

**Student Regulations Committee**  
**Revised Minutes**  
**Thursday, February 4, 2016**  
**4:00 PM**  
**Registrar's Office Conference Room**  
**First Floor Savant**

<b>Voting Members</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Role</b>
Richard Barke	Public Policy	
Al Ferri	ME	Chair
Ty Herrington	LMC	
Gordon Kingsley	Public Policy	
Andrea Laliberte	ISyE	
Joe Montoya	Biology	
Laura Margaret Burbach	UG Student	
Pavan Thaker	GRAD Student	
Adam Greenstein	UG Student	
<b>Non-Voting Members</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Role</b>
Reta Pikowsky	Registrar	Secretary
John Stein	Vice President-SL and DOS	
Doug Nation	Faculty Exec. Board Liaison	
<b>Standing Guests</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Role</b>
Steven Girardot	VProvost-UG EDU	

There are nine voting members. There are five needed to reach a quorum. **All votes are unanimous except where noted.**

**Present:** Greenstein (UG Student), Ferri (ME), Herrington (LMC), Pikowsky (Registrar), Thaker (Grad Student), Burbach (UG Student), Stein (Student Life/ODOS)

**Guests:** Gray (Registrar), Wasch (Legal Affairs), Girardot (UG Education)

1. A motion was made to approve the Minutes from the January 28, 2016 meeting. The motion was seconded and approved.
2. A motion was made to changes to the Student Code of Conduct and to the Code of Conduct for Student Organizations. The motion was seconded and approved.

It was noted that these changes are not related to the Sexual Misconduct Policy. That is a separate policy. Committee members were also informed that the University System is working on a Student Code of Conduct and process for the System. As soon as the new policy and process information are provided, the Committee will be asked to review and oversee introduction into the Catalog.

The changes considered by the Student Regulations Committee were in response to the recommendations from a commission formed by President Peterson, which completed their work in December of last year. Changes to the Student Code of Conduct fall under 6 main categories:

- A. Definition and Refinement of Process. Some language was changed in order to clarify operating procedures (Section 3a. page 4). In particular, the code now emphasizes in two places that the rules and procedures pertaining to student sexual misconduct are governed by a separate document, the Student Sexual Misconduct Policy. Further changes to the operating procedures will be further developed by OSI in consultation with the GT Office of Legal Affairs.
- B. Case Investigation. The revised Code (Section D.4.a., page 9) makes it clear that the pre-charge review is limited to a determination whether the facts as alleged in the complaint or report are sufficient to initiate a conduct process. If a conduct process is initiated, the Respondent is notified and an Administrative Conference is held with the Respondent (Section 4c., page 10) prior to further investigation of the complaint or report.
- C. Aggregation of Unrelated Cases. The revised code states that under certain circumstances, multiple complaints against the same Respondent might be “aggregated.” The committee agreed to the following wording (D.4.b): *If OSI receives multiple complaints involving the same Student, each complaint will be considered separately in determining whether a conduct process should be initiated. Multiple charges against the same Respondent will generally be investigated and adjudicated separately; however, multiple charges may be investigated and adjudicated together under appropriate circumstances, which may include, but are not limited to, consent of the parties, similar or related conduct, and the administrative burden of considering the charges separately.*
- D. Appellate Rights. The original Student Code of Conduct lists 5 possible sanctions if a Respondent is found Responsible (E.1): Disciplinary Warning, Disciplinary Probation, Suspension Held in Abeyance, Suspension, and Expulsion. Due to potential problems that arise with the rights of the Respondent’s to appeal it, the new Code of Conduct eliminates the middle sanction level of Suspension Held in Abeyance. The sanctions of Suspension and Expulsion may all be appealed to the Institute President through appropriate channels.
- E. Challenges to Hearing Officer Bias. The revised Code (Section D.4.e., page 10) permits a Respondent to request that the case be adjudicated by a different Student Conduct Administrator in the event of perceived bias of the initially authorized official. Reasons for appeal from an adverse finding (Section G.1,

page 16) include whether the original hearing was conducted fairly. This provides the additional mechanism for consideration of perceived bias on appeal from the decision of a hearing officer.

- F. Technical and Editorial Changes. The revised Code was revised to be more consistent and to update certain language. For example, the designation of the student suspected of misconduct has been changed from “Accused” to “Respondent.” References to the Dean of Students have been changed to the Vice President for Student Life and Dean of Students,” etc. The Code also clarifies that allegations of sexual misconduct are handled under the separate Student Sexual Misconduct Policy. In the wording of the term Advisor (Section A.2) the Student Regulations Committee recommended that the definition be shortened to:

*“Advisor” refers to an individual chosen by the Student or Organization who assists a participant with the Student Conduct Process.*

The differences between the two codes of conduct were noted and discussed.

3. Copies of both Codes of Conduct are attached to these Minutes as [Appendix A: Student Code of Conduct](#) and [Appendix B: Student Organizations Code of Conduct](#).
4. Next Meeting: February 25, Thursday, 3:00 PM, Registrar’s Office Conference Room, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Savant.

Adjourned,

Dr. Al Ferri, Chair, ME