

RYERSON UNIVERSITY

SENATE POLICY 60: ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Revision Approval Dates: January 26, 2016; June 2, 2015; Amended Nov. 3, 2015

Revision Implementation Date: September 1, 2015

Previous Approval Dates: March 4, 2003. Amended October 2003; January 2004; April 2006; April 1, 2008; June 4, 2013

Policy Review Date: 2018

Responsible Office: Provost and Vice President Academic

PROCEDURES AVAILABLE AT: http://ryerson.ca/senate/policies/pol60_procedures.pdf

RYERSON SENATE POLICY 60: ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

- 1.1 The Purpose of the Academic Integrity Policy
- 1.2 Scope
- 1.3 Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity
- 1.4 Educational Emphasis
- 1.5 Fair Process
- 1.6 Awareness of Academic Integrity
- 1.7 Academic Integrity and Graduate Studies
- 1.8 Academic Misconduct and Professional Codes of Ethics/Conduct
- 1.9 Procedures
- 1.10 Accommodation

2. ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

- 2.1 Plagiarism
- 2.2 Cheating
- 2.3 Misrepresentation of Personal Identity or Performance
- 2.4 Submission of False Information
- 2.5 Contributing to Academic Misconduct
- 2.6 Damaging, Tampering or Interfering with the Scholarly Environment
- 2.7 Applicability to Research-Related Activities
- 2.8 Unauthorized Use of Intellectual Property
- 2.9 Misconduct in Re-graded/Re-submitted Work
- 2.10 Violations of Specific Departmental or Course Requirements

3. INVESTIGATING A SUSPICION OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

- 3.1 Authority to Investigate Suspected Misconduct
- 3.2 Dealing with Allegations of Discrimination or Harassment
- 3.3 Verification
- 3.4 Proceeding with an Investigation
- 3.5 Communicating the Decision
- 3.6 Enrollment Status

4. DECISION MAKING BODIES: TERMS OF REFERENCE

- 4.1 General
- 4.2 The Designated Decision Makers' Council (DDMC)
- 4.3 The Academic Integrity Council (AIC)
- 4.4 Registrar's Appeals Committee (RAC)
- 4.5 Graduate Admissions Appeals Committee (GAAC)
- 4.6 Senate Appeals Committee (SAC)

5. PENALTIES AND OTHER OUTCOMES FOR ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

- 5.1 Disciplinary Notation
- 5.2 Penalties that may be *Assigned* by an Initial Decision Maker
- 5.3 Penalties that may be *Recommended* by the Initial Decision Maker, *Recommended or Assigned* by the AIC, or *Assigned* by the SAC
- 5.4 Progressive Discipline and Repeated Misconduct
- 5.5 Other Consequences

6. APPEAL HEARINGS AND PENALTY HEARINGS

- 6.1 Appeal Hearings
- 6.2 Penalty Hearings
- 6.3 Enrollment During the Appeal Process
- 6.4 Filing an Appeal
- 6.5 Conflict of Interest and Perceptions of Bias
- 6.6 Sequence of Hearings
- 6.7 Representation/Support at Hearings
- 6.8 Procedural Decisions by the Panel
- 6.9 Appeal Hearing and Penalty Hearing Decisions

RYERSON SENATE POLICY 60: ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

AGPC	Academic Governance and Policy Committee	FD	Facilitated Discussion
AIC	Academic Integrity Council	GA	Graduate Assistant
AIO	Academic Integrity Office	GAAC	Graduate Admissions Appeals Committee
ARUCC	Association of Registrars of Universities and Colleges of Canada	GPD	Graduate Program Director
CE	The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education	NFD	Non-Facilitated Discussion
CESAR	Continuing Education Students' Association of Ryerson	OVPRI	Office of the Vice President Research and Innovation
DDM	Designated Decision Maker	PD	Program Director
DDMC	Designated Decision Makers' Council	RAC	Registrar's Appeals Committee
HRS	Human Rights Services	RSU	Ryerson Students' Union
DN	Disciplinary Notation	SAC	Senate Appeals Committee
DS	Disciplinary Suspension	TA	Teaching Assistant
DW	Disciplinary Withdrawal	VPRI	Vice President Research and Innovation
FAI	Fundamentals of Academic Integrity	YSGS	Yeates School of Graduate Studies

1. ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

1.1 The Purpose of the Academic Integrity Policy

The purpose of this policy is to guide the Ryerson community in understanding i) what academic integrity and misconduct are for students; ii) the processes the University will follow when there is a suspicion of student academic misconduct; and iii) the academic penalties and other consequences that may be imposed if students are found to have engaged in academic misconduct.

1.2 Scope

This policy applies to all current and former Ryerson students (undergraduate, graduate and continuing education) and applies to all academic activities, whether on or off campus, whether within or outside of a course. Research misconduct not associated in any way with academic advantage or benefit at Ryerson University is to be dealt with under Policy 118 (see Section 2.7).

1.3 Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity

This policy is premised on the commitment of Ryerson University (the “University”) to foster and uphold the highest standards of *academic integrity*, the fundamental values of which are *honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, courage¹, as well as trustworthiness*. These values are central to the development and sharing of knowledge. All members of the Ryerson community, including faculty, students, graduate assistants and staff, have a responsibility to adhere to and uphold them in their teaching, learning, evaluation, scholarly research and creative activity. This includes a responsibility to take action if they have reasonable grounds for thinking that academic misconduct has occurred.

1.4 Educational Emphasis

One of the central values motivating this policy is that of education. Ryerson University recognizes it has a role in fostering academic integrity by providing students and faculty with information and learning opportunities about the nature and importance of academic integrity. Those involved in applying this policy are to keep this emphasis in mind at all stages of the processes described in this policy and the accompanying Procedures.

1.5 Fair Process

The University recognizes that it is a serious matter for students to be involved in an academic misconduct investigation and is therefore committed to handling these matters in a respectful, timely and thoughtful manner. The University will apply the policy in a non-adversarial, investigative manner that is consistent with the principles of natural justice, including the right to be heard and the right to a timely and fair decision based on the merits of each individual case. Within the decision-making processes associated with the implementation of this policy, as well as any related Procedures, all decision makers will make reasonable efforts to acquire all the information needed to make a fair decision, and will do so in an unbiased manner. The onus is on the University to establish that misconduct has occurred. The standard of proof is the balance of probabilities. This means that, for a finding of misconduct to be supported, based on the information presented, it is more likely than not that the student committed academic misconduct.

¹ *International Centre for Academic Integrity (2013)*

1.6 Awareness of Academic Integrity

All members of the Ryerson community have a responsibility to inform themselves about academic integrity and misconduct, including the contents of this policy. Anyone with concerns or questions about academic integrity should feel free to consult with the Academic Integrity Office (AIO) or, in the case of students unsure about a particular matter, the appropriate instructor or academic supervisor. The AIO provides educational material and information about this policy for the use of faculty, staff and students.

