APPENDIX A
PROCEDURES FOR ACADEMIC INTEGRITY PROCESS

Below are the basic procedures that are followed when an academic integrity violation is suspected.

I. Making A Charge

1. Gather evidence, which may include meeting with the student and should include making copies of any documents related to the case.

2. Determine who is responsible for making a charge. (See Table 1: Primary Responsibility for Bringing a Charge)

3. Determine whether prior violations exist by completing and submitting a Discovery Form to the Provost’s Office using the PEAR email system at go.uis.edu/PEAR to ensure the security and confidentiality of your email.

4. The faculty member or academic unit head should then notify the student in writing of the basis of the belief that a violation occurred, using the PEAR email system referenced above. This notice should advise the student he or she has 10 business days to respond to the allegation. If the student is either unwilling or unable to respond or drops the course, the case must be referred to the Academic Integrity Council (Council) for review by a Hearing Panel. Discuss the circumstances with the student and decide whether a violation occurred.

5. If both the student and faculty member or academic unit head agree to the student's responsibility for the violation and to the sanction to be imposed, the faculty or academic unit head must submit an Academic Integrity Violation Report Form to the Council and send copies of the report to the student and the Provost. If the student disagrees, the student may request a hearing.

6. Determine the Tier level that applies to the alleged allegation (See Preface for Tier levels).

   a. If no prior violations have occurred, proceed to Tier 1 (written warning with a learning plan) or to a more consequential Tier which includes Tier 2 (agreement with sanctions) or Tier 3 (referral to hearing).

   b. If one or more prior violation(s) have occurred, but the new violation is different in kind to the previous violation, then proceed to Tier 1, Tier 2 or Tier 3.

   c. If one or more prior violation(s) have occurred, and the new violation is the same in kind as the previous violation(s), proceed to Tier 2 (agreement with sanction) or Tier 3 (request a hearing).

   d. If one or more violations have occurred and you are uncertain about how to proceed, please consult with the Council Chair to make this determination.

II. Referral to a Hearing

Cases not resolved through Tiers 1 and 2 will be referred for a hearing. If a student disagrees with the charge, he or she may request a hearing. A hearing is initiated when the Council receives a request for a hearing by either the student or the faculty or academic unit head. In the case of online students or faculty whose physical presence at a hearing would impose a hardship, the hearing may be conducted using technologies deemed appropriate by the Hearing Panel presiding officer.

1. Composition of Hearing Panels

   A Hearing Panel will normally consist of a presiding officer, two faculty members, and one student who are selected by the Council Chair from a pool of faculty and students solicited by the
Academic Integrity Council. An alternate will also be selected to serve in case a member of the panel needs to be excused during the course of the hearing. Decisions will be by a majority vote (two votes or more). The presiding officer will vote only in the event of a tie. Students have the right to object to any member of the Hearing Panel they believe to be biased in the case. In such instances, the presiding officer will decide whether or not to act on that objection. Members of the Hearing Panel have the responsibility to remove themselves from cases in which there is a conflict of interest.

2. **Presiding Officer**

The chair or vice chair of the Council will normally serve as the presiding officer of all Hearing Panels. If the chair or vice chair is unavailable or the caseload becomes unmanageable, the Chair will appoint another faculty member of the Council to preside over the hearing.

3. **Pool of Panel Members**

Each academic department shall select one faculty member who will serve for a term of two years as a potential hearing panel member. Each year the SGA will select 10 students who will be added to a pool of potential hearing panel members.

4. **Procedures Preliminary to Hearing**

An allegation of academic dishonesty will be reviewed by the Council Chair who will appoint a Hearing Panel and designate whether the Council Chair or the Council Vice Chair shall serve as the presiding officer. No other members of the Council shall be eligible to serve on Hearing Panels, however, if the chair or vice chair are not available to serve, the council chair shall appoint a member of the Academic Integrity Council to serve as presiding officer.

The presiding officer will select the date, time, and place for the hearing and notify both the referring faculty member or academic unit head and the student by personal delivery or campus mailbox a minimum of five business days prior to the hearing. It is desirable that the hearing occur as soon as reasonably possible after the alleged incident. While not always possible, a hearing should occur no later than 20 business days after the Council receives the request for a hearing, excluding any tolling of the timelines.

The presiding officer shall notify the student of the allegation in writing, including the report of the faculty member or academic unit head and will request a written response to the allegation from the student. Any written response will become part of the record and be reviewed by the Hearing Panel in preparation for the hearing.

Both the student and the faculty or academic unit head may submit a list of witnesses to appear at the hearing. Witnesses are limited to only those individuals who can present direct evidence that bears on the allegation. The presiding officer shall determine in advance of the hearing anyone who may be called as a witness.

Timelines shall be tolled (held in abeyance) during Thanksgiving, winter and spring breaks, as well as any times when no classes are scheduled. Timelines may be tolled in other circumstances only with the consent of the presiding officer, but in no case shall exceed an additional 20 business days. Faculty not on summer contract, sabbatical, other leave, or otherwise unavailable may delegate authority to another faculty member, including the department chair, to appear and act on their behalf. Any delegation shall be reduced to writing and received by the presiding officer before the hearing.

A member of the Council will meet with the student before the hearing to review hearing procedures and process and after the hearing to discuss the ramifications of the findings and the student's options for appeal.
5. The Hearing Panel Process

The purpose of a hearing is to explore and investigate the incident giving rise to the appearance of academic dishonesty and to reach an informed conclusion as to whether or not academic dishonesty occurred. All persons at a hearing are expected to assist in a thorough and honest exposition of all related facts.

