Academic Disciplinary Actions Procedures

Academic disciplinary actions are sanctions and outcomes imposed when any student violates the University Policy on Academic Integrity including cheating, plagiarism and unauthorized assistance.

Statute of Limitations

There is no statute of limitations that precludes course instructors from acting on the discovery of alleged violations either during the semester of enrollment in the course in question or after the course has concluded including after the student(s) has graduated.

Course-Level Review, Decision, and Action

Incidents of alleged violations of the University's Policy on Academic Integrity will be initially reviewed and adjudicated at the course level or the equivalent academic level for projects that involve research or creative inquiry. Investigations may be managed by the course instructor(s) or departmental designee. In all cases involving alleged violations of the University Policy on Academic Integrity, the following procedures apply:

Gathering Information

1. Suspected violations should be investigated within a reasonable timeframe, ideally within one to two weeks of discovering the alleged violation.
2. Instructors should notify the involved student(s) of the alleged violation(s) and provide the student(s) the opportunity to respond in an in person meeting or by phone or videoconference as circumstances warrant.
3. Course instructors may receive information from other individuals (e.g., students, staff, faculty) who possess direct information related to the alleged violation(s) under review. For example, someone may have observed the suspected incident or interacted directly with the involved student(s) before, during, or after the incident in question.
4. When discussing alleged violations with the involved student(s) or witnesses, instructors should avoid revealing the identity of other involved parties
unless it is necessary in order to determine responsibility.

5. If a student does not respond to notification of an alleged violation(s) of the University Policy on Academic Integrity, the matter may be reviewed in their absence by the course instructor after a reasonable period of time. In these circumstances, the course instructor may proceed with determination of responsibility and sanction.

**Determining Responsibility and Course-Level Sanction**

1. The course instructor will decide whether the suspected violation(s) occurred based on available evidence. At this stage, instructors are encouraged to consult with the department's designated Academic Integrity Liaison, department/program head, the college dean's office or the Office of Community Standards and Integrity regarding the nature of the suspected violation(s), the nature of the evidence related to the alleged violation(s), and the range of sanctions under consideration.

2. When assessing responsibility for an academic integrity violation, the course instructor should apply a preponderance of the evidence standard. A preponderance of the evidence means that the course instructor has determined that it is more likely than not that the student has violated the University Policy on Academic Integrity.

3. If the course instructor concludes that the student is responsible for the alleged violation(s), the course instructor should determine a sanction. The most severe sanction that can be assessed at this level of review and action is course failure although the instructors and/or department heads may recommend additional sanctions and/or outcomes for consideration during second-level review, decision, and action.

4. Students who have pending or documented academic disciplinary action may not drop or withdraw from the course in question. In rare circumstances, the course instructor may provide explicit approval to drop the course. Students who drop the course without the proper permission will be manually re-enrolled in the course and further sanction may result.

**Documenting and Reporting the Course-Level Decision**

1. After determining responsibility and sanctions for a violation(s), the
instructor should immediately and in writing via email notify the involved student(s) of the decision. If found responsible, the rationale for the determination of responsibility should be included in that notification. The sanction(s) that the course instructor has assessed should be noted as well. Students should also be informed of the opportunity to request an appeal and the procedures for doing so.

2. All documented violations of the University Policy on Academic Integrity should be reported to the Office of Community Standards and Integrity upon completion of the investigation and student notification. Reports may be submitted using the Academic Integrity Reporting Form.

3. A copy of the email communication to the student should be included with the report. Course instructors are also encouraged to submit all evidence and supporting documentation.

4. Upon receipt of the violation report, the Office of Community Standards and Integrity will notify the following individuals of the course-level decision and action:
   - Head of the student’s home department
   - Associate dean of the student’s home college
   - Academic advisor for the student
   - Head of department in which the course is registered (if different from the student's department)
   - Associate dean of the college in which the course is registered (if different from the student's college)

5. Students will receive official notification that the report has been received from the Office of Community Standards and Integrity. The notification will include an invitation to meet with a process advisor in the Office of Community Standards to discuss the case, review the appeal process, and prepare for second-level review (if needed).

