Syracuse University’s Academic Integrity (AI) Hearing Guide establishes the process that is followed during all Academic Integrity Hearings. Most recently revised in January 2015, the Hearing Guide is based on requirements specified in Syracuse University’s Academic Integrity Policies and Procedures and draws upon prior versions of the AI Hearing Guide as well as on SU’s Judicial System Training Manual 2005-2006.

AI hearings are informal and administrative in nature. Their goal is to provide the instructor with an opportunity to present evidence that a violation of SU’s Academic Integrity Policies and Procedures has occurred and to provide the student with an opportunity to respond to that evidence either by acknowledging the violation or by challenging it. AI hearings also provide the student with an opportunity to accept or challenge the sanction proposed by the instructor. In complex cases, such as those involving multiple students, the AIO may, with approval of the Associate Provost for Academic Programs, modify hearing procedures to ensure fairness and efficiency.
Immediately Before the Hearing Begins

1. The hearing panel chairperson, officially named the University Academic Integrity Representative or “UAIR,” speaks privately with the student(s) and the instructor to obtain phone numbers and email addresses for use in informing both parties of the outcome of the hearing after the panel concludes its deliberations. (Students are also welcome to wait nearby to hear the outcome in person.)

2. The UAIR meets with hearing panel members to answer any procedural questions they have before opening the hearing.

3. The UAIR resolves any issues arising from the failure of any panel member, student, instructor or other party to the hearing to appear on time.¹

4. The UAIR calls the instructor, student(s) and any support person(s) accompanying them into the hearing room to join the panel members.²

Opening the Hearing

5. The UAIR performs introductions and explains the nature of the hearing, including the role of the UAIR, and the obligation of all hearing participants to maintain confidentiality and civility:

   a. **Introductions:** The UAIR introduces her/himself and asks the panel members, instructor and student to state their names and roles in the hearing.

   b. **Nature and Purpose of Hearing:** The UAIR explains that the hearing is an informal administrative proceeding, not a civil or criminal trial. Civil and criminal rules of evidence and standards of proof do not apply. The purpose of the hearing is to provide the student and the instructor with an opportunity to present testimony and evidence regarding the charge that the student violated Syracuse University’s Academic Integrity Policies and Procedures.³ All evidence and testimony will be presented while the student and instructor are present unless one of the parties fails to attend the hearing. No private testimony to the hearing panel by either party is permitted.

¹ The UAIR may delay the start of a hearing for a short period in order to contact or wait for a hearing panel member or other party to the hearing. If the absent party does not arrive within approximately 15 minutes, the UAIR will consult with AIO staff immediately. In most cases, including the absence of the student or instructor, the hearing will proceed. An exception occurs if the absence of a panel member would result in failure to satisfy requirements for panel composition, e.g. that each panel include an equal number of students and instructors and at least one administrator (Academic Integrity Policies and Procedures, Section IV.A., School/College Hearings, pp. 15-16).

² The student and the instructor are each permitted to bring one support person to the hearing. The support person may be an advisor, department chair, friend, family member or someone else in a position to provide emotional or practical support, including legal counsel. The support person may only advise the student or instructor and is not permitted to address the Hearing Panel during the proceedings or to direct or coach testimony.

³ Cases that occur outside of courses may be brought by the Academic Integrity Coordinator of the school or college where the violation occurred or by another representative of the University. In such cases, references in this Hearing Guide to “the instructor” will apply to the person bringing the case on behalf of the school/college or University.
Opening the Hearing (continued)

i. **Role of the Hearing Panel:** The hearing panel listens to the testimony, considers it impartially, asks relevant questions, decides whether a violation of the Academic Integrity Policies occurred, and recommends an appropriate sanction for any violation it finds. *The standard of proof is “a preponderance of the evidence.”* This means that a charge will be upheld if the panel concludes it is “more likely than not” that the student violated the Policies (Academic Integrity Policies and Procedures, Section VI.C., Procedures Applicable to Academic Integrity Hearings, p. 17).

