

Caltech Honor Code Handbook

2023-24 Academic Year

I. Mission

The mission of the California Institute of Technology is to expand human knowledge and benefit society through research integrated with education. We investigate the most challenging, fundamental problems in science and technology in a singularly collegial, interdisciplinary atmosphere, while educating outstanding students to become creative members of society.

II. Caltech Core Values

- Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
- Freedom of Expression
- Honor Code

III. Honor Code

“No member of the Caltech community shall take unfair advantage of any other member of the Caltech community.”

IV. Philosophy of the Honor Code System

The Honor Code allows students the trust and freedom that honesty merits. It states simply that “No member of the Caltech community shall take unfair advantage of any other member of the Caltech community.” It is not restricted to transactions of a purely academic nature between students and faculty.

The Honor Code allows students and faculty an unusual level of trust in one another and affords students uncommon opportunities. For example, exam proctoring is discouraged under current faculty regulations, because faculty simply expect students to follow the Honor Code. Students assume and expect a deep level of trust with one another in academic, residential, and co-curricular spaces because of the Honor Code.

It must be stressed that responsibility for the preservation of the Honor System lies with each individual student, and each new generation of students. It requires us to consider any possible consequences of our own actions: Does it impact another community member, and how? The key words are “unfair advantage.” To not take unfair advantage, it is often sufficient to simply employ common sense and show respect for others. But there are times when distinguishing fair and unfair courses of action requires a considerable amount of thought. Failure to realize the consequences of a course of action does not justify it.

The rewards of life under the Honor System are considerable. The responsibilities at times are equally considerable, but it is through such challenges that we grow our individual character and integrity. These obligations have been met successfully in the past, and only we can ensure that they will continue to be met.

V. Scope of the Honor Code and Honor Code Handbook

The Honor Code and Honor Code Handbook apply to the conduct of individual undergraduate students, student organizations, student groups, and houses whether the alleged behavior occurred on or off campus. The individual undergraduate student, student organization, student group, or house implicated in allegations of misconduct described in the Honor Code Handbook are referred to as “respondents.”

The processes described in the Honor Code Handbook may be initiated when a respondent is charged with conduct that potentially violates both civil/criminal law and Institute policy, without regard to pending litigation in court or criminal arrest and prosecution. This includes instances where a current student is charged with serious violations of civil or criminal law, regardless of when or where that violation occurred. Institute resolution processes may be carried out prior to, simultaneously with, or following criminal proceedings off campus. Determinations made and sanctions imposed under the Honor Code Handbook will not be subject to change because criminal charges arising out of the same facts were dismissed, reduced, or resolved in favor of or against the criminal law defendant.

VI. Reasonable Accommodations for Students with Disabilities

Any student with a disability involved in any process outlined in the Honor Code Handbook has the right to request reasonable accommodation in order to ensure their full and equal participation in the process. Students wishing to request reasonable accommodations should make those requests directly to Caltech Accessibility Services for Students (CASS). Students do not have to disclose information about the complaint or charge to CASS to request reasonable accommodation except to the extent that it may assist in the determination of reasonable accommodations. Accommodations are determined on an individual basis by CASS staff and implemented in consultation with the Dean’s office. Examples of reasonable accommodation include but are not limited to sign language interpretation, real-time communication access during hearings, large print documents, extended time to review documents, or assistance with transcribing questions during interviews or hearings. Students are responsible for requesting accommodations in a timely manner; failure to do so may result in a delay in the process.

VII. Rights and Responsibilities

The following rights and responsibilities apply to those involved in a matter being addressed by any process outlined in the Honor Code Handbook.

A. Rights of Respondents

All respondents involved in any process outlined in the Honor Code Handbook have the following rights:

- To be presumed not responsible for a violation of prohibited conduct until found in violation by a preponderance of the evidence.
- Written notice of the charge(s) made against them and the basis of the allegation(s) that led to the charge(s), prior to any interview or hearing.
- To receive written notification of the time, date, and location of any interview or hearing.
- To an advisor who must be a member of the Caltech community (but who may not be an attorney). In the Board of Control Process, the advisor is also

known as a silent witness. In the Board of Control (BOC) process, respondents are also entitled to an assistant from the BOC.

