

9-1-2018

Academic Honor Code

Saint Mary's College of California

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.stmarys-ca.edu/undergrad-handbook>

Recommended Citation

Saint Mary's College of California (2018) "Academic Honor Code," *Student Handbook*: Vol. 2018 , Article 51.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.stmarys-ca.edu/undergrad-handbook/vol2018/iss1/51>

This Main Text is brought to you for free and open access by the SMC Handbooks at Saint Mary's Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Handbook by an authorized editor of Saint Mary's Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@stmarys-ca.edu.

Saint Mary's College Academic Honor Code

Saint Mary's College expects every member of its community to promote and abide by ethical standards, both in conduct and exercise of responsibility towards other members of the community. Academic Honesty must be demonstrated at all times to maintain the integrity of scholarship and the reputation of the College. Academic dishonesty is a serious violation of College policy because, among other things, it undermines the bonds of trust and honesty between

members of the community and betrays those who may eventually depend upon the College's academic integrity and knowledge.

As an expression of support for academic integrity throughout the Saint Mary's learning community and as an administrative tool to discourage academic dishonesty, Saint Mary's has implemented an Academic Honor Code. The Academic Honor Code has been approved by the Student Involvement and Leadership (SIL) Student Body, the Faculty Academic Senate, the Provost and the President of Saint Mary's College.

Pledge

All students, whether undergraduate or graduate, agree to the following pledge, the Academic Honor Code, by accepting their admittance to the College and not having read the Code is not an excuse for violating it. The pledge reads as follows:

As a student member of an academic community based in mutual trust and responsibility, I pledge:

- To do my own work at all times, without giving or receiving inappropriate aid;
- To avoid behaviors that unfairly impede the academic progress of other members of my community; and
- To take reasonable and responsible action in order to uphold my community's academic integrity.

Principles of Action

Confidentiality

All student information generated in connection with the Code and its implementation are education records of the student(s) involved and cannot be discussed or disclosed (or redisclosed) other than on an educational need-to-know basis or with the student(s)'s prior written and dated consent. This principle applies to all involved parties, including any faculty, staff, other students, and all Council members.

Individual Responsibility

It is the responsibility of every student and faculty member of the College community to know and practice the tenets of the Academic Honor Code. If there is confusion over the appropriateness of a particular action in light of the Code, or if a community member has recommendations about how to amend or alter the Code, those questions and suggestions should be addressed to the Academic Honor Council through the Academic Honor Code Coordinator, or to the program director or dean for adult and graduate programs. Community Responsibility In addition to maintaining one's own academic integrity, each member of the academic community should strive to preserve and promote integrity among his/her peers. This community empowers its members to take appropriate action in support of the Academic Honor Code. If a student, faculty member, staff member, or administrator suspects a violation of the Academic Honor Code, he or she should take action consistent with the Academic Honor Code Procedures described below. Additional possible actions include:

- Actively encouraging academic integrity among one's peers.
- Using moral suasion to avert a peer's academic dishonesty.
- Alerting a faculty member to suspected violations of academic integrity.
- Educating one another regarding the responsibilities of academic integrity.
- Helping a faculty member maintain an environment that is conducive to integrity.

Violations

All violations of the Academic Honor Code are administered by the Academic Honor Council (AHC). Members of the academic community are presumed to be familiar with the procedures outlined for determining a violation of the Academic Honor Code and, therefore, ignorance of the Code is not available as an excuse for an alleged violation of it. Forms of violations of the Academic Honor Code include, but are not restricted to:

In Examinations

Unauthorized talking during an exam; use of “cheat sheets” or other unauthorized course materials during an exam; having someone other than the student registered in the course take an exam; copying from another student’s work; giving assistance to another student without the instructor’s approval; gaining access to an exam prior to its administration; informing students in other course sections of the contents of an exam; preparing answer sheets or books in advance of an exam without authorization from the instructor; unauthorized collaboration on a take-home exam; altering another person’s answers in the preparation, editing, or typing of an exam; bringing unauthorized materials into an exam room.

