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The following requirement will be added to the Business Ethics Experiential Learning Module (ELM) and ELM instructions, expectations, and course catalog descriptions:

Students found responsible by the Office of Judicial Programs to be in violation of the Student Code of Conduct and/or Code of Academic Integrity during their tenure in the MBA program at the Smith School of Business will fail to satisfy Business ELM completion requirements. With the permission of the Dean or the Dean’s designee this failure can be remedied by satisfactory completion of the following: (1) the Business Ethics ELM, and (2) a non-credit assignment and/or course under the direction of a faculty member chosen by the Dean or the Dean’s designee. Completion of these requirements will take place at the dean’s discretion and will not be subject to the convenience of schedule or student desire. Students affected by this policy will have the right of appeal to the dean of the graduate school.
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MEMORANDUM

TO: Jim Gates
Chair, Senate Programs, Curricula, and Courses Committee

FROM: Joel Cohen
Chair, University Senate

SUBJECT: Proposal to Impose Additional Sanctions for Cheating on Students in the MBA Program
(Senate Document Number 03-04-12)

Last year, the Senate Executive Committee unanimously rejected a proposal from the Smith School of Business that would have revised the Code of Academic Integrity by imposing additional sanctions on graduate students found guilty of cheating. The universal application of the proposal, the unprecedented authority given to college deans, and the absence of an appeal process were among the committee’s principal objections.

Some of us on last year’s committee were sympathetic to the dilemma of the Business School, which requires courses in business ethics yet faces academic dishonesty among its MBA students. For that reason, we asked the Graduate Council to consider drafting an alternative proposal that would promote a higher ethical standard for graduate students and at the same time protect their rights. Since then, the Smith School of Business has developed the attached new and narrowly focused proposal. It addresses our previous objections and imposes additional sanctions by changing the Business School’s academic requirements not by changing the Code of Academic Integrity. The Graduate Council has found this new approach acceptable and approved the proposal at its meeting on October 14.

We are forwarding the proposal to the Programs, Curricula, and Courses Committee for review and advice. Your committee is the Senate’s resource in curricular matters and has the institutional knowledge to assess changes in academic requirements and modifications of academic programs. Some aspects of the Business School’s approach are unusual and raised questions during the Executive Committee’s discussion. We ask that you consider them when you examine the proposal.

• Is there any other program at the University that includes disciplinary action within its curriculum? If not, is there adequate justification for this new direction?
• Consider the underlying principle: if students take an ethics course, they can be judged if they behave unethically. Would there be any advantage in extending this principle to all programs requiring a course in ethics?
• Does the approval of the proposal have wider ramifications for the campus or does its enactment just affect the Business School?
• Would it be appropriate to ask the Business School to describe the kind of "non-credit assignment and/or course" that the Dean could require?

Please submit your committee’s report by Thursday, February 25, 2004, to the Senate Office. If you need assistance or more time to complete the report, please call Mary Giles on extension 5-5804.

JC:mdg

cc: Victor Korenman, Associate Provost for Academic Planning and Programs

Attachment
BACKGROUND

Our Program
The business school has been engaged in providing ethics training to students in the MBA program for the past 10 years. The academic component of this training has taken place in two courses: BUSI 765 Business Ethics an elective, and BUSI 608 Business Ethics ELM. A full description of these courses may be found in the “Supplemental Information” section at the end of this document. In addition to this academic training in the area of ethics, the business school has also had a student organization, the Ethics Committee, devoted to educating all students in the Smith community on the issues of ethics through workshops, presentations and speakers.

Another opportunity to educate students on ethics comes during full-time MBA student orientation. Ethics, and particularly the accepted practices of ethical and professional behavior within the academic environment is presented to new MBA students in a special session during orientation. During that time, in addition to educating students on what is and is not accepted ethical behavior within the school and on campus, students are asked to sign the campus code of academic integrity thereby acknowledging their understanding of this policy and code. This practice will be extended to our part-time MBA program beginning fall 2004.

Lastly, over the past few years, our dean has been quite public and vocal on the Smith School’s adherence to ethical and professional behavior, stating that the Smith school has a zero tolerance policy with respect to violations and breaches of the campus code of academic integrity and student conduct.

