Why are we here?

- Welcome and Introductions
Goals and Objectives

- To give appeals committee members an overview of the entire Lehigh University conduct system.
- To provide appeals committee members with needed information regarding the appeals process.
- To elect a faculty chairperson.
Conduct System Overview

Report generated (Police, Gryphon, Other)

Investigation and Assignment

Resolution

Appeal
Resolution Methods

- Resolution Methods:
  - Administrative Hearings (88%)
  - Disciplinary / Academic Integrity Conferences
  - UCOD Hearings
  - (Sanction Only Hearings – new in 2015)
Types of Sanctions

- **Primary**
  - Expulsion
  - Suspension
  - Deferred Suspension
  - Probation
  - Warning

- **Secondary Sanctions**
  - Counseling
  - Parental Notification
  - Apology Letters
  - Self Reflection
  - Academic Integrity Seminar
  - Restrictions on Activities
    - Greek Affiliation
  - “F” in course
  - Grading recommendation
  - E-Checkup
  - Fines
Statistics 2014-2015 (cases)

- **Incident Reports:** During the 2014-2015 Academic Year, the Office of Student Conduct & Community Expectations processed 883 disciplinary cases. This is similar to the number from 2013-2014. This represents about 13% of the total student (graduate and undergraduate) population.

  - The majority of reports were submitted by gryphons, LUPD, and OSC&CE staff (77%)

  - 53% of students were found responsible for violations.
## Disciplinary Case Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanctions Imposed</th>
<th>Expulsion</th>
<th>Suspension</th>
<th>Deferred Suspension</th>
<th>Disciplinary Probation</th>
<th>Warning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2014</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring 2015</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics 2014-2015 (sanctions)
## Academic Dishonesty Case Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanctions Imposed</th>
<th>Expulsion</th>
<th>Suspension</th>
<th>Deferred Suspension</th>
<th>Disciplinary Probation</th>
<th>Warning</th>
<th>Fin Course</th>
<th>Grading Rec</th>
<th>AIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statistics**

2014-2015 (sanctions)
## Statistics

**2014-2015 (Appeals)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Filed 2014-2015</th>
<th>Filed 2015-2016</th>
<th>Granted</th>
<th>Denied</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent Granted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unduly Harsh</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Information</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Violation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Why Does Lehigh have an appeals committee?
  • Fundamental Fairness
  • Check on the Conduct System
  • Review of how the process relates to the community
Information was not available at the time of the hearing, is now available, and could reasonably be expected to have altered the outcome of the case.

- Was the information available at the time of the hearing?
- Is it reasonable to expect that this information would have impacted the outcome of the case. (finding)
The University disciplinary procedures were violated in a way that probably adversely affected the outcome of the case.

- Were the procedures MATERIALY violated?
- What was the violation?
- What adverse effect did they have?
- Did that adverse effect impact the outcome (finding) in the case?
The sanction was unduly harsh.

- Unduly – “in an inappropriate, unjustifiable, or improper manner” (dictionary.com)
- Harsh – “ungentle and unpleasant in action or effect” (dictionary.com)
  - What sanction is said to be unduly harsh?
  - Was the sanction inappropriate, unjustified, or improper?
  - How was it inappropriate, unjustified, or improper?
Educational

Punitive

Restorative

Appeals Committee
(Grounds for Appeal 3)
What can impact sanctions:

- Impact on victim
- Impact on the accused
- Impact on others / community
- Previous disciplinary record
- Remorsefulness / Attitude of respondent
- Facts of case
- Sanctioning guidelines
- Past practice
Appeals Committee Process

- Quorum
- Course site
- Meeting
  - *Do not re-hear the case (de novo hearing)*
- Online Reporting Form
- Rationale Writing
Appeals Committee Process

• Granted Appeals
• Process and New Information (New Hearing)
• Unduly Harsh (sanction meeting)
Needed Skills

- Confidentiality
- Impartiality
- Recusal
Sexual Misconduct / Sexual Assault / Harassment

- **Article V of the Code of Conduct**
  - Student respondents only
  - Both (all) parties can appeal
  - Information will be sanitized and redacted.

- *Additional training prior to these cases.*
Q&A

• What do you need to know that you don’t know?