Instructor's Guide to Academic Misconduct by Students

Rev. August 2025

Senate Academic Standards and Misconduct Committee

The University of Winnipeg

The SASMC is grateful to Sheila Page, past Chair of DRC for the Department of Rhetoric, Writing and Communications, and Catherine Taylor, Tracy Whalen, and Anne-Laurence Caudano, former SASMC Chairs, for writing, revising, and circulating earlier editions of this guide. Please contact current SASMC Chair Brandon Christopher with suggested additions or revisions.

Contents

Prefatory Note

The advice in this manual is intended to help instructors decide how to proceed when a student appears to have committed academic misconduct, which includes the following:

- Plagiarism
- Cheating
- Improper Research/Academic Practices (e.g., fabricating or falsifying results or references; using others' results without permission; misrepresenting research results)
- Obstruction of the Academic Activities of Another
- Impersonation
- Falsification or Unauthorized Modification of an Academic Record
- Aiding and Abetting Academic Misconduct

For complete information on University regulations regarding academic misconduct, see the Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedure documents available at the following links:

- https://www.uwinnipeg.ca/policies/docs/policies/academic-misconduct-policy.pdf
- https://www.uwinnipeg.ca/policies/docs/procedures/academic-misconduct-procedures.pdf

These forms of misconduct are different from those pertaining to non-academic misconduct, which includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- theft, damage, or destruction of property;
- unauthorized entry or presence on University property;
- fraud or impersonation;
- disruptive or dangerous behaviours to the UW Community;
- unlawful use of alcohol or drugs; or
- other activities that result in criminal charges, conviction, a court judgment, or a decision by the Ombudsman under the Human Rights Code

The University of Winnipeg Non-Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedures (2019) can be found at https://www.uwinnipeg.ca/policies/docs/policies/student-non-academic-misconduct-policy.pdf and https://www.uwinnipeg.ca/policies/docs/procedures/student-non-academic-misconduct-procedures.pdf.

Helping Students Avoid Academic Misconduct

Many instances of academic misconduct can be prevented by taking time at the beginning of a course to impress upon students the importance of avoiding misconduct through plagiarism or other forms of cheating. UW Academic Misconduct Policy defines plagiarism as "a form of academic dishonesty in which students present published or unpublished work (written, digital, or other) of another person or persons, or one's own prior work, in its entirety or in part, as their own original work" (1). It is strongly recommended that instructors not only explain what plagiarism is through examples, but also incorporate active learning modules, especially in first- and second-year courses. First-year students in particular may not understand where the line is drawn between paraphrasing and plagiarism. However, senior students who are unaccustomed to assignments that ask for original analysis may sometimes resort to plagiarism as well.

Some students may not realize that they can ask their professors for help when they are struggling with an assignment, and they end up cheating out of desperation. **Misconduct of this sort can sometimes be prevented by encouraging students to email you and make use of your office hours if they have questions about how to approach an assignment.** They should also be informed of and encouraged to visit the peer tutoring services provided by the Writing Centre in the department of Rhetoric, Writing, and Communications: https://www.uwinnipeg.ca/writing-centre/.

Instructors may also find useful these links about academic integrity from the Library:

- Academic Integrity main page: https://library.uwinnipeg.ca/use-the-library/help-with-research/academic-integrity.html
- Video series: https://youtube.com/playlist?list=PLo24xfjXVa0zrF0s8ttMTDNAA1WZvvfbd
- Avoiding Plagiarism: https://libguides.uwinnipeg.ca/c.php?g=318087&p=2124326
- ChatGPT and Generative AI: https://library.uwinnipeg.ca/use-the-library/help-with-research/chatgpt-and-genai.html
- Tutorials and Workshops for Students and Instructors: https://library.uwinnipeg.ca/use-the-library/help-with-research/tutorials,-videos,-workshops.html#self
- Citing and Referencing Sources: https://library.uwinnipeg.ca/use-the-library/help-with-research/citing-and-referencing-sources.html

Other useful resources include:

- University of Calgary, Taylor Institute for Teaching and Learning, Academic Integrity: https://taylorinstitute.ucalgary.ca/resources/academic-integrity
- University of Manitoba, Academic Integrity: https://umanitoba.ca/student-supports/academic-supports/academic-integrity

