

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	Draft as of 3.10.17						
2	Page	Section	Affiliation	Suggestion	Rationale	Current Policy	Date Received
3	N/A	A	Staff	Review the code every two years vs yearly.	Give the community an opportunity to see how the policies are working.	No policy currently exists on this - would be creation of new policy	3.1.17
4	3	A.3.a.iii	Staff	Update the definition of student organization in SCOC to mirror SALD definition e.g. "group of students who unite and work together to achieve a common interest or goal."	Allows SCOC to apply to student orgs who are no longer registered or recognized by SCOC.	The term "student organization" refers to any number of students who have completed necessary requirements to be registered and recognized by the university.	2.10.17
5	6 and 12	A.3.e.i. & B.3.a.i.a	Staff	The wording about where a allegation of academic misconduct stems from needs to be consistent. There are different policies in A.3.e.i. B.3.a.i.a - should likely reflect the one in B to make it so that academic misconduct can be managed in cases where there is not a correlating class	Our code needs to be consistent.	"Cases involving academic misconduct originate with the instructor in whose course the alleged misconduct occurred." VS "The original jurisdiction of any case involving academic misconduct shall be with the instructor in whose course the alleged misconduct occurred or in the absence of the instructor, with the department chair of the course or the dean or designee."	2.28.17

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
6	9,10	A.4.k	Staff	Make medical amnesty available to all students who solicit and receive help for alcohol or drug intoxication.	Will ensure that fear of getting in trouble isn't a barrier for students to solicit or receive help	The university community encourages the reporting of conduct code violations and crimes involving a victim, especially sexual misconduct. Sometimes, victims are hesitant to report such conduct to university officials because they fear that they may be accused of policy violations, such as underage drinking at the time of the incident. It is in the best interests of this community that as many victims as possible choose to report code violations to university officials. To encourage reporting, the University of Cincinnati has the discretion to not charge alleged victims, bystanders or witnesses, or others who participate in the SCOC process with certain non-violent violations—such as personal use of alcoholic beverages or drugs—related to the incident.	1.19.17

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
7	9,10	A.4.k	Student	<p>I acknowledge that UCPD acts as if there is a form of medical amnesty on campus when dealing with non-academic misconduct involving drugs and alcohol. However, I would like to see this amnesty formalized in the Student Code of Conduct.</p> <p>http://ssdp.org/campaigns/all-911-good-samaritan-policies/</p> <p>The preceding link describes in detail the overview of what a medical amnesty/good samaritan policy looks like and how it can be implemented.</p> <p><i>Feedback with same wording received twice</i></p>	<p>I would feel more safe on campus if I or a peer of mine were able to call for help if I or they were in a medical emergency involving alcohol or other substances.</p> <p><i>Feedback with same wording received twice</i></p>	<p>The university community encourages the reporting of conduct code violations and crimes involving a victim, especially sexual misconduct. Sometimes, victims are hesitant to report such conduct to university officials because they fear that they may be accused of policy violations, such as underage drinking at the time of the incident. It is in the best interests of this community that as many victims as possible choose to report code violations to university officials. To encourage reporting, the University of Cincinnati has the discretion to not charge alleged victims, bystanders or witnesses, or others who participate in the SCOC process with certain non-violent violations—such as personal use of alcoholic beverages or drugs—related to the incident.</p>	2.13.17
8	6,10, 18,23	A.C.D	Staff	<p>Remove the Title IX procedures out of the SCOC and incorporate it through reference.</p>	<p>This will make it easier for students to understand the process and timelines.</p>	<p>Throughout code</p>	1.25.17

