgment.
- C. Fabrication:* submitting contrived or altered information in any academic exercise.
- D. Multiple Submission:* submitting, without prior permission, any work submitted to fulfill another academic requirement.
- E. Misrepresentation of Academic Records:* misrepresenting or tampering with or attempting to tamper with any portion of one's own or any other person's transcripts or academic record, either before or after coming to the University of Pennsylvania.

F. Facilitating Academic Dishonesty: knowingly helping or attempting to help another violate provisions of this Code.

G. Unfair Advantage: attempting to gain unauthorized advantage over fellow students in an academic exercise.

III. Code of Clinical Conduct

The relationship of modern biomedical research to the clinical setting may place BGS students in direct contact with patients, patient medical records, or health care workers. BGS students must behave with paramount concern for patients' welfare and with respect for the rights of patients. The expectations of BGS students' conduct in the clinical setting include the following:

- A. adherence to appropriate standards of behavior in the presence of patients;*
- B. adherence to appropriate standards of confidentiality with respect to information about patients;*
- C. honesty in interactions with clinical colleagues and in recordkeeping;*
- D. respect for the limits of responsibility and activity set forth by supervisors;*
- E. appropriate interactions with colleagues and co-workers.*

PART TWO: CHARTER OF THE BIOMEDICAL GRADUATE STUDIES STUDENT JUDICIAL SYSTEM

I. Statement of Purpose

The BGS Student Judicial System exists to investigate and resolve alleged violations by graduate students of BGS and University rules, regulations and policies. The system provides for notice of charges, opportunity for settlement or hearing, judgment by BGS community members, and the right to appeal, thus ensuring fundamental fairness to all parties involved.

Persons involved in a dispute may avail themselves of advice from other members of the BGS and University communities including the Graduate Group Chair, the Vice Provost for Graduate Education, the School of Medicine's or the University's Ombudsman, and other persons who can assist in particular situations, to help achieve reconciliation. If the parties fail to reach an agreement, the complainant may file a formal complaint with the Director of BGS, the Graduate Group Chair, and/or the appropriate administrative Dean/Director. This includes: The Dean of the School of Medicine, the Dean of the School of Veterinary Medicine, the Dean of the School of Dental Medicine, the Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences, the Director of the Wistar Institute, and/or the Director of the Institute for Cancer Research.

II. The BGS Student Judicial Panels

A. Hearing Panels

The Director of BGS will establish Hearing Panels, as necessary, to hear complaints of alleged violations. The Hearing Panels will consist of five members each, drawing on the membership of the BGS Advisory Committee (excluding ex-officio members). Each Panel shall include one graduate student (nominated by the Biomedical Advisory Committee) and three faculty members, one of whom shall be the respondent's Graduate Group Chair.

The Director of BGS will serve as the Chair of the Hearing Panel (CHP) unless disqualified by a conflict of interest. The Director will select one faculty member to serve as Co-Chair. If it is not possible to form a full Panel from the available members of the Advisory Committee, additional members will be selected by the Director from faculty who have previously served on the Advisory Committee, or who serve on the Biomedical Curriculum/Academic Standards Committee or as course directors.

B. Appellate Panels

Appellate Panels will be constituted in the same way as initial Hearing Panels, except that members, including the Director, may not have served on the original Hearing Panel. If it is not possible to form a full Appellate Panel from the members of the Advisory Committee who did not serve on the original Panel, additional members will be selected

by the Director from faculty who have previously served on the Advisory Committee, or who serve on the Biomedical Curriculum/Academic Standards Committee or as course directors.

III. Staff

A. Director of BGS

1. The Director of BGS will serve as the judicial administrator and shall administer this Charter and preside as Chair of each Hearing Panel (CHP). If the Director cannot be available for a hearing, the Co-Chair will serve as the judicial administrator. If neither the Director nor Co-Chair can serve, or if they find it necessary to disqualify themselves from a particular case, the Director shall appoint another faculty member of the Advisory Committee to serve as CHP for the particular case.
2. Upon request, the Director shall refer a complainant or respondent to an advisor. The Medical School or University Ombudsman may also assist the student in identifying an advisor. Potential advisors include any member of the University community.
3. The Director may advise respondents, complainants and their advisors on procedural matters.
4. Upon a showing of good cause by the Inquiry Officer (IO), complainant, respondent, or another involved party, the Director may grant a reasonable extension of any time limit set forth herein.

