

## **Initial Intake Process**

Conflict Education and Student Accountability (referred to as CESA, pronounced “see-sah,” and formerly known as Student Rights and Responsibilities or SRR) receives reports of harm, concerning behavior, and policy violations by students, student organizations, and student groups. Incident referrals can be made on our website or by contacting a CESA team member.

Once we receive a case, a CESA team member is assigned, and they reach out to the identified parties, inviting them to a meeting that focuses on identifying resources and options available through CESA and other university processes.

Following that, CESA will make a determination about the best available resolution pathways, incorporating the preferences of the parties and CESA’s obligations to reduce future harm and support the wellbeing of all community members. Not all resolution pathways are available for every case and parties can discuss that with their case manager.

In approximate order from least formal to most formal, these are the pathways CESA typically offers:

- 1-1 Conflict Coaching: A 1-1 meeting focused on helping students develop effective skills for general or specific conflicts.
- Educational/Policy Outreach: Outreach to a harming party to educate them about community expectations and to document that education.
- Conflict Coaching Workshops: Proactive group coaching focused on helping students develop general conflict management skills.
- Community Building Circles: Drawing on indigenous traditions, community members meet and strengthen relationships, including possibly building community expectations.
- Listening Circles: Drawing on indigenous traditions, these circles help people process an issue that poses community challenges or harms.
- Mediation: Coming soon to CESA, mediation is a voluntary collaboration for parties in conflict to seek a mutual agreement, facilitated by a multi-partial mediator.
- Restorative Conference: Brings together a person directly harmed with the harming person in structured and supportive format to work collaboratively to identify and repair the harm.
- Circle of Support and Accountability (COSA): Used after an incident or time away from GW to help a student rejoin the community smoothly and with support.
- Warning/Amnesty: Used for low-level policy violation allegations or amnesty cases. Requires students to engage in educational measures. Students can refute this resolution through policy adjudication.
- Mutual Agreement Policy Adjudication: Voluntary agreement between GW and a student who accepts violations and mutually agreement outcomes.
- Formal Policy Adjudication: A fact-finding process used to determine if a student violated policy and, if so, identify outcomes.

In the event that a matter would benefit from another or additional resources, CESA may make appropriate referrals to other university or external resources.

For further questions or to learn about or pursue a specific pathway, please contact us.

---

## **Academic Integrity Process**

The following summarizes the process for academic integrity incidents resolved by warning, mutual agreement policy adjudication, or formal policy adjudication according to the Code of Academic Integrity. This provides an overview of the process. Students are encouraged to read the Code in its entirety. In the event that this guide is inconsistent or in conflict with the Code, the Code will apply. If you have questions or concerns, please contact CESA. CESA works with students and instructors of record to manage each case individually.

If an instructor determines that an academic integrity violation may have occurred, they are required to report that to CESA for an initial review. To initiate review, the instructor should first contact CESA to learn if any prior violations should be considered in the review. Then, the instructor should meet with the student to review concerns, invite a response or explanation from the student, and the instructor should also suggest a sanction outcome.

Cases recommended for suspension or expulsion require resolution through an Academic Integrity Panel. Assuming that the sanction/outcome recommendation from the instructor does not include suspension or expulsion, then the case can be resolved with either a Warning, an Academic Integrity Agreement, or an Academic Integrity Panel.

If a case is resolved through a warning, the instructor of record directs CESA to issue and record the warning. Warnings do not generate a formal academic integrity record and cannot include a grade-related sanction. If a student accepts the warning, the process ends with CESA recording the warning internally in the event of future reported violations. A student may dispute a warning and request a fact-finding process using an Academic Integrity Panel.

If a case is resolved through an Academic Integrity Agreement, a student agrees to accept a finding of responsible for the alleged violations and agrees to the sanction proposed by the instructor. The student must also waive their right to appeal. CESA will confirm the Academic Integrity Agreement with both the instructor and the student and maintain the record of the agreement. The completed Academic Integrity Agreement ends the process.

Academic Integrity Panels are used to resolve cases when either (a) the instructor recommends suspension or expulsion; (b) the student refutes the warning; or (c) the student declines the Academic Integrity Agreement. An Academic Integrity Panel is a group of students and faculty who hear the case. The Panel determines whether or not the student is in violation and, if so, recommends a sanction.

If a Panel finds a student not in violation, the process ends with notification to the student, the instructor, and any other needed parties.

If the Panel finds a student in violation, the Panel will provide a report including the finding of violations, the rationale for that finding, and a recommendation for sanctions. This report is provided to the Dean of the school/college in which the violation occurred (or to the Dean's designee).

The Dean or designee reviews the sanctions to ensure there are not significant deviations from similar cases. The Dean may modify the sanction and may not change the finding.

Following the Dean's review, the student and the instructor receive the outcome, including the finding of violations, the rationale for that finding, the sanction outcomes, and the rationale for the sanction outcomes. The student may appeal that outcome. If the student does not appeal the outcome the process ends.

