

# Gonzaga University

## Academic Integrity Policy

### 1. Preamble

The institution's mission statement expresses Gonzaga University's self-understanding through its Catholic, Jesuit and humanistic heritage and identity. These spiritual and intellectual traditions are expressed in the ideals of reflective and critical thought, ethical discernment, innovation, and commitment to social justice. The ideals imply a deeply held, rigorously maintained, and clearly articulated standard of academic integrity. This document presents that standard as understood by the Gonzaga University community of learners, teachers, and scholars and outlines the processes followed when these standards are violated. The Academic Integrity Policy (AIP) applies to all faculty and students (undergraduate and graduate) at Gonzaga, except for the Law School which is exempt from this policy but governed by their own policy.

Gonzaga University believes that a commitment to academic integrity contributes, not only to a campus climate of trust and community, but also to individual integrity, honesty and well-being. Conversely, violations of academic integrity are detrimental to both the community and to the individual. This belief entails just sanctions for violations of these ideals, the details of which are contained herein. Just sanctions require that all students and faculty be aware both of the sanctions, and of the policies that they enforce. Therefore, the University publishes the AIP in its catalogues; students are informed of the policy as part of the student handbook; advisors are encouraged to discuss the AIP with their advisees; and all faculty members should indicate on each course syllabus how the University policy applies to their course and they are strongly encouraged to discuss academic integrity and honesty in their classrooms. Documents and resources which guide the faculty's work with students are available through the Center for Student Academic Success (CSAS) and the Center for Teaching and Advising (CTA).

### 2. Academic Dishonesty

Students follow the University's standards of honesty and integrity by doing their own work, by refraining from representing other's work as their own, and by respecting University records and property as well as each other. They do not engage in plagiarism, cheating, falsification, or abuse of property in any aspect of University life. Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to, the examples listed below. This list is not meant to be exhaustive, but rather indicates the general character of academically dishonest actions. The University reserves the right to determine in a given instance what action constitutes an infringement of academic honesty and integrity.

**Plagiarism** is the representation of the words, ideas, or other works belong to another as one's own. It also includes re-submission of one's own prior as work for credit without prior permission to do so from the instructor. It includes any work that is assigned to be original,

including artist production, computer or other digital coding or programming, computational processes, and the like. It includes failure to cite references or improperly citing references with the intent to deceive, submitting a paper or any assignment written by another person, submitting a paper or any assignment obtained, wholly or in part, from the internet or from any other electronic or print source without proper attribution. The act of plagiarism may occur with or without intent.

**Cheating** can take many forms, including but not limited to inappropriate collaboration when independent work is reasonably assumed by the nature of the assignment; giving or receiving unauthorized information and materials; unauthorized use of an aid or tool (to include online resources) during an exam; the falsification or fabrication of references; and multiple submissions of the same paper or report for assignments in more than one course without the prior permission of all involved faculty members or other instructors.

**Falsification** and misrepresentation of academic documents, records or standing includes forgery and/or misrepresentation of any signature on any academic document. It includes falsification or fabrication of academic research materials, personal academic records and files, admission and financial aid applications, resumes, and portfolio essays. It also includes falsification of internship, service learning, or other practicum records, and falsification of patient or student records, or other reports involved in teaching/learning processes in any academic program of the University. In addition, it includes falsification of client records, or other clinical/professional reports or process notes involved in the teaching/learning process in any academic program of the University. While many issues of falsification manifest as a falsification of written records, any oral misrepresentation or lying to faculty, or any other school official, is considered falsification; honesty is expected in all forms of communication. Misrepresentation also includes the practice of circumventing registration priority by arranging to have a seat in a course held by a student with higher registration priority with the intent of it being filled by a student with lower registration priority. In cases where this practice is identified, both students involved will be found to have violated this policy.

**Abuse of University physical or intellectual property** is the destruction or alteration of the work of another student, faculty, staff, or other member of the University. It includes unauthorized access or use of University computer accounts or files, and the removal, mutilation, or deliberate concealment of academic materials belonging to the University libraries, computer laboratories, or other learning resource centers. It also includes any unauthorized video or audio recording, sale, or use of lectures or other instructional materials.

