

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

Standards of Academic Integrity for Evangel University

As an institution of higher education committed to excellence in educating and equipping students to become Spirit-empowered servants of God who impact the church and society globally, the Evangel University community is committed to the highest levels of academic integrity. Therefore, staff, faculty, and students will

- Deal openly and honestly with one another.
- Conduct and produce accurate and original research according to professional standards and in pursuit of Truth.
- Choose and use academic sources appropriately and ethically, being careful to cite the work and ideas of others.
- Submit academic work as an accurate representation of their own learning and ability.
- Diligently adhere to and consistently apply the disciplines and methodologies appropriate to their professional fields.
- Complete assignments, projects, and papers according to the explicit guidelines of their professors or supervisors and the implicit expectations of the Evangel University academic integrity policy.

The integrity of the Evangel University community, above all other factors, establishes the reputation of the University, the value of the academic degrees, and the legitimacy of students' learning experiences. As people of Christ, members of the broader academic community, and future professionals, it is incumbent upon every member of the Evangel University community to employ and encourage integrity in all academic and professional pursuits.

Understanding Academic Dishonesty

Any and every instance of academic dishonesty¹ compromises the mission of Evangel University and violates the standards we hold as people of Christ and ethical practitioners within our respective professional fields. Evangel University expects its students to maintain the highest level of integrity for all course work. Although discussion and collaboration are encouraged as part of course interaction, **all work submitted in any course** (seated, online, or hybrid) **must be the original work of the individual student. Therefore**, students are expected to understand and avoid all forms of academic dishonesty, which includes falsification, cheating, collusion, and plagiarism.

¹ Note that throughout this policy, the terms "academic dishonesty," "academic misconduct," and "violation" are used interchangeably.

Generative Artificial Intelligence (“AI”) Tools and Academic Integrity

It is the position of Evangel University that the principles of this policy extend to the use of generative AI (Artificial Intelligence) tools (such as but not limited to ChatGPT, CopyGenius, Quilbot AI, Dall-e) in student work. **Honest representation of one’s own work is the guiding principle: the assumption is that all work must be the student’s own work.** It is already a violation of this policy for students to submit work that is not their own, a principle which extends to the use of AI resources as well. Content generated by or substantially altered by AI tools should not be seen as a substitute for individual, student-generated work.

The rapid growth of generative AI tools has raised significant questions surrounding their use in academic work and potential for ethical issues. While we recognize that such tools potentially offer many new possibilities and there may be legitimate applications of such tools in a variety of fields, care must be taken to consider the ethical implications of their use in an academic setting.

However, while there are clear limitations on the use of generative AI tools, faculty have the discretion to use or not use such tools in their classroom. Faculty are encouraged to decide whether such tools serve the pedagogical purposes for each course, and to include a clearly defined syllabus statement of their course policy regarding the use or misuse of generative AI tools in their course. Students are expected to read and understand the policy regarding the use or misuse of generative AI tools in their courses and will be held accountable for following those policies. Students should assume AI tools are not to be used unless specifically outlined by the professor within the course syllabus.

Definitions

The following are commonly encountered types of academic misconduct. This list is not an exhaustive list. Definitions and examples in this section are provided solely to help clarify and illustrate potential violations.

Falsification: modifying or fabricating information with the intent to mislead others or gain an advantage.

Examples of falsification include but are not limited to the following:

- Fabricating data, citations, or other information for any academic work.
- Misrepresenting facts about yourself or others (e.g., providing false reasons for taking a make-up exam).
- Forging attendance or other academic records.
- Taking credit for group work in which the student did not participate.
- Changing the answers or score on previously graded academic work.
- Using generative AI programs to fabricate content, data, or sources.

Cheating: using deceptive means to obtain credit for academic work or gain an advantage or assisting others to do the same.

Examples of cheating include but are not limited to the following:

- Composing or completing any academic work for another student.
- Buying academic work or answers.
- Using or attempting to use unauthorized materials such as electronic devices or cheat sheets, information, notes, or study aids on a quiz or exam.
- Taking, using, sharing, selling, or posting questions, answers or information regarding a quiz or exam (before, during, or after the quiz or exam).
- Submitting the same or similar paper, project, or assignment in multiple classes without prior approval from the professor. This practice is also known as “self-plagiarism.”
- Copying or knowingly sharing information with another student during a quiz or exam.

