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Academic Integrity Review Board (AIRB) 2020-21 Meeting Schedule

FALL QUARTER 2020

Friday, November 20, 2020
9:00 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.

WINTER QUARTER 2021

Friday, February 26, 2021
9:00 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.

SPRING QUARTER 2021

Friday, May 21, 2021
9:00 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.
**Academic Integrity Review Board (AIRB) 2020-21 Schedule of Hearings**

Hearings held typically every 1st Friday of each month  
9:00 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FALL QUARTER 2020</th>
<th>WINTER QUARTER 2021</th>
<th>SPRING QUARTER 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 16th *</td>
<td>January 15th *</td>
<td>April 2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 6th</td>
<td>February 5th</td>
<td>May 7th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 4th</td>
<td>March 5th</td>
<td>June 4th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not 1st Friday

**Hearing schedule may be subject to change. Contact AIRB analyst for more information.**
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Bylaw 138. Teaching, Learning, and Student Experience, Council on
(En 5 Jun 03) (Am 10 Nov 05) (Am 5 April 2007)(Am 7 June 07) (Am 10 March 16)

A. Membership
The Council on Teaching, Learning, and Student Experience (CTLSE) shall consist of twelve members of the Irvine Division, with at least one member from each Faculty offering an undergraduate degree. The chair of the Board on Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors, and Financial Aids (BUSHFA); the chair of the Campuswide Honors Program Board; the chair of the Academic Integrity Review Board; the Vice Provost of Teaching and Learning (VPTL) and Dean of Undergraduate Education; the Dean of the Graduate Division; and the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs shall be ex officio members of the council.

B. Duties
The Council shall promote teaching, its quality, evaluation and promotion, diversity, equal opportunity, and the quality of the student experience, and shall advise the Chancellor and the Irvine Division on issues in the areas of teaching, student life and welfare, and intramural and intercollegiate athletics.

1. Teaching
   a. Consider policies and issues concerning the quality of teaching on campus, e.g., the improvement and evaluation of teaching and the role of teaching in academic advancement.
   
   b. Advise administrators, faculty, and other Senate committees on matters affecting the quality of teaching on campus and matters affecting teaching contributions that promote diversity and equal opportunity.
   
   c. Make recommendations to the above and other appropriate bodies concerning such issues as the improvement of teaching, the evaluation of teaching, and the assessment of teaching in the academic personnel process.
   
   d. Formulate general policies concerning instructional support activities on campus, and advise the administration regarding campus budgetary needs for instructional support.
   
   e. Advise the Dean of Graduate Division, VPTL and Dean of Undergraduate Education, and the Center for Engaged Instruction regarding programs and services that will foster effective teaching, to stimulate and aid all departments in fostering effective teaching.
   
   f. Select faculty and other instructors for Celebration of Teaching Awards and other awards as appropriate. Provide direction to the Center for Engaged Instruction in matters regarding CTLSE business, and when required, in any matters concerning the Council’s instructional support.

2. Student Affairs
   a. Consider and review formally as needed, those programs of the Office of Student Affairs, the Graduate Division, and the Division of Undergraduate Education that affect the University experience of UCI students. Such programs include, but are not limited to: the Learning and Academic Resource Center, Student Transition Services, Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program, Career Center, Student Health Service, Counseling Center, Disability Services, Cross Cultural Center, and the UCI Bookstore.
b. Consider and review formal matters affecting the promotion of student diversity and equal opportunity as defined by the University of California Diversity Statement (adopted by the Assembly of the Academic Senate on May 10, 2006). Such a review includes but is not limited to, an examination of enrollment, retention, and student satisfaction/campus engagement data.

c. Advise the Chancellor on behalf of the Academic Senate regarding the allocation of student registration fees and recommendations for the enhancement of student diversity and equal opportunity.

d. Appoint ad hoc Grievance Panels to hear student grievances which pertain to matters under the authority of the Academic Senate and, where such grievances are found to be justified, the Panel shall determine appropriate means of redress. Hearings by the Grievance Panel and related procedures are to be conducted in accordance with the statement entitled "Student Academic Grievance Procedures Relating to Non-Discrimination." (See IR A365 ((A)(3) and (B)) and Appendix II.) Grievance Panels shall consist of three voting members of the Academic Senate, at least one of whom is a member of the CTLSE; this member shall be chair of the Panel.

3. Intramural and Intercollegiate Athletics
Review and report to the Chancellor and the Irvine Division on issues of significance regarding the UCI intramural and intercollegiate athletics program.

C. The following Boards report to and advise CTLSE:
1. Board on Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors, and Financial Aid
   a. Membership
      The Board on Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors, and Financial Aid shall consist of at least ten (10) members of the Irvine Division, the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs and the VPTL and Dean of Undergraduate Education, ex officio.

   b. Duties
      i. Recommend to the President, through the Chancellor, the awarding of scholarships according to the terms of the various conditions set forth and subject to such other conditions as the Irvine Divisional Senate Assembly may prescribe. In making its recommendations, the Board will take into account diversity.

      ii. Make recommendations to the President through the Chancellor, to the Irvine Division, or to the Academic Senate, or to the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs regarding the policies of the University on scholarships, honors, and financial aid. In making its recommendations, the Board will take into account diversity.

2. Campuswide Honors Program Board
   a. Membership
      i. The Campuswide Honors Program Board shall consist of one member appointed from each of the Faculties with undergraduate degree programs, and the VPTL and Dean of Undergraduate Education and the Director of the Campuswide Honors Program, ex officio.

      ii. The chief administrator of the Campuswide Honors Program shall be the Dean of Undergraduate Education.
b. Duties
   i. Determine admission to the Program and the policies of admission, within adopted guidelines;

   ii. Certify graduation from the Program and determine policies relating to graduation;

   iii. Approve courses and instructors for lower- and upper-division courses in the Campuswide Honors Program curriculum, and determine the policies for same, within adopted guidelines;

   iv. Advise the chief administrator of the Campuswide Honors Program concerning the academic advising of students in the Program or enrolled in its courses, recruitment of such students, extracurricular opportunities and academic prerequisites (such as housing and library privileges) for Campuswide Honors Program students.

3. Academic Integrity Review Board
   a. Membership
      i. The Academic Integrity Review Board shall consist of fourteen members. Three Associate Deans representing undergraduate student education and three Associate Deans representing graduate student education shall be ex officio members of the Board.

   b. Duties
      i. Convene panels to hear student appeals of academic integrity cases. (See Appendix VIII. Section VI.D. Role of the Hearing Panel.) The Hearing Panel shall consist of two faculty, two students, and one Associate Dean. The Hearing Panel will be convened for each case submitted during the year. The pool from which the panels shall be drawn consists of all faculty on the Academic Integrity Review Board, and student Peer Academic Advisors selected by the VPTL and Dean of Undergraduate Education from a larger pool. The Academic Integrity Review Board Chair will select an Associate Dean to serve on the hearing panels.

      ii. Make recommendations to the Office of Academic Integrity and Student Conduct, and the Academic Senate regarding policies and procedures on academic integrity.

      iii. Report summary of activities annually to the CTLSE.
I. Preamble
The University of California, Irvine is an institution of learning, research, and scholarship that is strengthened by the existence of an environment of integrity. As members of the academic community, instructors, students, and administrators are responsible for maintaining this environment. It is essential that all members of the University practice academic integrity and accept individual responsibility for their work and actions. Violating the Academic Integrity Policy is unacceptable, devaluing the teaching and learning experience for the entire community. While at UCI, members of the academic community should become better educated about the ethical framework underpinning academic integrity and improve their moral standards supporting it.