- To request reasonable accommodations due to disability.
- Reasonable access to inspect and review their own case file, which includes all information that would be used during the process, to the extent permitted by confidentiality laws.
- Explanation of the resolution options available to them through Honor Code Handbook.
- To speak or not speak on their own behalf. A respondent who decides to not attend a hearing or interview, or who elects to attend but not speak, will not be presumed responsible simply for their decision not to attend or speak on their own behalf. However, the process will still move forward, and a decision will be made based on the information available to the decision-maker at the time.
- The opportunity to respond to information used as part of the decision-making process.
- To receive written notice of the outcome and any sanction imposed.
- The right to appeal within seven days of the Dean issuing a written decision.

B. Responsibilities of Respondents, Witnesses, and other Student Participants

All respondents, witness, and other student participants involved in any process outlined in the Honor Code Handbook have the following responsibilities:

- To be honest and forthright in all information they provide during the process.
- To attend all required meetings, conferences, or hearings, as scheduled, unless alternate arrangements are made in advance.
- To otherwise cooperate with Caltech officials in the performance of their duties.
- To seek assistance or clarification when needed.
- To refrain from disruption of the process.
- To refrain from recording any proceedings described in the Honor Code Handbook in which they may be involved.
- Respondents have the responsibility to prepare and present their entire case as well as secure the presence of any witnesses who will speak on their behalf.

VIII. Prohibited Conduct

In order to better help students understand the expectations of the Honor Code, the Honor Code Handbook provides examples of conduct that are not in keeping with the Honor Code and are prohibited.

A. Prohibited Conduct – Academic

1. Exceeding the time limits of a given assignment without permission from the instructor or a pre- approved accommodation due to disability.
2. Use of references or other resources not allowed per the assignment and/or permitted by the instructor.
3. Collaborating with others on an assignment beyond the scope permitted by the instructor.

4. Using another's work, in whole or in part, without acknowledging the source and presenting that material as one's own academic work.
5. Any attempt by a student to answer questions on an assignment by means other than their own knowledge, without authorization from the instructor. This also includes completing work on behalf of another student or asking another student to complete work on your behalf as well as misrepresenting attendance for yourself or another student.
6. Submitting the same academic work for credit more than once unless specifically authorized by the instructor of record.
7. Knowingly using and/or presenting invented or fabricated information, falsified research, or other findings. Falsification or theft of results ("drylabbing") are serious acts of intellectual dishonesty, as is claiming undue credit for another's work or ideas. The [Research Misconduct Policy](#) is applicable to all researchers, including undergraduate students.
8. Knowingly assisting another student in prohibited academic conduct. This may include sharing work or previous course materials with another student, completing another student's work for them, or providing false information in connection with any inquiry regarding academic integrity.

B. Prohibited Conduct – Non-Academic

1. Possessing/Providing False and Misleading Information
 - a. Furnishing false information to Institute officials or law enforcement officers acting within the scope of their job duties.
 - b. Forgery, alteration, or misuse of Institute documents and/or records.
 - c. Possession, use and/or attempted use of false identification.
 - d. Transferring, lending, borrowing or altering Institute identification.
 - e. Failure to carry and/or provide Institute identification (student ID card).

2. Substance Abuse
 - a. The unlawful use, manufacture, distribution, cultivation, dispensation, possession, sale, purchase of, or offer to sell or purchase controlled substances or alcohol on the Caltech campus or its off-site locations, including the Jet Propulsion Laboratory ("JPL"), or any part of its activities, is prohibited. Controlled substances include, but are not limited to, marijuana, heroin, cocaine, LSD, and amphetamines. Despite recent changes to California law, marijuana is still a controlled substance under federal law, and therefore the use, manufacture, distribution, cultivation, dispensation, possession, sale, or purchase of or offer to sell or purchase marijuana on the Caltech campus or its off-site locations, including JPL, or as any part of its activities, continues to be prohibited. The recreational use of nitrous oxide is also prohibited under the Institute's [Substance Abuse Policy](#).

- b. Misconduct under the influence of a controlled substance and/or alcohol including but not limited to operating a vehicle under the influence, disorderly conduct by intoxication, and public intoxication.
- c. The abuse, misuse, sale, or distribution of prescription or over the counter medication, except as expressly permitted by law.
- d. Intentionally or recklessly inhaling or ingesting substances (e.g. nitrous oxide, glue, paint, etc.) that will alter a person's state of mind.
- e. Misconduct under the influence of a controlled substance, including but not limited to operating a vehicle under the influence, disorderly conduct by intoxication, and public intoxication.
- f. Violation of the Institute's [Substance Abuse Policy](#).

