

Cornell University University Assembly

109 Day Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853
p. 607.255.3175
f. 607.255.2182
e. assembly@cornell.edu
w. <http://assembly.cornell.edu>

Minutes

Codes and Judicial Committee
University Assembly
February 20th, 2019
4:45pm – 6:00pm
Day Hall Room 163

I. Call to Order

- a. Call to Order
 - i. D. Barbaria called the meeting to order at 4:51pm.
- b. Roll Call
 - i. *Present:* K. Ashford, D. Barbaria, R. Bensel, A. Brooks, K. Kebbeh, L. Kenney, R. Lieberwitz, S. Vura
 - ii. *Absent:* D. Geisler, A. Viswanathan, K. Zoner
 - iii. *Others Present:* J. Anderson, M. Battaglia, J. Dominguez, M. Horvath, M. Lee

II. Approval of Minutes

- a. November 7, 2018
 - i. Minutes **approved** by unanimous consent.
- b. November 28, 2018
 - ii. Minutes **approved** by unanimous consent.
- c. February 5, 2019
 - i. Minutes **tabled** by unanimous consent.

III. Business of the Day

- a. Approval of UHRB Applicant Questions
 - i. D. Barbaria revised question 4 of the UHRB application questions to include tentative training session dates.
 - ii. M. Horvath said that question 9 could discourage potential applicants because it asks them to list whether they were subject to discipline even if they are currently in good standing, while question 10's reference to the Office of the Judicial Administrator is unwarranted. She said that she has voiced these concerns in previous meetings. She also objected to the use of the word "accuse" in the applicant questions because Cornell's disciplinary system is not a criminal judicial system.

1. M. Battaglia dissented to changing the word “accused” because he believes “accused” allows the applicant to best understand the question.
- iii. M. Horvath proposed to amend the language of question 12 to “As a board member are you able to find somebody not responsible all the way to dismissal”. She also proposed to strike “transcript annotation” from the question as the University Hearing and Review Boards (UHRB) have no right to transcript annotation.
- iv. M. Battaglia proposed to amend the language to “The Hearing Boards are called upon to adjudicate [...] As a member of a Board, are you comfortable finding someone not responsible? Alternatively, are you comfortable finding someone responsible, potentially imposing a sanction up to expulsion? Please explain.”
- v. R. Benseal asked what the purpose of the question is.
 1. D. Barbaria said that it is to ask individuals if they are comfortable in reaching the conclusion of expulsion if necessary.
 2. R. Benseal said that the question could simply ask that.
 3. D. Barbaria said that they hope to clearly ask whether the applicant is comfortable either finding an individual responsible or not responsible.
 4. R. Benseal said that the question may not be easily interpreted. He said that it should ask whether the applicant is comfortable reaching a conclusion of expulsion.
- vi. J. Dominguez said that the question is becoming unnecessarily complex. He proposed to ask if the applicant would be comfortable with finding somebody responsible if the facts suggest appropriate.
- vii. R. Lieberwitz said that “comfortable” and “able” retain different meanings. She suggested to make the language simple and ask whether the applicant is “able” rather than “comfortable”.
 1. D. Barbaria amended M. Battaglia’s proposed language from “comfortable” to “able”.
 2. S. Vura agreed with R. Lieberwitz.
 3. M. Horvath agreed and said that Board members need to be able to do the job. She said that the Committee should ensure they have knowledge that they can find somebody responsible or not responsible.
- viii. S. Vura said that question 13, which asks how the applicant would apply the Campus Code of Conduct when an ambiguity arises, is too obscure and open-ended.
- ix. M. Battaglia said that considering that the Code is not a perfect document, question 13 is asking how comfortable the applicant would be in operating