The Smith School has provided education and awareness of the issues of ethics in its academic training through specific coursework, extracurricular education through student organization and leadership, program and administrative education and leadership through orientation and the constant reminder of the campus academic and student conduct code on all course syllabi.

Our Students
Students in the MBA program have on average 5 – 7 years of professional work experience. In many cases, our students have supervised others and were responsible for maintaining and are subject to the ethical code of their respective organizations and companies. All of our students have had the benefit of a four-year baccalaureate degree, or its foreign equivalent, at this and other institutions. Approximately one third of our student population is comprised of international students who have chosen to pursue their education at the Smith School. The average age of our students is 28. In addition, the majority of the students in our part-time program are currently employed and in positions of supervising others and maintaining and are subject to the ethical code of their respective organizations and companies.

Overall Program Goals
The Smith School trains and graduates individuals who will pursue positions of leadership in companies and organizations around the world. To this end, and knowing that our students will be among the next generation of corporate leadership, we are committed to training leaders who will uphold, define and maintain only the highest standards of ethical and professional behavior. We are all too aware of the impact of individuals in corporations, government and society as a whole who breach, stretch, ignore, and violate these standards. As a result, we are constantly striving for ways in which we can improve our teaching and program in this area.

REASONS FOR THE CHANGE TO THE COURSE AND DEGREE REQUIREMENTS
At this time, we have an academic approach (courses), an extracurricular approach (student organizations), program approach (presentations at orientation and broadcast of academic code on all syllabi), and a vigorous process of bringing breaches and violations of the code to the attention of the
Office of Judicial Programs for a full review (within 24 hours of notice). However, we lack a full measure of deterrence.

**Past Attempt to Institute a Measure of Deterrence**

In a letter written to Gary Pavela, Director, and VP for Student Affairs, dated December 18, 2001, we proposed a revised version of the Code of Academic Integrity for the R. H. Smith School of Business. This letter and the revised code may be found in the “Supplemental Information” section at the end of this document. This code was brought before the University Senate, Committee on Student Conduct on April 12, 2002 under the subject of “Proposed Higher Judicial Sanctions for Graduate Students.” The minutes of this meeting may be found in the “Supplemental Information” section at the end of this document.

This proposal was rooted in the campus code of academic integrity and student conduct, and acted in deference to the campus process of findings of responsibility. This proposal acknowledged the difference of experience of graduate students to undergraduate students and brought attention to the fact that the educational setting of undergraduates extends to their relationships with and shared experiences with graduate students. During the conversation with the committee, revisions were made to the statement and forwarded to Andrew Canter the week of April 15, 2003 that allowed for students to appeal the decision to the dean of the graduate school. However, this revised statement was never forwarded or included in subsequent communication. The revised statement may be found in the “Supplemental Information” section at the end of this document.

On July 1, 2002 Andrew Canter, the Chair of the University Senate Committee on Student Conduct forwarded a recommendation to Kent Cartwright, Chair of the University Senate, and to the Graduate School recommending the change to the Code of Academic Integrity. (However, the change was not the revised change.) A copy of this letter may be found in the “Supplemental Information” section at the end of this document.

On September 24, 2002, the proposal was denied by the campus out of concern that there was no appeal process or enough protection for students. Further, discussions in February of 2003, with committee members revealed that the campus did not want to set up a different standard for graduate students. In addition, there was concern that the proposal did not take into account the differing ideas and behaviors of international students with respect to the idea of ethics and professional behavior.

It is unfortunate that the revised version never made it into the decision-making process of the Senate Executive Committee or to the Graduate School. The revised proposal clearly states: “If the sanction of dismissal is imposed, the student will have the right of appeal to the dean of the graduate school for reinstatement to the school, college, or program from which they were dismissed due to academic dishonesty.”

To address the committee’s concern of a different standard for graduate students, the business school does make a distinction between undergraduate and graduate students in many areas, including knowledge of, exposure to, responsibility for, and consequences related to ethical and professional behavior. As stated above, students in the MBA program have on average 5 – 7 years of professional work experience. In many cases, our students have supervised others and were responsible for maintaining and are subject to the ethical code of their respective organizations and companies. All of our students have had the benefit of a four-year baccalaureate degree or its foreign equivalent, at this and other institutions. Approximately one third of our student population is comprised of international students who have chosen to pursue their education at the Smith School. The average age of our students is 28. In addition, the majority of the students in our part-time program are currently employed and in positions of supervising others and maintaining and are subject to the ethical code of their respective organizations and companies.
In addition, the school is quite clear that since our undergraduates share the same building, faculty, and news with regard to ethics as our graduate students, our graduate students must serve as role models for our undergraduate students, or at least not serve to undermine the teaching and education of ethical and professional behavior.

