

Contents

A	Definitions	2
B	Standards of Academic Integrity	2
C	The Academic Integrity Committee (AIC)	4
D	The AIC Process in Alleged Violations of Academic Standards by Students	6
E	Restorative Hearings in Cases of Inappropriate Student Academic Conduct	9
F	Formal AIC hearings	10
G	Student Originated Request for Change of Grade	14

A Definitions

1. **Academic integrity** is the set of academic ethical standards by which members of the academic community at CSUM should adhere if they wish to be in good standing. These standards are established around core virtues such as honesty, fairness, respect, openness, and integrity, always with an eye toward fostering a healthy academic environment.
 2. The **Academic Integrity Committee** or **AIC** is a committee tasked with maintaining the standards of academic integrity at CSUM.
 3. **Academic misconduct** refers to behaviors which violate or attempt to violate standards of academic integrity.
 4. An **allegation** is a formal declaration that charges an individual with one or more acts of academic misconduct. It is the input which initiates an AIC process.
 5. A **case** refers to a specific allegation with related evidence, documents, processes, etc. under consideration by the AIC.
 6. A **hearing** is a meeting of the AIC whose purpose is to adjudicate an allegation.
 7. A **result** of the AIC is a determination that an allegation put before the AIC has merit or not. It is the output of an AIC process.
- 3.32.528 0 Td [(allegation)]TJ/F25 10.9091 Tf 57.124d.909ion

identity and reputation for excellence requires a steadfast dedication to academic integrity from all parties.

Individual faculty members whose job entails guiding student learning should be vigilant against actions which subvert academic integrity. And students seeking an education should not diminish their Academy experience by choosing expedience over ethical behavior.

2. **Due process:** Individuals who are accused of violating standards of academic integrity should be given due process with the chance to respond or rebut the allegation before a body whose purpose is to evaluate and adjudicate such claims in as objective and unbiased a way as is reasonable. This policy establishes the Academic Integrity Committee to address this need (see §

- (c) Violating stipulated rules of an assignment or exam: This can include, but is not limited to:
- i. Unauthorized collaboration.
 - ii. Unauthorized use of materials.
 - iii. Submission of altered or falsified data.
 - iv. Taking or copying work from another student, either with or without their knowledge.
 - v. Knowingly providing work to another student.
 - vi. Before taking an examination, soliciting information concerning the examination from students who have already taken the examination.
 - vii. After taking an examination, providing information concerning the examination on to students who have yet to take the examination.
- (d) Misrepresentation of identity: Substituting for another person or permitting any other person to substitute for oneself for an assignment, examination, or participation in a course.
- (e) Lying to an instructor for academic gain: This can include:
- i. Lying to an instructor to excuse a missed class session, assignment or exam.
 - ii. Altering graded work to make it appear that the instructor has made a mistake.
- (f) Disruption of academic environment: This means engaging in behavior which substantially interrupts or degrades the learning environment.

Tier 2 violations:

- (a) Sabotaging another student's or instructor's work or academic reputation.
- (b) Falsification of records:

- (b) student originated requests for change of grade (see [Senate policy AA-03-020](#) for information on this process),
 - (c) other issues which fall under the purview of academic integrity at CSUM.
3. **Membership:** The AIC will be comprised of three faculty members to be appointed by the Academic Senate as they see fit. One of these members will be designated Chair of the committee. Faculty appointments shall be made at the start of the Fall semester as needed, and last for a period of two years.
- Membership will be staggered so that two appointments are made in the Fall of even-numbered years, while one appointment is made in the Fall of odd-numbered years.
- Once the membership of the AIC is decided, a Chair among the members is decided by the members of the AIC. If the members of the AIC are unable to decide on a Chair, the decision will be made by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. Faculty may be appointed either as Chair or member for consecutive terms.
4. **Backup membership:** Because of the demands of scheduling the activities of the AIC, a list of faculty willing to serve on the committee will also be maintained by the Academic Senate, and will be asked to serve should the need arise.
5. **Duties of a member:** A member of the AIC is expected to attend all hearings, unless there is a strong reason why he/she should recuse themselves. They are expected to help investigate and adjudicate allegations while maintaining as neutral and bias-free a position as can be reasonably expected.
6. **Duties of the Chair:** The Chair of the AIC is expected to facilitate all communications outside AIC hearings between the accuser, accused, and the AIC. The Chair is expected to run meetings efficiently and effectively while maintaining civility. The Chair is expected to write a letter communicating the results of AIC hearings with the appropriate parties (described below). The Chair is expected to use her/his best judgment to make decisions on issues not covered by this policy, while keeping in firm consideration the underlying principles and spirit of the AIC and its policies.
7. **Temporary Chair:** Should the Chair of the AIC be unable to carry out her/his duties, the Chair can appoint a member of the AIC to act in their stead.
8. **Confidentiality:** All activities of the AIC will be confidential. Processes and results will be shared only with individuals who are permitted by this policy to know, with the following exceptions:
- (a) If a resolved case is materially relevant to an ongoing case under adjudication, then the resolved case may be shared with the committee members.
 - (b) If an ongoing AIC case impinges upon issues of academic integrity relevant to a subset of the academic community (e.g. a class) who is presumably uninformed about the allegation, then at the discretion of the Chair, this case can be shared with an appropriate representative of the subset (e.g. the instructor of the course).
 - (c) When a new Chair of the AIC is elected, the outgoing Chair will transfer the archive (see [§C.11](#)) of past AIC cases to the incoming Chair.
 - (d) If the AIC determines that an expert witness would be useful in evaluating the allegation, and if consulting this expert witness would break the confidentiality of those involved, then the AIC may proceed.

