



PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF
THE
SENATE POLICY ON ACADEMIC HONESTY

March 28, 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY MEMBERS.....	2
SAMPLE LETTER FOR EXPLORATORY MEETING	6
FORM A: RECORD OF MEETING(S).....	8
FORM B: ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF OFFENCE.....	9
RECOMMENDED PENALTY	10
SAMPLE LETTER FOR HEARING	11
INFORMATION FOR STUDENTS.....	12
SENATE POLICY ON ACADEMIC HONESTY.....	15
INVIGILATION OF EXAMINATIONS, POLICY ON.....	24

CONTACT:

Louise Lewin
Associate Principal, Student Services
C112 York Hall
Glendon
Telephone: 416-487-6716
Email: lewin@glendon.yorku.ca

PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY MEMBERS

Faculty members are directed to the Senate Policy on Academic Honesty (page 15 of this package) for the guidelines and procedures governing York University. The following information is meant to be used as guidelines for members of Glendon community when involved in a suspected breach of academic honesty. It describes the Glendon-specific implementation of the Senate approved procedures. If you have any questions regarding academic honesty, please contact the Associate Principal, Student Services.

DEPARTMENTAL LEVEL

It is the responsibility of the Course Director to deal with suspected breaches of academic honesty within a course. Teaching assistants, laboratory coordinators and instructors who identify a possible breach of academic honesty should refer the matter to the Course Director. Suspected breaches of academic honesty not involving a specific course should be referred to the Undergraduate Program Director or Chair of the Department. With respect to tests and examinations, Course Directors are reminded to review procedures for dealing with possible cases of academic misconduct during examinations (Appendix A) and to ensure that invigilators are informed of these procedures prior to all tests and examinations.

A. PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION

1. When a Course Director has concerns about the academic integrity of a piece of work, s/he may contact the student to schedule an appointment for a preliminary discussion. However, for cases where evidence clearly suggests that a breach of academic honesty has occurred, a Course Director should proceed directly to an exploratory meeting (see section B) without having a preliminary discussion with the student.
2. The purpose of a preliminary discussion is:
 - to discuss the Course Director's concerns with the piece of work in question
 - to allow an opportunity for the student to respond to the instructor's concerns
 - to introduce the subject of academic honesty, and to refer the student to the procedures governing academic honesty within Glendon.
3. Based on the preliminary discussion, the faculty member will decide whether or not to proceed with the matter as a possible breach of academic honesty. As soon as a Course Director decides to pursue the matter as a possible breach of academic honesty, s/he should:
 - contact the Assistant to the Associate Principal, Student Services, to alert the Associate Principal. The Assistant to the Associate Principal will arrange with the Office of Student Programs for a "pending academic investigation" alert to be mounted for the course on the Student Information System, to prevent the student from receiving a grade or dropping the course until the matter is resolved.
 - forward a package including Form A (page 8), a statement outlining the nature of the concern, the evidence, statements from other instructors or teaching assistants involved in the matter, and any other relevant information to the Associate Principal, Student Services, requesting an Exploratory meeting.

*Notes:

- *If more than one student is involved, each student should be interviewed separately.*
- *If a Course Director wishes to hold a preliminary discussion but is unable to contact the student s/he should forward the matter to the Associate Principal and request an Exploratory meeting.*

B. EXPLORATORY MEETING (see section 3.5.1 of the Senate Policy)

1. If a Course Director decides to pursue a possible breach of academic honesty, as per section 3.5 of the Senate Policy on Academic Honesty, an exploratory meeting will be scheduled by the Office of the Associate Principal, Student Services, to allow the Course Director to fully articulate his/her concerns with the work in question and to enable the student to respond. At this meeting it will be determined “whether or not there are reasonable and probable grounds to proceed with a charge of breach of academic honesty”.
2. When scheduling an exploratory meeting:
 - the student will be given at least 7 calendar days written notice of meeting and provided with a brief description of the reason for the meeting. The student will be notified of the exploratory meeting via registered mail to provide confirmation that the letter has been delivered to the student. See sample letter on page 7. A copy of the Faculty-specific procedures will also be included, or the student will be referred to a website where the procedures are posted.
 - the meeting will be convened and chaired by the Associate Principal, Student Services, or designate.
 - the student may be accompanied by a representative and the faculty member may have another person present. If the student elects not to attend the meeting, the meeting may proceed without the student.
 - the Associate Principal or designate will keep a record of the meeting and write a brief report following the meeting.

C. OUTCOMES OF EXPLORATORY MEETING (see section 3.5.2 of the Senate Policy)

1. Decision not to proceed with a Charge

If after discussion at this meeting the Course Director wishes to not proceed with a charge, the Assistant to the Associate Principal will be directed to ask the Office of Student Programs to remove the ‘pending’ alert for the course. No record of the case will be kept on file.

2. Admission of Guilt and Joint Recommendation of Penalty:

If the student admits guilt and there is a jointly recommended penalty which falls within the Senate guidelines on the range of penalties not exceeding failure (F) in the course (i.e. zero on assignment, lower grade in course etc.), then the student will be invited to sign a statement indicating acceptance of responsibility for the offense and a joint submission with regard to penalty recommendation* (Form B – see pages 9 and 10). Once a joint submission form is completed,

- Form A and Form B and all relevant documentation are kept on file in the Office of Student Programs.
- Copies of Form A and Form B, (which must include a summary of the case), are forwarded to the Secretary to the Committee on Academic Standards, Teaching and Learning (CASTL) for ratification by CASTL.
- CASTL reviews the summary of the case and the recommendation, ensuring that the recommended penalty is within the appropriate penalty range and that proper procedures have been followed. If satisfied, the committee will vote to approve the recommendation. The Office of the Associate Principal (Student Services) will then send a copy of Forms A & B to the student.
- If the Committee does not accept the penalty, the case will be referred back to the Secretary to the committee to arrange for a full hearing into the matter.

- Prior to forwarding the case to CASTL, the Assistant to the Associate Principal will check for previous offenses. If the case is not a first offense, the recommendation is deemed null and void and the entire file will be forwarded to CASTL for a hearing to determine penalty.
- If a recommended penalty exceeds failure in the course, the case will be forwarded to a hearing for consideration by CASTL.

3. Admission of Guilt but no Agreement on Recommended Penalty

If a student wishes to admit to a breach of academic honesty but no agreement is reached on recommended penalty, a document signed by the student and the faculty member (Form "B"), which includes the admission, a summary of the matter and individual submissions by the student and faculty member as to penalty shall be forwarded to the Secretary to CASTL, who shall arrange a hearing for penalty.

4. No Admission of Guilt

If a student does not admit guilt and if there are sufficient grounds to warrant a charge, the case (including all relevant documentation) will be forwarded to the Secretary to CASTL who shall arrange a hearing of the matter.