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
9	10	B.1.b	Staff	Take out the lengthy pledge example on page 10 and wording about examples of pledges and academic integrity information.	The pledge example is unnecessary and only adds to the length of the code. The academic integrity information no longer exists on the website.	The pledge may contain language such as: "On my honor I pledge that this work of mine does not violate the University of Cincinnati Student Code of Conduct provisions on cheating and plagiarism." Honor pledges serve primarily as a teaching tool; unless a college has a mandatory honor code, pledges are used at the discretion of the instructor without imposition of a disciplinary sanction for students who honestly do passing work but object to a signed affirmation. Alternative pledges as well as information about the Academic Integrity Campaign can be obtained from SCCS and online at http://www.uc.edu/conduct .	2.28.17
10	11	B.2.b.i	Staff	Take out "possession of" from cheating policy	This wording is ambiguous, since every student in every classroom will be "in possession of" a technological device during an examination if they have a cell phone in their backpack. "Or possession" should be removed from the sentence; the point is that cheating cannot occur without the actual "use of" technology during an exam.	Use or possession of unauthorized material or technological devices during an examination, an "examination" meaning any written, oral work or assessment submitted for evaluation or grade.	1.13.17

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
11	11	B.2.b.i	Staff	<p>My feedback is specific to this section. I suggest the wording be changed to "Use of unauthorized material or technological devices..." instead of "Use or possession of..."</p> <p>(b) Cheating Any dishonesty or deception in fulfilling an academic requirement such as:</p> <p>(i) Use or possession of unauthorized material or technological devices during an examination, an "examination" meaning any written, oral work or assessment submitted for evaluation or grade.</p>	<p>Technically every student in possession of a cell phone during an examination is in violation of the Cheating portion of the Academic Misconduct Section. "Use of" would be more specifically linked to students who are using the technological devices to cheat, not just students who are in possession of a cell phone during an exam that is sitting in their backpack. Right now the students who have a cell phone or iPad in their backpack during an exam (probably 99% of our student body) are technically in violation of this section the way it is currently worded.</p>	<p>Use or possession of unauthorized material or technological devices during an examination, an "examination" meaning any written, oral work or assessment submitted for evaluation or grade.</p>	2.17.17

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
12	11	B.2.b.i	Student	<p>In regards to the Academic Misconduct Section of the Student Code of Conduct section:</p> <p>"(b) Cheating Any dishonesty or deception in fulfilling an academic requirement such as: (i) Use or possession of unauthorized material or technological devices during an examination, an "examination" meaning any written, oral work or assessment submitted for evaluation or grade."</p> <p>My feedback is that I think the wording of this clause should be altered from "Use or possession of" to just "Use of".</p>	<p>My rationale for altering the clause to say "Use of" is because every single student at UC who owns a cell phone is in violation of this clause. Even if students put their cell phone away in their backpack or if their cell phone is turned off, they would still be in violation since it is officially still considered to be in their possession. I was in a class where the teacher made an example of a student whose cell phone went off during an exam even though it was in their backpack. It does not seem fair that a student should go through academic misconduct or lose a letter grade or even fail a class because there is a cell phone in their backpack.</p>	<p>Use or possession of unauthorized material or technological devices during an examination, an "examination" meaning any written, oral work or assessment submitted for evaluation or grade.</p>	2.20.17

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
13	12	B.2.d.	Staff	The definition of self-plagiarism currently only includes "written or oral work". Especially given some of the mediums of our DAAP or CCM students, this does not seem to encompass all of the mediums of self-plagiarism	Need to ensure that we have a definition that applies to all the different types of work our students do.	Submitting one's own previously written or oral work without modification and instructor permission.	2.28.17
14	12 thru 18	B.3	Faculty	I'd like to see the university take a stand on academic misconduct so that it doesn't have to be decided on a college by college basis. I'm thinking in particular of the "2 strike" policy that LCB has and that A&S is considering. This really should be a university-wide policy. We should not be shuffling students who have plagiarized around from college to college or degree program to degree program.	I suggest that the university come up with an across-the-board policy on plagiarism and other forms of student misconduct.	Lengthy process - refer to code	2.13.17
15	12 thru 18	B.3	Faculty	UC should have a uniform 'expelled if two validated cheats' that A&S and other colleges are individually developing.	Not provided	Lengthy process - refer to code	2.13.17