Helping Students Avoid Academic Misconduct in Exams

Remind students before the test and on the test what material they are allowed to have with them, if any. The UW Final Examination Regulations (excerpted below) include steps to prevent cheating. It is advisable to adapt this protocol for in-class and online tests as well:

1. Students must not carry any notes, unauthorized texts or other extraneous material into the examination centre. If writing an online test, students should not have such materials anywhere in the vicinity of their computer and certainly not within sight. Students should have all tabs closed on their computer, including those for Nexus and other information sites. A student is vulnerable to a filing of academic misconduct if they access course materials through an open tab during the writing of a test or exam.

2. Students are not to communicate with others for the purposes of obtaining information while writing an exam. If an instructor suspects that students are communicating with each other inappropriately or are positioned in a way that appears to be facilitating the copying of work, students should be separated.

3. Any mathematical tables, texts or other equipment (as authorized by the committee of examiners) taken into the examination centre must not contain any written notes, formulas or other extraneous material. This also applies to the space a student occupies for an online test.

4. Calculators authorized for use in examinations must not be mini-computers capable of displaying alphabetical or symbolic data.

5. During an examination, students must not be in possession of any electronic device (such as a phone or iPod) capable of recording or transmitting data, unless approved by their instructor.

6. ALL STUDENTS MUST HAVE IDENTIFICATION AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST WHEN WRITING TESTS OR EXAMINATIONS. In cases where identification is requested but the student is unable to present identification, the student may complete the test or examination, but will be required to produce appropriate identification within 1 (one) working day. The test or examination will not be graded until identification is assured.

Instructor's Procedure for Responding to Academic Misconduct

In this section we explain the steps involved in responding to Academic Misconduct.

INSTRUCTOR TIMELINE

Once misconduct is suspected, **you have two working days** to invite the student to meet to discuss your concerns by email.

Once the student has been invited, **you have five working days** to meet with student either virtually or in person. The purpose of the meeting is to decide whether to treat the incident as teachable moment and offer the student a chance to resubmit, or to report the incident to DRC as a case of suspected misconduct.

If you decide to report the incident, you have five working days after meeting with the student to submit a formal report of suspected academic misconduct to your DRC.

If you decide to treat the incident as a teachable moment, it is at your discretion in consultation with the student as to when a revised assignment is submitted.

Note: The University's policy states this communication is to be made using webmail; since many students rarely check their webmail, it is advisable to let the student know in person, if possible, that you have sent them an email or to send the same email to an address they are more likely to check. Please consult the email template in this document.

It is, unfortunately, not always possible to contact students easily, and the student may not respond to your email, so you may have to make your decision without any discussion with the student.

Each of the above actions is fully discussed in the section below.

Please adhere to the timeline and use the templates provided for related communications as they contain crucial elements required by Senate policy and procedure. Departures from required procedure could result in a misconduct case being dismissed or a decision being appealed.

Step One: Noting Apparent Misconduct

When reading an assignment or test, at the first inkling that the student has plagiarized,

- read through the entire paper, noting all sections that are concerning. **Do not, however, write any comments on the paper claiming that the student has plagiarized.** (If you employ a marker, make sure that they understand this, too. Only the Senate Academic Standards and Misconduct Committee can make this claim).
- do not provide a grade for the paper.
- make a copy of the paper that you can use to make more extensive notes on what has been copied and where it has been copied from.
- do not hand the paper back.

Where misconduct appears to be occurring during a test or exam,

- do not suspend the exam process.
- do not suspend the exam for the student or the students concerned.
- allow the student(s) to continue to completion, but collect any allegedly prohibited materials at the time they are discovered.
- note your concerns on the exam when you receive it.
- at the time you receive the exam, communicate your concern with the student or students.
- notify the student or students that they will be invited to meet with you within 5 working days. (If there's an invigilator, the student(s) will be informed that they will hear from the instructor within 5 working days.)

The person overseeing the exam should intervene to stop the misconduct (e.g., by removing a phone or notes or separating students) as soon as they observe it. They may want to photograph contraband materials such as an unauthorized device or notes. The student should be given extra time to finish the exam commensurate with the length of the interruption.

