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Academic Integrity at UW-Madison

“The value of a University of Wisconsin-Madison degree depends on the commitment of our academic community to promote high levels of personal honesty and respect for the intellectual property of others.”

Introduction

The Dean of Students Office continues to focus on academic integrity from the standpoint of both intervention, when a student commits academic misconduct, and prevention, educating faculty, staff and TA’s about this issue. During the 2011 to 2012 academic year, many presentations were made to faculty, staff and students, the academic integrity website was greatly improved, and a survey was sent to all faculty. The following end of the year report outlines these efforts, compiles misconduct incidents and shares results of the faculty assessment.

Website Features and Resources

Information for Students:
- How can I avoid academic misconduct?
- What happens if I engage in academic misconduct?
- What should I do if I know a classmate is cheating?
- Academic Integrity Quiz
- Examples of academic misconduct

Information for Faculty and Staff:
- What instructors can do to prevent academic dishonesty
- How to confront students about academic misconduct violations
- What happens to a student’s record?
- Sample syllabus statements
- Sample finding letter

Additional Information and Resources:
- Academic Misconduct Flowchart (to the right)
- UWS Chapter 14
- Links to campus resources/centers
Academic Integrity Presentations, 2011-2012

Fall 2011
Monday, August 15  Counseling Psychology 125 professors  College Library
Thursday, August 18  House Fellow Training (not AI)  Housing
Monday, August 29  CEO Student Scavenger Hunt  Bascom 87
Tuesday, August 30  CALS & Engineering TA’s  Mech Eng Bldg 1152
Tuesday, August 30  Political Science TA training  North Hall 422
Tuesday, August 30  McBurney Transition Panel  SAC, 4th floor
Wednesday, August 31  Engineering TA Training Session  ME Hall
Monday, September 12  First Year Athletes class  Athletes dining hall
Tuesday, September 13  CFYE Res Hall Presentations  Bradley/Sellery Halls
Thursday, September 15  Law School Faculty Lunch  Law School
Thursday, November 10  International Student Success Luncheon  On WI room, Red Gym
Friday, November 11  First year experience conference session  Pyle Center
Friday, December 16  Industrial & Systems Engineering faculty mtg  3210 Mechanical Eng

Spring 2012
Tuesday, January 10  Crossroads Committee  Union South, TITU
Tuesday, January 17  New Engineering/CALS TA Training  Mech Eng Bldg 1152
Wednesday, January 18  Returning Engineering TA workshop  Mech Eng Bldg
Thursday, February 2nd  Multicultural Graduate Network  Union South
Thursday, February 9th  Dean of Students Advisory Board  260 Bascom Hall
Wednesday, February 22nd  Success Lunch: Academic Success and Integrity  Red Gym
Thursday, March 1st  SPA conference  Union South
Tuesday, March 13th  Delta Graduate Student Class  L151 School of Ed
Friday, March 16th  Crossroads Academic Integrity Committee  Rennebohm Hall
Wednesday, March 21st  Associate Deans Counsel  260 Bascom Hall
Wednesday, April 11th  Library Staff Meeting  Wendt Library
Thursday, April 12th  Dean of Students Advisor Board  Bascom Hall
Monday, April 16th  L&S Department Chairs Meeting  165 Bascom Hall

Summary of 2011-2012 Cases

Year to Year Comparison
2011-2012: 107 reported cases (+4 open cases)
2010-2011: 135 reported cases
2009-2010: 139 reported cases
2008-2009: 91 reported cases

Basic Outline of Academic Misconduct in 2011-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2011-2012</th>
<th>Spring 2011-2012</th>
<th>Additional cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011-2012</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Right to Hearing

According to UWS 14.06(3)(c), students have the right to request a hearing. Here is a detailed description of the 12 hearings conducted in 2011-2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Type of Hearing</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Sanction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Upheld</td>
<td>F in course, probation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Upheld</td>
<td>F in course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Upheld</td>
<td>F in course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Examiner</td>
<td>Upheld</td>
<td>F on paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Upheld</td>
<td>F on exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Examiner</td>
<td>Upheld</td>
<td>F on paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Examiner</td>
<td>Upheld</td>
<td>F in course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Overturned</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Overturned</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Upheld</td>
<td>Lower grade on work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Overturned</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Overturned</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 of 12 hearings upheld in favor of the instructor's recommendations

4 of 12 hearings overturned in favor of the student

A Noteworthy Correlation

Plagiarism and Lower Grades Assigned to Work
In 2011-2012, 67 cases of plagiarism were reported. Of the 67 cases, 48 were sanctioned with a lower grade on work. Put simply, students caught plagiarizing are punished with a lower grade on their work 71% of the time.

