

Academic Integrity Policy 4.8

([https://www.sandiego.edu/legal/policies/faculty/Policy%204.8%20\(revised%202.1.2017\).pdf](https://www.sandiego.edu/legal/policies/faculty/Policy%204.8%20(revised%202.1.2017).pdf))

Current Section II.4(g) of the Academic Integrity policy

If a Hearing Committee determines that no serious violation or infraction has in fact occurred, it will remand the matter to the instructor or supervisor who determined the infraction or probability of serious violation with a request that the instructor or supervisor take further action with respect to the course or exercise that is consistent with the Hearing Committee's determination.

Proposed Revision

If a Hearing Committee determines that no serious violation or infraction has in fact occurred, it will remand the matter to the instructor or supervisor who determined the infraction or probability of serious violation. ~~with a request that t~~The instructor or supervisor will take further action with respect to the course or exercise that is consistent with the Hearing Committee's determination.

Rationale from Dr. Tom Herrinton: “In a recent case, the Academic Integrity Hearing Committee found a student not guilty of either an infraction or a serious violation. The faculty member, however, was certain the student was guilty and imposed a grade penalty despite the finding of not guilty. It was impossible to explain to the student how it made sense she could be found not guilty and still be penalized. The current policy does allow for this outcome (as you will see in the attachment) as the Hearing Committee requests that the faculty member's action be consistent with the Committee's finding of not guilty. The revision is to mandate that the faculty member's action be consistent with it.

Basically under the revision the Committee would be the sole judge of guilt and the faculty member would remain the sole determiner of the course penalty in the event the student is found guilty by the Committee.”