



Protecting Student Truth: Navigating Bias, Policy, and Honesty in Writing

The **Academic Integrity Protocol (AIP)** for Student Writing is an expert-designed framework for making determinations of academic honesty and significant human authorship in student writing. The AIP is a tool that schools and districts can use to guide them as they review potential writing policy violations. This protocol provides a transparent and legally defensible approach for addressing allegations of academic dishonesty in

student writing. It ensures fairness, protects student reputation, and upholds institutional integrity through clear procedures and due process safeguards.

Guiding Principles

The guiding principles provide the foundational values and priorities that shape the protocol. These principles serve as a compass for decision-making and process implementation, promoting accountability and due process.

Transparency: The process must be clearly documented and communicated to all stakeholders (students, parents, faculty).

Equity: Students must be treated impartially, with safeguards against bias or discrimination.

Evidence-Based: Decisions must rely on documented, verifiable evidence.

Educational Focus: Consequences should align with the goal of fostering ethical behavior and academic growth.

Legal Compliance: The protocol complies with relevant educational laws, privacy rights (e.g., FERPA), and institutional policies.

General Guidelines for Expedited Completion

- Use email as the primary mode of communication to streamline notifications and confirmations.
- Schedule meetings during the school day to minimize delays caused by availability conflicts.
- Be cognizant of international students' families who may be in different time zones and need time to travel for an in-person meeting.
- Require written responses and documentation to be submitted in digital form for ease of distribution and review.
- Designate a single point of contact (such as an AI and writing expert from PWC) to manage the case and reduce miscommunication. If not possible, use the Academic Integrity Coordinator until such time as that person must serve on the panel. At that time, the outside expert should take the point of contact role for the duration of the process.

General Guidelines for Legal Compliance and Timeliness

- Protect student records and evidence at all stages, in compliance with FERPA.
- Ensure every step of the process is documented for transparency and legal defense, if required.
- Resolve all steps, not including appeals, within 15 school days of the initial report to ensure expediency.



Academic Integrity Protocol

Date:

Allegation:

Initiating Party:

Student:

Academic Integrity Coordinator:

PWC Point of Contact:

Step 1: Initiating the Concern and Launch of Protocol

Note: The due process protocol must conclude within 15 school days from the initial report, including appeals, to balance fairness and efficiency.

- **Identification and Initial Detection** of Possible Academic Dishonesty

A teacher or staff member identifies a possible violation, such as:

- Use of AI-generated content without attribution.
- Plagiarism (copying or paraphrasing without proper citation).
- Submission of work not authored by the student.

- **Collection and Documentation** of Evidence

The teacher or reporting party compiles and submits documents and specific examples of suspected dishonesty, including:

- All drafts, submissions, and digital records (e.g., Google Docs revision histories).
- Detector scores and reports.
- Written observations of a student's process.
- Source materials (if plagiarism is suspected).
- Notes on irregularities (e.g., discrepancies in writing style).

The teacher/staff member makes copies of the student's work in question.

- **Submission** of Concern (Day 1) Date: _____

The reporting party submits a formal, written report to the Academic Integrity Coordinator including:

- The specific nature of the alleged violation.
- Supporting evidence (e.g., flagged text, comparison documents, etc.) as clarified above.

Ensure all reports and evidence are securely transmitted to prevent unauthorized access, maintaining compliance with FERPA.

- **Evaluation** of Concern and Evidence

The Academic Integrity Coordinator (AIC) reviews the evidence for completeness and procedural compliance.

- If the evidence is insufficient or the report is **incomplete**, the case is dismissed, and the student is notified.
- If the evidence is deemed sufficient, AIC notifies the teacher, the student, and the student's family, as appropriate (minor or high school) of the intent to proceed with the Academic Integrity Protocol.

If not dismissed by the AIC, then:



Step 2: Preliminary Exploratory Review

- **Notification of Student and Family**

If the Academic Integrity Coordinator (AIC) deems the evidence is sufficient evidence and procedural compliance, the student receives a formal written notice of the allegation from the (AIC) within two school days of receiving the report from the teacher, that includes:

- A description of the allegation.
- Specific evidence supporting the concern including all copies of writing, rubrics, reports, etc.
- A copy of the academic integrity policy with a specific citation of the part of the policy that the student has been accused of violating.
- An explanation of the student's rights, including access to the evidence and the timeline for responding.
- Information on their **rights** and **next steps**.

- **Academic Integrity Coordinator Consultation** with the Student

The AIC meets with the student (in-person or via Zoom) within two school days to:

- Discuss the concern and provide their perspective.
- Document the fact-finding in a formal transcript of the meeting for record-keeping.
- Parents of high schoolers or minor students may attend.

- **Teacher Consultation** with the Student

The teacher arranges a meeting with the student (in-person or via Zoom) within two school days to:

- Share the specific concerns.
- Provide the student an opportunity to explain or refute the concerns.
- Ask clarifying questions about the writing process and sources used.
- Document the discussion in a formal transcript of the meeting for record-keeping.
- Parents of high schoolers or minor students may attend.

