



Academic Misconduct Procedure

This procedure is governed by its parent policy. Questions regarding this procedure are to be directed to the identified Procedure Administrator.

Functional category	Academic
Parent policy	Student Judicial Affairs Policy
Approval date	February 9, 2025
Effective date	February 9, 2025
Procedure owner	Vice President, Academic
Procedure administrator	Dean, Academic Strategy and Integration

Overview

NorQuest College (College) is committed to maintaining high standards of non-academic conduct and academic performance and integrity, in order to foster a learning environment conducive to the personal, educational, and social development of its students. This commitment is founded upon the principles of fairness, trustworthiness, honesty, respect, and responsibility. The college expects that its students will be guided at all times by these principles in the work that they submit and the behaviour in which they engage.

To this end, the college had adopted a [Student Judicial Affairs Policy](#) that both directs and standardizes the quasi-judicial procedures that govern alleged incidents of student academic and non-academic misconduct requiring a resolution mechanism and, where appropriate, the application of sanctions.

The Academic Misconduct Procedure directs the adjudication of cases of alleged academic misconduct and establishes the steps in the process, the standards by which alleged misconduct shall be judged, and the range of sanctions that may be imposed. Authority to establish this procedure is derived from the NorQuest College Board of Governors Policies:

- [No. 5](#), which delegates authority to the President and CEO to establish policies and procedures for the college's management and operation, and
- [No. 8](#), which requires the President and CEO to establish policies and procedures to ensure that college students comply with the college Code of Conduct.

Procedure

NorQuest College is committed to maintaining high standards of academic performance and integrity, and it is incumbent upon all members of the college community to uphold these standards. Allegation of academic misconduct will be addressed using the adjudication principles stated in the Student Judicial Affairs Policy and the actions specified below.

Role of the Student Resolution and Integrity Office (SRIO)

While the SRIO does not investigate or make decisions on alleged academic misconduct incidents, the SRIO oversees the Academic Misconduct Procedure, which includes managing and processing the submissions of the misconduct reports through the centralized system and keeping records of academic misconduct findings.

In addition, the SRIO

- maintains its neutral stance and provides objective and unbiased procedural advice to all parties involved in the alleged academic misconduct and its adjudication process.
- reviews submissions from faculty and students in order to ensure they are valid as per the Academic Misconduct Procedure and requests additional information if needed. This includes reviewing imposed

sanction(s) to ensure they are proportionate to the nature and seriousness of the alleged misconduct.

- assures the responding student's Procedural Rights in the adjudication process.

Forms of Academic Misconduct

Academic misconduct may be defined broadly as the giving, taking, or presenting of information that dishonestly aids an individual or group in the determination of academic merit or standing. Common examples include, but are not limited to, plagiarism and cheating.

Plagiarism is a form of academic misconduct that occurs when someone presents, as one's own, work that has been created by another. Specific examples include:

- Presenting in any format the words, ideas, images or data created by or belonging to someone else as if it were one's own.
- Manipulating source material in an effort to deceive or mislead.
- Submitting work that contains misleading references that do not accurately reflect the sources actually used.

Cheating is a form of academic misconduct that occurs when someone employs unauthorized means to obtain credit for work submitted, to gain advantage over others in the assessment of academic work, or to assist others in obtaining such advantages. Specific examples include:

- Accessing information from unauthorized sources (e.g., other students, notes) in the course of completing an assignment, test, or examination.
- Possessing unauthorized evaluation materials in advance of their administration.
- Collaborating on any project, assignment, or examination without prior permission.
- Completing any assignments, tests, or examinations for another student or having another student substitute for oneself in any activity related to academic evaluation.

- Submitting work for academic evaluation that has been obtained in whole or in part from other sources, including the internet or other individuals.
- Submitting, without prior approval, all or a substantial portion of academic work that was submitted for credit in another course.
- Altering any document related to academic status or progress.
- Misrepresenting or withholding information or providing false information to gain academic or financial benefit.
- Willfully interfering with or damaging the academic work of another student.
- Failing to comply with a specific condition of academic integrity required within a particular course.
- Assisting others to cheat or plagiarize.

Allegations of Academic Misconduct

Allegations of academic misconduct will be investigated. Investigations will comply with the College's FOIP Act Policy and related procedures, as well as all applicable legislation.

