

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Mar. 7, 2013

In attendance:

Paul Abegg (PA)

Dianne Hirning (DH)

Robert Carlson (RCa)

Scott Lindsey (SL)

Rob Cowan (RCo)

Erin O'Brien (EO)

Jerry Harris (JH; secretary)

Matt Smith-Lahrman (MS)

Lish Harris (LH)

RCa: Has everyone had a chance to review the minutes from the last two meetings? Can I have a motion to approve them? (RCo moves; EO and DH second.) Discussion? (None.) All in favor? (Approved.) Now, Tim Eicher (TE) is here as chair of the Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) to describe the process for academic misconduct.

TE: All right, the process, as set down in [policy](#), is: if a faculty member has an issue in which they have evidence that there's been misconduct by a student, and the faculty member has wherewithal to sanction that student, there are a number of ways that can be done, depending on his/her contractual responsibility. For example, they can assign an F to an assignment, flunk the student out of class, and things like that. Is everyone good with that definition of our responsibilities as professors? The AIC gets involved when the professor believes that *other* sanctions are warranted, based on the severity of the misconduct, repetition of misconduct, or, in the case of programs such as nursing, where someone's misconduct makes them unfit in the eyes of faculty to license a student. These other sanctions include: expulsion or kicking the student out of a program; other things that are acceptable by policy include community service, but it's pretty creative. I think the AIC would consider *any* sanction that seemed relevant to help the student and/or program, even if it's not explicitly stated in policy. Another sanction, a more severe sanction, but one that is within the purview of the AIC is annotating a student's transcript that a failing grade was assigned for reasons for misconduct. That's something that can only be placed by AIC.

DH: Can that be overturned by the Academic Vice-President?

TE: Yes, it can. At that point, the professor has the responsibility to notify the student what his/her intent is, so the student can begin his/her part of the process. The faculty member has to get written support from his/her department chair.

RCa: That's not in [the policy](#)—it's an option, but a faculty member can go straight to the AIC.

TE: The reason why we did this, and this is a case that LH was involved in, was that we had a situation in which a student was accused of misconduct, given F's for both the course and on the final exam by an adjunct. The student went to the faculty member, who subsequently resigned. Some of this is fuzzy—the student apparently tried to go to the faculty member many times, left him notes, etc., but never got responses from the faculty member, so many days went by. If everyone along the chain of action refuses to participate, or otherwise lengthens the process, the process can't function. So the AIC has imposed on faculty that s/he must get written support from the department chair and dean to show that they are behind the faculty member. Then we don't have to convene a hearing and have the student go back to someone over the faculty member and get the case thrown out.

RCa: They can't do that per the policy. The policy says that there are two paths—they can either go straight to the AIC or go through the dean.

TE: Yes, but the student can still go to the department chair and have a case overturned. This is a problem with the policy. I submitted recommended changes to it about this to Martha last April, but this stuff gets funneled through Human Resources before it gets put into policy. I've submitted changes to policies for years, but never seen them implemented by Human Resources.

LH: If the faculty member goes to the AIC, whether or not s/he should also go through his/her department chair and dean—it's better if s/he does because then s/he has the letters of support. The faculty member can say that s/he supports this sanction, and then can say that they have support.

SL: You say that for any policy that gets implemented, Pam (Montrallo) has legal oversight?

TE: She's the one that has contact with our representative in the Attorney General's office.

RCa: Human Resources doesn't vote, but they have a lot of influence over the process.

TE: And maybe what I proposed wasn't legal, but I was never told one way or another.

RCa: So in the event of an appeal to the AIC, then what's the faculty member to do? That's not in policy...?

TE: It's in the AIC's hands to contact the student, get a hearing within 10 working days, with the faculty member and the student, and tell them their rights. We've gone with closed hearings, which is also not in policy. But we had a recent case—and LH was in on this, too—in which the student wanted to bring 25 other students in as character references. The policy says they can have *one* advocate. I made the administrative call on making the hearings closed.

RCa: Is "closed hearing" the right term? In policy, that means "when a committee votes."

TE: OK, that makes sense.

EO: The policy for the appeals process is similar to what you're describing. I sat in on one appeal, in which a student had two advocates, a parent and an attorney. I don't know if you guys also look at the appeals policy, but it makes sense to have them match.

RCa: The hearing process does, yes.

PA: Is this addressed in a faculty policy?

RCa: No; there's one really old policy that refers to committees that don't exist anymore, so we have to go to the Student Rights and Responsibilities policy.

TE: I've tried to send out summaries of what that document says.

RCa: I do know that that one is not being actively pursued for revision right now because another policy has higher priority, and there's no current policy writer.

TE: If a hearing happens, it has to have four voting faculty members.

RCa: Should be five—that's what is listed in the policy, plus a non-voting chair, and two students.

