

**Student Conduct Code DTF**  
**Meeting Notes-not reviewed yet**  
**March 10, 2010**

Present: Wendy Endress, April Meyers, Sara Huntington, Britt Hoover, Amanda Steinberg, Bill Gilbreath, Andrea Seabert Olsen

Absent: Ray Campbell, Tristan Powell

- Approved Meeting Notes of March 3.
- Wendy reported that the invite to faculty to cover the Code during spring term will go out on Thursday or Friday.
- Wendy reported that the infrastructure for a blog has been set up.
- Andi reported on her efforts to have faculty cover the Code in their program. About 8 faculty were definitely interested; two were maybes; 7 she will follow-up on. George Freeman is interested in covering it but needs the recommended Code at the beginning of quarter. Andi will send version we receive from attorney.
- Andi shared draft text for an FAQ
  - Q. What is the point of interim restrictions and when can they be put into place?
  - R. Interim restrictions can be put into place when issues of health or safety arise. The most common interim restrictions include a separation order or a restriction from various areas on campus for a specific period of time while a conduct case gets resolved. A separation order would be put in place between the student and the reporting party. This order is to protect the reporting party from possible retaliation and would prohibit both parties from engaging in direct, indirect, or electronic communication. Depending on the situation, a separation order could also include a restriction from certain parts of campus that would allow for the reporting party to study, work, or live without impact or fear. Once a case is completed, any interim restrictions would be removed or replaced by permanent restrictions or mediated agreements. This practice has been a regular part of the conduct system and students who are the reporting party have stated that they feel more comfortable that immediate action can take place while the sometimes time consuming conduct process is completed. Specific examples would be limiting access to the residence hall or classroom of the reporting party.
- We revisited text for why one administrator addresses misconduct off campus. Michael provided the following edits:

The person making a determination about whether or not alleged misconduct that occurs off-campus should be addressed has to meet a number of special criteria. First, they must have a working knowledge of the Code, some experience working with codes of conduct, and they must be able to properly apply the **standard** outlined in the Code. They also must be independent from the Campus Grievance Officer/Senior Student Conduct Code Administrator. The first criteria could be met by the Campus Grievance Officer, but having the decision to apply the **standard** outlined in the Code, and the decision on resolving the grievance rest in one person's hands seems too centralized. Balanced with the need for being consistent, quick, and accountable, there are few senior level positions that meet this criteria.
- Brainstormed ideas for vetting in April:
  - warm-up tabling in Library for two weeks
  - ask a question/week at tabling and via tescrier
  - hold several forums – possibly:
    - Info Session – April 7

Code Seminar – April 14/21 @ HCC 7-8 pm

Code Seminar – April 14 in SemII 3-5 pm

Code Seminar – April 17 – noon-1 pm

Code Seminar – April 21 in SemII 1-3 pm

- invite Jose Gomez to have his program prepare a session about the Code
  - encourage faculty to participate in feedback process and encourage their students to do so via faculty meeting
  - request Core Connectors address opportunities
  - request it be covered in Tacoma Lyceum
  - TESCrier invite to blog and provide feedback
  - Open Door time in offices
  - connect with student group coordinators
  - share information at Rare Books Tea Party
  - article in CPJ and CounterPoint Journal by student members
  - Student Affairs Seminar
- 
- Determined to cancel 3/17 meeting
  - Reminder – no meeting 3/24
  - We will meet 3/31 at 4 pm in Library 2205