

Summary of changes to policy for:

PART E: DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURES – ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

1. In the current policy, there is no time limit established for when a student may file an appeal to the department Chair after being notified of academic sanctions by the instructor.
 - a. In section 2b, the following line has been added to establish a time limit for student appeals in this instance: “The appeal to the Department Chair must be made using the Academic Misconduct Student Appeal Form **within seven (7) University calendar days of receipt of the Instructor’s written decision** and should include substantial evidence supporting the student’s innocence or suggesting that the Instructor’s standard was applied unfairly.” This wording is similar to how appeals of non-academic sanctions are handled, with the exception that we have increased the time limit from 3 days for non-academic sanctions to 7 days for academic sanctions.
 - b. In accordance with the permissible means of notification outlined in the Student Code, it is understood that delivery of notice by University email is sufficient to constitute the “Instructor’s written decision”.
 - c. We have also added the statement “in writing” item 1c to emphasize to the instructor that they should document notice to the student. “Instructor shall attempt to notify the student **in writing** of the alleged misconduct and sanction to be applied. “
 - d. The Academic Misconduct Report forms were modified to remind the instructor to attach documentation of notification
2. The current policy also does not specify a time limit for the student to appeal the decision of the Department Chair.
 - a. Section 2c is modified to read “If upon receipt of the ruling by the Department Chair the Accused Student still believes she or he has been unjustly accused, she or he may contact the Office of Student Conduct **within seven (7) University calendar days** to request a hearing **of the Faculty Hearing Board**.”
3. In many cases, the Office of Student Conduct has met with both the faculty and the student and it has been possible to solve the problem by mutual consent by all parties. In this instance it would not be necessary to call for a full Faculty Hearing board to decide the appeal, but the current policy does not explicitly state that this is an option. The following modification is intended to better explain the role of the Office of Student Conduct as it has been found to work best in actual practice.
 - a. In section 4a, “The Office of Student Conduct will determine **if the matter can be disposed of administratively by mutual consent of the Accused Student and the Instructor or** if a Faculty Hearing Board shall be convened (per item 5a) and the Director or his/her representative will preside over such hearings.
4. Minor editorial changes:
 - a. The links to the Academic Integrity Committee webpage were corrected.
 - b. In the last sentence of the first paragraph, the phrase “in each university.” Was deleted at the end of that sentence because it was superfluous.

- c. A few extra spaces found throughout the document were deleted.