Collusion: unauthorized or illegitimate cooperation among students on work intended to be an individual assessment.

Collusion effectively abdicates the responsibility for work, learning, or self-evaluation to others and is deceptive in the academic setting because the act misrepresents the knowledge, skill, and ability of the individual student. Work submitted through collusion invalidates the assessment of a student’s learning. Collusion is often confused with collaboration; therefore, it is important to know the distinction between the two concepts. Collaboration involves learning and working with others, collectively focusing on the learning outcomes or project goals, and sharing the responsibility of the task while *maintaining accountability for one’s own work* and contributions. Instructors often use collaboration as a learning strategy. Unauthorized collaboration is considered collusion when the instructor’s intent for the assignment is to assess individual work. Students working together on assignments intended to be individually completed have moved from collaboration to collusion. Consequently, instructors should provide clear expectations and students should ask questions to gain a full understanding of their instructors’ expectations to avoid collusion.

Examples of collusion include but are not limited to the following:

- Allowing or hiring someone else to write any part of a paper or writing any part of someone else’s paper.
- Sharing work with or receiving work from another person, group, or entity for any assignment (in whole or in part) that is *intended to be an assessment of individual work*.
- Allowing or hiring someone (e.g., parent, friend, roommate, tutor, etc.) to substantially change any assignment submitted for academic evaluation.

Plagiarism: using any portion of someone else’s work as your own without proper citation.

Plagiarism occurs when the writer uses or copies a source (or sources) and presents the information in a way that makes it appear as if the content is the original work of the writer. Plagiarism can occur both inadvertently and intentionally. Plagiarism can occur even when the writer does not intend to cheat or

deceive but fails to follow appropriate methods of using and citing sources. Therefore, plagiarism is not determined according to the writer's intention.

Plagiarism occurs when writers improperly use any kind of work or source, including print media (e.g., books, poetry, essays, statistical data, etc.), digital media (e.g., journal articles, web content, musical compositions, etc.), audio compositions (e.g., podcasts, songs, speeches, etc.), visual works (e.g., drawings, paintings, movies, documentaries, etc.), and source code (e.g., program code generated by or obtained from classmates, AI apps, the internet, or any other source not authorized by the professor).

Examples of plagiarism include but are not limited to the following:

- Using a source appropriately without proper citation
 - Omitting quotation marks when using the exact words of a source, with or without proper citation.
 - Using ideas from a source, even if properly summarized or paraphrased, without proper citation.
- Changing the words of a source without changing the structure or original phrasing, with or without proper citation.
- Blatantly or grossly misrepresenting ideas from a source, even with citation

More blatant examples of plagiarism include but are not limited to the following:

- Providing or writing/composing/drawing/coding any portion of an assignment for someone else.
- Submitting as one's own work a paper, composition, drawing, source code, or any other learning artifact prepared in full or in part by someone else (e.g., work taken or bought from someone else).
- Using sections of a source or sources without quotation or citation, even if some of the wording has been changed (e.g., changing words using a thesaurus, paraphrasing tool, or omitting a few words).
- Rewriting a paper from someone else.
- Committing self-plagiarism. Revising or reusing a paper submitted in a previous course and submitting it as original work for a current course.

Facilitating Academic Dishonesty

Facilitating academic dishonesty occurs when a student knowingly or unwittingly assists (or attempts to assist) another student to commit an act of academic dishonesty. This help can include aiding others in overt acts or allowing others to use their work in a dishonest manner (e.g., allowing another student to "borrow" a paper).

Other Forms of Academic Dishonesty

Other dishonest or deceptive behaviors not specified in the other definitions may still be considered violations of academic integrity.

Examples of other dishonest behaviors include but are not limited to the following:

- Sabotaging other students' academic work (e.g., deleting, destroying, or stealing work).
- Destroying academic records.

- Selling or distribution of course materials without authorization (e.g., publishing recorded lectures or class materials online).

Academic Integrity Resources

Evangel University provides appropriate help to support the success of students and protect the integrity of their work. The academic leadership of Evangel University scrutinizes the provided support services and practices to ensure they support the academic success of students and maintain the standards of academic integrity set forth in this policy.

Evangel University provides tutoring and writing resources to help students avoid plagiarism and improve their writing. These resources are available to all Evangel University students at no additional cost to the student. Students are encouraged to access and use these resources to support their academic learning and prepare them for professional success. Students may find more information at The Write Place Online in Course Commons.