The UCI Academic Senate Policy on Academic Integrity states the general rules and procedures associated with student academic integrity. This Academic Integrity Policy applies to undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in a UCI course. A separate policy governs the integrity of research.


II. Defined Terms
1. Academic Integrity Policy: the UCI Academic Senate Policy on Academic Integrity.


3. Academic Consequences: grades assigned by Instructor.


5. OAISC: Academic Integrity Administrative Office.

6. Instructor: faculty member or instructor of record.

7. Student: any student or students who have allegedly violated the Academic Integrity Policy

III. Students' Responsibilities
All students are expected to complete a course in compliance with the Instructor's standards. No student shall engage in any activity involving any Academic Integrity Policy Violations. No student shall engage in any activity that involves attempting to receive a grade by means other than honest effort, and shall not aid another student who is attempting to do so. All students are encouraged to notify instructors, but may also notify the OAISC, about observed incidents of Academic Integrity Policy Violations. Instructors should take reasonable steps to preserve the confidentiality of students making such reports.

All students have the responsibility to become familiar with and abide by the Academic Integrity Policy.

IV. Instructors’ Responsibilities
Instructors should create an environment in their classes where academic integrity is understood and supported. They should assign grades in a transparent and equitable manner. Specifically:

1. They should monitor student work to ensure these policies are followed;
2. They should report all Academic Integrity Policy Violations to the OAISC;
3. They should faithfully administer and participate in the Academic Integrity Policy;
4. They should state in writing how graded assignments and exams will contribute to the final grade in the course. If any course-specific rules are required by the Instructor for maintaining academic integrity, the Instructor shall also inform students of these in writing. A reduction in a grade for an assignment or a course in response to academic dishonesty is not to be considered as a punishment, but instead responds to a failure by the student to fulfill one of the requirements of the course.

When an Instructor believes that a Student has violated the Academic Integrity Policy, the Instructor should report the incident to the OAISC within thirty instructional days of discovering the possible Academic Integrity Policy Violation. The Instructor shall participate in the process according to the Academic Integrity Policy.

In all cases, the Instructor shall determine the Student’s grade in the course.

V. Teaching Assistant’s (TA) and Reader’s Responsibilities
A student acting in the capacity of a Teaching Assistant (TA) or Reader has a special responsibility to safeguard academic integrity. A TA/Reader shall equitably grade student work in the manner set by the Instructor. A TA/Reader shall not provide a student with any information or collaboration that would aid the student in completing the course in a dishonest manner (e.g. providing access to unauthorized material related to tests, examinations, or homework).
When a TA/Reader has evidence of an Academic Integrity Policy Violation, the TA/Reader should report the incident to the Instructor. The Instructor should report the incident to the OAISC.

VI. Responsibility for Resolution of Cases of Violation of the Policy
The responsibility for maintaining the standards of academic integrity rests with two University authorities: the Instructor and the OAISC. Under the Standing Orders of the Regents, discipline is the exclusive responsibility of the campus administration while authority over courses and curricula is under the exclusive authority of the Instructor through the Academic Senate.

A. Role of the Instructor
The Instructor shall assign grades in the course as appropriate to the work involved. All Academic consequences (e.g. scores on the assignments and course grades) are under the sole purview of the Instructor in the course.

B. Role of The OAISC
The OAISC manages the cases for all students accused of Academic Integrity Policy Violations and is the central repository for all case-related materials. The OAISC is the initial contact for the Instructor or students on all cases of Academic Integrity Policy Violations.

The OAISC is also responsible for imposing administrative sanctions. These sanctions shall be in accordance with guidelines authorized by the Council on Student Experience. Administrative sanctions range in severity from administrative probation to dismissal from the University. Students found responsible for multiple cases of Academic Integrity Policy Violations may be subject to dismissal from the University.

The OAISC must notify the Student (and if needed, the Instructor) of any allegations of Academic Integrity Policy Violations. The OAISC adjudicates cases when the Student disputes the possible imposition of administrative sanctions related to Academic Integrity Policy Violations. The OAISC can request meetings with the Instructor and Student to discuss the case, sanction, or procedure. The OAISC must follow the procedures and communicate in a timely manner. He or she may extend any timelines in the Academic Integrity Policy when practical exigencies so dictate, in which case all involved parties will be notified in writing and via email.

If the Student appeals the OAISC's decision, the OAISC shall schedule a Hearing Panel (see below) to review the case and make a final determination of the appropriate sanction.

The duty of the OAISC is not merely disciplinary. The office is encouraged to work with faculty and students to create a culture in which academic integrity is valued.

C. Records Management
The OAISC must archive its records to reflect the resolution of the case, and shall maintain a record of all cases as described in the Procedures document. The OAISC shall report annually to the Academic Senate Council on Student Experience, to the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor, the Associated Undergraduate Students of the University of California, Irvine, and the
Associated Graduate Students of the University of California, Irvine on all of the following: (1) the number, nature, and type of cases; (2) the pattern of decision-making; (3) the severity and type of academic consequences and administrative sanctions; and (4) other relevant matters as directed by the Council on Student Experience.

D. Role of the Hearing Panel
If the Student requests a hearing, the OAISC will request the Subcommittee on Academic Integrity of the Council on Student Experience to convene a Hearing Panel to review the case. (See the Procedures document.) The Hearing Panel will hear evidence on the case from the Student, Instructor, and other relevant parties as determined by the panel. The Hearing Panel shall communicate the final decision to the OAISC.

VII. Procedures for Resolution of Cases of Academic Integrity Policy Violations
These are described in the Procedures document of the Policy.

VIII. MAINTENANCE OF DISCIPLINARY RECORDS
The OAISC will maintain a record of each student who receives a letter(s) of Academic Integrity Policy Violations as described in the Procedures document. Maintaining such a record is not an administrative sanction.
PROCEDURES FOR RESOLUTION OF CASES OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY VIOLATIONS

A. Overview
The procedure for resolution of Academic Integrity Policy Violations is divided into four phases:

1. **The Reporting Phase.** During this phase, the Instructor or a student communicates to the OAISC about any alleged Academic Integrity Policy Violation;

2. **The Review Phase.** During this phase, the Student is afforded the opportunity to review the charges. The OAISC reviews the evidence in consultation with the various parties and decides responsibility.

3. **The Decision Phase.** During this phase, the OAISC decides on the Administrative Sanctions and communicates the decision to the various parties; and

4. **The Hearing Phase.** During this phase, if the Student chooses to contest the sanctions, a Hearing Panel will be convened to review the case and make a final decision.

The four phases are described in more detail below.