ii. **Role of the UAIR:** The UAIR chairs the hearing and ensures that Academic Integrity Policies and Procedures are followed. Only members of the hearing panel - not the UAIR – vote. However, the UAIR is responsible for ensuring the fairness of the hearing process. Therefore, it is appropriate for the UAIR to raise relevant questions and points not addressed by the student or instructor during their presentations or by hearing panel members during questioning. As discussed below, the UAIR is also responsible for maintaining civility and guiding discussion if it strays from topics relevant to the hearing. Finally, the UAIR has authority to resolve any conflicts or last-minute requests (e.g. for presentation of additional evidence or calling of new witnesses) that arise during the hearing. If necessary, the UAIR may call a brief recess to consider the matter in question and/or to consult with AIO staff.

iii. **Confidentiality:** The UAIR reminds hearing participants that, “Academic integrity hearings are confidential. The student, instructor, UAIR and hearing panel members are prohibited from disclosing (a) correspondence, documents, evidence and other written materials prepared or submitted in connection with an academic integrity hearing; as well as, (b) information discussed during an academic integrity hearing. However, a student may share information regarding an academic integrity matter with a support person or with legal counsel.”

**Challenges**

6. **By the Instructor:** The UAIR asks the instructor whether she or he believes any panel member has a conflict of interest that could prevent the panel member from weighing testimony impartially.

7. **By the Student:** The UAIR asks the student whether she or he believes any panel member has a conflict of interest that could prevent that panel member from weighing testimony impartially.

---

4 If the student admits academic dishonesty but appeals the sanction, the hearing panel typically considers only the sanction, not whether a violation occurred. Testimony and questioning focus on matters relevant to determining the sanction and may be abbreviated if the UAIR deems this appropriate.

5 Panel members should not be close friends or colleagues of the instructor or student, should not hold a position of authority over either, and, to the extent possible, should not be in the same department as either. The UAIR has authority to recess the hearing to confer privately with any party asserting a conflict of interest, to decide whether a conflict exists, and to dismiss any panel member found to have a conflict. In the event that dismissal is necessary, the UAIR will consult AIO staff immediately to determine whether the hearing will proceed or be postponed. The UAIR also has authority to resolve any other potential conflicts of interest that arise, e.g. involving support persons or witnesses.
Summary of the Charge and Student Response

8. **Summary of the Instructor’s Charge:** The UAIR summarizes the case contained in the *Charge of Academic Dishonesty* (also known as the “Instructor Resolution”) provided to all hearing participants in advance of the hearing. The UAIR may also summarize additional documentation provided by the Instructor. The UAIR asks the instructor whether she/he wishes to amend the Charge. (The instructor will have an opportunity to present her/his case later during the hearing. Only amendments will be heard at this time.)

9. **Summary of the Student’s Response:** The UAIR summarizes the student’s response contained in the Student Hearing Statement provided to all hearing participants in advance of the hearing. The UAIR may also summarize additional documentation provided by the student. The UAIR asks the student whether she/he wishes to amend the Student Hearing Statement. (The student will have an opportunity to present her/his case shortly. Only amendments to the Student Hearing Statement will be heard at this time.)

10. **Scope of Hearing Panel Decisions:** The UAIR clarifies what decisions the hearing panel will make. If the student admits academic dishonesty, the hearing panel will review only the proposed sanction. If the student denies having been academically dishonest (either by admitting academic negligence or by denying the violation entirely), the panel will review both the evidence that a violation occurred – either through dishonesty or negligence – and the proposed sanction.

Instructor Presentation of the Case and Student Response

11. **Standards and Procedures for Presentation and Response:** The UAIR reviews applicable standards and procedures, summarizing each point below:
   
   a. **Length, Detail and Subject Matter:** The instructor’s presentation and the student’s response provide an opportunity for each to expand upon key points in the Instructor’s Charge and Student Hearing Statement. As these documents are provided to hearing panel members in advance and summarized by the UAIR, neither the instructor nor student should read or describe either document in its entirety.