While this policy's focus is on issues related specifically to academic integrity, it must be noted that Gonzaga University takes seriously any issues of personal integrity, including inappropriate and unacceptable behavior. Any student engaging in these types of behaviors as an attempt to gain academic advancement (as described above) will be subject to the processes and sanctions described herein. Faculty who observe inappropriate or concerning behaviors that occur in an academic setting but are not related directly to an academic issue per se, should report those issues promptly to the Center for Cura Personalis using the REFER system. A faculty member

feeling threatened or intimidated by a student in an academic setting is encouraged to contact Human Resources and Campus Security in addition to reporting the issue using the REFER system. Any behaviors observed by a faculty member that may violate the University's Harassment and Non-Discrimination policy must be promptly reported to the University's Title IX Coordinator.

### 3. Acknowledgment of the Policy

All members of the Gonzaga community are expected to adhere to principles of honesty and integrity in their academic endeavors. While students will not be asked to affirm their understanding of this policy, it is the expectation that students be familiar with this policy and the potential sanctions for violations of this policy. As with all other University policies, by virtue of enrollment every student at Gonzaga University (with the exception of Law students) abides by the policy outlined herein. Under no circumstances shall ignorance of this policy serve as a defense against any violations.

### 4. Academic Integrity Board

The Academic Integrity Board (AIB), convened by the office of the Provost, advocates and raises the awareness of academic integrity at Gonzaga University by upholding the AIP. The AIB acts to:

1. Review, approve and adjudicate violations of the AIP
2. Render decisions and impose sanctions
3. Report and use data for the purpose of facilitating an active and constructive dialogue within the University concerning academic integrity, honesty and ethics
4. Work closely with the CTA and the CSAS to disseminate current academic procedures and to educate faculty and students on issues of academic integrity and dishonesty
5. Inform academic integrity violators of the process and direct them to resources to assist in the process
6. Ensure the academic integrity practices and policy of the University are current and in alignment with best practices

#### 4.1. Mission of the Academic Integrity Board

The mission of the AIB is to promote a climate of academic integrity at Gonzaga University by serving as the principal administrator of this policy, to secure its fair and consistent application across the University, and to facilitate communications to all relevant parties regarding such administration.

#### 4.2. Composition of the Academic Integrity Board

Understanding that scheduling difficulties and conflicts of interest arise, along with the necessity for timely resolution of cases considered by the AIB, the full membership of the AIB shall consist of nine faculty, two undergraduate students, two graduate students and two representatives from the Student Affairs Division. From this membership, the chair of the AIB will attempt to compose the board present for each hearing such that it includes seven voting members: four faculty members, one undergraduate student, one graduate student and one representative from the Student Affairs Division.

When necessary due to unavailability of certain participants, seven members of differing configurations may be convened by the chair.

The Director of the CSAS serves as the Chair of the Board and a non-voting member except in the case of casting the deciding vote in the event of a tie.

#### 4.3. Criteria for and Terms of Academic Integrity Board Membership

Elected faculty members of the AIB shall be full-time faculty members (must be tenured, tenure-track, Senior Lecturer or Lecturer on a long-term contract). At least one of these elected faculty members must be from the College of Arts and Sciences, and at least one must be involved in graduate education. Faculty members shall serve terms of three years and the terms will be staggered so that 1-2 new faculty members are elected each spring semester to serve during the following three years. No faculty member can serve more than two consecutive terms on the AIB.

By September 15th each academic year, the Gonzaga Student Body Association (GSBA) and the Graduate Student Association (GSA) shall each appoint two student members to serve one-year terms on the AIB. Student members of the AIB shall be current Gonzaga University students, either full- or part-time and shall be in good academic standing. Undergraduate student members must have achieved at least junior status. Graduate student members must have completed at least one semester at Gonzaga. No student members of the AIB may have any violations of the Academic Integrity Policy before or during their service on the AIB.

The Student Affairs Division shall appoint two representatives from their full-time staff to serve the AIB. The length of those terms will be at the discretion of their office.

#### 4.4. Orientation to the Academic Integrity Board

The AIB shall create and maintain orientation materials for members of the board; these materials shall be available through the CSAS. Newly appointed AIB members are encouraged to access and review all orientation materials (including case studies) before beginning their service on the AIB, and as needed during that service. The AIB shall annually review, and update as necessary, the orientation materials.