B. **The Reporting Phase**
When an Instructor has evidence that a Student has committed an Academic Integrity Policy Violation, the Instructor should meet with the Student to discuss the alleged Academic Integrity Policy Violation. If the Instructor suspects that there is evidence of an Academic Integrity Policy Violation, he or she should submit a formal charge describing the alleged Academic Integrity Policy Violation to the OAISC and the OAISC will send a copy of the charge to the Student.

All cases of alleged Academic Integrity Policy Violations should be reported to the OAISC. Within thirty (30) instructional days of the confirmation of evidence of an Academic Integrity Policy Violation, the Instructor should notify the OAISC of the case by submitting through an online form the following information: the Student’s name, the Student’s ID, the course name and number, the date of the incident, and a description of the incident.

If, after reporting a charge to the OAISC, the Instructor decides to withdraw the charge, the Instructor shall notify the OAISC via email of his or her decision. The OAISC shall notify the Student and the appropriate Associate Dean (if necessary) that the Instructor has withdrawn the charge against the Student. All notation of the charge shall be removed from the Student’s academic record. Should new evidence become available, the charge may be reinstated in accordance with the Academic Integrity Policy.

In all cases, the Instructor shall determine the grade for the assignment and for the course.

If a student reports an incident of a violation of academic integrity to the OAISC, the OAISC shall communicate the allegation to all involved parties.

C. **The Review Phase**
Once the Instructor or student has reported a charge of an Academic Integrity Policy Violation to the OAISC, the OAISC shall notify the Student in writing and via email that the Student is charged with an Academic Integrity Policy Violation. The official notice shall be sent to the Student’s UCI email address. Reference to (or a copy of) the UCI Academic Senate Policies on Academic Integrity should
be included in the notice. The letter may include a notification to the student to schedule a meeting with the OAISC to discuss the case. The student will have ten (10) instructional days to schedule the meeting to review the case. If the student does not schedule or fails to attend a scheduled meeting, the OAISC will move forward with determining a policy violation and will impose sanctions without the students input.

If the Student schedules a review, the OAISC shall review the charge(s) with the Student and may advise the student regarding possible administrative sanctions and the process for resolution of the charge(s) of an Academic Integrity Policy Violation. The OAISC will conduct the review by collecting the relevant documents, including the facts of the charge and the Student’s description of the disagreement with the facts of the charge. The OAISC can request meetings with the Instructor and Student to discuss the case, the sanctions, or the procedures. The OAISC decides, based on the preponderance of the evidence, whether there was an Academic Integrity Policy Violation justifying administrative sanctions.

D. The Decision Phase
If the Student is found responsible for an Academic Integrity Policy Violation, administrative sanctions shall be determined by the OAISC. Administrative sanctions can range from administrative probation to dismissal from the University, depending on the severity of the case, any previously recorded offenses, and any mitigating circumstances. In such cases, these sanctions, as described below, will be administered by the OAISC.

In the decision letter, the student will be notified of the hearing process and will be provided with a link to the procedures.

The OAISC shall notify the Instructor and the appropriate Associate Dean(s) of the administrative sanction(s). A record of the administrative sanction(s) shall be maintained by the OAISC. The OAISC shall notify the Student of the decision.

E. The Hearing Phase
Once the OAISC has issued a decision and sanctions, the Student may contest the decision and/or sanctions within ten instructional days of receiving notification by the OAISC, by requesting an Academic Integrity Hearing Panel. The Student may request a hearing by submitting a written appeal to the OAISC. The OAISC will forward the appeal to the Academic Integrity Review Board (AIRB), which will schedule a hearing of the case before the Hearing Panel. The hearing will be scheduled as soon as possible, but no later than sixty (60) instructional days after the Student requests a hearing.

F. Hearing Panel on Academic Integrity
The AIRB will hear undergraduate and graduate student cases. The AIRB will be a standing senate committee comprised of fourteen senate faculty members, three Associate Deans representing undergraduate student education, and three Associate Deans representing graduate student education.

G. Hearings
If the Student requests a hearing, the AIRB shall schedule a hearing of the case. The student will be afforded two options.

Option A: (for outcomes of warning, probation and educational sanctions)
1. A student contests in writing within ten (10) instructional days to request a hearing;
2. The student contests outcome(s) based on three criteria
a. New evidence which could not be adduced earlier which is likely to change the results;
b. Violation of due process; or
c. An imposed sanction that is too harsh given the findings of fact.

3. The student is not present; hearing panel reviews all written information;
4. The hearing panel will convene and review the written request, and all materials that were utilized in the original finding of responsibility;
5. The hearing panel will complete review and may affirm, modify, or reverse original sanction;
6. Decision is final and communicated to OAISC to notify student.

Option B: (for outcomes of suspension and dismissal)
1. A student contests decision in writing within ten (10) instructional days to request a hearing;
2. The request is to hear the case from the beginning;
3. The student is present;
4. The student will have the opportunity to present to the hearing panel, have an advisor *
5. The OAISC will present all relevant information to the hearing panel;
6. The hearing panel will determine a finding and sanctions, if appropriate; they may affirm, modify or reverse original sanction
7. Decision is final and communicated to OAISC to notify student.

- Students are allowed to have an advisor. An advisor can be an attorney, parent, friend, etc. During the hearing, an advisor may act as a consultant for the student; however, an advisor may not speak on behalf of the student. If a student chooses to have an attorney as the advisor, the student shall pay all fees, costs, and expenses for the retention of an attorney. If the student chooses to be accompanied by an advisor or attorney during the hearing, the student must sign a Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA) waiver, to grant access to the information. In the interest of expediency, as a general practice, hearings shall not be delayed due to the unavailability of an advisor/attorney.

Once the hearing is scheduled, the AIRB must provide written notice to the parties involved regarding the date, time, and place of the hearing. The AIRB will rule on all questions of procedure, the admission or exclusion of evidence, and the need to call witnesses for additional testimony. Hearings shall be held in accordance with generally accepted standards of procedural due process.

Hearings will be closed. Reasonable efforts will be made by all parties to preserve confidentiality during the process. The Chancellor shall establish and publish campus regulations providing for the handling of academic integrity cases in accordance with basic standards of procedural due process. Authority may be delegated to the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs as outlined in Section 11.00 Authority of the University of California Policies Applying to Campus Activities, Organizations and, Students (http://dos.uci.edu/conduct/uci_policy.php). Consistent with this requirement, procedures specified in such regulations shall be appropriate to the nature of the case and the severity of the potential discipline.

When a formal hearing is held, the following minimum procedural standards will ensure the accused student a fair hearing:

1. Written notice within a reasonable time before the hearing. The written notice shall include the following information: (1) a brief statement of the factual basis of the charges; (2) the University policies or campus regulations allegedly violated; and (3) the time and place of the hearing.
2. The opportunity for a prompt and fair hearing where the University shall bear the burden of proof, and at which the student shall have the opportunity to present documents and witnesses, to contest evidence, and to confront and cross-examine witnesses presented by the University. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, no inference shall be drawn from the silence of the accused student.

3. A record of the hearing and an expeditious written decision based upon the preponderance of evidence, which shall be accompanied by a written summary of the findings of fact.

H. Report of the AIRB Hearing Panel on Academic Integrity Hearing Panel
After the hearing, the Hearing Panel shall arrive at a final decision. When a decision is reached, the OAISC will be informed of the decision. There are no further appeals or processes.