The teacher may request additional evidence of the writing process, such as:

- Drafts, notes, or outlines.
- Access to cloud-based writing tools (e.g., Google Docs revision history).
- Research sources cited in the work.

The teacher may dismiss the concern and halt any further steps in the protocol.

The teacher must notify the AIC, the student, and the parents, as appropriate, of their intent to dismiss or proceed with the Academic Integrity Protocol within 48 hours of the meeting.

If not dismissed by the teacher, then:

Step 3: Formal Review Panel

- **Consultation** with an External Artificial Intelligence and Writing Expert from Provenance Writing Counsel (PWC)

The AIC, reporting teacher, and the principal or head of the school meet with the PWC expert within two school days to:

- Establish a context for the accusation.
- Recommend appropriate panel members.
- Receive counsel on proceeding in an unbiased and fair manner.
- Delegate point of contact as the external AI and writing expert who will be referred to as PWC.

- **Composition** of a Review Panel

PWC will assemble a neutral panel consisting of:

- The Academic Integrity Coordinator.
- Two faculty members (one from outside the student's department).
- One student advocate.

- **Notification** of Panel Hearing and Procedures

The principal or the head of the school or their designee (PWC) will notify the student and family of the details of the hearing which include:

- The composition of the panel,
- The hearing date and location,
- The procedures and timeline that will be followed for the hearing,
- The process for a timely appeal of the decision, if necessary.
- Parents of high schoolers or minor students may attend.

- **Redaction** of Identifiable Information

The PWC removes all confidential and identifiable information from the evidence documents including:

- Student name and ID number.
- Class or assignment details that could reveal identity.
- Comments or notes made by the reporting party.

- **Distribution of Report and Evidence Packets**

PWC will consolidate and prepare documents and distribute them to all parties including:

- The Academic Integrity Coordinator.
- Two faculty members (one from outside the student's department).
- One student advocate.
- The student and parents, as appropriate.
- The principal or head of school.

- **Implementation** of Review Panel Hearing

Both parties (teacher and student) present evidence and statements.

The panel reviews evidence using a **structured rubric**, evaluating:

- Consistency with the student's prior work.
- Verifiability of sources and processes.
- Results of technology-based analyses (e.g., AI detection, plagiarism reports).

The panel adheres to a "preponderance of evidence" standard, ensuring decisions are based on whether it is more likely than not that a violation occurred.

- **Decision** Rendered

Within 48 hours of the hearing, the panel delivers a written decision to PWC that includes:

- A summary of the evidence and rationale for the decision.
- The determination (violation or no violation).
- Any **assigned consequences and remediation plans**.

- **Notification of Decision**

Within 24 hours of the decision being rendered, PWC forwards the written decision to all named parties (principal, head of school, student, parents, etc.) that includes:

- A summary of the evidence and rationale for the decision.
- The determination (violation or no violation).
- Any **assigned consequences and remediation plans**.

If not dismissed by the review panel, then:

PROVENANCE
— WRITING COUNSEL —

Step 4: Appeals Process

- **Submission** of Student Appeal

Students have 5 school days to file a written appeal based on one or more of the following:

- Procedural errors.
- New evidence unavailable during the original review.
- Disproportionate consequences.
- Parents or family legal representatives may submit an appeal on a student's behalf.

An appeals board (separate from the original panel) reviews the case and renders a final decision within 10 school days of receipt of the written appeal AND NO LATER THAN the first day of the new term.

- **Consultation** with an External Artificial Intelligence and Writing Expert from Provenance Writing Counsel (PWC).

The AIC, reporting teacher, and the principal or head of the school meet with the PWC expert within two school days to:

- Discuss outcome of the formal panel review hearing.
- Recommend additional (new) appropriate panel members.
- Receive counsel on proceeding in an unbiased and fair manner.
- Determine if legal representation is necessary.

- **Composition** of a Review Panel

PWC will assemble a neutral panel consisting of:

- The Academic Integrity Coordinator.
- Two faculty members (one from outside the student's department).
- One student advocate.

- **Notification** of Panel Hearing and Procedures

PWC will notify the student and family of the details of the hearing which include:

- The composition of the panel,
- The hearing date and location,
- The procedures and timeline that will be followed for the hearing,
- Parents of high schoolers or minor students may attend.

- **Implementation** of Review Panel Hearing

Both parties (teacher and student) present evidence and statements.

PWC will present an opinion and evidence of their own findings, as expert testimony in the appeals process.

The panel's decision must be unanimous to overturn the original outcome.

- **Decision** Rendered

Within 48 hours of the hearing, the panel delivers a written decision to PWC that includes:

- A summary of the evidence and rationale for the decision.
- The determination (upheld or overturned).