- in an area with uncertainties.
- x. L. Kenney said she believes that question 12 is important, but suggested adding “considering ambiguous evidence or circumstances” to the end of the question.
 - xi. K. Ashford said that she does not think that the question is too open-ended. She said that part of the reason is because there are several ways to approach the question.
 - xii. S. Vura said that he believes the question does not belong on the application unless it is absolutely necessary.
 - xiii. M. Horvath said that she would prefer to have a question that asks the candidate’s ability to deal with confidential matters. She said that she believes question 11 already deals with the issue of ambiguity.
 - xiv. R. Bensel proposed to replace “responsible” with “violate” in question 11.
 - xv. R. Bensel asked what “ambiguous evidence” refers to in question 13.
 - 1. D. Barbaria said that it refers to understanding that there is no right answer.
 - 2. R. Bensel said that he is unsure if applicants will understand the purpose of question 13.
 - xvi. M. Battaglia said that there is no right answer to question 13, and that he expects a wide range of responses. He said that assuming there is unclear or ambiguous language, the question is aiming to form a holistic picture and ask how the applicant would go about the situation.
 - xvii. D. Barbaria said that the question may not be clear to the regular applicant.
 - xviii. J. Anderson said that the question is an important one. He also said, however, that it is important that an applicant who has no experience with the Code may be wondering why it is there. He said that the question is important in terms of assessing how the applicant thinks more so than how they answer.
 - xix. K. Ashford said that she respectfully disagrees about asking to give a specific example.
 - xx. S. Vura said that he thinks the Committee would be able to evaluate the applicant’s thought process through other questions.
 - xxi. R. Lieberwitz suggested keeping the question as is, and then returning to the question next year after seeing the type of responses received.
 - xxii. J. Dominguez suggested amending the language to “How would you think about or manage ambiguity,” considering that the Committee aims to see how the candidate thinks about ambiguity.
 - xxiii. M. Battaglia said that he is concerned about the question being too broad and suggested amending the language to “How would you view and potentially resolve ambiguity”. He suggested asking how the applicant would think and react in the case of an ambiguous situation.

- xxiv. R. Bensel said that the question itself is subject to radically different interpretations.
- xxv. K. Ashford said that she thinks that M. Battaglia’s rephrased language resolves those issues.
- xxvi. M. Battaglia proposed to amend question 12 to “If in a case there is a question as to the meaning of a specific provision of the Code, how would you review and potentially resolve this ambiguity?”
- xxvii. R. Lieberwitz said that question 11 seems to educate the candidate about the concept of recusal, which does not seem appropriate for this application.
- xxviii. M. Battaglia proposed striking “recuse yourself from the hearing panel” from question 11.
- xxix. K. Ashford said that M. Horvath’s point about the lack of a question on the issue of confidentiality is important. She said that adding a question about the candidate’s ability to handle confidential matters would be appropriate towards the end of the application.
 - 1. M. Battaglia suggested adding a question about confidentiality towards the front since it would match with the “yes or no questions” in the front of the application.
 - 2. K. Ashford agreed and suggested adding a question about confidentiality after question 7.
 - 3. R. Bensel suggested the following language for question 8: “Would you be able to respect the confidentiality of all Hearing and Review Board proceedings?”
- xxx. R. Bensel proposed to strike the sentences following “How would you respond” in question 11.
- xxxi. R. Lieberwitz suggested replacing “were” with “have been” in question 9, as it is written in the subjunctive.
- xxxii. M. Battaglia said that question 9 has historically provided some of the best responses from applicants and that it gives an insight to how applicants see the process. He said that the question could be changed to a hypothetical to address some of M. Horvath’s concerns.
- xxxiii. M. Horvath said that there is nothing that requires an individual to have good standing to be a member of the UHRB. She said that it is important to understand that the Committee may be asking a question that has no criteria through this question.
- xxxiv. M. Battaglia said that he respectfully disagrees. He said that he has personally seen phenomenal responses to this question in terms of how their experience informed their perspective. He said that he believes it is of value to ask such a question.
- xxxv. R. Bensel suggested amending the third sentence of the question to “Any disclosures will be treated confidentially.”

- xxxvi. R. Lieberwitz said that she agrees with M. Horvath and that the entire question should be removed. She said that she believes disclosing a confidential matter is an invasion of privacy.
- xxxvii. M. Horvath said that there is no point in asking the question if the applicant is in good standing.
- xxxviii. S. Vura said that he believes the question has the potential to receive meaningful responses, but he is also concerned about violating privacy. He said that if he were a candidate, he would probably perceive this question as disqualifying. He also said that the Committee could strike the question to ensure that someone who is in good standing is not held against by their previous penalties.
- xxxix. R. Bensel said that he believes the question is a little odd, as it does not apply to everyone. He suggested amending the question to “If someone had been subject to discipline, please explain how this experience might make them a more conscientious member” to address this issue.
 - xl. K. Ashford said that the question could help draw in members with a wide range of experiences.
 - xli. S. Vura suggested including a phrase such as “the experience will not be held against you” so that it is clear that no candidates are excluded.
 - xlii. M. Horvath said that if a student is in good standing, there are no provisions in the Code that disallow them from serving on the UHRB. She urged the Committee not to include a question that defers candidates from the opportunity to serve on the Board.
 - xliii. S. Vura said that there should be a disclaimer in the question that having a previous penalty would not lower their chances of becoming a member of the Boards.
 - xliv. R. Bensel asked how many students were involved in cases last year.
 - 1. M. Horvath said that there were 625 cases last year, a figure that is not inclusive of Title IX cases.
 - 2. R. Bensel said that is a significant pool that cannot be ignored.
 - xlv. M. Horvath motioned to strike question 9.
 - 1. Motion **approved** by a vote of 4-2-2.
 - xlvi. M. Horvath suggested amending question 10 to an open-ended version such as the following: “The code has prescribed timelines for hearings. If either of the parties did not adhere to that, what would you do as a Board member?”
 - xlvii. M. Battaglia suggested amending the question so that it asks how the candidate would view a procedural defect.
 - xlviii. R. Lieberwitz said that the direction of the question is fitting, but it does not make sense.
 - xlix. R. Bensel said that the question is biased as M. Horvath indicates.