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
16	12,13 ,14	B.3.a	Staff	Form A and Form B are confusing and some faculty see completing two forms as redundant.	Asking faculty to complete two forms makes them not want to report academic misconduct and they want to "handle it themselves" which is problematic and doesn't allow us to track numbers/students accurately. If we want them to report, we need to make it streamlined and as easy as possible.	Within ten (10) days of discovering the misconduct, the instructor will inform the student verbally or in writing, and follow up with formal notice in Form A (http://www.uc.edu/conduct.html). Form A will include a description of the alleged academic misconduct, the instructor's recommended sanctions and the student's options for resolution. The instructor or student may arrange a review meeting. The student may have an adviser at that meeting. This meeting must occur within five days of receiving Form A. If the student and instructor are unable to reach a resolution through Form A, the CCA and student will be notified through Form B. Form B includes a description of the alleged misconduct, the instructor's recommended sanctions and the student's options for resolution, including the College Hearing Panel (CHP).	1.13.17

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
17	12,13 ,14	B.3.a	Faculty	<p>I would recommend streamline the process and collapse Forms A and B into one — rather than having separate forms that students need to sign, which makes it seem like you are repeating the same process twice. I found these guidelines which have been helpful: http://undergrad.psu.edu/aa/ppm/sanctioning-guidelines.html</p>	<p>I think many professors find the process a bit arduous and just handle the incident within the confines of their class. However, without a record of incidents, then students can potentially repeat the same issues across multiple classes, but receive simply a minor sanction each time. I receive a lot of resistance from students in signing Form A, as they think simply by signing the form they are admitting to something, which they are not. I don't think it should be necessary to get a signature on Form A or provide a potential sanction since it is just a notification of the allegation and the instructor should hear the student's side before determining an appropriate sanction.</p>	<p>Within ten (10) days of discovering the misconduct, the instructor will inform the student verbally or in writing, and follow up with formal notice in Form A (http://www.uc.edu/conduct.html). Form A will include a description of the alleged academic misconduct, the instructor's recommended sanctions and the student's options for resolution. The instructor or student may arrange a review meeting. The student may have an adviser at that meeting. This meeting must occur within five days of receiving Form A. If the student and instructor are unable to reach a resolution through Form A, the CCA and student will be notified through Form B. Form B includes a description of the alleged misconduct, the instructor's recommended sanctions and the student's options for resolution, including the College Hearing Panel (CHP).</p>	2.14.17

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
18	12 & 13	B.3.a.ii & iii.	Staff	The code is unclear on where faculty members should modify Form A or modify Form B if they have met with a student and come to a resolution of moving forward with the allegation and sanctions. In section B.3.a.ii it seems as though they would do this on Form A. In section B.3.a.iii it seems as though they would do this on Form B. The course of action needs to be clearly laid out one way or another.	The academic misconduct process is incredibly confusing as it is, so we need to make sure the code is clear on what faculty members are supposed to be doing.	"If the student and instructor are unable to reach a resolution through Form A, the CCA and student will be notified through Form B." VS "Move forward with the allegation and provide Form B to the student outlining the alleged misconduct and proposed sanctions."	2.28.17

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
19	13	B.3.a.iii. a	Staff	The academic process specifies that if a faculty member receives Form A back from the student and the student wants to meet with them to discuss the allegations, that the instructor needs to take action within 5 days or the charges will be dismissed. It also says that they need to meet within 5 days but does not specify what will happen if they do not meet with the student within 5 days. So is taking action inherently just meeting with the student? I think it is reasonable that the faculty member needs to email the student back to set up the meeting within 5 days, but 5 days to meet seems like an unrealistic window for faculty who may only be on campus a couple times a week if they are adjuncts.	This sets a more realistic timeline and also clarifies the outcome if timelines are not met. It will eliminate confusion.	If a student challenges the finding or sanctions, the student and instructor will meet within five days of the instructor receiving Form A back from the student AND If the instructor takes no action after five days of receiving back Form A from the student, the allegations shall be considered dismissed.	3.9.17

