

**Syracuse University's Academic Integrity Policy:
How Cases Are Reported, Reviewed & Decided under
Emergency Academic Integrity Procedures**

1. **MAINTENANCE OF CASE RECORDS:** The Center for Learning and Student Success will remain responsible for creating and maintaining centralized records of academic integrity cases.
2. **NEW CASE REPORTING:** Faculty and instructors (hereafter "reporting instructors") will continue to report cases and evidence using the *Academic Integrity - New Case* link under *Faculty Services* in MySlice. Students and staff are encouraged to report suspected violations to the course instructor, the School or College Academic Integrity Coordinator or the Center for Learning and Student Success.
3. **PROCEDURAL FAIRNESS FOR STUDENTS AND INSTRUCTORS:** No student may be penalized for any suspected violation until the suspected violation is reported, reviewed and upheld. Except under extraordinary circumstances, students may not drop or withdraw from a course while a suspected violation is under review.
4. **EVIDENTIARY STANDARD:** Suspected violations will be upheld if a preponderance of the evidence indicates that a violation occurred, that is, it is more likely than not that the student's actions violated the Policy.
5. **SINGLE CHARGE:** Cases will be brought using a single charge: *Violation of the Academic Integrity Policy*.
6. **VIOLATION LEVEL:** Each suspected violation will be classified as Level 1, 2 or 3 based on the Violation and Sanction Classification Rubric. The reporting instructor may recommend a classification level. Final decisions regarding classification level will be made by members of the School or College Academic Integrity Panel.
7. **GRADE SANCTIONS:** Reporting instructors have authority to recommend and apply the grade sanction of their choice. However, instructors who wish to reserve the option to apply course failure for violations classified as Level 1, should state this on their syllabus. The grade penalty may be applied only if the violation is upheld by Academic Integrity Panel members representing the School or College where the suspected violation was reported. The Center for Learning and Student Success will notify the reporting instructor once a final decision has been made so that they may apply the grade penalty.
8. **SCHOOL AND COLLEGE SANCTIONS:** Non-grade sanctions will be based on the violation level:
 - a. Level 1 (e.g., inappropriate collaboration on homework) – Letter of Reprimand
 - b. Level 2 (e.g., possession or use of a cell phone during an exam) – Academic Integrity Probation with temporary transcript notation during probation (6 or 12 months or until graduation, if that is sooner)
 - c. Level 3 (e.g. falsification of a transcript or a medical excuse) – Suspension or Expulsion
9. **ADVISING:** Every School and College will have a trained Academic Integrity Advisor available to help students understand and consider how best to respond to charges against them. Conversations with the Advisor will not become part of the case record, and the Advisor will not participate in decision making for any cases.

**Syracuse University's Academic Integrity Policy:
How Cases Are Reported, Reviewed & Decided under
Emergency Academic Integrity Procedures (p. 2)**

10. AVENUES OF CASE RESOLUTION:

- a. Waiver: Level 1 and 2 cases may be eligible for resolution via a signed waiver of the formal case processes if the school or college Academic Integrity Coordinator approves and the student chooses to acknowledge that their actions violated the Academic Integrity Policy and accepts the proposed grade and non-grade penalties.
- b. Faculty Interview: A faculty interview will take place when a student contests the violation or proposed sanctions or is at risk of suspension or expulsion due to the nature of the current suspected violation or the existence of a prior violation. The trained faculty interviewer will meet with the student to get their account of the case and make recommendations on behalf of the School or College based on evidence provided by the reporting instructor and the student. The faculty interviewer will assess whether it is more likely than not that the student violated the Policy and, if so, the level of the violation and associated non-grade sanctions. The faculty interviewer will not serve as a voting member of any Hearing or Appeal panel convened to decide the case. Cases will be closed after the faculty interview if:
 - i. The faculty interviewer finds insufficient evidence of a violation and the Academic Integrity Coordinator and reporting instructor agree; or,
 - ii. The faculty interviewer determines based on a preponderance of the evidence that a Level 1 or 2 violation has occurred, and the Academic Integrity Coordinator agrees.
- c. Hearing: A hearing will take place when:
 - i. The student is at risk of suspension or expulsion because the faculty interviewer and/or Academic Integrity Coordinator determine that a Level 3 violation has been committed or the student has a prior violation on record; or,
 - ii. The reporting instructor disagrees with the finding that insufficient evidence exists to conclude that a violation occurred and requests a hearing.

11. COMPOSITION OF PANELS:

- a. Hearing Panels will consist of three voting members: one faculty member, one administrator, and one student. The faculty member or administrator will be designated to act as hearing chair.
- b. Appeal Panels will consist of three voting members and one non-voting chair. The voting members will include one faculty member, one administrator, and one student. The non-voting chair will be a faculty member or administrator.

12. REPEAT VIOLATIONS: When a student with a prior violation is suspected of a new violation, the existence of the prior violation will not be disclosed to the reporting instructor or to the faculty interviewer prior to the conclusion of the faculty interview. If, however, the faculty interviewer determines that it is more likely than not that a violation occurred, the Center for Learning and Student Success will reclassify the new violation as Level 3 with a minimum presumptive penalty of suspension, and a hearing will be required.

13. APPEALS: Requests for appeal will be granted based on one of two grounds: (i) the emergence of new, previously unavailable evidence, or (ii) failure to follow required procedure – when either is significant enough to likely alter the case outcome. Successful requests for appeal will be heard by a new appeal panel.