1. K. Ashford suggested amending the question to “If you notice a procedural irregularity, what do you do?”
- li. M. Battaglia said that the question is meant to help the Committee understand the candidate’s thoughts about how procedures or rules affect this case.
- lii. R. Bensel said that there are important and unimportant procedural irregularities. He said that it is irrelevant unless referring to a specific irregularity. He said that it would be beneficial to ask for an example of a serious procedural irregularity.
- liii. K. Ashford said that leaving the question as a more open-ended one would be useful.
- liv. R. Bensel proposed to strike the question as painting a specific scenario would make the question biased.
- lv. R. Lieberwitz suggested making the language of the question more concrete if the question were to be kept. She proposed the following: “For example, the accused did not receive a witness list one day before the hearing rather than the three days required.”
- lvi. M. Horvath said that she thinks the intention question may not be entirely necessary.
- lvii. M. Battaglia moved to extend the meeting by 15 mins.
 1. Motion **approved** by unanimous consent.
- lviii. D. Barbaria said that he hopes to finalize these questions and bring draft amendments to the next meeting.
- lix. M. Battaglia said that there are currently seven “yes or no” type of questions, one full response question, six or seven situational questions, and six or seven non-substantive questions.
- lx. M. Battaglia asked how often respondents submit materials late.
 1. M. Horvath said that respondents usually either submit their materials on time or refuse to make an appearance.
- lxi. R. Lieberwitz said that question 10 is asking what the candidate would do and how active they should be as a Hearing Board member, which are two different questions. She said that asking how active they would be as a Hearing Board member would be more relevant, since the question intends to ask what their role is and how much they should intervene.
- lxii. K. Ashford suggested to remove the question from the application, as it would be more suitable for the training.
- lxiii. R. Bensel said that he would like for Board members to have an incentive to follow procedures. He said that the question may be contradictory as it asks for the candidate’s judgment while also asking them to police the procedures.
- lxiv. M. Battaglia said that this question may be relevant to the revised question


12 that deals with ambiguities. He said that it may be more sensible to group this question with the one that involves ambiguity.

- lxv. M. Battaglia suggested amending question 12 to include three parts as follows: “Assume you are on a hearing board. How would you react if one of the following were to occur? A. A provision of the Code is ambiguous. B. There is a failure by one of the parties to follow hearing procedures as they are prescribed in the Code. C. An advisor to an individual charged with a violation of the Code does not raise an objection to a procedural error.”
- lxvi. K. Ashford said that this question would seem intimidating to an undergraduate student.
- lxvii. R. Bensel agreed.

IV. Adjournment

- a. Adjournment
 - i. The meeting was adjourned at 6:18pm. Members continued to have a discussion on the UHRB applicant questions.
 - ii. K. Ashford suggested adding “about” after “a case” to part c of question 14.
 - iii. R. Bensel proposed to replace “an acquaintance of yours” with “someone you know personally” in question 14.
 - iv. R. Lieberwitz said that members seem to agree upon having a reflective aspect to the applicant questions.
 - v. M. Battaglia said that he hopes that the Committee can conduct interviews with finalists this year.
 - vi. D. Barbaria asked if members have any requests.
 - 1. M. Battaglia requested a version of the applicant questions that includes amendments from today.
 - 2. R. Lieberwitz requested a version of the Code that is more easily readable.