Evangel University subscribes to services that support academic integrity, such as *Turnitin*, *Copyleaks*, and *Respondus (LockDown Browser and Monitor)*. *Turnitin* analyzes student work for originality and creates a similarity report for student submissions; this allows professors to easily identify the sources used in the composition of a submission to verify that the student work is not plagiarized from online or other sources. *Copyleaks* promotes originality of student work by detecting AI generated text. *Respondus (LockDown Browser and Monitor)* is used to promote the integrity of quizzes and exams in seated and online courses and to provide remote proctoring of exams.

To safeguard the academic trust necessary within the Evangel University community and protect the students who are operating in good faith and integrity in their academic efforts, Evangel University adjudicates instances of alleged academic dishonesty and assigns consequences for academic dishonesty to

- deter all forms of dishonest behavior,
- educate violators to facilitate an understanding what they did wrong and instruct them on how to avoid violations in the future,
- discipline those who deliberately or consistently practice dishonest behaviors, and
- restore the violator's standing in the community.

Roles & Responsibilities

Students

As members of the Evangel University community, students have the responsibility to uphold high standards of academic integrity in all their work and should strive to deal openly and honestly with their professors and with each other. Therefore, students should familiarize themselves with the expectations and standards outlined in this policy and are encouraged to seek guidance from faculty members or the Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) in any situation that may be unclear. Students share the responsibility to promote academic integrity and to discourage and report academic dishonesty. Thus, students are encouraged to report academic misconduct to appropriate faculty or staff members when they become aware of an academic integrity violation.

Faculty

Faculty members form the first line of defense for deterring and detecting academic misconduct and have a responsibility to foster and uphold high standards of academic integrity in their courses. This responsibility includes deterring academic dishonesty as much as reasonably possible, by detecting such incidents when they occur, and by reporting all incidents, regardless of the category of offense, to the Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) for record-keeping and adjudication purposes.

Please note: ALL incidents—even those resulting only in an official warning—need to be reported to the Academic Integrity Committee. The AIC maintains the confidential records of academic integrity incidents and, thus, might be privy to information that would necessitate an escalation due to repeated warnings or offenses; therefore, it is imperative that faculty file a report of their decision and course of action in each case.

When an integrity violation is suspected, faculty members have two methods for addressing suspected incidents. Regardless of which route is taken, faculty members are encouraged to consult with the AIC for guidance, clarification, and support at any point as they work through the investigation and adjudication process.

1. Faculty Adjudication:

Faculty members may investigate and adjudicate allegations of academic misconduct that fit the pattern of Category I or Category II (see [Sanctions](#)) offenses and administer sanctions accordingly. This course of action is most effective when the evidence is clear, or the student admits fault and accepts the sanctions. Faculty members should strive to be consistent with this policy's intent and guidance in their adjudication decisions.

Faculty members may also request that the alleged academic misconduct be investigated and adjudicated by the AIC.

2. Referral for Academic Integrity Committee Adjudication:

The AIC can serve as a third-party adjudicator for Category I and Category II (see [Sanctions](#)) offenses. Faculty members are encouraged to submit suspected incidents for committee review when the case is complex or the potential for conflict of interest is present. Either the student or faculty member may request that the case be sent to the AIC for investigation and adjudication for any reason. In cases when AIC adjudication is preferred or necessary, the AIC may seek input from the faculty member and the student. A request for AIC adjudication by either student or faculty will not be considered an admission of wrongdoing nor be weighed against the student in adjudication deliberations.

Regardless of which route is taken, faculty are encouraged to consult with the AIC for guidance, clarification, and support at any point as they work through the investigation and adjudication process.

Academic Integrity Committee (AIC)

The AIC has the primary responsibility to investigate and adjudicate alleged violations. The process comprises reviewing all available evidence and applying the policy in an impartial manner consistent with the intent of the policy and with the values of Evangel University as a whole. The AIC serves as a third-party adjudicator for Category I and Category II offenses when requested and is the primary adjudicator for Category III and Category IV offenses.

The AIC also maintains confidential records of previous reports, warnings, and violations (see [Confidential Records & Escalation](#) section below).

As outlined in the AIC Charter, the committee reserves the right to escalate sanctions when appropriate per this policy and to enforce sanctions administered at the course and university level.

Office of Academic Affairs

The Office of Academic Affairs is responsible for oversight of the AIC, including selection and approval of committee members, reviewing and approval of proposed sanctions for Category IV offenses, and maintaining this policy.