B. Chair of Hearing Panel (CHP)

The CHP is responsible for overseeing the procedural integrity and decorum of the Hearing Panel. She or he shall, for example, consider and resolve prehearing challenges to jurisdiction or procedures; alert the Hearing Panel to procedural consequences of its actions; advise the Hearing Panel of inconsistencies between the demands of fairness and its actions at any point in the proceedings; and consult as appropriate with faculty members and others about procedural issues and convey their advice, together with the CHP's recommendations, to the Hearing Panel.

C. Inquiry Officer

The Director of BGS shall appoint, for each case, an Inquiry Officer (IO) who is a member of Biomedical Graduate Studies and of the University of Pennsylvania Standing Faculty and whose duties under this Charter shall include assisting BGS in investigating complaints against students under the regulations of BGS and the University; helping determine whether charges against students should be brought before a Hearing Panel and/or before other bodies; resolving by agreement charges against students (with the

approval of the Director, as provided herein); presenting information supporting charges in hearings before the Hearing Panel; testifying as a fact witness before the Hearing Panel; and assisting in ensuring that agreements and sanctions are enforced.

A faculty member requested by the Director to serve as an IO should disqualify himself or herself from investigating a case if he or she believes in good faith that, as a result of information previously acquired about the case or individuals involved in it, the nature of the alleged violation, or any other cause, his or her capacity for conducting an impartial investigation is, or to reasonable members of the community may appear to be, impaired.

IV. Procedures

The resolution of a complaint shall take place in separate, distinct stages, as outlined in this section (see flow chart, Appendix B). These stages are: the Complaint and Subsequent Investigation by the IO, see IV.A.; the Settlement Stage, see IV.B.; and, the Hearing Stage, see IV.C.

A. The Complaint and Investigation

1. Any student, faculty member or staff member who believes that a student has violated a School or University rule may file a complaint with the Director of BGS or any other appropriate administrative official, such as the Graduate Group Chair, or the Dean of the School of Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Dental Medicine or Arts and Sciences. Complaints made to others should be referred to the Director. Informal resolution may be reached at any point in the process prior to formal proceedings.

Within a reasonably prompt time after the filing of a complaint, and if informal resolution has not been achieved, the Director shall inform the appropriate administrative Dean, the Vice Provost for Graduate Education, the Graduate Group Chair, the Director of the Office of Student Conduct, the IO who has been appointed by the Director for the particular case, the respondent and the complainant in writing of the complaint. The written notice shall also include a copy of this Charter, a copy of the regulations, rules, or policies alleged to have been violated, and a summary of the rights and responsibilities of those involved in the process (complainant, respondent, witnesses and advisors), including the right of the respondent and witnesses to be assisted throughout the process by an advisor, and the means for obtaining such an advisor, as defined in this Charter, and the responsibility to observe confidentiality.

2. The IO shall investigate complaints within the jurisdiction of the Hearing Panel and shall decide if there is reasonable cause to believe that an offense has been committed. The IO shall make the determination of reasonable cause ordinarily after conducting a preliminary investigation. The IO may interview any appropriate witness, including a potential respondent and witnesses suggested by a potential respondent, but shall not do so until the witness has been furnished with a summary of the rights and

responsibilities of those involved in the process.

3. In light of evidence uncovered by the investigation, the IO may suggest dismissing charges as unfounded, adding charges beyond the scope of the original complaint, and adding additional students as respondents.
4. BGS may proceed under this Charter regardless of possible or pending civil or criminal claims arising out of the same or other events. If BGS defers proceeding with judicial charges pending resolution of a civil or criminal tribunal, then BGS may subsequently proceed under the Charter irrespective of the time provisions set forth in the Charter.
5. At any time after the filing of a complaint, the IO may recommend that the Director place a "Judicial Hold" on the academic records of a respondent for the purpose of preserving the status quo pending the outcome of proceedings under this Charter. When reasonably possible a respondent shall be given an opportunity to comment on a proposed Judicial Hold prior to its institution and otherwise shall be given that opportunity promptly thereafter. The Director shall review any comments of the respondent and decide upon the propriety of a Judicial Hold. The IO and the Director shall expedite the hearing of charges against a respondent whose academic records have been placed on Judicial Hold if the respondent so requests. A Judicial Hold may prevent, among other things, registration, the release of transcripts, and the awarding of a diploma.