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
20	14,15,16	B.3.b.	Faculty	College hearing panel puts undue burdens on faculty. The time commitment is unreasonable. Additionally, it basically puts the faculty member on trial.	Not provided	Lengthy process - refer to code	2.15.17
21	16,17,18	B.3.b.iii. d. AND B.4.e&g	Staff	Do not allow students to be suspended or dismissed from the university as a result of academic misconduct or create a process where if they are going to be dismissed, it needs to go through SCCS.	The way the code currently reads, a faculty member supported by a College Dean could suspend or dismiss a student from the university. This seems very drastic without some further check.	If a student is found responsible for violating academic misconduct, the CHP recommends all sanctions to the college dean, or vice provost or designee which include, but is not limited to, disciplinary reprimand, probation, suspension or dismissal, failure of assignment or class, and/or educational sanctions.	2.28.17

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
22	16	B.3.b.iv	Staff	Under B.3.b.iv regarding the appeal process for academic misconduct cases, it says that in the Dean's letter the student will receive information about the appeal process with the UAA's name and address. However, if they are going to file an appeal don't they need to submit the appeal in writing to the Director of SCCS per section D? This needs to be consistent and referenced if that is the appropriate process.	The appeals process needs to be consistent throughout the code. If it is actually different for academic misconduct and does go straight to the UAA, then this needs to be referenced in D.	Notification to the student will include information about the appeal process and the name and address of the university appeals administrator.	2.28.17
23	N/A	C	Faculty	I would favor stricter penalties for someone who is forced to Haze if a death or lasting brain damage occurs, e.g., the frat or sorority would be banned from campus forever, police will be called in to arrest and prosecute, etc.	The Miami Univ. experience of the resent female student who died recently due to hazing.	N/A	3.9.17

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
24	18	C.2.a	Student	I believe that those who are surrounding an act of crime should not be at fault unless they are actively participating. Instead of using the language of "bystander" , say active participant.	If I'm in a room where someone is committing a crime and I have nothing to do with it, yet I am at fault, that's bs. This only people at fault should be those who are actively taking a role in the situation. (Videotaping, helping someone escape, etc...)	Aiding and abetting misconduct Being in the presence of nonacademic misconduct, helping, procuring, or encouraging another person to engage in nonacademic misconduct.	2.13.17
25	22	C.2.cc	Student	Specify what students can possess as means of defense. And Specify what students cannot possess as means of defense AND WHY.	Numerous armed robberies, burglaries, and sexual assaults have occurred and the code of conduct discourages and confuses students on self defense. We need to know explicitly what we can and cannot use/possess when on campus so that we can know the liability the university is willing to take our lives and livelihoods	Weapons: Use, storage, or possession of a firearm, explosive device of any description, ammunition or anything used to threaten, harm, or disrupt the university community including, but not limited to, firecrackers, compressed air or spring activated guns, pellet guns, BB guns, paintball guns, water guns, nerf guns and knives of any type or any other items which would reasonably be deemed threatening by a reasonable person	2.13.17
26	19	C.2.g	Staff	I wonder if information needs to be added about Ohio's medical marijuana law. In addition, what about information addressing students from other states that have a medical marijuana law--are they allowed to use that substance here? Should we spell that out?	I think we need to stay on top of the changing laws of Ohio and addressing the behaviors that students will engage in (or think they're allowed to engage in) based on Ohio laws. I worry that students will push the boundaries and we won't have accountability.	Drugs or narcotics Uses, manufactures, distributes, buys, sells, offers for sale, or possesses illegal drugs, narcotics, drug paraphernalia, or prescription medication.	2.2.17