Initial Review

1. If an instructor has reason to believe that a student in one of the instructor's courses may have engaged in an act of academic misconduct, the instructor (who may be assisted by a program- or faculty-appointed designate) will investigate the alleged misconduct and establish a reasonable degree of certainty that the act did occur prior to proceeding.
2. If an individual other than the student's instructor has reason to believe that a student in one of the instructor's courses may have engaged in an act of academic misconduct, the individual will inform the instructor and provide any supporting evidence that is available.
3. If the instructor is reasonably certain that an act of academic misconduct did occur, the instructor will request a meeting with the

student in person, over the phone, or via electronic communications, as appropriate. Either party may be accompanied by an Attendant.

Parties Agree

1. If a resolution can be reached with regard to the alleged act of academic misconduct, the instructor and student will record their mutual understanding of the incident and any resulting sanction(s) via [the Advocate reporting system](#).
 - a. The instructor will complete an '[Academic Misconduct – Faculty Submission](#)' report within five (5) working days of the initial meeting.
 - b. Upon receipt of the instructor's report, the Student Resolution and Integrity Office (SRIO) will contact the responding student for their response.
 - c. The student will confirm their understanding of the incident by responding to the report within five (5) working days of being contacted for response by the SRIO.

The SRIO will review the student's record to determine if there have been any previous incidents of academic misconduct in the past five (5) years.

- d. If there is no prior record, the SRIO will place the report on file and inform the parties of the disposition of the case.
- e. If a record of a previous incident is found, proceed to 'Subsequent Occurrence'.

Parties Disagree

1. If, following the initial review process (above), the instructor and student fail to agree on the facts of the alleged incident of academic misconduct:
 - a. The instructor will complete an '[Academic Misconduct – Faculty Submission](#)' report within five (5) working days of the initial meeting.
 - b. Upon receipt of the instructor's report, the Student Resolution and Integrity Office (SRIO) will contact the responding student for their response.

- c. The student will provide their response regarding the description of the academic misconduct allegation within five (5) working days of being contacted for response by the SRIO. If the student does not respond within five (5) working days, the report will be processed as if the student agrees (see 'Parties Agree').
2. The SRIO will review the student's record to determine if there have been any previous incidents of academic misconduct in the past five (5) years. If a record of a previous incident is found, proceed to 'Subsequent Occurrence'.
3. If there is no prior record, the SRIO will review the student's submission to determine if a Chair Review is warranted.
 - a. If the student's response does not provide explanations and/or supporting documents that contradict the facts of the alleged incident, the SRIO will place the report on file, close the case, and inform the parties of the disposition of the case.
 - i. Disagreeing with the proposed sanction(s) alone is insufficient to warrant a Chair Review.
4. If the student's response provides explanations and/or supporting documents that contradict the facts of the alleged incident, the SRIO will notify the instructor's Academic Chair (or designate; hereafter called the reviewer), who will conduct a review of the case and notify the SRIO of the decision and any sanction(s).
 - a. The SRIO may designate an alternate reviewer if, otherwise, there would be perceived bias on the part of the reviewer. The Academic Chair may designate an alternate reviewer subject to the test for reasonable apprehension of bias (see definitions for reasonable apprehension of bias).
5. The SRIO will place the report on the file, and, if applicable, monitor the fulfillment of any conditional sanctions.
6. The SRIO will inform the parties of the outcome and the allowable grounds for appeal within two (2) working days of the decision.

Subsequent Occurrence

1. If there is a record of a previous finding of academic misconduct, the SRIO will notify the instructor and student that the entire Academic

Misconduct file has been referred to the instructor's Academic Chair (or designate; hereafter called the reviewer) to review the case in light of the previous finding. The sanction(s) agreed to by the instructor and student will be set aside and will not be binding upon the reviewer.

- a. The SRIO may designate an alternate reviewer, if otherwise, there would be perceived bias on the part of the reviewer. The Academic Chair may designate an alternate reviewer subject to the test for reasonable apprehension of bias.
2. The SRIO will inform parties if a meeting between the reviewer and student will be offered or if the file will be adjudicated based on the written statements and the evidence submitted.
 - a. A meeting between the reviewer and student will be offered in cases where a major sanction is being considered or on the determination of the SRIO.
 - b. This meeting may take place in person, over the phone, or via contemporaneous electronic communication (e.g. video call).
 - c. The student may decline the meeting if the student does not attend the meeting after agreeing to its time and mode (in person, by phone, by electronic means, etc.). The student will be taken to decline the meeting if the student does not respond to an offer for a meeting within five (5) working days or if, during the course of the meeting's scheduling, ceases communication for a period of or beyond five (5) working days.
 - d. In the event that a meeting is not offered as per 2 and 2a above, the student may request a meeting by providing a written request to the SRIO within two (2) days of being informed if a meeting will be offered or if the file will be adjudicated based on written statements and the evidence submitted. The SRIO will provide written reasons for its decision if the student's request for a meeting is declined.
 - e. The reviewer may meet with more than one student at a time- in other words, the reviewer may hear multiple files concurrently- when files are related.
3. Following a review of the file, the reviewer will then submit their decision and the sanction(s) to be applied to the SRIO.