Appeals must be submitted in writing within five business days of the outcome being provided to the student. Grounds for appeal are (a) material deviation from procedures or (b) new and relevant information that was unavailable at the time. The Provost or their designee reviews the appeal and makes a final decision. The Provost's (or designee's) decision is provided to the instructor and the student and then the process ends.

In the academic integrity proceedings, respondents (accused students) have the following basic rights:

- Notice of charges and the date of the proceeding.
- Reasonable access to the case file.
- The ability to question and respond to information used to make a decision in a case.
- The right to present and question witnesses.
- The right not to be sanctioned unless the hearing body finds a preponderance of the evidence that the respondent is in violation.
- The right to appeal decisions.
- The right to have a support person present, at the student's request. A support person may not be anyone otherwise involved in the incident. An attorney may serve as a support person, but may not represent the respondent. Because of the educational nature of the process, participants or expected to articulate on their own behalf.

---

## **Student Conduct Process**

The following summarizes the process for student conduct incidents resolved by mutual agreement policy adjudication or formal policy adjudication according to the Code of Student Conduct. This provides an overview of the process. Students are encouraged to read the Code in its entirety. In the event that this guide is inconsistent or in conflict with the Code, the Code will apply. If you have questions or concerns, please contact CESA. CESA works with parties to manage each case individually.

Once CESA receives a report, we conduct an initial intake and review. CESA may conduct a preliminary investigation to clarify and inform this review of the report.

If the respondent (accused student, student organization, or student group), poses a threat, the university may temporarily remove them or limit their access while the case proceeds.

CESA refers cases to either a Student Conduct Process or a Student Conduct Panel.

CESA will refer a case to a Student Conduct Conference if the outcome is not likely to include removal from housing, suspension, or expulsion. A Student Conduct Conference consists of an informal meeting between the respondent and a university administrator or a member of the University Integrity and Conduct Council.

CESA will refer a case to a Student Conduct Panel if the outcome could reasonably include removal from housing, suspension, or expulsion. A Student Conduct Panel consists of 3-5 students and typically a faculty member or administrator.

In both a Student Conduct Conference and a Student Conduct Panel, the respondent presents their case and the hearing body makes a decision about whether it is more likely than not that the respondent committed the alleged violations.

Whether a case is referred to a Student Conduct Conference or a Student Conduct Panel, the respondent can opt for a Student Conduct Agreement. This is an option for respondents who accept an in violation finding for all charges and who reach mutual agreement with their case manager about specific sanction outcomes. This includes that the respondent must waive their right to appeal. If an agreement is finalized, the process concludes.

If a case is referred to a Student Conduct Panel, the respondent can instead opt for a Panel-Level Conference. This resolves the case in a conference format, with a single administrator serving as the hearing body. The full range of sanctions is available in a Panel-Level Conference.

In a Student Conduct Conference, a Student Conduct Panel, and a Panel-Level Conference, the hearing body makes a finding about whether or not the respondent is responsible based on what the evidence indicates is more likely than not to have occurred.

A respondent may be found not in violation for all charges. In that case, the respondent receives the outcome in writing, including a rationale for the finding. The process concludes when the finding is provided to the respondent.

If a respondent is found in violation for some or all of the charges, they will receive an outcome letter including the rationale for the finding, sanction outcomes, and the rationale for the sanction outcomes.

If a respondent is found in violation through a Student Conduct Conference, a Student Conduct Panel, or a Panel-Level Conference, they have a right to appeal that outcome.

Appeals must be submitted in writing within five business days of the outcome letter. Grounds for appeal include (a) material deviation from the procedures, (b) new and relevant information that was unavailable, and (c) the sanction was inappropriate or disproportionate to the prohibited conduct.

If the designee of the Vice Provost for Student Affairs finds that grounds are presented, the appeal will be forwarded to an Appeals Panel.

The Appeals Panel may: 1.) affirm the finding of the original hearing body, 2.) remand the case to the original hearing body, 3.) request that a new hearing body hear the case, or (4) recommend revised sanctions (if that is the grounds for appeal).

The decision of the Appeals Panel or outcome of the remanded or requested hearing body will be final. During the appeal period, (implementation of) sanctions will be deferred, unless concern for campus safety necessitates immediate implementation of sanctions.

### **Basic rights of respondents in university student conduct proceedings**

- Notice of charges and date of conduct proceeding.
- Reasonable access to the case file at least three days before proceeding.
- Question and respond to information to be used to make a decision in a case.
- Right to present and question witnesses
- Right not to be sanctioned unless the hearing body finds a preponderance of the evidence that the respondent is in violation.
- Right to appeal decisions.
- A support person may be present (not legal representation).

For cases involving a complainant, the process will vary to incorporate the options relevant to that party.