

OVERVIEW OF SCHOOL-LEVEL PROCESSES AND POSSIBLE OUTCOMES

School- Level Procedures

Teacher of the Unit (e.g. lecturer, tutor, marker) or **Examinations Supervisor** suspects student may have engaged in academic misconduct - if considers there is evidence to warrant suspicion, reports to Unit Coordinator (signed or emailed report)

Teacher of the Unit and **Unit Co-ordinator** confer.

Possible outcomes:

- If decide suspicion unwarranted, no action required.
- If decide suspicion warranted and investigation required, Unit Coordinator calls interview with student (may include Head of Program) and advises student and Head of School of action.

Unit Co-ordinator and Teacher of the Unit (plus Head of Program, if UC considers appropriate) meet with student.

Possible outcomes:

- If investigation and interview reveal no misconduct, dismiss allegation. Advise student, in writing.
- If find minor misconduct (definition as per Policy), outcome may include academic counselling (e.g., advice about proper referencing) and/or a penalty (as per Policy) Advise student, in writing.
[If minor misconduct and student's first offence within School, Unit Co-ordinator has option of asking the Head of School to waive the record of academic misconduct (in consultation with SAC Chair or SAC Executive Committee.)]
- Student may choose to appeal UC's decision re minor misconduct to Head of School.
- If find substantial misconduct is possible or likely, UC to refer to Head of School, for determination. Advise student of referral, in writing.

Head of School (or formally appointed delegate) calls meeting with the student and representative of Academic Registrar (information may also be sought from Unit Coordinator).

Possible outcomes:

- If investigation and interview reveal no misconduct, dismiss allegation. Advise student, in writing.
- If Head of School finds minor misconduct (definition as per Policy), outcome may include academic counselling (e.g., advice about proper referencing) and/or a penalty (as per Policy) - advise student, in writing.
[If minor misconduct and only for student's first offence within School, Head of School, on recommendation of Unit Coordinator and in consultation with SAC Chair or SAC Executive Committee, may waive record of academic misconduct.]
- If find substantial misconduct, outcome may include academic counselling and/or a penalty (as per Policy) Advise student, in writing.
- Student may choose to appeal Head of School's decision to the College Academic Standards and Integrity Committee.

OR

- If Head of School finds substantial misconduct that is either threat to integrity of University's assessment processes or is misconduct by a student whose level of experience suggests he or she should be aware of appropriate standards of ethical scholarship, refer to College Academic Standards and Integrity Committee. Advise student, in writing.

[Student may appeal a decision by a Unit Coordinator to Head of School or a Head of School's decision to the College Academic Standards and Integrity Committee]

[Student may appeal a decision of a College Academic Standards and Integrity Committee to Senate Academic Standards and Integrity Committee]

Principles of procedural fairness are to be followed at all times, including:

1. Student to be advised clearly of specific allegation, together with evidence claimed for it.
2. Student entitled to a fair hearing, including opportunity to challenge.
3. University representatives must deal with the particular allegation on the merits and strive to avoid bias, including bias on basis of any knowledge of student's prior record of misconduct.
4. University representatives must, where appropriate, initiate further enquiries to minimise doubt or obscurity concerning the facts of the case.
5. University representatives must provide reasons (brief) for decisions.
6. Student to have right to appeal decision on grounds specified in Appeals section of the Policy.

Standard of proof

"Balance of probability," **not** "beyond reasonable doubt."