6. In addition to the above notifications, the Office of Community Standards and Integrity will be responsible for coordinating all second-level review, decision, and action and documenting the violation in the student's university conduct record consistent with the university policy on Student Conduct Records Retention and Reporting.

Appeals of Course-Level Action

When a student has received official notification of course-level action from the Office of Community Standards and Integrity, a student has seven calendar days to
request an appeal of course-level action. All requests for appeal must be submitted in writing via email to the Office of Community Standards and Integrity.

The written appeal request must indicate whether the student is appealing the finding of responsibility, the sanction, or both, as well as the basis for the appeal itself. The basis of an appeal will be limited to one or more of the following:

- A gross error in procedural process that materially affected the outcome;
- Inconsistency between the available evidence and the finding(s) of responsibility in the course-level review;
- Stated course-level outcome(s) of failure in the course(s) that was not commensurate with the violation(s) of the University Policy on Academic Integrity for which the student was found responsible; and
- New information, which was not reasonably available at the time of the course-level review, merits re-consideration of the final disposition.

The vice president for student affairs or designee will review the written appeal request and determine whether, in their judgment, the appeal presents an appealable issue that warrants review by an Academic Review Board.

In the event of an appeal, sanctions will normally be held in abeyance pending the outcome of the appeal.

Should the vice president for student affairs or designee determine that sufficient grounds exist for further review, the Academic Review Board will adjudicate the appeal in a hearing with the participation of the course instructor(s) or designee and the involved student, both of whom are required to participate in the proceedings. The purpose of the hearing will be to make a recommendation to the vice provost for education or designee as to whether the course instructor’s initial decision should be upheld, vacated or modified based on a preponderance of the evidence standard. A preponderance of the evidence means that it is more likely than not that student violated the University Policy on Academic Integrity.

The course instructor(s) will be asked to provide all documentation related to the case if not already submitted, including the email to the student documenting the course-level action and supporting evidence related to the violation, to be considered by the Academic Review Board. Appropriate redaction will be made by the Office of Community Standards and Integrity prior to board member review.
Second-Level Review, Decision, and Action

Second-level review is required in the following circumstances:

- Cases in which a student has committed more than one violation of the University Policy on Academic Integrity that has been reported to the Office of Community Standards and Integrity.

- Cases in which a course instructor/student’s department head or designee requests additional action beyond course failure.

Multiple Violation Reports

Second-level review is required in all cases in which a student has committed more than one violation of the University Policy on Academic Integrity that has been reported to the Office of Community Standards and Integrity.

When more than one violation has been reported about a student, the Office of Community Standards and Integrity should notify the head of the student’s home department. The student's department head or designee may recommend appropriate sanctions and/or outcomes given multiple violations of the University Policy on Academic Integrity and document that recommendation in writing via email to the student and the Office of Community Standards and Integrity. The departmental recommendation will then be reviewed by an Academic Review Board in a sanctioning hearing.

If the student's department head or designee declines to recommend a sanction/outcome or outcome, members of the Academic Review Board will recommend a sanction and/or outcome as part of their review in a sanctioning hearing. If the student’s department head or designee declines to recommend a sanction and/or outcome, the student’s department head or designee should document that decision in writing via email to the student.

The Academic Review Board will review the departmental recommendation (if advanced) in a sanctioning hearing in which the involved student will be given the opportunity to participate. The student’s department head or designee and course instructors will also be given the opportunity to participate in the full review. If they opt not to attend the full hearing, they should be available to participate in the
hearing as witnesses. The purpose of the hearing will be to determine whether additional university action beyond the course-level sanctions is warranted given multiple violations of the University Policy on Academic Integrity.

In order for the Academic Review Board to determine an appropriate outcome, the student’s department head or designee and course instructors will be asked to provide all documentation related to the case if not already submitted, including the email to the student documenting the course-level actions and supporting evidence related to the violations, to be considered by the Academic Review Board. Appropriate redaction will be made by the Office of Community Standards and Integrity prior to board member review.