5. Failure to Attend Exploratory Meeting

If a student elects not to attend the meeting, the meeting will proceed without the student present. If it is determined that there are sufficient grounds to warrant a charge, the case (including all relevant documentation) will be forwarded to the Secretary to CASTL who shall arrange a hearing of the matter.

Note: It is important to communicate to students at an Exploratory Meeting that they may not withdraw from a course in which they have been found guilty of a breach of academic honesty.

***Note on Second Offenses:** *At some point during the exploratory meeting, prior to signing any documentation, the student will be asked to indicate whether this is a first offense. If the student indicates that it is not a first offense, the student will be advised that, should there be agreement that an offense has occurred, the student may choose to acknowledge and accept responsibility for the offense, but there can be no joint submission of a recommended penalty. In the case of second or subsequent offenses, penalty is determined at a hearing (CASTL) for penalty only. Alternatively, the student can choose not to acknowledge and accept responsibility for the offense in which case a full hearing into the matter will be called.*

D. PRIOR TO A HEARING (see section 3.6.2 of Senate Policy)

1. The Assistant to the Associate Principal prepares case information, ensuring that it is complete. The Secretary to CASTL reviews the case information and arranges the hearing. The Secretary to CASTL will notify all relevant parties of the details of the hearing. The student will be notified via registered mail and given at least 21 calendar days advance notice of the hearing (see sample letter on page 11). A student may choose to waive advance notice in order to have a hearing scheduled at an earlier date.
2. The Secretary to CASTL will make himself/herself available to answer any questions the student may have with respect to the hearing process and the options available to the student. Where appropriate the Secretary may refer the student to other offices/people for additional information.
3. As per section 3.6.2 of the Senate Policy, if a student acknowledges the accuracy of the charge(s), the student may waive the right to a hearing by submitting a written statement to the Secretary to CASTL that both admits guilt and waives the right to a hearing. In this statement, the student may make submissions as to an appropriate penalty and give reasons. If the faculty member submitting the charge concurs with the penalty

recommendation of the student, a jointly signed submission may be completed and forwarded to CASTL for review. In such cases, the agreed upon penalty shall not exceed failure in the course. If the faculty member and student do not agree on a recommended penalty, individual written submissions as to penalty shall be made by the student and faculty member to the Secretary to CASTL, who will in turn arrange a hearing (penalty only) for consideration by CASTL.

E. HEARING (see section 3.6 of Senate Policy)

1. CASTL, or a panel consisting of members of CASTL, meet to hear cases unresolved under processes described in section C.
2. The Associate Principal (Student Services) or designate presents each case to a panel.
3. The Faculty presenter reviews the facts of each case, presents evidence and may call witnesses.
4. The student will be invited to attend. S/he may be represented at the hearing and may call witnesses.
5. Both parties must inform the Secretary to CASTL of their intention to call witnesses and file names of these witnesses at least seven calendar days in advance of the hearing.
6. If a student fails to appear at a hearing after proper notice, the hearing may proceed, a decision may be made and sanctions may be imposed, unless the student can establish, in advance of the hearing and to the satisfaction of the committee, that there are circumstances beyond his or her control which make an appearance impossible or unfairly burdensome.
7. The Secretary to CASTL will send the written decision of the panel to the student via registered mail.

Note: Please refer to section 4 of the Senate Policy on Academic Honesty to review the order of a Faculty Hearing.

F. APPEALS

Decisions of the Committee on Academic Standards, Teaching and Learning may be appealed to the Senate Appeals Committee (c/o the University Secretariat's Office N926 Ross Building), and will be permitted only on grounds of new evidence or evidence of procedural irregularity in the Faculty committee's handling of the case. An appeal or notice of appeal must be filed with the Senate Appeals Committee within 30 days of the date of decision letter from the Faculty. The Secretary of the Senate Committee may be reached at (416) 736-5012.

Sample Letter in Cases of Suspected Cheating on a Test or Exam

By Courier

Date

Student name

Address

Dear [student name],

I am writing to inform you of a concern regarding possible cheating during the test/exam for [course number] on [date]. Cheating is defined in section 2.1.1 of the Senate Policy on Academic Honesty, which may be accessed at the following website:

<http://www.yorku.ca/secretariat/policies/document.php?document=69>. I encourage you to review this policy.

In accordance with section 3.5 of the above policy, I am scheduling an exploratory meeting to discuss the matter with you and Professor X on (date/time/location). You may be accompanied by a representative. Please contact “Y”, Assistant to the Associate Principal (Student Services) to confirm your attendance at this meeting or to reschedule if you are unable to attend on this date. If you do not contact us by [date two weeks** from date of letter], I will assume that you have elected not to attend the meeting. The meeting will proceed in your absence and the case information will be forwarded to the Committee on Academic Standards, Teaching and Learning for further action.

Please note that you may not drop the course in question while this matter is under investigation.

Yours sincerely,

“X”

Associate Principal (Student Services)

LL/nl

Cc: Course Director

“Z”, Secretary to CASTL

Note: The sample letters may need to be adjusted to fit the relevant charge. They are meant to act as a guide for formatting purposes.

Sample Letter in Cases of Suspected Plagiarism

By Courier

Date

Student name

Address

Dear [Student Name],

I am writing with regard to your essay (or assignment) entitled "[title or other descriptor]" which you submitted for [course number] on [date]. Specifically, there is concern that your essay may contain plagiarized material. Plagiarism is defined in section 2.1.3 of the Senate Policy on Academic Honesty as follows:

“Plagiarism is the misappropriation of the work of another by representing another person’s ideas, writing or other intellectual property as one’s own. This includes the presentation of all or part of another person’s work as something one has written, paraphrasing another’s writing without proper acknowledgement, or representing another’s artistic or technical work or creation as one’s own. Any use of the work of others, whether published, unpublished or posted electronically, attributed or anonymous, must include proper acknowledgement.”

I encourage you to review the entire Senate Policy on Academic Honesty, which can be accessed here:

<http://www.yorku.ca/secretariat/legislation/senate/acadhonesty.htm>.

In accordance with section 3.5 of the above policy, I am scheduling an exploratory meeting to discuss the matter with you and Professor “X” on (date/time/location). You may be accompanied by a representative. Please contact “Y”, Assistant to the Associate Principal (Student Services), to confirm your attendance at this meeting or to reschedule if you are unable to attend on this date. If you do not contact us by [date two weeks** from date of letter], I will assume that you have elected not to attend the meeting. The meeting will proceed in your absence and the case information will be forwarded to the Committee on Academic Standards, Teaching and Learning for further action.

Please note that you may not drop the course in question while this matter is under investigation.

Your sincerely,

“X”

Associate Principal (Student Services)

LL/nl

Cc: Course Director

“Z”, Secretary to CASTL

File: student number

**FORM A - GLENDON COLLEGE
RECORD OF MEETINGS FOR ACADEMIC HONESTY CASE**

Sections marked by * to be completed by Course Director and forwarded, with relevant documentation, to the Office of the Associate Principal, Student Services.