3. Disruptive Conduct

- a. Conduct that substantially and materially disrupts or interferes with Institute operations including but not limited to teaching, research, and/or administrative activities which occur on or off campus.
- b. Causing, inciting, or participating in any disturbance that presents a clear and present danger to others, causes physical harm to others, or damage and/or destruction of property, including but not limited to participating in or inciting a riot.
- c. Failure to comply with orders of Institute officials or law enforcement officers acting within the scope of their job duties.
- d. Failure to permit Institute employees to enter a residence or house room for the for the purpose of enforcing Institute policy or to respond to a possible or actual health and safety emergency.
- e. Verbal harassment or abuse of Institute employees acting within the scope of their job duties.
- f. Misuse and/or tampering with any Institute safety equipment including but not limited to: firefighting equipment, fire alarms, smoke detectors, blue light phones, etc.
- g. Public urination.

4. Harmful Behavior

- a. Physical harm or threat of physical harm to any person.
- b. Reckless but not accidental action that poses a reasonable risk of physical harm to others.
- c. Unauthorized recording. Caltech recognizes that the State of California makes it illegal to make a recording of any meeting or conversation in which there is a reasonable expectation of privacy or confidentiality, and the recorder fails to get the affirmative consent of all persons who are party to the meeting or conversation. Making an illegal recording also violates

Caltech's [Acceptable Use of Electronic Resources](#) Policy and a student found to have made such a recording is subject to discipline including, potentially, expulsion from the Institute. In addition, depending on the facts and circumstances, making a recording in an intimate or sexual context, without affirmative consent, may constitute sexual harassment or sexual exploitation and additionally violate Caltech's [Sex- and Gender-Based Misconduct Policy](#), Title IX, and California law. Finally, depending on the facts and circumstances, making a recording even in a non- confidential setting at Caltech, without the appropriate affirmative consent, may violate Caltech's Honor Code.

- d. Fire safety violations, including but not limited to: setting fires intentionally or recklessly; intentional or reckless misuse of fire safety equipment (e.g. fire extinguishers, fire alarms, exit signs); intentionally initiating or causing to be initiated any false report, warning or threat of fire, explosion or other emergency on Institute premises or at any Institute sponsored events; unnecessary activation of fire alarms.
- e. Possession, storage or use of weapons including but not limited to firearms, compressed-air guns, pellet guns, swords, etc. on Institute owned or affiliated property except as expressly permitted by law, and other violations of the [Firearms and Other Dangerous Materials Policy](#).
- f. Possession, storage, or use of dangerous materials including but not limited to fireworks, explosives, or chemicals which are corrosive or explosive on Institute owned or affiliated property, except as expressly permitted by the appropriate Caltech employee; any other violation of the [Firearms and Other Dangerous Materials Policy](#).
- g. Use of a weapon to intimidate, threaten, or harm another person, including the use of any object not mentioned above that is used to intimidate, threaten, harm, and/or provide force can be considered a weapon under this provision.

5. Harassment and Discrimination

Please note that the Honor Code Handbook does not outline the process used to resolve allegations of sex- and gender-based misconduct. The [Sex- and Gender-Based Misconduct Policy](#) addresses both behavior prohibited by the policy and the process for resolution.

- a. Harassment is a form of misconduct that includes unwelcome physical, verbal, or nonverbal conduct that results in a person feeling intimidated, threatened, humiliated, or demeaned, and is likely to interfere with an individual's work or education, or adversely affects an individual's living conditions. Harassment based on protected characteristics as described in the Institute's

[Unlawful Harassment Policy](#) is unlawful and is contrary to the pursuit of inquiry and education.

- b. Discrimination is differential treatment based on protected characteristics listed in the Institute's [Nondiscrimination and Equal Employment Opportunity Policy](#) and includes applying policies and practices that have an adverse impact on individuals based on protected characteristics.