#### 4.5. Removal and Recusal of Members of the Academic Integrity Board

Any finding of a violation of this policy disqualifies a student member from serving. The Chair of the AIB, with the approval of the Provost, may remove any student member of the AIB at his/her discretion. While this policy focuses on the actions of students, all employees of Gonzaga University are also expected to conduct themselves with the highest standards of academic integrity. If the actions of a faculty or Student Affairs member of the AIB are questioned, the Chair of the AIB, with the approval of the Provost, may remove that member from the AIB at their discretion.

Any member who is on leave or unable to complete an appointed term shall be replaced for the length of the leave (or remainder of the term) by another qualified member appointed by the appropriate body. Student members are to be replaced by either the GSBA or GSA. Given that faculty members are elected to the AIB, the Faculty President shall appoint using the criteria described in 4.3, replacements of those positions when necessary. The Student Affairs Division shall replace members by appointment of another qualified full-time staff member.

*\*\*\*Note: The Faculty President shall only appoint replacement of elected faculty members.*

Any member of the AIB shall have the right to recuse him/herself from any vote or from participation in any deliberation or decision of the AIB. All members of the AIB shall be requested to declare conflicts of interest or an appearance of a conflict of interest prior to any hearings. These members, in consultation with the Chair, are required to recuse themselves. This includes both faculty and student members of the AIB. Accused students also have the right to request removal and replacement of any member of the AIB prior to adjudication of their case if they have reason to believe a conflict of interest exists. In such cases, the student must submit this request in writing to the chair of the AIB who shall make the determination if the member should be recused.

#### 4.6. Meetings and Hearings of the Academic Integrity Board

There shall be regularly scheduled monthly meetings of the AIB during the regular academic year. Additional meetings may be scheduled at the discretion of the Chair, including during the summer months (which may require replacement of regular members for these months). Meetings may be canceled by the Chair of the AIB if there are no cases to be reviewed (requests for adjudication). Hearings conducted by the AIB will be scheduled on a case-by-case basis and every effort shall be made to set a date for the hearing within 10 working days from the time the request for adjudication is made, including during the summer terms.

For the purposes of this policy, working days are defined as weekdays from the day classes begin to the last day of class (excluding regular and Gonzaga holidays) during the normally scheduled terms. If any aspect of the process described below occur at the end of a term, the day count will roll over to the beginning of the new term.

## 5. Investigation, Reporting, Adjudication and Sanctions

### 5.1. Investigation and Report (Initial Inquiry Phase)

The burden of proof in cases of alleged violations of the Academic Integrity Policy resides with the University, whose role is to establish by a preponderance of evidence that an accused student has committed the violation in question.

#### 5.1.1. Suspected Violation Not Related to Specific Courses

If the suspected violation of the AIP is not related to a specific course, students, or members of the University teaching, administrative, and support staff should forward such cases directly to the appropriate administrative officer for the College, School, or Department involved (the Dean, Dean's designee, or Department Chair). That administrative officer shall initiate an initial

inquiry into the allegation, taking the same steps as described below for faculty members.

#### 5.1.2. Suspected Violation Related to Specific Courses

Because cases of suspected violations of academic integrity are usually related to a specific course, any member of the University community can report a possible violation by notifying the faculty member who is teaching the course or by notifying an appropriate administrative officer for the College, School, or Department in which the course is offered (who shall, in turn, notify the faculty member).

#### **STEP 1: Begin initial inquiry by informing chair or administration official**

Any faculty member who discovers, or who is informed of, a suspected violation of the AIP shall begin an initial inquiry of the incident as promptly as possible. The faculty member must first inform their Department Chair (or Program Director, as applicable) of the incident and must consult with their Chair throughout the initial inquiry. For programs without Department Chairs or Program Directors, a designee of the Dean (Associate or Assistant Dean) shall perform the roles of the Chair described herein. Every effort should be made to conduct this initial inquiry within 10 working days of the time the suspected violation became known to the faculty member. Henceforth when the phrase "Department Chair" is used it is meant to include Program Directors or designee of the Dean where appropriate.