TE: Yes.

RCa: It also says there only need to be three *voting* members.

TE: That's not good!

RCa: How do students in these hearings do?

TE: Good—we've usually had one, but sometimes two. We've only had half-dozen of these cases over the years, and the students we've had involved in hearings are sticklers and know what misconduct means. They can only work with the evidence presented at the hearing. Therefore, the faculty member has to have documentation, signatures, evidence, etc.

PA: And it's up to the professor to gather that?

TE: Yes, within their job descriptions.

RCa: What about when it's a student appeal?

TE: The burden of proof is that the student has to bring in evidence, but the faculty member does, too. Student appeals works kind of the same way. The problem we ran into in 2012, when we had an appeal filed about a misconduct charge, the sanction imposed was within the teacher's rights to fail the assignment and the student out of class. The student appealed on the failing, saying s/he was falsely charged. But that appeal came first...it was really herky-jerky how it happened. The student tried to contact the teacher, but teacher never replied; then the student went to the assistant dean because the student was going to enroll into another class with the same professor, but the professor barred the student from doing so, saying that s/he didn't want that student in another class. The assistant dean overrode the professor's wish to keep the student out. The faculty member then resigned.

PA: Because of that?

TE: That's my understanding. We didn't get to the hearing until the beginning of February, way after the limitations. We told the student that s/he needed to go to the department chair, dean, etc. because any one of them could overturn the case.

PA: What does the faculty member do without that support from his/her chair?

TE: If the student appeals, then the chair can remove an F and other sanctions. In a sense, the appeals process is to keep professors from behaving unethically.

SL:

LH: It's fair to say that there are some objective cases. But there are other times when evidence seemed subjective or circumstantial.

TE: The evidence presented was hearsay, not concrete.

RCa: What about if the evidence is witnesses? In a case I know about from another institution, a student taking a test asked to use restroom in which s/he had stashed his/her backpack, studied the material in the restroom, then went back and did better on the exam. Two other students saw that student in the bathroom with the backpack.

LH: We had 4-5 students say that they saw cheating in this one case. Unfortunately, because the process was so messy in this case, I had students that did not write letters but that have since told me that they saw the student cheating. The students that wrote said only that they *thought* they saw it.

TE: That one ended up getting tossed out because of the inferential nature of the evidence.

RCa: But if it was other students...!

TE: You can see how problematic that is! This student only had hearsay from other students. But if the evidence was concrete—saying "At this time, on this date, myself and others saw ____..."

EO: So are faculty supposed to be responsible for seeing if no backpacks are stashed in bathrooms now? If no faculty member can prosecute for this, it increases the attractiveness for students to do it.

TE: Faculty members on the AIC are trying to sort out a lot of material, and have to go with what does and doesn't sound good in any situation.

LH: There needs to be something to address that there's one person that can unilaterally change the AIC's work. We appealed the AIC's decision on this particular case in part because the adjunct faculty member had left; we were hoping that if we saw the case through, that adjunct might come back. A lot of students liked this person. When it came to the Academic Vice-President she dismissed everything. The evidence was weird, but if the students come to you and say that they saw someone cheat, but the one person can dismiss the evidence because they don't like the accusations, etc...!

TE: So students are also required to run a gamut of those administrators because we prefer not to have a hearing. It needs to be solved in the department.

RCa: The policy encourages that.

TE: In the AIC, we have votes, and they can be split. I write them up and send them to all the faculty students and administrators that were involved in writing letters about the case, etc., and then inform the faculty member and student of the appeals process to the Academic Vice-President who can make decisions quickly, do his/her own investigation, etc., and can ultimately overturn or support the AIC's decision. In our experience, Donna overturned one of the five cases we have done. That one case was like the one Erin referred to, in which the student said s/he didn't understand that what s/he did was cheating. The AIC said that that claim wasn't good enough, and the professor asked for an annotation on the student's transcript, but Donna overturned that particular sanction. She's supported all the other ones.

RCa: What can make the process better, considering that there's a balance? If you've only had 5-6 cases, that's a gross underestimate of the actual number of incidences of misconduct!

TE: I've tried to suggest changes over the last two years because this has to be an administration-driven process—the dean has to know his/her butt is in this, too. In the overthrown case, the student went to the dean when s/he couldn't contact the faculty member that leveled the accusation. The dean has to get the issue talked about. I

RCa: Has any faculty member notified the AIC when s/he took a local sanction, like docking a grade?

TE: They don't need to.

RCa: Yes, they do, per policy.

TE: Do they have to notify the registrar?

TE: No, I don't think that's right.

RCa: It's in [the policy](#) (reads). It's not awful because there's a strong feeling that such reports may be necessary because there is concern of serial offenders. There needs to be a central place documenting such things in order to see this, and it could be the AIC.