On Papers and Class Assignments (understood as all work assigned in a course)

Submitting work prepared by someone else as one’s own; using the thesis or primary ideas of someone else, even if those ideas have been edited or paraphrased, without proper citation; plagiarizing words, phrases, sections, key terms, proofs, graphics, symbols, or original ideas from another source without appropriate citation; receiving unauthorized assistance in preparing papers, whether from classmates, peers, family members, or other members of this or any other College community; collaboration within a class or across sections of a class without the consent of the instructor; preparing all or part of a paper for another student; intentional failure to cite a source that was used in preparing the paper; citing sources that were not used or consulted to “pad” a bibliography; citing sources out of another’s bibliography without having consulted those sources; re-using previous work without the consent of the current instructor; providing a paper to another student for any purpose other than peer editing or review; using unapproved sources in preparing a paper; lying to an instructor to circumvent grade penalties; interference with access to classrooms, computers, or other academic resources.

In Research

Fabricating or falsifying data in any academic exercise, including labs or fieldwork; using material out of context to inappropriately support one’s claims; sabotaging another person’s research; using another researcher’s ideas without proper citation; taking credit for someone else’s work; hoarding materials and/or equipment to advance one’s research at the expense of others.

In the Use of Academic Resources

Destruction, theft, or unauthorized use of laboratory data, research materials (including samples, chemicals, lab animals, printed materials, software, computer technology, audiovisual materials, etc.); stealing or damaging materials from the library or other College facilities; not returning materials when asked to do so; appropriating materials needed by others such that their work is impeded; helping others to steal, hoard, destroy, or damage materials.

In Academic Records

Changing a transcript or grade in any unauthorized way; forging signatures on College documents; willful public misrepresentation of achievements, whether academic, athletic, honorary, or extracurricular; falsifying letters of recommendation to or from college personnel; bribing any

representative of the College to gain academic advantage; breaking confidentiality about the 111 proceedings of the Academic Honor Council, an Academic Review Board, or an investigative committee in the adult and graduate programs.

In Community Participation

Engaging in conduct that, if found to have occurred, violates the College's Technology Use and Whistleblower policies.

These types of conduct constitute violations of the Academic Honor Code and will be considered, if determined to have occurred, as acts of academic dishonesty. Any conduct that represents falsely one's own performance or interferes with that of another is academic dishonesty. Academic dishonesty is distinguished from academic inadvertence. The Academic Honor Council or the dean or program director for adult and graduate programs, receives and considers all reports of conduct that is alleged to be a violation of the Code and, thereafter, decides whether the alleged conduct, if determined to have occurred, constitutes academic dishonesty or academic inadvertence, which involves an act that might appear to be a violation of the Academic Honor Code, but is determined during the Review Board process not to be. In cases of academic inadvertence, no charge of academic dishonesty is made and the student is referred to the instructor for appropriate resolution. The Academic Honor Code is not intended to impede or inhibit the free exchange of ideas and collaborative learning which are hallmarks of a Saint Mary's education. The College supports and encourages cooperative learning, group projects, tutoring, mentoring, or other forms of interchange of ideas among students and faculty, one of the most important benefits of academic life.

Oversight and Sanctions

The procedures for the administration of the Academic Honor Code, the determination of violations, and the imposition of sanctions are overseen by the Academic Honor Council (AHC).