B. Settlement

A settlement is an agreement among the Director, the appropriate administrative Dean and the respondent regarding the outcome of an alleged violation of one of the conduct codes described in Part One of this document.

1. During all settlement discussions, the respondent has the right to have an advisor present who is a member of the University community.
2. Reasonable efforts may be made to consult with a complainant about terms of settlement before the proposed terms are made final; however, failure to consult with the complainant does not invalidate the settlement.
3. The Director and the appropriate administrative Dean shall approve the terms of all proposed settlements before they take effect. The terms of the proposed settlements shall include a decision regarding whether the sanction should appear in the transcript of the respondent, and, if so, for how long, or in the Dean's letter of recommendation for postgraduate training.
4. All sanctions allowed under Section VI. A. of this Charter are available as part of a settlement.

5. Settlement may occur at any time after a complaint has been filed but prior to the disposition of a final appeal, if any. Settlements shall be recorded in writing, signed by the IO, the Director, the appropriate administrative Dean and the respondent, who shall waive further proceedings under the Charter.

6. Data on the pattern of sanctions imposed in any prior similar cases which were settled or decided within the past three years shall be made available by the IO to the respondent during the settlement discussions. The identities of the respondents in these prior cases shall be scrupulously protected.

C. Procedures for Hearing

1. Preliminary Procedures

a. The Panels that hear cases shall meet as needed when convened by the CHP to hear cases brought before them.

b. The CHP shall notify the complainant, respondent, and witnesses by hand delivery or certified mail, return-receipt requested, of the hearing place, time and date, at least ten days before the hearing date. This notice shall also contain the names of the panel members assigned to hear the case. If this notice is given by mail, it shall be deemed to be effective when mailed.

c. Within a reasonable time and in any case not less than two days before the hearing, the IO, the complainant, and the respondent shall exchange among themselves and with the CHP copies of the exhibits to be introduced, the names to be called and a brief summary of the objectives of the testimony. In exceptional circumstances, when a witness or exhibit becomes known or available immediately before the hearing, the CHP may, at his or her discretion, admit the witness or exhibit or reschedule the hearing. The CHP shall promptly provide members of the Panel with the names of the complainant, the respondent, and witnesses.

d. If a party anticipates that a key witness will be unavailable for a hearing, the party may preserve the testimony of the witness on tape and introduce it as evidence at the hearing. All interested parties, including the IO, the CHP, the complainant and the respondent, must be notified in advance of the time, place and date of the testimony to be taped.

e. Upon receiving a written request by any party, the CHP may expedite proceedings involving graduating students or students who are about to take a leave of absence or study elsewhere.

2. Disqualification of Panel Members

a. Members of a Hearing Panel shall disqualify themselves from hearing a case if they believe in good faith that, as a result of information previously acquired about the case or individuals involved in it, the nature of the alleged violation, or any other cause, their capacity for making an impartial judgment upon the evidence is, or to reasonable members of the community may appear to be, impaired. Members should not disqualify themselves for any other reason. Mere service on another panel involving the same respondent is not grounds for disqualification.

b. A respondent or complainant may object for specific cause to any Panel member scheduled to hear the case; any existing objection must be written and received by the CHP at least five days before the hearing. The conduct of a Panel member during a case shall not be grounds for disqualification but may be considered on appeal. Upon ruling that a challenge is valid, the Director, after notifying the respondent, complainant, and the IO, shall replace the challenged member with another from the same category. A faculty member shall be replaced by an alternate faculty member, and a student member shall be replaced by an alternate student member.

c. A respondent or complainant may object for good cause to the replacement member within a reasonably prompt time of the member's appointment, but no later than the beginning of the hearing. The Director shall rule upon the objection.

3. Conduct of Hearings

a. All hearings shall be held in appropriate University facilities designated by the CHP and shall be private unless both the respondent and complainant request an open hearing in writing to the CHP. The CHP may in any case limit attendance at a hearing to ensure fair and orderly proceedings.

b. The CHP shall preside over all hearings but he or she shall not vote with the Panel on either a verdict or appropriate sanctions.

c. The responsibility of the IO at the hearing is to present relevant evidence supporting the charges.

d. All hearings shall be conducted in such a manner as to permit the Panel to achieve substantial justice. Panel members have the right to question all individuals providing testimony. The appropriateness of questions is subject to approval of the CHP. Participants and observers shall conduct themselves in accordance with these objectives.

e. Formal rules of evidence shall not apply. Evidence, including hearsay evidence, shall be admitted if it is relevant and not unduly repetitious, and is the sort of evidence on which responsible persons are accustomed to rely in the conduct of serious affairs.

