

community values honesty and integrity and holds its members to high standards of ethical conduct. Academic dishonesty is unacceptable, and students who are found to have engaged in academic dishonesty as defined by [3344-](#)

Definitions in 3344-21-02 Policy on academic misconduct are applicable here.

Assessment - An academic assignment, quiz, examination, paper, project, portfolio, thesis, dissertation,

Academic Misconduct –Any act described in Policy 3344-21-02(A).

Minor Infraction - Minor infractions are instances of academic misconduct on an individual assessment which comprises less than twenty percent of the overall course grade. Two or more instances of minor infractions within a course, across courses, across terms constitute a major infraction.

Major Infraction - Major infractions are instances of academic misconduct on an individual class assessment which comprises twenty percent or more of the overall course grade. Two or more instances of minor infractions within a course or across courses constitute a major infraction. The second minor infraction will result in a major infraction in the second course

Reporting Party –The party who will conduct the investigation of whether student academic misconduct has occurred. This person may be a faculty member, instructor, department chairperson, staff person, F R O O H J H R U V F K R R O G H D Q R U D V V R F L D W H

Respondent –The student who is responding to an accusation of committing an academic misconduct infraction.

University Community Standards Officer K H U H L Q U H I H U U H G W R D V ‡ & R P P X Q L
2 I I L F H H H e Cleveland State University staff person who facilitates the process of charging the Respondent with academic misconduct and facilitates appeals if desired by the Respondent. The Community Standards Officer also documents all instances of academic misconduct

III. Procedure

(1) Any member of the University community may raise allegations of academic misconduct to a Reporting Party.

a. Whenever a Reporting Party (most likely a faculty member) weighs the evidence based on a preponderance and concludes that an infraction of misconduct has occurred, the Reporting Party will choose an appropriate sanction (See IV Sanctions below) and inform the University Community Standards Officer. The Community Standards Officer shall inform the Respondent in an email of the Charge, the 5 H S R U W L Decision 312 612 72 reW h B/F1 11.04 Tf1 0 0 1 217.92 for the decision, and the sanction imposed with a copy sent to the Reporting Party. The Reporting Party may implement a grade-based sanction (See IV Sanctions below) at the same time that they notify the Respondent and Community Standards Officer of the Charge and sanction. If the Reporting Party is not the instructor of record for a course, the Reporting Party will keep the faculty member informed of the Charge and the results of the investigation.

b. If the misconduct is course 0.0000092 0 612 72 reW h B/F1 11.04 Tf1 0 0 1 217.92

misconduct has occurred (e.g., by imposing a sanction or reporting the academic misconduct), they will promptly reverse the actions.

(2) The Respondent may appeal the Charge or the sanction to the chairperson of the department in which the course is offered (for course-related misconduct) or to the chairperson of the Respondent ¶ V P D M R U G H B D r a n M i s t r a c t i o n ¶ The Respondent shall inform the Community Standards Officer by email within five University business days of receipt of the email containing the Charge that they wish to appeal the 5 H S R U W L d e c i s i o n o f t h e A n d i c i o n ¶ The Community Standards Officer shall coordinate a meeting between the Reporting Party, the Respondent, and the relevant chairperson. A Support Person may attend this meeting.

- a. The chairperson shall inform by email all parties of their decision based on a preponderance of the evidence within five University business days of the meeting.
- b. The Respondent and the Reporting Party may appeal the decision of the chairperson within five University business days of the receipt of the email. If neither party appeals, the c K D L U S H U V R s O n a I V G H F L V L R Q

(3) The Respondent or Reporting Party may appeal the decision of the chairperson by informing the Community Standards Officer by email within five University business days of receiving the F K D L U S H U . ¶ The Community Standards Officer shall coordinate a meeting between the Reporting Party, the Respondent, and the relevant dean. A Support Person may attend this meeting.

- a. The dean shall inform by email all parties of their decision based upon a preponderance of the evidence within five University business days of the meeting.
- b. The Respondent and the Reporting Party may appeal the decision of the dean within five University business days of the receipt o l W K H H P D L O , I Q H L W K H U S D decision is final.

(4) The Respondent or Reporting Party may appeal the decision of the dean to the Academic Misconduct Review Committee by informing the Community Standards Officer by email within five University business days of receiving the dean ¶ V H ¶ The Community Standards Officer will schedule the hearing. The Academic Misconduct Review Committee chairperson will oversee the hearing. The Respondent and the Reporting Party will have the right to present evidence and call any witnesses. The hearing shall be closed to the public. The meeting will not be recorded. A Support Person may attend this meeting.

- a. Neither the finding of academic misconduct nor a previously imposed sanction shall in any way limit the options for sanctions available to the Academic Misconduct Review Committee.
- b. The Respondent and the Reporting Party are responsible for submitting all relevant information to the Community Standards Officer who will pass it on to the Academic Misconduct Review Committee. The Academic Misconduct Review Committee does not gather evidence or conduct its own investigation of the allegation of academic misconduct.
- c. The Academic Misconduct Review Committee shall inform by email all parties of

their decision based upon a preponderance of the evidence within five University business days of the hearing.

- d. If the Academic Misconduct Review Committee determines, based upon a preponderance of the evidence, that no violation occurred, the sanction will be reversed, the Charge will be closed, no further action will be taken pursuant to this procedure, and no permanent record will be made of the Charge by the Community Standards Officer.
- e. If the Academic Misconduct Review Committee finds, based upon a preponderance of the evidence, that a violation has occurred, it may confirm an earlier sanction or impose an alternative sanction pursuant to paragraph (IV) of this Procedure.

