

SCOPE OF THE HEARING AND ROLE OF THE AIC

To help you better understand the hearing process, below are some clarifications regarding the scope of the academic integrity hearing and the role of the Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) in the College of Arts & Sciences.

We understand that this can be an emotionally taxing process for some students. If you have questions or concerns after your intake meeting, please reach out to the Academic Integrity Officer with whom you spoke.

1. Please **carefully review** the Undergraduate Academic Integrity policy, the course syllabus, and assignment/exam guidelines to make sure you understand their relevance to the reported claim that you violated the AI policy.
2. The AIC's decision on responsibility **will be based on** the preponderance of evidence standard. This means that the AIC is tasked with determining, based on the evidence presented, if it is more likely than not that an academic integrity violation occurred.
3. In determining responsibility, the AIC **only considers** intent when the potential violation is deliberate (e.g., fabrication or falsification of data).
4. The AIC **may consider** whether the student's actions, allegedly in violation of the policy, could be attributed to a reasonable misunderstanding of the assignment or exam expectations.
5. When making a decision, the AIC **does not consider** evidence regarding a student's character or their standing in any academic course. The decision is based on the likelihood a violation occurred, not on character or history of academic performance.
6. The AIC **does not decide** the specific sanctions to apply. The AIC only makes a decision regarding the likelihood that a violation occurred. Grade penalties are at the full discretion of the course instructor.
7. **Only** the course instructor(s) **will determine** any grade penalties to be applied. This is the policy regardless of whether a student admits responsibility and waives a hearing or pursues a hearing and is found in violation by the AIC.
8. Even if a student decides to admit responsibility and waive a hearing, **they may still submit** a statement of mitigation to share with the instructor. Students can ask the Academic Integrity Officer for more information about such document.
9. A student is presumed innocent of the alleged violation unless and until the AIC determines that evidence demonstrates it is more likely than not that the student is responsible for the violation of the AI policy. Students may provide **relevant evidence** for the AIC to consider in making that determination; the AIC finds it especially helpful when student respondents provide a statement responding to the complaint. Additional evidence might include documentation, the course syllabus, assignment or exam guides, cited materials, emails, or screenshots of messages (this list is not exhaustive).