---

6 Instructor amendments are appropriate only when the instructor becomes aware shortly before the hearing of new information that substantially alters her or his understanding of the facts of the case. If the instructor gains significant, new information after filing the Charge but more than a week before the scheduled hearing, she or he should contact the school/college Academic Integrity Coordinator and the AIO immediately so that the new information can be provided to the UAIR and hearing panelists prior to the hearing.

7 A student’s failure to submit a Statement will not delay a scheduled hearing.

8 Student amendments are appropriate under two circumstances: a) when the student becomes aware shortly before the hearing of new information that substantially alters her or his response to the Charge, including an amendment by the instructor, or b) when the student decides shortly before or at the hearing to change her or his stance, e.g. from denial to acceptance of the dishonesty charge. If these events occur a week or more before the scheduled hearing, the student should contact the school/college Academic Integrity Coordinator and the AIO immediately so that the new information can be provided to the UAIR and hearing panelists prior to the hearing.
Instructor Presentation of the Case and Student Response (continued)

If the instructor and/or student feels that the case is explained sufficiently by these documents, each has the option to decline to make a presentation or to make an abbreviated presentation. Whether or not the instructor and student make presentations, the hearing panel will have an opportunity to question each party. The instructor presentation and the student response are normally limited to no more than 10 minutes each. Presentations may be shorter. The UAIR may extend the time if necessary, e.g. to allow full explanation of the circumstances of a particularly complex case.

b. **Questioning:** Panel members will have an opportunity to ask questions of the instructor and of the student after each presentation. (During the presentations, panel members should refrain from posing questions other than requests for clarification.) Once the panel members have posed their questions, the student and the instructor will have an opportunity to ask questions of one another. Although panel members pose their questions directly to the instructor and student, the student and instructor pose any questions they have for each other to the UAIR, who will direct the question to the relevant party.

c. **Civility and Respect:** The UAIR is responsible for maintaining an atmosphere of civility and respect for all hearing participants. Restating or elaborating on a question once for purposes of clarification is permissible. Badgering a hearing participant by repeating the same question multiple times or engaging in other rude behavior is prohibited. If any hearing participant (instructor, student or panel member) violates these norms, the UAIR will warn the participant to refrain from the behavior. If the behavior continues, the UAIR may call a brief recess, discuss the matter privately with the hearing participant, and, if necessary, excuse the hearing participant or discontinue the hearing (Academic Integrity Policies and Procedures, Section VI.G., Procedures Applicable to Academic Integrity Hearings, p. 18.)

d. **Relevance of Testimony and Questioning:** The subject of the hearing is the charge of academic dishonesty brought against the student. Hearing panels do not pass judgment on the student’s overall character or on the strengths or shortcomings of the instructor’s course. The instructor, student and hearing panel members should address the specific charge of academic dishonesty during presentations and questions and answers. The UAIR is responsible for keeping the hearing focused on the key question: Did the student violate SU’s Academic Integrity Policies? The UAIR may limit testimony that is not pertinent to this question.

12. Instructor Presentation

a. **Presentation:** The UAIR invites the instructor to present her or his case to the panel.

b. **Panel Member Questions:** Panel members put questions directly to the instructor.

c. **Student Questions:** The UAIR invites the student to state to the UAIR any questions that the student would like the UAIR to put to the instructor. Only questions – not statements - are allowed at this time. The student will have an opportunity to present her or his case shortly.

d. **UAIR Questions:** The UAIR asks the instructor any additional questions that the UAIR believes are pertinent to the case and have not yet been addressed.
Instructor Presentation of the Case and Student Response (continued)

13. Student Response

a. Response: The UAIR invites the student to respond to the case presented by the instructor.

b. Mitigating Circumstances: If the student acknowledges having violated the Policies and wishes to raise potentially mitigating circumstances, the student should do so at this point in the hearing. Any student who raises potentially mitigating circumstances will be expected to document those circumstances with credible evidence.

c. Panel Member Questions: Panel members put questions directly to the student.

d. Instructor Questions: The UAIR invites the instructor to state to the UAIR any questions that the instructor would like the UAIR to put to the student.

e. UAIR Questions: The UAIR asks the student any additional questions that the UAIR believes are pertinent to the case and have not yet been addressed.