1.7 Academic Integrity and Graduate Education

In graduate education it is essential that an environment exist where faculty and students have the utmost regard for academic integrity. Graduate students often engage in research with a large degree of independence. Therefore, they are expected to and must pursue their academic and research activities in a manner that is consistent with the highest standards of ethical and scholarly practice.

1.8 Academic Misconduct and Professional Codes of Ethics/Conduct

In some programs, students may be required to abide by the standards of a professional code of ethics or code of conduct as a condition of successful completion of a practicum or field placement. Where such professional codes substantively differ from or impose requirements at variance with this policy, violations of such codes are not to be pursued under this policy.

1.9 Procedures

Procedures related to this policy shall be established by the Office of the Provost and Vice President Academic in consultation with the Academic Integrity Office, the Designated Decision Makers' Council (DDMC), the Academic Integrity Council (AIC), the Senate Appeals Committee (SAC), and student representatives from RSU and CESAR. These shall be published annually at the start of the academic year. Any recommendations for changes will be submitted to the Secretary of Senate no later than the end of the spring semester. Interpretation of the Procedures shall be the responsibility of the Academic Integrity Office.

1.10 Accommodation

All processes and procedures associated with this policy are to be carried out in accordance with relevant law and Ryerson policy concerning the accommodation of students.

2. ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

Any behaviour that undermines the University's ability to evaluate fairly students' academic achievements, or any behaviour that a student knew, or reasonably ought to have known, could gain them or others unearned academic advantage or benefit, counts as academic misconduct. While the following list of examples characterizes the most common instances of academic misconduct, it is not intended to be exhaustive.

2.1 Plagiarism – includes but is not limited to:

- 2.1.1 claiming, submitting or presenting the words, ideas, artistry, drawings, images or data of another person, including information found on the Internet and unpublished materials, as if they are one's own, without appropriate referencing;
- 2.1.2 claiming, submitting or presenting someone else's work, ideas, opinions or theories as if they are one's own, without proper referencing;
- 2.1.3 claiming, submitting or presenting another person's substantial compositional contributions, assistance, edits or changes to an assignment as one's own;
- 2.1.4 claiming, submitting or presenting collaborative work as if it were created solely by oneself or one's group;
- 2.1.5 submitting the same work, in whole or in part, for credit in two or more courses, or in the same course more than once, without the prior written permission of the instructor;
- 2.1.6 minimally paraphrasing someone else's work by changing only a few words and not citing the original source.

2.2 Cheating - includes but is not limited to:

- 2.2.1 having ready access to and/or using aids or devices (including wireless communication devices) not expressly allowed by the instructor during an examination, test, quiz, or other evaluation;
- 2.2.2 copying another person's answer(s) on a test, exam, quiz, lab report, or other work to be evaluated;
- 2.2.3 copying another person's answers, with or without their permission, to individually assigned projects;
- 2.2.4 consulting with another person or with unauthorized materials outside of an examination room during the examination period (e.g. discussing an exam or consulting materials during an emergency evacuation or when permitted to use a washroom);
- 2.2.5 improperly submitting an answer to a test or examination question completed, in whole or part, outside the examination room unless expressly permitted by the instructor;
- 2.2.6 resubmitting altered test or examination work after it has already been evaluated;
- 2.2.7 presenting falsified or fabricated material, including research results;
- 2.2.8 improperly obtaining, through deceit, theft, bribery, collusion or otherwise, access to examination paper(s) or set of questions, or other confidential information;
- 2.2.9 collaborating on work to be evaluated where such collaboration has been expressly forbidden by the instructor.

2.3 Misrepresentation of Personal Identity or Performance - includes but is not limited to:

- 2.3.1 submitting stolen or purchased assignments or research;
- 2.3.2 impersonating someone or having someone impersonate you in person, in writing, or electronically (both the impersonator and the individual impersonated, if aware of the impersonation, may be subject to a penalty);
- 2.3.3 falsely identifying oneself or misrepresenting one's personal performance outside of a particular course, in a course in which one is not officially enrolled, or in the admissions process (e.g. submission of portfolios, essays, transcripts or documents);
- 2.3.4 withholding or altering academic information, portfolios, essays, transcripts or documents, including during the admissions process.

2.4 Submission of False Information - includes but is not limited to:

- 2.4.1 submitting altered, forged or falsified medical or other certificates or documents for academic consideration, or making false claims for such consideration, including in or as part of an academic appeal, or the academic misconduct process;
- 2.4.2 submitting false academic credentials to the University;
- 2.4.3 altering, in any way, official documents issued by the University;
- 2.4.4 submitting falsified letters of reference.

2.5 Contributing to Academic Misconduct - includes but is not limited to:

- 2.5.1 offering, giving, sharing or selling essays, questions and/or answers to tests or exams, quizzes or other assignments unless authorized to do so;
- 2.5.2 allowing work to be copied during an examination, test or for other assignments.

2.6 Damaging, Tampering or Interfering with the Scholarly Environment - includes but is not limited to:

- 2.6.1 obstructing and/or disturbing the academic activities of others;
- 2.6.2 altering the academic work of others in order to gain academic advantage;
- 2.6.3 tampering with experiments or laboratory assignments;
- 2.6.4 altering or destroying artistic or creative works such as drawings or films;
- 2.6.5 removing, altering, misusing or destroying University property to obstruct the work of others;
- 2.6.6 unauthorized access to, stealing, or tampering with any course-related material;
- 2.6.7 unauthorized access to, or tampering with, library materials, including hiding them in a place where they will not readily be found by other members of the Ryerson community.

2.7 Applicability to Research-Related Activities

For purposes of this policy, “supervised research” is treated as a separate category to accord with the *Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research*, and normally includes academic milestones such as Comprehensive Examinations, Major Research Papers, Research or Thesis Proposals, Theses and Dissertations, as well as the research and associated writing carried out towards any of these at either the undergraduate or graduate level. (See Section 3.4.2 regarding the process to be followed in addressing suspicions of misconduct in these areas.) Suspicions of research misconduct that may have occurred under the auspices of Ryerson University, but are in no way directed towards academic advantage or benefit, are to be addressed under Policy 118 (Scholarly, Research and Creative Activity (SRC) Integrity) rather than Policy 60.

2.8 Unauthorized Use of Intellectual Property

Use of the intellectual property of others for distribution, sale or profit without the authorization of the owner of that material. This includes slides and presentation materials used in a class wherever the owner of those materials has not authorized further use.

2.9 Misconduct in Re-graded/Re-submitted Work

All of the provisions of this policy will apply to work that is re-assessed (See *Undergraduate Academic Consideration and Appeals Policy 134*, and *Graduate Student Academic Appeals Policy 152*.)

