CSL Meeting on 1/23/2015

Minutes

1. Members Attending:
   a. Members present: Helen Marrow, Consuelo Cruz, Jamie Kirsch, Anne Poncet, Ece Kocak, Linda Jiang, Mickey Toogood, Bruce Reitman
   b. Minutes taker: Linda Jiang
2. Wendell Phillips Award
   a. 13 candidates - Members will read and review all candidates by February 3rd and send rating back to the chair
   b. Also their votes for the final oral question
   c. Finalists will be selected on 2-6-15
3. Appeals
   a. #1 organization re-recognition appeal – CSL found no grounds for appeal based on new evidence or fair process; members do not believe that the texts and emails shown as evidence are relevant as new evidence, and believe was fair process given to all clubs
      i. But members will continue discussing with TCUJ our thoughts about whether the proof of event requirement is “unreasonable”, or has been provided with enough lead time, early this winter
      ii. Communicate that and our expectation that most likely they will get recognized next semester if document activity here forward
   b. #2 individual appeal – CSL found grounds for appeal based on severity of sanction and reduced the sanction from a year-long Pro II to a warning
      i. Wording of the ARC testing handbook and the Tufts student handbook regarding academic integrity need to be looked at.
         (Discrepancy in University policy)
   c. Helen Marrow will send emails to all appellants with the decision (cc’ing Judicial Affairs Officer Mickey Toogood)
4. Overview by Mickey Toogood of his and Mary Pat McMahon’s progress on revising the Handbooks
   a. In general, members think the work is good, useful, and important
   b. Members like the change from Warning → Pro I → Pro II to Warning → Reprimand → Probation
   c. Members also like the addition of Indefinite Dismissal because it helps to put the burden of readmission onto Tufts rather than the victim in cases where one may be involved
   d. Now hierarchy stands as 6 steps: Warning → Reprimand → Probation → Suspension → Indefinite Suspension → Expulsion
   e. Question from CSL: What is difference between one’s transcript and one’s disciplinary record?
i. Answer: Transcript is academic, normally requested
ii. But sometimes a disciplinary record might also be requested (ie, have you ever had any disciplinary action taken against you?) Usually Tufts just sends a copy of the outcome letter, or provides a summary of it. And currently Tufts keeps them a long time.
iii. Both are part of a student’s “educational record”, among other things (including emails, parking tickets, etc.)
f. Summary: Main Discussion re: whether records should be retained with disciplinary cases, presentation to students, years records should be retained. Discussion will continue next CSL meeting. Mickey would like our help in the future thinking about:
   i. Retention of records – yes/no, and if so, for how long at each level?
      1. Warning – no retention
      2. Reprimand – only while at Tufts?
      3. Probation – considering reducing to 7 years, which is more or less the time that FERPA requires educational institutions to house “educational records”? / What about something more permanent in cases of sexual assault?
      4. Suspension – to retain permanently or temporarily, and any variation within (esp. sexual misconduct)?
      5. Indefinite Dismissal – ditto?
      6. Expulsion – permanent?
      7. Consuelo Cruz advocates keeping more of the records the farther up the sanction we go, for “history” and “narrative”. We can imagine it may be important in the future, esp. for severe sanctions.
   ii. If we retain records, how to do so – via a notation or just by storing the outcome letters?
   iii. Are the examples listed in the correct places? Do they give sufficient example while also keeping space open for adjudication and discretion?
   iv. Linda Jiang advocates lots of education about new policies, including examples, to students and student RAs, for clarity