- f. The respondent and the complainant may petition the CHP to question witnesses in order to clarify the testimony.
- g. No evidence other than that received at the hearing shall be considered by the Panel.
- h. The Panel may proceed to hear evidence against a respondent in his or her absence, upon proof by the CHP that the required notice was provided.

4. Advisors

- a. At each stage of the procedures provided by this Charter, a respondent, a complainant (and a witness if he or she is being subjected to sanctions under IV.C.6.b) may be assisted by an advisor who is a member of the University community (student, faculty or staff). Such an advisor may not, however, question witnesses or address a Panel except as provided below with respect to advisors generally.
- b. During the hearing, the advisor may consult with his or her advisee, but, unless granted permission to do so by the CHP, may not question witnesses or address the Panel, except that an advisor may make a summary statement to the Panel before it begins private deliberations. The time allowed for such summary shall be set by the CHP. Permission to an advisor to question witnesses or to address the Panel may be withdrawn.
- c. Any advisor who refuses, or repeatedly fails, to abide by the procedures of this Charter or rulings in the case may, after due warning, be disqualified from continuing to serve by vote of a majority of the Panel, which decision shall be subject to immediate review by the Director. In the event the disqualification is upheld by the Director, the Panel may (but need not) proceed in the absence of a replacement advisor. Any person who is disqualified from serving as an advisor, whether or not a member of the University community, shall be ineligible again to serve as an advisor for a period of two years.

5. Decisions of the Hearing Panel

- a. The Hearing Panel's deliberations shall be divided into two separate stages:
 - (i) determination of guilt or innocence; and, if guilt is determined,
 - (ii) recommendation of a sanction to the Director of BGS and the appropriate administrative Dean
- b. The Hearing Panel shall presume a respondent innocent until proven guilty by a preponderance of the evidence.

- c. All decisions shall require a majority vote of the Hearing Panel.
- d. As soon as possible after conclusion of the hearing, and in all events within ten days, the Hearing Panel shall present its written opinion, including findings of fact, and the Panel's conclusions therefrom, to the respondent, the complainant, the IO, the Director of BGS and the appropriate administrative Dean.
- e. If innocence is determined, all records regarding the charges against the student will be destroyed.

6. Failure to Appear or Cooperate

a. Cooperation

A fair, conclusive adjudication of a dispute under this Charter depends on the cooperation of all involved persons, including complainants, respondents, and witnesses. Therefore, all community members who may be interviewed are obliged to provide honest, complete statements to the IO and to the Hearing Panel in order that disputes may be equitably resolved as quickly as possible.

b. Sanctions

- (i) The Hearing Panel may recommend to the Director of BGS that any reasonable and appropriate sanction authorized by this Charter be imposed upon a student who is a complainant, respondent or witness and who fails, without good cause, to appear for a hearing after receiving notice thereof or fails, without good cause, to cooperate with the investigation of the IO. However, a witness may not be required to incriminate her or himself.
- (ii) A student who receives a sanction under this section may, within ten days, file a petition with the Director for removal of the sanction or for a hearing under this Charter on the propriety of the discipline. The petition shall state the reasons for the student's failure to appear or cooperate. The Panel that recommended the sanction, or as many members as are available, shall rule on the petition, considering (among other relevant factors) the reason for student's failure to appear for the hearing or cooperate with the IO.
- (iii) A hearing, if granted, shall be conducted in accordance with the procedures contained in this part IV.C.

V. Temporary Sanctions Pending Hearing

If a student's presence is deemed to be a potential threat to order, health, safety or to patient care, the Director of BGS, together with the appropriate administrative Dean,

may take any action which is deemed appropriate, including placing the student on temporary leave of absence pending a hearing of charges. The Director shall consult with persons of appropriate expertise and, when reasonably possible, provide the student with an opportunity to be heard, before making such a decision. Such a decision shall in all cases be subject to prompt review by the Director at the student's request. Any student placed on temporary leave of absence shall not be liable for tuition or fees attributable to the period of leave.