2.10 Violations of Specific Departmental or Course Requirements

Instructors may, in order to encourage Academic Integrity, include additional specific requirements as long as these are consistent with this policy. Any additional requirements must be published in the course outline (see also Section 5.2.3).

3. INVESTIGATING A SUSPICION OF MISCONDUCT

3.1 Authority to Investigate Suspected Misconduct

The formal processes to investigate suspicions of academic misconduct may be initiated by any one of the following:

- 3.1.1 Ryerson employees holding an academic position at Ryerson University, which includes Designated Decision Makers (DDMs, see below)
- 3.1.2 course instructors employed by Ryerson University
- 3.1.3 the Registrar (or designate).

All others, including but not limited to, students, graduate assistants, other staff, associate members of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies and external examiners, who become aware of possible misconduct should report the basis for their concern to an appropriate eligible person as listed above.

3.2. Dealing with Allegations of Discrimination or Harassment

If there are concerns or allegations of prejudice, discrimination or harassment related to a suspicion that a student has engaged in academic misconduct, the student must consult with Human Rights Services (HRS). Normally, any such allegations should be dealt with before a Facilitated or Non-Facilitated Discussion (FD/NFD) occurs.

3.3 Verification

The University or any persons eligible under Section 3.1 may verify documents submitted under this policy and its Procedures at any stage of the proceedings. Any evidence involving personal information relating to individuals other than the student who is the subject of the investigation or proceeding, must be accompanied by the consent of those individuals authorizing the University to collect, verify or share that information.

3.4 Proceeding with an Investigation

A person eligible under Section 3.1 to investigate and/or decide regarding a suspicion of academic misconduct must first make a determination as to whether or not the suspected misconduct is specific to course related or supervised research activities of the student. If the suspected misconduct falls under **academic misconduct in course related activities**, decision makers are to follow the process in Section 3.4.1. For **academic misconduct in supervised research activities**, the process to be followed is described in Section 3.4.2.

3.4.1 Academic misconduct in course related activities

3.4.1.1 An eligible investigator (see Section 3.1) should proceed if they suspect misconduct by a student or students, unless informing another person of the suspicion is more appropriate (e.g. the suspected misconduct took place in relation to a course or examination where another faculty member is the instructor or supervisor, etc.). This preliminary inquiry is conducted prior to contacting the student, and will be completed in such a fashion that the student's identity is protected. The purpose is to see whether there is a sufficient basis to support a reasonable belief that misconduct may have occurred. This involves collecting information regarding the suspected offence by means such as examining work submitted or checking work for originality by various means (e.g. Internet searches, text comparison, use of originality detection tools, websites, clarifying what an invigilator may have observed or discovered, etc.). In unusual cases, or where investigators have questions or concerns regarding how to proceed, they should consult with the AIO.

3.4.1.2 A faculty member who has formed a reasonable belief that misconduct has occurred has two options or routes regarding how to proceed, and may follow only one of these options:

OPTION A: The faculty member may continue with the matter as the decision maker (in which case, skip to Section 3.4.1.5); or

OPTION B: If the faculty member does not wish or is unable to pursue the matter, they may request that another decision maker be appointed. A Designated Decision Maker (DDM) will then be assigned, by the Chair of the Designated Decision Makers' Council (DDMC), in conjunction with the AIO, to pursue the matter and be the decision maker with respect to any finding regarding academic misconduct. The DDM will contact the faculty member to ask for all information relevant to the suspicion, and may need to clarify the forwarded information. The referring faculty member will also be asked to submit a recommendation regarding an appropriate penalty, should the DDM make a finding of academic misconduct.

3.4.1.3 NOTE: Once a faculty member refers the matter to a DDM, they have given all decision-making authority with respect to whether academic misconduct has occurred to the DDM. The referring faculty member may not appeal either the decision of the DDM or any penalty or consequences assigned or recommended. The referring faculty member may, however, still be called as a witness in the event of an appeal.

3.4.1.4 In cases where a DDM has decided not to proceed with formally registering a suspicion and further information relevant to the matter later becomes known, the faculty member can forward this to the AIO. A DDM will be assigned (the same or other) to re-assess the matter and proceed if they decide proceeding is warranted.

3.4.1.5 Once the faculty member or DDM decides to proceed, they will then arrange to have either a Facilitated Discussion (FD) or Non-Facilitated Discussion (NFD) with the student. This must be arranged through the AIO in accordance with the accompanying Procedures. Students must be notified of a suspicion of academic misconduct in a confidential and timely manner. The student has the right to an FD if they prefer that option to an NFD. Students will receive all notifications via their Ryerson email address in accordance with the Procedures accompanying this policy.

3.4.1.6 The notification of a suspicion to the student must include a detailed summary of the basis for the suspicion to enable the student to prepare for the FD/NFD.

3.4.1.7 The purpose of the FD/NFD is to inquire into the basis of the suspicion(s), and to give the student an opportunity to answer questions and to articulate their perspective on the facts. The meeting is not to be accusatory in nature, but investigative and non-adversarial. Students may bring, or be asked to bring, rough notes, drafts or other documents. Students are entitled to have an advocate from the RSU or CESAR accompany them to either type of discussion. The advocate may raise questions of the decision maker and speak during the FD/NFD, but students are expected to speak for themselves with respect to matters of fact. A support person may be present but may not participate in an FD/NFD. They remain silent and do not sit at the table or take notes. They may confer with the student or the respondent only outside the FD/NFD (see Procedures).

3.4.1.8 If a student fails to attend an FD/NFD and fails to notify the AIO in a timely way to re-schedule, the decision maker may proceed without the student's input. If a faculty member/DDM fails to attend the FD/NFD, and fails to notify the AIO in a timely way, the matter shall be dismissed and a "no finding of misconduct" registered through the AIO.

3.4.1.9 After the FD/NFD, the faculty member or DDM will decide, based on the information available and applying a “balance of probabilities” standard of proof, whether academic misconduct has occurred. If it is found that misconduct has occurred, prior to assigning any penalty or consequences the faculty member or DDM may wish to consult with the AIO regarding the general practice regarding penalty for similar violations.

3.4.1.10 Normally, once a finding has been made that the suspicion is not supported and misconduct has not occurred, no further proceedings related to the suspicion as set out in notice to the student may be initiated. Any work in question will be assessed/re-assessed/re-graded in accordance with the processes outlined in Policy 134. Notwithstanding the above, in exceptional cases further information that becomes known may be so serious as to require review. All such information shall be forwarded to the AIO. The Chair of the DDMC (or designate) will jointly review the new information with the AIO to decide whether it warrants re-opening proceedings.

3.4.1.11 If a final grade for the course must be submitted while a suspicion of misconduct is under investigation, the instructor will assign a grade of DEF. Once the matter is resolved, a final grade must be assigned by the instructor (or designate) as soon as reasonably possible.