TE: Or the registrar. The chair of the AIC, maybe.

RCa: "Notification" is vague, though.

TE: I think it's excessive to do this because professors are able, per their contracts, to make *some* sanctions.

LH: It would be helpful for tracking purposes. I'd bet my house that the student that cheated twice in my class has done it elsewhere, too. And we're not allowed to talk about it to other faculty members that might have the student and warn them to watch for it.

MS: That requires a new policy...? If the AIC says Joe Blow has been accused in in five different classes...?

TE: That's not in policy.

RCa: So we need to figure out what to do with it.

TE: Interestingly, we had a Communications student that handled an accusation very well in which the sanction was probation from the program for a year. She didn't appeal, and admitted that she needed time to grow up some more. We didn't even have to hold a hearing because the student accepted the sanctions.

LH: So if a faculty member decided that s/he wanted to suspend or dismiss a student from a program, and the student doesn't appeal, then the AIC doesn't have to meet?

TE: Correct.

LH: So if a student cheats in one of my classes, and I want that student's transcript annotated, then it just goes forward?

RCa: No, higher sanctions still need to go through the AIC.

LH: So up to giving a student an F in a course, a faculty member can do on his/her own, but for anything else, like transcript annotation, the AIC has to be activated, even if student doesn't want to appeal it? The AIC has to meet to approve the sanction?

TE: Yes.

LH: This is why I brought this up: some of these sanctions definitely should be handled by the AIC, but others should be resolved at the departmental level.

TE: I agree.

MS: Unless it's appealed. There are some things that are classroom level, others department level, and others school level.

TE: I only have a few more minutes, but are there other questions I can answer?

PA: We need to get all this into the faculty policy, too. It's not conducive to any faculty to even think about pressing charges.

MS: Yes, faculty members can just say that a student wrote a bad paper and give that an F, rather than say that the F is because of cheating and have to go through the process!

LH: To me, it doesn't sit well that we're just sweeping all this under a rug as an institution. If we want to take ourselves seriously, and our product is students, it's a huge black eye that students can leave thinking that this institution doesn't take cheating seriously. SUU just had to revamp their whole policy about this because they had a case that made the news.

TE: We had a case in which the AIC ruled against the professor, and the faculty member has missed three appointments requested by the student so s/he could get help. The professor wasn't going to let the student do a final paper, but the committee said that the student got to do final paper and get the grade it deserved—the faculty member wouldn't accept the paper before that. The student still got an F, though.

RCa: The faculty member just has to send a one-sentence e-mail informing the AIC, the department chair, etc. that they are imposing a sanction. In the case of adjuncts, the assistant deans and deans provide extra cover.

TE: Yes. But faculty are still unclear on what to do.

MS: Could it be a form they just fill out on-line?

RCo: That will have to be protected info, though.

LH: I think we do need to address some of these sanctions and the levels at which they should be administered. The appeals process should always be available, but faculty members should be aware of process.

RCa: We can find a place to put it.

TE: Banner, maybe...? It's pretty secure. Julie would help us set that up.

MS: And create a department-level thing.

LH: Exactly—a discussion/debate about where the sanctions not easily accessible to faculty should be bumped down to different levels, and we need to engage in discussion about that.

RCa: We can easily do that. The policy isn't perfect, but it's a start.

LH: Having worked with the AIC, I've felt that TE and the committee have done an upstanding job, and I don't envy the position as chair of that committee!

RCa: One problem with the current policy: it says that two people can decide for the whole committee—a hearing only needs three people, and the majority must vote one way.

TE: My recommendation included to get more people involved. Hearings have to happen quickly, and it's hard to get all faculty in that short a period of time. Let me know if I can help more on this.

RCa: Once we start to make more changes, we'll run them by you. (TE leaves.) Quickly, I want to bring up a couple of other issues that have been brought up, though we can't talk about them now. I've heard from two different parts of campus of problems with how GE status is determined.

RCo: I'm on the committee for that, and said something about the same problems!

RCa: One department had to submit something *four* times!

RCo: We just had 40 documents dumped on us with expectations of making decisions about them in a week!

RCa: If you have ideas for how to improve the process, please let me know!

DH: When it comes to the GE Committee, does it come from a department or from the Curriculum Committee?

RCo: I'm not sure.

RCa: Usually a department chair submits things to determine a course's GE status.

RCo: We're mostly doing workload now. But my big question was about documentation for a course that didn't support GloCup status, but people that have knowledge of course said it's an obvious fit for that status. So there's a knowledge-based problem. I wonder if the department level might be better to make an informed decision, rather than the committee. I don't know what the politics are of this, but...

RCa: The other thing is: I want to remind everyone that *anyone* can recommend a policy change. We've tried to create a system to help us tackle big issues, but if you have a pet project, you can create the policy draft, and it will go through us eventually.