Optional Witness and Closing Statements

14. Presentation of Evidence by Witnesses

a. Eligible Witnesses: Either party may call relevant witnesses in support of her or his position. Witnesses must have knowledge of facts relevant to the academic integrity charge. The UAIR may preclude witnesses from testifying if their statements are not relevant or they offer only opinions, not facts.

b. Notice of Plans to Call a Witness: An instructor who wishes to call a witness should include this information at the time she or he files the original academic dishonesty charge. A student who wishes to call a witness should include this request in the Student Hearing Statement. Advance notice of requests for witnesses allow the school/college Academic Integrity Coordinator to include a list of scheduled witnesses in the hearing materials and, in consultation with the Academic Integrity Office, to confirm that each witness possesses relevant, factual information about the case. The UAIR has authority to make final decisions on the hearing day with regard to potential challenges to witnesses or last-minute requests for presentation of witnesses.

c. Procedures for Witness Testimony: Witnesses will be called in one at a time to make a short statement generally lasting no more than five minutes. The UAIR will then give hearing panel participants an opportunity to question each witness. Panel members will pose their questions first, followed by the instructor and then the student. Then, the UAIR may pose any pertinent questions not already asked of the witness. Immediately thereafter, each witness will be excused.

15. Closing Statements

a. Procedures for Closing Statements: Closing statements are allowed at the discretion of the UAIR. The UAIR has authority to dispense with closing statements if she or he judges that each party has had adequate opportunity to present her or his case. If closing statements are permitted, each party will have an opportunity to speak for no more than five minutes. The UAIR has authority to enforce this time limit and will begin with the instructor’s closing statement.
Dismissal of Instructor, Student and Support Persons

16. Confidentiality Reminder:
The UAIR reminds all hearing participants of their obligation to maintain the confidentiality of the hearing proceedings and documents.

17. Thanks and Dismissal:
The UAIR explains that the main, information gathering portion of the hearing is concluded. After ascertaining whether the student wishes to wait nearby to hear the outcome of the hearing in person or be notified via phone or email, the UAIR thanks the instructor, student and any support persons for their participation and dismisses them from the hearing room.

Deliberations and Sanction Selection

18. Majority vote:
All panel decisions regarding the violation and sanction are made by majority vote.

19. Decision 1: Did a violation occur?
Deliberation typically takes place in two stages. First, if the student has denied the violation or made a case that the violation constituted academic negligence rather than academic dishonesty, the panel considers whether a violation has occurred and, if so, what type of violation. The panel has three options at this stage: (1) Uphold the original charge of academic dishonesty; (2) Downgrade the dishonesty charge to academic negligence; or (3) Overturn the charge based on a conclusion that no violation occurred. The panel may not discuss potential sanctions during this stage of the deliberations. Discussion of potential sanctions is appropriate only after a panel decides by majority vote that a violation has occurred. The relevant standard of proof in considering whether a violation occurred is a preponderance of the evidence. That is, the panel members must find the student in violation if they conclude by majority vote that it is “more likely than not” that the student has violated the policies (Academic Integrity Policies and Procedures, Section VI.C., Procedures Applicable to Academic Integrity Hearings, p. 17).

a. Decision of no violation: If the panel determines by majority vote that no violation has occurred, the UAIR thanks the panel members, collects all hearing materials from them, and concludes the hearing. The UAIR then moves to Step Number 21 of this Hearing Guide on page 9, under the section titled “Closure of the Hearing.”