6. Hazing and Unregistered Pranks

- a. Hazing is any activity carried out in any connection with a student organization or group, regardless of whether the organization or group is officially recognized by Caltech, that reasonably places another person in danger of physical or psychological harm, or demonstrates disregard for another person's dignity or well-being, when participation in, or exposure to the activity is an implicit or explicit condition for initiation or admission into, affiliation with, or continued membership in the group or organization. Conduct constituting hazing is prohibited regardless of whether the person subjected to the conduct consents or voluntarily participates in the hazing activity, or whether any physical or mental harm actually results. Examples of specific behaviors that may constitute hazing under this policy, as well as some commonly asked questions about hazing, are provided in the [Hazing Prevention Policy](#).
- b. Unregistered Pranks. All pranks must be registered with and approved by the appropriate Institute official in advance using the [Prank Registration Form](#). All pranks must comply with the [Prank Protocol](#).

7. Theft and/or Possession of Stolen Property

- a. Taking without consent the property or services of the Institute, another person, business, or organization.
- b. Possessing property that can reasonably be determined to have been stolen from the Institute, another person, business, or organization.

8. Misuse, Unauthorized Use or Damage to Property

- a. Abusing, mishandling, or misappropriating the property, equipment, or materials of the Institute, another person, business, or organization.
- b. Damaging, destroying, or misusing any property belonging to the Institute, another person, business, or organization.
- c. Other conduct or actions in which the integrity of the Institute's physical facilities or grounds are threatened or harmed or could reasonably be expected to result in damage or harm.

9. Misuse of Keys, PIN Codes, and/or Access Device

- a. Unauthorized use, distribution, duplication, or possession of any key or other access device issued for any campus building, structure, tunnel, room, or facility.
- b. Use of a PIN Code to access or attempt to access any locked door without authorization or permission from the person to whom the PIN Code was issued.

10. Trespass or Misuse of Facilities

- a. Misuse or unauthorized use of any Institute facility, including but not limited to individual offices, classrooms, laboratories, meetings spaces, and individual residence hall rooms.
- b. Unauthorized entry or attempted entry into any Institute facility, including but not limited to individual offices, classrooms, laboratories, meeting spaces, tunnels, and individual residence hall rooms.
- c. Occupying Institute offices, buildings, property, or grounds without authorization.
- d. Entry into or presence on the rooftop of any building or facility owned or operated by the Institute without express permission from the appropriate Caltech employee.

11. Violation of Other Institute Policies

Violation of any other Institute policy and/or procedure, including but not limited to:

- a. [Acceptable Use of Electronic Resources](#)
- b. [Firearms and Other Dangerous Materials Policy](#)
- c. [Hazing Prevention Policy](#)
- d. [Prank Protocol](#)
- e. [Research Misconduct Policy](#)
- f. [Resident Guide and Housing Policies](#)
- g. [Sex- and Gender-Based Misconduct](#)
- h. [Speech Policy](#)
- i. [Student Affairs Policy on Alcohol and Other Drugs](#)
- j. [Student Health and Hygiene Policy](#)

12. Violation of Law

- a. Conduct not otherwise described in this Handbook that would constitute a violation of any local, state, and/or federal law.

IX. **Resolution Processes**

A. **Allegations of Academic Misconduct – Board of Control Process**

The Board of Control (the Board, BOC) shall review all cases of alleged academic violations of the Honor Code and shall make recommendations to the Deans' Office for action in those cases. The purpose, composition, duties, and procedures of the Board of Control are set forth in [Article XIII of the ASCIT Bylaws](#).

Reporting an Incident:

Suspected academic Honor Code violations can be reported by any member of the community by completing and submitting the [Online Incident Referral Form](#). This form collects information about the nature of the concern, available evidence, and the course/s and instructors involved. Once the information has been received by the BOC and the deans' office, the reporting party may be contacted for more information. Please email deansoffice@caltech.edu with questions about the form.

The Board of Control leadership and the Director of Conduct and Community Standards will make an initial assessment of the allegations, evidence, and likely sanctions for a responding student's case. If possible, they will offer the responding student the chance to participate in the Early Resolution Option (ERO), according to the guidelines outlined below.

Early Resolution Option

The Early Resolution Option (ERO) is available for uncontested academic Honor Code cases. It allows students to expedite the process and waive their right to a full Board of Control hearing. Once a responding student has opted into the Early Resolution Option, the decision is final. There is no appeal process.