DH: We'd bring it to the FSEC, and then...?

RCa: It would go to our policy subcommittee, then to Louise, the new policy person.

DH: She could tweak it?

RCa: We might have to negotiate with Pam.

DH: When we do these policy drafts, we may not know all laws, restrictions, etc. that would be pertinent.

SL: Do we know what policies are being brought up and in which order?

RCa: Faculty Rights, first, including Academic Freedom, misconduct, etc.

SL: We're not going to swallow the whole elephant at once?

RCa: No, but there is a draft of the whole elephant!

DH: Is anything being done to address the workload problem *[the not switching from 27 to 24 credit hours with the change to university status—JH]?*

RCa: We're talking about it.

RCo: The President is going around to all the departments, and brought this issue up in ours. The adjuncts and part timers are based on full-time workload. In our department, we have lots of adjuncts, and we'd lose lots of people if it changes.

RCa: It's been recommended that all faculty will have the 27 credit load with full time status, but three credits will be given to everyone for non-classroom assignments. That's a new, informal proposal—not yet vetted.

SL: That has problems with accreditation—not to the entire institution, but to individual schools. In Business, we run accreditation into problems all the time because of workload. To continue that 27 hour load is going to create more problems!

RCa: I know; this is just what has been informally proposed. It satisfies Board of Regents policy without violating federal law. All teaching-related requirements will still be at the 24 level for full-time faculty.

SL: Where did this originate?

RCa: Dean's Council, I think, but again, it was informal and needed to be run by lawyers. I don't know where they will go with this ultimately, but they're looking for a cheap way to avoid hiring lots more adjuncts, which is hard for many departments for which the local pool of adjuncts is tapped out.

NOTE: TE later forwarded several documents and additional information to append to the minutes; this information appears below (with minor editing by JDH) and on the following pages; each of five appended documents begins on its own page.

Here are some documents that might help the FSEC see what this committee has been doing.

1. **ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COMMITTEE:** This was the document submitted last August to Pam Montrallo through Martha Talman. Or it was supposed to have been submitted. I never heard anything.
2. **AIC Committee Charter:** This was the document we started with, given to us by Human Resources through Sheila Bastian.
3. **AIC Mission:** This is a mission statement written by the committee as we did not have a mission statement provided when this committee was started.
4. **ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COMMITTEE HEARING OUTLINE:** This document, called 'internal controls of the committee' was conceived by me and accepted by the committee. It presently guides how the hearings are conducted.
5. **Academic Integrity Committee Sanction Document:** This is kind of an outline for how the procedure is supposed to be implemented according to policy.

For the record, this committee still needs much work. It needs some standardized forms for both student and teacher that help them negotiate through the policy guidelines. I can work on that, if the FSEC wants, and submit some recommendations. I think it's great that the executive committee is willing to get involved with this committee. Another couple of things that came up in the meeting are changing the number of committee members. I think a bigger group is better, and Robert recommended that. He also strongly recommended that the hearings have a larger number of participants, with which I also agree. Document #1 is the important one for FSEC to prioritize, and then getting the recommended changes actually entered into an official policy document is the next trick.

I. **Student Academic Misconduct**

A. **Standards of Academic Conduct:** In order to ensure that the highest standards of academic conduct are promoted and supported at the College, students must adhere to generally accepted standards of academic honesty, including but not limited to, refraining from cheating, plagiarizing, falsification, misrepresentation, and/or inappropriately colluding or collaborating. The College shall consistently hold students accountable for instances of academic dishonesty and apply appropriate consequences. Definitions for some types of academic misconduct follow:

i. **Cheating:** Includes but is not limited to the use of unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in any academic exercise; failing to observe the expressed procedures or instructions of an academic exercise; substituting for or impersonating someone else during a test or exam or other fraud; or receiving the content of a test or exam before it is administered.

ii. **Plagiarism:** Includes but is not limited to the use of another's words or ideas as if they were one's own, including, but not limited to, representing, either with the intent to deceive or by the omission of the true source, part of or an entire work produced by someone other than the student, obtained by purchase or otherwise, as the student's original work or representing the identifiable but altered ideas, data, or writing of another person as if those ideas, data, or writing were the student's original work.

iii. **Inappropriate collaboration or collusion:** Includes but is not limited to unauthorized or inappropriate collaboration between students or between a student and any other person when individual work is required.

iv. **Multiple Submissions:** Includes but is not limited to the resubmission by a student of any work which has been previously submitted for credit in identical or similar form in one course to fulfill the requirements of a second course, without the informed permission/consent of the instructor of the second course; or the submission by a student of any work submitted for credit in identical or similar form in one course to fulfill the requirements of a concurrent course, without the permission/consent of the instructors of both courses.

v. **Falsification/Fabrication/Misrepresentation:** Includes but is not limited to the intentional and unauthorized invention of any data, information, or citation in an academic activity.

vi. **Facilitating Academic Dishonesty:** Includes but is not limited to knowingly helping another student commit an act of academic misconduct or failing to report another student for academic misconduct.

vii. **Coercion Regarding Grading or Evaluation of Coursework:** Includes but is not limited to issuing threats or offering favors or bribes toward an instructor to coerce the instructor to change a grade or otherwise evaluate the student's work by criteria not directly reflective of coursework.

viii. **Copyright Violation:** Includes but is not limited to copyright and other violations of the College's Computer Use Policy 6-53. Such matters are adjudicated under the Student Behavioral Conduct section of this code.

