

# Center for Honor Enrichment & Community Standards

## Academic Misconduct Process

### Academic Misconduct Incident Happens

Incidents are typically observed or discovered by faculty member instructing the course, but can be reported to a faculty member by anyone, including other faculty members, staff, or students.

### Faculty Member Investigates Alleged Incident

The faculty member will investigate and determine whether or not an academic misconduct violation occurred. During this investigation the faculty member will attempt to discuss the incident with the student who is suspected of violating academic standards.

### Faculty Determination

After investigating the incident, the faculty member will make a determination as to if the suspected violation took place. If the faculty member determines that a violation occurred, they will issue academic remedies which could include a grade of "F" for the course, a grade of "F" on the work in question, or other reductions in grades or assigned work.

*In addition, if a violation occurred, the faculty member is obligated to report the incident to the Center for Honor Enrichment & Community Standards.*

### University Review Begins

After CHECS receives the report, a Notice of Incident is sent to the student's CNU email address. The notice instructs the student to contact CHECS within 72 hours to schedule an Initial Conference.

### Initial Conference

The Conduct Officer and student meet to discuss the report and get the student's perspective.

### CHECS Decision

A decision is made by the Conduct Officer and the student is notified of the outcome of the case.

### University Sanctions are Issued

Student is found responsible for an additional violation of the university standards of the Honor Code.

### Appealing the Academic Remedy

Should a student be found responsible for academic misconduct by a faculty member and the student chooses not to accept responsibility for the academic misconduct the student's recourse for the academic remedy is to challenge the course grade at the end of the semester following the standard grade appeal process.

**This process is separate from the Center for Honor Enrichment & Community Standards University review process and an appeal has no impact on the University review of the academic misconduct.**

### No University Sanctions are Issued

Student is found not responsible for an additional violation of the university standards of the Honor Code.

### University Sanctions Issued

If a student is found responsible for an additional violation of the university standards of the Honor Code, university sanctions will be issued. These university sanctions are educational, reflective, campus contribution, and punitive. Examples include but are not limited to: written warning, disciplinary probation, reflective papers, educational programs or meetings, suspension from the University, dismissal from the University.

### Request for Honor Council Review

Requests for review must be received within five (5) business days of the decision.

*This request is ONLY regarding the University Review of the academic misconduct. This will not review the faculty member's determination that academic misconduct took place or any academic remedies issued by the faculty member. To appeal the faculty member's decision, please see the red outlined box above.*

### University Sanctions Completed

Student accepts the decision and completes all University sanctions issued by their due dates.

### Student Honor Council Panel

The Honor Council will review all material and determine whether an additional violation of the university standards of the Honor Code has occurred, and if so, issue appropriate sanctions.

### Appeal to the VPSA or AVPSA

Appeals are only granted if:

- New information now exists that was unknown at the time of the panel proceeding. This new information must be so significant that it would likely alter the panel's decision on violations or their recommendations on sanctions.
- Provisions for a fair hearing set out in *Sections G. Panel Procedures* (pg. 23) were not followed and that failure resulted in fundamental unfairness. Disagreeing with sanction(s) does not constitute fundamental unfairness.

Case Closed