#### **Not enough evidence – INQUIRY ENDS**

If the faculty member, in consultation and agreement with their Department Chair, does not find sufficient evidence of a violation of the AIP during the initial inquiry, then no further action is required and the process ends.

#### **STEP 2: Enough evidence – meet with student(s)**

If the evidence warrants continuing the inquiry, the faculty member is to meet with the student(s) in question to discuss the allegation. The Department Chair may also be present at the request of the faculty member or the student. This meeting may take place in person, or via telephone or video conference (the later options being more suitable for incidents in online courses). If more than one student is involved, the faculty member must meet with each student individually, but may also choose to hold an additional meeting with all involved students present. If more than one student is involved in the allegation, each student shall have their case considered individually, although the larger context should be noted in the inquiry and any potential report and adjudication.

The initial meeting between the faculty member and student is for information-gathering and fact-finding. During the individual meeting, the faculty member shall describe the complaint and provide copies of the evidence regarding the allegation to the student. The student will tell the faculty member what happened from their perspective. The meeting ends.

#### **Not enough evidence – INQUIRY ENDS**

If this meeting leads the faculty member (in consultation and agreement with their Department Chair) to believe no violation has occurred, then no further action is required. The process ends without a formal report and the faculty member will notify the student of this outcome.

### **STEP 3: Enough evidence – move forward**

If, after meeting with the student, the faculty member (in consultation and agreement with their Department Chair) continues to suspect that a violation of the AIP has occurred and/or the student acknowledges the violation, the process continues as follows.

#### 5.1.3. Process for Violations

##### **OPTION 1: Student admits fault**

If the student admits fault during the initial inquiry, the individual conducting the inquiry (either the faculty member or administrative officer) shall consult the Violation and Sanction Rubric (see section 5.5 to this Policy) and determine the appropriate proposed sanction. The student will be contacted so that they know the sanction and confirmation of this conversation will be documented in the Academic Integrity Violation Report (AIVR), and the individual shall also promptly file an Academic Integrity Violation Report (AIVR -- section 5.2) with the CSAS indicating that the student has admitted fault; this report will include the proposed sanction and supporting evidence. The AIVR will also include whether the student may be allowed to do make-up work. (See 5.5.2) Every effort should be made to file the AIVR within 5 working days of the conclusion of the initial inquiry. Per section 5.3, if the proposed sanction is not appropriate or supporting evidence is lacking, CSAS will contact the individual and provide guidance on how to revise the AIVR.

##### **OPTION 2: Student does not admit fault**

If the student does not admit fault, but the faculty member (in consultation and agreement with their Department Chair) believes the initial inquiry indicates by a preponderance of evidence that a violation of the policy has occurred, the individual conducting the inquiry (either the faculty member or administrative officer) shall consult the Violation and Sanction Rubric (see section 5.5) and determine the appropriate proposed sanction. The student will be contacted so that they know the sanction, and the individual shall also promptly file an Academic Integrity Violation Report (AIVR -- section 5.2) with the CSAS indicating the student has not admitted fault; this report will include the proposed sanction and supporting evidence. Every effort should be made to file the AIVR within 5 working days of the conclusion of the initial inquiry. The case (i.e., the AIVR and all evidence) is forwarded directly to the AIB with a request for adjudication.

##### **OPTION 3: Student does not admit fault; chair and faculty do not agree**

In instances where the student does not admit fault and the faculty member and their Department Chair are not in agreement on how to proceed, the case is forwarded to the Dean (or designee of the Dean). If the Dean feels the initial inquiry indicates by a preponderance of evidence that a violation of the policy has occurred, the Violation and Sanction Rubric is consulted (see section 5.5), the appropriate proposed sanction is determined, the student is notified of the sanction, and an AIVR (section 5.2) is completed and forwarded as stated above with the disagreement between the faculty member and the Department Chair noted in the report. Should the Dean find that evidence of a violation is insufficient, the process ends. However, this decision must be documented and kept on file with the Dean's office.