3.4.1.12 If evidence of misconduct is discovered more than 20 business days after a final grade in a course has been assigned, the instructor may forward that evidence to the AIO requesting permission to proceed with an investigation. The Chair of the DDMC (or designate) will decide whether formally proceeding is warranted given the circumstances, including the basis for the suspicion, the amount of time that has passed, and nature of the alleged violation. The Chair of the DDMC (or designate) will notify the instructor of the decision in a timely manner.

3.4.2 Academic misconduct in supervised research activities

3.4.2.1 The following process applies to all allegations or suspicions of misconduct in academic work done towards the completion of supervised research, which normally includes academic “milestones” such as Comprehensive Examinations, Major Research Papers, Research or Thesis Proposals, Theses and Dissertations, as well as the research and associated writing carried out towards any of these at the undergraduate or graduate level. Normally, papers and assignments produced in relation to undergraduate or graduate courses are covered by the process in Section 3.4.1.

3.4.2.2 Before registering a suspicion of misconduct involving the supervised research activities of a student, an eligible person under Section 3.1 must consult with the relevant Program Director (PD) or designate, who will determine who should act as the investigator/decision maker.

3.4.2.3 In cases where the person (or persons) raising the suspicion is eligible under Section 3.1 (and in a case involving a graduate student, is also a member of the Yeates School of Graduate Studies) they may continue as the decision maker provided the PD is in agreement. The PD or their faculty designate may act as a co-respondent.

3.4.2.4 In cases where the person (or persons) under Section 3.1 raising the suspicion does not wish to proceed, or is in a conflict of interest, or is not eligible under Section 3.1, the PD may choose to pursue the case themselves (with or without a co-respondent), or to assign a faculty designate. If there is disagreement between the Program Director and the person raising the suspicion regarding how to proceed, the matter will be referred to the relevant Dean (i.e. the Dean of the student’s Faculty for undergraduates, or the Dean of YSGS in the case of a graduate student). The Dean shall, in consultation with the AIO, decide who shall be the decision maker(s).

3.4.2.5 This decision maker will investigate the basis of the suspicion. Prior to requesting a Facilitated or Non-Facilitated Discussion (FD/NFD) and, therefore, prior to contacting the student, the decision maker may ask one or more faculty members with subject matter expertise to review the evidence in order to clarify the import of the evidence and identify areas where further evidence or clarification should be sought. This must be done making all reasonable efforts to protect confidentiality, including the identity of the student(s) in question. The decision maker must also determine whether the student receives tri-agency funding in support of their supervised research activities

3.4.2.6 If the decision maker(s) determines there is reasonable belief that misconduct has occurred, they must formally register a suspicion with the AIO and an FD/NFD must be scheduled as per Section 3.1.4.5.

3.4.2.7 In recognition of the severity of the potential impact of even a formal suspicion upon students at the graduate level, there is no option of a Non-Facilitated Discussion (NFD) with these students.

3.4.2.8 In all cases of suspected research misconduct, the Vice President Research and Innovation (VPRI) must be notified by the AIO. In the case of graduate student misconduct, the Dean of YSGS must also be notified of the suspicion.

3.4.2.9 In the case of a student in receipt of tri-agency funding, the VPRI will assign an additional investigator, external (i.e. arms-length) to the university, who will also attend and participate in the FD as an investigator and decision maker and will sign a confidentiality agreement registered with the OVPRI.

3.4.2.10 The purpose of the FD is to inquire into the basis of the suspicion(s), to give the student an opportunity to answer questions, and to articulate their perspective on the facts. The meeting is not to be accusatory in nature, but investigative and non-adversarial. Students are entitled to have an advocate from the RSU or CESAR accompany them to either type of discussion. The advocate may raise questions of the decision maker and speak during the FD/NFD, but students are expected to speak for themselves with respect to matters of fact. A support person may be present but may not participate in an FD/NFD. They remain silent and do not sit at the table or take notes. They may confer with the student or the respondent only outside the FD/NFD.

3.4.2.11 If a student fails to attend an FD/NFD and fails to notify the AIO in a timely way to re-schedule, the decision maker may proceed without the student's input. If a faculty member/DDM fails to attend the FD/NFD, and fails to notify the AIO in a timely way, the matter shall be dismissed and a "no finding of misconduct" registered through the AIO.

3.4.2.12 If the initial investigation has not established whether a breach has occurred or additional issues are identified at this stage, more than one FD/NFD may be required.

3.4.2.13 After the FD/NFD, the decision maker(s) will decide whether there are sufficient grounds for a finding of academic misconduct. They will then also assign and/or recommend penalties (see Section 5) for breaches of this policy.

3.4.2.14 This entire process should be conducted in a timely manner and concluded, as per Policy 118, within six (6) months. If circumstances warrant and appropriate justification is provided, this timeline may be extended.

3.5 Communicating the Decision

3.5.1 Once a decision has been made, the faculty member or DDM will notify the AIO (see Procedures) of the finding, and any penalties, consequences or educational remedies assigned.

3.5.2 The student will receive, via the AIO, a decision letter outlining whether or not there has been a finding of misconduct, the reason(s) for the decision, and, when there has been a finding of misconduct, information regarding any penalties, consequences or educational remedies assigned, as well as appeals procedures.

3.5.3 The faculty member or DDM is not to notify the student or discuss the matter with the student while the student awaits the formal decision.

3.5.4 The AIO is also responsible for ensuring that the Registrar's Office is notified of any finding of academic misconduct, as they must place a Disciplinary Notation (DN) (see Section 5.1) on the student's academic record. For a list of all those who will be notified, see Procedures.

3.6 Enrollment Status

3.6.1 **Dropping a Course:** Students may not drop a course in which there is a suspicion of academic misconduct. The Registrar's Office, at the start of this process, will place a DEF on the student's academic record.

3.6.1.1 If the student drops the course before the matter is resolved, the Registrar's Office will re-enroll the student in that course and will notify the student and the AIO of the re-enrollment.

3.6.1.2 If there is no finding of academic misconduct, and the decision is sent *on or prior to* the published deadline to drop a course, the student may drop the course. See Procedures regarding how to proceed, particularly when the decision is sent less than three (3) days prior to the published drop date.

3.6.1.3 If there is no finding of academic misconduct and the decision is sent *after* the published deadline to drop a course has passed, but (normally) prior to the official last day of the term, the student has up to two (2) days from the date/time of the decision being sent to request to drop the course. See Procedures regarding how to proceed with such a request.

3.6.1.4 If there is a finding of misconduct and the decision is sent *on or prior to* the published deadline to drop a course, and any penalty assigned is less than an "F" in the course, the student may drop the course. See Procedures regarding how to proceed, particularly when the decision is sent less than three (3) days prior to the published drop date. In such a case, a Disciplinary Notation (DN) will still be placed on the student's academic record.