Oversight: Academic Honor Council

Council Membership

The AHC consists of a minimum of sixteen student members and six faculty members as specified below. These members share special responsibility for the dissemination and implementation of the Academic Honor Code on campus:

- 6 students: Two students from each of the traditional undergraduate schools at the College (Economics and Business Administration, Liberal Arts, and Science). These representatives are appointed for a term of at least two years on a biannual basis by the Academic Honor Council.
- 4 students: One student from each program that takes special responsibility for community education on academic integrity (Advising, Athletics, Collegiate Seminar, and Composition). These representatives are appointed for a term of at least two years on a biannual basis by the Academic Honor Council.
- 6 or more students: A minimum of six students will be appointed as members-at-large. These representatives are appointed for a term of at least two years on a biannual basis by the Academic Honor Council. 112
- 6 or more faculty members: A minimum of six faculty members of the traditional undergraduate college. These representatives are appointed by the Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Programs for a term of two years; service may be extended with the approval of the vice provost.

Rotation Process

In order to facilitate consistency in the processes of review and policy formation, representatives are appointed using a system of rotation as needed to meet the membership requirements above.

Responsibilities of the Academic Honor Council (“AHC”): The responsibilities of the AHC include, but are not limited to, the following:

- To select from its membership a student Chair, or Co-Chairs, who will oversee the operations of the AHC for one year.
- To review and revise the Academic Honor Code as necessary, offering recommendations for changes to the Code to the Admissions and Academic Regulations Committee of the Educational Policies Board.
- To serve in an advisory capacity for the College community in understanding and interpreting the Code.
- To promote and maintain the Code, primarily through community education via publications, workshops, forums, and community events.
- To create and facilitate a non-credit seminar on academic integrity to be taken by students who are in violation of the Code.
- To constitute Review Boards from among its membership to consider alleged violations of the Code.
- Through its Chair or Co-Chairs to consider requests for the removal of “XF” grades and to be a Review Board as a whole for petitions of reconsideration brought forward by the Chair or Co-Chairs.
- To provide an annual report (maintaining appropriate confidentiality) for the Educational Policies Board and the Student Senate reviewing the AHC’s activities for the year.

Coordinator of the AHC

In addition to the members of the Academic Honor Council, there is a staff Coordinator who is part of the staff of the Office of Academic Affairs. The Coordinator’s responsibilities are: to serve as “first contact” for a party who wishes to register a concern; to maintain office hours during which community members may file concerns, seek advice, obtain written materials relevant to the Academic Honor Code; to update written materials and information as per the instructions of the AHC; to distribute materials to appropriate parties during student orientation and at the beginning of new academic terms; to function as a “neutral party” in organizing and scheduling reviews by the AHC; to contact all involved parties and inform them of their rights and responsibilities in the process of pursuing a concern; to assign Advisors at the earliest possible time; to compile brief case inventories on concerns that are raised; and to schedule and book meetings of the Academic Honor Council at large, and to coordinate with the Chair of the AHC the constitution and meetings of Honor Review Boards. 113

A reported student has 5 business days to contact the AHC coordinator to discuss their options. After the 5-day period, the student has 24 hours to inform the AHC coordinator of their decision of whether they want to go forward with a review board or sign a No-Contest Resolution. If there is no contact within the specified time frame, an immediate XF grade will be assigned to the student’s academic transcript for the course in question.

Honor Review Boards

In cases when a violation of the Academic Honor Code is not handled through the channels of No-Contest Resolution, the Chair(s) of the AHC designate the case for review and establish an Honor

Review Board comprised of members of the AHC. If there are two or more pending cases, the reported student is given the option to decide whether or not they want their review boards to consist of the same AHC members. The pending review boards are not allowed to be scheduled on the same day. If the student chooses to not make this decision it is at the discretion of the Co-Chairs, to decide whether or not the board consists of all the same members.

The Honor Review Board consists of eight members of the AHC as follows:

Five voting members comprised of four student representatives and one faculty representative, one non-voting Facilitator, and two non-voting Advisors. The appropriate sanction is decided by the majority vote of the five voting members. The non-voting Facilitator serves as the neutral presiding officer of the review.

