



Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) Policy

Policy Number:	AS 01-008
Policy Administrator:	Academic Senate Executive Committee
Policy Initiator:	Academic Senate Executive Committee
Authority:	Academic Senate
Effective Date:	
Revised Date:	
Approved AS Chair:	Chair, Dinesh Pinisetty
Approval Signature AS Chair:	
Approved:	President Cropper
Approval Signature:	/s/

Purpose: This policy establishes the standards for academic integrity at The California State University Maritime Academy and the action to be undertaken upon a perceived violation of those standards. This policy also establishes the Academic Integrity Committee and the rules and process which govern it. The following policy is controlled by the California Code of Regulations, specifically, Title 5 §41301 and California State University Executive Order 1073 IV K.

Scope: This policy applies to all alleged violations of academic integrity charged against students of California State University Maritime Academy. This policy will apply to the graduate school unless and until it is superseded by a policy created specifically for the graduate program.

Accountability: Upholding the standards for academic integrity outlined in this policy is the responsibility of the academic community of students, faculty and administrators. Students have a right to due process in the form of a fair hearing in the event of an allegation of a violation of academic integrity. This policy charges the Academic Integrity Committee, a standing committee of the Academic Senate whose purpose is to address academic integrity issues, with the task of providing this due process for students.

Contents

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

A Definitions

1. **Academic integrity** is the set of academic ethical standards by which members of the academic community at CSUM should adhere if they wish to be in good standing. These standards are established around core virtues such as honesty, fairness, respect, openness, and integrity, always with an eye toward fostering a healthy academic environment.
2. The **Academic Integrity Committee** or **AIC** is a committee tasked with maintaining the standards of academic integrity at CSUM.
3. **Academic misconduct** refers to behaviors which violate or attempt to violate standards of academic integrity.
4. An **allegation** is a formal declaration that charges an individual with one or more acts of academic misconduct. It is the input which initiates an AIC process.
5. A **case** refers to a specific allegation with related evidence, documents, processes, etc. under consideration by the AIC.
6. A **hearing** is a meeting of the AIC whose purpose is to adjudicate an allegation.
7. A **result** of the AIC is a determination that an allegation put before the AIC has merit or not. It is the output of an AIC process.
8. The **accused** is the individual or individuals who is/are being charged with academic misconduct.
9. The **accuser** is the individual or individuals who is/are bringing forth the charge of academic misconduct.
10. **Disciplinary sanctions** refer to penalties or punishments which are non-academic in nature. Some examples are assigning of demerits, suspension or expulsion.
11. **Academic sanctions** refer to penalties or punishments which are related to the academic mission of the Academy. This includes changing grades or assigning extra coursework.
12. **Preponderance of evidence** refers to the standard of evidence that the Academic Integrity Committee will use in adjudicating cases. A claim meets a preponderance of evidence standard if the evaluator of the claim (in this case, the AIC) believes the claim is more likely to be true than not.
13. **Retributive justice** refers to the theory and practice of punishment which seeks to make an offender suffer in a way proportional to their offense.
14. **Restorative justice**, in contrast to retributive justice, refers to an alternative set of responses to offenses which seeks to make make amends for the harms caused by an offense.

B Standards of Academic Integrity

1. **Academic integrity is the responsibility of the academic community:** The academic community, comprised of students, faculty and administrators, have a responsibility to see that standards of academic integrity are upheld. The institution's