(e) The Chair of the AIC may request that the accused and/or accuser waive their right to confidentiality if it is helpful to do so (for instance, if an allegation involving multiple individuals could be adjudicated with a single hearing).

9. **Fairness:** Members of the AIC will do their best to maintain an objective stance free of bias when adjudicating allegations.

errigh328t:

ae) The Execuctive Committee (e) 408 (of) 408 (The) 4047 (cad Mem-17 (i) 1 cf) 408 (Sencat) 408 (is) -08 (The
rbe) The nste may l (so) -333 pr (n) 28 (iden) -333 (adiatioaly) -334 (n) 28 (y) 28 (errigh) 28 (e) 445 (See: J) J/F
fce) active/ey AICny l (so) -500 pr (n) 78

2. **Submission of allegation:** The bringer of the allegation (henceforth, the accuser) submits the allegation by sending it by email to both the Chair of the AIC and the accused individuals. If neither the accuser nor the accused are an instructor of record of a course adversely affected by the allegation if true, then the instructor of record should be notified as well.

If the allegation is determined to merit further review by the Chair, then a hearing will be scheduled.

3. **Hearings:** The primary way the AIC conducts its business is by holding hearings. These are meetings held in response to the receipt of an allegation of academic misconduct which has been deemed to merit further review. The Chair is charged with leading these meetings.

4. **Forum:** The preference is for in-person, closed-door meetings, but online video meetings are also permitted should the need arise.

5. **Determination of the type of hearing:** The Chair of the AIC will examine the accused individuals' past history with the AIC. Those accused individuals who have no prior history with the AIC may be eligible to obtain resolution by a "restorative hearing" (see details and conditions on this process in §E). This requires the consent of the Chair of the AIC, the accuser and the accused. If a restorative hearing is determined to be inappropriate, then a "formal hearing" will be held (see details on this process in §F).

6. **Determination of the number of hearings:** The accuser or accused in an allegation may involve more than one individual. In this case, the Chair of the AIC may decide that more than one hearing is necessary, particularly if the right to confidentiality would be jeopardized with a single hearing.

7. **Pre-hearing process:**

- (a) Once the type of hearing is determined, the Chair of the AIC notifies the Academic Support Coordinator for scheduling.
- (b) The means of communication between the Academic Support Coordinator and the hearing attendees will typically be email.
- (c) If the accuser is unresponsive to communications for scheduling, then the matter will be dropped with no consequences.
- (d) If the accused is unresponsive to communications for scheduling, then this will be interpreted as the accused waiving their right to a hearing (see §D.8)
- (e) If a formal hearing is to be held, the Cadet Conduct Officer will be contacted to determine if disciplinary processes involving the accused have occurred or are currently underway.

8. **Waivers:**

- (a) **Voluntary waivers:** Between the time when the accused first receives the allegation (see §D.2) and the hearing, the accused may decide to waive their right to a hearing.
 - i. The accused who wish to exercise this waiver should notify both the Chair of the AIC and the accuser immediately.
- (b) **Consequences of waiving:** Waiving the right to a hearing has the following consequences:

- i. No hearing will take place.
 - ii. The claims made in the allegation will be interpreted and responded to as if they are true.
 - iii. No testimony or evidence from the accused will be considered by the committee.
 - iv. The AIC, along with one student representative (see [§F.3](#)), will review and discuss the allegation and make a recommendation for sanctions as appropriate.
 - v. Reporting of the results will follow the procedures described in section [§F.16](#) of this policy for formal hearings.
- (c) Situations in which a hearing is automatically waived: The accused waives their right to hearing if the following situations occur:

13. Reporting of results:

- (a) With whom the letter reporting a result is communicated depends on the type of hearing and if the accused has waived their right to a hearing.
 - i. Please see [§E.7](#) for information on reporting in the case of a restorative hearing.
 - ii. Please see [§F.16](#) for information on reporting in the case of a formal hearing.
 - iii. If the accused waives their right to a hearing, then this result will be communicated to the same set of people who would have been communicated with had a formal hearing occurred. See [§F.16](#) for this list of people.
- (b)

- (a) The first goal is to have an honest, productive and positive discussion about the act of misconduct so there can be a mutual understanding of both the conditions that led to the unfortunate decision, as well as the consequences.
 - (b) The second goal is to find a satisfactory resolution which allows the accused to make amends and fix the harm they have caused.
5. **If a goal is not achieved:** If either of the goals of a restorative hearing described in §E

- (d) the accuser,
- (e) the accused.

