**Codes and Judicial Meeting December 3rd**

**I. Attendance**

Voting members

Name NetID Title

Christopher Balch ckb47 Member

Kevin Clermont kmc12 Member

Gleb Drobkov gvd7 Chair

Risa Lieberwitz rll5 Member

Rachel Weil rjw5 Member

Kathy Zoner krz1 Member

Ex-officio and non-voting members

Name NetID Title

Mary Grant meg36 Ex-officio member (represented by Scott Grantz, JA)

Evan Magruder ejm256 Ex-officio member

Pempa Dongtoe pd35 Ex-officio member

**II. Minutes**

G. Drobkov said that there is a quorum. The only voting members not present were Ulysses Smith and Gary Stewart. Six out of eight voting members were present at the meeting.

Members discussed the proposed resolution and any changes that needed to be made before a vote.

R. Weil and E. Magruder agreed to reach out the deans of faculty to invite them to promote the position of Hearing Board Chair to faculty members. G. Drobkov agreed to help draft the letter to the Deans.

R. Leiberwitz requested to revisit the discussion over the items because she was not able to attend the first two meetings of the CJC this semester.

On Item 1, she asked why the limit for appeals was 15 days. E. Magruder and S. Grantz, representing the JCC and JAs offices respectively, said that they agreed that this was an acceptable time frame.

On Item 2, the grammar and language of the resolution was changed to be more consistent with the rest of the code.

On Item 3, R. Weil requested a reconsideration of the deferred sanction addition to the code. She explained that the CJC should not put language in the code to make the UHB more hesitant about suspending students.

C. Balch said that the CJC should promote flexibility and deference in the Code, and the deferred sanctions accomplished this.

G. Drobkov believes that there is no problem with deferred sanctions because they add more flexibility and because they are already employed by the JAs office in their summary decision agreements.

R. Lieberwitz also approved deferred sanctions because she said the Code should allow for more individualized sentencing. There are always special circumstances.

E. Magruder said that the UHB has highlighted that deferred sanctions are not in the Code and that the Codes and Judicial Committee must address the issue. It has not agreed to revoke summary decisions because they do not exist in the Code.

K. Claremont said that there is no regulation on deferred sanctions in probation either. The topic of what triggers deferred sanctions and probation should be discussed by the CJC in the next semester.

G. Drobkov said that a vote must be taken to decide whether to include the deferred sanction provision in today’s resolution or whether to leave the code inconsistent with the practice of deferred sanctions in summary decision agreements for now.

The committee decided to include the provision as it is. The changes were made on G. Drobkov’s computer and a new proposal was printed by S. Grantz. The members of the committee reread this proposal, voted on it and passed it unanimously.