Sanctions

Sanctions for violations of academic integrity are decided at the discretion of the faculty or the AIC and will be applied even-handedly in keeping with the intent and provisions of this policy. Sanctions are scalable and based on the circumstances of each incident, taking into account the nature, type and severity of the offense (see [Definitions](#)). **Repeated violations may result in escalation of sanctions** (see [Confidential Records & Escalation](#)).

To ensure the consistent application of this policy, the following Categories serve as guidelines. Although integrity is understood to be vital in all circumstances, the nature, type, and severity of offenses, and violators' culpability may vary in individual situations. The overarching principle of the policy is to match sanctions proportionate to the violation.



Figure 1—Academic Integrity Violations

Examples are provided for guidance and illustration but should *not* be considered as a definitive or exhaustive list. Note that Categories do *not* necessarily correspond to the student's record (i.e., 1st offense, 2nd offense, etc.); in other words, a first offense may be adjudicated under any Category depending on the nature, type, and severity of the offense.

Category I

Category I offenses can be adjudicated by either the course instructor or the AIC. Faculty are encouraged to consult with the AIC at any point as they work through the decision-making process.

Category I offenses are generally less serious in nature or generally limited in severity and generally do not involve malicious intent or forethought. Note that some incidents may be construed as either Category I or Category II at the discretion of the adjudicator (faculty or AIC), dependent on the nature and severity of the offense. (See [Figure 1](#)).

Category I offenses include but are not limited to the following:

- Violations on low-stakes assignments (i.e. minor infractions).
- Violations resulting from misunderstanding instructions.
- Violations resulting from lack of understanding of proper citations.

Possible sanctions for Category I violations may include one or more of the following:

- The instructor may issue an official warning with or without imposing specific academic consequences.
- The student may be required to redo the assignment or complete an alternate assignment.
- The student may receive a reduced grade for the assignment or may receive a “0” on the portion(s) of the assignment that constituted the infringement.
- A grade of “0” or “F” may be assigned for that assignment, with or without the option to redo the assignment.

Remediation for Category I violations may include any of the following:

- One-on-one meetings with the professor.
- Completion of an online ethics/integrity module.
- Completion of *How to Recognize Plagiarism* tutorial and certification test.
- Tutoring appointment(s) with a tutor in the Write Place or the Center for Student Success.

If for any reason, either the student or the faculty member wishes the allegation to be investigated and adjudicated by a third-party, either party may request a review by the AIC. A request for AIC adjudication by either student or faculty will not be considered an admission of wrongdoing nor be weighed against the student in adjudication deliberations. (See [#2 under Faculty](#))

Please note: ALL incidents—even those resulting only in an official warning—need to be reported to the AIC. Previous violations or multiple warnings/offenses may result in the escalation of sanctions and will be adjudicated by the AIC.

Category II

Category II offenses can be adjudicated by either the course instructor or the AIC. If for any reason, either the student or the faculty member wishes the allegation to be investigated and adjudicated by a third-party, either party may request a review by the AIC. A request for AIC adjudication by either student or faculty will not be considered an admission of wrongdoing nor be weighed against the student in adjudication deliberations. (See [#2 under Faculty](#))

Category II offenses comprise violations of a more significant nature than Category I offenses. Typically, these offenses include higher-stakes assignments or incidents of a more serious nature than Category I violations.

Category II offenses include but are not limited to the following:

- Any form of falsification.
- Cheating on an exam or assignment.
- Blatant or substantial (i.e., over 20% of the document) plagiarism.
- Collusion.
- Circumstances indicating an intent to deceive (such as premeditation) or blatant or intentional disregard for academic integrity.
- Repeated violations.

Possible sanctions for Category II violations may include one or more of the following:

- The student may receive a reduced grade for the assignment.
- The student may receive a grade of “O” or “F” for that assignment without the opportunity to redo the assignment.
- The student may receive a reduced grade in the course (This sanction is not at faculty discretion and *must be adjudicated by the AIC*).

Remediation for Category II violations may include any of the following:

- One-on-one meetings with the professor.
- Completion of an online ethics/integrity module.
- Completion of *How to Recognize Plagiarism* tutorial and certification test.
- Tutoring appointment(s) with a tutor in the Write Place or the Center for Student Success.