In addition, the following people may also be present at a formal hearing:

- (a) The accused may choose to bring one non-professional advisor to the meeting, subject to the approval of the Chair of the AIC. This advisor may speak during the hearing, but cannot speak in place of the accused.
 - (b) Expert witnesses called to be present by the accuser, the accused, or the committee may be present subject to the approval of the Chair.
 - (c) For oversight purposes, members of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate may attend.
3. **Student representative:** One student will be chosen by the Chair of the committee to serve as a student representative and overseer during formal hearings. It is recommended that the Chair contact the President of the Associated Students (ASCMA) to obtain a list of students willing to serve.
4. **Recusal:** A member of the AIC should recuse themselves from a hearing if the following situations apply:
- (a) If that member is among the accusers or accused.
 - (b) If that member is a current instructor of the accused or accuser.
 - (c) If that member has an established relationship with the accused or accuser (or members thereof) which would make a neutral evaluation of the facts impossible.
 - (d) If the member is in a state where their presence at a hearing is unreasonable, unsafe or impossible (e.g. illness or travel away from campus).

Requests for recusals should be made to the Chair who will decide on their merit. Should a member be recused, the Chair will seek out a substitute member for the hearing by consulting the list of persons willing to serve.

Either the accused or accuser may request that a member scheduled to be a part of the committee be recused. Such a request should be delivered to the Chair in writing prior to the hearing. The Chair can accept or reject such a request based upon its merits.

5. **Sharing of Received Evidence:** Once the attendees of the hearing are determined and prior to the hearing, the Chair must share all elements of the allegation they have in their possession with the meeting attendees.
6. **Recording:** No recording of the meeting should be created unless the consent of all attendees is given. Notes are permitted.
7. **Agenda requirements:** The precise format or agenda for the hearing is the discretion of the Chair. However, every hearing should contain the following elements:
- (a) testimony from the accuser describing the allegation and presenting evidence which supports the allegation
 - (b) testimony from the accused and presentation of evidence which either mitigates or rebuts the allegation,
 - (c) questions from the committee,

- (d) dismissal of the accused and accuser,
 - (e) discussion among the committee members in private.
8. **Presentation of evidence:** Evidence by both the accused and accuser presented to the committee and is evaluated by the committee in as unbiased and objective way as is reasonable.
 9. **Standard of evidence:** A "preponderance of the evidence" standard is used by the committee to produce a final determination on whether the allegation has merit or not. A body of evidence supports a claim by a "preponderance of the evidence" standard if the claim is more likely to be true than not.
 10. **Voting:** There are four voting attendees present at a formal hearing { the three members of the AIC along with the student representative. At the conclusion of a hearing, a vote is taken to decide whether the allegation presented has merit or not.
 - (a) If three or more votes support the allegation, then the determination of the committee will be that the allegation does have merit.
 - (b) If two or less votes support the allegation, then the determination of the committee will be that the allegation does not have merit.
 11. **Further investigation and or counsel:** If, after deliberating on the evidence presented during the hearing, the committee decides that further investigation or counsel is required before voting can proceed, the committee may resolve to delay the vote.
 - (a) The accused and accuser should be notified of this delay, and given the reason or reasons why.
 - (b) During the course of any further investigation, care should be taken to preserve the confidentiality of the parties involved if possible. However, if information obtained from an expert will provide decisive and reliable information to the committee, and

14. **Demerits:** Recommendations by the AIC for demerits will be considered by the Cadet Conduct Officer. The Cadet Conduct Officer will make the final determination of the number of demerits that are appropriate.
 - (a) Should there be an appeal submitted to the Provost's office (See §F.17), the Cadet Conduct Officer should wait to hear the final disposition of the Provost before assigning any demerits.
15. **Suspension/Expulsion:** Recommendations by the AIC for suspension or expulsion will be considered by the Provost. The Provost will make the final determination of what sanctions are appropriate.
16. **Reporting of results:**
 - (a) The results of a formal hearing are communicated by a letter written by the Chair of AIC.
 - (b) The letter should be completed and distributed within five working days of the vote.
 - (c) This letter is distributed only to the following parties:
 - i. The accused.
 - ii. The accuser.
 - iii. The instructor(s) of record of affected courses.
 - iv. The Dean of the school which houses the affected courses.
 - v. The members of the AIC present at the hearing.
 - vi. The student representative present at the hearing.
 - vii. The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate (for oversight purposes).
 - viii. The University Advisors.
 - ix. The Cadet Conduct Officer.
 - x. The Provost.
17. **Appeals:**
 - (a) Within three working days of receipt of the AIC's findings, the accused may submit a written appeal to the Provost to be included and considered with the AIC report.
 - (b) A copy of this appeal should be sent to:
 - i. the Provost's office,
 - ii. the Chair of the AIC,
 - iii. the Cadet Conduct Officer.
 - (c) The Provost, after reviewing both the AIC report and the appeal, will determine their final disposition on the case.
 - (d) Appeals by students cannot seek relief for academic penalties such as reduction of grades penalties both the AIC report,

- (a) If the accused has not submitted an appeal, and the recommendation for sanctions made by the AIC does not involve suspension or expulsion, the Provost is not required to take any action upon receipt of an AIC report regarding an allegation. However, if the Provost determines that a violation of this policy