---

9 However, if the student has accepted responsibility for the violation, the panel may skip Step Number 19 of this Hearing Guide and move directly to Step Number 20 on page 8, consideration of an appropriate sanction.

10 Cases brought to a hearing panel generally involve charges of dishonesty. However, the AIO will reclassify a negligence charge as dishonesty for purposes of appeal when a student makes this request. In such cases, the AIO notifies the UAIR and panel members of the reason for reclassification, but the hearing panel retains final authority over the violation decision and may uphold the instructor’s original negligence charge, upgrade the case to dishonesty, or find that no violation occurred.
Deliberations and Sanction Selection (continued)

b. Negligence vs. dishonesty: If the panel believes that a violation occurred but is not confident that the student violated the Policies intentionally, the panel may consider whether the facts of the case merit reducing the charge from dishonesty to negligence. The Policies define academic negligence as “careless or mistaken academic work that otherwise appears to constitute deliberate academic dishonesty” (Academic Integrity Policies, Section III.B., Academic Dishonesty and Academic Negligence, p. 8). The nature and extent of the violation bear on questions of intent. “For example, a student who cites long passages from a book without acknowledgment cannot expect to convince decision makers that the omission was merely ‘negligent.’ All students – especially graduate and professional students – bear a heavy burden of scrutiny when claiming that apparent acts of academic dishonesty lacked an intent to deceive” (Academic Integrity Policies, Section III.A., Academic Dishonesty and Academic Negligence, pp. 7-8). In distinguishing between negligence and dishonesty, the panel should consider that undergraduate and graduate students provide their electronic signature in MySlice each fall and spring acknowledging that they have read a short description of SU’s Academic Integrity Policies and agreeing to abide by them or risk sanctions up to and including expulsion from SU. Hearing panel members considering a charge of academic negligence should review Section III. of the Academic Integrity Policies and Procedures, “Academic Dishonesty and Academic Negligence” (pp. 7-9 of the Policies). Only students without a prior violation on record may have the current charge downgraded to negligence. A hearing panel that decides to downgrade the charge to negligence and subsequently learns that the student has a prior established violation on record must return to a charge of dishonesty as described further below.11

20. Decision 2: What sanction is appropriate?

If the panel decides that the student did violate Academic Integrity Policies either through academic dishonesty or through academic negligence, the panel moves to the second stage of deliberations:

a. The UAIR opens a sealed envelope containing a memorandum from the AIO to the hearing panel. The UAIR reads this memorandum aloud. It specifies whether the student has any prior violations and briefly describes them and their resolutions.

b. Panel members discuss what sanction or sanctions are appropriate, taking into account circumstances specific to the case as well as the applicable presumptive penalty under SU’s Academic Integrity Policies and Procedures (Section VII., Consequences of Violations, pp. 18-19). The UAIR and hearing panel members should consult the guidelines for sanction selection on pages 10-12 of this Hearing Guide before beginning deliberation on sanctions. Except in cases in which a student is accused of altering a transcript, information about the transcript will not be included among the hearing materials, and the student’s academic standing in the course and in the school/college should not be considered in evaluating an appropriate sanction.

---

11 Under the Policies, a student may benefit from the assumption of negligence (unintentional violation) only once. Any subsequent violation will be treated as academic dishonesty since the existence of a prior negligence or dishonesty charge indicates that the student received official notification from the AIO of her or his responsibility to learn and abide by SU’s Academic Integrity Policies and since prior negligence charges “may be considered in the fact-finding and penalty components” of subsequent charges (Academic Integrity Policies and Procedures, Section III.D., Academic Dishonesty and Academic Negligence, p. 9).
Closure of the Hearing

21. All hearing materials are collected:
To preserve confidentiality, the UAIR collects all hearing materials from hearing panel members and gives them to the school/college Academic Integrity Coordinator or the Coordinator’s designee for safekeeping until time limits for student appeal of any suspension or expulsion recommendation have expired.