The campus concern regarding international students is an interesting one. The business school has been quite active in its recruitment and education of international students. We expect the same quality of work, and participation in the growth and advancement of the program of our international students as we expect of our domestic students. We do not expect less of our international students than we would of any other student who actively chooses to be a member of our community and makes the independent decision to enroll and abide by all of the rules and regulations of the business school and the university upon acceptance of admission and enrollment in the program, including their adherence to and understanding of ethical and professional behavior. It might also be interesting to note that many of our international students have worked for US companies.

**Current Proposal**

The change we are proposing will allow us to present a full consequence to student action and choice in violations of the campus code. This proposal is restricted to students in the MBA program only. This proposal also protects students by allowing them to appeal the decision to the dean of the graduate school. We will present and fully disclose this change at orientation both verbally and in writing to each and every student. This requirement will also be placed on the syllabus of BUSI 608 Business Ethics ELM. This change will only affect students entering in fall 2004 and all subsequent years.

This proposed change has been discussed with Gary Pavela, Director and VP for Student Affairs (September 24, 2003). Mr. Pavela does not have a problem or concern with this proposal from a judicial affairs perspective.
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Course Description Information

BUSI 608 Business Ethics ELM (course description)
Guest speakers and student role playing animate such ethics topics as workplace discrimination, sexual harassment, product defects, and whistle-blowing. A visit to a federal prison provides a unique opportunity to speak with former executives-turned-inmates about the serious consequences of compromising ethical standards.

BUSI 765 Business Ethics (course description)
This course surveys applied topics relating to business ethics. The course will examine corporate social responsibility, the relationship of law and ethics, and individual ethical decision-making.

************************************************************************************

Original proposed change to the code of academic integrity brought to the University Senate, Committee on Student Conduct Meeting of April 12, 2002.

Code of Academic Integrity

The Robert H. Smith School of Business recognizes honesty and integrity as necessary cornerstones to the pursuit of excellence in academic and professional business activities. Ultimately, the viability of a business will depend on the integrity and the capabilities of its members. Thus, it is necessary that each student conduct his or her personal and academic affairs ethically. In particular, cheating on exams or assignments, unauthorized collusion on assignments, and plagiarism will not be tolerated. The Dean’s Office has required the faculty to follow University rules and regulations when any violation of the student conduct code has occurred.

In pursuing this objective, The Robert H. Smith School of Business community embraces and supports the student conduct code administered by the student honor council. When a violation of the student conduct code occurs, and the individual(s) involved are found in violation of the student conduct code by the University judicial system, the individual(s) involved will be referred to the School of Business for sanctions in addition to those imposed by the council, up to and including dismissal.

It is highly advised that students visit the following website for a detailed description of this policy (http://umdacc.umd.edu/III100A).

Revisions to the proposed change after the meeting with the University Senate, Committee on Student Conduct, April 12, 2002. This revision was sent to Andrew Canter the week of April 15, 2002.

Suggested Revision to Proposed Changes to Part 20 of the Code of Academic Integrity

In addition to any other penalty imposed, graduate students found responsible under this Code for any act of academic dishonesty may be subject to additional sanctions, up to and including dismissal from the school, college, or program in which they are enrolled, as determined by the appropriate school, college, or program dean, or designee. The sanction of dismissal will be imposed after the student is accorded an opportunity to be heard by the dean, or designee. If the sanction of dismissal is imposed, the student will have the right of appeal to the dean of the graduate school for reinstatement to the school, college, or program from which they were dismissed due to academic dishonesty.
December 18, 2001

Gary Pavela  
Director and Vice-President for Student Affairs  
2108A Mitchell Bldg., #5221  
University of Maryland  
College Park, MD 20742

Dear Mr. Pavela:

Enclosed please find a revised Code of Academic Integrity for the R.H. Smith School of Business. We propose this revision as part of our ongoing effort to improve the personal, professional, and academic environment at the Smith School. Currently, our code details our adherence to the established university code, policy and procedures regarding student conduct. We believe that as members of the university community, we have a role in upholding as well as adhering to university established guidelines regarding ethics, and integrity issues on campus. However, we also believe that students at the Smith School in addition to their responsibilities as citizens of campus, also have a responsibility to their classmates and alumni and to the reputation of the Smith School in particular.