International Students
Of the 107 cases of academic misconduct in 2011-2012, international students constituted 23 cases, roughly 21% of the total.

Detailed Breakdown

Pages 4-11
On the following pages, you will notice a detailed breakdown of the 2011-2012 cases by violations, sanctions, student classification, school or college, gender, course, grade point average, and ethnicity.
Violations

Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violation</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plagiarism</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unauthorized Materials/Fabricated Data</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forging/Falsification of AC Docs/Records</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Representation of AC Performance</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting AC Misconduct of Others</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>116</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The number of violations outweighs the number of cases (107) because students can be charged with more than one violation.*
Sanctions

### Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanction</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>Amount Imposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Grade on Work</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing Grade in Course</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Grade in Course</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Reprimand</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat Assignment</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal from Course</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>132</strong>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The number of sanctions outweighs the number of cases (107) because students can be given more than one sanction.*
Classification

Academic Year

- Sophomore: 32
- Junior: 31
- Senior: 29
- Freshman: 8
- Graduate: 6
- Special: 1
- Total: 107

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th></th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td></td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School/College

Academic Year

- Letters and Science, College of 32%
- Business, School of 9%
- Engineering, College of 8%
- Education, School of 5%
- Pharmacy, School of 3%
- Human Ecology, School of 2%
- Nursing, School of 2%
- Agricultural and Life Sciences, College of 1%
- Music, School of 1%
- Undeclared 36%

Letters and Science, College of 34
Business, School of 10
Engineering, College of 9
Education, School of 5
Pharmacy, School of 3
Human Ecology, School of 2
Nursing, School of 2
Agricultural and Life Sciences, College of 1
Music, School of 1
Undeclared 39

Total 107
**Gender**

**Academic Year**

- Male: 60%
- Female: 40%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fall**

- Male: 61%
- Female: 39%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spring**

- Male: 60%
- Female: 40%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Arts</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and Women's Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Business</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages and Cultures of Asia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature in Translation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and Human Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutritional Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing and Evaluation Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre and Drama</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>107</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Grade Point Average

### Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 to 3.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 to 3.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 to 2.9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 to 2.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 to 1.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 to 1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 to 0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1 to 0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 57   | 48    | 107   |

*Includes the two additional cases
Ethnicity

Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>107</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes the two additional cases
Faculty Assessment Results

In Collaboration with Don McCabe, Rutgers University

As explained in Kelly Ocasio’s Assessment Report, the Dean of Students Office is proactively making efforts to educate faculty and TAs about academic misconduct, how to establish an environment of academic integrity, and how to identify and report misconduct when it occurs. We administered an initial assessment to get faculty feedback and perceptions of academic integrity and misconduct. 457 faculty members completed the survey.

Survey Results

*Top 3 sources of information on student integrity policy:
  1. Campus website (52%)
  2. Other faculty (42%)
  3. Faculty handbook (27%)

*Top 3 reactions to catching a student cheating on an exam/assignment:
  1. F on exam/assignment (52%)
  2. Report to Dean of Students Office (42%)
  3. Reprimand/warning (41%)

*Top 5 most serious violations (moderate cheating):
  1. Turning in a paper copied from another student (190%)
  2. Working with others when asked for individual work (56%)
  3. Working with others electronically on individual work (56%)
  4. Receiving unpermitted help on an assignment (56%)
  5. Copying from electronic source without footnoting (54%)

*Top 5 most frequent cheating behaviors:
  1. Getting help electronically during an exam (76%)
  2. Using electronic device as unauthorized aid during exam (76%)
  3. Using electronic crib notes during test (75%)
  4. Turning in paper purchased from term paper “mill” (70%)
  5. Using unpermitted crib notes during test (68%)

*Top 3 safeguards against cheating:
  1. Closely monitor exams (69%)
  2. Change exams regularly (65%)
  3. Info on cheating in syllabus (63%)

*Note: Not all percentages add up to 100. Faculty members were allowed to choose more than one answer per question.