*STUDENT NAME:	*COURSE DIRECTOR:
*STUDENT NUMBER:	*COURSE:
*NATURE OF (SUSPECTED) OFFENSE:	(Please include session, department, section and tutorial if applicable)

RECORD OF MEETING WITH STUDENTS

1. *Preliminary Discussion	*Date:
* Present at Discussion	
2. Exploratory Meeting	Date:
Present at Meeting:	
Summary of Meeting (attach a separate page)	

***Please attach the following documentation (keep a copy of all documents for your records):**

<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence (assignment/test, copy of original source, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Outline of assignment, syllabus (if relevant)
<input type="checkbox"/> Statements by Course Director, teaching assistant, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/> Student's grade breakdown in course

OUTCOME OF EXPLORATORY MEETING

<input type="checkbox"/>	Not proceeding with a charge <input type="checkbox"/> No resolution – forward for hearing
<input type="checkbox"/>	Student accepts responsibility for breach of academic honesty, but no joint recommendation is reached with regard to penalty (attach Form B)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Student accepts responsibility for breach of academic honesty, and student and Course Director agree on penalty recommendation (attach Form B)
_____	_____
Signature of Course Director	
_____	_____
Signature of Associate Principal or designate	Date

Glendon College

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC STANDARDS, TEACHING AND LEARNING (CASTL) JOINT SUBMISSION FORM

In accordance with Senate Policy, when a complaint is received "an exploratory meeting shall be arranged to determine whether or not there are reasonable and probable grounds to proceed with a charge of breach of academic honesty". The exploratory meeting may result in dismissal of the matter, an acknowledgement of academic misconduct (with or without an agreed-upon recommended penalty) or a formal charge of a breach of academic honesty. CASTL is responsible for ratification of recommended penalties. If a case is not ratified, then a formal hearing will be held. Cases that are not resolved are forwarded to CASTL for a formal hearing.

Acknowledgement Section:

Offense: Cheating Impersonation Plagiarism Aiding and Abetting
 Falsification or unauthorized modification of an academic document/record
 Other _____

Student Name: _____

Student Number: _____

Course: _____ Instructor: _____

Weighting of the Test/Assignment/Examination in Final Grade: _____

Summary (brief description of the nature of the offense and the relevant facts of the case):

To the best of my knowledge, this statement accurately represents the offense and the facts of the case.

I accept responsibility for having committed the academic offense described above.

Signature of Course Director or designate

Signature of Student

Date

Date

Is this a first offense? Yes No

A permanent record of the offense shall be placed in the student's academic file. This record is for internal academic purposes only (assigning a penalty on a second offense for example). Once a student has been assigned a penalty the final course grade cannot be removed from a student's transcript.

Joint Statement of Recommended Penalty:

PROPOSED PENALTY

One or more of:

- Written Reprimand
- Complete an Academic Honesty Assignment
- Rewrite/make-up Assignment
- Zero on Assignment/Test/Exam
- Grade Point Reduction of ____* on Final Grade
- Permanent Grade of Record
- Failure in Course and Permanent Grade of Record
- Transcript notation for the period of _____ (can be unspecified)
- Other _____

For more severe penalties, such as Transcript notation, suspension, expulsion or withholding a degree, a formal hearing must be called.

Section 2.2.7 of the Senate Policy describes permanent grade of record as follows: The grade assigned shall remain as the one grade of record for the course, even if the course is repeated. This penalty can be added to any other penalty, but shall always be attached to the penalty of failure in the course.

* One full grade point reduction would, for example, take a C+ grade down to C

INSTRUCTOR'S SIGNATURE *By signing here, the instructor agrees to the proposed penalty*

Signature _____ Date _____

STUDENT'S SIGNATURE

- I accept the proposed penalty.
In signing and agreeing upon a penalty the student waives the right to a formal hearing.

Signature _____ Date _____

- I do **not** accept the proposed penalty. I propose the following penalty:

Signature _____ Date _____

An agreement on recommended penalty is based on the understanding that this is a first offense of academic honesty; should any previous offense(s) of academic honesty be on record, this agreement will be voided and a hearing will be called to determine penalty. All recommended penalties must be ratified by CASTL. If the penalty is not ratified, or if the student and faculty member cannot agree upon a penalty, then a formal hearing will be scheduled to address the penalty. During a hearing, proposed penalties may change as a result of additional information and discussion.

ASSOCIATE PRINCIPAL'S SIGNATURE (After Ratification by CASTL)

Signature _____ Date _____

Sample Letter to Inform Student of Hearing

By Courier

Date

Student Name and Address

Student Number

Dear XXXX,

I am writing on behalf of Glendon's Committee on Academic Standards, Teaching and Learning (CASTL) to inform you that a panel composed of members of the Committee will hear the case of academic dishonesty involving you in FWXX GL/[Course Code] "[Course Title]", on [Date and Time], in [Room and Building].

If you wish to be present at the hearing, but are unable to attend on the scheduled date, you may make application, in writing or in person, by [Date and Time], with appropriate supporting documentation, to have the hearing date changed. No changes will be made by telephone.

Please inform me, in advance of the hearing, whether or not you will be present and whether you will be represented. Should you choose not to be present and would like the hearing to proceed in your absence, please inform me in writing in advance of the meeting. If you intend to call witnesses, you must inform me of the names of these witnesses at least 7 calendar days prior to the hearing.

Please note that you have been served proper notice of the hearing. Should you choose not to respond and/or not to appear, the hearing will proceed in your absence.

Please find enclosed the following documents:

- a copy of the charge
- a copy of the material submitted by the professor (including a summary of the evidence)
- a copy of the procedures to be followed

You may wish to review the Senate Policy on Academic Honesty prior to the hearing. This document is available from the following web address: <http://www.yorku.ca/secretariat/legislation/senate/acadhone.htm>. Please note section 3.6.2 of the Senate Policy on Academic Honesty, which states:

Prior to the hearing, if a student acknowledges the accuracy of the charges, the student may waive the right to a hearing by submitting a written statement that both admits guilt and waives the right to a hearing.

If you have any questions regarding the hearing, your options, or any information in this letter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

"Y"

Secretary

cc: Chair of CASTL
Course Director
Student file

INFORMATION FOR STUDENTS REGARDING ACADEMIC HONESTY

The following is intended only to provide general responses to questions commonly asked by students. It is consistent with existing legislation, but is NOT itself legislation. Students should consult the Senate Policy on Academic Honesty at:

<http://www.yorku.ca/secretariat/legislation/senate/acadhonesty.htm>

1. **Why does the University take matters of academic honesty so seriously and deal with them so formally?**

A clear sense of academic honesty and responsibility is fundamental to good scholarship and learning. As an educational institution, the University and its faculty members can provide students with guidance as to the meaning of and expectations for academic honesty. As members of the academic community, students have final responsibility for conducting themselves in accordance with these expectations. Where a breach of academic honesty is suspected, the University must treat the matter with a level of seriousness which reflects the fundamental importance we attach to academic honesty. At the same time, the University has in place a formal process, which protects students' rights.