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

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

2. **Due process:** Individuals who are accused of violating standards of academic integrity should be given due process with the chance to respond or rebut the allegation before a body whose purpose is to evaluate and adjudicate such claims in as objective and unbiased a way as is reasonable. This policy establishes the Academic Integrity Committee to address this need (see §C).
3. **Innocent until proven guilty:** In particular, an accused individual must be treated as innocent until the Academic Integrity Committee finds that the accused is guilty of academic misconduct.
4. **Applying academic sanctions:** Under no circumstances should faculty members impose penalties for alleged violations of academic integrity in a unilateral fashion; all allegations must be adjudicated by the Academic Integrity Committee before sanctions can be imposed.
 - (a) Examples of academic sanctions which should not be imposed in response to an alleged violation:
 - i. Changing a grade on a assignment or exam.
 - ii. Removing the ability of a student to complete an assignment or exam that is a standard part of a course.
 - iii. Assigning additional assignments or exams to a student.
 - (b) Should a student find themselves in a situation in which they have been penalized academically, without due process through the Academic Integrity Committee for an alleged violation of academic integrity, then they may find relief by bringing a student originated request for change of grade to the Academic Integrity Committee. Please see [Senate policy AA-03-020](#) for information on this process.
5. **Violations of academic integrity:** Below is a list of specific types of violations of academic integrity that are within the purview of this policy. This list is not exhaustive – if a member of the academic community believes that a violation of academic integrity has occurred but that it does not appear on the list below, they are still entitled to seek relief.

The list is separated into two tiers of violations with tier 2 violations representing more egregious acts of greater concern to our institution. The tiers should not be considered inflexible – an tier 1 violation could certainly be severe enough to warrant treatment as if it was a tier 2 violation. Multiple tier 1 violations may also collectively be construed as a tier 2 violation.

Tier 1 violations:

- (a) **Plagiarism:** Plagiarism is the representation of words, creative works or ideas of others as one’s own without providing proper citation and credit.
- (b) **Self-Plagiarism:** Submitting the same work for credit in more than one course.

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

Tier 2 violations:

- (a) **Sabotaging another student's or instructor's work or academic reputation.**
- (b) **Falsification of records:** This refers to providing members of the Academy with false, misleading, incomplete, or fraudulent materials for academic gain.
- (c) **Destruction, damage, theft, or misuse of academic resources.**
- (d) **Criminal behavior for academic gain.**

C The Academic Integrity Committee (AIC)

1. **Purpose:**

- (a) The Academic Integrity Committee (henceforth, AIC) is a faculty body charged by the Academic Senate to oversee and ensure that standards for academic integrity are being met at California State University, Maritime (CSUM).
- (b) The AIC is empowered to investigate, evaluate, and adjudicate allegations of academic misconduct.
- (c) The AIC also serves as a means of providing due process to those accused of academic misconduct.

2. **Responsibilities:** Areas of responsibility include:

- (a) alleged violations of academic standards by students (see §D for information on this process),

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

- (e) The Chair of the AIC may request that the accused and/or accuser waive their right to confidentiality if it is helpful to do so (for instance, if an allegation involving multiple individuals could be adjudicated with a single hearing).
9. **Fairness:** Members of the AIC will do their best to maintain an objective stance free of bias when adjudicating allegations.
10. **Oversight:**
- (a) The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate is the primary body which oversees and enforces proper conduct in the AIC.
 - (b) The Provost may also provide additional oversight. See §F.18.
 - (c) Student representatives for some AIC processes also provide oversight. See §F.3.
 - (d) Members of the AIC will oversee each other for proper behavior. If a member is found to be acting derelict in their duty or responsibilities by another member, the issue should be brought to the Chair and then the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for resolution.
 - (e) Members of the academic community may also register grievances with the Executive Committee if they believe that the AIC is acting inappropriately.
11. **AIC archive:**
- (a) All results of AIC hearings are distributed to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, as well as the Provost's office. They will maintain separate, independent archives of AIC activities.
 - (b) Further, the Chair of the AIC shall maintain a private, digital archive of all AIC cases.
 - (c) When the Chair steps down and a new Chair is elected, the outgoing Chair will transfer this digital archive to the incoming Chair. This record of past decisions will help inform the incoming Chair, and maintain institutional memory of past decision-making.
 - (d) Documents for each case should be contained in their own folder. Each folder should contain at least the allegation and the result.
 - (e) The contents of this archive are confidential.

D The AIC Process in Alleged Violations of Academic Standards by Students

1. **Allegations:** Every AIC process begins with the submission of a formal written allegation of academic misconduct to the Chair of the AIC. The allegation should include:
- (a) all relevant background information,
 - (b) a detailed description of the alleged violation,
 - (c) a description, or inclusion of the evidence supporting the allegation, as appropriate.