If you suspect a student is cheating during an online exam, you can move the student to a break-out room where you can voice your concerns and request that the student either explain and/or stop the concerning behaviour. Recording the session is helpful for assessing the event, should it go forward for deliberation.

Step Two: Considering the Evidence

When confronted with evidence of apparent misconduct, the first decision instructors must make is whether they believe that the student has deliberately cheated. The University recommends that instructors think carefully about the incident to determine whether it warrants a teachable moment approach rather than moving to a formal report to the Department Review Committee (DRC). A teachable moment is one where the student is likely to be highly motivated to learn how to avoid misconduct in future. A formal report is normally warranted when the misconduct has been deliberate.

However, it can sometimes be difficult to decide. The process begins by reviewing the evidence, and ideally also involves meeting with the student to give them a chance to make their case (see Steps Three and Four).

The advice below considers the two main types of academic misconduct: plagiarism and other forms of cheating on tests.

MATERIAL COPIED FROM UNACKNOWLEDGED/UNAUTHORIZED SOURCES

What to Consider

To make this decision, you can consider the following points:

- the definition of plagiarism from the University's Academic Misconduct Policy:
  "a form of academic misconduct in which students present published or unpublished work (written, digital, or other) of another person or persons, or one's own prior work, in its entirety or in part, as their own original work" (Note: the full definition can be found in 6a(i) of the Regulations & Policies section of *The University of Winnipeg Calendar*)
- the characteristics of the paper handed in by the student:
  - has the student partly met documentation requirements?
    - for example, has the student included citations and references for the copied work but not quotation marks?
    - do the sources listed in the references match the sources from which information has been copied?
    - do the sources, as referenced or quoted, exist?
- your experience with and knowledge about the student
  - consider the student's previous work in the course, attendance record, and attitude toward the course
- the opportunities the student has had to understand proper academic practices. For example, has the student had instruction on plagiarism and proper documentation? Have they taken an Academic Writing course? Have you met with the student on a previous occasion to discuss such issues?
- *Copying from another student* is a common form of plagiarism that may occur in many forms, including, among others, entire essays, short answers, translations, programming code, or mathematical calculations. Some points to consider:

- The material may have been copied from a student in the same course or in another course, and in the same year or a previous year.
- If the project in question involved group work, it is possible that the student genuinely believed that it was appropriate to submit the other student's work as their own.
- The student may have submitted the copied material as part of a take-home assignment or during an invigilated test.
- The original author of the plagiarized material may or may not have consented to the student copying their work. If they have consented, they have abetted plagiarism, and they, too, have committed academic misconduct.

The points in the following lists can help you assess the benefits of treating the incident as a teachable moment rather than a deliberate attempt to plagiarize that warrants a formal report to the DRC/ARC:

- you may consider using the incident as a teachable moment if
  - the student has made an honest attempt to use documentation (however flawed)
  - the student's copying represents a very small portion of the assignment or is part of a preliminary draft
  - copied passages show minor changes in wording from the original, and do not have quotation marks, but are accompanied by citations and references (which could suggest that the student thought they had adequately paraphrased, rather than deliberately attempted to deceive),
  - it is the first university assignment in which the student has used information from sources.

- you may consider the incident a deliberate attempt to plagiarize if
  - the assignment was previously submitted by another student or may be found on a filesharing site
  - no attempt is made to document or even acknowledge sources from which information has been copied or paraphrased
  - information has been copied, and a reference list has been included, but it only lists some of the sources from which information was copied or paraphrased
  - a reference list has been included, but it lists sources that were not used in the paper and/or does not list sources from which material was copied and/or it lists sources that, as referenced, do not exist
  - references and citations, but not quotation marks, have been used and the copying is extensive

Treat these lists as guidelines rather than absolute indicators. Just as there is individuality in student writing, there is also individuality in how students commit academic misconduct, and some incidents have characteristics from both lists.

A student may, for example, copy extensively without using quotation marks, but may also include a citation and a reference for every copied passage. If this is the first paper in which the student has used information from sources, this may be treated as a teachable moment. If this is the second or third paper in which the student has used sources and their approach is a departure from their previous practices, or they continue to copy without using quotation marks, you may want to consider a formal report. If you have already provided the student with specific individual instruction on using sources, and the instruction has not been followed in the submitted paper, you likely *will* want to consider a formal report.