Requests for Additional Sanctions and Outcomes

Second-level review is required in all cases in which a course instructor or a student’s home department requests additional action beyond course failure.

In these circumstances, the course instructor/student’s department head or designee should notify the student in writing via email that additional sanctions and/or outcomes are being requested given the severity of the policy violation. This notification may occur in the initial course-level action notification or in a subsequent communication.

The Academic Review Board will adjudicate the request for additional sanctions and/or outcomes in a sanctioning hearing in which both the party who is requesting the action and the involved student will be given the opportunity to participate. The purpose of the hearing will be to determine whether additional university action beyond course failure is warranted given the nature of the policy violation.

In order for the Academic Review Board to determine an appropriate outcome, the course instructor will be asked to provide all documentation related to the case if not already submitted, including the email to the student documenting the course-level action and supporting evidence related to the violation, to be considered by the Academic Review Board. Appropriate redaction will be made by the Office of Community Standards and Integrity prior to board member review.

Academic Review Board
The Academic Review Board has jurisdiction in the following cases:

- Appeals of a course instructor's course-level decision and action.
- Cases in which a student has committed more than one violation of the University Policy on Academic Integrity that has been reported to the Office of Community Standards and Integrity.
- Cases in which a course instructor/student's department head or designee requests additional action beyond course failure.

**Composition of the Academic Review Board**

Each case presented to the Academic Review Board is heard by two student board members and three faculty board members. The board for any case must include at least one member from the college(s) represented by the parties. When possible, the board for any case must include at least one student member at the same degree level as the student who is appearing before the board. In addition, a trained moderator presides over the hearing.

The faculty board members will be appointed by the Office of Community Standards and Integrity in consultation with Faculty Senate. The student board members will be appointed by the Office of Community Standards and Integrity in consultation with Undergraduate Student Senate and the Graduate Student Assembly following a selection process coordinated by the Office of Community Standards and Integrity. All appointees must complete initial and ongoing training in order to be eligible to serve as board members. Once trained, board members may complete up to three years of service, and board members may be reappointed.

Members participating in a given hearing will be selected from a list of eligible individuals based upon availability and disinterestedness in the case or parties following review by the student who is appearing before the Academic Review Board. The involved course instructor(s), department head or designee, and board members will also have the opportunity to note any potential conflicts of interest. The following circumstances would preclude participation as a board member in a given hearing:

- Individuals with prior substantial knowledge of or interest in the student(s) involved or the case(s) under review
• Individuals who may appropriately be a witness in the case(s)

**Conduct of the Academic Review Board**

The university attempts to ensure fair, timely and orderly procedures in all academic disciplinary actions. To provide for this, the university has adopted the following procedural protections. The following is a list of procedures that govern the Academic Review Board process:

**Hearing Preparation and Scheduling**

1. In advance of the hearing, the members of the Academic Review Board will be provided a pre-read packet, which may include, among other relevant items: the initial academic integrity violation report(s); any supporting documentation related to the violation(s); any departmental recommendations for sanctions and/or outcomes (if applicable); and a statement from the student to the board.

2. The student may submit a written statement and up to three written letters of support by a date specified by the process advisor. Additional information that is relevant to the review including email correspondence and assignment documentation may be submitted by the student. This documentation will be included in the pre-read packet at the discretion of the process advisor.

3. It is the responsibility of the Office of Community Standards and Integrity to ensure that times set for hearings are reasonable and that necessary accommodations have been offered to both the student and course instructor(s) whenever appropriate. In turn, both the student and course instructors(s) will be expected to demonstrate good-faith efforts in their participation with this process, particularly in relation to the scheduling of the hearing. If a case involves exigent circumstances that prevent the student or course instructor(s) from participating in a scheduled hearing, the hearing will be rescheduled.

4. Every effort will be made to avoid conflicts with a student’s class schedule when identifying a hearing date and time. When circumstances warrant, classroom attendance, except for scheduled examinations, will not be a reasonable excuse for delaying a hearing.
Hearing Process and Procedures

1. Information provided during an Academic Review Board hearing must be kept confidential by all parties. The student is provided a full copy of all materials provided to the hearing board for the purpose of preparing for or use during the hearing, consistent with the privacy rights of those involved. These materials are to be kept confidential and may be shared only with permission from the process advisor. These documents may not be duplicated nor utilized for any other purpose. All materials provided to the student must be returned to the process advisor at the conclusion of the hearing.