Please note: ALL incidents need to be reported to the AIC. Previous violations or multiple warnings/offenses may result in the escalation of sanctions and will be adjudicated by the AIC.

Category III

All Category III offenses are adjudicated by the AIC. Faculty should report all suspected incidents of Category III offenses to the AIC for review and adjudication. Category III offenses comprise violations of a serious nature.

Category III offenses include but are not limited to the following:

- Violations on assignments or exams that are comprehensive (e.g., final exams, capstone projects, or research papers).
- Incidents demonstrating extreme dishonesty or maliciousness or that cause direct harm to others (such as sabotaging another student’s work).
- Repeated Category I or Category II offenses.

Possible sanctions for Category III violations may include one or more of the following:

- The student may receive a grade of “O” or “F” for that assignment without the opportunity to redo the assignment.
- The student may receive a reduced grade in the course.
- The student may receive a failing grade in the course (A student cannot avoid a failing grade due to academic dishonesty by withdrawing from the course).
- Revocation of previously granted grade in the course (including “W”). (See [Retroactive Grade Changes](#))

Remediation for Category III violations may include any of the following:

- One-on-one meetings with the professor.
- Completion of an online ethics/integrity module.
- Completion of *How to Recognize Plagiarism* tutorial and certification test.
- Tutoring appointment(s) with a tutor in the Write Place or the Center for Student Success.

Category IV

Category IV violations are exceptionally consequential and will be handled with commensurate seriousness. All suspected incidents of Category IV violations will be adjudicated by the AIC; faculty are not permitted to adjudicate Category IV offenses on their own discretion.

Category IV offenses are exceptionally grave offenses which call into question not only the student's grade in the course but also his/her standing within Evangel University.

Category IV offenses include but are not limited to the following:

- Repeated offenses demonstrating a pattern of misconduct.
- Blatant plagiarism on a program culmination assignment (e.g., a capstone project, a master's thesis, or a doctoral dissertation).
- Misconduct so egregious that it calls into question the legitimacy of the student's earned degree and harms the University's reputation.

Category IV violations will result in failure of the course, with a notation added to the student's transcript that the failure was due to academic dishonesty. The failure will be indicated by a grade marking of "XF" on the student's transcript. A failing grade for academic dishonesty (i.e., "XF") cannot be avoided by withdrawing from the course or replaced by retaking the course. Students may petition for removal of "XF", according to certain conditions (see [Failure Due to Academic Dishonesty](#)).

Additional sanctions for Category IV offenses may include the following:

- Revocation of previously granted grade. (See [Retroactive Grade Changes](#))
- Suspension from the University. (See [Suspension Due to Academic Dishonesty](#))
- Dismissal from the University. (See [Dismissal Due to Academic Dishonesty](#))
- Revocation of degree. (See [Revocation of Degree](#))

Failure Due to Academic Dishonesty ("XF")

For Category IV sanctions of a failing grade due to academic dishonesty, the student's transcript will record that the failure was due to academic dishonesty using the grade designation "XF." A failing grade for academic dishonesty cannot be avoided by withdrawing from the course or replaced by retaking the course. The "XF" designation will remain on the student's transcript for a minimum of one (1) calendar year, at which time the student may petition the AIC to have it replaced with the grade of "F," according to the following conditions:

- The petition includes a formal letter from the student that communicates his/her remorse for the behavior and reflects on his or her learning and growth from the experience.
- The petition is accompanied by three (3) letters of reference from individuals (not related to the student) who are in a position to evaluate the student's personal or academic integrity, learning

or personal growth from the relevant experience, and academic performance and/or leadership potential.

- The student submits the petition to and agrees to meet with the AIC in person.
- No subsequent violations of academic integrity involving the student have been documented or reported.
- The opportunity to change an “XF” grade to “F” is only available one (1) time per student per program of study.

Suspension Due to Academic Dishonesty

Suspension is the involuntary, complete separation from the University. Suspension from the University due to academic dishonesty is presumed to go into effect immediately upon adjudication of such sanctions. Academic work in progress is forfeited; standard institutional policies will be applied for the refund of tuition, room, and/or board, as applicable. Record of suspension due to academic dishonesty will be kept in the student’s official record.

