1. Call to Order
2. Questions for Committee Vote:
   a. Section 2.5.1: Should it be as written to up to VP SCL?
   b. Section 2.5.3: Should it be up to an appeal panel of VP SCL?
   c. Section 3: Should mental health be presented earlier in the process or later?
   d. Section 4.2: Should prior conduct be any prior conduct from any other prior institution or just limited to previous conduct at Cornell?
      i. Also noted in Section 5.6
   e. Section 4.2: Should suspension be up to 3 years, up to 5 years, or limitless?
   f. Section 4.2: For individuals, should we add restitution in full/part?
   g. Section 4.2 For organizations, should we add
      i. Restitution in full/part?
      ii. Oral warnings?
      iii. Probation
      iv. Suspension
   h. Section 4.3: Should a transcript notation be added while the conduct process (any part) is in progress?
   i. Section 5: Quick description of Administrative Panel
      i. Need to define logistics chair, will be done later.
   j. Section 5.2: Consistent time frames
   k. Section 5.3: Should a proposed administrative resolution be presented, or should it be up to the panel?
      i. Related in Section 5.6: Should OSCCS be allowed an opportunity to propose appropriation sanctions after the finding of the panel?
   l. Section 5.4: Should the hearing proceeds if the respondent doesn’t show up?
   m. Section 5.4 (and in further relevant sections): Should formal rules of evidence apply?
   n. Section 5.4 (and in further relevant sections): Should there be public hearings?
   o. Section 5.4: Should all questions go through the Chair?
   p. Section 6.3: Should it be 3 or 5 days to exchange exhibits to be used?
   q. Section 6.6:
      i. Should the complaint be required to testify?
      ii. Should the hearing panel have the ability to order a witness to testify?
      iii. Should the investigative report be admissible evidence, and should the investigator be able to testify as a witness? (Might split this question in two)
      iv. Is audio recording a substitute for verbatim recording?
r. Section 6.7: Should there be written closing statements?
s. Section 6.9 (and in further relevant sections): Should there still formalized dissenting opinions?
t. Section 7.3: Should there be more stringent standards for appeals?
   i. See relevant comment.
u. Section 7.3: Should complainant, respondent, and OSCCS have the same right to appeal?
v. Section 7.4: Should grounds for appeal be the same for Administrative Panel and Hearing Panel?
w. Section 7.4: Should complainant and respondent have the same right to appeal?
x. Section 7.5: Should there be a shorter timeline for appeal?
y. Section 7.5: Should there be a hearing associated with an appeal?
z. Section 8.3: What circumstances would prior findings of responsibility not be admissible?
   aa. Section 8.5: Is it necessary to include the VP SCL or let the body decide?
   bb. Section 8.5: Should conflict of interest decisions be up to the individual or up the body (in this case the appeal panel)?