Similarly, if you have evidence that the student has purchased the essay from an online paper mill or submitted a paper written by a student in a previous year, you will likely decide to submit a formal report to the DRC/ARC. **However, as in every case of suspected misconduct, you still need to notify the student and offer them the opportunity to meet with you about the assignment currently in question before filing a report. This is the case even if you don't think a teachable moment is applicable.**

CHEATING OBSERVED DURING A TEST

Cheating during a test may involve copying from another student, as described in (1) above. Other situations involve the following:

- Communicating with another student
- Having access to unauthorized materials, such as a phone or study notes
- Gaining unauthorized access to test questions
- Impersonating someone to write a test
- Having someone else impersonate them to write a test

In the case of communicating with another student, you should consider whether the communication, although clearly forbidden, appears to have been for a purpose unrelated to cheating, such as gesturing goodbye to a departing roommate. This would be relevant information to include should you decide to proceed with a formal report to DRC.

In the case of unauthorized materials, you should consider whether the student was observed using these materials, or only had access to them. For example, a student may claim that they had completely forgotten about the study notes or cell phone in their jacket pocket and would never have used them. In such a case, you may want to consider whether the test rules were clearly communicated in class and repeated before the test begins, giving students a chance to remove unauthorized material.

Step Three: Notifying the Student that You Suspect Misconduct

If you suspect misconduct when marking an assignment or test, inform the student **within two working days** of first suspecting misconduct, via email or in person with a follow-up email, that you want to meet to discuss your concerns about the assignment or test. Again, do this whether or not you feel that a teachable moment approach is warranted.

Note: Unless you decide that your initial suspicions were completely groundless and that no action needs to be taken, it is very important that you offer to meet with the student when you suspect misconduct. The meeting is your opportunity to register the importance of academic integrity and their opportunity to present their case before you make a final decision as to whether to proceed to a formal report.

If you first suspect misconduct while invigilating a test, communicate your concern when the student submits the test, and notify them that they will be invited by email to meet with you (or, if an invigilator is communicating the message, students will be told that the instructor will contact them). Send the email promptly and definitely within two days – even if you have met with the student for a similar discussion on a previous occasion and believe the misconduct to be deliberate.

SAMPLE EMAIL NOTIFICATION TO STUDENT BY INSTRUCTOR

Dear (student's name),

I am writing to ask you to meet with me **within the next five working days** to discuss my concern that you appear to have committed misconduct in your [final essay / book review / coding assignment / mid-term test]. I could meet with you in my office (3Z99) any afternoon this week. If you are unable to meet in person, I could talk to you by phone or over Zoom [insert online platform] during those times. If you cannot be available at any of these times, please contact me by replying to this email to tell me when you are able to meet.

If you do not contact me, I will be initiating University misconduct procedures by reporting my concerns to the Department Review Committee, which will then contact you to invite you to appear before the committee.

Thanks,
[Your name]

Step Four: Meeting with the Student

Your meeting with the student (if they agree to meet with you) can help you decide whether to report the incident. The meeting can be difficult, but it can also give you a better sense of what may have happened. You can simply say to the student that you have concerns about some of the passages in the assignment (for example) and ask the student to talk about them. The student's response can help you make your decision:

- If, for example, the student vehemently denies copying despite being shown the match between passages in the assignment and passages in sources, it is likely deliberate plagiarism.
- If the student admits to copying out of haste or desperation, you can decide whether to make a formal report or treat the meeting as a teachable moment/warning
- If the student indicates they tried to use sources properly, but doesn't understand how to do it or what is wrong with the work that was done, you may elect to treat this as a teachable moment.

If you decide that the student would benefit from a second chance, spend as much time as is reasonable with the student discussing the correct approaches to using and documenting sources (if applicable to the assignment). Have the student re-submit the assignment. Set a new deadline in consultation with the student, one that reasonably allows for the requested revisions.

Note: it can be beneficial in the case of plagiarized research essays to have the student rewrite the assignment using the same topic and sources. Other assignments may require that you set a different topic or test questions.