How would you rate (%):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severity of penalties</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student understanding of policy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty understanding of policy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student support of policy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty support of policy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of policy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Comments

Other Reactions to Suspected Cheating:
• “Depends on the situation” (common response)
• “Attend an Academic Conduct class”
• “Follow the university policy, which includes more than one option”
• “Consult with department chair”

Why Unsatisfied with Handling of Reports of Suspected Cheating:
• “I think the procedure makes it too hard to actually penalize students who have committed some act of academic dishonesty. I understand that students have to have a rebuttal, but I believe the existing procedures discourage faculty from pursuing appropriate action.”
• “The policies are somewhat overwhelming to report cheating except on major tests/assignments. For infractions on assignments with a “low value,” the effort to report is unrealistic.”
• “I felt the case was treated lightly by administrators, who tried too hard to accommodate the student’s needs and his/her financial investment in the course.”
• “I have no idea what happened after I reported it, whether any higher-level action was taken.”
• “In my cases, the Dean’s office took the sides of the students. The Dean’s office encouraged the students to request a hearing and review boards overturned nearly all my cases.”

Faculty Role in Promoting Integrity
• “I think we play the primary role, both in designing our courses intelligently and in either policing cheating ourselves or making sure our TAs know how to do so.”
• “Faculty should be proactive by clearly articulating expectations at the start of, and throughout, the semester.”
• “Be clear about expectations. Hold students to those expectations and follow through when issues arise. Support and assist students who bring concerns and attempt to help self-monitor and minimize problems.”
• “Essential role. Faculty should be very upfront with a non-tolerance policy.”
• “We should be role models; we should provide the rules and reiterate them from time to time.”

Future Academic Integrity Efforts

Summer 2012
• Create a 2-minute academic integrity video for faculty to show students during the first weeks of classes. The video will also be posted to our Academic Integrity website.
• Create a professional pamphlet through University Communications on academic integrity for faculty.

Fall 2012
• Survey students and TAs about academic integrity/misconduct via Don McCabe’s assessment tool.
Academic Integrity

Academic Integrity is critical to the mission of the University of Wisconsin-Madison, a research one institution with high academic standards and rigor. As a faculty/staff member, you play a crucial role in fostering an environment in which student learning is achieved in a fair, just and honest way. You set the tone in your classroom by communicating clear expectations of your students, educating them on the consequences of academic misconduct, and referring them to campus resources such as the writing center and campus libraries.

Information on how to establish an atmosphere of integrity including sample syllabus statements, the UWS Chapter 14 code of conduct process for academic misconduct and campus resources can be found under the academic integrity tab of the Dean of Students website.

Link to UWS Chapter 14: http://students.wisc.edu/doso/acadintegrity.html#acadintegritystandards

Ways to Establish an Atmosphere of Integrity

- Clear, concise, and inclusive information on syllabus
- Clear rules and expectations, consequences for misconduct
- Links to websites, Division of Student Life, writing lab, libraries
- Classroom discussion on academic misconduct
- Informing students of usage of on-line plagiarism programs (Turnitin.com)
- Class Honor Code
- Eliminating electronic devices during exams
- Assigning appropriate spacing in exam area
- Ensuring sufficient proctors
- Create multiple versions of an exam
- No book bags in exam area and require Student Identification

How to Confront Students About Academic Misconduct Violations

1. Tell the student you need to speak to them and set up a face to face meeting
2. In the meeting, tell the student what you suspect and ask them to tell you from their perspective how they wrote the paper or what they were doing in the exam.
3. After the meeting, decide if the student is responsible or not responsible for committing academic misconduct and recommend an appropriate sanction
4. Notify the student via email, see sample letter, and send a copy of the letter to the Dean of Students office, dean@studentlife.wisc.edu if the sanction falls into UWS Chapter 14 Group B category (see reverse side for outline of process).
Academic Integrity

