



OFFICIAL ELEMENT ESPORTS POLICY

DISCIPLINE AND APPEALS POLICY

DOCUMENT CODE	GOV-POL-003
VERSION	1.0
EFFECTIVE DATE	OCTOBER 4, 2026
POLICY OWNER	ELEMENT ESPORTS LEADERSHIP

Element Esports is the non-FPS sister organization of ADHD Esports. This edition preserves the shared leadership and operating standard while applying Element branding, contacts, community structure, and game scope.

Role terminology: formal position names govern authority and responsibility. Element-themed names are friendly Discord display roles only unless a written appointment states otherwise.

1. **PURPOSE** Element Esports needs a process that can act quickly when safety or integrity is at risk without treating every allegation as proven. This policy establishes how reports are received, triaged, reviewed, decided, documented, corrected, and appealed. It supports consistent judgment while preserving the authority necessary to manage a volunteer organization.
2. **SCOPE** This policy applies to Owners, Management, department heads, team leads, staff, formal players, Academy and Development players, creators, volunteers, and other appointed members. Community-only moderation actions first follow Community Standards, while formal member consequences arising from the same conduct may be referred here. Tournament, platform, publisher, safeguarding, law-enforcement, or other external processes retain independent authority.
3. **STATUS AND LIMITS** Element Esports is not a public employer, government agency, law-enforcement body, labor union, or court. This policy is not a collective bargaining agreement and does not create employment, wages, benefits, civil-service status, union representation, contractual tenure, or legal due-process rights beyond applicable law and executed agreements. It is an internal commitment to good-faith, proportionate, documented decision-making.
4. **CORE PRINCIPLES** - Safety and safeguarding may require immediate protective action before full review. - An allegation is not a finding, and protective action is not automatically discipline. - Material decisions should use reliable facts, reasonable notice, an opportunity to respond, and a neutral reviewer when practical. - Corrective action should be proportionate to severity, intent, impact, pattern, role authority, notice, cooperation, and organizational capacity. - Similar cases should be treated consistently while meaningful factual differences remain relevant. - Reports, participation, support, and appeals made in good faith are protected from retaliation.
5. **KEY DEFINITIONS** - Protective action - a temporary safety, access, separation, roster, communication, event, or evidence-preservation measure that is not by itself a final finding. - Administrative action - a non-disciplinary decision based on strategy, capacity, eligibility, inactivity, restructuring, program need, funding, or another operational reason. - Corrective action - coaching, direction, warning, improvement planning, restriction, probation, suspension, reassignment, title change, removal, or another response to established performance or conduct concerns. - Formal outcome - a documented finding or material action communicated to the directly affected member. - Appeal - a time-limited written request to review a formal outcome on defined grounds.
6. **AUTHORITY AND APPROVAL LEVELS** Leads and managers may coach, redirect, document expectations, and recommend action within their assigned authority. Material role restriction, probation, suspension, demotion, roster removal, program removal, or separation requires the approval level established by the org chart, role agreement, or written delegation. No person may approve a final finding concerning themselves or control review when materially conflicted and another qualified decision-maker is reasonably available.
7. **REPORTS AND INTAKE** A concern may begin through Report a Concern, an Incident Report, moderator referral, tournament or platform notice, leadership observation, member disclosure, guardian communication, audit, security alert, or another credible source. Intake should identify the people involved, alleged conduct, date and location, immediate risk, minor involvement, relevant rules, available evidence, conflicts, requested support, and any external process.
8. **TRIAGE** The receiving leader should determine whether the matter is an emergency, safeguarding concern, community moderation issue, competition-integrity issue, privacy or security incident, ordinary performance matter, interpersonal conflict, administrative decision, or allegation requiring formal review. The leader should select the safest appropriate route, preserve evidence, and avoid forcing serious allegations through informal mediation.
9. **EMERGENCY AND PROTECTIVE MEASURES** Leadership may separate people; restrict channels, accounts, files, devices, events, travel, finances, rosters, matches, public representation, or supervisory duties; preserve records; or pause participation when reasonably necessary to protect people, competition, evidence, systems, or operations. Scope and duration should be reviewed as information develops. When safe, the affected person should receive the general reason and review contact.
10. **REVIEWER SELECTION AND CONFLICTS** The reviewer should have appropriate authority, sufficient independence, and no material personal, financial, romantic, family, reporting, or outcome interest. A reviewer must disclose a conflict and transfer the matter when practical. Concerns involving one founder should be reviewed by the other founder with a neutral

leader or advisor when practical; concerns involving both founders may require an outside advisor or another documented safeguard.

11. NOTICE OF CONCERN Before a formal adverse finding, the affected member should normally receive a understandable summary of the concern, the rule or expectation involved, the potential seriousness, the response route, and a reasonable deadline. Notice may be delayed, narrowed, or staged when immediate danger, safeguarding, reporter privacy, evidence integrity, external direction, or account security requires it.