Suspension due to academic dishonesty will remain in effect for a minimum of one (1) calendar year from the date of adjudication. After this time the student may petition for readmission, according to the following conditions:

- The petition includes a formal letter from the student that communicates his/her remorse for the behavior and reflects on his or her learning and growth from the experience.
- The petition is accompanied by three (3) letters of reference from individuals (not related to the student) who are in a position to evaluate the student’s personal or academic integrity, learning or personal growth from the relevant experience, and academic performance and/or leadership potential.
- The student submits the petition to and agrees to meet with the CAO in person to discuss the petition.
- The opportunity to petition for readmission after suspension due to academic dishonesty is only available one (1) time per student per program of study.
- The petition for re-admission following suspension due to academic dishonesty may be combined with the petition to remove an “XF” grade from the student’s transcript, as described in this policy (i.e. the same petition letter, interview, and letters of reference may apply towards both readmission and removal of an “XF” grade).

If such petition is granted, the student may then reapply following the standard application processes.

Dismissal Due to Academic Dishonesty

For Category IV offenses subject to this sanction, the AIC will issue a recommendation of dismissal to the Chief Academic Officer (CAO). Such recommendations must be made unanimously by the AIC. The CAO will issue the final decision of dismissal from the University.

Dismissal due to academic dishonesty means that the student is permanently separated from the university with an appropriate notation of the reasons for such termination being placed in the student’s official record. Any academic work in progress is forfeited; standard institutional policies will be applied

for the refund of tuition, room, and/or board, as applicable. Students dismissed from the University are not allowed to be on University property (including the campus and Evangel-owned residential rental properties) or in attendance at University-sponsored events. Those violating this provision may be charged with trespassing. Dismissal from the University is deemed final and no readmission will be accepted.

Retroactive Grade Changes and Revocation of Degree

Evangel University retains the right to change a grade or revoke a degree previously awarded if a Category III or Category IV violation of academic integrity is discovered after the conclusion of a course or the completion of a program.

Retroactive Grade Changes

If a violation that could be considered a Category III or IV violation is discovered after a grade has been entered in the course (including a “W”), the faculty member should submit evidence of the violation to the AIC for adjudication. If the violation is determined to be a Category III or IV offense, such that it calls into question the student’s grade in the course, the AIC may recommend to the CAO that the student’s grade be retroactively reduced or changed to an “F” or an “XF.” Subject to CAO approval of the recommendation, the Registrar’s office will indicate the grade change and the student will be informed of the action. Although faculty members are encouraged to report allegations of major violations from any time period, retroactive changes may be made only within five (5) years of the completion of the course. If retroactive grade changes affect a student’s graduation requirements (even if graduation has already occurred), the student’s degree may be revoked (see [Revocation of Degree](#)). Students may remedy a retroactive grade change either by retaking the class for an improved grade or, in cases of an “XF”, by following the “XF” removal process outlined in this policy.

Revocation of Degree

If a Category IV offense is discovered after a student has graduated, and it consists of misconduct so egregious that it calls into question the legitimacy of the student’s earned degree and harms the University’s reputation, including but not limited to repeated Category III violations or plagiarism on a master’s thesis or doctoral dissertation (or equivalent), the AIC may recommend to the CAO that a degree be revoked due to academic dishonesty. Such recommendations must be made unanimously by the AIC. The CAO must consult with the appropriate academic dean (graduate) or department chair (undergraduate) before issuing a decision. All decisions to revoke a degree must be approved by the President of Evangel University. Revocation of degree will be indicated on the student’s record and official transcripts. The decision to revoke a degree may be appealed to the Board of Trustees, who may or may not consider the appeal at their discretion.

Confidential Records & Escalation

The AIC will maintain confidential records of all official warnings and violations. The AIC records are maintained on a “need-to-know” basis and will not be shared with anyone not directly involved with the proceedings or otherwise having a legitimate need to access them. Unless otherwise specified in this

policy, such records are retained solely for the purpose of institutional reporting and the tracking of repeat violations and will not be regarded as part of the student's record (apart from “XF”, suspension, and dismissal as previously outlined).

Repeated offenses will be considered grounds for escalation of sanctions. In cases of repeat offenses, the AIC reserves the right to escalate sanctions, notwithstanding faculty-adjudicated sanctions in a given case.

Student belligerence, threats, or obstruction of the investigation process will be considered grounds for escalation. Threats against faculty, staff, or students will not be tolerated and will result in Category IV sanctions. Threatening or aggressive or violent behavior will also be referred for disciplinary proceedings and will be reported to appropriate authorities.