2. **Where does the University tell me what constitute a breach of academic honesty?**

Full details regarding academic honesty and the process for dealing with cases are provided in the Senate Policy on Academic Honesty, which appears in the York University Undergraduate Calendar and on the website above. The Faculty of Science and Engineering's practices flow from that Senate legislation. In addition, many Departments and instructors include information on academic honesty in mini-calendars and course syllabi, and some instructors allocate class time to discussions of issues such as proper research and citation practices. It is the responsibility of students to make themselves aware of and abide by these policies and practices.

3. **How is the process initiated when a breach of academic honesty is suspected?**

Usually, if an instructor has concerns about any academic aspects of a student's work or suspects a breach of academic honesty (most frequently plagiarism on an essay/assignment or cheating on a test/assignment/lab report), the instructor will report those concerns to the course director (if s/he is not the course director). The course director may arrange to meet with the student to discuss that piece of work. If this occurs, you are informed (in person or by an email/note/letter) of the instructor's/Course Director's concerns. The purpose of this preliminary discussion is:

- to discuss the Course Director's concerns with the piece of work in question
- to allow an opportunity for the student to respond to the instructor's concerns
- to introduce the subject of academic honesty, and to refer you to the procedures governing academic honesty within Glendon College.

If the Course Director decides on the basis of the initial discussion to pursue the matter further, s/he will refer the matter to the Associate Principal, Student Services. The Assistant to the Associate Principal will schedule a second meeting – known as an “exploratory meeting” -- to allow both the instructor and student to fully articulate the concerns. At the end of this meeting, you may wish to sign a statement indicating acceptance of responsibility for a breach of academic honesty and a joint submission (signed by both the Course Director and yourself) with regard to a penalty recommendation.

Notes:

- *You may not withdraw from a course while suspicion of an academic offense is under investigation.*
- *You may not withdraw from a course in which you have been found guilty of a breach of academic honesty.*

- *In some cases, for example if the Course Director cannot reach you or if there is substantial evidence that a breach has occurred, a Course Director may choose to proceed directly to an exploratory meeting without having a preliminary discussion.*

4. What are my rights in this process?

You must be given at least seven calendar days notice of the exploratory meeting. You may be accompanied or represented (by a friend, family member, or student advocate (from the York Federation of Students for example). A written record of the meeting will be kept. A neutral third party (normally the Associate Principal or designate) will be present.

5. What kinds of penalties are assigned for breaches of academic honesty?

Each case is decided on its own merits. However, the Senate Policy on Academic Honesty includes guidelines on the assignment of the penalty, which describe a range of penalties normally associated with various kinds of offenses. Factors such as the nature and extent of the breach, the year level of the student, and personal circumstances are considered. In some cases, especially cases of plagiarism at the first-year level, educative actions (such as the completion of an Academic Integrity Tutorial) are combined with penalty recommendations. The usual penalty for cheating on a test/report/assignment/examination ranges from zero on the piece of work and a reduction in the final course grade of 1 grade point to failure in the course. Depending on the severity of the cheating, it may also include a transcript notation. In instances of other kinds of offenses, more severe penalties are contemplated. For offenses such as impersonation or forgery of documents, a suspension from the University for a period of time (one or more years) is typically imposed; a second offense of any kind may also result in suspension or expulsion.

6 (a). What happens if I sign a statement accepting responsibility for having committed a breach of academic honesty and agree to a joint recommendation of penalty?

The acknowledgement and joint recommendation will be forwarded to the Committee on Academic Standards, Teaching and Learning (CASTL) for ratification. The committee will review the matter provided

- the penalty is one which is not more severe than a failure (F) in the course and
- the penalty is within the range normally assigned for this kind of offense (see #5 above).

If the above conditions are met, then the Committee will approve and impose the recommended penalty without a formal hearing. If not, the case will be forwarded to a Panel of CASTL for a resolution as to penalty.

6 (b). What if I acknowledge a breach of academic honesty but believe the penalty the instructor wishes to recommend is too harsh?

If you wish to admit to a breach of academic honesty but no agreement is reached on recommended penalty, a document signed by the student and the faculty member, which includes the admission, a summary of the matter and individual submissions by the student and faculty member as to penalty shall be forwarded to the Secretary to CASTL, who shall arrange a hearing of the matter for penalty only.

6(c). What if I do not want to sign an acknowledgement because I do not believe that I have committed any offense?

If you believe that you have been erroneously accused, but the instructor wishes to pursue the case, you should not sign anything. The case will be forwarded to the Secretary to CASTL who will arrange a hearing. You should be aware, however, that not fully understanding what constitutes an offense, or not intending to commit an offense, does not absolve you from responsibility.

7. What happens if an unresolved case is forwarded to CASTL?

The Secretary to CASTL will arrange for a hearing.

8. Will my offense be noted on my record? If so, how public is this information and what are its implications?

- If you are found not guilty NO RECORD IS KEPT either in the Department, the Office of the Associate Dean's Office or the Office of Student Programs.
- If you admit responsibility or are found guilty of an offense, a confidential record of your case will be maintained in the Office of Student Programs at Glendon, and if you are not a Glendon Student, copied to the Dean's Office of your home Faculty. This information will be used internally only (that is, only if you are found guilty of a second offense) and is never released to prospective employers, parents, or other universities (unless you give permission to release such information).
- If you are suspended from the University (which must be noted on your transcript) or if the decision of the panel includes a penalty of a transcript notation, this information will appear on your transcript. Your transcript is only released on your authorization. Normally, you may petition to have a transcript notation removed any time after the specified duration.

9. How can I avoid committing a similar offense in future?

Take steps to make sure you understand what constitutes an academic offense in general, as well as the expectations of each individual instructor. Frequently Departments and instructors provide discipline-specific materials on what constitutes cheating and/or plagiarism. If you are unsure about whether an action you are contemplating may constitute a breach of academic honesty, or if you need clarification about, for example, proper citation practices in a particular discipline or the extent of permissible collaboration on an assignment, ask your instructor.