Academic Integrity is critical to the mission of the University of Wisconsin-Madison, a research one institution with high academic standards and rigor. As a UW-Madison student, it is your responsibility to be informed about what constitutes academic misconduct, how to avoid it and what happens if you decide to engage in it. Examples of academic misconduct include (but are not limited to):

- plagiarism (turning in work of another person and not giving them credit),
- stealing an exam or course materials,
- copying another student’s homework,
- cheating on an exam (copying from another student, turning in an exam for re-grading after making changes, working on an exam after the designated time allowance)

How to avoid academic misconduct?

- Know how to cite sources in a paper, lab report or other assignments
- Use the writing center for help with citations. They are experts in APA, MLA and other citation styles.
- Avoid copying and pasting directly into your paper from the internet
- Understand the expectations and limitations when working in groups (i.e. Is collaboration allowed on the project and the written paper, or just the project and your written paper should be done alone)

What happens if I commit Academic Misconduct?

The University of Wisconsin-Madison takes academic misconduct allegations very seriously. Your professor will contact you if they believe you have engaged in academic misconduct and ask you to explain your work. If they still believe you engaged in such an act after meeting with you, they will decide on a sanction, which may include a zero on the assignment or exam, a lower grade in the course or failure in the course. The Dean of Student's Office is informed and will contact the student about their rights. Repeated acts of academic misconduct may result in more serious actions such as probation or suspension.

Link to Dean of Students website, UWS Chapter 14: [http://students.wisc.edu/doso/](http://students.wisc.edu/doso/)

Contact Information

Tonya Schmidt, Assistant Dean of Students
70 Bascom Hall, 608-263-5700, tschmidt@studentlife.wisc.edu
Academic Misconduct Investigation Process at UW-Madison
UWS Chapter 14

1. Faculty/TA suspects student of academic misconduct and requests a face to face meeting with student.

2. Faculty meets with student to review allegation. Student accused is given an opportunity to respond to the allegation.

3a. Not Responsible. Faculty determines that academic misconduct DID NOT occur and notifies the student that no violation was found. Case closed

3b. Responsible. Faculty determines that academic misconduct did occur and selects a sanction from Group A or B, and can recommend C under UWS Chapter 14. Faculty sends a written finding to student and the Dean of Student’s Office.

4. Accused student has 10 days to request a formal hearing with a hearing panel or examiner.

5. Formal Hearing Held. Faculty member presents the rationale for their finding. Student responds to the allegation.

6. Hearing body decides case based upon information provided during hearing. Both faculty member and accused student are informed of decision.

UWS Ch. 14 Sanctions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determined by Faculty</th>
<th>Determined by Dean of Students Office (DOS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group A</strong>: (not reported to DOS)</td>
<td><strong>Group C</strong>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>An oral reprimand</em></td>
<td><em>University disciplinary probation</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Written reprimand</em></td>
<td><em>Suspension</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(presented only to student)</td>
<td><em>Expulsion</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Repeat work</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(graded on its merits)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lower or failing grade on work*  
*Lower grade in course*  
*Failing grade in course*  
*Removal from course*  
*Written reprimand*
What to Expect at an Academic Misconduct Hearing - Instructor

Before the Hearing:

- Approximately a week before the hearing, a hearing packet will be delivered to your office.
- Look over the packet. It will include the letter you wrote the student, the follow up letter from the Dean of Students Office and any supporting information for the case (i.e. plagiarized work, turn-it-in report, copy of exam, illegal note card, emails exchanged with student, etc.)
- Decide what you’d like to say to present your case - “bring your written letter to life”
- Develop questions to ask the student (point “j” in the outline below), you may come up with more as the student presents their case (point “h” below)
- Prepare a summary statement to be presented at the end of the hearing. You may add to this during the hearing to dispute any discrepancies presented in the student’s statements.

