



ADELPHI
UNIVERSITY
NEW YORK

Sanctioning

Student Conduct Hearing Board Training Module 6

Recorded June 2025

Learning Objectives

- Identify the two (2) types of sanctions and how they should be applied in the event of findings of responsibility
- Apply the criteria prescribed in the Code of Conduct for the issuing of sanctioning (online code of conduct, p. 20)
- Identify aggravating and mitigating factors in scenarios and apply them to inform imposed sanctions
- Practice applying sanctions to a given scenario

Types of Sanctions: Inactive

Requires no action; holds the student accountable; incentivises to abstain from further misconduct; may safeguard community

- Warning
- Probation
- Suspension
- Expulsion
- Deferred Suspension
- Deferred Removal from Housing
- Removal from Housing
- Removal of Privileges/Restriction From Facilities and Activities
- Restitution*

Types of Sanctions: Active

Requires action on the part of the student to create a learning opportunity.

- Community Service
- Counseling
- Workshop Completion Facilitated by a Professional or Licensed Practitioner
- Active Educational Sanctions

Educational Active Sanctions

Reflective

- Am I Trustworthy?)
- Artistic Expression
- Autobiography
- Avoid Plagiarism*
- Board of Directors
- Decision Making
Process/Reflection
- Drinking Age Persuasive
Letter
- Explain Your Motives
- Goals to Graduate
- Letter to Future Self
- Letter to Loved One
- Letter to Past Self
- Letter to Past Self (Academic
Integrity)*
- Peer Profile
- Personal Mission Statement
- Perspective Reversal
Reflection
- Seven Types of Plagiarism*
- Values/SMART Goals
- Why Did This Happen?

* Academic Integrity cases only

Educational Active Sanctions

Creative

- Artistic Expression
- Informational Poster
- Listicle
- Informational Academic Honesty Poster*
- Informational Plagiarism Poster*

* Academic Integrity cases only

Educational Active Sanctions

Connective

- Center for Student and Community Engagement Dialogue
- Meeting with the Interfaith Center
- Meeting with the Center for Academic Support and Enrichment (CASE)
- Meeting with the Center for Career and Professional Development
- Residence Life Interview

Educational Active Sanctions

Passing Criteria

- Worksheets
 - Paragraph/sentence minimums
- Essays
 - Rubrics
- Creative pieces
 - Rubrics
 - Written reflections

* Academic Integrity cases only

Active Sanction Considerations

- What does the student need to be successful throughout the rest of their time here?
 - Connection to resources, reorient goals, counseling
- How can the student repair the harm to the individual(s) affected and community?
 - Community service; gain perspective; reimburse damages to school property
- What reflection does the student still need?
 - Reevaluate decision, consider future consequences/implications, strengthen understanding of expectations
- What is appropriate and realistic for the student to complete?

General Considerations

- The nature of the violation(s)
- The educational or developmental goals identified
- The severity of the damage, injury, or harm resulting from the behavior
 - Impact on complainant(s), witnesses, individuals, community
- The previous disciplinary history of the student
- Mitigating circumstances
 - Lack of disciplinary history
 - Personal circumstances
 - Demonstrated (believed) remorse
- Aggravating circumstances, which may include bias-motivation
 - Recklessness
 - Disciplinary history

General Considerations and Caveats

- It is inappropriate and unlawful to ask a student about any disability that they may have
- This disclosure of a disability may never be considered an excuse to commit a violation of the Code of Conduct or other university policy
- Remember that you are striving for consistency among outcomes in sanctioning

Case Study 1 Scenario: General Conduct

Respondent Dylan lives on the second floor of Residence Hall B. One night around eleven PM he decides to play a prank. He finds an unlocked room and finds one resident showering and the other asleep in bed. He decides to sit and wait for the resident to come out of the shower to scare them.

When complainant Helena emerges from the shower, she sees Dylan in her bed, laughing. Her screams awaken her roommate Gemma. They both scream at him to leave. Initially he refuses until Helena picks up a broom and points it at him. Dylan gets up from the bed and yanks the broom from Helena, points it at her, then throws it at Gemma before leaving. Gemma is not injured but extremely upset, and had difficulty calming down to speak to the Administrator on Call and Public Safety.