B. Procedure

A student who engages in academic misconduct may be subject to academic sanctions identified below. Sanctions may also include community service, a written reprimand, and/or a written statement of misconduct that can be put into an appropriate record maintained for purposes of the profession or discipline for which the student is preparing. other sanctions specified below under letter C. Sanctions.

a. Any person who observes or discovers academic misconduct by a student must file a written complaint with the faculty member responsible for the pertinent academic activity within fifteen (15) days of the date of discovery of the alleged violation.

1. A student's failure to report academic misconduct on the part of another can result in academic misconduct charges against that student.

b. A faculty member who discovers or receives a complaint of misconduct relating to an academic activity for which the faculty member (is responsible) shall take action under this code and impose an appropriate sanction for the misconduct.

***There is a question whether the policy should include language that a faculty member who fails to report academic misconduct is also open to allegations of misconduct.

c. Upon receipt of a complaint or discovery of academic misconduct, the faculty member shall make reasonable efforts to discuss the alleged academic misconduct with the accused student no later than ten (10) days after the receipt of the complaint or discovery of misconduct, and give the student an opportunity to respond.

d. Within ten (10) days thereafter, the faculty member shall give the student written notice of the academic sanction, if any, to be taken and the student's right to appeal the academic sanction to the Academic Integrity Committee.

C. Sanctions

In all cases, the sanction for academic misconduct should reflect how knowing, intentional and serious the instructor judges the academic misconduct. dishonesty to be. If a faculty member has firm evidence of academic misconduct in a course he/she is instructing, the claim of academic misconduct shall be considered substantiated. The faculty member may impose the following sanctions:

- a. Require that the work be redone, an exam retaken, or an alternate assignment substituted.
- b. Reduce the grade for the assignment or other academic activity.
- c. Issue a grade of 'F' for the paper, project, test, exam, or other academic activity in which the misconduct occurred.
- d. Reduce the grade for the course.
- e. Issue a failing grade for the course.

i. Academic sanctions that can be imposed by the Academic Integrity Committee in these cases include but are not limited to the following:

a. A notation on the student's academic transcript that the F grade in a specific course was issued for academic misconduct. ***THIS SANCTION SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AUTOMATIC IF THE STUDENT HAS BEEN ACCUSED AND SUBSTANTIATED FOR REPEAT ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT.

b. Academic Conduct Censure or Probation. Academic Conduct Probation imposes conditions on a student for a specific period of time.

c. Specified community service.

d. Academic Conduct Suspension or Dismissal from a program. Academic Conduct Suspension shall be for a minimum of one semester following the semester the student is found responsible for academic misconduct.

e. Academic Conduct Suspension or Dismissal from the College. Academic Conduct Suspension shall be for a

minimum of one semester following the semester the student is found responsible for academic misconduct. Dismissal from the college shall be reserved for the most serious or egregious instances of academic misconduct. **SUCH AS any academic misconduct clearly premeditated and consciously chosen and enacted.**

f. Denial of a degree or certificate for which requirements have been completed or revocation of an awarded student's degree or certificate. Grounds for denial or revocation include convincing evidence that the degree recipient engaged (IN) academic misconduct serious enough to negate the legitimate completion of one or more substantive requirements of that degree or certificate.

1. Revocation of an awarded degree or certificate requires the additional approval of the President of the College.

ii. If the faculty member imposed any sanction for academic misconduct, within ten (10) days of imposing the sanction the faculty member shall report the misconduct and the sanction imposed to:

a. The Chair of the Department offering the course.

b. The Registrar's Office **who will maintain an unofficial record of the report not connected to student transcript for the purpose of tracking multiple offenders.**

iii. If the faculty member believes that the student's academic misconduct warrants further academic sanctioning, he/she may, within **ten (10) days** of receiving notice or discovering the misconduct, submit a written complaint with recommendations to the appropriate Department Chair.

iv. Within ten (10) days of such notification, a Department Chair who believes that a student's academic misconduct warrants further academic sanction, may submit a written complaint and recommendation to the AIC on his/her own volition.