3.6.1.5 If there is a finding of misconduct and a grade of "F" is assigned for the course, whether before or after the published drop deadline, the student may not drop the course. That grade of "F" shall remain on the student's transcript and a DN will be placed on the student's academic record.

3.6.1.6 If there is a finding of misconduct and the decision is sent after the published deadline to drop a course, and a penalty of less than an "F" is assigned, the student may normally *not request* a late course drop.

4. DECISION MAKING BODIES: TERMS OF REFERENCE

4.1 General

In acting under this policy all members of each of the decision-making bodies must ensure that they are acting in an unbiased and fair manner at all times.

4.1.1 Whenever possible, each decision-making body should be representative of all teaching Faculties (including the Yeates School of Graduate Studies). Faculty shall be appointed to a term of two years (renewable) as a member of any decision-making body and will receive adequate training in this policy, the principles of natural justice and the accompanying Procedures. Students shall be appointed for a term of one year (renewable) and will receive adequate training in this Policy, the principles of natural justice and the accompanying Procedures.

4.1.2 Each body will convene as a whole *at least* once each academic year to discuss relevant issues that have arisen in cases, to receive ongoing in-service training, and to make any policy recommendations they may wish to make to Senate through the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC).

4.1.3 Members shall be selected via a recruitment process that aims for a high level of diversity with respect to subject expertise, social demographics and academic discipline. Members of each body are expected to exemplify commitment to fair decision-making and academic integrity.

4.1.4 Decision makers and Panel Chairs are further responsible for communicating the basis for their findings in a timely way and as clearly as possible, in accordance with the educational emphasis of this policy and the accompanying Procedures.

4.2 Designated Decision Makers' Council (DDMC)

4.2.1 To ensure that there is an available, trained group of faculty Designated Decision Makers (DDMs) to pursue referred suspicions of academic misconduct, there shall be a Designated Decision Makers' Council (DDMC). A list of current DDMs shall be maintained by the AIO and forwarded annually to Senate as information.

4.2.2 Faculty members wishing to serve as DDMs may apply through the AIO.

4.2.3 There shall be a Chair of the DDMC who shall be elected by and from the DDMs, and approved by Senate for a two-year term (renewable). The Chair will work collaboratively with the Academic Integrity Office to oversee the functioning of the DDM process, including:

4.2.3.1 recruitment and training (both initial and ongoing) of DDMs;

4.2.3.2 monitoring DDM workload and appropriate assignment of cases;

4.2.3.3 identifying issues emerging from cases which need to be addressed;

4.2.3.4 reviewing cases involving a second Disciplinary Notation with respect to calling a penalty hearing regarding Progressive Discipline.

4.3 Academic Integrity Council (AIC)

4.3.1 To implement this policy, the AIO shall establish an Academic Integrity Council, comprised of faculty and student representatives from each of the Faculties. The AIC will conduct appeal and penalty hearings (see Procedures) subsequent to an initial finding of misconduct.

4.3.2 AIC panels shall consist of two (2) faculty members and one (1) student. One faculty member should, where possible, be from the Faculty in which the finding of misconduct has been made. For graduate student hearings, the student panel member shall be a graduate student and normally, for an undergraduate student hearing, the student panel member shall be an undergraduate student. The AIO shall name in advance which faculty member will chair the hearing and write the decision letter.

4.3.3 Students and faculty may apply to be appointed to the AIC through the AIO.

4.3.4 The role of an AIC panel is an inquiring or inquisitorial one. That is, the primary responsibilities of an AIC panel are to ensure that any hearing is conducted in accordance with this policy and Procedures, and to make all reasonable efforts to ensure that it has received all available relevant information regarding the facts of the case prior to making a finding as to whether or not misconduct has occurred in accordance with this policy. (See Procedures for further details regarding AIC Hearings.)

4.4 Registrar's Appeals Committee (RAC)

The Registrar shall establish an Appeals Committee comprised of a minimum of three (3) members of the Registrar's Office for appeals outside of a course that are deemed to be the responsibility of the Registrar's Office. The Registrar will be a permanent member of this committee and will appoint a designate and/or other members as needed based on the issue. The Director of the AIO, or designate, will be present to provide advice on policy and procedure (see Procedures).

4.5 Graduate Admissions Appeals Committee (GAAC)

The Dean of YSGS shall establish an Appeals Committee comprised of a minimum of three (3) members of the Graduate Admissions Office for appeals outside of a course that are deemed to be the responsibility of the Graduate Admissions Office. The Dean of YSGS will be a permanent member of this committee and will appoint a designate and/or other members as needed based on the issue. The Director of the AIO, or designate, will be present to provide advice on policy and procedure (see Procedures).

4.6 Senate Appeals Committee (SAC)

4.6.1 The Senate Appeals Committee is established by the Senate By-Law. It shall consider appeals of the decisions of the AIC, RAC, GAAC or other hearings as specified within this policy. (See the specific grounds for appeals to SAC in Section 6.1.3.)

4.6.2 Students and faculty may apply to be appointed to the SAC through the Senate Office.

4.6.3 SAC panels shall consist of two (2) faculty members and one (1) student. For graduate student hearings, the student panel member shall be a graduate student and normally, for an undergraduate student hearing, the student panel member shall be an undergraduate student. The Senate Office shall decide in advance which faculty member will chair the hearing and write the decision.

4.6.4 The role of an SAC panel is an inquiring or inquisitorial one. That is, the primary responsibilities of an SAC panel are to ensure that any appeal hearing is conducted in accordance with this policy, and to make all reasonable efforts to ensure that it has received all available relevant information regarding the facts of the case prior to making a finding regarding misconduct in accordance with this policy. (See Procedures for further details regarding SAC Hearings.)

5. PENALTIES AND OTHER OUTCOMES FOR ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

Once a decision maker has made a finding that academic misconduct has occurred the decision maker must assign an appropriate penalty and the Registrar's Office will place a Disciplinary Notation (DN) on the student's academic record. In conjunction with any penalty, students may also be assigned one or more academic integrity quizzes or workshops.

5.1 Disciplinary Notation

5.1.1 Students found to have committed academic misconduct will have a Disciplinary Notation (DN) placed on their academic record. The DN will not appear on the official transcript. The assignment of a DN may not be appealed as it is a consequence of a finding of misconduct whose principal purpose is to track findings of misconduct and implement the Principle of Progressive Discipline (see Section 5.4).

5.1.2 For undergraduate and Chang School students, a DN notation shall remain until a student graduates, at which time it shall be removed². If a student does not graduate in the normal maximum time (8 years for full-time undergraduate programs, 14 years for part-time programs) they may request, via their Chair/Director to have the DN removed from their academic record. For graduate students, the DN will normally remain on their academic record.

