Consensus Recommendations of the Academic Integrity Policy Review Advisory Committee

1. CENTRALIZED REPORTING: Maintaining the current system of instructor case reporting via MySlice, with tracking of all Academic Integrity cases by the Academic Integrity Office (AIO).

2. SINGLE CHARGE: Adopting a single charge – “Violation of the Academic Integrity Policy” – in place of the two current charges, “academic negligence” and “academic dishonesty.”

3. MORE EDUCATION: Making academic integrity central to teaching and learning.
   a. Adding rotating banks of automatically graded quiz questions and a video to the summary of AI expectations acknowledged by incoming 1st-year and transfer students via Think About It and by returning undergraduate and graduate students each fall/spring semester via MySlice.
   b. Instituting a registration hold to prevent students who fail to successfully complete the academic integrity seminar after a violation from registering for the subsequent semester.
   c. Expanded production by the AIO of educational materials for classroom use in the Schools and Colleges.

4. SANCTIONS: Replacing the current presumptive penalties (XF/suspension/expulsion) with a rubric classifying violations based on extent and severity. Instructors would determine appropriate grade-related sanctions. School/college AI Panels would determine non-grade sanctions:
   a. Level 1 (e.g., inappropriate collaboration on homework) – Letter of Reprimand
   b. Level 2 (e.g., possession/use of cell phone during an exam; limited failure to attribute sources) – Probation
   c. Level 3 (e.g., altering a transcript, extensive plagiarism of major paper/ thesis) – Suspension or expulsion

5. AI PANELS: Each school and college would annually appoint faculty, student and senior administrative members to serve on a University Academic Integrity Panel. Members from each School/College – with assistance from members of other Schools/Colleges when requested or required – would be responsible for:
   a. Representing School/College interests, advising faculty coordinating with AIO (AI Coordinator)
   b. Advising students (AI Advisor)
   c. Interviewing students to gather information before formal case initiation (faculty member)
   d. Designating case level & non-grade sanction (School/College subpanel)
   e. Resolving cases as described below (School/College- or School/College-majority subpanel)

6. CASE RESOLUTION: Establishing three avenues for case resolution:
   a. Expedited: Student promptly admits a Level 1 or 2 violation and accepts the grade-related sanction set by the instructor and non-grade sanction determined by the School/College subpanel
   b. Written review: Student admits a Level 1 or 2 violation but submits a written request for a reduction in the proposed grade- or non-grade sanction. This request will be considered by a School/College subpanel, which will issue a written decision. No hearing will be held.
   c. Hearing by School/College-Majority subpanel: Student does not admit violation; or, student faces likely suspension or expulsion (Level 3 violation); or, AIC requests hearing.

7. APPEALS: Appeal processes would be based within the School/College rather than the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Programs. Students would have 7 business days after receipt of a subpanel decision to submit a written request for appeal based on (i) the emergence of new, previously unavailable evidence or (ii) failure to follow required procedure –when either is significant enough to likely alter the case outcome. Successful appeals will be considered by a new School/College-majority subpanel.

8. FINAL DECISION LETTERS: Final case decisions will be issued on behalf of the School/College Dean to convey the importance the School/College places on academic integrity and the significance of the violation.
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