At the student's request, and if adequate information is available upon investigation by the IO, the IO and the Director shall expedite the hearing of charges against a student placed on temporary leave of absence.

VI. Sanctions

If the Panel finds that a student has violated School or University rules and regulations, it shall recommend to the Director of BGS an appropriate sanction. Before the Panel considers a sanction, the Inquiry Officer shall inform the Panel of any previous findings of guilt under this charter committed by the respondent and the sanctions, if any, that were imposed in those cases. This includes cases that were decided by Hearing Boards and settlements. Data on the pattern of sanctions imposed in any prior similar cases which were settled or decided in the past three years shall also be made available to the Panel at this time.

A. Available Sanctions

The Panel, acting under Part IV, may recommend to the Director of BGS that he or she impose any reasonable sanction against a respondent, including, but not limited to, warning, reprimand, fine, restitution, disciplinary probation for a specified period, withdrawal of privileges, a period of mandatory service to the University community, indefinite probation (i.e., probation whenever and as long as the respondent is a full or part-time student at the University), term suspension (ordinarily not to exceed two years), or indefinite suspension without automatic right of readmission. If the Panel recommends the sanction of dismissal, the Director, in consultation with the Graduate Group Chair and appropriate administrative Dean, may impose that sanction. The Panel, acting under Part IV, shall recommend and the Director shall decide whether the sanction should appear on the transcript of any individual respondent, and, if so, for how long, or on the dean's letter of recommendation for postgraduate training.

The respondent shall be informed in writing of any sanction that will be imposed, including whether or not the sanction will appear on his or her transcript, and, if so, for how long.

B. Enforcement

The Director of BGS shall ensure that sanctions are enforced. No sanctions shall be enforced until the appeal process is completed.

C. Grading

After the imposition of sanctions, a faculty member involved in an academic integrity matter will be informed of the outcome of the disciplinary proceedings. The faculty member may or may not then decide to alter the grade he or she originally gave to the student. If the student has been found not to be responsible for an academic integrity violation, the instructor should assign a grade (which may differ from the grade originally assigned) based on the student's academic performance in the course. If the student has been found responsible for an academic integrity violation, the instructor may assign any grade the instructor deems appropriate. In the event that the student believes the final grade is unfair or fails to take account of the outcome of the disciplinary proceeding, the student may appeal the grade through the Director of BGS and Appellate Panel.

VII. Appeals

A. Jurisdiction

The Appellate Panel shall have exclusive jurisdiction to decide appeals from decisions by a Hearing Panel.

B. Procedures

1. A respondent must submit any appeal to the Director of BGS, in writing, within fourteen days of the sending of the decision; the appeal shall state in detail the specific ground upon which it is based, and shall attach a copy of the charge and the decision.
2. Upon receipt of an appeal, the Director shall establish an Appellate Panel and shall provide it with any exhibits considered by the Hearing Panel in reaching its decision.
3. The Appellate Panel shall review the appeal as expeditiously as possible. Upon request of the IO, the complainant or the respondent, or upon their own motion, the Appellate Panel may hear oral argument.
4. The Appellate Panel shall issue its decision reasonably promptly after it reviews an appeal.

C. Scope of Review

1. Appellate review shall be limited to material and prejudicial procedural error, error in the interpretation or application of the Charter, and the severity of sanctions. Findings of fact may be reversed only if those findings are unsupported by substantial evidence.

2. Upon finding error, or that the facts were not supported by substantial evidence, the Appellate Panel may rescind or reverse the decision, or return the case for a new hearing to a Hearing Panel that did not originally hear the case.

D. New Evidence

1. Upon the discovery of new and material evidence, the respondent may petition the Hearing Panel for a new hearing by filing a written request with the Director stating the evidence to be presented and the reason for the failure to present the evidence initially. The Director shall furnish a copy of the petition to the other parties, who may respond in writing.

2. If the Director concludes that it is reasonably possible that the new evidence would alter the original Panel's judgments, then the original Panel, or as many members as are available, shall rule on the petition, considering (among other relevant factors) the reason for the respondent's complainant's or IO's inability to discover or present the evidence initially and the likely effect of the omission upon the original decision.