The R.H. Smith School of Business has a strong commitment to upholding academic, personal, and professional integrity as requisites of our community. The MBA and MS students at the School of Business have all been through prior academic training as they all must have at least a bachelor level degree, and on average have at least five years of professional experience prior to joining our programs. We believe and expect that all individuals admitted to and enrolled at the Smith School have the ability to distinguish between appropriate and inappropriate behavior in a professional and academic setting.

Part of our educational mission is to train and graduate business and industry leaders; people who will be looked to for the establishment and adherence of policies governing ethical conduct in a professional setting. In addition, part of the training that occurs results in academic work that is given to outside agencies. We pride ourselves on the work of our students and on their ability to deliver a unique and professional product to those with whom we do business. Any breach of academic and or professional integrity
related to these works would immediately jeopardize the school’s and by default the university’s relations with these outside clients and constituencies.

Since we believe that our students represent us both on campus and to outside constituencies on a regular basis (as it is part of the curriculum), we believe they have a particular responsibility to uphold the highest standards of personal, professional, and academic integrity. We look to the revised Code of Academic Integrity to allow the Smith School to continue it’s role as a good citizen of the campus, as well as to improve and strengthen our commitment to uphold the highest standards of personal, professional, and academic ethics to our students, alumni, and outside clients.

Please let me know if you need more information regarding the proposed code. In addition, if the proposed code is approved, we have plans in place to implement an appeal program here at the business school.

I look forward to hearing from you soon. I may be reached by phone at 301-405-2028 or via e-mail at cscricca@rhsmith.umd.edu should you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Cherie A. Scricca
Assistant Dean for Masters Programs
UNIVERSITY SENATE
Committee on Student Conduct
April 12, 2002 – Falk Conference Room
9:00 A.M.

Meeting Notes

Members in Attendance: Andrew Canter (Chair-Undergraduate), Gary Pavela (Consulting Member), Jeanne Rutenburg (Faculty), William Strein (Faculty), Aubrey Williams (Faculty), and Justin Wingate-Poe (Undergraduate).

Members not Present: Sandy Kita (Faculty), Ann DiClemente (Graduate), Emily Malarkey (Undergraduate), Abdullah Al-Abbadi (Undergraduate), and Jamie Cohen (Undergraduate).

Item 1 – Meeting Called to Order:

Chair Canter called the meeting to order at 9:10 A.M.

Item 2 – Proposed Higher Judicial Sanctions for Graduate Students

Although the Senate Executive Committee had sent no formal charge, the Committee on Student Conduct met to discuss a possible change to the Code of Academic Integrity. Joanne DeSio, Ombudsperson for Graduate Students, and Justin Coon, Chair of the Student Honor Council were in attendance. The President of the Graduate Student Government (GSG), Alfredo Perez, was also invited but chose to send a written statement instead. Guest Cheris Scriba, Assistant Dean of Masters programs in the Smith School of Business, began with a discussion of the problem at hand.

The Business School felt that the standard sanction for academic dishonesty, an ‘XF’ notation on the transcript, was not a strong enough penalty for their graduate students. Even though MBA students have an undergraduate degree, an average of 5 years experience in the workplace, and exposure to a substantial program in Business Ethics, several are still found responsible for academic dishonesty each year. Also, MBA students are continuously hired out to private firms for consulting, such that any incidence of cheating or plagiarism would be very public and embarrassing for the program. Furthermore, MBA graduates do not need a transcript for job placement, making the ‘XF’ sanction insignificant.

In discussing the Business School’s problem, the Committee utilized draft language prepared by Gary Pavela. Mr. Pavela’s document contained the current text of the Code of Academic Integrity, along with several different options for the Committee’s perusal.
Option #1 gave the Student Honor Council the responsibility of sanctioning up to suspension and expulsion, while Option #2 placed this power in the hands of each graduate program. Option #3 emphasized a campus-wide standard, placing this authority with the Dean of the Graduate School. Each option maintained standards of due process, a major concern of all parties involved.