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
27	20&2 1	C.2.k,o, &r	Staff	There are a few definitions of violations of non-academic misconduct that are duplicative of one and other. Public endangerment's definition has shared portions of its definition with misuse of safety equipment, and false report of emergency.	We need to wrap these violations into one or clearly break them apart so we are not triple charging students.	<p><i>False report of emergency</i> Causes, makes, or circulates a false report or warning of a fire, explosion, crime or other catastrophe or emergency; including, but not limited to, activating a false fire alarm.</p> <p><i>Misuse of safety equipment</i> Unauthorized use or alteration of firefighting equipment, safety devices, fire alarms, fire extinguishers or other emergency safety equipment.</p> <p><i>Public endangerment</i> Actions that endanger others, including: dropping objects from buildings, activating a false fire alarm, or tampering with safety equipment.</p>	2.28.17
28	20	C.2.m	Staff	Remove "generally means" from the hazing definition	If there are going to be definitions in the code (which you may want to consider getting rid of anyway), you need to stick with actually defining things and not just what they "generally mean"	Hazing generally means any act which endangers the mental or physical health or safety of a student, for the purpose of initiation, admission into, affiliation with, or as a condition of continued membership in a group or organization regardless of one's willingness to participate.	2.28.17

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
29	21	C.2.q	Staff	Take the word "physical" out of physical abuse or harm.	Even if physical could mean damage fear of physical harm, students can easily be confused when they are charged with physical abuse or harm for stalking or threatening to hurt someone. Abuse or Harm would cover this and be less confusing.	Physical abuse or harm Acts which cause or reasonably could cause physical harm to any person are prohibited. Actions that specifically threaten or cause a person to reasonably believe that the offender may cause physical harm are also prohibited. Examples of prohibited behavior include, but are not limited to, assault, battery, stalking, telephone harassment, sex or gender-based violence, threats, intimidation, physical abuse of another, dating violence, domestic violence, and any other speech or conduct not protected under the first amendment that threatens the health or safety of any person.	2.28.17
30	22	C.2.u	Staff	Add UC's new "Tobacco Free Policy" to the code.	This reflects the new University Board Rule Policy.	Smoking inside buildings, athletic facilities, and vehicles owned, operated or leased by the University of Cincinnati or within twenty-five feet of all university building entrances, exits, air intakes, operable windows, bridges, overpasses or enclosed walkways.	1.25.17

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
31	22	C.2.x&y	Student	<p>Section 2. x: "Unauthorized use of property or services: Unauthorized use, distribution, duplication or possession of any keys issued for any university building, laboratory, facility, room, or vehicles."</p> <p>Section 2. y: "Unauthorized use of university key: Unauthorized use, distribution, duplication or possession of any keys issued for any university building, laboratory, facility, room or vehicles. Keys are defined as any mechanism used to access locked areas."</p>	It doesn't make sense for the same definition to be used twice for two different clauses. This definition doesn't really address "unauthorized use of property or services." A new definition should be created to match property and services.	Current code does not reflect this - was error on the website which has been remedied	2.16.17
32	24	C.3.a.iii.e	Staff	Allow hearing officers to hear a case in a student's absence without having to go to the ARC. Change language in SCOC to indicate that if students do not contest the outcome and or sanctions within 72 hours the decision is final.	Simplifies process for the student by not having them go to hearing if students do not respond to allegations.	If a student or student organization fails to attend a procedural review, SCCS may schedule an administrative review committee (ARC) hearing.	2.10.17

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
33	25	C.3.a.iv. d	Staff	Allow hearings that involve the same common nucleus of facts to be consolidated at the discretion of the Title IX Coordinator or SCCS	Prevents victims and complainants from having to participate in multiple hearings.	SCCS encourages students or student organizations charged in the same incident and who choose to have an ARC Hearing, to have their cases consolidated. SCCS reserves the right to request consolidation of hearings if students both agree to be heard together.	2.10.17
34	26	C.3.b	Staff	There is a groundswell of negative public opinion regarding the way that 'hearings' are held. According to local attorneys who have attempted to represent accused students, the students are assumed guilty until proven innocent. I think this process should be extensively reviewed and at the very least the public should be informed as to why the system works the way it does so both sides of the issue are addressed.	Not provided	Lengthy process - refer to code	2.10.17
35	26	C.3.b.i.a	Student	I believe that student representatives should have a say in Title IX cases again.	Students have a better understanding of current culture regarding Title IX topics and it is important that if students are being held accountable that they have their voice represented.	For cases of harassment and discrimination referred by Title IX, the ARC shall consist of the hearing chair and three faculty or staff selected from the ARC Pool	2.13.17