v. Alternatively, a faculty member, Department Chair, or Dean may take a complaint directly to the AIC.

a. The Department Chair may undertake an investigation of the allegation and recommendations set forth in the complaint.

b. Within **five (5) days** of receiving the complaint, the Department Chair shall forward the complaint and recommendation to the appropriate Dean. The Department Chair shall accompany the complaint with his/her recommendation supporting or opposing the sanction sought in the complaint.

c. The Dean may undertake an investigation of the allegations and recommendations set forth in the complaint. Within **five (5) days** of receipt of the complaint or learning of the academic misconduct, the Dean shall forward the complaint and recommendation to the Academic Integrity Committee. The Dean shall accompany the complaint with his/her recommendation supporting or opposing the sanction sought in the complaint. The person initiating the original complaint remains as the complainant unless that person agrees that the Department Chair or Dean or other administrative designee shall become the complainant.

***IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT ANY CHARGE OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT BE DISCUSSED IN PERSON OR ELECTRONICALLY BY ALL MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOLS ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP TO FACILITATE PROMPT (within 10 working days) RESPONSE TO THE SITUATION AND IN PREPARATION FOR A POSSIBLE HEARING.**

d. In cases of multiple instances of substantiated academic misconduct, substantiated academic misconduct that damages the academic integrity of a program or the College as a whole, or other egregious circumstances, a faculty member, Department Chair, or Dean, including the Dean of Students or Vice President of Academic Services, may submit a written complaint with recommendation to the Academic Integrity Committee at any time.

vi. STUDENT APPEALS

- A. A student may appeal a charge of academic misconduct and the grade or sanction chosen by the faculty member as a result of the charge of academic misconduct.
- B. The student must exhaust the proper channels within the department and the school before appealing to the Academic Integrity Committee for a hearing. Each level of administration has an opportunity to review the case and make an investigation and written determination of position regarding the charge of academic misconduct.
 - a. The professor.
 - b. Department chair
 - c. Associate dean and/or dean
- C. The student has ten (10) working days from the professor's notification of sanction due to academic misconduct to file a complaint and request for hearing with the Academic Integrity Committee.
- D. If the student has appealed the academic sanction imposed by the faculty member, the time periods may be extended until ten (10) days after the resolution of the student's appeal.

II. **Academic Integrity Committee- The Academic Integrity Committee is charged with adjudicating appeals from students regarding an academic sanction imposed by a faculty member after substantiated academic misconduct and with determining sanctions beyond the faculty member issuing a failing grade for the course.**

- A. The Academic Integrity Committee will be comprised of at least five (5) voting faculty members chosen by the Faculty Senate President and the Vice President of Academic Services, and at least two (2) students selected by the DSCSA President. A **non-voting member will chair the committee**. Members shall be selected for broad representation from College schools, divisions, departments, and programs.
- B. **At least three (3) voting members of the committee must be present at any hearing.**
 - a. **To the extent possible, students and faculty will have representation.**
 - b. The Vice President of Academic Services may excuse any member of the Committee if s/he determines that the member has a conflict of interest. The Vice President of Academic Services shall select an appropriate replacement for the excused member.
- C. The Committee shall establish internal procedures consistent with the Student Code.
- D. **Committee decisions are based on a majority vote.**
 - a. The written appeal or complaint shall be filed with the Committee Chair. Within five (5) days of receipt of the appeal or complaint, the Committee Chair will notify the other parties, supplying copies **of the written appeal**.
 - b. The person responding to the appeal or complaint may deliver his/her written response to the chair of the Committee no later than five (5) days after notification of the complaint and recommendations.
 - c. The Committee Chair shall provide a copy of any written response to the corresponding party.

E. **Hearing Schedule**

The Academic Integrity Committee chair will schedule a hearing date within ten (10) days after the Committee receives the written complaint or appeal. **AS SEMESTERS END PRIOR TO VACATION TIMES, SCHEDULED VACATIONS WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED PART OF WORKING DAYS FOR THE FACULTY/STUDENT MEMBERS OF THE AIC. THE COMMITTEE WILL MAKE EVERY REASONABLE EFFORT TO STAY WITHIN THE TIME GUIDELINES OTHERWISE IN ORDER TO COMPLETE THE HEARING PROCESS IN A TIMELY FASHION.**

Written notice must be sent to the parties not less than five (5) days before the scheduled hearing. Such notice must include the nature of the appeal or complaint, the names of the Committee members, and the time and place of the hearing.