Chair Canter asked the committee members if they had any questions or concerns:

**Concern:** Aubrey Williams wondered if a culture change within the Business School would be more helpful than a patchwork solution through *Code of Academic Integrity* changes.

**Response:** Cherie Scricca replied that this proposal was being taken in conjunction with other measures from the Business School’s Student Ethical Committee, which... (signature)

**Concern:** Aubrey Williams inquired about patterns of cheating among Graduate Students in general.

**Response:** Chair Canter responded that cases of academic dishonesty are certainly on the rise, but specific numbers of Graduate cases are unavailable. Justin Coon agreed, and clarified that cheating cases may be increasing because of more publicity surrounding academic integrity, including the new Honor Pledge.

**Concern:** Joanne DeSiaio commented that any proposal discussed and approved today would have to go through the Council of Deans and the Graduate Council for more discussion.

**Response:** The Committee agreed. Cherie Scricca clarified that departments would not have to raise sanctions, but it would be permissible if this policy were implemented.

**Concern:** William Strein remarked that Graduate programs and departments have a wide degree of autonomy, and should be permitted to create different sanctioning standards for undergraduates and graduate students. A “one size fits all” policy would not work in a University this large.

**Response:** There were other thoughts from the Committee that each academic community should create its own standards, regardless of outside influences.

**Concern:** Chair Canter shared a letter from GSG President Perez to the Committee, in which Perez expressed doubt that Administrators would remain impartial from political pressure, faculty competition, and enmity in making suspension and expulsion decisions. Perez supported the draft of Option #1, vesting suspension and expulsion power in the Student Honor Council.

**Response:** Justin Coon discussed the Honor Council’s perspective in sanctioning graduate students. Graduate standing is not currently considered an aggravating circumstance in hearings, but the Honor Council understands that the experience and knowledge expected of graduate students may require higher sanctions for academic dishonesty. The Honor Council would be more in favor of Option #2, giving the Dean or Director of each program options of higher sanctioning.
Concern: Gary Pavela mentioned that any ‘F’ on a graduate student’s transcript could warrant dismissal from his or her program, making this proposal unnecessary.
Response: Joanne DeSiato replied that the policies on dismissal are dispersed among the schools, and vary between departments and programs.

Concern: William Stein inquired about the weight of Student Honor Council decisions and possible aggravating circumstances. Would group work be considered an aggravating circumstance?
Response: Gary Pavela replied that Honor Council recommendations are final, except when making recommendations of suspension and expulsion. Justin Coon added that group work could be considered an aggravating circumstance, depending on the specific context of the case.

Concern: Cherie Scricca asked about the negative aspects to Option #2, restating the Business School’s hope not to impose on other programs and departments. She also opined that the proposal’s support of due process should cover the GSG’s concern of an overzealous Dean.
Response: A discussion of the term “subject to” ensued, resulting in the conclusion that “subject to” is the legal equivalent of “may,” and not “will.”

Concern: Joanne DeSiato mentioned that the Graduate Council’s final meeting of the semester would be in four days, leaving little time for appropriate input from the campus community.
Response: Chair Canter agreed and indicated that more work would be needed in the Fall 2002 semester, after sufficient advice from the Graduate Council and the rest of the University. The Committee and guests unanimously agreed that the proposal needs much more input before it can become a viable policy.

At this point Chair Canter asked for a sense of the Committee on Student Conduct. After some minor revision, Option #2 was endorsed by a majority vote. The final proposal is reprinted below:

The following paragraph should be added to Part 20 of the Code of Academic Integrity:

- In addition to any other penalty imposed, graduate students found responsible under this Code for any act of academic dishonesty are also subject to additional sanctions, up to and including dismissal from the school, college, or program in which they are enrolled, as determined by the appropriate school, college, or program dean, or designee. No such dismissal will be imposed unless the student is accorded an opportunity to be heard by the dean, or designee.