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
36	26	C.3.b.i.a	Staff	The currently policy on the ARC says that there will be a pool of 5 faculty or staff in consultation with the academic colleges. The cap on the number of faculty or staff on the ARC should be eliminated because it does us no harm to have more members available as long as they are trained. We should eliminate the requirement to consult with academic colleges, USG, and GSGA because there may be people that want to be on the ARC that are not plugged into their academic college, USG, or GSGA.	Allows the largest trained pool of ARC members as possible and allows anyone that has interest the opportunity to apply to be on the ARC.	A pool of members will be available to serve on the ARC. This pool will consist of five faculty and staff selected by the director of SCCS in consultation with academic colleges, no fewer than ten student representatives selected by SCCS in consultation with student government association, and no fewer than four graduate or professional students selected by SCCS in consultation with the graduate student governance association.	2.28.17
37	27	C.3.b.ii	Staff	On page 27 (ii)(a) clarify that "ARC hearings are closed to the public. Presence at hearings shall be restricted to the parties (complainant(s) and respondent(s)) and their advisers, members of the ARC, and SCCS staff to support with facilitation."	This clarifies who can be present allows SCCS staff to shadow hearings and/or help with logistics e.g. escort witnesses and parties in and out of the room, help with partitions, etc.	Presence at hearings shall be restricted to the complainant and accused involved except as otherwise noted. The ARC hearing shall be closed to the public.	2.28.17

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
38	27	C.3.b.ii. e	Staff	Remove timelines associated with scheduling hearings.	Will allow cases to be adjudicated more swiftly.	Both parties must disclose to the hearing officer the identity of the witnesses, a summary of what each witness will speak to, and submit any other evidence at least ten (10) days prior to the hearing. The hearing chair will provide a list of the witnesses and any other submitted evidence to the parties generally five (5) days prior to the hearing.	1.24.17
39	25	C.3.iv.c	Staff	On page 25 iv.(c), instead of sending the case to the ARC, let it mirror academic misconduct and the decision and sanctions stand.	Mirrors academic misconduct. More efficient.	If the accused student or student organization fails to notify the SCCS of the option selected within three days of the procedural review, an ARC hearing will be scheduled.	3.3.17
40	32	D	Staff	Create a post-appeal process that will allow students to submit an appeal to the Dean of Students if new information is discovered that could alter the decision at anytime.	Currently, students have short window of time to respond to appeals. If new information is discovered that can clearly impact the outcome of a case after that time lapses, in the interest of fairness, it should be considered.	An appeal must be submitted in writing to the director of the SCCS within five (5) days of receipt of the sanction decision letter.	2.10.17

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
41	32	D.1	Student	In order to maintain balance and fairness, there should be a change in policy so that the appeal process is handled by a minimum of three University Appeal Administrators and a maximum of five, rather than a minimum of one and a maximum of three. Even though we can altruistically believe that the UAA won't be biased, eliminating that possibility will maintain fairness.	Having just one UAA brings in the possibility of bias. Making a minimum of three and a maximum of five eliminates that chance, at least as much as it can ever be eliminated, without dragging the appeals process into a quagmire.	The vice president for student affairs or designee will appoint no less than one and no more than three university faculty or staff to serve as a University Appeal Administrator (UAA).	2.25.17
42	32	D.2.a	Staff	On page 32 under appeal, allow students additional time to submit an appeal if it is specified in writing.	If a student is shocked about an outcome or if the outcome occurs during a critical point in the semester (midterms, finals, etc.), they may need additional time to submit an appeal other than the five days.	An appeal must be submitted in writing to the director of the SCCS within five (5) days of receipt of the sanction decision letter	3.7.17