At the Hearing:

- Pay attention to the instructions on the cover of your hearing packet. They will include what room the hearing will be held in and what time the hearing will begin. It will also indicate where you should wait to be called into the hearing room.
- A Dean of Student’s staff member will let you know when it is time to enter the hearing room.
- Once in the hearing room, the digital recorder will be turned on and the chair of the hearing will begin reading the statements in the hearing outline.
- The student will be asked if they admit or deny the charges. If they admit the charges, the hearing will proceed to determine an appropriate sanction. If the student denies the charges, the hearing will proceed to determine if the student violated the policy (see outline below).
- Investigating Officer is the instructor in academic misconduct cases, you will present your case first (a below)
- If discrepancies come up during the student’s statement, formulate them into questions to ask the student during your questioning time (point “j” below) or save them for your summary statement.

Procedures for Hearing Information:

a. Ask Investigating Officer/Instructor to present case.

b. Committee may question Investigating Officer/Instructor.

c. The Student may question the Investigating Officer/Instructor.

d. Investigating Officer/Instructor may present any witnesses. Investigating Officer questions witness or asks witness to make a statement.

e. Committee questions witness.

f. Student may question witness.

g. Witness excused after informed to not speak to any other witnesses waiting to testify. (Repeat steps d-g as needed)

h. Ask Student to make their statement regarding the case and the charges against them.

i. Committee questions Student.

j. Investigating Officer/Instructor questions Student.

k. Student may present witnesses as in above. (follow steps d-g)

l. Summary statement from Investigating Officer

m. Summary statement from Student

After the Hearing:

- The Dean of Student’s staff member will email you the hearing panel’s decision (typically the day of the hearing) and will email the written decision within 14 days.
- Proceed with changing the grade from an incomplete to reflect the hearing panel’s decision.

Appendix D
What to Expect at an Academic Misconduct Hearing - Student

Before the Hearing:

- Approximately a week before the hearing, a hearing packet will be available for pick up in 70 Bascom Hall
- Look over the packet. It will include the letter you received from the professor, the follow up letter from the Dean of Students Office and any supporting information for the case (i.e. plagiarized work, turn-it-in report, copy of exam, illegal note card, emails exchanged with student, etc.), and a section submitted by you (the student)
- Decide what you’d like to say to present your case, why you didn’t commit academic misconduct
- Develop questions to ask the professor (point “c” in the outline below), you may come up with more as the professor presents their case (point “a” below)
- Prepare a summary statement to be presented at the end of the hearing. You may add to this during the hearing to dispute any discrepancies presented in the professor’s statements

At the Hearing:

- Pay attention to the instructions on the cover of your hearing packet. They will include what room the hearing will be held in and what time the hearing will begin. It will also indicate where you should wait to be called into the hearing room
- A Dean of Student’s staff member will let you know when it is time to enter the hearing room
- Once in the hearing room, the digital recorder will be turned on and the chair of the hearing will begin reading the statements in the hearing outline.
- You will be asked if you admit or deny the charges of academic misconduct. If you admit the charges, the hearing will proceed to determine an appropriate sanction. If you deny the charges, the hearing will proceed to determine if you violated the policy (see outline below)
- Investigating Officer is the instructor in academic misconduct cases, and will present their case first (“a” below)
- If discrepancies come up during the professor’s statement, formulate them into questions to ask the professor during your questioning time (point “c” below) or save them for your summary statement

Procedures for Hearing Information:

a. Ask Investigating Officer/Instructor to present case.
b. Committee may question Investigating Officer/Instructor.
c. The Student may question the Investigating Officer/Instructor.
d. Investigating Officer/Instructor may present any witnesses. Investigating Officer questions witness or asks witness to make a statement.
e. Committee questions witness.
f. Student may question witness.
g. Witness excused after informed to not speak to any other witnesses waiting to testify. (Repeat steps d-g as needed)
h. Ask Student to make their statement regarding the case and the charges against them.
i. Committee questions Student.
j. Investigating Officer/Instructor questions Student.
k. Student may present witnesses as in above. (follow steps d-g)
l. Summary statement from Investigating Officer
m. Summary statement from Student

After the Hearing:

- The Dean of Student’s staff member will email you the hearing panel’s decision (typically the day of the hearing) and will email the written decision within 14 days