12. OPPORTUNITY TO RESPOND The affected member should receive a meaningful opportunity to provide context, corrections, witnesses, records, accessibility needs, mitigation, and relevant prior instructions. Silence, delay, or inability to answer one question does not automatically prove misconduct. Review may continue when a person declines, cannot be reached after reasonable attempts, or refuses to participate, provided the limitation is documented.

13. SUPPORT PERSON A member may request one reasonable support person for a scheduled formal investigatory, disciplinary, appeal, or grievance meeting. The support person may take notes, help the member understand the process, request clarification or a short break, and provide quiet support. They may not intimidate participants, disclose protected information, answer every question for the member, disrupt the meeting, or create an unreasonable conflict. This does not create union representation or bargaining rights.

14. EVIDENCE AND REVIEW STANDARD Formal findings should rely on information that is sufficiently reliable, relevant, and complete for a reasonable good-faith decision. When a factual finding is required, the reviewer should ordinarily determine whether the conduct is more likely than not to have occurred, while clearly identifying material uncertainty. Higher-risk outcomes require stronger attention to corroboration, source reliability, context, technical limitations, motive, consistency, and alternative explanations.

15. INTERVIEWS AND RECORDS Use focused, respectful questions and create an accurate summary of material information. Preserve original messages, links, IDs, files, access logs, VODs, match records, financial records, and external notices when relevant. Do not promise absolute confidentiality, conduct coercive questioning, alter evidence, suppress exculpatory context, publicly debate an open case, or distribute sensitive material beyond need-to-know review.

16. TARGET TIMELINES Acknowledge a formal report or referral as reasonably practical, normally within three calendar days. Provide an initial routing or status update normally within seven days and aim to complete ordinary reviews within 30 days. These are targets, not forfeiture deadlines. Safety, safeguarding, external investigations, evidence access, volunteer capacity, complexity, and participant availability may require a documented extension and reasonable status updates.

17. CORRECTIVE-ACTION FACTORS - Nature, severity, duration, and actual or reasonably foreseeable impact. - Intent, knowledge, recklessness, mistake, coercion, and role-related responsibility. - Whether conduct was isolated, repeated, concealed, normalized, directed, or retaliatory. - Prior notice, training, coaching, warnings, agreements, and comparable cases. - Credibility, cooperation, honesty, evidence preservation, accountability, repair, and mitigation. - Safety, safeguarding, competition, privacy, security, financial, partner, and organizational risk. - Practical capacity, role necessity, restoration potential, and effect on affected people.

18. CORRECTIVE-ACTION LEVELS - Level 0 - Clarification, coaching, education, mediation, or documented direction. - Level 1 - Written expectation or formal warning identifying required correction and recurrence risk. - Level 2 - Improvement plan or probation with defined objectives, support, restrictions, and review date. - Level 3 - Access, duty, event, communication, public-representation, roster, or supervisory restriction. - Level 4 - Temporary suspension, benching, reassignment, title reduction, or pause from specified activity. - Level 5 - Removal from a team, program, staff role, management authority, creator appointment, or organization membership.

19. PROGRESSIVE ACTION AND SERIOUS MISCONDUCT Progressive action is preferred for ordinary first-time performance, communication, reliability, or lower-risk conduct concerns when correction is realistic. It is not mandatory. Safeguarding violations, credible threats, violence, stalking, severe harassment, doxxing, grooming, sexual misconduct, cheating, match manipulation, fraud, credential abuse, major confidentiality breaches, deliberate evidence destruction, retaliation, or other serious conduct may bypass lower levels.

20. **ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS** A role, roster, team, program, title, or access level may change because of inactivity, eligibility, strategy, funding, capacity, restructuring, performance selection, partner or tournament requirements, or operational need without a misconduct finding. The notice should describe the action accurately and avoid mislabeling an administrative decision as discipline. Administrative decisions may still be reviewed for conflict, retaliation, discrimination, factual error, or violation of a written term.

21. **WRITTEN OUTCOME** A formal outcome should identify the general concern, finding, controlling standard, key facts relied upon, material uncertainty, action, effective date, duration, required conditions, follow-up owner, record status, and appeal deadline. The notice need not reveal reporter identity, private records, safeguarding information, security methods, or another person's discipline. No-action or inconclusive outcomes should be recorded without implying that a good-faith report was improper.

22. **APPEAL ELIGIBILITY AND DEADLINE** A directly affected member may submit one written appeal within 14 calendar days of receiving a formal warning, probation, restriction, suspension, role reduction, removal, or other material formal outcome. A shorter external tournament deadline does not replace the internal deadline but may require immediate separate action. Late appeals may be accepted for documented accessibility, delivery, emergency, or other good-cause reasons.