## **FOR ALL OPTIONS**

Once an AIVR is filed, the CSAS will confirm receipt of the report with the student, the faculty member and their Department Chair (or appropriate administrative officer), and the student's academic advisor(s) (primary and secondary). In cases where the student admits fault, how the process moves forward is dependent on whether the incident is a first-time or a repeat violation of the AIP. In cases being forwarded to the AIB for adjudication, the CSAS will also note in the forwarded report if the occurrence is a first-time or repeat violation for the student in question prior to adjudication.

### 5.2. Academic Integrity Violation Report (AIVR)

The faculty member (or the investigating administrative officer) must document and file an AIVR within 5 working days of the conclusion of the initial inquiry. The report must contain a detailed explanation of the alleged violation of the Academic Integrity Policy, and must include:

- Course name and number
- Date of infraction and/or date violation was identified
- A copy of the course syllabus which shows the AIP language
- A detailed description of the violation, including any relevant context such as multiple students involved
- The proposed sanction, including if make-up work is being allowed (see section 5.5.2 regarding make-up work)
- A confirmation of whether the student has accepted the proposed sanction
- Copies of any supporting evidence (in electronic format if possible; scanned documents are acceptable)

The report shall be completed online with the CSAS. All reports are forwarded to the AIB, either for approval (if no action is required) or for adjudication. In cases not requiring adjudication, once the case is finalized (by approval of the AIB), the final report will be issued by the AIB chair via email to the student, reporting faculty member, and other relevant participants.

In cases requiring adjudication, both the reporting faculty member and the student who is accused have the option to submit additional information to the AIB to support their case (see Section 5.4 below). The AIB will add their final decision to the AIVR. Following completion of adjudication, the final report will be forwarded (by email) to the student, the student's academic advisor(s), the faculty member involved, the Department Chair, and the appropriate Dean. All reports are kept on file with the CSAS and are subject to all ordinary requirements of University policies and governmental statutes regarding confidentiality.

### 5.3. Violations Not Requiring Adjudication by the Academic Integrity Board

In cases where a student admits fault, the faculty member (in consultation with his/her department chair) shall inform the student of the minimum sanction (see section 5.5). The minimum sanction is the standard in cases of academic integrity violations, and it automatically applies if a student admits to violating the policy. It is at the faculty member's discretion as to



whether or not the student may be allowed to do make up work for a first violation at level I or II, and it is also up to the faculty member to determine the nature and worth of this work toward the student's grade (see section 5.5.2 below for guidance).

The AIVR is forwarded to the AIB for review; if the proposed sanction is not appropriate, the director of CSAS will coordinate with the faculty member to revise the proposed sanction. Approval by the AIB is required and shall be indicated in the final AIVR to be kept on file with CSAS. The case will be considered closed, with a violation recorded.

#### 5.4. Adjudication by the Academic Integrity Board

##### **PROCEDURES FOR ADJUDICATION**

Following the submission of an unresolved case and a request for adjudication, the Chair of the AIB will determine the composition of the hearing board, subject to the requirements in Section 4.3. Each hearing shall be scheduled on a case-by-case basis. Every effort shall be made to set a date for the hearing within 10 working days from the time the request for adjudication is made. The hearing date should not exceed 20 working days beyond the report date. Any delays in the timeline shall be justified and documented in the AIVR. The Chair of the AIB shall provide the student who is suspected of violating the AIP with a copy of the AIVR and copies of all relevant supporting evidence and shall notify the student of the time and place of the AIB hearing. In an effort to schedule the hearing at a time that does not conflict with the student's and the AIB member's academic schedule, adjudication hearings will take place during the common meeting time when possible and will be held via Zoom when necessary or preferred.

Faculty members reporting a violation should be aware that they will only have ten (10) minutes (which may be extended by a maximum of five (5) minutes if the AIB chair agrees to the presenter's request for more time) during the adjudication to summarize why they feel an academic integrity violation has taken place. Therefore, it is important that reporting faculty members include in their AIVR a detailed rationale for why they believe a violation of the academic integrity policy has taken place and all supporting evidence. If they prefer, faculty may submit a separate document in addition to the AIVR that goes into more detail; this should be sent to the chair of the AIB at the same time the AIVR is filed. All members of the academic integrity board who participate in the hearing will read the AIVR and any supplementary documentation before the adjudication; these documents will be central to their determination of whether an act of academic dishonesty has taken place or not.