22. Appreciation of service and confidentiality reminder:
The UAIR thanks the hearing panel members for their service and reminds them of their obligation to maintain the confidentiality of all hearing materials and proceedings.

23. Informal notification of student and instructor:
The UAIR communicates the outcome of the hearing to the student and instructor as soon as possible after the hearing concludes.

24. Formal notification of student and instructor:
The UAIR completes and submits the Hearing Decision Form to the Academic Integrity Office (AIO) within three business days. The AIO uses this form to provide written notice of the hearing outcome to the instructor, the student, and the Academic Integrity Coordinator(s) and Advisor(s) of the school/college where the violation was reported and of the student’s home school/college if these differ.

25. Appeal rights for suspension/expulsion recommendations:
Under SU’s Academic Integrity Policies and Procedures, Section V., Appeals from Hearing Panels, pp. 16-17, cases in which a panel imposes a penalty less than suspension or expulsion are not subject to appeal. In these cases, the hearing panel’s findings as to whether a violation occurred, whether any violation found involved academic dishonesty or academic negligence, and any associated penalties imposed by the hearing panel are final. However, cases in which a hearing panel recommends suspension or expulsion are automatically subject to review by the Associate Provost for Academic Programs. In such cases, the AIO will notify the student and instructor of their option to submit a written response to the Hearing Panel’s recommendation within five business days.
Guidelines for Sanction Selection

The presumptive penalties stated in the Policies and listed below serve as important guidelines. *In the interest of fair and uniform treatment of academic integrity cases, hearing panel members are encouraged to seriously consider the presumptive penalty and to avoid deviating greatly from it;* if hearing panel members conclude that a greater or lesser penalty is appropriate, they should give serious consideration to the penalty logically one step above or below the applicable presumptive penalty before considering a penalty that departs further from the applicable presumptive penalty.

**Presumptive penalty for a first violation by an undergraduate student:**
A failing course grade with a transcript notation specifying that course failure resulted from an academic integrity violation. This notation may be removed if the student successfully completes SU’s Academic Integrity Seminar.

**Presumptive penalty for a first violation by a graduate student or a second or higher violation by an undergraduate student:** Suspension or expulsion from SU.

*For an undergraduate student facing a first dishonesty charge, the sanction one step above the presumptive penalty: is one-semester suspension, while the sanction one step below the presumptive penalty is course grade reduction (or failure of an exam or assignment of enough significance to result in course grade reduction).*

*For a graduate student facing a first dishonesty charge or an undergraduate facing a second or higher dishonesty charge, the presumptive penalty of suspension or expulsion itself encompasses a range of options, including suspension for one or two semesters and expulsion. There is no greater penalty than expulsion. One step below the presumptive penalty is course failure. The Policies state that the decision by a hearing panel to impose a penalty less than suspension or expulsion in the case of a graduate student “requires a written explanation” (Academic Integrity Policies and Procedures, Section VII.A.2, Consequences of Violations, p. 18).*

**Penalties for Negligence:** Although the Policies specify that students shall be held “accountable” for academic negligence and are subject to penalties (Academic Integrity Policies and Procedures, Section III.B., Academic Dishonesty and Academic Negligence, p. 8), hearing panels typically levy lesser sanctions for negligence, such as a grade reduction for the paper in which the negligence occurred. The AIO strongly encourages hearing panel members to align sanction selection with the violation decision so that a lesser charge of negligence is accompanied by lesser penalties.