In addition, the University has a number of sources of support -- both academic and personal -- for students. These include:

- Foundation courses with an explicit focus on critical thinking, writing, research methodology, etc.
- the Academic Writing Workshop at Glendon, a free service offered in both English and French designed to help you succeed in all aspects of your academic work!
<http://glendon.yorku.ca/academicwriting>
- a number of workshops, which are offered free of charge through the Glendon Career and Counselling Centre (Glendon Hall E103). These workshops often focus on topics such as study skills, reading and research skills, lecture note-taking, stress management, and other areas which will help you cope with the various new experiences and pressures of university study. <http://www.glendon.yorku.ca/counselling/workshops.html>
- the Career and Counselling Centre, which provides free counselling in relation to personal difficulties
- advisors in your Department and in the Glendon Academic Advising Office, who can help you plan your program realistically, taking into account your other commitments
- York's Academic Integrity Website for Students, which includes an on-line tutorial
<http://www.yorku.ca/academicintegrity/students/index.htm>

10. How can I get more details about the process?

If you have questions your instructor cannot answer, call the Office of the Associate Principal, Student Services at (416) 487-6716. Should your case go to a hearing, the Secretary to CASTL (c/o Office of Student Programs, C102 York Hall) will give you details about the process.

University Policies, Procedures & Regulations Database

Senate Policy

Senate Policy on Academic Honesty

Notes: Approved by Senate 2005/04/28

Approval Authority: Senate

Signature: "Harriet Lewis"

- 1 [Senate Policy on Academic Honesty](#)
 - 2 [Senate Guidelines on Academic Honesty](#)
 - 2.1 [Summary of Offences Against the Standards of Academic Honesty](#)
 - 2.2 [Summary of Penalties for Academic Misconduct](#)
 - 2.3 [Factors Considered When Imposing Academic Penalties](#)
 - 3 [Procedures Governing Breach of Academic Honesty](#)
 - 3.1 [Purpose](#)
 - 3.2 [Jurisdiction](#)
 - 3.3 [Investigating Potential Academic Misconduct](#)
 - 3.4 [Initiating an Investigation of Potential Academic Misconduct](#)
 - 3.5 [Meeting at the Unit Level](#)
 - 3.6 [Formal Hearing at the Faculty Level: Preliminary to the Hearing](#)
 - 4 [Order of the Hearing](#)
-

1. Senate Policy on Academic Honesty

The Policy on Academic Honesty is an affirmation and clarification for members of the University of the general obligation to maintain the highest standards of academic honesty. As a clear sense of academic honesty and responsibility is fundamental to good scholarship, the policy recognizes the general responsibility of all faculty members to foster acceptable standards of academic conduct and of the student to be mindful of and abide by such standards.

Academic honesty requires that persons do not falsely claim credit for the ideas, writing or other intellectual property of others, either by presenting such works as their own or through impersonation. Similarly, academic honesty requires that persons do not cheat (attempt to gain an improper advantage in an academic evaluation), nor attempt or actually alter, suppress, falsify or fabricate any research data or results, official academic record, application or document.

Suspected breaches of academic honesty will be investigated and charges shall be laid if reasonable and probable grounds exist. A student who is charged with a breach of academic honesty shall be presumed innocent until, based upon clear and compelling evidence, a committee determines the student has violated the academic honesty standards of the university. A finding of academic misconduct will lead to the range of penalties described in the guidelines which accompany this policy. In some cases the University regulations on non-academic discipline may apply. A lack of familiarity with the Senate Policy and Guidelines on Academic Honesty on the part of a student does not constitute a defence against their application. Some academic offences constitute offences under the Criminal Code of Canada; a student charged under University regulations may also be subject to criminal charges. Charges may also be laid against York University students for matters which arise at other educational institutions.

2. Senate Guidelines on Academic Honesty

2.1 Summary of Offences Against the Standards of Academic Honesty

The following summary of offences is not exhaustive, nor are the definitions provided for each offence confined to the examples cited.

2.1.1 Cheating is the attempt to gain an improper advantage in an academic evaluation. Forms of cheating include:

- Obtaining a copy of an examination before it is officially available or learning an examination question before it is officially available;
- Copying another person's answer to an examination question;
- Consulting an unauthorized source during an examination;
- Obtaining assistance by means of documentary, electronic or other aids which are not approved by the instructor;
- Changing a score or a record of an examination result;
- Submitting the work one has done for one class or project to a second class, or as a second project, without the prior informed consent of the relevant instructors;
- Submitting work prepared in collaboration with another or other member(s) of a class, when collaborative work on a project has not been authorized by the instructor;
- Submitting work prepared in whole or in part by another person and representing that work as one's own;
- Offering for sale essays or other assignments, in whole or in part, with the expectation that these works will be submitted by a student for appraisal;
- Preparing work in whole or in part, with the expectation that this work will be submitted by a student for appraisal.

2.1.2 **Impersonation** is to have someone impersonate one's self in class, in a test, examination or interview, or in connection with any other type of assignment or placement associated with a course or academic program. Both the impersonator and the individual impersonated may be charged.

2.1.3 **Plagiarism** is the misappropriation of the work of another by representing another person's ideas, writing or other intellectual property as one's own. This includes the presentation of all or part of another person's work as something one has written, paraphrasing another's writing without proper acknowledgement, or representing another's artistic or technical work or creation as one's own. Any use of the work of others, whether published, unpublished or posted electronically, attributed or anonymous, must include proper acknowledgement.

2.1.4 **Improper research practices.** Academic research includes the collection, analysis, interpretation and publication of information or data obtained in the scientific laboratory or in the field. Forms of improper research practices include:

- Dishonest reporting of investigative results, either through fabrication or falsification;
- Taking or using the research results of others without permission or due acknowledgement;
- Misrepresentation or selective reporting of research results or the methods used.

2.1.5 **Dishonesty in publication.** It is a violation of academic honesty to knowingly publish

information that will mislead or deceive readers. This includes the falsification or fabrication of data or information, as well as the failure to give credit to collaborators as joint authors or the listing as authors of others who have not contributed to the work. Plagiarism is also considered a form of dishonesty in publication.

- 2.1.6 **Dissemination of information without permission.** Information or experimental data that was collected with a member of faculty or another student, and other works that involved the participation of a faculty member or another student, should not be submitted for publication or otherwise disseminated without their permission.
- 2.1.7 **Abuse of confidentiality.** Taking or releasing the ideas or data of others that were given with the expectation that they are confidential is inappropriate. This includes the ideas or data obtained via the evaluation of confidential grant proposals, award applications or manuscripts that will be or may have been submitted for possible funding or publication. Unless one is authorized to do so, it is improper to obtain a password assigned to another or to copy or modify a data file or program belonging to someone else. Proper authorization means being granted permission either by the owner or originator of that material, or by an appropriate faculty member or administrator.
- 2.1.8 **Falsification or unauthorized modification of an academic document/record.** It is a breach of academic honesty to falsify, fabricate or in any way modify, either through omission or commission, an application to the University or a program, course student examination or test, transcript, grade, letter of recommendation or related document, a degree, a physician's letter/form or any other document used in support of an academic application, record, petition/appeal or endeavor.
- 2.1.9 **Obstruction of the academic activities of another.** It is a violation of academic honesty to interfere with the scholarly activities of another in order to harass or gain unfair academic advantage. This includes interference or tampering with experimental data, with a human or animal subject, with a written or other creation (e.g., a painting, sculpture or film), with a chemical used for scientific study, or with any other object of study.
- 2.1.10 **Aiding and abetting.** Encouraging, enabling or causing others to do or attempt any of the above with intent to mislead an instructor, academic unit, program, office or committee as to a student's academic status, qualifications, actions or preparation, or knowingly aiding or abetting anyone in a breach of academic honesty shall itself be considered misconduct.

