



Student Academic Conduct Policy

APPROVED: May 11, 2018

Policy effective for alleged misconduct occurring after August 15, 2018

OVERVIEW

As a community of students and scholars, the University strives to maintain the highest standards of academic integrity. All members of the community are expected to exhibit honesty and integrity in their



Student Academic Conduct Policy

APPROVED: May 11, 2018

a. Home-college cases

When misconduct is alleged to have occurred with a majority of faculty panelists and both student panelists should be from that college.

b. Cross-college cases

When misconduct is alleged to have occurred in a college other than the home college, a majority of faculty panelists should be from the college in which the infraction occurred. A minority of faculty panelists and both student panelists should be from the

3. Panel Authority

Panels may prescribe penalties, sustain penalties, reduce penalties (including reduction to no penalty), or dismiss charges, as appropriate to the case. In subsequent-offense cases, as well as those involving alleged academic misconduct beyond the scope of a specific class and/or instructor, the panel may prescribe dismissal from a program, college, or the University. In subsequent-offense cases limited to a specific class and/or instructor, however, a panel should not typically increase the severity of the previously prescribed penalty.

PROCEDURES

1. Initial Reporting

When evidence suggests that academic misconduct has occurred, the instructor of record will assign a penalty, and the involved student will be informed. The incident and the assigned penalty will be reported into the official case record by the initial reporter. In most cases, the initial reporter will be the instructor of record, although department chairs, deans, or other involved parties may also do so.

a. The initial reporter should gather and submit into the official case record all material related to the case, including the course syllabus, the work in question, and any other documentation.

b.



- f. If the student has not accessed the charges within seventy-two (72) hours of the initial notification being sent, a second notification will be sent. The student has an additional seventy-two (72) hours to access the charges. Thereafter, failure to access the charges will be considered agreement with the charge, acceptance of the penalty, and forfeiture of the right of appeal.

2. Departmental Conference

Upon receipt of a response, the chair of the department in which the infraction is alleged to have occurred will arrange for a conference, the purpose of which is to seek a mutually satisfactory resolution. The chair should schedule and hold the conference as soon as practicable, ensuring there is no delay that might unfairly penalize the student.

- a. The conference, which should include a review of the allegations of the case and the student, is to be conducted by the department chair and must include both the student and the involved instructor (Should the involved instructor be unavailable, the dean shall delegate an appropriate proxy.)
- b. At the conclusion of the conference, the chair shall submit a report for inclusion in the department's Dispute Report. The report should detail the results of the conference, including the penalty to be enforced (if any).
- c. Notification of the outcome of the conference will be delivered electronically to the student, as well as involved instructors, department chairs, deans, and the Office of the Provost.
- d. A student who is unsatisfied with the outcome of the departmental conference has seventy-two (72) hours from delivery of the notification to submit a written response and thereby request an Academic Integrity Review. Failure to respond within seventy-two (72) hours will be considered agreement with the charge, acceptance of the penalty, and forfeiture of the right of appeal.

3. Academic Integrity Review

Academic Integrity Review is the review and appeal process for cases of alleged academic misconduct, and is coordinated and overseen by the Office of the Provost.

- a. Administrative Review

In a first-offense case, if a student appeals the result of the departmental conference, the Office of the Provost will conduct an administrative review of the Academic Misconduct Penalty Record (AMPR). After considering the relevant materials, the Office of the Provost may either uphold the departmental recommendation or refer the case to an Academic Integrity Review Panel (AIRP). When an administrative review upholds the departmental recommendation, the ruling is subject to no further appeal.
- b. Panel Review

Academic Integrity Review Panels (AIRPs) will review first-offense cases that have been



referred by the Office of the Provost. In addition, the Office of the Provost will ensure that AIRPs review all subsequent-offense cases in which the charges have not been dismissed, as well as those involving alleged academic misconduct beyond the scope of a specific class and/or instructor; in such cases, the Office of the Provost must solicit a penalty recommendation from the dean of the college.

- i. AIRPs are constituted on an ad-hoc basis and drawn from the UAIRB. An AIRP can be empaneled to hear a single case or a docket of separate cases, as circumstances dictate. The Office of the Provost will endeavor to schedule reviews in a timely fashion, ensuring there is no delay that might unfairly penalize the student.
- ii. Once an AIR has been empaneled and given its charge by the Office of the Provost, a faculty panelist shall be elected chair. The chair shall maintain complete, confidential records of all proceedings, including minutes of all meetings; these will become part of the AMPR. However, neither minutes nor recordings will be made of meetings when deliberations occur.
- iii. The AIRP will meet to conduct its review interviewing both parties and any witnesses it chooses. Other than the members of the AIRP, only the involved student, faculty