4. The SRIO will inform the parties of the outcome and the allowable grounds for an appeal within two (2) working days of the decision.
5. The SRIO will place the report on the file and, if applicable, monitor the fulfillment of any conditional sanctions.

After each academic misconduct, a mandatory workshop, registered through the SRIO, will be required within three months. Failure to complete this workshop in the three months will result in blocked registration for the following semesters until the SRIO receives confirmation of completion.

Academic Misconduct Sanctions

Normally, students who have been found to have committed acts of academic misconduct will receive one or more of the following sanctions commensurate with the nature, frequency, and seriousness of the violation(s) of stated academic integrity requirements.

Minor Sanctions

Warning/Admonition: A written notice that further incidents of academic misconduct may result in additional disciplinary action that could carry more serious consequences.

Remediation: A requirement, often combined with another sanction, that a student re-do an assignment or participate in an academic integrity activity (e.g., workshop, on-line tutorial, assignment).

Grade Reduction: A reduction in grade or a failing grade for the activity or work which was found to be an incident of academic misconduct.

Failing Grade: A failing grade for a course in which academic misconduct occurred, as a result of the academic misconduct *

Transcript Notation: A notation on the transcript stating that academic misconduct occurred. A student may request removal of this notation after a minimum of two (2) years *

Suspension of Application: A temporary suspension of an application for financial aid, scholarship, or prior academic credit pending satisfactory completion of conditions related to a violation of standards of conduct related to Student Judicial Affairs Policy *

Suspension of Credential: A temporary suspension of credential pending satisfactory completion of conditions related to a finding of academic misconduct *

**Academic Chair authorization required.*

Major Sanctions

The application of major sanctions requires the approval of the Academic Program Manager and the Dean of Academic Strategy and Integration.

Program Withdrawal: A removal of the reported student's enrolment in their current program. The student may or may not be permitted to be re-admitted to the program.

Suspension: An exclusion from accessing college buildings, facilities, programs, and services for a prescribed period or until specified conditions have been satisfied. The reported student will be prohibited from enrolling in & attending any courses offered by the college during this period.

Expulsion: A permanent exclusion from accessing any college buildings, facilities, programs, or services. The reported student will be permanently prohibited from enrolling in & attending any courses offered by the college.

Termination of Application: A permanent cancellation of an application for financial aid, scholarship, or prior academic credit resulting from a violation of standards of conduct related to Student Judicial Affairs Policy.

Revoking of Credential: A credential awarded in good faith by the college that is subsequently rescinded following a discovery that it was based upon significant dishonest or fraudulent conduct.

Appeals

Students have a right to appeal academic misconduct decisions if there is evidence that a decision was unduly influenced by bias or unfair procedure or there is new evidence and if it can be shown that the outcome of the decision

might have been substantially affected by any of these circumstances. It is the student's responsibility to bring forth evidence for the appeal within ten (10) working days of deemed receipt of the decision. Evidence for appeals are submitted to the SRIO.

The SRIO will refer appeals that meet the above criteria to the Academic Program Manager or delegate of the program or department area, who meets the test for reasonable apprehension of bias (see definitions for reasonable apprehension of bias). The SRIO will determine if the criteria for reasonable apprehension of bias are met based on available information. The Academic Program Manager or delegate will hear the appeal and provide a final decision to the SRIO. Final decisions will be communicated to the student through the SRIO to a NorQuest College student email address within two (2) days of receiving the decision.

Recommended Timelines for Academic Misconduct Procedure

Initial Review Process

WHO	WHAT	WHEN
Instructor	Investigate incident	Immediately upon becoming aware of the possible violation
Instructor/ Student	Meet to discuss alleged incident	As soon as possible, following instructor's review of the alleged violation
Instructor/ Student	Record outcome on Misconduct Report and submit to SRIO	Within 5 working days of meeting
Student Resolution & Integrity Office (SRIO)	Review student record for previous occurrences of academic misconduct. If none, consider incident a first offence	Within 2 working days of receiving Misconduct Report.

