



# University Assembly

---

## 1           **Resolution 2: Campus Codes Committee’s** 2           **Involvement in the Student Code of Conduct** 3           **Review and Revision Process**

4    **Abstract:** This resolution addresses the administration’s failure to recognize the Campus Codes  
5    Committee’s oversight role in the process of reviewing and revising the Student Code of  
6    Conduct.

7    **Sponsored by:** Paul Nadasdy

8    **Reviewed by:** Campus Codes Committee, 12/10/2025

---

9    **Whereas,** in 1970, the Board of Trustees acted with strong community support to delegate to the  
10    University Senate (and later the UA, one of its successors) jurisdiction over a Campus Code of  
11    Conduct and the campus judicial system.

12   **Whereas,** the UA Bylaws formerly established a Codes and Judicial Committee to consider  
13   changes to the Code and the process for selection of the University Hearing Board and  
14   University Review Board. The UA formerly participated in the selection of the Judicial  
15   Administrator to assure that office’s independence from the central administration.

16   **Whereas,** this shared governance strategy operated successfully for nearly 50 years, during a  
17   period of significant growth and shared prosperity of the Cornell community.

18   **Whereas,** a prolonged effort was made to revise the Code beginning with the Presidency of  
19   Martha Pollack in 2017, which progressed into 2020 with significant disagreement between  
20   constituent parties and the administration. UA Resolution 8 from 2020 established two versions  
21   of the Revised Code were submitted to the University Council for combination: one from the  
22   CJC and one from the Student Advocate Office. The resolution called for the University Council  
23   office to “to review the two versions and find a fair and equitable approach to use the most  
24   appropriate elements from the two drafts in producing the new Code of Conduct.”

25   **Whereas,** UA Resolution 8 from 2020 further resolved that “the final version of the Code of  
26   Conduct from the University Counsel return to the University Assembly for review and response  
27   during the Fall 2020 semester prior to the Board of Trustees Meeting in October 2020.”

28   **Whereas,** President Pollack accepted this resolution and further affirmed “I will look forward to  
29   reviewing the feedback from the robust Cornell community comment period established by the

---



# University Assembly

---

30 resolution before returning the final version to the UA for review and response in the Fall and  
31 ultimately to the Board of Trustees in October.”

32 **Whereas**, the returned Revised version of the Campus Code eliminated oversight roles of the  
33 University Assembly, including 1) editing of the Code, 2) participation in approval of the  
34 administrator in charge of implementing the Code, and 3) ability to appoint members of the  
35 conduct Hearing Panels. This version was subject to limited public comment and not approved  
36 by the UA. It was then approved by the Board of Trustees in December 2020.

37 **Whereas**, in 2023 a protracted negotiation between Central Administration and the University  
38 Assembly resulted in the approval of UA Resolution 6 rewriting UA bylaws to formally remove  
39 jurisdiction of the UA over revisions to the Student Code of Conduct, Appointment of Hearing  
40 Board members, and consent over the office responsible for implementing the Code  
41 ([https://assembly.cornell.edu/sites/default/files/ua\\_minutes\\_02.07.23.pdf](https://assembly.cornell.edu/sites/default/files/ua_minutes_02.07.23.pdf)).

42 **Whereas**, the intervening period since the adoption of the Revised Code has resulted in delays in  
43 Hearings, potential conflict of interests in the complainant procedures, and concerns of undue  
44 pretrial burdens on defendants, all of which are beneficial for community stability to receive  
45 independent review by broad stakeholders.

46 **Whereas**, Student and Campus Life’s [student code of conduct review and revision process](#),  
47 presented in August 2025 does not recognize a governance role for the University Assembly or  
48 the Campus Codes Committee.

49 **Whereas**, the University Assembly retains the responsibility to receive regular reports and data  
50 from the OSCSC regarding the implementation of the Code, and OSCSC is required to deliver  
51 such reports.

52 **Whereas**, the Campus Codes Committee is charged with the following responsibilities:

53 By delegation from the University Assembly, the Campus Codes Committee will review any  
54 proposed motion related to:

- 55 • The Student Code of Conduct; and
- 56 • Solicitation of applications from interested faculty, students and staff for service on the  
57 University Hearing and Review Boards as specified in section “II C” of the Cornell  
58 Student Code of Conduct Procedures; and
- 59 • Issues involving academic freedom and freedom of speech for all members of the Cornell  
60 University community, including faculty, students, and staff on the Ithaca campus and  
61 those located outside the United States.



# University Assembly

---

62 The Committee may propose, review, and amend resolutions as it deems appropriate. The  
63 Committee must approve resolutions referred for its consideration before they can be  
64 advanced to the Assembly for a vote and for debate;

65 **Whereas**, the Campus Codes Committee's mandate includes reviewing proposed motions  
66 related to the Student Code of Conduct.

67 **Be it further resolved**, that the Code and Procedures Review Committee (CPRC) shall give full  
68 consideration to proposed revisions from the Campus Codes Committee.

69 **Be it finally resolved**, that the UA and the Campus Codes Committee shall have a formal role in  
70 appointing the chair of the Office of Student Code of Conduct and Community Standards or  
71 whatever office succeeds it.

72 Respectfully Submitted,

73 Paul Nadasdy

74 Campus Codes Committee