If an allegation is found to be incomplete, it may be sent back to its author for revision.

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. **Pre-hearing process:**

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

8. **Waivers:**

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

- i. No hearing will take place.
 - ii. The claims made in the allegation will be interpreted and responded to as if they are true.
 - iii. No testimony or evidence from the accused will be considered by the committee.
 - iv. The AIC, along with one student representative (see §F.3), will review and discuss the allegation and make a recommendation for sanctions as appropriate.
 - v. Reporting of the results will follow the procedures described in section §F.16 of this policy for formal hearings.
- (c) **Situations in which a hearing is automatically waived:** The accused waives their right to hearing if the following situations occur:
- i. The accused does not respond to requests for scheduling or other information in a reasonably timely manner.
 - ii. The accused refuses to conduct themselves in a reasonable, civil manner. In this situation, the case will be forwarded to the Cadet Conduct Officer for possible disciplinary hearings and sanctions.
 - iii. The accused does not appear at the hearing at the scheduled time, unless the absence is excused by the Chair.
9. **Results:** The end product of an AIC process is communicated by a letter written by the Chair.
10. **The verdict:** The verdict of the AIC is binary: either the AIC will find that the allegation presented has merit or that it does not.
11. **Recommendations for disciplinary sanctions:** Recommendations for disciplinary sanctions may be included within results when the AIC finds that the accused has committed a violation of academic standards.
- (a) The result of a restorative hearing will make no recommendations for sanctions, but rather seek restitution for harms caused. See §E.6.
 - (b) Formal hearings which find that a violation of academic standards occurred result in recommendations for sanctions ranging from assignment of demerits, to suspension or expulsion. See §F.13.
 - (c) The severity of the recommended sanctions is based primarily on two factors:
 - i. The severity of the violation (see §B.5),
 - ii. The number of times that a student has been found to have committed an act of academic misconduct by the AIC, whether that be for restorative hearings or formal hearings. For example, a repeat plagiarizer should typically be recommended a more severe disciplinary sanction than a first-time plagiarizer.
12. **Academic sanctions are the instructor's discretion:** The AIC does not make recommendations for academic sanctions. Academic sanctions such as changes to grades or assignment of extra work are solely the discretion of the instructor of record for an affected course. However, instructors should not apply academic sanctions in response to a perceived violation unless the alleged violation has been adjudicated by the AIC and found to have merit.

13. Reporting of results:

- (a) With whom the letter reporting a result is communicated depends on the type of hearing and if the accused has waived their right to a hearing.
 - i. Please see §E.7 for information on reporting in the case of a restorative hearing.
 - ii. Please see §F.16 for information on reporting in the case of a formal hearing.
 - iii. If the accused waives their right to a hearing, then this result will be communicated to the same set of people who would have been communicated with had a formal hearing occurred. See §F.16 for this list of people.
- (b) If a hearing is held, the letter communicating the result should be completed and distributed within five working days of the hearing, unless further inquiry is determined to be necessary.

If no hearing is held because the accused waived their right to a hearing, the letter communicating the result should be distributed within five working days of receiving the waiver by the accused.

14. **Retaliation:** All instances of retaliation will be forwarded to the Cadet Conduct Office.

E Restorative Hearings in Cases of Inappropriate Student Academic Conduct

1. **Purpose:** A restorative hearing is a meeting whose purpose is to resolve an AIC allegation in a way that is less stressful and stigmatizing for both the accused and the accuser. It is to be organized around principles of restorative justice (as opposed to retributive justice) so that the accused who admits to their offense is given the chance to repair the harm caused by their actions. The hope is that the accused and accuser can openly and honestly discuss the consequences of the violation and come to a mutual agreement on how best to find a restorative resolution.
2. **Conditions for eligibility:** A restorative hearing can take place if and only if all of the following conditions are met:
 - (a) The accused has had no past history with the AIC.
 - (b) The alleged violation does not rise to the level of a tier 2 violation in its severity (see §B.5).
 - (c) The accused, the instructor of record for the affected course, and the Chair all consent to a restorative hearing as a resolution to the allegation.
 - (d) The accused concedes that the bulk of the claims made within the allegation are true. In particular, the accused must concede that they committed the act of academic misconduct described within the allegation.
3. **Attendees:** A restorative hearing should be attended by:
 - (a) the accused,
 - (b) the instructor of record for the affected course,
 - (c) the Chair.
4. **Goals:** A restorative hearing has two goals:

- (a) The first goal is to have an honest, productive and positive discussion about the act of misconduct so there can be a mutual understanding of both the conditions that led to the unfortunate decision, as well as the consequences.
 - (b) The second goal is to find a satisfactory resolution which allows the accused to make amends and fix the harm they have caused.
5. **If a goal is not achieved:** If either of the goals of a restorative hearing described in §E.4 is not achieved, then a formal hearing will be held to resolve the allegation (see §F).
6. **Results:** The output of a restorative hearing is a restorative resolution to the allegation. Such a resolution may have multiple elements. Some examples:
- (a) A student who admits to plagiarizing a paper because of time pressures may be asked to consult with university advisors with the goal of improving study habits and time management skills so that academic pressure doesn't lead to academic misconduct.
 - (b) A student may participate in the creation and execution of a community service project, supervised by the Coordinator for Community Engagement, to repair the harm caused by academic misconduct on our institution.
7. **Reporting of results:** If a resolution is found, the Chair of the AIC will communicate this result in a letter. This letter will be shared with the following people:
- (a) The individuals present at the hearing.
 - (b) The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate (for oversight purposes).
 - (c) Any individuals who have agreed to assist in facilitating the resolution (e.g. university counselors or community outreach coordinators).
 - (d) The Provost's office.

In particular, in contrast to the results of formal AIC hearings, the letter will not be shared with the Cadet Conduct Office. This means that under this situation, no record of the violation will be put into the student's record though it will be recorded by the AIC.

8. **Second offense:** If the accused, after undergoing a restorative hearing for a first offense, should appear before the AIC again for a second offense, the record of the first offense will be opened and used in consideration in adjudicating the second matter. Further, the record of the first offense will be sent to the Cadet Conduct Officer to be added to the student's record.

F Formal AIC hearings

1. **Purpose:** A formal hearing is a meeting whose purpose is to investigate, evaluate and adjudicate allegations of academic misconduct.
2. **Participants:** Formal hearings must be attended by:
 - (a) the Chair of the AIC,
 - (b) two additional faculty members of the AIC,
 - (c) one student representative selected by the Chair of the AIC (see §F.3),

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

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

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

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

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

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

- (d) dismissal of the accused and accuser,
 - (e) discussion among the committee members in private.
8. **Presentation of evidence:** Evidence by both the accused and accuser presented to the committee and is evaluated by the committee in as unbiased and objective way as is reasonable.
9. **Standard of evidence:** A “preponderance of the evidence” standard is used by the committee to produce a final determination on whether the allegation has merit or not. A body of evidence supports a claim by a “preponderance of the evidence” standard if the claim is more likely to be true than not.
10. **Voting:** There are four voting attendees present at a formal hearing – the three members of the AIC along with the student representative. At the conclusion of a hearing, a vote is taken to decide whether the allegation presented has merit or not.
- (a) If three or more votes support the allegation, then the determination of the committee will be that the allegation does have merit.
 - (b) If two or less votes support the allegation, then the determination of the committee will be that the allegation does not have merit.
11. **Further investigation and or counsel:** If, after deliberating on the evidence presented during the hearing, the committee decides that further investigation or counsel is required before voting can proceed, the committee may resolve to delay the vote.
- (a) The accused and accuser should be notified of this delay, and given the reason or reasons why.
 - (b) During the course of any further investigation, care should be taken to preserve the confidentiality of the parties involved if possible. However, if information obtained from an expert will provide decisive and reliable information to the committee, and the divulging of the identity of the parties is required, then the committee may break confidentiality.
12. **Results:** The final product of a formal hearing is a determination by the AIC on whether the allegation has merit or not, and if so, recommendations for disciplinary sanctions.
13. **Sanctions:** If the result of a formal hearing is that an allegation of a violation has merit, then the AIC will make recommendations for disciplinary sanctions. These sanctions can range from assignment of demerits to suspension or expulsion. The severity of these sanctions depend on several factors:
- (a) The severity of the violation. See §B.5 for more information on tiers of violations.
 - i. It is typical that a tier 1 violation committed by a student with no prior history with the AIC is met with a recommendation for demerits, but not with a recommendation for suspension or expulsion.
 - ii. It is typical that only tier 2 violations, or repeated or multiple tier 1 violations are met with either recommendations for demerits, or recommendations for suspension or expulsion.
 - (b) Past violations.
 - (c) Disposition during the hearing – civility and honesty are favorably viewed and may mitigate the severity of the recommendation, whereas incivility and deception may exacerbate the severity of the recommendation.