- **Notification** of Decision

Within 24 hours of the decision being rendered, PWC forwards the written decision to all named parties (principal, head of school, student, parents, etc.) that includes:

- A summary of the evidence and rationale for the decision.
- The determination (upheld or overturned).



Sample Scenario

Academic Integrity Protocol

Date: January 6, 2025 opened; January 24, 2024 decision notification sent (15 school days)

Student Name: Jordan Adams (fictitious name, 17 years old)

Allegation: Jordan is accused of using ChatGPT to paraphrase sections of an essay submitted for an AP English assignment.

Initiating Party: Ms. Emily Parker, AP English Teacher

Academic Integrity Coordinator: Dean Smith

Point of Contact: Christina Supe, Provenance Writing Counsel

Step 1:

Initiation

Date: January 6, 2025

- Action: Ms. Parker identifies discrepancies in Jordan's essay, suspecting ChatGPT use.
- Evidence: Essay drafts, Google Docs revision history, and notes from a class discussion.
- Outcome: Ms. Parker submits a formal report to the Academic Integrity Coordinator (AIC) with supporting evidence.

Preliminary Review

Date: January 7-8, 2025

- Action: The AIC reviews the evidence to determine sufficiency and procedural compliance.
- Outcome: Deemed sufficient: AIC notifies Jordan and parents via email, providing evidence, policy details, and information on rights.

Step 2:

Consultation Meetings

Date: January 9-10, 2025

- Action 1: AIC meets with Jordan and parents to discuss the concern and collect their perspective.
- Outcome: Meeting transcript documented for record-keeping.

Date: January 13-14, 2025

- Action 2: Ms. Parker meets with Jordan to present specific concerns and ask clarifying questions about the writing process.

- Outcome: Not dismissed so formal review panel process begins with notification of all parties by 1/16/25.

Step 3:

Assemble the Panel

Date: January 15-16 and 20, 2025

- Action: The Academic Integrity Coordinator collaborates with Christina Supe (Provenance Writing Counsel) to assemble a neutral review panel.
- Composition of the Panel:
 - Academic Integrity Coordinator (AIC).
 - Two faculty members (at least one from outside Jordan's department).
 - One student advocate.
 - Christina Supe as the external AI and writing expert.
- Outcome: The panel composition is finalized, and all members are briefed on the case including date/time of hearing, when to expect documents (no later than 1/21/25).

Review Panel Hearing

Date: January 22, 2025

- Action: The review panel convenes to examine evidence and hear statements from both Jordan and Ms. Parker.
- Procedure:
 - Evidence reviewed using a structured rubric.
 - Panel considers prior work consistency, source verifiability, and AI detection results.
 - Jordan presents their perspective and any additional supporting materials.
- Outcome: The panel renders a decision within 48 hours based on a "preponderance of evidence" standard.

Notification of Decision

Date: January 24, 2025

- Action: The PWC designee communicates the decision to all parties via email.
- Outcome:
 - If violation: Consequences and remediation plans are outlined.
 - If no violation: Case is closed with an explanation.
- Appeals: Jordan has five school days to submit a written appeal, if necessary.

Email Templates

Subject: Academic Integrity Concern Notification

Dear [Parent/Guardian Name] and Jordan,

We are reaching out regarding an academic integrity concern related to Jordan's recent AP English essay. Evidence suggests that sections of the essay may have been paraphrased using AI tools without proper attribution.

Attached, you will find:

1. A summary of the concern.
2. Evidence supporting the allegation.
3. A copy of the school's Academic Integrity Policy.

Jordan is entitled to review the evidence and provide an explanation. We have scheduled a meeting to discuss the matter:

Date:

Time:

Location: [School Address or Zoom Link]

If you have any questions, please contact me directly.

Sincerely,

[Name]

Academic Integrity Coordinator


PROVENANCE
— WRITING COUNSEL —

Subject: Academic Integrity Review Panel

Dear [Parent/Guardian Name] and Jordan,

Following the initial review, the Academic Integrity Review Panel will convene to assess the concern regarding Jordan's essay. Details are as follows:

Date:

Time:

Location: [School Address or Zoom Link]

The panel will review all evidence and provide Jordan an opportunity to present their perspective.

The outcome will be communicated within 48 hours.

Christina Supe from Provenance Writing Counsel will serve as the external AI expert.

Please confirm your attendance by replying to this email.

Best regards,

[Name]

Academic Integrity Coordinator

Subject: Academic Integrity Review Outcome

Dear [Parent/Guardian Name] and Jordan,

The Academic Integrity Review Panel has concluded its review of the concern related to Jordan's essay.

Decision: [Violation/No Violation]

Summary: [Brief rationale based on evidence]

Consequences (if any): [Details of remediation or penalty]

You have the right to appeal this decision within five school days. Appeals must be submitted in writing to [AIC Contact].

Please reach out with any questions.

Sincerely,

[Name]

Academic Integrity Coordinator

PROVENANCE
— WRITING COUNSEL —