First Occurrence- Parties Agree

WHO	WHAT	WHEN
SRIO	If parties are in agreement on a first offence, record decision, inform parties, and close case	Within 5 working days of receiving Misconduct Report

First Occurrence- Parties Disagree

WHO	WHAT	WHEN
SRIO	If parties disagree on a first offence, review the student's submission to determine if a Chair Review is warranted. • If Chair Review is warranted upon review, forward the case to the Academic Chair (or alternate) • If Chair Review is not warranted upon review, close the case and inform parties	Within 5 working days of receiving Misconduct Report from faculty
Academic Chair	Review documentation, meet with parties as necessary, and render decision on first offence	Within 5 working days of receiving notice from SRIO
SRIO	Inform parties of decision and further process	Within 2 working days of receiving decision from Academic Chair

Any Subsequent Occurrence

WHO	WHAT	WHEN
SRIO	If review of student record reveals any prior offence(s), notify parties and advise if a meeting between the Academic Chair and responding student will be offered	Within 5 working days of receiving Misconduct Report
Academic Chair/ Student	If a meeting is offered, meet to discuss alleged incident	Within 10 working days of receiving notice from SRIO
Academic Chair	Hear case, render decision, and determine sanction(s)	Within 5 working days of receiving misconduct materials and meeting with student (if required)
SRIO	Notify parties of decision(s) and further process	Within 2 working days of receiving decision

Definitions

Academic Integrity: commitment to five fundamental values: honesty, trustworthiness, fairness, respect, and responsibility.

Academic integrity is honest and responsible scholarship. Learners and instructors are expected to submit original work and give credit to other peoples' ideas. Maintaining academic integrity involves:

- Creating and expressing your own ideas in course work
- Acknowledging all sources of information
- Completing assignments independently or acknowledging collaboration
- Accurately reporting results when conducting research or with respect to labs

- Honesty during examinations – completion of exams independently and in accordance with the provided exam rules

Attendant: an individual (e.g., an Association representative, counselor, colleague, or family member) selected by the complainant or respondent to consult with, accompany, or assist, at any meeting or hearing related to the incident. The Attendant(s) may observe but may not participate in any proceedings without the permission of a designated college official.

College community: Any student, faculty, administrative or staff member of the college, member of the public serving in a recognized capacity for the college, and employee of an agency contracted by the college.

Course: a series of prescribed learning outcomes and the learning activities to achieve those outcomes organized within a specific subject area.

Deemed Receipt: an email is deemed to be received two (2) hours after the time sent (as recorded on the device from which the sender sent the email), unless the sender receives an automated message that the email has not been delivered.

Instructor: any college member who provides credit or non-credit instruction for any course.

Notice: written notice delivered by any reasonable means.

Quasi-judicial procedure: a formal institutional process for hearing complaints and alleged contraventions of college policies or regulations, which results in a resolution based upon a balance of probabilities and, where appropriate, enforceable sanctions.

Reasonable: moderate and fair in the circumstances.

Reasonable Apprehension of Bias Test: this test is whether a reasonable person properly informed would perceive that there was conscious or unconscious bias on the part of the decision maker. A positive finding under this test does not mean that the decision maker necessarily made a decision

based on improper considerations- only that he or she reasonably appeared to be biased in the circumstances.

Sanctions: a punishment or penalty imposed as a result of violating a policy or regulation.

Student: (for the purposes of this procedure): Any individual who is or has been registered in any program or enrolled in any course(s) within the past twelve months or for any future terms whether credit or non-credit at NorQuest College. Another term for student is Learner.

Unaffiliated: status of an adjudicator who has not had a prior involvement or is not in a potential conflict of interest in hearing the case.

Related information

NorQuest College

- [Academic Misconduct Report](#)
- [Access to Information Procedure](#)
- [FOIP Act Policy](#)
- [Protection of Policy Procedure](#)
- [Student Judicial Affairs Policy](#)

External

- [Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms](#)
- [Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act](#)
- [Post-Secondary Learning Act](#)

Next review date

February 2029

Revision history

Date	Version Number	Action
November 2012	V1	New (replaces Standard Practice 2.20: Student Code of Behaviour)
August 2013	V2 (published as V1)	update for document links and branding
December 2013	V3 (published as V1)	update for procedure administrator and links
November 2014	V4 (published as V1)	update for document links
December 2015	V5 (published as V1)	revised (This procedure replaces part of The Code of Student Conduct: Academic Integrity and Non-Academic Misconduct Procedure)
August 2019	V6 (published as V1-C)	Compliance Office template & reorganization update
December 2019	V7 (published as V2)	reviewed and revised
June 2020	V8 (published as V2)	reviewed and revised
November 2022	V9	Modify adjudication process for subsequent allegations
February 2025	V10	Update new information and links, clarify the SRIO responsibilities and some sanctions, modify process for first allegation of misconduct.