2.2 Summary of Penalties for Academic Misconduct

When verified, violations of academic honesty may lead to the following range of penalties, which may be imposed singularly or in combination for any offence. The following penalties are listed in ascending order of severity.

- 2.2.1 **Written disciplinary warning or reprimand.**
- 2.2.2 **Required completion of an academic honesty assignment.**
- 2.2.3 **Make-up assignment, examination or rewriting a work, subject to a lowered grade.**
- 2.2.4 **Lower grade on the assignment, examination or work.**
- 2.2.5 **Lower grade in the course.**
- 2.2.6 **Failure in the course.**
- 2.2.7 **Permanent grade of record.** The grade assigned shall remain as the one grade of record for the course, even if the course is repeated. This penalty can be added to any other penalty, but shall always be attached to the penalty of failure in the course.
- 2.2.8 **Notation on transcript.** Notation on transcript can be a separate penalty or it can be added to any other penalty. Transcript notation shall always be included in cases of suspension, withholding or rescinding a York degree, diploma or certificate and expulsion from the University. Transcript notation can be for a limited period, at the end of which the notation will be removed from the student's transcript. When no period is specified for a transcript notation, a student may petition to the Faculty Petitions Committee to have the notation removed after a period of five years from the date at which the notation was

entered, with the exception of notation of expulsion from the University.

- 2.2.9 **Suspension from the University for a definite period, not to exceed 5 years, with transcript notation.** Suspension is defined as a penalty of a variable but limited period during which the student may not register in the University, imposed for serious academic offences such as plagiarism and cheating. A student who is otherwise eligible to graduate, but is suspended, may not apply to graduate until the suspension expires or is lifted. This penalty may be awarded only by a Faculty-level committee which is recognized by a Faculty Council as the responsible body to assign this penalty.
- 2.2.10 **Expulsion from the University with transcript notation.** Expulsion is defined as permanently terminating a person's right to continue as a student in the University. This penalty may be awarded only by a Faculty-level committee which is recognized by a Faculty Council as the responsible body to assign this penalty.
- 2.2.11 **Withholding or rescinding a York degree, diploma or certificate with transcript notation.** When a Faculty decides to rescind a degree, diploma or certificate, the decision, with supporting documentation, must be forwarded to the Senate Appeals Committee for approval on behalf of Senate.

2.3 Factors Considered When Imposing Academic Penalties

The circumstances surrounding each case of academic misconduct may vary to a significant degree. The penalty imposed should reflect, reasonably, these circumstances. These guidelines are not intended to restrict the authority or flexibility of Faculty committees in imposing the penalties contained in this Policy. In each case, Faculties shall exercise their discretion, taking into consideration the relevant factors, as outlined below. For the benefit of students, however, Faculties shall provide an explanation in their written decision of the major reason(s) the penalty imposed was deemed warranted.

Important factors to be considered by committees in imposing penalties or reviewing penalty recommendations are:

- 2.3.1 Extent of violation: The actions which constitute specific offences of academic honesty (i.e., plagiarism, cheating) vary in terms of severity. Some instances of academic dishonesty constitute only minor infractions while others represent the most extreme form of violation. Penalties should correspond to the nature of the offence. Penalties may be imposed singularly or in combination for any offence.
- 2.3.2 Basic considerations include:
- The level of the student's academic experience;
 - Extenuating circumstances may help explain the action taken by a student, and due weight should be attached to those circumstances;
 - If the student admits guilt, accepts responsibility for their action, and is amenable to educative remedies, committees may find it justified to levy a less severe penalty.
- 2.3.3 Prior/multiple incidents: If the offence is a second (or subsequent) one for the student and/or is in combination with another offence, then a severe penalty should be considered.

3. Procedures Governing Breach of Academic Honesty

Each Faculty shall ensure that its procedures are consistent with the following standards, approved by the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Academic Standards, published in the Calendar and available at the appropriate Faculty offices.

3.1 Purpose

The following procedures are provided for the investigation and resolution of cases of alleged violations of the Senate Policy on Academic Honesty. In these procedures, the term "student" includes a York graduate or undergraduate student, a York graduate, a former York student, or a student who is applying to take, is taking or has taken a York course.

3.2 Jurisdiction

- 3.2.1 Allegations of a breach of academic honesty in a course shall be dealt with by the Faculty offering the course. In cases where the course is in other than the student's home Faculty, then the student's home Faculty (or Faculties) shall have observer status at a hearing and may make submission as to penalty. For students in joint programs or where allegations arise in more than one Faculty, the Faculties can agree on which Faculty will have jurisdiction over the proceedings.
- 3.2.2 All allegations of breaches of academic honesty other than those in course work shall be communicated by the administrator, committee or other person with direct knowledge (faculty, staff, clinical supervisor, etc..) to the student's home Faculty.
- 3.2.3 Should a matter arise for which there appears to be no clear Faculty jurisdiction, the Senate Appeals Committee shall determine which Faculty shall have carriage of the matter.
- 3.2.4 Appeals of decisions of a Faculty committee are considered by the Senate Appeals Committee.

3.3 Investigating Potential Academic Misconduct

If a person (or persons) suspect(s) a breach of academic honesty:

- 3.3.1 on assignments, term papers, essays, theses and dissertations, etc., the matter shall be reported to the concerned course director or supervisor. For courses, if the evaluator is not the course director, the evaluator shall retain possession of the suspect material and provide a written report, together with the confiscated material, to the course director;
- 3.3.2 on non-course work, the person discovering the potential breach of academic honesty, shall retain possession of the suspect material and provide a written report, together with any confiscated material to the program/division/department chair (or his/her designate) or graduate program director or the Associate Principal of the Faculty;
- 3.3.3 in an examination, the invigilator, who is normally the course director, in cases of suspected impersonation, shall ask the student concerned to remain after the examination and shall require appropriate University identification or shall otherwise attempt to identify the student. In other cases of suspected breach of academic honesty the invigilator shall confiscate any suspect material. In all cases, the student will be allowed to complete the examination. The invigilator, other than the course director, shall give a full report, together with any confiscated material, to the course director (See the Senate Policy or Invigilation of Examinations for further information);
- 3.3.4 for research not conducted as part of a course, major research papers/projects, comprehensive examinations, theses and dissertations, person(s) suspecting potential academic dishonesty shall report the matter to the student's supervisor and, as appropriate, the supervisory and examination committees and/or the Associate Principal of the Faculty.