3. In order to maintain a fair and equitable process, no new materials will be accepted on the day of the hearing, with the exception of (i) oral testimony and (ii) such other evidence as may be necessary to rebut new oral testimony. Evidence offered as rebuttal will be accepted only at the discretion of the moderator.

4. Prior to the hearing, the student, course instructor(s), department head or designee who are participating in the review will be asked if they believe that the potential hearing board members are biased for or against them. If a perceived bias is reasonable, replacements will be chosen for the board and the hearing will be rescheduled.

5. The student has the right to have one person of their choosing present at the hearing. The student is required to notify the process advisor of their support person of choice at a date specified by the process advisor which will be at least three days in advance. If legal counsel will serve in this capacity, the hearing group may determine that it wishes to secure legal advice in connection with the hearing. Legal counsel or any other support person, if present, will not be permitted to participate in the proceedings but may advise the student and/or be present at a hearing. In the event that one party to a case is accompanied by legal counsel without advance notice, a hearing may be postponed until all parties to the case have had an opportunity to have counsel present. Registered support persons are not permitted to participate as witnesses in the same proceedings.

6. Witnesses may be registered for each Academic Review Board hearing by the student, course instructor(s), and department head. Witnesses should be able to provide direct information related to the case(s) under review.
by the Academic Review, such as direct observation of the incident(s) in question and/or direct interaction with any of the parties before, during or after the incident in question. All parties are required to notify the process advisor of their registered witnesses at a date specified by the process advisor which will be at least three days in advance of the Academic Review Board hearing.

7. In scheduling a hearing, consideration should be given to allow that witnesses significant to the case being heard are available to the hearing group. If a witness is not available to be called by the hearing group in person or via telecommunication, they may submit a written statement to the process advisor to be reviewed if the board requests information from the witness. Except in documented extenuating circumstances, students are expected to make a good-faith effort to provide information to the Academic Review Board when called as a witness.

8. It is within the discretion of the board to determine whether they wish to hear from suggested witnesses. Witnesses will be questioned one at a time by the hearing group and subsequently dismissed. They should be present in the room only when providing information to the board.

9. All proceedings, except the deliberation of the board members, will be recorded. Recordings will be kept in accordance with student conduct records retention practices.

10. During the actual hearing, the student has the right to be present during presentation of evidence.

11. Students and course instructors who are participating in a hearing will be limited to ten minutes for introductory statements and five minutes for summary statements following the presentation of evidence.

12. The majority of the proceeding will consist of questioning from the board members for all parties as well as registered witnesses. Students and course instructors will also have the opportunity to present questions for the board's consideration.

13. Following summary statements, the board will enter closed deliberations.

14. In cases that involve appeals of course-level action, no information about
the student's prior violations of the University Policy on Academic Integrity will be shared with the Academic Review Board. If the student has prior violations on record and the course-level action is upheld on appeal, the student may be recalled before the board to discuss the prior violations and sanctions prior to the Academic Review Board making a recommendation for appropriate sanctions and/or outcomes for the present case.

**Hearing Outcome Determination and Notifications**

1. A representative of the Office of Community Standards and Integrity will be responsible for notifying the vice provost for education or designee in writing of the recommendation of the hearing group.

2. The vice provost for education or designee makes the decision in the case, informed by the recommendation of the Academic Review Board. The vice provost for education or designee may accept, reject or modify the recommendation, or may remand the matter to a new Academic Review Board for review.

3. After reviewing the recommendations and rendering a decision, the vice provost for education or designee will notify the student in writing of their decision.

4. The Office of Community Standards and Integrity will send a copy of the final decision letter to the following individuals:
   - Course instructor(s)
   - Head of the student's home department
   - Associate dean of the student's home college
   - Academic advisor for the student
   - Head of department in which the course(s) is housed (if different from the student's department)
   - Associate dean of the college in which the course(s) is housed (if different from the student's college)

5. Parents of a student will not be notified of any academic disciplinary action, except as permitted by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).