Item 3 – Suspension Appeal (Confidential):

Page 3 of 3
The committee heard a suspension appeal. Minutes were not taken of this confidential proceeding. It should be noted, however, that Jeanne Rutenburg chaired the discussion and findings of the Committee. Chair Canter, a board member in the original hearing, removed himself from the appellate process.

**Item 4 – Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 A.M.
July 1, 2002

MEMORANDUM

TO: Kent Cartwright  
Chair, University Senate

Dennis O'Connor  
Vice President for Research & Dean of the Graduate School

FROM: Andrew Canter  
Chair, University Senate Committee on Student Conduct

SUBJECT: Changes to the Code of Academic Integrity

The Smith School of Business recently brought an important issue to the attention of the Committee on Student Conduct. The standard sanction for violations of the Code of Academic Integrity, the 'XF' transcript notation, has become obsolete for graduate students in the M.B.A. program. Even though M.B.A. students have an undergraduate degree, an average of 5-7 years experience in the workplace, and exposure to a substantial program in 'Business Ethics,' several are found Responsible of academic dishonesty each year. Furthermore, a transcript is frequently not required of M.B.A. graduates seeking a job, making an 'XF' insignificant.

After much discussion and input from the Smith School of Business, the Graduate Student Government, and the Student Honor Council, the Committee on Student Conduct recommends that the following paragraph be added to Part 20 of the Code of Academic Integrity:

- In addition to any other penalty imposed, graduate students found responsible under this Code for any act of academic dishonesty are also subject to additional sanctions, up to and including dismissal from the school, college, or program in which they are enrolled, as determined by the appropriate school, college, or program dean, or designee. No such dismissal will be imposed unless the student is accorded an opportunity to be heard by the dean of the school or college, or designee.

We feel that holding graduate students to a higher standard of conduct is reasonable, and the proposal maintains the University's standards of due process. Furthermore, it does not mandate suspension or expulsion, but leaves further sanctioning to the decision of each
program. It is the hope of the Committee that this measure will curb incidents of academic dishonesty in the Smith School and other departments that choose to utilize additional sanctions.

We recommend that this proposed change be sent to the Graduate Council and the Senate Executive Committee for further discussion.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Graduate Council

FROM: Kent Carwright
Professor of English and Chair of the University Senate

SUBJECT: Proposed Sanctions for Graduate Students

The Senate Executive Committee and I have had two separate conversations about the attached recommendation from the Senate’s own Student Conduct Committee to make changes to the Code of Academic Integrity. This recommendation, we know, was also sent to the Graduate School in July for review. Andrew Canter, past Student Conduct Committee chair, proposes imposing additional sanctions on graduate students who are found guilty of academic dishonesty. Because employers rarely see the XF grade on the transcript, the present sanction is not a sufficient deterrent or penalty for cheating.

The Executive Committee and I sympathize with the intent of this proposal to hold graduate students to a higher standard of conduct than undergraduate students. It is entirely reasonable to expect mature students, some of them teaching our undergraduates, to adhere to a stricter rule of behavior. It is instructive that the impetus for increased sanctions comes from the Business School which is particularly sensitive to the importance of ethics for M.B.A. students entering the world of corporate business.

Nevertheless, the Executive Committee and I do have reservations about this proposal. Our concern is whether the proposed procedure is the best and fairest means to reach the desired end of ethical behavior. Giving a dean or his designee the authority to dismiss a student at the end of the formal process is a significant departure from present practice. Under the Code, the Honor Board, comprised of faculty and students, has the power to review a case of academic dishonesty and determine sanctions. Parts 21 through 26 of the Code specify the rights and procedures that students have to appeal the Honor Board’s decisions.

This proposed procedure allows deans to act after the Honor Board reaches its decision. They can choose to exact additional sanctions, including dismissal. It appears that graduate students do not have the right to appeal their dean’s decision. The final line of the recommendation states that students have the right to a hearing by the dean but the wording suggests that they are not protected by further right of appeal to the faculty and
student board. "No such dismissal will be imposed unless the student is accorded an opportunity to be heard by the dean of the school or college, or designee."

We ask, as you review the attached proposal from the Senate Conduct Committee, to consider its implications and possible unforeseen consequences. We also ask you to decide whether you could recommend an alternative to Mr. Canter’s well-intentioned proposal that would promote a higher ethical standard for graduate students but at the same time protect their rights.

KC:amdg

Attachments