

**Student Conduct Code DTF  
Meeting Notes  
January 6, 2010**

Present: Wendy Endress, April Meyers, Bill Gilbreath, Andrea Seabert Olsen, Sara Huntington, Ray Campbell

Absent: Britt Hoover, Michael Sledge, Amanda Steinberg, Tristan Powell

Approved Meeting Notes with one edit to grammar of December 16.

Wendy reported that Marla Elliott and Rick McKinnon with the Grays Harbor Program will review and critique the Conduct Code this quarter. Andi has agreed to attend the program one Sunday this quarter to provide information and participate in a discussion.

Wendy reported that Michelle Aguilar-Wells with the Reservation Based Program will invite all students enrolled in the program and the Reservation Based Student Council to review the Code and comment – sending observations directly to Wendy.

Wendy is still pursuing the best way to obtain input from students enrolled in the Tacoma Program.

Next week plan to discuss the Purpose Statement. In preparation read the following:

- Social Contract
- Current Purpose Statement
- Proposed Purpose Statement

Sara volunteered to refine the proposed statement for next week.

Discussed #2 standard – obstruction and disruption. Compared with Model Code and sister institutions. Original intent was to be more transparent about the types of misconduct that are addressed with this type of standard. Determined to leave as is and incorporate the following into Student Rights & Responsibilities and the Purpose Statement:

“Students have the right to freedom of expression, including the right to dissent or protest, this expression cannot interfere with the rights of others or disrupt the college’s activities.”

Discussed Procedures.

Restorative Justice

Should we enhance our references to restorative justice in the procedures or purpose section?

Determined that the Purpose Statement could use more emphasis. E.g. “We strive for outcomes that are restorative in nature...”

Finding/Determination

Identified that our definition of Finding did not match our language in the procedures section. Discussion resulted in eliminating the word “finding” and using the language of “determination”. E.g. The SCA determines whether the respondent is responsible or not. Wendy will make associate edits.

Reasonable Person Standard & More Likely Than Not

Do we need to define? Determined we don’t need to define “more likely than not” and will explore possible definitions of “reasonable person”.

Appeal

Do we want to eliminate procedural appeal?

Rationale to do so: due process is provided; students are offered an appeal to the decision, when students have used this in the past it has been about discontent with the outcome of the hearing board not because process wasn’t followed

Undecided.