Criteria for an Early Resolution Option include:

- The responding student has not been found responsible for any prior academic Honor Code violations
- The responding student does not wish to contest the allegations as presented and is willing to accept the standard sanction without the option of appeal
- Types of alleged academic dishonesty that may be eligible include, but are not limited to:
 - Over-collaboration
 - Consulting an unapproved resource
 - Plagiarism (limited in quantity)
 - Sharing or distributing academic materials, including class notes, in violation of Caltech's intellectual property policy
 - Using materials, equipment, or assistance in connection with an assignment which have not been authorized by the faculty member
 - Submitting, without prior permission of the faculty member, any work that has been previously submitted for credit
 - Copying from someone else's work

Circumstances in which the Early Resolution Option would not be offered:

- The responding student has a prior academic Honor Code violation
- The allegations against a student do not have a standard sanction and/or precedent
- The Director of Conduct and Community Standards, in consultation with BOC leadership, determines a full Board hearing is the appropriate process
- The allegations against a student are so egregious as to require a full Board hearing. Types of academic dishonesty that would be considered egregious include:

- Theft of another student’s work and submission as one’s own
- Violations in multiple courses
- Deliberately damaging the academic work or effects of another
- Widespread academic misconduct involving a plurality of students (i.e. a “cheating ring”)

A student may choose to forgo the Early Resolution Option if they wish to contest the allegations against them or if they prefer to have the case heard by the Board of Control.

Early Resolution Option Process

If it appears that a case meets the standards for an Early Resolution, as outlined above, the Director of Conduct and Community Standards will notify the student(s) involved in writing to:

- Inform them of the reported allegations
- Provide them with access to the available evidence
- Explain the Early Resolution process
- Offer them the option to forgo a full BOC investigation and hearing
- Outline the standard sanction/s (nullification) and limitations to appeal

The responding student will be given 7 days to decide which process to follow. As with the full Board of Control process, responding students may seek the advice and support of another member of the Caltech community in navigating the Early Resolution process. If the responding student decides to accept responsibility for the alleged violations and waive their right to the Board of Control process, they will sign a waiver to that effect. The responding student will have the opportunity to respond to the charges and evidence, as well as to meet with the Director of Conduct and Community Standards to discuss the matter.

The Dean will inform the student in writing of the final decision, and a record of the violation will be kept by the Deans’ Office for the appropriate amount of time, as indicated by the Institute’s Record Retention Schedule. Faculty will be informed of any nullification decisions.

Full Board of Control Hearing Process

If a student is not eligible for the ERO, and/or elects for a full Board process, the following will occur:

1. Preliminary Meeting: A member of the BOC leadership and the Director of Conduct and Community Standards have a preliminary meeting with the respondent, determine whether there is a reasonable possibility of a violation, and either recommend dismissal or referral to a full Board hearing.
 - If it is dismissed, the Director of Conduct and Community Standards will inform the respondent, as well as the relevant faculty. The case is considered closed.
2. Mediated Conversation (optional): The respondent may elect to participate in a mediated conversation; they will meet with the Director of Conduct, the

reporting faculty and/or their designee, and a member of the BOC leadership. The mediated conversation is intended to be an educational opportunity for the respondent to engage with a faculty member to discuss the allegation and the Honor Code in general before it is determined if there has been a violation of the Honor Code. Following the mediated conversation, the reporting faculty member may recommend for the case to be dismissed or for the case to continue to a full Board hearing.

3. Full Board Hearing: If the BOC leadership remains concerned that a violation of the Honor Code occurred, the case will proceed to a full Board hearing.
 - a. Collection of evidence: The respondent may submit evidence relevant to the assignment in question for consideration in their case. The Director of Conduct and Community Standards will reach out to the reporting faculty to request additional evidence or clarifications, as necessary.
 - b. Secondary academic review: The Director of Conduct may request for all anonymized case materials to be reviewed by a faculty BOC liaison in the option. The faculty BOC liaison will provide a summary of their review for the BOC's consideration.
 - c. Respondent review: The respondent is given the opportunity to review any additional evidence that has been gathered. Prior to the hearing, the respondent will be provided with the names of the BOC representatives who are assigned to hear their case. If the respondent feels that a particular member of the BOC may be unable to render an unbiased judgement in their case, they may request to the Director of Conduct and Community Standards for that representative to be dismissed. All predissmissals must occur prior to the start of the hearing.
 - d. Board Hearing: Five Board members, chair, and secretary are convened to hear the case, and the Director of Conduct and Community Standards oversees the chair's facilitation of the hearing. The respondent is asked to attend the hearing and may bring a silent witness, who must be a member of the Caltech community.