I. IMPLEMENTATION
Once the decision has been rendered, the OAISC will notify the Student by issuing a letter to the Student and initiate any other necessary administrative actions. In case of a change in sanctions, the OAISC shall notify the Instructor and the appropriate Associate Dean(s) of the new administrative sanction(s). A record of the administrative sanction(s) shall be maintained by the OAISC.

Students found in violation of the Academic Integrity Policy must complete an online tutorial reviewing the Academic Integrity Policy. Students must complete this before they can enroll for courses during the year following the incident or, in the case of seniors, before a degree is awarded.

When, as a result of violations of the Academic Integrity Policy, a student is suspended or dismissed, a notation that the discipline was imposed must be posted on the academic transcript for the duration of the suspension or dismissal.

If a student receives a reduced grade in a course because of an Academic Integrity Policy Violation, the reduced grade will remain on the transcript even if the student retakes the course and obtains an improved grade.

Students with Academic Integrity Policy Violations may be excluded by the Associate Deans from consideration for academic honors at graduation. For students who wish to change majors, individual majors may take into account the commission of an act of dishonesty. Exclusions from consideration for honors and exclusion from major change are not determined at the time of the violation and do not fall under this Policy. Thus, students so affected are not eligible to request a formal hearing on the exclusion.

J. MAINTENANCE OF DISCIPLINARY RECORDS
The OAISC will maintain a record of each student who receives letter(s) of Academic Integrity Policy Violations and produce annual reports. The OAISC is required to report annually to the Academic Senate Council on Teaching, Learning, and Student Experience (CTLSE), the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor, the Associated Undergraduate Students of the University of California, Irvine, and the Associated Graduate Students of the University of California, Irvine, as outlined in Section VLC. of the Academic Integrity Policy.

Records will normally be destroyed after seven years, unless the OAISC determines in any particular case that there is good reason to extend the period of retention. To ensure that minor (refers to anything below a suspension) and nonrecurring infractions do not hurt a student's career beyond UCI, the OAISC will expunge academic records upon reward of degree. The University will release a student's disciplinary records to potential employers, governmental agencies, other educational
institutions, or other organizations or individuals only if authorized to do so by the student in question or if compelled by law. Any record expunged by the OAISC will also be expunged in the offices of the appropriate Associate Deans.

K. TYPES OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY VIOLATIONS
Academic integrity applies equally to electronic media and print, and involves text, images, and ideas. Violations include but are not limited to the following examples:

1. Cheating
   a. Copying from others during an examination.
   
b. Communicating examination answers to other students during an examination, or communicating examination questions to students who will take the same examination later.
   
c. Offering another person's work as one's own.
   
d. Taking an examination for another student.
   
e. Asking or allowing a student to take an examination for oneself or another student.
   
f. Sharing or collaborating on answers for a take-home examination or assignment unless specifically authorized by the instructor.
   
g. Tampering with an examination after it has been graded, and then returning it in an attempt to earn more credit.
   
h. Using unauthorized materials, prepared answers, written notes, or other information concealed in a blue book or elsewhere during an examination.

2. Dishonest Conduct
   a. Stealing or attempting to steal an examination or answer key from the instructor.
   
b. Submitting substantial portions of the same work for credit in more than one course without consulting all instructors involved.
   
c. Falsifying or forging academic documents or records.

3. Plagiarism
Plagiarism is intellectual theft. It means use of the intellectual creations of another without proper attribution. Plagiarism may take two main forms, which are clearly related:

   a. To steal or pass off as one's own the ideas or words, images, or other creative works of another.
   
b. To use a creative production without crediting the source, even if only minimal information is available to identify it for citation.

Credit must be given for every direct quotation, for paraphrasing or summarizing a work (in whole, or in part), and for information which is not common knowledge.
4. Collusion
Any student who knowingly or intentionally helps another student perform any of the above acts of cheating or plagiarism is subject to discipline under the Academic Integrity Policy. Examples of collusion include:

a. Allowing others to do the research and writing of an assigned paper (including use of the services of a commercial term-paper company).

b. Allowing another student to copy one's own work during a test or take-home assignment.

L. GUIDELINES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE SANCTIONS FOR POLICY VIOLATIONS
When a student is found to have violated University policies or campus regulations, any of the following disciplinary actions may be imposed. Any sanction imposed should be appropriate to the violation, taking into consideration the context and seriousness of the violation.

1. Educational Course
A tutorial or course which the student will be required to take.

2. Warning
Written notice or reprimand to the student that a violation of specified University policies or campus regulations has occurred, and that continued or repeated violations of University policies or campus regulations may be cause for further disciplinary action, normally in the form of disciplinary probation, loss of privileges and exclusion from activities, suspension, dismissal, or any combination of the preceding disciplinary actions.

3. Disciplinary Probation
Disciplinary probation is a status imposed for a specified period of time during which a student must demonstrate conduct that conforms to University standards of conduct. Conditions restricting the student's privileges or eligibility for activities may be imposed. Violation of any conditions of the probation or the policy may result in further disciplinary action, normally in the form of suspension or dismissal.

4. Suspension
Suspension is termination of student status at the campus for a specified period of time with reinstatement thereafter certain, provided that the student has complied with all conditions imposed as part of the suspension and provided that the student otherwise qualifies for reinstatement. Violation of the conditions of suspension or of University policies or campus regulations during the period of suspension may be cause for further disciplinary action, normally in the form of dismissal.

5. Dismissal
Dismissal is termination of student status for an indefinite period. Readmission to the University shall require the specific approval of the Chancellor of the campus to which a dismissed student has applied. Readmission after dismissal may be granted only under exceptional circumstances.
6. **Revoking Awarding of Degree**
Subject to the concurrence of the Academic Senate, a student’s degree may be revoked if obtained by fraud. Such revocation is subject to review on appeal by the Chancellor.

7. **Other**
Other disciplinary actions may include community service.
Procedures for Resolution of Cases of Academic Integrity Policy Violations

Allegation of Academic Misconduct: Faculty meets with student to discuss incident and grade

Faculty reports to OAISC

OAISC option for student meeting: meeting takes place prior to rendering decision

Finding of Not Responsible

OAISC notifies student, faculty and Associate Dean-Final

Finding of Responsible: Sanction(s) assigned

OAISC notifies student, faculty and Associate Dean

Option A

AIRB: For warning, probation and/or educational sanction

Decision is Final

Option B

Student contests finding

AIRB: For suspension or dismissal

OAISC notifies student, faculty and Associate Dean-Final
ACADEMIC SENATE
RECUSAL POLICY*

In the university, the term “conflict of interest” refers to financial or other personal considerations that may compromise a faculty member’s professional judgment in administration, management, instruction, research, or other professional activities. Conflicts of interest have the potential to bias, directly or indirectly, important aspects of the councils’ work, including their recommendations about academic personnel decisions, proposals for degree programs and academic units, budgetary and planning decisions, faculty grants programs, and other areas of shared governance. Senate council/committee members must always keep potential conflicts in mind and recuse themselves where a conflict of interest arises.