F. **Hearing Guidelines**

- a. Hearings shall be conducted **WITHIN TEN (10) WORKING DAYS** after the Committee's receipt of the complaint.
- b. DSC legal counsel shall serve as a resource to the Committee and may be present at the hearing to provide guidance on substantive law and procedural matters.
- c. Unless they are a complaining party, appropriate Dean(s), including the Dean supervising the student's declared major if applicable may attend the hearing ex officio.
- d. The responding party shall have a right to be accompanied by any person as an advisor, including legal counsel, who will be permitted to attend but not directly participate in the proceedings.
- e. Hearings will be held in accordance with generally accepted standards of procedural due process. Information may be received of the sort upon which responsible persons are accustomed to rely in the conduct of serious affairs, and is not restricted to information admissible under the strict rules of evidence of a court of law.
- f. Hearing shall be closed to the public.
- g. Hearings shall be recorded.
- h. A responding student who is considering an appeal will be granted post-hearing access on campus to review but not copy the recording.
 - i. The student may be accompanied at the review by the advisor who accompanied him/her to the hearing.
- i. No transcript will be made of the recording.
- j. Committee deliberations and voting shall take place in closed session and will not be recorded.
- k. Committee decisions are based on a majority vote.
- l. If the complaining party or the responding student fails to attend the hearing without good cause, the Committee may proceed with the hearing and render a decision based on available testimony and evidence.
- m. The Committee shall make its findings and recommendations based only on evidence and testimony presented by the parties at the hearing. Committee members shall not conduct their own investigations, rely on prior knowledge of the facts or develop their own evidence.
- n. Involved parties must be notified of the Committee's decision within ten (10) days after the conclusion of the hearing.
- o. Written notification to the student of any suspension is required, including conditions for reinstatement, and of the obligation of the student to petition for reinstatement, as appropriate.

G. **If sanctions are imposed or negated, the Registrar's Office must be so notified.**

III. **Appeal to the Vice President of Academic Services**

- A. Within ten (10) days of notification of the Committee's decision, any party may file a written notice of appeal with the Vice President of Academic Services.

- B. The Vice President of Academic Services shall consider the appeal and may solicit whatever counsel and advice the Vice President of Academic Services deems appropriate to arrive at a final decision.
- C. The Vice President of Academic Services may also convene an ad hoc committee composed of students and faculty members from outside the Academic Integrity Committee to determine if there were substantial defects that denied basic fairness and due process.
- D. After receiving the appeal, the Vice President of Academic Services shall, within ten (10) days, or twenty (20) days if an ad hoc committee is formed, take one of the following actions:
 - a. Accept the decision of the Academic Integrity Committee
 - b. Request the Committee to reconsider or clarify specific matters, materials, or issues with a second report regarding the decision relating to the specific matters under reconsideration due not later than ten (10) days after the request.
 - c. Reject all or parts of the Committee's decision, stating reasons and actions to be taken therefore.
- E. Written notification of the Vice President of Academic Services' decision and the basis for that decision shall be communicated to the parties concerned within ten (10) days after receipt of the appeal, or within twenty (20) days after receipt of the appeal if an ad hoc committee is formed.
- F. If sanctions are imposed or negated, the Registrar's Office must be so notified.
- G. The decision of the Vice President of Academic Services shall be final.

IV. MAINTENANCE OF RECORDS (This is a question for Mike and AG)

As all records, evidence, and conversation regarding hearings related to charges of academic misconduct are confidential and protected from public discourse, all evidence and materials following a hearing will be gathered by the Chair of the AIC and stored in restricted space for no more than five (5) years, after which it will be destroyed.

AIC MISSION

The Dixie State College Academic Integrity Committee exists to promote and support an educational environment where academic integrity, honesty and fairness can flourish. The Committee adjudicates appeals from students who have received sanctions from faculty for academic misconduct. It also considers fair and appropriate sanctions when a faculty member or a representative of the College's administration seeks to bring further sanctions against a student for academic misconduct.

Academic Integrity Committee (AIC). Evaluation Form for Student Academic Misconduct

The Academic Integrity Committee is charged with:

- A. adjudicating appeals from students regarding an academic sanction imposed by a faculty member after substantiated academic misconduct and**
- B. determining sanctions beyond the faculty member issuing a failing grade for the course.**

