

**Student Conduct Code DTF
Meeting Notes
October 6, 2009**

Present:

Michael Sledge, Britt Hoover, Wendy Endress, Andi Seabert, April Meyers, Stephanie Kozick, Raymond Campbell

Absent:

Bill Gilbreath, Crystal Robbins, Katie Garcin

DTF Membership:

Continue to seek new student members. Will invite interested students to attend the meetings and apply to serve on the DTF through the GSU process in an effort to support the GSU role in identifying students for campus governance. The GSU process should recommend appointments before the end of fall term.

Updates since last meeting of spring quarter:

Andi & Wendy met with Colleen Warren on the 6th. Discussion items included:

- use of the words: hearing, respondent, adjudicative
- use of brief administrative hearings for all appeals
- possibility of eliminating procedural appeal process
- conflict of interest
- signing a contract
- recommended corrective action
- authority
- #18 sexual misconduct threshold
- #24 alleged violation of the law
- #14 & #13 definitions
- #7 harm to self
- #3 failure to be forthcoming

She is still researching and considering some of these issues and will share her advice over the course of the term. She will attend the next DTF meeting and provide some observations about the following:

- jurisdiction expansion
- #18 sexual misconduct threshold
- #3 failure to be forthcoming
- #24 alleged violation
- #2 obstruction/disruption of teaching and learning

Committee discussed:

#18 sexual misconduct threshold

Revisited NCHERM recommendation. Determined to raise the threshold in order to prevent violations of code occurring with common conduct (e.g. two students 21 yo+ who have consumed a glass of alcohol) “diminished capacity for effective decision making”

#20 change “your” to “a student’s”

#10 sanctions

In response to student concern re: no sense of why someone would be suspended or expelled intended to added language to clarify this (e.g. misconduct that causes harm). Feedback from colleagues advised keeping options open. Sanctions are formulated on a case-by-case basis in an effort to address unique situation, history, pattern, severity, bias motivation, impact on community, student’s response, etc.

Need to add language re: context of sanctions.

VII #4 Board makeup

Joe Tougas advised against retaining flexibility in Board makeup. Preserve 3 students required for all hearings. Determined to eliminate flexibility clause.

#15 definition – Hearing Board

Agenda Committee v. Faculty appoint members of Board

Hearing has different meaning for attorneys and may make the Code more legalistic than we intended. Change hearing for SCO to “conduct conference”

Considered changing Respondent to Student. Determined it would not harm the clarity of the Code – except in cases when a group is responding. Postponed decision.