Recusal Policy
(A) Senate council/committee members must recuse themselves in the following circumstances:
1. The Senate council/committee member has, or has had, a family relationship with the applicant, such as that of a current or former significant other, partner, or spouse, or child, sibling, or parent.
2. The Senate council/committee member has a personal financial interest in the outcome of the action item.
3. The Senate council/committee member believes that his or her recusal is necessary to preserve the integrity of the review process.
(B) Upon joining the Senate council or committee, each member will be informed of this recusal policy and will be expected to abide by it.

Comment
In carrying out their work, Senate council/committee members are expected to rely on their academic expertise, experience, and judgment, and so professional agreements or differences of opinion are not by themselves a basis for recusal.

Grey Areas
In “grey areas” where a Senate council/committee member is uncertain regarding recusal, he or she may disclose the potential grounds for recusal to the Senate council or committee Chair. The Chair may then determine whether the member should recuse himself or herself, or the Chair may seek the advice of other council/committee members in making this determination. The Chair or members may suggest that a member abstain from voting when a conflict of interest exists. The Chair should consult the whole council/committee regarding potential grounds for his or her own recusal. In making its determination regarding recusal in grey areas, the council/committee will take into account the fact that, by design, each member brings valuable and unique expertise to the council/committee as a whole.

*Roberts Rules of Order, Newly Revised guides all Senate meetings.

Approved by the Senate Cabinet: May 19, 2009
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SANCTION LETTER

[date]

[student|fname] [student|lname]
[student|school_student_id]
[student|address]

Dear [student|fname] [student|lname]:

I am writing to confirm the results of the investigation conducted by the Office of Academic Integrity & Student Conduct and to share in writing the resolution that was reached in your case.

CASE SUMMARY

On DATE, the Office of Academic Integrity & Student Conduct was notified that you allegedly... ALLEGATIONS. On DATE, I sent you a Notification Letter which states that you allegedly violated the following UCI Academic Senate Policy on Academic Integrity:

[admin_action|charges]

MEETING SUMMARY

In the Notification Letter dated on DATE, I requested that you schedule an Administrative Meeting with me. We met on [meeting|meeting_date].

[admin_action|rationale]

FINDINGS

I have reviewed all the information related to the allegations. Based on the totality of the information provided and the preponderance of the evidence, I find that you are responsible for violating the following policies:

[admin_action|convictions]

SANCTIONS

Based on the information provided, the following sanction(s) will be imposed:

[admin_action|sanctions]
If you are an international student, this decision may affect your visa status. Please contact the International Center as soon as possible at (949) 824-7249 or internationalcenter@uci.edu.

This disciplinary action is taken with authority delegated to the Office of the Dean of Students. Should you wish to appeal this action, you may do so by submitting a written appeal letter to the Office of Academic Integrity & Student Conduct, or by email, to academicintegrity@uci.edu. The appeal must be in writing and received within ten (10) instructional days from the date of this letter. Your appeal must be received by 5:00 p.m. on INSERT DATE.

If you choose to appeal an outcome, your appeal must be based on one or more of the following grounds: (1) you feel that your due process rights were violated; (2) you have new evidence that was not available at the time of our meeting; or (3) you feel that the sanction imposed is too harsh. Your appeal letter must indicate the ground(s) on which you are basing your appeal.

If you submit an appeal for an outcome of suspension or dismissal, please note that your appeal letter will serve as the grounds for a hearing before the Academic Integrity Review Board of the UCI Academic Senate. Following receipt of your appeal letter, the AIRB will schedule your appeal hearing, during which you and the Office of Academic Integrity and Student Conduct will have the opportunity to present your case to the board, in its entirety, from the beginning.

If you submit an appeal for an outcome that does not include a suspension or dismissal, i.e. a warning, disciplinary probation, and/or educational sanctions, the Academic Integrity Review Board will limit its review to the written documentation you provide, your appeal letter, and the written documentation provided by the Office of Academic Integrity and Student Conduct. You will not attend an appeal hearing.

More information about the appeal procedures for cases of academic misconduct may be found on the UCI Academic Senate website at Academic Integrity Procedures.

The following resources are available to you should you have general questions pertaining to your case or about the Academic Integrity process:

**University Ombudsman**

The Office of the Ombudsman provides a safe place to discuss complaints, concerns or problems. The Ombudsman acts as an independent, informal, impartial, and confidential resource. The intervention of the ombudsman may be requested by the student or faculty involved in the process. The office can assist both parties by:

- Helping the student understand his or her rights.
- Helping faculty with any questions that he or she may have relative to the student contesting the assigned grade.
- Explaining or clarifying policies and procedures.
- Advocating for a fair process.

For more information about the Office of the Ombudsman, please visit www.ombuds.uci.edu.

**Student Peer Advisors**
Peer Advisors assist students in navigating the process for resolving Academic Integrity Policy Violations. They are available to provide proactive education to students who have been notified of an alleged policy violation. Peer Advisors can explain the components of the Academic Integrity process including the notification letter, the administrative meeting process, the standard of evidence used in investigations and an overview of possible sanction options. Please note that the Peer Advisor’s role is to help, assist, and support the student. The role of the Peer Advisors is not to act as a spokesperson, advocate, or defense counsel for the student. To schedule a meeting with a Student Academic Integrity Peer Advisor, please click here or e-mail scintern@uci.edu.

Additional information including directions to the office, related policies and frequently asked questions can be found by visiting the UC Irvine Office of Academic Integrity & Student Conduct website at___________________.

If you have any questions, or need clarification of any part of this letter, please do not hesitate to contact me at [staff|phone].

Sincerely,

[staff|fname] [staff|lname]
[staff|title]
STUDENT NAME
STUDENT EMAIL

RE: APPEAL HEARING
STUDENT NAME – STUDENT ID #

This letter serves as your written notice that your academic integrity appeal hearing with the Irvine Division Academic Senate Academic Integrity Review Board Hearing Panel is scheduled for:

Friday, October #, 20##, from 9:00am-9:30am.

The hearing will address the following issue(s):
On June 21, 2017, the OAISC was notified that you allegedly submitted a plagiarized assignment. On June 22, 2017, you received a Notification Letter which states that you allegedly violated the following UCI Academic Senate Policy on Academic Integrity:

"No student shall engage in any activity that involves attempting to receive a grade by means other than honest effort, and shall not aid another student who is attempting to do so."

Charge(s):
As noted in your letter dated July 17, 2019, the OAISC found you responsible of the following:

Academic Dishonesty/Plagiarism/15. Submit others work as own - To steal or pass off as one's own the ideas or words, images, or other creative works of another.

Sanction(s):
A sanction of Suspension was imposed effective October 1, 2019, and ending on December 19, 2019.

Appeal:
According to the appeal letter, the decision is being contested because you feel the sanction imposed is too harsh given the findings of fact.

Prior to the hearing:
1. The due date for submission of any information you wish the panel to consider and your list of witnesses is 12pm on Wednesday, October #, 2019, to the Academic Senate Office. You are responsible for coordinating and informing your witnesses of the time and location of the hearing.
2. If you wish to bring an advocate or support person for the hearing, please notify us by 12pm on Wednesday, October #, 2019. Please be aware that the advocate or support person cannot speak during the hearing.
3. Hearing panel members will be provided with copies of the materials submitted to the Hearing Panel for review.
4. When you arrive, please wait in the designated seating area with any of your advisors or witnesses until you are called.