The Board reviews the evidence, offers the opportunity for the respondent to respond to questions, and votes on three questions: whether an Honor Code violation has been committed and its scope (conviction/dismissal); how to nullify the unfair advantage gained (nullification); and how to uphold the Honor Code and protect the Caltech community from future violations (protection) based on the preponderance of the evidence. Prior violations of policy or the Honor Code may be considered when deciding the protection recommendation. Four out of five members must agree on each point. The Board's recommendations regarding conviction, nullification, and protection are recorded by the Director of Conduct and Community Standards.

4. Resolution: Following the Board of Control process, the respondent engages with the Undergraduate Deans' Office
 - a. Notification: The Director of Conduct and Community Standards informs the respondent of the Board's recommendation.

- b. Response: A written report is sent to the Dean for approval, and then to the respondent for review, who has seven days to respond in writing. The respondent will be given the opportunity to meet with the Dean to discuss the report and recommendations.
- c. Decision: The Dean will make a final decision and inform the respondent in writing. The respondent has the option to appeal in writing to the VPSA. The appeal process is outlined in Section X of the Honor Code Handbook.
- d. Conclusion: Following the close of the appeal period, or the confirmation of the decision of the VPSA in the case of an appeal, any final decision about nullification is communicated to faculty. The faculty communicates any change of grade to the Director of Conduct and Community Standards, and a change of grade is confirmed with the Registrar.
- e. Documentation: A record of any violation will be kept by the Deans' Office for the appropriate amount of time, as indicated by the Institute's Record Retention Schedule.

At any point in the Board of Control hearing process, the respondent may accept responsibility for an Honor Code violation and may opt for the ERO, if eligible. Any student who has a prior finding of responsibility for a violation of the Honor Code or is otherwise ineligible for ERO must proceed through the full Board process.

Advice to Respondents

Respondents are expected to realize that it is in their best interest to tell the truth, even if it contradicts earlier information they may have provided. Honesty is considered favorably by the BOC when voting on its protection recommendation. Witnesses must also be honest and not withhold as irrelevant any information asked for by the BoC.

The protection recommendation, as it indicates, is not intended to be punitive. Rather, it reflects the Board's assessment of the degree to which the respondent's past and/or present violations indicate a need to take steps to improve the respondent's understanding of the Honor Code and protect the Caltech community from future violations. The Board can recommend any number of protection options, but typically requires that a respondent have one or more discussions with members of the Board about the Honor System (known as a "BOC talk"). This is often done when the BOC feels that the respondent does not understand certain aspects of the Honor Code. The most serious recommendations the Board can make is to place a student on leave for one or more terms, or to recommend permanent separation from the Institute.

B. Allegations of Non-academic Misconduct

Allegations of non-academic misconduct are subject to the process described below, regardless of if the respondent is an individual student, a student group or organization, or a house. When a report of alleged non-academic misconduct is received, it will first be subject to a preliminary assessment. The preliminary assessment will include a review of the severity of the allegations, any ongoing risk to the community based on the allegations, and any previous violations of Institute rules or policies.

Based on the information on the preliminary assessment, the matter will be referred to one of the three following options:

1. Dismissal or Warning

For reports that either do not constitute a violation of the Honor Code Handbook or are minor infractions, the Dean (or designee) may choose to either dismiss the matter entirely or meet with the student to discuss the allegations, explain the Institute's policies and expectations for student conduct, and issue a warning.

Additionally, Office of Student Experience (OSE) staff may also review and resolve matters consisting of lower-level violations of the [Substance Abuse Policy](#), [Student Affairs Policy on Alcohol and Other Drugs](#), as well as [Housing policy violations](#) and other lower-level concerns. In these instances, the OSE staff may choose to either dismiss the matter entirely or meet with the student to discuss the allegations, explain the Institute's policies and expectations for student conduct, and issue a warning.