3.4 Initiating an Investigation of Potential Academic Misconduct

- 3.4.1 When a faculty member directing a course, or having or sharing responsibility for a student's research, examination, or dissertation preparation, becomes aware of a possible violation of academic honesty, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to forthwith notify the designated unit or Faculty office and initiate an investigation of the matter.
- 3.4.2 It is the responsibility of the faculty member to collect or assist in the collection of the necessary information and to be prepared to act as a witness at any committee hearing of the matter. The faculty member is not called upon to determine whether or not a breach of academic honesty has occurred, nor to impose punishment, mild or severe.
- 3.4.3 Once notified of a potential breach of academic honesty, the designated Faculty office shall

post a block on enrolment activity in the course. The student may not drop or be deregistered from the course for any reason, nor may transcripts be released to the student until a final decision is reached. A request by a student for a transcript to be sent to another institution or to a potential employer will be processed, but, if the student is found guilty of a breach of academic honesty, the recipients of the transcript will be provided automatically with an updated transcript.

- 3.4.4 If the investigation relates to work already presented for evaluation but not yet evaluated, the faculty member may elect to defer the evaluation of the work until after the matter has been dealt with. Normally, any evaluation of a work which relates to a charge will not be entered into the student's record until after the matter is concluded.
- 3.4.5 If the faculty member or person designated by Faculty policy decides to proceed with a formal complaint alleging a breach of academic honesty, the complaint shall be submitted in writing to the appropriate office as soon as is reasonably possible. The complaint shall contain a full, but concise, statement of the facts as perceived by the complainant and be accompanied by all available supporting evidence.

3.5 Exploratory Meeting at the Unit Level

3.5.1 When a complaint is received at the unit level an exploratory meeting shall be arranged to determine whether or not there are reasonable and probable grounds to proceed with a charge of breach of academic honesty. At least seven calendar days written notice of the meeting and a brief description of the reason for the meeting shall be provided. At this meeting, convened and chaired by the appointed representative, the student may be accompanied by a representative and the faculty member may have another person present. If the student elects not to attend the meeting, the meeting may proceed without the student present.

3.5.2 The exploratory meeting at the unit level will result in one of the following:

- i) It is agreed by all parties that no breach of academic honesty occurred. No records of the matter shall be retained.
- ii) Agreement is reached that the apparent breach of academic honesty was unintentional or the result of student error. In such cases, informal remedial steps may be taken (such as requiring that the student rewrite an assignment, exam or essay or complete an academic honesty assignment) so that the student may correct the mistake and avoid its recurrence;
- iii) If the student wishes to admit to a breach of academic honesty, a document signed by the student and the faculty member which includes the admission, a summary of the matter and a joint submission as to penalty shall be forwarded to the Faculty committee which deals with allegations of breach of academic honesty. In such cases, the agreed-upon penalty shall not exceed failure in the course. The responsible Faculty committee receiving such a joint submission will normally impose the penalty suggested, but if it is of the opinion that some other penalty would be more appropriate, it shall arrange for a hearing of the matter, to which the student and faculty member will be invited.
- iv) If the student wishes to admit to a breach of academic honesty but no agreement is reached on recommended penalty, a document signed by the student and the faculty member, which includes the admission, a summary of the matter and individual submissions by the student and faculty member as to penalty shall be forwarded to the responsible Faculty committee, which shall arrange a hearing of the matter, to which the student and faculty

member will be invited.

- v) If the student elects not to attend the meeting, and if those present find sufficient grounds to proceed with a charge of breach of academic honesty, a summary of the matter shall be forwarded to the responsible Faculty committee, which shall arrange a hearing of the matter, to which the student and the faculty member will be invited.

If it is decided that sufficient grounds exist to proceed with a formal charge of academic misconduct and the student does not admit to this alleged breach of academic honesty, a formal charge shall be prepared and submitted to the responsible Faculty committee. The charge shall contain a full, but concise, statement of the facts as perceived by the complainant and be accompanied by all available supporting evidence. The person chairing the exploratory meeting at the unit level will forward the documents contemplated in items iii and iv above and this section to the responsible Faculty committee.

3.6 Formal Hearing at the Faculty Level

3.6.1 The responsible Faculty shall give each party a written copy of the charge, a copy of the materials submitted by the faculty member which includes a summary of the evidence, a copy of the procedures to be followed and not less than twenty-one calendar days' written notice of the time and location of the hearing. If the student wishes to file a written response to the charge, it must be received within fourteen calendar days of the date on which the charge was sent to the student. The Faculty will send a copy of the student's response to the charge to the faculty member and unit level representative(s) concerned. Both parties must inform the committee of their intention to call witnesses and file names of these witnesses at least seven calendar days prior to the hearing.

3.6.2 Prior to the hearing, if a student acknowledges the accuracy of the charges, the student may waive the right to a hearing by submitting a written statement that both admits guilt and waives the right to a hearing.

- i) In this statement, the student may make submissions as to appropriate penalty and give reasons. If the faculty member submitting the charge concurs with the penalty recommendation of the student, a jointly signed submission will be forwarded to the responsible Faculty committee. In such cases, the agreed-upon penalty shall not exceed failure in the course. Should the Faculty Committee find that some other penalty would be more appropriate, it shall arrange for a hearing of the matter, to which the student and faculty member will be invited.

- ii) If the faculty member and student do not agree on a recommended penalty, individual submissions as to penalty shall be made by the student and faculty member to the responsible Faculty committee, which shall arrange a hearing of the matter, to which the student and faculty member will be invited.

3.6.3 Only the committee members, a recording secretary, the case presenter, the student, each party's representative(s) / adviser(s) (who may be lawyers), and the witnesses may be present at a hearing. Committee members shall be at "arms length" from the student charged with a breach of academic honesty. Committee members are not at "arms length" if they have had a significant personal or professional relationship with the student charged. Witnesses shall be present at the hearing only while testifying. Exceptions to this policy may be made at the discretion of the committee. The committee shall arrange for a recording secretary to take notes of the hearing. A record prepared from these notes will constitute the official record of the proceedings. Parties may, if they wish, arrange for their own written record of the hearing to be taken. The Chair of the committee has full authority to assure an orderly and expeditious hearing. Any person who disrupts a hearing, or who fails to adhere

to the rulings of the committee may be required to leave.