5.2 Penalties that may be Assigned by an Initial Decision Maker

5.2.1 The minimum penalty for undergraduate or continuing education students is a grade reduction on any academic work, ranging in severity up to and including a grade of "zero" (0) on the work.

5.2.2 The minimum penalty for misconduct with respect to work submitted in a course by a graduate student is a grade of "zero" (0) on the work.

5.2.3 A course-grade reduction greater than a grade of "zero" (0) on the work may be assigned. Note: This can only be applied to course components worth 10% or less, and any additional penalty cannot exceed 10% of the final course grade. Students must be given prior notice that such a penalty will be assigned (e.g. on the course outline, on the assignment handout, etc.).

5.2.4 A grade of "F" in the course may be assigned.

5.2.5 Temporary or permanent removal from a co-op program option, placement, internship or practicum in which the student is currently enrolled may be assigned.

5.2.6 For academic misconduct outside of a course, the minimum consequence is a DN on the academic record, but an initial decision maker may *recommend* additional penalties as outlined in Section 5.3.

5.2.7 When appropriate, a decision maker may assign a "Fail" or "Unsatisfactory".

5.2.8 Other penalties may be *recommended* by an initial decision maker (see Section 5.3).

² Students who received a DN on their transcript under the previous policy, in the first half of their program or certificate, are now in the final year of their program, and who have no subsequent misconducts, may request, via their Chair/Director to have the DN removed from their transcript. Part-time undergraduate program students who received a DN on their transcript under the previous Policy may request the removal of the DN from their transcript one calendar year after completing the first half of their program. The removal of the DN is at the discretion of the Chair/Director and this decision may not be appealed. If the student commits subsequent academic misconduct, the DN will be reinstated.

5.3 Penalties that may be *Recommended* by the Initial Decision Maker, *Recommended* or *Assigned* by the AIC, or *Assigned* by the SAC.

5.3.1 Disciplinary Suspension (DS)

A Disciplinary Suspension is an academic standing wherein a student is removed from a program for a specified period, normally for one term to two years, after which the student will be automatically reinstated. For undergraduate or continuing education students a penalty hearing may arise due to Progressive Discipline (see Section 5.4) or due to a *recommended* penalty of suspension by an initial decision maker or Program Director (or designate).

Note: Graduate students cannot be assigned a DS.

5.3.1.1 While an initial decision maker may recommend a DS, it may only be assigned by the AIC or SAC.

5.3.1.2 The length of the suspension, normally between one term and two years, is *determined* by the AIC or the SAC and may be *recommended* by the initial decision maker, DDM, or Program Director, or Chair/Director.

5.3.1.3 The DS designation shall be placed on both the academic record and official transcript, and remain there until a student graduates. In cases where a student does not graduate in the normal period during which a program is to be completed, or the student has not enrolled in a course at Ryerson University for at least five (5) years, a written request to the Chair/Director of the program can be made to remove the DS from the transcript. If there is a subsequent finding of misconduct prior to graduation the DS will be re-instated on the transcript.

5.3.1.4 Course work taken elsewhere during the period of Disciplinary Suspension will not be credited towards GPA calculations, Academic Standing or graduation requirements within the student's program.

5.3.1.5 The DS will normally begin in the term following the one in which the misconduct which led to the DS recommendation occurred. For students in full-time programs, this will normally be a fall or winter term or terms, as the spring/summer is not considered an academic term.

5.3.1.6 A student who is assigned a DS is automatically reinstated into their program, or may apply to any other program or certificate after serving the specified period of suspension and after meeting any specified conditions established by the AIC or SAC.

5.3.1.7 No courses may be taken at Ryerson, including at The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education, during the period of Disciplinary Suspension.

5.3.2 Disciplinary Withdrawal (DW)

5.3.2.1 Disciplinary Withdrawal is an academic standing where a student is permanently withdrawn from a specific program and fully withdrawn from the University as a whole for a period of at least two (2) years. After serving the specified period, a student assigned a DW may apply to other programs/certificates at Ryerson after meeting any specific conditions established by the SAC.

5.3.2.2 While a DW may be recommended by an initial decision maker, or the AIC, it may only be assigned by the SAC.

5.3.2.3 A student with a previous DS who has a further finding of academic misconduct will normally have a penalty hearing regarding DW (see Section 5.4 regarding Progressive Discipline).

5.3.2.4 An initial decision maker, Program Director (or designate), or AIC may recommend that the length of the DW be longer than two (2) years; however, the SAC will make a final decision as to how long the withdrawal period will be.

5.3.2.5 Students may not re-apply to any other Ryerson program, or take courses, including at The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education, during the period of Disciplinary Withdrawal.

5.3.2.6 Course work taken elsewhere during this period will not be credited towards GPA calculations, Academic Standing or graduation requirements within any Ryerson program.

5.3.2.7 A DW shall be permanently noted on a student's academic record and official transcript.

5.3.3 Expulsion

5.3.3.1 Expulsion is an academic standing involving permanent removal from Ryerson University. Expulsion may be assigned only by the SAC, though it may be recommended by the initial decision maker or the AIC.

5.3.3.2 A student with a previous DW who has a further finding of academic misconduct will normally have a penalty hearing regarding Expulsion (see Section 5.4).

5.3.3.3 Students who are expelled from the University shall not be allowed to register or enroll in any course, program or certificate offered by Ryerson University, including through The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education.

5.3.3.4 An Expulsion is effective immediately upon the Senate Appeals Committee decision.

5.3.3.5 Expulsion shall be permanently noted on a student's academic record and official transcript.

5.3.4 Revocation of a Degree, Diploma or Certificate

5.3.4.1 Revocation of a Degree, Diploma or Certificate may be recommended by the initial decision maker, the Program Director, Chair/Director, the relevant Dean (or designate) or the AIC.

5.3.4.2 Revocation may be assigned only by the SAC.

5.3.4.3 Revocation of a Degree, Diploma or Certificate shall be permanently noted on a student's academic record and official transcript.

5.4 Progressive Discipline and Repeated Misconduct

5.4.1 The Principle of Progressive Discipline increases the penalties/consequences assigned with repeated violations. To that end, the past record of a student will be reviewed by the AIO when a DN is placed on the student's academic record to determine if there has been a prior DN (or DS/DW) assigned.

5.4.2 In the case of undergraduate or continuing education students who receive a second DN, the Chair of the DDMC (or designate), Director of the AIO (or designate), and the relevant Program Director (or designate) will jointly decide whether a penalty hearing is warranted given the nature of the violations. In such cases, the Program Director (or designate) shall recommend a penalty, normally a Disciplinary Suspension ranging from one term to two years.

5.4.3 If the decision is that the nature of the violations leading to these two DNs does *not* merit a penalty hearing, the AIO will notify the student that any further findings of misconduct *will* result in such a hearing. A third violation will automatically result in a penalty hearing and the Program Director (or designate) shall recommend a penalty, normally a Disciplinary Suspension ranging from one term to two years.