The two non-voting Advisors, one assisting the party who brought forth the charge and one assisting the alleged violator(s), must be currently enrolled students at the College and members of the AHC. The role of the Advisor is to help the respective parties in their understanding of the Academic Honor Code, provide confidential guidance, assist in preparing the respective parties for the Honor Review Board process, aid the parties in understanding the decisions of the Honor Review Board, and inform the parties of processes for petition for reconsideration. At no time during the review does an Advisor formally represent the party in the hearing or speak on his/her behalf; rather, each party is expected to speak for him- or herself.

Sanctions

Standard Sanction: Assignment of an "XF" Grade

For violations pertaining to a course, the standard sanction upon a student who commits a violation of the Academic Honor Code is the assignment of an "XF" grade in the course.

- **First Violation Standard Sanction:** Assignment of an XF grade.
- **Second Violation Standard Sanction:** Semester Suspension. The standard sanction for a second violation is a semester-long suspension from the College. Timing of the suspension is to be determined by the review board that reviews the individual case.
- **Third Violation Standard Sanction:** Expulsion. The standard sanction for a third violation is immediate expulsion from the College.

For violations that do not pertain to a course, the sanction is determined by the Honor Review Board hearing the case. The "XF" grade indicates failure in the course, and that the course failure was the result of a violation of the Academic Honor Code. A notation will be included in the 114 student's transcript indicating the meaning of the grade. For the purposes of computing grade point average and class standing, the "XF" will be treated as an "F."

In addition to the notation on the student's transcript, an "XF" grade disqualifies a student from representing the College as the leader of an approved extracurricular activity, or as a member of an athletic or scholarly team that is sponsored by the College. Students with "XF" grades will be eliminated from consideration for departmental or College awards and honors. No student with a standing "XF" grade may be a member of the Academic Honor Council.

Through a letter filed with the AHC Coordinator, a student may petition the Academic Honor Council to remove an "XF" grade in the semester following its assignment. A successful petition will result in the replacement of the "XF" with the grade of "F" and the removal of the notation from the

student's transcript. Such a petition will be considered if the student has completed a non-credit seminar on academic integrity (administered by the Academic Honor Council) and has avoided any further violation of the Academic Honor Code. The decision to remove an "XF" grade resides with the Co-Chair(s) of the Academic Honor Council and is not guaranteed merely with completion of the seminar on academic integrity. A letter reflecting the violation, the sanction, and the removal of the "XF" grade remains in the student file held in the Office of the Registrar.

Alternative Sanctions

That the assignment of an "XF" grade is the standard sanction for violations that pertain to coursework does not preclude the right of the Honor Review Board to assign an alternative sanction, one that is either harsher or more lenient. The rationale for an alternative sanction other than the standard is the nature of the offense and not the status or identity of the offender. The community member who brings forth the charge against the alleged violator may recommend a particular sanction to the Honor Review Board, but the assignment of the sanction rests with the board.

Alternative sanctions include but are not limited to:

- Reprimand by the AHC, with a letter placed in the student's permanent file in the Registrar's office.
- Community service requirements, either to the College or to a selected community agency consistent with the offense committed.
- Community education requirements, including participation in the development of workshops, displays, bulletin boards, testimonials, brochures, or College forums.
- Attendance of a non-credit seminar on academic integrity.
- Academic or extracurricular probation.
- Loss of privileges for College leadership or athletic participation.
- Removal from the course, with alternate plans for completing it.
- Failure of the assignment.
- Failure of the course.
- Modified "XF" grade, with no limitation on extracurricular activities.
- Suspension from the College at the end of the term.
- Immediate suspension from the College.
- Expulsion from the College.
- Withholding of a degree, even in cases where all College requirements have been met.
- Revocation of a degree already received.

Procedures for Suspected Violations

The procedure to be followed in any suspected violation of the Academic Honor Code for traditional undergraduate students will follow four, and, in certain instances (as specified, below), a fifth step.

If a student or staff member wishes to report conduct that might constitute a violation of the Code, then he/she has two options:

- Refer the matter to the relevant faculty member, or
- Refer the matter to the Academic Honor Council through the AHC Coordinator (Step Four).