6. Academic disciplinary actions will be recorded in the student's
disciplinary record in the Office of Community Standards and Integrity in accordance with student conduct records retention practices. When academic disciplinary actions affect eligibility for enrollment, designation on other university records will be made. Academic disciplinary records will not be released as a part of the official transcript of the academic record of a student.

Appeals of Academic Review Board Decisions

A student may appeal a decision delivered by the vice provost for education or designee following the Academic Review Board process by submitting a request for appeal in writing via email to the provost of the university within seven calendar days of the official notification of the decision.

In cases in which the Academic Review Board decision pertains to an appeal of course-level action, the course instructor may submit a request for appeal in writing to the provost of the university within seven calendar days of the official notification of the decision. In cases in which the Academic Review Board decision pertains to matters that involve multiple violation reports or requests for additional sanctions or outcomes, the course instructor and/or student’s department head or designee may submit a request for appeal in writing to the provost of the university within seven calendar days of the official notification of the decision.

The written appeal request should indicate whether the appeal concerns the finding(s) of responsibility, the outcome(s), or both, as well as the basis for the appeal itself. The basis of an appeal will be limited to one or more of the following cases:

- A gross error in procedural process that materially affected the outcome;
- The sanction(s) and/or outcomes imposed during the second-level review were not commensurate with the violation(s) of the University Policy on Academic Integrity for which the student was found responsible;
- Inconsistency between the available evidence and the finding(s) of responsibility in the course-level action appeal review or second-level review;
- New information, which was not reasonably available at the time of the hearing, merits re-consideration of the final disposition.
The appeal officer designated by the provost will review the written appeal request and determine whether, in the judgment of the appeal officer, the appeal presents an appealable issue that warrants review by the appeal officer. In hearing an appeal, the appeal officer, at their discretion, may meet with individuals and review information relevant to the basis of the appeal.

In the event of an appeal, sanctions and outcomes will normally be held in abeyance pending the outcome of the appeal.

Appeals will be decided by the appeal officer in a timely manner as circumstances warrant. While an appeal is under review, the appeal officer will update the student, course instructor, and department head as necessary about the anticipated timeline.

The appeal officer will require that the dean of the student's college review the case and provide input on the final disposition.

The appeal officer has the authority to accept, vacate or modify the decision as they deem appropriate for resolution of the matter being appealed. The appeal officer may reconvene the initial Academic Review Board or remand the matter to a new Academic Review Board for review.

Sanctions and Outcomes

The academic disciplinary action sanctions and outcomes defined below comprise a range of official actions that may be imposed during second-level review. One or more of these actions may be imposed in response to a given situation. This list is not comprehensive, as other sanctions may be imposed as appropriate.

Non-compliance with sanctions and outcomes may result in further action through the Academic Review Board process.

The determination of sanctions and outcomes will be guided by the following considerations: the interests of the community, the learning and development of the student, the impact of the violation(s), and any mitigating or aggravating circumstances.

**Loss of Privilege:** Students may lose specified privileges, which may include access to facilities, services, and/or the opportunity to participate in university activities.
**Disciplinary Probation:** A student may be placed on disciplinary probation for a designated period of time. Probation may entail specific requirements to be met. When a student is on disciplinary probation, they may be subject to suspension or expulsion in the event of further academic disciplinary action.

**Community Service:** The university may require uncompensated service (a specified number of hours) to the university or an off-campus, non-profit organization as an outcome. The particular assignment of duties must be pre-approved by the process advisor. Students must provide appropriate documentation verifying their completed community service.

**Educational/Developmental Assignment:** The university may require a student to complete a project, assignment, or activity to promote the student’s education and development. These assignments are determined by the Academic Review Board and completion is monitored by the process advisor. Assignments may include but are not limited to: reflection or research paper, development of a presentation, discussion with an individual, apology letter, reading assignment, etc.