Appeals

Students have the right of appeal following the adjudication of a violation of academic integrity. All status/sanctions imposed will be in effect during an appeal unless a specific request is made to the Chief Academic Officer to delay implementation, but the presumptive stance is that status/sanctions will go into effect immediately. Graduation, study abroad, internships, conferences, etc. do NOT in and of themselves constitute exigent circumstances, and individuals may not be able to participate in those activities during their appeal process. In cases where an appeal results in resumption of privileges or reinstatement to the university, all reasonable attempts will be made to restore the individual to his/her prior status, recognizing that some opportunities lost may be irreparable.

Appeals must be in writing and submitted to the Chief Academic Officer, Riggs 304, during regular business hours (Monday-Friday 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.) within five (5) business days of the decision notification. After this time, the decision is final. Only one (1) request for an appeal may be submitted.

Appeal requests must meet both the Grounds and Criteria to be reviewed:

A. Grounds for Appeal

1. A procedural [or substantive] error occurred that significantly impacted the outcome of the hearing (e.g., substantiated bias, material deviation from established procedures);
2. To consider new evidence, unavailable during the original hearing or investigation, that could substantially impact the original finding or sanction. A summary of this new evidence and its potential impact must be included; and/or
3. The imposed sanctions fall outside the range of sanctions typical for the offence and the cumulative conduct history of the student.

B. Criteria

1. Appeals must be in writing and submitted to the Chief Academic Officer, Riggs 304, during regular business hours (Monday -Friday 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.) within five (5) business days of the decision notification. After this time, the original decision is final.
2. Clear error or compelling justification must be shown, as findings or sanctions are presumed to have been decided reasonably and appropriately during the original proceeding. It is not enough to simply assert one of the grounds for appeal. The written appeal must provide information that specifically supports grounds upon which the individual bases the appeal. If

an appeal does not contain sufficient information to support the grounds upon which the appeal is based, a review of the appeal will be denied.

3. Only one (1) request for an appeal may be submitted.

Appeal Consideration and Decision

Based on written requests/responses or on interviews, the appeals officer will send a letter of outcome for the appeal to the parties. In response to a request, the appeals officer can take one of three possible actions:

1. Dismiss an appeal request as untimely or ineligible,
2. Grant an appeal and remand the finding and/or sanction for further investigation or reconsideration at the hearing level, or
3. Modify a sanction.

A written decision concerning the appeal will be provided in person, mailed to the mailing address of the respective party as indicated in university records, or emailed to the parties' university-issued email accounts. Once received in person, mailed, or emailed, the notice of decision will be deemed presumptively delivered.

The procedures governing the hearing of appeals include the following:

1. All parties are timely informed of the status of requests for appeal, the status of the appeal consideration, and the results of the appeal decision.
2. Every opportunity to return an appeal to the original hearing body for reconsideration should be pursued.
3. Appeals are not intended to be full re-hearings of the allegation (de novo). In most cases, appeals are confined to a review of the written documentation or record of the original hearing, and pertinent documentation regarding the grounds for appeal.
4. Appeals decisions are to be deferential to the original hearing body, making changes to the finding only where there is clear error and to the sanction only if there is a compelling justification to do so.
5. An appeal is not an opportunity for appeals officers to substitute their judgment for that of the original hearing body merely because they disagree with its finding or sanctions.

The appeals officer will typically render a written decision on the appeal to all parties within five (5) business days from hearing of the appeal. The appeals officer's decision to deny an appeal request is final.

The Rights of Students Accused of Violations of Academic Integrity

Evangel University presumes students have academic integrity until the evidence indicates otherwise. Therefore, the following rights apply to students accused of violations of academic integrity:

- The right to request that any alleged violation be adjudicated by the AIC. Faculty may adjudicate Category I and Category II violations, but students retain the right to third-party adjudication by the AIC. A request for AIC adjudication by either student or faculty member will not be

considered an admission of wrongdoing nor be weighed against the student in adjudication deliberations. (See [#2 under Faculty](#))

- The right to be informed in writing (or via email) of any allegations of academic integrity violations prior to adjudication.
- The right to contribute evidence and supply testimony to the adjudicating faculty member or to a member of the AIC. The student will have no less than five (5) business days to respond to allegations.
- The right to continue courses or academic program without interruption or reprisal until the allegation has been adjudicated by the AIC.
- The right to be informed of the decision of the AIC in writing (or via email).