23. **GROUND FOR APPEAL** - Material new information that was not reasonably available during the original review. - A significant procedural error that could have affected the outcome. - Mistaken identity, material factual error, or demonstrably unreliable evidence. - An undisclosed conflict of interest or reasonable concern about decision-maker impartiality. - A clearly disproportionate or materially inconsistent action based on comparable known cases. - Misapplication of a controlling written policy, agreement, eligibility rule, or authority limit.

24. **APPEAL REVIEWER AND SCOPE** An uninvolved leader at the next appropriate level should review the appeal when practical. The reviewer may examine the existing record, request focused additional information, correct procedure, interview relevant people, or return the matter for limited further review. Appeal is not a complete restart merely because the appellant disagrees, and the reviewer should not increase an outcome solely because an appeal was filed in good faith.

25. **APPEAL OUTCOMES** The reviewer may affirm, reverse, narrow, replace, stay, or remand the outcome; correct the record; order additional review; modify conditions or duration; or close the appeal for insufficient grounds. The written result should explain the disposition without exposing protected information. The appeal decision is final internally unless Ownership authorizes exceptional reconsideration for material new risk, fraud, conflict, or a controlling external decision.

26. **STATUS DURING APPEAL AND RESTORATION** Protective restrictions and material access controls may remain while an appeal is pending. When an outcome is reversed or reduced, leadership should restore appropriate access, role, listing, record, and reputation as practically possible, notify people who need the correction, and remove unsupported restrictions. Restoration does not require publication of confidential case details or guarantee a roster spot eliminated for independent legitimate reasons.

27. **NON-RETALIATION AND FALSE INFORMATION** Retaliation for good-faith reporting, participation, support, refusal of prohibited conduct, or appeal is a separate violation. Knowingly fabricated allegations, deliberate evidence alteration, impersonation, or coordinated malicious reporting may be addressed. An allegation that is unsubstantiated, inconclusive, mistaken, or denied is not automatically false and must not be used as a basis for retaliation.

28. **MINORS AND GUARDIANS** When a minor Academy, Development, or creator participant is directly affected, an authorized parent or legal guardian should receive required formal notices, may attend qualifying meetings, and may submit or assist with an appeal. Safeguarding information may still be limited when disclosure could endanger a person, violate law, or interfere with an external process. No internal outcome may expand a minor's participation beyond approved online pathways.

29. **EXTERNAL PROCESSES AND NO WAIVER** Internal review does not require anyone to delay or surrender a good-faith report to emergency services, law enforcement, child protection, a regulator, platform, publisher, tournament organizer, sponsor, attorney, or other appropriate authority. Element Esports may pause, coordinate, limit, or resume its process based on external direction, safety, evidence, privacy, or controlling rules. External and internal outcomes may differ

because their authority and standards differ.

30. RECORDS, REVIEW, AND VERSION CONTROL Store material reports, notices, evidence references, findings, actions, appeals, and corrections with need-to-know access and proportionate retention. Leadership should periodically review outcomes for consistency, unresolved conditions, repeated risks, overreach, under-enforcement, retaliation, and training needs. Ownership approves this policy; material revisions must be dated, versioned, summarized, and communicated through an official channel.

APPENDIX A - CORRECTIVE ACTION NOTICE MEMBER / ROLE

MATTER / REFERENCE

POLICY OR EXPECTATION

FINDING ☐ Established ☐ Not established ☐ Inconclusive ☐ Administrative

ACTION LEVEL ☐0☐1☐2☐3☐4☐5

EFFECTIVE DATE / DURATION

REQUIRED CORRECTION OR CONDITIONS

SUPPORT / FOLLOW-UP OWNER

REVIEW DATE

APPEAL DEADLINE / ROUTE

KEY FACTS, RATIONALE, UNCERTAINTY, AND PRIVACY-LIMITED NOTICE

APPENDIX B - APPEAL REQUEST APPELLANT / ROLE

ORIGINAL DECISION / DATE

APPEAL DATE

GROUNDS SELECTED

REQUESTED REMEDY

SUPPORT PERSON

ASSIGNED REVIEWER

DECISION / DATE

SPECIFIC ERROR, NEW INFORMATION, CONFLICT, INCONSISTENCY, OR PROPORTIONALITY CONCERN

APPENDIX C - CONSISTENCY REVIEW - Was immediate risk separated from the final factual finding? - Did the decision-maker have authority and disclose or resolve conflicts? - Was understandable notice provided, subject to documented safety limits? - Did the affected member have a meaningful chance to respond and request support? - Were relevant favorable and unfavorable facts preserved and considered? - Does the outcome fit severity, intent, impact, pattern, role authority, notice, cooperation, and comparable cases? - Are conditions, duration, follow-up, privacy limits, record status, and appeal route clear?

Questions, reports, and requests for the current controlled copy: contact@elementesports.com