- 3.6.4 The committee shall consider the facts and circumstances of the case and determine whether there has been a breach of academic honesty. If a finding of academic misconduct is determined, the committee shall hear submissions as to the appropriate penalty and then decide the penalty.
- 3.6.5 If a student fails to appear at a hearing after proper notice, the hearing may proceed, a decision may be made and sanctions may be imposed, unless the student can establish, in advance of the hearing and to the satisfaction of the committee, that there are circumstances beyond her or his control which make an appearance impossible or unfairly burdensome.
- 3.6.6 Parties must be allowed a full and fair opportunity to present their evidence and to respond to the evidence presented against them. Parties are allowed to cross-examine each other's witnesses in matters related to the charge. The committee has the discretion to make rulings as to admissibility of evidence or the suitability of cross-examination. The committee is not bound by formal rules of evidence applicable in courts of law.
- 3.6.7 When the parties have presented all available relevant evidence and witnesses, each party may present a final argument. Following this the parties shall be excused without further discussion. The committee shall then enter into closed session to determine whether a breach of academic honesty has occurred. A finding of academic misconduct supported by a majority of committee members shall be binding.
- 3.6.8 If the committee does not render a finding of academic misconduct, all records of the charge and hearing will be held by the student's home Faculty until such time as appeals procedures are exhausted or abandoned. Thereafter, a record consisting of the complaint and the decision letter will be placed in a confidential file retained in the Dean's Office of the student's home Faculty.
- 3.6.9 Following a finding of academic misconduct, the committee shall next allow both parties to make a presentation as to suitable penalty. At this point the committee may be made aware of other academic offences in the student's file. The committee will again enter into closed session and decide upon the sanction. A decision by the majority of the committee to impose a particular penalty shall be binding. The decision of the committee, as described in Item 4.8 of the Senate Policy on Academic Honesty, must be communicated to the parties in writing, delivered by hand or by mail. A record of the offence, the proceedings and the finding will be retained in the Dean's Office of the student's home Faculty, regardless of the severity of the penalty, and be held for a time consistent with the University's records retention guidelines. This record is for internal academic purposes only. A note shall be placed on the Student Information System to bar retroactive withdrawal from the course.
- 3.6.10 If the student is found to have committed a breach of academic honesty in work related to a funded research project, the Vice President Academic shall be notified and the Vice President or a designate shall determine whether to notify the granting agency.
- 3.6.11 If a student from another institution enrolled in a joint program or attending York on Letter of Permission is found to have committed a breach of academic honesty, notice of the Committee's findings will be sent to the other institution.

4. Order of Faculty or Senate Hearings on Academic Honesty

The following indicates the order in which a Faculty or Senate committee should proceed when hearing a charge of breach of academic honesty. The committee may alter the order in the interests of fairness or in cases where multiple students are charged with related offences.

- 4.1 The Chair shall:

- introduce the parties and members of the committee;
- identify the nature of the case and evidence before the committee.

4.2 The presenter's case:

- briefly describe the case to be presented, in an opening statement;
- present support for the charge through oral testimony of complainant and witnesses, and through documentary evidence;
- the student (or her/his representative) may ask questions of each of the presenter's witnesses at the close of that person's testimony;
- committee members normally ask questions at the end of each person's testimony but may interrupt if clarity is required.

4.3 The student's case:

- the student (or her/his representative) shall briefly reply and indicate main arguments in an opening statement;
- present support for her/his case through oral testimony provided by her/himself and witnesses as well as documentary evidence.;
- the presenter may ask questions of each of the student's witnesses at the close of that person's testimony;
- committee members normally ask questions at the end of each person's testimony but may interrupt if clarity is required.

4.4 The presenter shall be allowed to present testimony or other evidence in reply to new issues raised in the student's case which were not raised in the original presentation.

4.5 At any time the committee may require other witnesses or the production of other written or documentary evidence and may, if it sees fit, adjourn the hearing after allowing both parties the opportunity to speak to the adjournment.

4.6 Following the presentation of evidence, the parties are entitled to make closing arguments and to summarize briefly the main points of their cases, but no new evidence may be introduced. This will proceed in the following order: the student (or her/his representative) followed by the presenter.

4.7 The committee will move into closed sessions for deliberations and decision. If there is a finding of academic misconduct, the committee will then consider submissions as to appropriate penalty, then return to closed sessions and decide on the appropriate penalty.

4.8 The written decision of the committee shall include:

- the names of committee members and all who appeared;
- a summary of the cases of the parties;
- the committee's findings of fact, decision and reasons;
- the route of appeal.

Appendix A: Invigilation of Examinations, Policy on

Notes: Approved by CCAS; Approved by Senate: 1989/06/22; Date Effective:1989/06/22

Approval Authority: Senate

Signature: "Malcolm Ransom"

POLICY: INVIGILATION OF EXAMINATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE CHIEF INVIGILATOR

Each Faculty is responsible for providing the Chief Invigilator with a written summary of Faculty regulations, policies or procedures which are to be announced to students prior to the start of an exam or that the Chief Invigilator would need to know in order to answer questions frequently asked by students (e.g. regulations concerning supplemental exams, deferred standing, Senate Policy on Academic Honesty, etc.).

PREPARING FOR THE EXAMINATION

Normally, the Course Director is expected to act as Chief Invigilator for the course's final examination, assisted by instructors teaching or marking in the course, who act as invigilators. In addition, invigilation assistants may be used to aid in seating students, distributing/collecting examination books, insuring no cheating occurs, and, generally, providing any assistance deemed necessary and appropriate by the Chief Invigilator.

The Chief Invigilator is expected to:Ensure that there will be enough invigilators and/or invigilation assistants in the room. The following is recommended as a general guideline. The specific ratio of invigilators to students will be determined by each Faculty.

- Students: 1-25 -- Invigilators Needed: 1
- Students: 26-50 -- Invigilators Needed: 2
- Students:50-100-- Invigilators Needed: 3
- Students:101-200-- Invigilators Needed: 4
- Students:201-250-- Invigilators Needed: 5

Whenever possible, more than one invigilator should be present for an examination. If this is not possible, it is recommended that arrangements be made for a regular check of the exam room by person able to conduct students to the washroom, carry a message to OSP, etc.

If the Course Director/Chief Invigilator is aware of students in the course who may require special examination arrangements (e.g. additional time), please refer them to their home OSP well in advance of the scheduled examination. When special circumstances exist, individual exams can be administered by a Student Programmes Office. (Please note that students enquiring in advance of the examination date about the possibility of receiving deferred standing should be referred to their Student Programmes Office, as they must file a petition.)

As the schedule of exams is very tight there is only < hour between exam slots. As a result, rooms will not be available earlier than 15 minutes before the scheduled start of the exam and must be vacated within 15 minutes of the end of the exam.

The Chief Invigilator is expected to collect question papers, answer booklets, attendance rosters and any other necessary exam materials early enough to be at the examination hall fifteen minutes prior to the beginning of the examination.

The Chief Invigilator should insure that the invigilators and invigilation assistants are familiar with the procedures to be followed at the examination:-for the seating of examinees; attendance sheet sign-in; distribution and collection of question papers and answer booklet; academic dishonesty policy; dismissal procedures at the end of the exam. It is most important that a seating pattern is predetermined and adhered to by all invigilators when seating students in order to minimize cheating.

CONDUCTING THE EXAMINATION

The Chief Invigilator should insure that all Faculty requirements are met at the announcement of academic