14. **Demerits:** Recommendations by the AIC for demerits will be considered by the Cadet Conduct Officer. The Cadet Conduct Officer will make the final determination of the number of demerits that are appropriate.
 - (a) Should there be an appeal submitted to the Provost's office (See §F.17), the Cadet Conduct Officer should wait to hear the final disposition of the Provost before assigning any demerits.
15. **Suspension/Expulsion:** Recommendations by the AIC for suspension or expulsion will be considered by the Provost. The Provost will make the final determination of what sanctions are appropriate.
16. **Reporting of results:**
 - (a) The results of a formal hearing are communicated by a letter written by the Chair of AIC.
 - (b) The letter should be completed and distributed within five working days of the vote.
 - (c) This letter is distributed only to the following parties:
 - i. The accused.
 - ii. The accuser.
 - iii. The instructor(s) of record of affected courses.
 - iv. The Dean of the school which houses the affected courses.
 - v. The members of the AIC present at the hearing.
 - vi. The student representative present at the hearing.
 - vii. The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate (for oversight purposes).
 - viii. The University Advisors.
 - ix. The Cadet Conduct Officer.
 - x. The Provost.
17. **Appeals:**
 - (a) Within three working days of receipt of the AIC's findings, the accused may submit a written appeal to the Provost to be included and considered with the AIC report.
 - (b) A copy of this appeal should be sent to:
 - i. the Provost's office,
 - ii. the Chair of the AIC,
 - iii. the Cadet Conduct Officer.
 - (c) The Provost, after reviewing both the AIC report and the appeal, will determine their final disposition on the case.
 - (d) Appeals by students cannot seek relief for academic penalties such as reduction of grades. An appeal for an academic penalty which is perceived as unfair can be made by bringing a student originated request for change of grade (see [Senate policy AA-03-020](#) for information on this process).
18. **The Provost's final disposition:**

- (a) If the accused has not submitted an appeal, and the recommendation for sanctions made by the AIC does not involve suspension or expulsion, the Provost is not required to take any action upon receipt of an AIC report regarding an allegation. However, if the Provost determines that a violation of this policy has taken place, they may elect to return the result to the Chair of the AIC to address the violation.
- (b) If the recommendation for sanctions made by the AIC involves suspension or expulsion, after reviewing the AIC report, the Provost will determine their final disposition on the case.
- (c) If the accused submits an appeal to the Provost, then the Provost, after reviewing both the AIC report and the appeal, will determine their final disposition on the case.
- (d) The final disposition must include the disciplinary sanctions (if any) that the accused shall receive.
 - i. If there is a large difference between the recommendation for sanctions made by the AIC, and the final disposition of the Provost, the reasons for this divergence must also be communicated.
- (e) The Provost's final disposition on the case shall be communicated with:
 - i. the accused,
 - ii. the accuser,
 - iii. the Chair of the AIC,
 - iv. the Cadet Conduct Officer.
- (f) The Provost shall communicate their final disposition within ten working days of receipt of the rebuttal.

G Student Originated Request for Change of Grade

1. **Purpose:** If a student believes that they have been inappropriately evaluated by a faculty member in a course, they may bring forth a student originated request for change of grade.
2. **Process:** This process is described in policy by [Senate policy AA-03-020](#). Please consult this policy for more information.