Students should be aware that they will only have ten (10) minutes total (which may be extended by a maximum of five (5) minutes if the AIB chair agrees to the presenter's request for more time) during the adjudication to summarize why they feel an academic integrity violation has not taken place. Therefore, students are highly encouraged to submit to the chair of the AIB, via email, their own statement rebutting the evidence in the AIVR. If submitted, all members of the academic integrity board who participate in the hearing will read this report before the adjudication in consideration of whether an act of academic dishonesty has taken place or not.

The student who is suspected of violating the AIP is obliged to attend the hearing. If the student

does not comply for any reason and chooses not to attend, the AIB can reach a judgment on the case in the student's absence. Under no circumstances may the student be represented by a proxy. The student may choose to have another person present for support (for example, their academic advisor or a representative for the Center for Cura Personalis), but that person may not speak on-the-record unless invited to by the Chair of the AIB.

Generally, only regular members of the AIB assigned to the hearing shall be present. The investigating faculty member (or administrative officer) is highly encouraged to attend the meeting to present evidence and to answer questions. The faculty member and the student will be invited to address only the board (not each other). The student may invite (but not compel) witnesses to the hearing, but only with permission of the AIB Chair.

The AIB can make determinations in any case as long as a quorum (simple majority) of the scheduled hearing board is present at the hearing. The AIB will typically meet to make determinations immediately following the hearing unless extenuating circumstances occur. All decisions of the AIB shall be determined by a simple majority vote of the members present. The Chair does not vote, except in cases of a tie. The AIB decision will be communicated via Gonzaga email to the student, the faculty member, and the chair within 48 hours of the conclusion of the hearing. In the event of a delay, due to extenuating circumstances, the AIB Chair will be in communication with all parties involved.

#### **ORDER OF HEARING**

At the hearing, the faculty member presents their case first (in ten (10) minutes or less), mindful that they bear the burden of proof and that they have already submitted their case in writing. When finished, the student then has up to ten (10) minutes to state their case. After this, the Board may address questions to any party or witness present. The conduct of the hearing shall be informal, and the Board is not bound by legal rules of evidence or court procedures. Matters of procedure shall be governed by the operating procedures of the AIB, which will be enforced by the Chair of the AIB and shared with all members and the accused student prior to the hearing. Hearings may be electronically recorded or transcribed upon agreement of all participants.

#### **ALLEGATION NOT SUPPORTED BY EVIDENCE**

If the hearing leads the AIB to find that the allegation is not supported by a preponderance of evidence, the AIB shall clear the student of any violation of the AIP and shall indicate this finding in the final AIVR to be kept on file with CSAS. The case will then be considered closed and with no violation recorded.

#### **ALLEGATION SUPPORTED BY EVIDENCE**

If the hearing leads the AIB to determine that the allegation has been supported by a preponderance of evidence, the AIB will determine the appropriate sanction for the misconduct after consulting with the reporting faculty member concerning possible sanctions. Before rendering its decision as to sanctions, the AIB shall consider the student's history of violating the AIP; repeat and more egregious violations shall result in more severe sanctions.

Once the AIB has reached a decision, the faculty member is notified, and the sanction is levied and noted in the AIVR which shall be kept on file with CSAS. The case will then be considered closed, with the violation recorded.

All information regarding the accusation, investigation, adjudication, and sanction are confidential and in accordance with FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act) are to be kept confidential by all members of the AIB and all parties involved.

#### 5.5. Sanctions for Violations of the Academic Integrity Policy

We acknowledge that in order to preserve and promote the academic integrity of Gonzaga University, violations of this policy will not be tolerated; at the same time, the fundamental mission of our institution encourages us to foster adherence to the principle of academic integrity through a restorative process focused on education, not punishment. Thus, in most cases, the sanctions recommended for first and second-time offenders shall provide students with an opportunity to resume their academic career without interruption and with a better understanding of scholastic integrity, character, and truth.

##### 5.5.1. Minimum Sanction

There is a minimum sanction (penalty) for violation of the AIP. This is to promote consistency, clarity, and fairness in sanctions across the University. Whether a student admits to violating the AIP in the initial inquiry or is found to have done so via the result of an adjudication by the AIB, the minimum sanction will be applied for the test or assignment in question. The minimum sanction is no academic credit (a zero) for the entire test or assignment in question.