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
43	33	D.4	Faculty	The meaning of “no grounds for the appeal” is unclear. If the appellant argues only new evidence, procedural error, or both but the UAA disagrees, would that be no grounds for the appeal? So then, if the appellant argues only the sanction was not commensurate with the violation but the UAA disagrees, would that be no grounds for the appeal? So would the appeal normally be returned the appellant or would it be forwarded to the appropriate administrator as required by rules (g)-(h) below for a concurrence with the sanctions? The rules seem inconsistent.	Need to clarify for the sake of making sure our policies are consistent	The UAA reviews appeals for appropriate grounds. If the UAA determines that there are no grounds for a submitted appeal, it will reject and return the appeal to the student and include a brief written explanation of the reason the appeal was rejected. That decision is final.	2.13.17

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
44	34	D.4.g	Faculty	Saying that the UAA has a final decision when the student argues that their sanction is not commensurate with the violation is not accurate because the administrator (dean, VP, Provost, etc.) has a chance to concur or modify the sanctions.	Wording is misleading and incorrect	For appeals of a sanction(s) for academic or non-academic matters based on a claim that a sanction(s) is not commensurate with the offense, the UAA will review the file and issue a final decision to concur with or modify the sanction, then send the file to the dean of students, the home college dean, vice provost or designee.	2.13.17
45	N/A	N/A	Student	Actually enforce the code when violations occur. Many times in the residence halls people are documented breaking the code of conduct only to have no actual sanctions given to them once they go to the conduct office.	Not enforcing a code means that the code is pointless.	N/A - feedback on implementation of process not process itself	2.13.17
46	N/A	N/A	Staff	This is not my specialty, but I noticed this section does not include the ability of the University to notify law enforcement should the misconduct also be a crime. Should that be noted?	My rationale is twofold: students should know that their actions are not subject only to University sanctions, but also to the larger community; also and in particular with sexual violence, the University has a responsibility to involve law enforcement, and spelling that out clarifies our position (in light of the national conversation about whether or not colleges handle these cases solely internally).	No specific section	2.13.17

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
47	N/A	N/A	Faculty	All new students must review & sign the code as well as instructors including on their syllabi	No changes but more focus upon its purpose for students	No specific section - more about practice of the code as opposed to actually content of code	2.2.17
48	N/A	N/A	Staff	I feel like students don't take academic misconduct seriously. I feel like the students REALLY don't take non-academic misconduct seriously	I'm not sure if the Code needs to be changed, but more of an understanding or if and the definitions/results.	No relevant section of code provided to update.	2.13.17
49	N/A	N/A	Staff	I think that the slide show makes the process easier to understand and the forms are accessible. The slide show is more engaging than the flow chart PDF.	N/A	N/A	2.14.17
50	N/A	N/A	Student	I would suggest that incoming students be required to look over scoc and be clear on what is expected from them.	N/A	N/A	2.14.17
51	N/A	N/A	Faculty	Form A does not print properly. Selections in the forms disappear when it's printed.	Not provided	Feedback not about portion of code but about implementation - SCCS has fixed	2.14.17
52	N/A	N/A	Faculty	The ideal of due process and the right to confront witnesses must be preserved. Absent this it is merely mob justice.	The US Constitution	N/A	2.16.17

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
53	N/A	N/A	Staff	Please go through and fix all of the typos and strange wording in the code during this revision cycle.	Not provided	Throughout code	2.28.17
54	N/A	N/A	Student	I don't have a specific piece of feedback, just that the code is really challenging to read. If it were more inviting more students might "buy into" it. I don't consider myself to be unintelligent but I have a hard time understanding and following many of the sections. It is very cumbersome and makes me feel like I should have a legal degree to understand my rights and responsibilities.	Not provided	Throughout code	2.28.17
55	N/A	N/A	Faculty	Students seem unaware that this code exists	Not provided	N/A	3.9.17
56	N/A	N/A	Faculty	overall looks good to me. We really need to address academic dishonesty in our classes better. are we prepared to deal with the many smoking policy violations that are likely to occur starting this summer and escalating this fall?	Not provided	N/A	3.9.17

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
57	N/A	N/A	Staff	The fact that COB has a "2 strikes" policy that conflicts with the University Code of Conduct is disturbing.	Not provided	N/A - no such policy exists that conflicts with this.	2.1.17