5.4.4 Once a decision to convene a penalty hearing is made, the AIO will notify the student of the hearing, including the type and length of the penalty recommended. The AIO will notify the Registrar's Office to place a hold on the student's record until the matter is resolved.

5.4.5 With respect to graduate students, a second finding of academic misconduct in coursework, or a single finding of academic misconduct in supervised graduate research, shall automatically require a penalty hearing regarding DW or, if recommended, Expulsion (see Section 5.3).

5.5 Other Consequences

Should a decision maker or AIC/SAC panel impose other consequences and/or require that a student fulfill any conditions, the Academic Integrity Office will monitor the implementation and completion of such conditions.

5.5.1 An initial decision maker or an AIC/SAC panel may require a student who has engaged in academic misconduct to replace any damaged or destroyed materials.

5.5.2 Whether or not there is a finding of academic misconduct, a decision maker and/or panel may assign an educational requirement such as an Academic Integrity workshop or online quiz. The AIO will monitor the attendance/completion of an assigned educational requirement.

5.5.3 Students in receipt of scholarships, bursaries, etc., may, where external funders require the University to report to them any cases of academic misconduct, face consequences related to funding.

5.5.4 Previously assigned grades may be adjusted.

5.5.5 A student's graduation may be delayed until all relevant academic misconduct matters have concluded.

5.5.6 The University may be required to inform outside parties whose interests may have been adversely affected by the academic misconduct.

5.5.7 In the case of forged documents, official or otherwise, the Registrar's Office or Director of Admissions will normally share the information with counterparts who are members of the Association of Registrars of the Universities and Colleges of Canada (ARUCC).

5.5.8 In cases where official documents or pertinent information is discovered after the student has been admitted to Ryerson, that were omitted by the student in the application/admission process, the student will normally be withdrawn from their program and the university on the grounds of academic misconduct regardless of their current level of study (see Procedures).

5.5.9 In some instances, criminal charges may be sought. Where warranted, students may also be charged with Non-Academic Misconduct under Policy 61.

6. APPEAL HEARINGS AND PENALTY HEARINGS

An appeal hearing is initiated by the student and is convened to hear the student's reasons why a finding of academic misconduct and/or a penalty ought to be overturned or altered. A penalty hearing is not initiated by the student, but can arise due to a recommendation of a severe penalty, or in accordance with various aspects of Progressive Discipline (see Section 5.4).

6.1 Appeal Hearings

6.1.1 A student assigned the *minimum penalty* on an assignment, test, or exam *may appeal the finding of misconduct but not the penalty* to the AIC.

6.1.1.1 If the appeal is granted, the penalty will be removed and the work shall be assessed/re-assessed/re-graded (see Section 3.4.1.10).

6.1.1.2 If the appeal is denied, the student may appeal to the SAC on specific grounds (see Section 6.1.3).

6.1.2 If the penalty is an assigned grade of "F" in the course, or if there is a *recommendation* for a penalty of DS, DW, Expulsion or Revocation of Degree, a student may appeal the penalty, in addition to the finding, to the Academic Integrity Council (AIC). Normally, the appeal of the penalty will be heard in conjunction with the appeal of the finding.

6.1.2.1 If the appeal of the finding is granted, the penalty will be removed and the work shall be assessed/re-assessed/re-graded (see Section 3.4.1.10).

6.1.2.2 If the appeal is denied, whether or not the penalty is revised, the student may appeal to the SAC on specific grounds (see Section 6.1.3).

6.1.3 A student may appeal the decision made by the AIC, RAC or GAAC to the Senate Appeals Committee (SAC). SAC hearings will normally deal with both the finding and penalty. The onus is on student to make a case in the submitted documents as to why the appeal should be heard based on one or more of the following four (4) grounds.

6.1.3.1 New Evidence: there is new evidence submitted with the Senate package that was not presented at the AIC, RAC or GAAC hearing and which has a reasonable possibility of affecting the decision;

6.1.3.2 Substantial Procedural Error: when it is believed there has been a substantial error in how this policy was applied, which could have affected the decision reached by the AIC, RAC or GAAC;

6.1.3.3 Evidence Not Previously Considered: evidence submitted as part of the AIC, RAC or GAAC package was not considered by the panel;

6.1.3.4 Higher penalty: if a higher penalty has been assigned by the AIC than what was recommended by the initial decision maker.

6.1.4 SAC hearings are not normally *de novo*, but an appellant may make a case in their submission as to why in a given case the hearing should be (see Procedures). The SAC panel will decide prior to the hearing whether or not the grounds for an appeal hearing have been met, and if so, whether it will be held *de novo*. The student and responding faculty member will be notified of these decisions.

6.2 Penalty Hearings

6.2.1 In cases where the recommended or assigned penalty (including in cases of Progressive Discipline) is a DS, DW, Expulsion, or Revocation of a Degree, Diploma or Certificate and a student does not wish to appeal the finding to the AIC, a penalty hearing of the AIC will still be convened. However, as only the SAC can assign penalties for DW, Expulsion or Revocation, the student has the right to waive the AIC penalty hearing and proceed to an SAC penalty hearing if they wish.

6.2.2 A penalty hearing of the AIC regarding a DW will be convened where a graduate student has, after all appeals are resolved, been assigned a first DN on the basis of misconduct in supervised research activities (see Section 3.4.2), or a second DN related to academic misconduct in course-related work (see Section 3.4.1), or where a DW has been recommended regarding misconduct in their course-related work.

6.2.3 If the AIC upholds the initial finding and/or recommends a penalty of DW, Expulsion or Revocation of a Degree, Diploma or Certificate and the student does not appeal to the SAC, there will be a further penalty hearing of the SAC. If the student does appeal to the SAC, then the SAC hearing will deal with both the finding and penalty.

6.3 Enrollment During the Appeal Process

Students may remain in class and may enroll for courses while their case is under appeal. If a suspicion is registered at a time such that an appeal hearing cannot be scheduled until the next semester, students may enroll for courses and continue in their program until a final decision is rendered. A student will not, however, be able to register in a course where a pre-requisite is the course which is under appeal. If the decision results in a DS, a DW or Expulsion being imposed, the student will normally be dropped from all courses and the fees refunded. However, the AIC/SAC panel will have the discretion to determine whether a DS or DW will come into effect at the end of the previous term or at the end of the term in which the student is currently enrolled.

6.4 Filing an Appeal

6.4.1 Appeals must normally be submitted in person (see Procedures). Only complete appeals will be accepted.

6.4.2 Students must receive advance notification of the scheduling of the appeal hearing, as well as all documentation that will be considered at the hearing, from the Academic Integrity Office (AIC hearings) or the Secretary of Senate (SAC hearing).