Hearing information:

1. The hearing is scheduled for **30 minutes**.
2. There will be at least three faculty members and one Associate Dean present on the panel, and up to two student representatives when available.
3. The hearing will be audio recorded.
4. You will have the opportunity to give an opening statement, then you may ask questions of the University Representative, present any evidence, and call any witnesses.
5. The University Representative will explain how they determined responsibility and why the particular sanctions were imposed.
6. The hearing panel will ask you any pertinent questions, and you will have the opportunity to give a closing statement.
7. After closing statements, you and the University Representative will be dismissed.
8. The hearing panel will deliberate after closing statements.
9. A notification letter of the proposed findings will be sent to the Dean of Students of the within **30 days**.

Requests to change the time, date, or place of the hearing must be made in writing via **mvn@uci.edu** no later than **five business days** prior to the date of the hearing. The Chair will grant or deny the request.

Should you have any questions regarding your appeal or the hearing, please contact me at **mvn@uci.edu**.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

Council Analyst
Academic Integrity Review Board
Council on Teaching, Learning, and Student Experience

c: Associate Director of Academic Integrity
   Office of Academic Integrity & Student Conduct

Chair
Academic Integrity Review Board
INTRODUCTION
Good [morn/afternoon]. The time is [insert time] and we will begin the hearing. Please note this hearing is being recorded. My name is [state name] and I will be serving as the chair. We will now have the other individuals in the room introduce themselves (other members of hearing panel, University Representative, Respondent, advisors, staff support, etc.)

Thank you. This hearing will be conducted in accordance with Section 103.11a of the “University of California Policies applying to Campus Activities, Organizations, and Students”, the UCI Academic Senate Policy on Academic Integrity, and the Procedures for Resolution of Cases of Academic Integrity Policy Violations. Both parties have submitted documents in advance. As the chair, I will rule on all questions of procedure, and I would like to remind all participants that they are expected to tell the truth. Today’s hearing is limited to the factual basis of the charges as detailed in the written notice of the hearing dated [DATE].

OPENING STATEMENTS
We will begin with Opening Statements. The University Representative and the Respondent will each have up to five minutes for their Opening Statement.

Let’s begin with the University Representative.

Now, the Respondent will have five minutes for your opening statement. The members of the panel have already been provided with the materials you submitted, so you do not need to repeat to us what you said in your materials. You can use your time instead on anything you’d like to say that is not in your materials or summarize or highlight specific things that you’d like us to focus on.

ORDER OF EVIDENCE (WITNESSES)
At this time, both parties will present their Order of Evidence. This means that parties may present any witnesses they have and also ask questions of each other.

We will begin with the University Representative. First, the Respondent will have an opportunity to ask any questions it has of the University Representative, and then the panel will have the opportunity to ask questions.

Respondent, you may now ask any questions you have of the University Representative.

Next, we will take questions from the hearing panel for the University Representative.

Does the University Representative have any witnesses? [If so, follow the below.]

The University Representative may now call their [first] witness. [Witness enters].

[To the witness] As a reminder, witnesses are expected to tell the truth.
The University Representative may now begin asking questions of the witness.

Respondent, you may now ask any questions you have of the witness.

At this time, we will take any questions from the hearing panel addressed to the witness.

[After last witness] Are there any final questions from the hearing panel for the University Representative?

Now, the Respondent will present their Order of Evidence. First, the University Representative will have an opportunity to ask any questions it has of the Respondent, and then the panel will have the opportunity to ask questions.

University Representative, you may now ask any questions you have of the Respondent.

We will now take questions from the hearing panel for the Respondent.

Does the Respondent have any witnesses? [If so, follow the below.]

   The Respondent may now call their [first] witness. [Witness enters].

   [To witness] As a reminder, witnesses are expected to tell the truth.

   The Respondent may now begin asking questions of the witness.

   The University Representative may now ask any questions it has of the witness.

   Now, the hearing panel may ask any questions it has of the witness.

   [After last witness] Are there any final questions from the hearing panel for the Respondent?

CLOSING STATEMENTS
At this time, both parties will each have up to five minutes to deliver their Closing Statements.

We will begin with the University Representative.

Respondent, you may now deliver your Closing Statement.

Now that both parties have presented their closing statements, the hearing is concluded. The hearing panel will now deliberate and make a final decision based upon the preponderance of the evidence. Please keep in mind that there are no further appeals or processes following this hearing.

The hearing panel will communicate their final decision to the Academic Integrity Officer (AIAO) and the respondent no later than 30 instructional days from the conclusion of the hearing. If applicable, the panel will submit their proposed findings and recommendations for sanctions to the Dean of Students today. The Dean of Students will notify the University
Representative and Respondent when he reaches a decision.

Thank you. This concludes our hearing. The time is [insert time]. At this time, the University Representative, Respondent, Complainant, and Advisors are excused. Thank you.

** IF AN ADVISOR SPEAKS DURING THE HEARING: 
For the record, Ms.Mr.______ has been given notice that advisors may not speak to any person other than the student whom they are assisting. Please be aware that further interruptions may result in being escorted out of the hearing.

** IF A RECESS IS NEEDED DURING THE HEARING TO DISCUSS A REQUEST: 
For the record, the Respondent/University Respondent has made a request. The hearing panel will take a_____minute recess to review the request and will return with a decision. The time is now____, and the recording will continue.

The time is____ and the hearing panel have returned from our recess. During our recess, we reviewed the following request: [summarize request]. We determined that____.

** IF A RECESS IS NEEDED FOR A BREAK IN THE HEARING: 
For the record, the Respondent/University Respondent has made a request for a [insert time] recess. The time is____, and the recording will continue. We will return at [insert time]. We have returned from the recess. The time is____ and we will now continue with the hearing.

** IF A RECESS IS NEEDED FOR AN EXTENDED PERIOD OF TIME AND THE RECORDING IS STOPPED: 
Stop Recording: 
“The time is____ and the Review Board Hearing will recess for [amount of time] and resume at [time]. The people present are [list names]. The recording will now stop.”

Begin Recording:

“We will now resume the recording. The time is now____ and the Review Board Hearing will continue. The people present are [list names]. “

If no conversations occurred during the recess:

“No discussions occurred during the recess.”

If conversations occurred during the recess, repeat any discussions or decisions that happened while the recording was off:

“The following discussions and decisions were made [list]…”

Ensure report includes:
Who said what when (i.e. “at [time], [name] stated the following…”
If decisions were made, include:
what the options were;
what matters were considered;
what was decided by whom and why
(i.e. “The Board decided [decision]. During the discussion, the following options/matters were considered. Based on [reason] the decision was made by [name(s)]).
AIRB APPEAL HEARING DECISION LETTER SAMPLE

August 8, 2019

KIM BURDETT
OFFICE OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY & STUDENT CONDUCT

Re: APPEAL HEARING DECISION
STUDENT NAME – STUDENT ID

The members of the Irvine Division Academic Senate Academic Integrity Review Board Hearing Panel have completed the review of STUDENT’S appeal. In accordance with Appendix VIII: UCI Academic Senate Policy on Academic Integrity and the Procedures for Resolution of Cases of Academic Integrity Policy Violations, we submit our report and final decision.