If you decide that the student has deliberately plagiarized or otherwise cheated, the next step is to prepare a formal report to the DRC/ARC. Keep in mind that your decision is not the final decision in this matter. As the instructor, **you <u>do not</u> have the right to declare that the student has committed academic misconduct or the right to levy a penalty for academic misconduct**. Your responsibility is limited to detecting possible academic misconduct and deciding whether it is appropriate to refer it to the DRC/ARC, who then direct their report to the Senate Academic Standards and Misconduct Committee for further investigation.

If the incident has taken place before the end of the term and the student is staying in your class, inform the student that you are submitting a formal report on the matter.

Advise the student that you are not making a judgement yourself about their work, but are referring the matter to an objective committee who will be asking the student for information about the incident. You can also refer the student to the chair of the DRC/ARC for more information about the process.

In cases where you suspect that academic misconduct has occurred, it can be onerous to gather the evidence and prepare a formal report. However, having the SASMC decide on the matter has important benefits:

- You can preserve a constructive relationship with the student.
- The SASMC has access to the student's academic misconduct record, while an instructor does not. Since an instructor does not know whether a student has been penalized for other instances of academic misconduct, they cannot know if their assigned penalty is appropriately severe.
- A decision and penalty levied independently by an instructor cannot be placed on a student's record. Thus, any subsequent reports would be considered without knowledge of any previous incident. The student as a result likely face less severe penalties than otherwise would be the case.

Academic Misconduct Involving the Unauthorized Use of Generative AI Tools

Even though you may feel that an assignment has been written by a text-generating tool like ChatGPT, proving that it is indeed the case can be more difficult. It is important that, in their course, instructors establish clearly upfront 1) whether or not these tools may be used; 2) the extent of such usage if they may be used; and 3) the ways in which to document their use. This is also a discipline-specific discussion: possible use (and its extent) will vary across different fields.

- When considering whether or not to forbid any use of generative AI tools in an assignment, remember that this technology is gradually being integrated into broader word processing systems and may become progressively more difficult to avoid.
- When allowing its use, clearly define its extent.
- Ask students to document their use of GenAI; this will enable you (and them) to see clearly what their portion of the work consisted of.

If you suspect that a student has made an unauthorized use of an GenAI tool, consider the following points, as you bring evidence forward to the DRC:

- Meeting with the student to determine the extent of their own work is key. In this meeting, you can establish whether the student can explain what they wrote, as well as discuss their research and writing processes. Here is an example of how such a discussion may go: https://taylorinstitute.ucalgary.ca/resources/how-to-lead-discovery-interview-contract-cheating (this example was created with contract cheating in mind, but it works well with GenAI too).
- Incorrect citations and fake references may be a sign that AI was used. Falsification of references falls under our Academic Misconduct Policy.
- A change in style between different assignments may be a sign that a GenAI tool was used or that someone else was involved.
- Using ChatGPT prompts to prove that ChatGPT is behind a student's work can be indicative but is weak evidence, since GenAI tools always generate different texts.
- The use of AI detectors, like GPTZero, is not recommended. These tools are not yet reliable and tend to generate many false positives. Because GenAI tools and AI detectors function on probabilities, they also disproportionately flag the work of non-native speakers who may be more likely to write in predictable ways.
- Remind students that the results of simple Google searches are now generated by AI. As such, students may think that they did not use a text-generating AI tool while, in fact, they did. Editing tools like Grammarly are now powered by AI and have similar capabilities to ChatGPT as well.

Resources:

- Brown University Library. *Generative Artificial Intelligence*. https://libguides.brown.edu/AI/LearningCommunity (with different style guides for citing GenAI)
- Sample syllabus statements: https://www.viceprovostundergrad.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/412/2024/04/Syllabus-language-for-Gen-AI-April-2024.pdf
- The University of Winnipeg Library: https://library.uwinnipeg.ca/use-the-library/help-with-research/chatgpt-and-genai.html
- University of Toronto, Artificial Intelligence: https://ai.utoronto.ca/

Step Five: Making a Formal Report of Academic Misconduct

When you decide that a student appears to have committed an act of academic misconduct, and that it does not warrant a teachable moment approach, your next step is to file a formal report alleging misconduct with the Departmental Review Committee (DRC) or Academic Review Committee (ARC)

The formal report should be addressed to the Chair of the DRC/ARC. Here are a few points to keep in mind as you write your report:

- it is not your responsibility to decide that academic misconduct has taken place or to penalize the student; by submitting a formal report, you are alleging that academic misconduct has occurred and informing the DRC/ARC of the reasons for your allegation
- your formal report will be read **by the student, the DRC/ARC, and the Senate Academic Standards and Misconduct Committee (SASMC),** and possibly the Senate Academic Misconduct Appeals Committee (SAMAC); hence, it needs to be as complete and clear and neutral as possible
- it is also helpful to make your report as well organised as possible; many people will read it and they need to be able to comprehend the case quickly
- your report must be dated, and you must sign it
- prepare a PDF (not a Word document) of the report for submission to the DRC/ARC
- all information must be kept confidential at all stages. Do not keep copies of the student's work. All material should be forwarded to the DRC/ARC; if you need to review it later to answer a question from the DRC/ARC, ask to look at the DRC/ARC file.

Your report should include the following information (see sample report in appendix):

- the student's name and student number
- the name, number, and term of the course
- a description of the alleged misconduct
    - identify the assignment
    - describe what the student has done
    - include the circumstances of the incident (for example, is this a first attempt at writing an essay in university? has academic misconduct been discussed previously with the student?)
- a copy of the course outline
- a copy of the assignment description
- the student's essay with the passages in question clearly circled with ink or highlighted. Number each passage in the margin, starting with "1"
- evidence to support the allegations (e.g., screenshots of pages with the relevant passages clearly highlighted. Put the number for the

corresponding plagiarized passage in the margin (e.g., #6 beside a plagiarized section in the assignment, and also beside the passage from which it was plagiarized).

- background information about the student's previous opportunities to learn about academic misconduct and how to avoid it (e.g., through classroom or individual instruction on proper documentation practices, rules regarding test-taking); if possible, include dates and describe (or include) supplementary material, such as handouts or PowerPoint presentations.
- background information about the student: attendance (particularly on the days that documentation or academic misconduct was discussed); the work the student has done on other assignments (if relevant)
- a description of any conversation you have had with the student; if there was email correspondence, include copies of all messages.

After you have drafted your report, you can ask for feedback from the Chair of the DRC/ARC; this is a good way of ensuring that you have included the necessary information and laid out your case clearly.

Instructor Relationship with the Student

If you report a case while the term is still on, proceed with a respectful relationship with the student. The student is innocent of the allegation until the SASMC declares that academic misconduct has taken place. By making the report, you are turning the decision over to neutral parties, and you and the student can leave the outcome in the hands of the DRC/ARC and the SASMC.

When you report a case of alleged misconduct, the student may ask you for information about the process or the potential penalties. It is best to refer the student to the Chair of the DRC/ARC, as that person is responsible for handling the process and can give the student the most accurate information.

Grading

You cannot give the student a grade of any amount either for the assignment in question or for the course on the basis of the alleged misconduct. It is the responsibility of the SASMC to impose such penalties.

If the misconduct case is still in process when you need to submit final grades, do not enter a grade for the student. **Advise Student Records and the DRC/ARC Chair by email that you are not entering a grade because of a pending case of academic misconduct.**

The DRC/ARC will notify the instructor of the SASMC's decision, and instructors will need to request a Change of Grade form from Student Records. Instructors complete the form and send it to the DRC/ARC Chair to sign and forward to Student Records.

SAMPLE FORMAL REPORT TO THE DRC/ARC
(Adapt as appropriate for different kinds of assignments and tests.
Send this report and all attachments in PDF Format.)

This is an official document that will be seen by the student and SASMC and should be written formally.

MEMORANDUM

Date

TO: Department Review Committee/Academic Review Committee, Name of Dept./Program/Unit

FROM: Instructor's name

RE: Academic Misconduct: Student's Name (Student Number and email address(es))

(In this paragraph, provide a summary of the allegation.) I am writing to report that I believe one of my students has committed an act of academic misconduct. In response to an assignment in my course, **name of course** (**course and section number**), **student's name** submitted **brief description of work handed in (what kind of assignment, how many assignments, extent of plagiarism).**

(Include a short paragraph here describing your discussions, if any, with the student about the suspected misconduct. If no contact has been made, explain why. You can also include any other background information relevant to the case, such as previous instances of plagiarism or the student's performance on other assignments.)

