



Cornell University
University Assembly

The Codes and Judicial Committee
of the University Assembly

Minutes of the March 27th, 2020 Meeting

9:00 AM – 10:30 AM

Held via Zoom

I. Call to Order

- a. J. Anderson called the meeting to order at 9:05am.
- b. Voting Members Present: *R. Lieberwitz, L. Taylor, C. Huang, B. Corrigan, U. Chukwukere, J. Hong, A. Llinas Vabos, J. Michael, G. Martin.*
- c. Voting Members Absent: *M. Adegbe.*
- d. Also present: *G. Kanter, B. Krause, C. Liang, B. Howarth, J. Pea.*

II. Schedule

- a. J. Anderson explained his email to the Committee, and requested a formalized vote on which version (OJA's or Counsel's) to work off of.
- b. R. Lieberwitz: it would be good to agree on a good goal as a group. Everything is different now. We're not saying we want an extension, we are saying under the present circumstances, we believe this is a reasonable timeline.
- c. B. Howarth: he understands the extreme difficulty of working remotely. We need to get community engagement. But he would ask that the CJC get it to the UA as soon as possible. In terms of asking for an extension, keep in mind it is not the President but the Trustees the Committee needs to ask. He wouldn't count on them giving an extension. Keep in mind there will be a brand new CJC next fall. If the Committee can get the UA a draft by the end of April that would be best.
- d. R. Lieberwitz doesn't think the CJC is in a conflict with what B. Howarth is saying. The Committee has the ability to put together a draft. But what about the public comment?
- e. G. Giambattista: in the past, all public comments were incorporated by the CJC and then sent to the UA.
- f. J. Anderson introduced B. Krause, who will be serving as interim JA.
- g. G. Kanter: believes there is a way we can get it to the UA by April, but not sure the UA should vote on it until public comment is done.



Cornell University University Assembly

- h. G. Kanter: the first 2-15 pages of Counsel's draft are completely contrary to OJA's version. We can copy and paste parts that are applicable. Thinks it would be a mistake to work off Counsel's draft because they are inconsistent.
- i. G. Giambattista: keep in mind all the processes can be changed, amended, especially in light of the present situation.
- j. R. Lieberwitz stressed how wrong it would be to adopt these changes without a robust public comment.
- k. J Anderson: it seems like we want to finish a draft and figure out public comment later in conjunction with the UA.
- l. B. Howarth was not convinced that they have to wait until the Fall for public comment, can do an online public comment. There will be a lot of turnover on the CJC and the UA. Not convinced the Board of Trustees will give an extension.
- m. R: Lieberwitz: we should pick a date to send a draft to the UA.
- n. B. Corrigan: can the UA commit to having a robust public comment?
- o. J. Anderson: from his conversations, it seems like the leadership of the UA has the time and will to do this.
- p. J. Pea: very much agree with that sentiment.
- q. R. Lieberwitz: asked when the next board meeting would be.
- r. J. Anderson: May, but not sure of the dates in May. Mid-to-late. Then October.
- s. R. Lieberwitz: so if public comment is feasible in Fall, the deadline would be October.
- t. B. Howarth: the Board would like it in May.
- u. B. Howarth: if it is not delivered in May, they will have Counsel write it and rewrite the UA's charter to take that power away.
- v. J. Michael: it feels like we owe it to ourselves to do the work we were asked to do. She doesn't want to be on a committee that doesn't fulfill what it was asked to do. Sometimes it feels like we are talking ourselves in circles.
- w. G. Kanter: fearful of the overhanging suggestions that Counsels draft will replace this. We should have a complete draft by April 17th, with public comment April 20-24. She is happy to reach out to organizations to talk about revisions.
- x. J. Anderson endorsed that timeline. We have the substantive violations section done. There can be online comments on that.
- y. J. Anderson **motioned** to accept the April 17th deadline, and to put Violations up for public comment now. The motion **passed** 9-0-0.

III. Procedures

- a. C. Liang put together a document of what the OJA currently does in Educational Conferences.



Cornell University
University Assembly

- b. G. Kanter put together revisions of the Administrative panel.
- c. G. Kanter explained the document “Advisors and Support People JCC Draft for OJA Version”.
- d. G. Kanter noted a couple of important pieces that need to be completed: question about complainant, appeals process, standard of proof.
- e. J. Anderson wanted to assign that work out. He asked C. Liang, G. Kanter, and B. Krause to tackle the administrative panel formal hearing and educational conference aspects. Asked R. Lieberwitz to work on complainants. J. Anderson can take the lead on standard of proof. G. Kanter can do appeals. C. Liang can help with appeals. J. Michael, C. Liang and R. Lieberwitz will work on the investigative process.
- f. The meeting was adjourned at 10:30am.

Respectfully Submitted,
Matthew Ferraro
Clerk of the Committee