3. A new hearing, if granted, shall be before the original Panel and shall be limited to the new and material evidence.

VIII. Confidentiality of Records and Proceedings

The identity of individuals in particular cases before the Director, the IO, the BGS Hearing Panel or the Appellate Panel, and all files and testimony, are confidential, in accordance with University guidelines concerning the confidentiality of student records pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, as amended. All members of the University community shall respect the confidentiality of judicial records and proceedings, mindful of the unfairness that can result from selective disclosures, partisan representations, and the inability to respond to such disclosures and representations. Failure to observe the requirement of confidentiality by a member of the University community, other than a respondent, who is involved in a case in whatever capacity, shall constitute a violation of University rules and subject the individual to the appropriate procedures for dealing with such violation.

When guilt is finally determined, the Dean of the School of Medicine, the Vice Provost for Graduate Education, the Director of the Office of Student Conduct, and any other appropriate administrative Dean shall be informed and the record of the case shall be made available to them.

Appendix: Definitions

1. Administrative Dean/Director: For all prethesis students, the sole administrative Dean

is the Dean of the School of Medicine. The appropriate administrative Dean/Director for thesis level students includes both the Dean of the School of Medicine and the Dean or Director of the School or Institute of the faculty research mentor. The administrative Dean/Director must be notified of all alleged cases of misconduct and participate in the final resolution of all cases investigated by the Hearing Panel as specified in the document.

2. *Advisor*: An individual whom a student chooses to assist him or her through a process governed by these policies. In the case of matters of academic progress, an advisor is a member of the Biomedical Graduate Faculty whom the student requests to participate in the review of his/her record by the Biomedical Advisory Committee.

In the case of matters of student conduct, an advisor is a member of the University community whom the student selects to assist him or her with respect to the particular matter. Advisors provide advice to students and are not representatives or advocates. They will not be permitted to speak as participants or on behalf of respondents during any judicial procedures, mediation or settlement conferences, or in meeting with School officials.

3. *Biomedical Advisory Committee*: This committee meets monthly with the Director of BGS to discuss policy matters and is comprised of the chairs of the Biomedical Graduate Groups and representatives from the Wistar Institute and the Institute for Cancer Research.

4. *Chair of the Hearing Panel (CHP)*: Presides over the Hearing Panel. The Director of Biomedical Graduate Studies serves as CHP unless disqualified.

5. *Complainant*: An individual who believes that a student may have violated a School or University rule and who brings that information to the attention of a BGS or School official. The complainant may not serve on any judicial panel.

6. *Director*: Director of Biomedical Graduate Studies who presides over the Biomedical Advisory Committee and who serves as the judicial administrator of the BGS Student Judicial System. The Director will serve as the CHP unless disqualified.

7. *Executive Session*: The segment of a committee meeting or hearing at which the deliberation on the case occurs and the decision is made with respect to the appropriate course of action. The executive session is restricted to the Director and to the members of the Committee or Hearing Panel or Appellate Panel.

8. *Ex-officio Member of the Biomedical Advisory Committee*: A member who serves on the Committee by virtue of his or her administrative position with Biomedical Graduate Studies, the University or affiliated institutions and who participates in committee discussions but does not vote on committee decisions.

9. Graduate Group Chair: The Chair of the Respondent's Graduate Group. This individual is a member of the Biomedical Advisory Committee and serves on the Hearing Panel unless he or she is the complainant.

10. Guest: An individual, other than the student's advisor, for whom the student requests permission to be in attendance at the segment of a committee meeting at which information on the student's academic progress is presented, and during the student's presentation.

11. Hearing Panel: A five member panel, consisting of four members of the Biomedical Graduate Faculty and one graduate student, which hears and makes recommendations with respect to complaints of alleged violations of the conduct codes described in Part One of this document.

An Appellate Panel is similarly constituted and charged, with a different set of members from those who initially heard and made recommendations on the particular case.

12. Inquiry Officer (IO): A member of the University and Biomedical Graduate Studies Faculty, appointed by the Director of BGS, who assists in investigating and resolving matters of student conduct under Part Two of the document (Charter of Biomedical Graduate Studies Student Judicial System).

13. Respondent: A student accused of having violated one of the conduct codes described in Part One of this document.

14. Settlement: An agreement among the Director, the appropriate administrative Dean, and the respondent regarding the outcome of an alleged violation of one of the conduct codes described in Part One of this document.

15. University Community: The faculty, staff and matriculated students of the University of Pennsylvania.