(Include a short paragraph here describing any classroom discussions about using information from sources, documentation, and academic misconduct; describe or attach relevant materials, such as PowerPoint presentations or handouts; indicate whether the student was in class when these matters were discussed or had access to the materials through Nexus. Also indicate whether you had other conversations with the student on matters related to proper documentation of sources.)

(In the following section, describe the material you are including in your report. The list in this example shows the basic information; add any other information that is relevant.)

I am forwarding with this memo:

- a copy of my course outline **(include a description of the parts of the outline that refer to academic misconduct)**
- a copy of the assignment/test/exam description **(provide the name of assignment and instructions given to students** about the use of outside sources and how to document them;
- a copy of the assignment/test/exam submitted by the student; (**if a plagiarized essay, highlight the copied material and number each highlighted section**);
- copies of the sources used by the student (**highlight the passages that were copied by the student and annotate them with numbers corresponding to numbers in the essay**).

Please let me know if you need further information.

(Signature)

Instructor's name, Department/Program

THE DRC/ARC PROCESS

Once you have submitted the formal report, the case is handled first by the DRC/ARC and later by the Senate Academic Standards and Misconduct Committee. The DRC/ARC's responsibility is to gather as much information as it can from both you and the student and to prepare a final report for the Senate Committee that recommends whether or not a finding of academic misconduct is justified and, if justified, **recommends** a suitable penalty. In carrying out this responsibility, the DRC/ARC seeks to be as impartial and as thorough as possible.

The DRC/ARC

- informs the student of the allegation by sending the student the instructor's report and attachments
    - the notification must be sent by email (registered mail is no longer used) **within two working days** of receiving the instructor's files (see sample notification letter)
    - remove any mention of other students' names in the instructor's report, if applicable

- gives the student **10 calendar days** to respond and invites the student to provide the DRC/ARC with any information that can help the Committee understand the case; the student can present this information in person or in writing, and can be accompanied by a third party for support
    - at the expiry of 10 calendar days, if there is no response from the student, the DRC / ARC can proceed with the case

- ensures that the student is not concerned about bias on the part of the Committee
    - if meeting with the student, either in person or on zoom, introduce all members of the Committee, to ensure that the student has no objection about someone's potential bias

- seeks further information from the student and from the instructor, if necessary

- prepares a report to the SASMC **within 5 working days** which
    - forwards the instructor report and attachments (in PDF)
    - explains its own procedures and discussions regarding the case, including a description of any conversation the DRC / ARC had with the student; if there was email correspondence, include copies of all messages
    - recommends whether or not a finding of academic misconduct is justified, and why or why not
    - if a finding of academic misconduct is justified, recommends a suitable penalty, and provides a rationale

In some cases, the DRC/ARC may want to ask the instructor some questions that haven't been anticipated in the instructor's report. It is the responsibility of the DRC/ARC to gather all of the

information that it thinks useful. **Keep in mind that instructor's responses will form part of the DRC/ARC's final report to the SASMC and will be read by the student; thus, maintaining a professional approach is important.** For example, when responding by email to a question from the DRC/ARC, avoid addressing unrelated matters in the email. The DRC/ARC must include all such correspondence in their report to the SASMC. Similarly, if you as an instructor have additional information to pass along to the DRC/ARC or have questions about the process, simply contact the DRC/ARC Chair to provide it.

SAMPLE DRC / ARC NOTIFICATION LETTER TO STUDENT

This should be sent to the student's UW email address. You may either send this notification as an email or include a pdf of this notification on an email. Include the Instructor's report and the accompanying files.

Dear < Student's name >,

As Chair of the < DRC / ARC > of < department name or PACE >, I am writing to inform you that an allegation of academic misconduct has been made against you on < date > by < instructor's name > in < course number and name > regarding your < incriminated test or assignment >. The instructor's report and accompanying files are attached to this email.

If you wish to discuss this matter and/or meet with the DRC, please contact me at < UW email > within 10 calendar days of receiving this letter. You may provide information that may help the DRC understand the case in writing, over zoom or in person. If you choose to meet in person or over zoom, please let me know of your availability.

