

Minutes for Student Regulations Committee

April 9, 2014

Student Regulations Committee

Present:

Members: Charles Parsons, Jung Choi, Richard Barke

Guests: Lucy Tucker (SGA), Bill Schafer (VPSA), Melanie DeMaeyer (Women's Center), John Stein (Dean of Students), Kathleen Gosden (Office of Legal Affairs), Mia Reini (Legal Affairs and Risk Management), Colleen Riggle (WRC), Peter Paquette (Office of Student Integrity)

The Committee was called to order at 1:30pm.

I. Policy on Student Sexual Misconduct.

The Committee was asked to consider revisions to existing policy, based on responses to a federal compliance mandate (Campus SaVE) and Clery Act, as well as Title IX and DOE letters to clarify needed actions, and coordination with best practices and benchmarking from 28 peer and aspirational universities. A Georgia Tech committee of more than fifteen staff, faculty, and students developed the revisions.

Major proposed changes:

- Updated the policy to reflect current Campus SaVE Act legal requirements, including:
 - Rights of Victim and Respondent
 - Standard of evidence
 - Training
 - Sanctions
 - Confidentiality
- Policy name change
- The Sexual Misconduct Policy is a standalone document with reference in the Student Code of Conduct.
- Added language related to “intimate partner violence”, “actively contributing to a hostile sexual environment”, “coercion” and “intimidation” as policy violations.
- Changed Complainant and Accused to Victim and Respondent.
- Provided first considered sanctions for policy violations.
- Altered investigation and resolution process to create a more supportive and less adversarial process consistent with peer institutions and best practices. Provides an opportunity for a student panel investigation, removes Judicial Cabinet from the process, making it an administrative investigation. (For all

other types of transgressions, students can choose a student or administrative panel.)

- Enhanced appeal process from a single person to panel of three administrators, who will receive thorough training.

Discussion of the proposal by the Students Regulations Committee included questions and concerns about:

- the clarity of the descriptors of possible sexual misconduct (Section B),
- the availability of resources for implementation and enforcement of the policy,
- confidentiality or explanation of possible legal implications of information revealed in investigations and hearings (particularly as this might pertain to the choice of an “advisor” or “advocate”),
- how the new policy will be promulgated to the campus community

The Committee was told that these and other issues that arise will be explored or carefully monitored by the appropriate campus officials. Some concerns about the precise language in the proposed policy were addressed by noting that characterizations and definitions were derived largely from the federal Campus SaVE, Title IX, and Violence Against Women policies.

A motion to approve the new Student Sexual Misconduct Policy was made by Choi, seconded by Barke, and **approved** unanimously.

It was noted that portions of this policy overlap with or supersede the Student Code of Conduct, particularly Sanctions (Section D). After discussion, a motion to amend the Student Code of Conduct to incorporate these changes was made by Choi, seconded by Barke, and **approved** unanimously.

Attachments:

1. [Clean copy of new policy](#) on Student Sexual Misconduct
2. [Markup](#) showing changes in detail.

2. Revision of the current sanction model proposed by the Academic Integrity Committee

The Student Regulations Committee received an informational item from the **Office of Student Integrity**, to establish consistent and minimum penalties for academic misconduct. The primary change is to clarify the required and supplemental penalties for the first, second, and third violations, mainly to provide an opportunity for student to learn from the first offense and to be more clear about the seriousness of subsequent violations.

It was noted that the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education has consented to these changes, but there has not been a response from the Vice Provost for Graduate Education regarding the penalties for graduate students.

There was discussion about whether this is a “model” or set of guidelines, or a “policy” that is more than informative. The Student Regulations Committee requested that the Executive Board and Academic Integrity Committee be asked to indicate whether this is a change that requires a change to student rules and regulations, noting that if this model is enforceable then it is a policy change.

The Committee considered whether the recommendation for a one-year suspension for a third violation was sufficient, indicating that the Academic Integrity Committee’s desire for leniency and student learning should apply to the second offense but that third violations should be subject to more severe penalties, allowing the *possibility* of expulsion, not simply a one-year suspension, based on the judgment of the Office of Student Integrity.

A motion was made by Barke and seconded by Choi to amend the “Proposed Academic Misconduct Sanctioning Model” to indicate that the Disciplinary Sanction for a third violation would be “Suspension from the Institute for a minimum of one calendar year *or expulsion.*” This motion was conditional, based on an agreement of the Academic Integrity Committee to this amendment and a finding by the Executive Board that the consent of the Student Regulations Committee on this matter is required. The motion was **approved** unanimously.

III. Request from Registrar on Tentative Honors

The Committee considered a letter from the Registrar concerning graduation with academic distinction, requesting that section XIII(E) be amended to indicate that “for students to receive honor cords for the commencement ceremony, they must qualify for honors according to the requirements before entering their final term.” (Underscored phrase is new.) Barke moved to agree to this request, Choi seconded, and the motion was **approved** unanimously.

The committee adjourned at 2:40pm.