

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY CODE INVESTIGATION PROCEDURES

I. DEFINITIONS

- A. Alleged Violator: a current or previous student alleged to have violated the Academic Integrity Code, or one about whom a reasonable suspicion of Violation arises in the course of an investigation.
- B. Class Day: any day, excluding Saturday, Sunday, and Winter Intersession, when Norman Campus classes are in session.
- C. Investigation Report: a written report issued by the OAIP noting the sufficient evidence received and the Investigators' findings and recommendation to proceed to a hearing.
- D. Investigator: an Integrity Council student assigned to inquire into possible Violations. Investigators may be aided by a faculty or staff advisor.
- E. Notice: actual notice; or any form of notice that is reasonably calculated to reach the Alleged Violator, for example U.S. mail to an address on file with the university or email to the Alleged Violator's official university address.
- F. The Office of Academic Integrity Programs ("OAIP"): the office approved by the Board of Regents and overseen by the Provost to be primarily responsible for handling all aspects of Academic Misconduct and the academic integrity process at the University of Oklahoma.
- G. Provost: the Senior Vice President and Provost of the University of Oklahoma Norman campus and/or their designee.
- H. Report: communication by a Reporter to the OAIP that a named Alleged Violator has or appears to have violated the provisions of the Academic Integrity Code. Reports are to be distinguished from (a) informal requests for advice on which no further action is taken and (b) requests for investigation of potential misconduct when no Alleged Violator has been identified.
- I. Reporter: the faculty member or other appropriate individual who reports a potential integrity Violation.
- J. Violation: any act that fits within the provisions of the Academic Integrity Code as improperly affecting the evaluation of a student's academic performance or achievement.

II. INVESTIGATIONS

- A. An Integrity Council investigation may, upon a finding of reasonable cause, be commenced:
- 1 Upon request by an Alleged Violator; or
 - 2 At the option of the OAIP Director; or
 - 3 At the option of the Investigators upon additional findings during an existing investigation.
- B. Investigations shall ordinarily be conducted by a team of Investigators who shall be members of the Integrity Council. Investigators may be aided and accompanied by other Integrity Council members, or others as appropriate, for example to provide special expertise or for training purposes. Cases involving graduate-level Alleged Violators should ordinarily include a graduate student Investigator or be advised by the OAIP Graduate Research Assistant as to general expectations of a graduate-level program. Investigators should recuse when their relation to an individual in the case raises a reasonable doubt as to their ability to investigate fairly. Knowledge of prior Reports, or current or previous enrollment in the same class, or similar levels of familiarity will not in themselves be grounds for recusal.
- C. The Investigator(s) may request statements and review documents submitted by the Reporter, Alleged Violator, or other appropriate parties; may request statements from and ask direct questions to witnesses and other persons with relevant information; may review university records including education records; and/or may make other inquiries reasonably necessary to conduct a thorough investigation. The Investigators should ordinarily refrain from contacting the Alleged Violator until the Alleged Violator has met, or passed the deadline to meet, with the Director.
- D. If a statement or evidence is not provided during the investigations stage of the process, it will not be included in the hearing stage of the process as allowable evidence to be considered in a finding of responsibility unless new and significant evidence emerges after the deadline to submit evidence during the investigations stage of the process that warrants review in the hearing stage of the process.
- E. In reaching their conclusions, Investigators should exclude evidence that is not relevant to the legitimacy of the claim of alleged academic misconduct. Excluded evidence may include, but is not limited to, character witness statements and claims of discrimination the Institutional Equity Office deemed not to be a policy violation. Investigators do not have authority to investigate concerns of impropriety that are not covered in the

Academic Integrity Code. Such concerns shall be relayed to the appropriate administrative office. Depending on the nature of the issues involved, the Reporter and/or Alleged Violator may be advised about the appropriate procedures to utilize. Where appropriate, the Provost may stay Integrity Code proceedings until the other proceedings are concluded.

- F. The Investigators shall determine if the evidence received is sufficient to proceed to a hearing. The evidence will be considered sufficient if a reasonable person might accept it as adequate to support a conclusion that the Alleged Violator is responsible for misconduct, even if conflicting evidence also exists. The Investigators shall dismiss a case if they find insufficient evidence. If the Investigators find sufficient evidence exists, they shall issue a written Investigation Report that will be provided to the Alleged Violator and Reporter, and other university officials, as necessary.
- G. Investigations will be initiated in the order requests are received. Exceptions (“expedited investigations”) will be permitted in the interest of justice and for good cause if requested by the Alleged Violator. Cases in which an expedited investigation may be appropriate include, but are not limited to, where the case is otherwise likely to delay graduation. It is the Integrity Council’s intent to complete any investigation within ninety (90) Class Days of receipt of the request, excluding Summer Intersession. However, an investigation may take longer, for example, if previously requested investigations are unusually numerous, if the issues in the case are especially complex or more than one Alleged Violator is involved, or if any relevant party’s actions contribute to delay. If an investigation must extend beyond ninety (90) Class Days, the Alleged Violator should be notified.
- H. Investigators and OAIP staff assisting in an investigation shall not communicate about the investigation with any adjudicator or OAIP staff assisting the Integrity Council with a hearing, or who may have decision-making authority on appeal, except as may be needed for statistical, scheduling/logistical purposes, or where the Alleged Violator is included as a party to the communication.
- I. In the course of an investigation, the Investigators may find reason to believe that an individual not originally reported has violated the Academic Integrity Code, or that a Violation not previously reported has occurred, or that a Violation previously reported is materially worse than originally alleged. In those cases, Notice of the new Violations or circumstances will generally be communicated to the Alleged Violator (or new Alleged Violator, as appropriate) within thirty (30) Class Days. Ordinarily such discoveries will expand the scope of the original investigation rather than creating a new investigation.

III. ALLEGED VIOLATOR RESPONSE TO INVESTIGATION REPORT

- A. Once the Investigation Report is sent, the Alleged Violator's written response will be due within five (5) Class Days.
- B. Acceptance of Responsibility. An Alleged Violator who accepts responsibility is ordinarily deemed to accept the facts as alleged by the Reporter and as modified by any investigation that has occurred.
- C. Denial of responsibility. An Alleged Violator who denies responsibility for the alleged Violation, either entirely or in material part, will receive the opportunity for a hearing.
- D. Default. An Alleged Violator who fails to respond to the Investigation Report by the deadline shall be considered in default and deemed to have accepted responsibility.
- E. If responsibility for misconduct is established by the Alleged Violator's acceptance or by default, a grade penalty and an institutional penalty shall ordinarily be imposed.