Although the minimum sanction is always zero for the assignment, the faculty member may allow a student to recoup points with a make-up assignment at her/his discretion, within the boundaries established in 5.5.2. If a make-up assignment is allowed, the faculty member should inform their chair and the AIB and mention the percentage of points the student is allowed to recoup with it. It will be up to the faculty member to adjust the student's course grade appropriately with the make-up points.

##### 5.5.2. Make-up work by student

There is no expectation or requirement that a faculty member would consider offering make-up work to a student who either admits to or is found responsible for a first violation, at level I or level II, of this policy. However, a faculty member may choose to offer a student who has been found responsible for violating the policy make-up work to earn back points toward the final course grade in the form of another test, a paper, assignment, etc., with the intention of allowing the student to demonstrate what they have learned. The make-up work is for first violations at level I and II only and is not allowed for second or subsequent violations at these levels or for level III violations. The recommendation is that for a level I violation, no more than 80% of the original points may be regained. The recommendation for a level II violation is that no more than 70% of the original points may be regained.

It is up to the faculty member, in consultation with their department chair or program director, to decide whether this is appropriate given the circumstances, what the work might be, and how much credit the student may recoup toward their grade for doing this work. This work should be offered to the student after the initial meeting and prior to the faculty member submitting the AIVR. The offer of make-up work should be noted in the AIVR as well for all cases where it is allowed and chosen.

Details on first, second, and third findings of violations of the AIP follow below.

#### 5.5.3. Sanctions for First Violations – Levels I and II

All charges of academic policy violations should be made in consultation with the Department Chair or Program Director. The level of violation may be determined by referring to the Violation and Sanction Rubric found on the Academic Integrity website. In cases where a student admits to violating the policy during the initial inquiry, the minimum sanction (no credit for the assignment/exam) shall be applied by the faculty member. As mentioned in section 5.5.2, for a first violation, in consultation with their department chair or program director, faculty have the option of assigning make-up work, at their discretion. The final sanction shall be confirmed following review by the AIB and included in the final AIVR filed with CSAS. The student found in violation of the policy may not request an adjudication hearing based solely on the minimum sanction applied.

In certain egregious cases, a faculty member may suggest to the AIB that it should consider further sanctions beyond the minimum. The AIB will take that recommendation into account while reviewing the case (whether the student accepts responsibility for the violation). In these cases where additional sanctions have been suggested, the AIB will determine if the additional sanctions are warranted after review or after the adjudication hearing, whichever applies. The decision of the AIB is final, except in cases of appeal (See Section 6).

#### 5.5.4. Sanctions for Second Violations

A second violation at Level I is automatically elevated to Level II, first violation and so, the section just above applies.

Otherwise, in cases where a student takes responsibility during the initial inquiry, the faculty member (who should consult with their Department Chair when making the charge) will assign the grade of zero for the assignment. The AIB will review the case and decide on the additional penalty for the second offense. If a course grade of “F” is assigned, the student may not withdraw from the course (even if that determination is made prior to the University scheduled withdrawal date). The sanction confirmed by the AIB will be included in the final AIVR filed with CSAS. If the student is not willing to accept the proposed sanction, the case is forwarded to the AIB with a request for adjudication. Should the student deny responsibility following the initial inquiry (or accept the proposed sanction) but is found responsible for a second violation following adjudication, the sanction shall be determined and applied by the AIB, and that shall be indicated in the AIVR. The decision of the AIB is final, except in cases of appeal (see Section 6).

In addition to the sanction determined above, any student found to have committed a second (or greater) violation of the AIP must also consult with the CSAS for a meeting with an academic advisor to discuss the violation and develop a plan to prevent further violations of the policy. This plan shall be forwarded to the student's academic advisor(s).

#### 5.5.5. Sanctions for Third and Further Violations

If a submitted AIVR involves a student who has violated the AIP twice before, the AIVR will be forwarded directly to the AIB with a request for adjudication following the initial inquiry step. In these cases, the faculty member is not involved in determining the sanction. For students found responsible for a third violation of the AIP, the AIB will impose sanctions as they deem appropriate. Following a third violation of the AIP, possible sanctions include change of final course grade to an "F" or a one-semester suspension. If the AIB finds a student responsible for a fourth violation of the AIP, the student faces automatic dismissal from the University.