Case Study 1 Scenario: General Conduct

Dylan is charged with:

- Endangerment, Threatening Behavior, and Intimidation
- Unauthorized Access to Facilities

Gemma and Helena act as complainants in the hearing. They describe feeling extremely distraught and traumatized; they barricade their door every night. Gemma failed a test the morning after because she couldn't go back to sleep. They do not know Dylan and feel extremely threatened by his presence. They bring in their neighbors Harmony and Casey who state they were awakened by the screaming and shouting, and are also disturbed. Dylan insists that it a joke and that the complainants and the University are overreacting by putting him through the conduct process.

Dylan has been removed from the residence hall as an interim measure. You find him responsible for the applicable charges. He does not have any prior incidents.

Case Study 1: Considerations

- What was the harm?
 - Incident had significant impact on complainants.
 - Impact on neighbors
- What were the aggravating factors?
 - Respondent did not immediately leave
 - Respondent intimidated complainant with the broom before leaving.
 - Respondent does not demonstrate understanding of why this behavior is problematic
- What were the mitigating factors?
 - No disciplinary history
 - No physical injury
 - Complainants' door was unlocked

Case Study 1: Sanctions

What sanctions will help the student take **accountability** and **learn** from the incident, and how?

- Accountability
 - Removal from housing (deferred if desired)
 - Restriction from Residence Hall B
 - No contact with complainants
 - Probation at minimum
- Learn
 - Educational sanctions
 - Informational Poster
 - Am I Trustworthy?
 - Perspective Reversal Reflection

Case Study 2: Title IX

Jan and respondent Andi are freshmen. They dated in 10th and 11th grade but are now just friendly. Andi retained some nude photographs of Jan on their phone. While drinking at a gathering, Another person at the gathering was going through their phone and noticed them. This person suggested Andi should print out the photos. Wanting to make friends Andi does this. Andi only printed out a few photos using the host's printer, but they lost track of where they went. The next day copies of the photos appear on the walls, stairwells, and bathroom stalls of Linen Hall. When Jan finds out, she has a psychiatric episode and is rushed to the hospital. She does not return for the remainder of the semester.

Case Study 2: Title IX

Andi is charged with

- Sexual Misconduct
- Alcohol

An SCCS staff acts as complainant on behalf of the University.

In the hearing, Linen RA Kelly describes many of her residents being disturbed by these photos appearing in random places in the hall.

In the hearing Andi provides documentation of autism spectrum disorder; their psychologist attests that Andi struggles with insight and decision making. Andi indicates they are extremely sorry, stating that they did this due to peer pressure and the influence of alcohol. They deny having issues with alcohol, stating this was the first time they drank on campus.

After the hearing board decides on findings of responsibility, they will be informed that Andi has a warning for a possession of alcohol case from last semester.

Case Study 2: Considerations

- What was the harm?
 - Images shared without consent of victim and residents.
 - Impact on victim
- What were the aggravating factors?
 - Impact on victim
 - Respondent was under the influence
 - Respondent is underage
 - Respondent has alcohol history
- What were the mitigating factors?
 - Respondent provides documentation of disability
 - Respondent did not personally distribute the photos outside of the gathering
 - Respondent expresses remorse

Case Study 2: Sanctions

What sanctions will help the student take **accountability** and **learn** from the incident, and how?

- Accountability
 - Suspension or expulsion
 - Removal from residence halls
 - No contact with complainant

- Learn
 - Alcohol treatment
 - Educational sanctions
 - Letter to Past Self
 - Board of Directors
 - Peer Profile

Case Study 3 Scenario: Academic Integrity

At the end of the spring semester Professor Tucker, a history professor, is reading respondent Haley's final paper about the Civil War and sees the language is very familiar. After copying and pasting a few sentences into a search engine, Professor Tucker finds that these sentences are copied and pasted from his own doctoral dissertation. TurnItIn's AI checker also points out that the introduction and conclusion of the paper, which weren't copied from the dissertation, were AI generated.

Case Study 3 Scenario: Academic Integrity

Haley is charged with

- Academic Integrity: Plagiarism

Professor Tucker acts as the complainant. He states that Haley usually participated well in class and turned assignments in on time but had several absences that he could not excuse, as she did not respond to outreach from him asking if anything was wrong.

In the hearing, Haley denies using AI for portions of the paper and points out that Quillbot, GPTZero, and Grammarly do not perceive the introduction and conclusion to be 100% likely to be AI generated; although they point out some sentences are possibly AI generated, she insists they are not. She states that she did not know it was Professor Tucker's dissertation she was copying from. She explains she copied because she's had a rough year with deaths in the family, financial insecurity, and caregiving responsibilities that limited her ability to focus on school. She presents obituaries and has her mother in the hearing confirm this explanation. She also presents documentation of ADHD and language based learning disability. She states that as a commuter from Brooklyn it is challenging for her to find the time to access on campus resources like writing tutors and CASE.