Step One: Initial Discussion

If a faculty member, staff or student becomes aware of conduct that might constitute a violation of the Code, then he/she should first discuss the conduct with the suspected violator. This discussion

might include asking the suspected violator(s) to explain the situation or confronting them with relevant information about the suspected conduct. The possible outcomes are:

- If the suspecting party concludes that no violation has occurred, then the matter will be dropped.
- If the discussion results in confirmation by both parties that a violation has occurred, then the student can request a No-Contest Resolution through the AHC Coordinator or an Honor Review Board through the AHC Coordinator.
- If the discussion results in lack of confirmation by both parties that a violation has occurred, then the faculty member refers the case for review by an Honor Review Board through the AHC Coordinator (Step Four).

Step Two: Meeting with the AHC Coordinator

After a violation of the AHC code has been found the case is referred to the Coordinator of the AHC. When a suspected of a violation of the Code is referred to the Coordinator, the reported student has two options to resolve the issue.

1. No-Contest Resolution (Step Three)
2. Academic Honor Review Board (Step Four)

After initially meeting with the AHC Coordinator the student has five business days to contact the AHC Coordinator to discuss their options. After the 5-day period, the student has 24 hours to inform the AHC coordinator of their decision of whether they want to go forward with a review board or sign a no-contest resolution. If there is no contact within the specified time frame, an immediate XF will be given. 116

Step Three: No-Contest Resolution

The No-Contest Resolution process is an option in cases when the following five conditions are met: 1) neither party contests that the conduct has occurred; 2) the nature of the violation caused by the conduct is clear; 3) the violation is course-related, 4) both parties agree to the standard sanction for the admitted violation and, 5.) if it is the first violation

In No-Contest Resolution, the standard sanction of “XF” is applied. To provide fairness in its application, the AHC Coordinator is witness to the No-Contest Resolution process.

Step Four: Honor Review Board

In the absence of a No-Contest Resolution, the case is referred through the AHC Coordinator to an Honor Review Board for review and determination.

Preparation. The AHC Coordinator informs the Co-chairs of the AHC of the need to convene an Honor Review Board. Once the Co-chairs have established the Honor Review Board for a case, it will hold a review hearing. The hearing is a closed and confidential meeting with the person raising the concern, the alleged violator(s), and any witnesses who have relevant information that either party wishes to include in the proceedings. Prior to the review hearing, the Facilitator will provide a list of witnesses and relevant information to both the person raising the concern and the alleged violator(s).

Confidentiality. All of the testimony and relevant information from the review hearing will be kept in confidence, in accordance with the College policy and to protect the privacy of the student(s) involved under Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (“FERPA”). Failure to maintain the

confidentiality of the matters and/or the student's privacy of the student(s) involved will result in a separate and independent charge of Code violation. No lawyers or lawyers' representatives (e.g. paralegals) representing the involved parties or family members of either party may be present during the review process or the deliberations of the Honor Review Board.

Multiple Alleged Violators. In the case of multiple alleged violators in closely related cases, one Honor Review Board will hear all testimony and evidence. The Facilitator has the discretion to hold one review for all students concerned subject to receipt of the prior written and dated consent of the student(s) involved, or separate reviews for each alleged violator. Reviews will be closed to all other persons unless all parties concerned consent in writing to an open review.

The Review Hearing. The Coordinator's office determines sets and coordinates the time and place for the review hearing, as well as its structure and flow. Each party has the opportunity to present his/her position and offer relevant information and testimony, including of witnesses, to support their respective positions. Members of the Honor Review Board may forward questions during any phase of the review with the permission of the Facilitator.