Respectfully submitted,
Dongyeon (Margaret) Lee
Codes and Judicial Committee Clerk



Cornell University University Assembly

109 Day Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853
p. 607.255.3175
f. 607.255.2182
e. assembly@cornell.edu
w. <http://assembly.cornell.edu>

Minutes

Codes and Judicial Committee
University Assembly
February 27th, 2019
4:45pm – 6:00pm
Day Hall Room 163

I. Call to Order

- a. Call to Order
 - i. D. Barbaria called the meeting to order at 4:51pm.
- b. Roll Call
 - i. *Present:* K. Ashford, D. Barbaria, R. Bensel, A. Brooks, K. Kebbeh, R. Lieberwitz, S. Vura
 - ii. *Absent:* D. Geisler, L. Kenney, A. Viswanathan, K. Zoner
 - iii. *Others Present:* J. Anderson, M. Battaglia, M. Horvath, M. Lee

II. Approval of Minutes

- a. February 5, 2019
 - i. Minutes **approved** by unanimous consent.
- b. February 20, 2019
 - i. M. Battaglia motioned to postpone approval of the minutes.
 1. Minutes **tabled** by unanimous consent.

III. Business of the Day

- a. Approval of UHRB Applicant Questions
 - i. D. Barbaria said that last meeting, the Committee decided to remove questions 9 and 10, and significantly alter questions 11 and 12 of the University Hearing and Review Boards (UHRB) applicant questions. He said the Committee is yet to decide whether to include question 11(c).
 - ii. M. Battaglia said that question 11(c) helps the Committee see applicants' thought processes.
 - iii. M. Horvath said that 11(a) and 11(b) are stronger questions that already address the issue of thought process.
 - iv. D. Barbaria said that question (c) has not officially been added to the list of UHRB applicant questions.

- v. J. Anderson said that question 11(c) informs applicants about the rights of respondents, but he hopes that it could be rephrased.
- vi. M. Battaglia said that he agrees with J. Anderson and that reference to an individual entity can be removed if there is concern about the current wording. He also said that question 9, which was stricken last meeting, has elicited thoughtful responses in the past in which applicants exhibited their understanding of discipline and its effect on people. He suggested having a similar question such as “How do you believe going through the discipline process of Cornell affects an individual’s perspective”. He said this informs the Committee of the applicant’s thought process while wording the question neutrally.
- vii. M. Horvath said that applicants should understand that they are expected to find individuals both responsible and not responsible in order to maintain a safe community. She said that the most important part of the applicant’s job is to adhere to the values of the community, which include maintaining a safe educational environment.
- viii. M. Battaglia said that the Committee should not lead applicants to respond in a certain manner by specifically mentioning complainants. He said that asking how a certain incident would affect the community addresses the issue of sanctions, which directly relates to the role of the Hearing Boards.
- ix. R. Bensel said that an open-ended question is important as there are broader issues that are not addressed in other questions.
- x. D. Barbaria asked the Committee how 11(c) addresses an issue that is different from question 8, which asks about the purpose of the Boards.
- xi. J. Anderson said that question 8 could encapsulate both M. Battaglia and M. Horvath’s points, as it addressed the role in the judicial system but also its effect to the campus as a whole.
- xii. K. Ashford said that the Committee decided to strike question 9 last meeting because of potentially deterring candidates from applying. K. Ashford proposed to add the following question to the applicant questions: “What, if any, life experiences would make you a more conscientious board member?”
 - 1. M. Battaglia seconded.
 - 2. M. Battaglia motioned to vote.
 - a. By a vote of 4-0-3 “What, if any, life experiences would make you a more conscientious board member?” was adopted as an additional UHRB applicant question.
- xiii. M. Battaglia proposed to add “and their effect on the campus as a whole” to the end of question 8.
 - 1. M. Horvath proposed a friendly amendment to change “judicial system” to “Code of Conduct”.

2. M. Battaglia said that he would not perceive that as a friendly amendment.
 3. M. Horvath yielded.
- xiv. R. Bensel proposed to add “If two or more of these considerations were in tension with one another, how would you reach a decision?” to M. Battaglia’s amendment to question 8.
1. R. lieberwitz said that while she understands R. Bensel’s intent, she doubts whether an applicant would be able to fully understand the question.
 2. R. Bensel yielded.
- xv. M. Battaglia said that the Committee should create a document that outlines which questions garner the best responses at the end of the year in order to better select UHRB members in the future.
- xvi. M. Battaglia **called the question** on the amendment to question 8.
1. The additional language was adopted by unanimous consent.
- xvii. J. Anderson said that he believes question 11(c) is important to add.
1. M. Horvath said that question 11(b) already calls for the applicant’s thought process, making 11(c) unnecessary to add in.
- xviii. M. Battaglia said that (c) helps the applicant outline their thought process in greater detail.
- xix. R. Bensel said that he cannot conceive of a situation in which a Board member recognizes a procedural error without the respondent recognizing it. He proposed to strike 11(c).
- xx. D. Barbaria asked if anyone would propose to include 11(c): “an advisor to an individual charged with a violation of the Code does not raise an objection to a procedural error.”
1. The question was **withdrawn** by unanimous consent.
- xxi. M. Battaglia asked what the timeline will be for the UHRB applications.
1. D. Barbaria said that Director of the Office of the Assemblies will proceed with preparing the application form sometime between next Monday and Wednesday. He said that the application can be sent out by the end of next week, and due during the beginning of spring break, with the Office of Assemblies preparing the forms while students are on break. He said that the Committee can decide on this timeline further.
 2. M. Battaglia asked that D. Barbaria clearly communicates with the Office to ensure there are no issues with anonymization.
 3. D. Barbaria said that the date is set for anonymization of the application.
 4. M. Battaglia said that the Committee reserves right to interview candidates.