In cases where a student is found responsible for a third (or greater) violation following adjudication, the sanction shall be determined and applied by the AIB and that shall be indicated in the AIVR. The decision of the AIB is final, except in cases of appeal (See Section 6).

#### 5.5.6. Special Considerations

In cases where students are found in violation of the AIP that are not directly related to a particular course, the AIB shall determine appropriate sanctions.

If during an inquiry or adjudication process, it is discovered that previous violations of the AIP by the student in question have gone undiscovered, those violations shall be considered at the time of discovery. If there is a preponderance of evidence that the student is responsible for the previously unknown and undocumented violations, those violations must be considered and the current case will be considered a repeat violation accordingly. Violations of the AIP involving graduate students shall be considered more serious. In these cases, the AIB shall consider accelerating the severity of sanctions. This would be especially true in instances where violations are found to have occurred in work that has been (or is planned to be) disseminated.

More severe sanctions are possible for violations of the AIP that the AIB deems more egregious, and may result in more severe penalties such as suspension or dismissal prior to third or fourth violations. Examples of these violations may include, but are not limited to:

- Manipulation or falsification of credentials submitted in an application to gain admission to Gonzaga University
- Compromising security resources to manipulate academic records, be it paper files, by compromising IT (Information Technology) security, or by other means
- Compromising security resources to obtain copies of examinations, be it gaining entry into faculty workspace, by compromising IT security, or by other means
- Providing copies of previous examinations or previously written assignments in exchange for monetary gain, or otherwise

- Obtaining and distributing (for monetary gain, or otherwise) materials developed by publishers intended for instructional use only (particularly test banks)
- Any violation of the AIP related to work that has been (or is planned to be) disseminated as a published work or as a conference presentation or poster.

In all cases, should resolution of the case require extension of the decision beyond the end of a semester, the student shall receive an incomplete (“I”) grade until the allegation is resolved and the case closed. In most cases, students shall be permitted to continue into the following semester pending resolution of their case. When the following semester requires a course co-requisite or clinical setting, such as in the BS (Bachelor of Science) Nursing program, students found in violation of academic integrity may not be permitted to continue until the case is resolved.

- If the student is found to have committed the alleged violation of the AIP, the “I” grade is replaced as determined by the sanction. Should a grade change make the student ineligible for any coursework they have begun in the new semester, they must be dropped from the course (even if beyond the drop deadline determined by the Registrar’s office).
- If the student is cleared by the AIB, the student may continue with their current semester schedule, the grade in the course in question shall be determined and submitted to the Registrar, and the “I” shall be completely removed from their transcript.

## 6. Appeals

The right to appeal a decision of the AIB is limited to the student found responsible for a violation of the policy by the AIB. Decisions of the AIB may be appealed for the following two reasons only:

1. Because the student has new information that was not available prior to the original adjudication by the AIB.
2. Because the process and procedures outlined in this policy were not adhered to during the student’s original adjudication.

Any sanctions resulting from a decision of the AIB shall be considered in place and enforced until such time as determined otherwise by the appeals process. The filing of an appeal does not relieve the student from complying with the sanctions from the time they are initially imposed. Any appeal must be submitted in writing by the student to the Provost within 10 working days of the student’s receipt and acknowledgment of the final AIVR in their case.

Upon receipt of such an appeal, the Provost and/or designee shall review the case and shall make a determination of the appeal based upon the information contained in the written request and the relevant AIVR and accompanying documents. The Provost and/or designee may, at their discretion, ask for a meeting with the student and/or the chair of the AIB in reaching their decision.

An appeal may result in one of the following actions:

1. Affirmation of the original decision and sanctions.

2. Overturn the original decision and sanctions in full.
3. Return to the AIB for reconsideration.

The Provost shall be the final appeal authority for the University in all cases related to violations of the AIP. The Provost shall make a determination on the appeal within 10 working days of receipt of the appeal. A written decision regarding the appeal shall be given to the student (via electronic mail). All documents relevant to the appeal must also be added to the final AIVR filed with the CSAS.