Case Summary:
On April 11, 2019, the OAISC was notified that the student allegedly had another individual take multiple exams on your behalf. On April 12, 2019, the student received a Notification Letter which states that you allegedly violated the following UCI Academic Senate Policy on Academic Integrity:

"No student shall engage in any activity that involves attempting to receive a grade by means other than honest effort, and shall not aid another student who is attempting to do so."

As noted in the student’s letter dated May 11, 2019, the OAISC found the student responsible of the following charge(s):

Charge(s):

Academic Dishonesty/Cheating/5. Having someone take exam for you.

A sanction of Suspension was imposed effective May 26, 2019, and ending on October 13, 2019.

According to the appeal letter, the decision is being contested because the imposed sanction is too harsh given the findings of fact.

Hearing Summary

The Academic Integrity Review Board held a hearing on August 4, 2019 to hear statements from both parties, testimony from witnesses, and review materials submitted by the OAISC and the student.

AIRB Panel Members present included Professors Panel Member 1, Panel Member 2, Panel Member 3, Panel Member 4, and Associate Dean 1.

During opening statements, the University Representative summarized the OAISC findings that led to Student Name being found responsible for violating university policy and the imposition of sanctions.
The documents referenced by the OAISC included an incident report submitted by Prof. Shirey, the OAISC notification and meeting request letter, the AISC meeting confirmation letter, and the AISC decision letter. The OAISC described the charges they reviewed and noted that they came to the decision by the preponderance of evidence and in accordance with the UC Irvine Academic Integrity policy. The OAISC reported that STUDENT’S sanctions were in line with similar violations administered through AISC. The OAISC did not submit additional evidence.

STUDENT did not submit additional evidence at that time. The OAISC also did not submit additional evidence.

During closing statements, the OAISC stated they had no additional information.

Findings:
The panel deliberated all of the information related to the allegations and the appeal, and as presented by STUDENT and the University Representative. The standard of review for an AI appeal hearing is the preponderance of evidence. The panel considered the following question:

-Was the imposed sanction too harsh given the findings of fact?

*Imposed Sanction Too Harsh Given the Findings of Fact*
The panel decided that the sanction imposed was not too harsh due to the fact that the panel agreed that this is an egregious violation.

Conclusion:
The Academic Integrity Review Board Hearing Panel will modify the sanctioning with the following:

1. The original imposed sanction of **Suspension** with the original dates.

Sincerely,

Chair
Academic Integrity Review Board
Council on Teaching, Learning, and Student Experience

c:  Associate Director, Academic Integrity
Office of Academic Integrity & Student Conduct

Senate Analyst
Academic Senate
Table of Contents: Resources

Common Allegations

Listening Skills: Be Attentive and Critical

Question Asking Skills: Clarifying and Probing

Top Ten Ways to be an Effective Panel Member
## COMMON ALLEGATIONS, EVIDENCE & QUESTIONS TO ASK IN ACADEMIC INTEGRITY REVIEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALLEGATION</th>
<th>QUESTIONS TO ASK/ THINGS TO CONSIDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exam Misconduct</strong></td>
<td>What exactly was observed and by whom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the observations alone sufficient to suggest copying was “more likely than not?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Copying/ Allow Copying</strong></td>
<td>In Exam Comparison, do the exams show similarities (e.g., wrong answers; wrong values; answers that match the other exam version) that are unlikely unless from copying?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If no observation of copying, who copied from whom and was the “copied from” person complicit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unauthorized Aid</strong></td>
<td>Was the student caught with an aid (e.g., notes, phone, another person) that was not allowed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was the student observed using the aid (even having an aid is a violation of Policy, but sometimes the aid is a normal possession—e.g., a cell phone—so may need to determine if it was used as an aid)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When finding an aid in the restroom (or somewhere not on the person), is it more likely than not that the aid is the alleged student’s? (can you compare handwriting on the aid with the handwriting on the exam, for example)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was the aid stored in the restroom in an “attempt to earn a grade by means other than honest effort”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When reading the exam, Are there answers on the exam that are verbatim copies/paraphrases of online or other information?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If no observation of the student using the aid, could the student have replicated the words and ideas of another by some other method (e.g., memorization)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exam Proxy</strong></td>
<td>Did the professor/proctor observe an unknown student in the exam?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did the professor or TA/Proctor check IDs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there a misspelling of the student’s name on the exam?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there different handwriting than earlier exams?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** if two exams definitely show evidence of copying and you cannot determine who copied from whom (because the students are withholding some truths), both students should be held responsible.

**NOTE:** If insufficient evidence to suggest the student did use an aid, but it is clear that the student submitted another’s words or ideas in an exam, the student should be found responsible for plagiarism.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Altering Exam for Regrade</th>
<th>When comparing exam copies, does the professor provide a photocopy of the originally graded exam and the exam resubmitted for regrade? If so, compare them to look for changes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When reading the exam, what is the probability of a grader mis-grading the particular answer in question?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does it look like the student’s writing is over the grader’s marks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the writing instrument different for the alleged added material?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment/Homework Misconduct</td>
<td>When comparing homework/assignments, is it possible to determine who copied from whom and if the “copied from” person was complicit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are there odd similarities like errors or uncommon phrasing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the similarities unlikely to have occurred without copying?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When reading turnitin reports, does the turnitin report provide information about what and how much was copied? Are the suspected similarities “normal” for students who are in lab group or study groups together?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unauthorized Aid</td>
<td>When reading the homework/assignment, are there odd errors or wordings that would not normally occur?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there a use of sophisticated wording or analysis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plagiarism</td>
<td>In comparison of papers turnitin report, did the student receive permission from the instructor to submit the previously submitted work? (if not, Policy is clear that this is misconduct)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resubmission of own previously submitted work</td>
<td>In a Turnitin Report, what are the real overlaps that are not cited and that are not “common sayings?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the comparison of paper with source, are the overlaps there – even in a small amount? (AIRB doesn’t distinguish between limited &amp; extensive plagiarism— the Deans will for sanctioning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When presented with sophisticated wording, was it possible for this student to use such language without having copied it from another source?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When examining the use of facts/data that would otherwise require citation, was it scholarly negligence or plagiarism (scholarly negligence is still a Policy violation, but leads to a lesser sanction)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Listening Skills: Be Attentive & Critical

Listening can be exceptionally difficult in the context of an Academic Integrity Review because you are in an atypical relation with a variety of different speakers. The relation is atypical because it is more formal and structured than most times you are a listener, for example when you are listening to your partner, your best friend, your teacher, or your parent. Listening in a Review is also challenging because you have to listen to several different speakers with different ways of speaking and different motives for speaking, for example the instructor bringing the charge forward, the accused student(s), the student advocate(s), and any witnesses on behalf of the instructor and/or student.

You can decrease the impact of this challenging situation by listening attentively and critically. The following information is adapted from the Center for Communication in Science, Technology, and Management at Northern Carolina State University.