You have the right to represent yourself and to be accompanied by a support person at the meeting. This support person might, for instance, help you overcome any difficulty you have expressing yourself, provide emotional support, or address particulars of the case you may have discussed with them. The University of Winnipeg Students' Association (UWSA) Vice President, Student Affairs, is available to support, guide and accompany students during this process, and can be contacted at 413.279.0159 or at vpsa@theuwsa.ca.

Sincerely,

DRC / ARC Chair name
Chair, DRC / ARC of < department name or PACE >

SAMPLE DRC / ARC REPORT TO SASMC

This should be on official Departmental letterhead and be submitted in PDF format. All attachments should be in PDF format as well. Adapt this template as appropriate for the situation.

< DRC / ARC > of the < name of Department or PACE >
Report to SASMC on an Allegation of Academic Misconduct by
< Student's name and student number >
< Course number, section number, and course title >
< Assignment name (e.g., final essay, mid-term test) and percentage of final grade >

Summary

On June 10, 2019, the DRC / ARC received a report from < instructor or invigilator names > concerning suspicions that a student < student name and student number > had committed academic misconduct in < assignment/test and course >, which is worth < x% > of the final grade for the course.

The ARC informed < Mr / Ms + student last name, or full student name if preferred gender is unknown > of this allegation in a "Letter of Notification" on < date > sent via email. < Student name > responded by email on < date > requesting a meeting with the DRC. < Student name > appeared before the Committee on < date >.

The < DRC > is recommending a finding of misconduct, with a grade of 0 for the final exam.

Background Information

<u>Information provided by < Instructor / Invigilator name ></u>

- At the start of the exam, the rules for were read out
- During the exam, < Student name > was observed looking at the exam paper of a student in the next row.
- The instructor moved <student name> to another location in the room
- When the student submitted the exam paper, the instructor advised the student that they would be receiving an invitation to meet to discuss the instructor's concerns that the student had tried to copy from another student. The instructor sent an email within two days but the student did not respond.
- < Student name >'s paper contains answers identical to the other student's, including identical incorrect answers. After < Student name > was moved, there is little correspondence between their answers.

<u>Previous Instructions Provided on Academic Misconduct</u>

- The course outline clearly describes the serious penalties for academic misconduct including cheating on exams.

- The instructor < name > discussed rules on conduct during exams in class the week before the exam
- At the start of the exam, rules were read to the class
- All exam booklets have expectations and rules printed on the front cover, including the importance of not seeming to be looking at another student's answers.

DRC / ARC Meeting with the Student

The DRC met with the student on < date >. The meeting was chaired by < name >. < Student name > was accompanied by the UWSA Vice President; he was introduced to all members and when asked had no objections to anyone present.

< Student name > explained that they were only stretching and not trying to copy from another student. When questioned by DRC < Student name > described having taken at least 15 final exams at the University and knowing the rules.

Recommendation and Reasons

The DRC recommends there be a finding of misconduct, with a grade of 0 for the final exam. The PACE ARC makes this recommendation based on:

- < Student name > was aware that looking at another student's exam booklet was forbidden
- < Student name > was observed by both the instructor and the invigilator to be attempting to see another student's exam booklet.
- Wording is identical to the student from whom < Student name > was copying for some answers.
- < Student name > is a third-year student who has had multiple opportunities to understand the rules for conduct during an exam.

Respectfully submitted,

DRC / ARC Chair name
Chair, DRC / ARC of < department name or PACE >

Attachments:

Instructor Report
Notice to Student
Course Outline
Copy of two exam papers showing correspondence between answers until Q 12, when < Student name > was moved

THE SASMC PROCESS

The SASMC reviews the DRC/ARC's report and any additional information that the student may provide and makes the final decision about academic misconduct as well as the appropriate penalty. The Senate Committee may or may not agree with the DRC/ARC's recommendations. In its assessment of penalty, the SASMC considers such things as the following:

- Whether this is a student's first-time offense
- Whether procedures and timelines were followed
- The extent of the misconduct
- The weight of the assignment
- Other mitigating factors

After it has made its decision, the SASMC communicates such to the student and to the DRC/ARC, who communicates the decision to the instructor. If found guilty, the student has the right to appeal the decision before the Senate Academic Misconduct Appeals Committee, which is chaired by the Vice President (Academic).