6.4.3 Students are required to provide a written response to the notification of hearing using the appropriate form. If the student does not submit the form, the hearing will proceed based on the available information.

6.5 Conflict of Interest and Perceptions of Bias

It is of the utmost importance that appeal and penalty hearings both be, and be perceived to be, fair.

6.5.1 No member of a hearing panel shall have had any prior involvement with the case under appeal.

6.5.2 No member of a panel which has heard a previous appeal under this policy may serve on a subsequent panel regarding another finding against the same student. No member of a panel hearing an appeal shall have been the initial decision maker in a prior case involving a suspicion of misconduct by the same student.

6.5.3 No panel members shall be selected from the student's home department. If specific subject area expertise is required, witnesses can be called.

6.5.4 Any person participating in an appeal or other hearing must disclose any potential conflict of interest, if known, no less than five (5) days before the hearing. If the perceived conflict is with a panel member, unless the conflict of interest is resolved, the panel member shall be replaced.

6.5.5 If either party raises a conflict of interest concern regarding any panel member(s) once the hearing has begun, the hearing panel will, in camera, judge the extent and validity of the conflict, and the Panel Chair will make a decision as to whether the panel member may sit on the appeal. The panel member(s) that is/are challenged may offer a statement but may not take part in the panel's decision on the conflict. If the panel member is excused, the hearing may be adjourned and a new hearing scheduled, or may be held without that panel member if the student, responding faculty member(s) and remaining panel members agree.

6.6 Sequence of Hearings

6.6.1 As noted in Section 3.2, if there are concerns or allegations of prejudice, discrimination or harassment related to a suspicion or determination that a student has engaged in academic misconduct, these shall be dealt with before the issue of misconduct is heard. While the appeal or penalty hearing will not be heard until an investigation has been done by Human Rights Services (HRS) and a decision made as per the Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Policy, any misconduct appeal should still be submitted to meet any deadlines.

6.6.2 If there is both an appeal of a finding or penalty *and* a pending hearing based on Progressive Discipline (see Section 5.4), the appeal must be heard and decided before the second hearing can take place.

6.6.3 If there is an appeal of a finding of academic misconduct which affects a grade or academic standing appeal, the misconduct appeal will be heard before the academic appeal. Once a decision has been reached on the misconduct, the appropriate School/Department/Program should be notified so that the academic appeal can proceed. (Note: The academic appeal should not proceed until changes to the academic record resulting from the misconduct hearing, if any, are made.)

6.6.4 If there is group misconduct at issue, related appeals shall normally be heard by the same panel, either individually or in a group. Students may request an opportunity to be heard separately.

6.7 Representation/Support at Hearings

6.7.1 Students at an AIC hearing may be accompanied and represented by an advocate from the RSU or CESAR, but not by legal counsel. The advocate may raise questions of the decision maker and speak during the hearing, but students are expected to be present, and speak for themselves with respect to matters of fact.

6.7.2 At an SAC hearing students may be accompanied and represented by an advocate from the RSU or CESAR or by legal counsel (see Procedures). The advocate or legal counsel may raise questions of the decision maker during the hearing, but students are expected to be present, and speak for themselves with respect to matters of fact.

6.7.3 At an SAC hearing, the University may retain legal counsel to represent the responding faculty member. Legal counsel may speak on behalf of the respondent faculty member, and may confer with the respondent as necessary. The respondent is expected to be present and answer questions, especially with respect to matters of fact.

6.7.4 Students and responding faculty members may bring witnesses to an AIC or SAC hearing, but these must be declared in advance on the appeal or penalty hearing form.

6.7.5 Assistance in preparing for a hearing: Faculty may seek assistance from the Faculty Advisor whose role is to provide support and guidance to faculty on issues related to academic integrity and appeal package/hearing preparation. Students are strongly encouraged to contact an advocate from the RSU or CESAR for assistance/advice regarding appeal and penalty hearing submissions.

6.7.6 In addition to the aforementioned persons, students and responding faculty members may be accompanied by an advisor/support person in an AIC, RAC, GAAC or SAC hearing. However, a support person may not participate in a hearing. They remain silent and do not sit at the table or take notes. They may confer with the student or the respondent only outside the hearing.

6.7.7 In unusual circumstances the Panel Chair, as an agent of the University, may request advice from, or the presence of, legal counsel prior to or during the hearing with respect to matters of process.

6.7.8 A member of the Academic Integrity Office or Secretary of Senate (or designate) will normally be present at the hearing for the purpose of providing advice on procedural issues and/or responding to questions concerning the student's academic record.

6.7.9 For further information about preparation for and conduct of hearings please see the accompanying Procedures.

6.8 Procedural Decisions by the Panel

6.8.1 The Panel Chair may adjourn the hearing when it is required for a fair process.

6.8.2 If either the appellant or the respondent fails to attend the hearing, and there are no extenuating circumstances, the hearing may proceed in their absence. Hearings will not normally be postponed if a witness, advocate or counsel fails to appear.

6.8.3 Hearings are closed to the public.

6.8.4 Hearings may not be audio or video recorded by anyone, and no minutes of the proceedings are taken. The decision letter is considered the official record of the proceedings.

6.8.5 All witnesses called by either side should be present at the start of the hearing to be introduced, and then, unless the panel decides otherwise, only while giving testimony.

6.8.6 If either party brings witnesses not listed in the appeal form or the notice of hearing, the panel must decide if those witnesses are to be heard.

6.8.7 If new documentation is presented, the panel must determine if that documentation is to be considered. If there is no objection from the other party, the documentation should normally be accepted. The hearing may be adjourned to allow the other party time to review the new documents. However, the panel may determine that the documentation is not relevant and is not to be accepted.

6.8.8 In exceptional circumstances when a member of the panel cannot attend, the hearing can still continue if both the appellant and respondent agree.

6.9 Appeal Hearing and Penalty Hearing Decisions

6.9.1 The onus is on the University to establish that misconduct has occurred and the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities. This means that, for a finding of misconduct to be supported, based on the information presented, it is more likely than not that the student committed academic misconduct. The standard of proof in all decisions shall be “a balance of probabilities.”

6.9.2 The Chair of an AIC panel must forward a copy of the panel’s decision to the AIO. The AIO will forward the decision to the student, the respondent, and such others as required by the accompanying Procedures. Decisions of SAC panels will be forwarded to the Senate Office. The Senate Office will then forward the decision to the student, the respondent, the Chair of any AIC panel that heard the case, and such others as required by the Procedures.

6.9.3 An AIC or SAC panel may, where it is based on new evidence presented, or is more consistent with prior decisions, assign a penalty higher than that assigned by the initial decision maker, or the penalty recommended to it.

6.9.4 The Academic Integrity Office will maintain statistics on Academic Misconduct, reporting these, in a non-identifying manner, annually to Senate.