As an active listener on the Panel, your goal is to understand and remember what you are hearing as well as demonstrate care for the speaker(s) by:

**Maintaining an open posture**---do not hide behind a laptop or pad of paper, but instead face whomever is speaking squarely, make eye contact with the speaker, and even incline toward the speaker. Avoid crossing your arms in front of your body, tapping your fingers, or engaging in other distracting movements.

**Providing non-verbal feedback**---you can let the speaker know that you are listening by occasionally nodding your head, using facial expressions to reflect emotions back to the speaker, and adjusting your body position in non-distracting ways.

As a critical listener, your goal is to evaluate (assess, interpret) what you are hearing so that you can ask good clarification and probing questions. You can critically evaluate what you are hearing if you pay specific attention to recognizing differences between facts and opinions, relevant and irrelevant information, credible and incredible sources of information. You can do this by:

**Reviewing and previewing as you listen**: this involves anticipating where the speaker is going next, how the argument will be developed and what issues have been and/or should be covered.

**Mapping as you listen**: determining the purpose of the speaker’s statement, identifying the main points, assessing the adequacy of the main points.
Question Asking Skills: Clarifying & Probing

Second in importance only to attentive and critical listening is the ability to ask good questions. Your main job in the Review is to decide whether it is “more likely than not” that a student violated the Academic Integrity Policy as alleged, thus your ability to ask questions to get at the facts and truths of the situation is imperative.

Questions of Clarification
Questions of clarification are typically structured as closed questions which seek brief answers like yes, no, or maybe (“Did you say that you specifically told the students they could not collaborate on this assignment?”) or multiple choice questions that help to sort out confusion by giving limited choices (“So, are you saying that students were told orally in class, in writing in the syllabus, or in writing in the assignment guidelines sheet?”). In each instance, it is likely that the speaker will expand beyond the initial brief answer dictated by the structure of the question in order to establish the context for other questions.

There are three common types of questions of clarification relevant for AI Reviews:

Paraphrasing: Re-stating in your own words what you believe the essence of the speaker’s presentation or statement in the form of a question to check your understanding. For example, “So you’re suggesting that the student took the graded exam back, changed your answer on the second question to make it a correct answer and then returned it to you specifically to ask for it to be regraded?”

Summative Reflection: Stating the main points of the presentation and how they relate to the case in the form of a question to check your understanding. For example, “If I understand correctly, your position is that you did not understand that you could not use Wikipedia for this assignment and therefore you did not violate the Academic Integrity Policy, is that correct?”

Clarification of Confusion: These questions tend to be more open-ended in structure than other questions of clarification because they ask the speaker to expand on an earlier comment that was not clear. For example, “Will you explain again what you meant by your statement that you misunderstood the instructor’s instructions?”

Probing Questions
Probing questions usually take the form of open-ended questions encouraging longer, more in-depth responses to allow additional facts or information to emerge. For example, “Please tell me more about your process of writing the paper in question. How did you begin, how did you use and find sources, and so on?”

There are two common types of probing questions relevant for AI Reviews:

Application: Use this type of question to ask for application of ideas presented to better understand the situation and context. For example, of the instructor, “How do you usually talk to students about collaborating too closely on their assignments? What kinds of things do you say?” Or, of the student, “You say that you didn’t plagiarize but just inadvertently missed citing all of this
material. Can you please show us how you would cite this material properly?"

**Challenging:** This type of question seeks to uncover and examine the underlying assumptions of a statement. When using a challenging question, monitor the relational aspect of the question as well as its content because you want to challenge the material not the person. For example, to the instructor, "The student may have consulted with other people on her assignment, but how does that constitute academic misconduct rather than just the normal collaborative process we all undertake when we write papers?" Or, as another example, to a witness, “You may be convinced that your friend would not engage in academic misconduct, but how is it that you know for sure that he did not when you were not present the entire time?”

**Question Asking Tips**

**Tip #1:** In a Review, you have to be able to listen to an entire presentation by the instructor before you can ask him/her any questions, and this repeats later in the Review with the student. So, it may be helpful for you to jot down questions as you think of them when you are actively and critically listening to the presentations.

**Tip #2:** Only ask questions that are relevant to the case at hand or specifically to information that has already emerged from the presentations or answers to other questions. You cannot ask the student about other misconduct cases, other classes, or his/her personal life unless s/he first brings that information into the Review. For example, if a student says “I have never been accuse of cheating before and I am a really good student so why would I cheat?” you can ask probing questions to the student regarding his/her disciplinary record and can you ask the instructor “How was the student doing in your class before this alleged incident?”

**Tip #3:** Avoid the use of “loaded” questions that operate more to convey your opinion or formed judgment rather than uncover additional information from the participants in the Review. Loaded questions usually include words like, aren’t, wouldn’t, couldn’t, doesn’t, shouldn’t. An example of a loaded question is "By stating that you just didn’t know you were plagiarizing, aren’t you admitting that you did actually plagiarize?” Or, of a witness for the student, “Why should we believe what you’re saying because you’re going to say anything to get your friend off, aren’t you?” Such loaded questions can be perceived as manipulative and indirect and contribute to creating an adversarial environment.

**Tip #4:** Do not monopolize the Review with your questions. Ensure there is the space and opportunity for others to ask questions that you might not have thought of.

**Tip #5:** On the other hand, always make sure that you ask all of the questions you have. Do not enter into deliberations wishing you had just asked this one question! Communicate with the Presiding Officer and step up when you have questions.

---

**Source:** Center for Communication in Science, Technology, and Management, North Carolina State University, [http://www.chass.ncsu.edu/ccstm/scmh/](http://www.chass.ncsu.edu/ccstm/scmh/) Version 1.0, created on 6/20/99
Top Ten Ways to Be an Effective Panel Member

1. Learn from your experiences. Being an effective Panel member takes practice and you will start off a bit shaky. Don’t be afraid of making “mistakes”—if you do, apologize, learn from it, and move on.

2. Do not use legalistic language such as “guilty,” “innocent,” “defense,” or “prosecution.” This is an administrative review of a Policy violation, not a courtroom trial of an illegal activity.

3. Remember your role as a Panel member to ask questions of the parties and make a judgment about the allegation. The Presiding Officer runs the Review and makes decisions about procedural issues. If you have a question/concern about the procedures, please direct them politely and discreetly to the Presiding Officer.

4. Keep your feelings about individuals to yourself. You are on the Panel to make a judgment about an ACT not the PERSON. Do not make disparaging comments about the Involved Student(s), Instructor, or Relevant Parties. You can respect the persons while being direct and forthright with your questions.

5. Ask questions to get at what isn’t said and any conflicting information. Ask all of the questions you have so you do not have to make guesses during deliberation.

6. Listen carefully to both what is said and what isn’t said (i.e., non-verbal clues).

7. Refrain from making any judgments about the case until you have reviewed the documentation and heard from all relevant parties.

8. “Bracket” your preconceived notions of academic misconduct so you can review the information objectively.

9. Arrive on time and leave your daily “distractions” at the door.

10. Mark your Panel commitments in your calendar and set reminders.

---

1 Adapted from pg. 26 of the 2003-2004 Brown University Disciplinary Council Handbook, which was adapted from Marshall University Student Judiciary Manual.