2. Referral to the Conduct Review Committee

The [Conduct Review Committee](#) (CRC) manages the resolution process for allegations of non-academic policies. The process for review by the CRC is as follows:

- a. The co-chairs of the CRC meet to initiate an investigation. As part of the investigation, the co-chairs (or designees) gather evidence, determine a charge, inform the respondent/s, and meet with them to decide whether to move to a full committee.
 - i. The co-chairs may determine that preliminary sanctions may be warranted. Recommendations for preliminary sanctions will be made to the Dean of Undergraduate Students for individual respondents and to the Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs for House respondents. Preliminary sanctions may be imposed prior to the resolution of any conduct case.
 - b. If the co-chairs (or designees) feel that there is insufficient evidence to proceed, they may refer the matter for dismissal by the Dean (or designee). See Appendix A for explanation of "Designee."
2. If the co-chairs (or designees) believe the facts are undisputed and the sanction is clear, they will make that recommendation to the Dean (or designee).
 3. If the co-chairs (or designees) believe that the matter warrants a full hearing, they will refer the matter for that hearing.
 - a. The full committee will consist of three members (one student, one faculty, and one staff).
 - b. During a full hearing, the committee will convene, review the evidence, speak with witnesses and the respondent, and make a recommendation for responsibility and sanctions.
 - c. The recommendation regarding responsibility, along with a recommended sanction (if appropriate) is then sent to the Dean

(or designee) and the respondent in the form of a report, written by the co-chairs (or designees).

4. The respondent has an opportunity to review and respond to the report by writing a letter and submitting it to the Dean.
 5. After reviewing the report and the respondent's response (if any), the Dean (or designee) will meet with the respondent in order to make a final determination.
 6. The Dean (or designee) will inform the respondent of their final determination, including any sanctions that may be imposed, in writing. That notice will also include information regarding the respondent's ability to appeal the Dean (or designee)'s determination and the process for doing so.
3. Referral for Dean's Investigation
- The Dean retains the discretion to refer matters to a Dean's investigation instead of the CRC. The Dean may choose this option for a number of reasons, including but not limited to when the matter is highly personal or sensitive, requires an expedient review and resolution, or when convening a full CRC board is impractical due to the availability of enough trained board members to make up a full panel.

The process of a Dean's investigation is as follows:

1. The Dean (or designee) appoints two investigators to conduct the investigation
2. The investigators gather evidence, interview witnesses, meet with respondents, and write a summary report of their findings and recommendations.
3. The respondent has an opportunity to review and respond to the report.
4. After reviewing the report and the respondent's response (if any), the Dean (or designee) will meet with the respondent in order to make a final determination, including any sanctions that may be imposed, in writing. That notice will also include information regarding the respondent's ability to appeal the Dean (or designee)'s determination and the process for doing so.

X. Criteria and Process for Appeal

The determination of the Dean may be appealed in both academic and non-academic misconduct cases. An appeal must be submitted in writing within seven days of the Dean (or designee)'s written notification of the final outcome.

Grounds for an appeal are limited to the following:

1. New evidence that was not available at the time of the investigation or hearing that would impact the outcome of the matter;
2. A sanction that is disproportionate to the violation;
3. A procedural error that would impact the outcome of the matter.

Should an appeal be submitted, the Vice President of Student Affairs will review the appeal and render a decision in writing.

If an appeal is not submitted within seven days of the receipt of the notification letter, the decision and sanctions communicated in the letter are final.

XI. Sanctions

The Institute is a learning community, and it is therefore focused on the education, growth, and development of its students. The philosophy guiding sanctioning decisions is in keeping with the Institute's [Statement on Community](#) and centered on providing opportunities for meaningful reflection and growth. However, in the interest of protecting the integrity and safety of the community, there may be times when separation of a respondent, either for a set period of time or permanently, may be appropriate. Separation is a serious sanction and will be considered in matters involving arson, violence, weapons, and ongoing risk of harm to the Institute's property and community.

APPENDIX

- A.** The CRC hears cases involving both individuals and groups (i.e. Houses, clubs, other campus organizations). If the respondent/s is a group advised or funded by the Office of Student Experience, the Dean will designate the AVP of Student Experience or their designee as the person to whom the CRC recommendation will be given. They will make the final decision regarding responsibility and sanctions.