This is Haley's fourth academic integrity violation this academic year. One incident happened in the fall semester involving AI usage. Two happened this semester; one in Professor Tucker's class where she copied and pasted from Wikipedia for a small assignment, and one in her biology class where she was accessing information on her phone during a midterm exam, for which she received a deferred suspension that is currently active.

Case Study 3: Considerations

- What was the harm?
 - Plagiarism
 - Recklessness in using professor's dissertation
- What were the aggravating factors?
 - Three prior incidents, including one in this class.
 - Prior incidents involve AI
 - Current deferred suspension status
- What were the mitigating factors?
 - Proof of personal debilitating circumstances
 - Proof of learning disability
 - Reasonable deterrence from accessing campus academic support resources

Case Study 2: Sanctions

What sanctions will help the student take **accountability** and **learn** from the incident, and how?

- Accountability
 - One semester suspension
- Learn
 - Educational sanctions
 - Avoid Plagiarism
 - Meeting with CASE
 - Informational Plagiarism Poster

Case Study 4: Your turn!

Charlotte, Miranda, and respondent Samantha, all residents, are returning from dinner Applebee's around 9 PM. Samantha is driving. She misses the entrance to the Nexus lot and uses the barrier arm outside of Levermore, running over it with her car and crashing into the back of a park Public Safety vehicle in front of it. No one is injured. The Public Safety vehicle's bumper and right taillight need replacing. Public Safety Officer Biggs responds at the scene and observes Samantha smelling of alcohol, giddy, stumbling to walk, and slurring her speech (they did not confirm with a breathalyzer).

Parts and labor to repair the Public Safety vehicle cost \$750.

During the investigation, Charlotte says Samantha, who is 21, had two margaritas at the restaurant and insisted on driving. She shows a picture from Samantha's Instagram depicting Samantha and a margarita. She also shares that Samantha had sent a text before the meeting that read "tell anyone and I will kill u." Charlotte does not believe Samantha is capable of murder but feels unsafe and requests a mutual no contact order. After it is issued, Samantha uses Miranda's phone to send a video of herself to Charlotte saying "You're a bitch."

Miranda's interview with Student Conduct was scheduled for a day later. She confirms that Samantha had been drinking the night of the incident. She explains that she had given Samantha her phone to show her a funny video while at lunch, and Samantha took the opportunity to send the video. Miranda was not aware of the no contact order between Samantha and Charlotte and thought Samantha was just making a joke consistent with her sense of humor. Charlotte confirmed in a follow up meeting she did not make Miranda aware of the no contact order and has no hard feelings towards her.

Case Study 4: Your turn!

Samantha is charged with

- Alcohol
- Property Damage or Destruction
- Retaliation

An SCCS staff acts as the complainant on behalf of the University. The case goes to a hearing because Samantha never showed for a resolution conference. Samantha shows up to the hearing too late to make an opening statement. Charlotte and Miranda have already completed their questioning by the hearing board where they both confirmed Samantha had two margaritas and very little water, and that she demonstrated symptoms of intoxication in front of Public Safety. Samantha says she is only here because her mother made her come. Samantha arrived in time for Officer Biggs's questioning. While SCCS questions the officer, Samantha continually rolls her eyes. When she is given the opportunity to question the officer, she asks how he knows she was drunk. He reiterates that she was stumbling, slurring her speech, laughing, and smelled of alcohol. She tells him he is a liar and had no proof her blood alcohol concentration was above the legal limit.

While the Board questions Samantha, she claims to have had one margarita with a big dinner and that she has a high alcohol tolerance. She claims that she was laughing and uncoordinated because she was nervous. She states it was hard to see and she didn't put the Nexus Lot in her GPS which led her toward Livermore, and she didn't remember that the barrier arm doesn't automatically open. She says that she texted Charlotte "I'll kill u" as a joke and sent the video after the instatement of mutual no contact order because she was annoyed at Charlotte but they jokingly call each other bitches all the time. She claims not to be aware that the no contact order included contact via a third party. She feels that she should just be made to pay the damages for the Public Safety vehicle and the rest is no big deal because she is old enough to drink, they have no proof she was above the legal limit, and Charlotte was a bad friend for "snitching."

What is next?

There is another training module for Title IX (Sexual Misconduct) incidents.