Procedure

Faculty Member	Department Chair	Dean	Academic Integrity Committee
<p>1. If the faculty member has imposed a sanction for academic misconduct, he has ten (10) days to report said misconduct and sanction to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Department Chair of department offering the course b. Registrar’s Office (To the registrar) <p>2. If the faculty member feels the offense deserves further sanctioning, within twenty (20) days of discovering the misconduct, make a recommendation for the extra sanctioning to the appropriate department chair.</p> <p>*This person remains the complainant throughout, unless agreeing to permit Department Chair or Dean to become complainant.</p>	<p>Within ten (ten) days of notification, the Department Chair who also believes the offense warrants further sanction, may submit a recommendation to the AIC. The Department Chair may conduct an investigation of the allegation during this time. Within ten (10) days of receiving the faculty member’s complaint, the Department Chair shall forward the complaint and recommendation to the appropriate Dean.</p>	<p>The Dean may undertake an investigation of the allegation and recommendations. Within ten (10) days of receipt of complaint, the Dean shall forward the complaint to the AIC, along with his/her recommendations supporting or opposing proposed sanctions.</p>	<p>While the due process specified for the complainant(s) goes forward, the AIC may receive an appeal from the student on the original sanction given by the faculty member. All time periods may be extended until ten (10) days after the resolution of the student’s appeal.</p> <p>Within five (5) days of receipt of the appeal or complaint, the Chair will notify the other parties, supplying the written document submitted.</p> <p>The Person responding to the document must deliver his/her response no later than 5 days after receiving the notification and document.</p> <p>The AIC will hold a hearing within ten (10) days after receiving the complaint or appeal, notifying all parties not less than five (5) days before the hearing. Notice will include details of complaint/appeal, names of all parties including committee members.</p> <p>Committee decisions are based on majority vote; minimum three (3) voting members required.</p> <p>The AIC Chair will prepare a written report and notification of AIC findings, determinations, recommendations, and/or sanctions within ten (10) days</p>

Academic Misconduct and Sanctions

Academic Misconduct	Cheating	Plagiarism	Inappropriate collaboration	Multiple Submissions	Falsification, Fabrication, Misrepresentation	Facilitating Academic Dishonesty	Coercion Regarding Grade
Academic Sanctions							
1. Work redone or alternative assign.							
2. Reduce grade for assignment							
3. Reduce the grade for course							
4. Issue an 'F' grade for the activity							
5. Issue an 'F' grade for the course							
AIC Sanctions							
1. Notation in academic transcript							
2. Censure or Probation							
3. Community Service							
4. Suspension or Dismissal(Program)							
5. Suspension or Dismissal (college)							
6. Denial or revocation of degree/ certificate							

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COMMITTEE HEARING OUTLINE

I. Hearing Committee Organization and Rules for Interaction

- a. Organization: All participants organize themselves under the direction of the committee chairperson who will preside, call the hearing to order, direct the course of the hearing, rule on admissibility of evidence, and generally see that the hearing proceeds in an orderly and fair manner
- b. Rules for interaction: All participants will conduct themselves with respect to other participants. Interruption of the presentation of evidence or opinion is unacceptable. The presiding chairperson will facilitate interaction in a way that permits each participant to speak to evidence, answer questions, and clarify points of confusion without interruption. Confidentiality of the meeting will be maintained by all Dixie State College representatives in compliance with FERPA standards for colleges and individuals.
- c. The chair will open the meeting with introductions and a verbal reminder of the requirement of civil and respectful exchange at all times. In order to accomplish a fair and impartial decision, all participants will try to understand the perspective of both parties.

b. II. Order of presentation

- a. Opening statement by chair presiding, stating the nature of the appeal and the sanction that has been imposed by the faculty member.
- b. The instructor will present the evidence collected to substantiate the sanction chosen. The instructor will be given no more than fifteen (15) minutes to present the evidence and to justify the sanction based on the rigor of professional and departmental expectations. Time will carefully be monitored by a member of the committee, and an alert given within two (2) minutes of the ten minute period.
- c. The student will present his/her evidence for appealing the sanction chosen by the instructor. The student will be given no more than fifteen (15) minutes to present this evidence. In addition to presenting the evidence for the appeal, the student may also use this time to ask questions of clarification of the instructor as part of the appeal. The instructor will be permitted to respectfully and directly answer questions to the best of his/her ability.
- d. The chair will then open discussion to all participants. Committee members will ask questions of either instructor or student seeking to clarify points of confusion on either side. At this time, representatives, instructor, and student may ask questions of each other and the committee. This discussion will be limited to no more than fifteen (15) minutes.

III. Ruling

- a. The instructor and his/her representative will take leave of the hearing. There are no further obligations for either in the hearing process.
- b. After departure of the instructor and representative, the student and his/her representative will leave the hearing room and wait outside.
- c. The AIC committee will discuss the evidence presented and choose a ruling in the case based on the guidelines provided in the Student Academic Misconduct Policy. The committee will treat all evidence as sensitive and confidential. Members are obligated not to discuss evidence or persons involved outside of these proceedings.
- d. The committee will develop a statement of decision based on the facts as presented by both parties, in consideration of the guidelines in the policy, and decided by a majority vote of the

committee members. The statement will include a decision justified by the guidelines in the policy.

- e. The student are representative are brought back into the hearing room and given the statement of decision as well as justification. The student is informed that the committee's decision may be appealed once more to the Academic Vice-President.
- f. The committee chair will put the statement of decision into writing and copy all participants, the department chair and dean of the school, and the academic vice-president. Included in the statement will be an advisement to all participants that there is a further appeal process beyond this committee.