Deliberation and Decision. Upon hearing all arguments, the Honor Review Board meets privately to deliberate and make its decision. A valid decision constitutes a simple majority arriving at a common conclusion as to whether a violation "more likely than not" occurred. In the event of a split or tied vote, the case will be referred to the full body of the AHC for deliberation and decision. Within 48 hours of the close of deliberations, the Student Advisors and/or Facilitator of the Honor Review Board informs both parties about the decision and sanction, either through written 117 notification or in person, depending upon the request of the parties involved preference. Notwithstanding this notice requirement, failure to inform both parties of the decision and sanction within 48 hours does not constitute a material procedural irregularity.

Removal of a Board Member. Any member of the Board who has a conflict of interest or bias or whose participation would give rise to the appearance of bias or conflict of interest must recue him or herself from the deliberation and decision process. If during the review hearing or the deliberations the Facilitator detects a bias that may interfere with the impartial consideration of information by any voting member of the Honor Review Board and that may significantly affect the outcome of the Board's decision, the Facilitator must remove that representative from the Review Board immediately. Review and deliberations will continue with the remaining members.

Ad Hoc Review Boards. In the event that a review is necessary outside of the confines of the regular academic calendar (in the summer or over Christmas break, for example), then the Academic Vice Provost may convene a special ad hoc Honor Review Board consisting of two students and one faculty member. If possible, those representatives should be current or former members of the Academic Honor Council, but the Academic Vice Provost may exercise the right to appoint other representatives as necessary.

Step Five: Petition to Reconsider

Grounds for Reconsideration. Except as permitted below, the decision of the Honor Review Board is final (whether it is the product of a regular or ad hoc review board), and will be reported to the Academic Honor Council as well as to the Registrar's office. The decision may be reconsidered only if: 1) new information not available at the time of the deliberation and Board's decision can be offered for consideration, 2) one or more parties can provide information that supports an allegation that there was a failure to follow procedure that materially affected the decision of the

board, or 3) the sanction applied goes beyond the standard sanction. If the case is not subject to reconsideration, then the matter ends at this step.

Reconsideration: If a student that has been found in violation of the honor code chooses to submit a request for reconsideration, that person has 5 business days starting the day after their decision has been made by the review board to turn in their request in writing to the coordinator. School holiday breaks do not count as business days (as defined in the student handbook). If they do not turn it in within the designated time frame, the request will be rejected.

Any petition for reconsideration of a decision by the Honor Review Board is filed with the AHC Coordinator, who informs the Co-Chairs of the Academic Honor Council. The Co-Chairs determine whether or not the information and reasons offered support the request for reconsideration (based on the above criteria). If the Co-Chairs deem that the information offered is sufficient to support reconsideration of the case, then it is brought before the full body of the Academic Honor Council. The Council rehears the case, taking into account the new information and/or material procedural irregularity that have been established.

The Co-Chairs present the original case (in brief), the board's decision, and the stated grounds of the petition to the AHC. The AHC may, in its sole discretion, rely on existing written information or call for new information and/or testimony as needed to allow a full and fair consideration of the petition. If the AHC disagrees with the decision of the Honor Review Board, then a new decision may be reached by the entire Academic Honor Council by a majority vote of those present. The Co-Chairs will be excluded from the initial vote and will only vote in the case of a tie. If the AHC upholds the decision of the Honor Review Board, then the case will be closed. In either situation, the decision of the Academic Honor Council is final.

Final Responsibility

Saint Mary's, through its designated officers, faculty and/or employees is solely charged with and responsible for interpreting and applying the Academic Honor Code. In exercising that responsibility, the College chooses to give students a distinct and significant role in designing the Code, hearing cases, recommending sanctions, and educating the campus community about the importance of academic integrity. This student participation, however, in no way prevents Saint Mary's from exercising its sole discretion, without prior notice, in interpreting, implementing and/or amending these policies and procedures.

Turnitin® Policies and Procedures

Saint Mary's College uses the Turnitin service. The following policies apply to students: Turnitin is integrated into the Saint Mary's learning management system (Moodle) as a course activity, where faculty set up links for students to submit written work.