The purpose of a hearing is to explore and investigate the incident giving rise to the appearance of academic dishonesty and to reach an informed conclusion as to whether or not academic dishonesty occurred. All persons at a hearing are expected to assist in a thorough and honest exposition of all related facts. Council Hearing Panel proceedings are not legal proceedings.

The sequence of a hearing is necessarily controlled by the nature of the incident to be investigated and the information to be examined. It lies within the judgment of the presiding officer to determine the most reasonable approach.

The following steps are generally recommended:

a. The referring faculty member or academic unit head reporting an alleged violation, and then the student will briefly present their respective cases, including any relevant information or arguments. The faculty may recommend a sanction.

b. Only witnesses who have knowledge of the incident or can offer documents or other materials bearing on the case may be called. Members of the Hearing Panel may request additional material or the appearance of other persons, as needed.

c. The referring faculty member or academic unit head reporting the allegation and the student may make brief closing statements.

d. The Hearing Panel will meet privately to discuss the case and determine whether a violation has taken place based on a preponderance of evidence.

e. If the student is found in violation, the Hearing Panel will independently determine an appropriate sanction. When determining the sanction, the Hearing Panel will be informed of any other violations of academic integrity on the part of the student, as well as past sanctions.

f. The presiding officer will provide the referring faculty or academic unit head, the student, and the Provost with a written report of the facts found, identifying the parts of the policy that have been violated and describing the sanction, if any, to be imposed.

6. The Hearing Panel presiding officer will ensure that the following rules are observed:

a. The student may be accompanied by a person of his or her choosing for emotional support only, provided that the support person is not a party to the case. This person will not actively participate in the hearing process in any way.

b. Hearings will be audio recorded for the purposes of the Hearing Panel's deliberations and any Council appeals and kept for a minimum of five years.

c. Presence at a hearing lies within the judgment of the presiding officer. A hearing requires a deliberative and candid atmosphere, free from distraction. Accordingly, it is not open to the public or other interested persons.

d. The presiding officer may remove from the hearing any person who disrupts or impedes the investigation, or who fails to adhere to the rulings of the presiding officer.

e. The presiding officer will direct that persons, other than the student, who are to be called
upon to provide information be excluded from the hearing except for that purpose.

f. Members of the Hearing Panel may conduct private deliberations at such times and places as they deem proper.

g. Failure to appear before a Hearing Panel will not preclude the Hearing Panel from hearing evidence and determining outcomes. It is the responsibility of the person desiring the presence of a witness before a Hearing Panel to ensure that the witness appears. Written statements by witnesses should not be used unless the individual cannot reasonably be expected to appear. Any written statement must be dated, signed by the person making it, and witnessed by a university employee. The work of a Hearing Panel will not, as a general practice, be delayed due to the unavailability of a witness.

h. A hearing is not a trial. The Hearing Panel will consider all relevant, probative, and credible evidence. The presiding officer will determine what evidence will be considered.

7. Hearing Panel Outcomes

If the Hearing Panel determines that the allegations of academic dishonesty are unfounded, no sanctions will be imposed.

If the Hearing Panel determines that the allegations of academic dishonesty are founded, it will send copies of its decisions to the referring faculty or other individual, the student, and the Provost’s Office as the office of record.

If this is a first violation and the faculty or academic unit head, or department or program has provided a clear statement about penalties for violations of academic integrity in the syllabus, department or unit handbook, website, or other documents or materials that the student received, the Hearing Panel shall not normally substitute its judgment as to the penalty.
**TABLE 1: Primary Responsibility for Bringing a Charge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES</th>
<th>WHO MAKES THE CHARGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• For incidences of academic dishonesty in courses</td>
<td>• Instructor of record/faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If charge is not made within a reasonable time, the department chair/unit head may bring charge if needed with or without faculty’s written consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The department chair/unit head will be involved in the academic integrity process if the faculty member is an adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For instances of dishonesty in a Master’s thesis or project, dissertation, or comprehensive examination</td>
<td>• Thesis, project, dissertation, or comprehensive exam chair/head or committee member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In cases of falsified documents, such as transcripts, letters of recommendation, medical documentation</td>
<td>• Faculty or department chair/unit head, director, associate dean, or dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For instances of student academic dishonesty not covered above</td>
<td>• Faculty or department chair/unit head, director, associate dean, or dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plagiarism, such as using a direct quotation without quotation marks or citation, paraphrasing without citing, or having someone else re-write or heavily edit a paper</td>
<td>• Department chair or unit head with consent of person bringing charge:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cheating, including unauthorized possession, copying, or sharing of an exam or exam questions, or having another person take an exam</td>
<td>A student may report a violation to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Misrepresentation of academic experiences, ability, or effort</td>
<td>• Council using the Academic Integrity Violation Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic interference such as stealing, destroying, defacing, or concealing library materials or retaining, possessing, or using examination materials</td>
<td>• A faculty or staff member with or without naming the individual suspected of the violation*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student reported violations follow the AIC procedures described for courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Every effort will be made to preserve the anonymity of the student reporting the incident; confidentiality, however, cannot be guaranteed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Charges at higher levels</td>
<td>• Appropriate faculty or department chair/unit head of the academic unit involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• When the person who bears the primary responsibility for bringing a charge fails to do so within a reasonable period of time, it becomes the responsibility of the department chair or head of academic unit, who may do so with or without the primary person’s written consent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other instances not covered above</td>
<td>• Appropriate faculty or chair/head of the academic unit involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Any violation that is discovered in an academic support unit in the division of Student Affairs shall be reported to the appropriate faculty or academic unit head in Academic Affairs.</td>
<td>UIS Registrar or UIS Admissions will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic dishonesty during or after the application process</td>
<td>• Examine evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Determine whether a violation has occurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discuss with student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consult with the Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>