**Behavioral Assessments and Recommendations:** The university may require a student to meet with a health care provider and/or a mental health care provider within a specified time frame. If so, the student will be expected to fully participate in any relevant assessment requested by the provider and complete any consequent recommendation(s), such as a treatment plan or a referral to another provider. The student is also expected to provide the appropriate releases to allow the university to confirm compliance with this outcome.

**Academic Disciplinary Suspension:** A student may be barred from enrollment for a designated period of time. Students who have been suspended are required to absent themselves from the campus (including university housing, fraternity or sorority houses, offices, labs, and libraries) within a maximum of two days after the action and to remain off the campus for the duration of the time specified as outlined in the [University Policy on Student Suspension/Required Withdrawal](#). A student on academic disciplinary suspension is not eligible for student employment by the university during the period of suspension.

**Drop from Academic Program:** The student is required to sever entirely their connection with the academic program in which they are currently enrolled. Students who have been dropped from an academic program may apply for admission to other academic programs at the university.
**Expulsion:** The student is required to sever entirely their connection with the university. Students who have been expelled are required to absent themselves from the campus (including university housing, fraternity or sorority houses, offices, labs, and libraries) within a maximum of two days after the action and to remain off of the campus permanently, unless otherwise specified. Students who have been expelled from the university may not apply for admission to other academic programs at the university.

**Withholding a Degree:** The dean of students or designee may direct that a degree not be certified by the university registrar and therefore not awarded pending the resolution of university academic disciplinary action proceedings, including completion of all sanctions and outcomes.

**Important Definitions**

**Academic Advisor:** The individual designated in SIO/S3 as the primary major academic advisor. The Academic Advisor may be designated by the department to disseminate relevant correspondence related to academic disciplinary action within the department according to departmental procedure.

**Academic Disciplinary Action:** Academic disciplinary actions are sanctions and outcomes imposed for violations of the University Policy on Academic Integrity including cheating, plagiarism, and unauthorized assistance.

**Academic Integrity Liaison:** Each department designates an individual who is trained by the Office of Community Standards and Integrity to provide guidance to course instructors in cases of alleged violations of the University Policy on Academic Integrity. Absent a departmental designation, the associate dean of the college in which the course is housed is the default liaison for consultation purposes.

**Course Failure:** A grade of “R” as outlined in the University Policy on Grading.

**Course Instructor:** Any person responsible for the instruction or grading of a course at the university as documented in the Schedule of Classes.

**Department Head:** The university faculty or staff member who leads an academic department. In academic disciplinary cases in which the home department is an academic program, the program director is considered to be the department head.
Email: The official Carnegie Mellon University email address designated in the university directory.

Moderator: The Student Affairs staff member who facilitates an Academic Review Board hearing. Moderators are appointed and trained by the Office of Community Standards and Integrity. The hearing runs at their discretion according to process guidelines.

Process Advisor: As a staff member in the Office of Community Standards and Integrity, the Process Advisor is responsible for the logistics of convening an Academic Review Board. The Process Advisor schedules the hearing, assembles the hearing board, informs the involved parties of the procedures for the hearing, and manages other administrative tasks.

Student: Any person registered for, enrolled in, or auditing any course(s) at Carnegie Mellon University at the time of the alleged violation. An individual is also considered to be a student if they have been accepted for admission to the university but are not currently matriculating. Examples include, but are not limited to, students who are enrolled but not taking classes due to an academic break, medical leave, suspension, or other personal leave; students who were enrolled at the time of the incident; persons who demonstrate an intent to enroll by registering for courses; and students participating in study abroad programs. Because there is no statute of limitations for academic integrity violations and proceedings can be commenced after a student has left the university or graduated, “student” also includes former students.

Student's Home College: The college designated in SIO/S3 as the student’s department of enrollment.

Student's Home Department: The department designated in SIO/S3 as the student’s department of enrollment.

Support Person: A person of the student’s choosing who accompanies the student during the Academic Review Board hearing. The support person does not participate in the proceedings but may advise the student and/or be present at a hearing. Registered support persons are not permitted to participate as witnesses in the same proceedings.