**Suspension and Expulsion:** All cases in which a hearing panel selects suspension or expulsion (with or without additional penalties) become recommendations to the Associate Provost for Academic Programs. Cases in which a panel selects a penalty or penalties lesser than suspension/expulsion are final decisions not subject to further review. (See Step Number 25 above of this Hearing Guide and Academic Integrity Policies and Procedures, Section V. Appeals from Hearing Panels, pp. 16-17).
Guidelines for Sanction Selection (continued)

Course-Related and Non-Course-Related Violations and Sanctions: Most violations occur within the context of a course, for example, cheating on an examination or assignment. In some cases, however, violations are not directly related to a course or take place well after the relevant course ends. Examples include falsifying a transcript submitted in conjunction with a scholarship or graduate school application and claiming another student’s work as one’s own for purposes of a job application. The AIO will notify the UAIR in advance of the hearing when an alleged violation is not course related. In such cases, a separate set of potential sanctions (listed below) applies.

Number of Sanctions: Hearing panels recommending suspension or expulsion typically also recommend a course-related penalty if the violation occurred within the context of a course. For example, a graduate student found to have plagiarized a final paper might receive a failing grade for the course with a suspension. Similarly, students found to have violated the Policies for a second time usually receive sanctions beyond those associated with the violation itself, for example, course failure for the violation and suspension in recognition of the prior violation.

Range of Possible Sanctions for Academic Integrity Violations Occurring within a Course:12

- Grade of zero for the assignment or exam in which the violation occurred
- Reduction of the overall course grade, e.g. one letter grade lower than the student would have received otherwise
- Failing course grade – transcript notation indicating failure resulted from a violation will be removed upon successful completion of the Academic Integrity Seminar
- Failing course grade – permanent transcript notation indicating failure resulted from a violation
- Suspension for one or two semesters – permanent transcript notation indicating suspension resulted from a violation
- Expulsion – permanent transcript notation indicating expulsion resulted from a violation

Range of Possible Sanctions for Academic Integrity Violations NOT Occurring within a Course:13

- Transcript notation indicating the occurrence of a violation – removable upon successful completion of the Academic Integrity Seminar
- Permanent transcript notation indicating an academic integrity violation – not removable
- Suspension for one or two semesters – permanent transcript notation indicating suspension resulted from an academic integrity violation
- Expulsion – permanent transcript notation indicating expulsion resulted from an academic integrity violation

12 The hearing panel determines whether the transcript notation accompanying course failure is temporary or permanent. However, all transcript notations indicating that suspension or expulsion resulted from an academic integrity violation are permanent.

13 The hearing panel determines whether the transcript notation accompanying a non-course-related violation is temporary or permanent. However, all transcript notations indicating that suspension or expulsion resulted from an academic integrity violation are permanent.
Guidelines for Sanction Selection (continued)

The Academic Integrity Seminar

Any student whose academic dishonesty charge is upheld is required under the Policies to take and successfully complete an educational seminar offered by the AIO. This free, online seminar is offered through Blackboard, with new sessions available approximately every six weeks. Students are automatically enrolled in the next available seminar session after their dishonesty charges are established. Students have approximately three months to complete the seminar.

The seminar includes reading and writing designed to educate students about SU’s AI Policies and Procedures and an essay requiring the student to describe and reflect upon the violation and subsequent experiences and learning. Hearing panels have the option to require that a student successfully complete the next available seminar or face an increase in the severity of her or his sanction. For example, a hearing panel could require a student to successfully complete the next available seminar or face an increase in the sanction from course failure to course failure with one-semester suspension. (The AIO reserves the option to adjust seminar deadlines when necessary.)

Other Sanctions

The AIO is ordinarily unable to supervise or enforce sanctions beyond those listed in this Hearing Guide, such as individually tailored writing assignments or requirements for community service. The UAIR should contact the AIO during deliberations if hearing panel members wish to consider sanctions not listed here.

Students Approaching Graduation

No student found in violation of SU’s Academic Integrity Policies will be allowed to graduate without fulfilling all requirements established by the hearing panel, including any deadline set by the panel for successful completion of the AI seminar. A student who has met all requirements for graduation except those established by the hearing panel will not be eligible to graduate until she or he fulfills those requirements, including any period of suspension recommended by the Hearing Panel and approved by the Associate Provost.