

Academic Integrity Council

Procedures – Guidelines for Faculty

When faculty suspects an Academic Integrity (AI) violation (see [AI policy](#) for definition of violations)

- **Enquiry Stage (AI Policy V 1. B)**
 - Faculty member weighs evidence.
 - Faculty **may** consult dept. chair with respect to suspicion of AI violation.
 - Faculty member notifies the student individually, orally and/or in writing.
 - A meeting with student **may** occur to gather information.
 - Student may not change registration, i.e. may not withdraw from the course. Faculty member should notify student of this.
 - Withdrawal from the course would be considered a separate violation.
 - If evidence is substantial proceed to determination stage.
 - If evidence is not substantial drop the case.

- **Determination stage (AI Policy V.2.A)**
 - Faculty believes that there **is** an Academic Integrity (AI) violation.
 - Faculty is required to consult Provost's office to check for prior violations by the student suspected of AI violation. Use Request to Determine Prior Violation form (Form 1). Based on result, proceed to either #1 or #2

1) If a prior violation **has** occurred

- Provost's office notifies faculty member of prior and refers the case to AIC for formal resolution with the details of the prior violation

Formal resolution process

- *AIC sets up a hearing panel.*
 - Student and faculty member are informed of time and location (see AI Policy V.3.D for details)
 - Hearing is conducted (see AI Policy V.3.E for details of the Hearing panel process)
 - Hearing Panel renders a decision
- *Outcome/Decision form (Form 3)* to be completed by the Hearing panel chair and sent to the provost's office.
 - A letter is sent to the student by the hearing panel chair with complete information including the potential for appeal (AI Policy V.2.E.)

- Provost's office:
 - Information from Form 3 entered into Provost's database.
 - Notifies Academic records as appropriate.

2) If no prior violation has occurred

<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Faculty member informs student of AI violation in writing (email is acceptable).○ The faculty member should make it clear that the student has a chance to respond within 10 business days.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ If no response from student or if the student responds but does not agree to proceed with informal resolution.<ul style="list-style-type: none">– Refer to AIC for setting up a hearing panel to follow the formal resolution process (see previous page).
<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Student responds and agrees to proceed with informal resolution process.<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Faculty or academic unit head and student will discuss the allegation.- If after discussing the circumstances with the student, the faculty or academic unit head concludes that there is no violation of this policy, the matter is over. Notify the Provost's office that the case was dropped.- If the faculty still believes a violation has occurred, the faculty or academic unit head and the student may pursue an informal resolution. (See AIC policy section V.2.B. for informal resolution options)- Either the faculty or student may seek the assistance of the course's Department chair, and subsequently the course's Dean at the informal resolution stage. Please consult one or both before abandoning the informal resolution.- If the student does not admit responsibility for the violation or disagrees with the sanction to be imposed by the faculty member or academic unit head, either party may request that the case be referred to the Council.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ AI informal resolution form (Form 2) is completed by the faculty member.

- Faculty member and student sign the informal resolution form.
- A copy of the signed form should be given to the student, a copy retained by the faculty member and the original sent to the Provost's office.
- The informal resolution form (Form 2) is used to enter violation in Provost's database.

Rev: 07/30