- Any student requested to do so by his/her instructor must submit written work to a specified Turnitin link within Moodle.
- All students enrolled in a Collegiate Seminar course or in English 003, 004, or 005 are required to submit their final versions of all essay assignments within the Moodle courses Turnitin link.

Turnitin Directions for students may be found here:

https://guides.turnitin.com/03_Integrations/Turnitin_Partner_Integrations/Moodle/03_Moodle_Direct_V2/03_Students

- If students need assistance using Turnitin, they can visit the Tech Bar located on the first floor of the library, or contact the IT Service Desk: servicedesk@stmarys-ca.edu or (925) 631-4266.

Academic Appeal Process

The Committee on Academic Appeals is a faculty/student committee which hears appeals from undergraduate students regarding decisions concerning academic regulations and standards affecting them individually. A standing committee, it is convened and chaired by the Vice Provost of Undergraduate Academics, at the request of the student:

- To hear appeals regarding decisions of the Dean of the School or of the Registrar (and approved by the Dean of the School) concerning courses, standards, academic regulations and requirements for graduation;
- To hear appeals regarding grades given by instructors.

The Committee consists of up to ten members:

- Vice Provost of Undergraduate Academics (ex officio and nonvoting)
- three ranked faculty members appointed by the Chair of the Committee on Committees;
- three ranked alternates (but also including Christian Brothers currently teaching at the College), one each from the Schools of Liberal Arts, Science, and Economics and Business Administration, appointed by the Vice Provost of Undergraduate Academics;
- four students appointed by the AS President for one-year, renewable terms and confirmed by the Executive Council of that group.

Procedures

1. When the student expects to appeal a decision by the Dean of his/her School and/or the Registrar, or to appeal a grade given by an instructor (see 1 and 2 above), the student must file a notification to that effect with the Vice Provost of Undergraduate Academics within one month from the beginning of the next long term.
2. The student is normally expected first to take his/her appeal to the instructor or administrator involved. If the student is not satisfied with the outcome, he/she should next take the appeal to the department chairperson or to the appropriate academic administrator.
3. If the matter is not resolved in step 2, the student will file a written statement of appeal with the Vice Provost of Undergraduate Academics. The Vice Provost will notify the appropriate instructor, department chairperson, and the School Dean that an appeal has been filed.
4. If the student decides not to pursue the appeal, he/she must advise the Vice Provost of Undergraduate Academics that the notification and/or statement of appeal be withdrawn.
5. The appeal must be brought to the Committee on Academic Appeals before one long term has elapsed since the term in which the cause for appeal occurred.
6. The Committee will not consider an appeal until and unless all the above avenues of informal resolution have been pursued.
7. The Vice Provost of Undergraduate Academics serves as the nonvoting Chair for each appeal hearing. Representatives of the two principals (a faculty member chosen by the student—a

Christian Brother on staff may also serve this role—and a ranked faculty member chosen by the other principal, or in the case of an appeal of a decision by the Registrar's Office, a representative of that office not involved in the original decision) will present to the Committee the respective arguments of the two principals whom they represent. The two principals do not attend the meeting unless requested to do so by the Committee.

8. Minutes of the proceedings will be taken and kept on file in the Office of Academic Affairs. All proceedings and correspondence, and the minutes are confidential and will not be maintained in the student's permanent academic record.

9. In hearing an appeal, the Committee has authority to:

- a. set time limits on presentation by representatives of the two principals;
- b. request written statements from the principals, if necessary;
- c. determines if the principals are to appear before it;
- d. consider during its deliberations all documents and any records considered by the initiating instructor or administrator; oral and/or written argument of both principals; additional evidence the Committee deems appropriate.

10. The Committee, upon reaching a majority decision, has the authority in the individual case to instruct the Registrar to waive an academic regulation or requirement, make an exception to an academic standard, or to change a grade.

11. The Vice Provost of Undergraduate Academics gives written notification of the Committee's decisions to the principals.