5. D. Barbaria said that the Committee can discuss specifics of the timeline at the next meeting.
- xxii. R. Bensen motioned to approve UHRB applicant questions.
1. UHRB applicant questions were approved by a vote of 5-0-1.
 2. D. Barbaria said that he will send out the questions with amendments to Committee members today and send them to the Office tomorrow.
- b. For Discussion: Individual amendments contained in reorganized Campus Code of Conduct
- i. M. Battaglia provided an update of the process of the reorganization of the Campus Code of Conduct. He said that he had just sent out an email to the Committee outlining substantive change. He also said that in speaking with the administration about the Code revisions and processes, they were supportive of reorganizing and simplifying. He said that as long as the Committee does not make further substantive changes outside of what has been discussed so far, the reorganized version can be sent out for public comment by the end of the semester.
 - ii. M. Battaglia said that he has also spoken with the Office of University Counsel regarding the issue of regulation of maintenance of public order concerning Title IV. He said that he does not anticipate the need to devote a formal section on the issue of Title IV that would require approval from the Board of Trustees.
 - iii. M. Battaglia said that in addressing the issue of whether faculty and staff should be included under the Code, the Working Group on Hate Speech and Harassment recommended to change the name of the “Campus Code of Conduct” to the “Cornell Code of Conduct” to expand its reach. He said that the administration was on board with keeping everyone in the Code and making the procedures clear.
 - iv. D. Barbaria asked how the Committee anticipates receiving confirmation that the Board of Trustees is on board with making changes based on Title IV.
 - v. M. Battaglia said that the Office of the University Counsel would recommend a sign-off.
 - vi. D. Barbaria asked what would happen if the Board of Trustees rejects the Counsel’s recommendation.
 - vii. M. Battaglia said that he thinks such a case would be highly unlikely. He said that Title IV will continue to exist separately if that is the case.
 - viii. D. Barbaria said that receiving pre-approval from the Board would be desirable if the Committee is to make such a substantive change.
 - ix. M. Battaglia referred members to his email. He said that the definitions of

harassment, stalking and assault are similar to the recommendations made by the Working Group and in accordance with New York State law. He also said that the definition of harassment includes an expanded list.


- x. M. Horvath asked what “an individual or group of individuals” refers to.
 1. M. Battaglia said that his understanding of a group of individuals is a small group that is being targeted because of a shared characteristic.
 2. M. Horvath recommended keeping the original language of “an individual or organization”, since organizations retain rights that a group of people do not.
- xi. M. Horvath proposed to strike the descriptions in (i), which defines assault. She said that there is no general assault provision in the Code.
- xii. R. Bensel suggested adding political belief to the list of harassed groups.
- xiii. R. Lieberwitz said that she also believes that political belief should be added and that this is in line with the comments she added to the Box.
- xiv. R. Lieberwitz said that on M. Horvath’s question about individuals or group of individuals, the Working Group recommended this to include that harassment could take place against a group, not just individuals. She said that “organization” seems to exclude a smaller group that is physically together.
- xv. M. Horvath said that some of the complainant’s rights may be taken away if the definitions are to be so broad. She said that such language may leave room for confusion, when there are already different protections between individuals and organizations.
- xvi. R. Lieberwitz said that she does not see the language to be confusing as it refers to either individuals or a group of individuals.
- xvii. D. Barbaria asked what would happen if physical groups of individuals are harassed altogether.
- xviii. M. Horvath said that each individual has their own rights.
- xix. K. Ashford asked what the difference is between the definition of harassment in (c) and (d) from the language presented in the email. She said that (d) merely appears to be broader.
- xx. R. Lieberwitz said that (c) is actually broader than (d). She said, for example, bullying could be a violation of the code under (c) but not under (d) because it is not a protected status. She said that the specificity in (d) is important for readers of the Code to observe that the Code pays attention to specific protected groups but is also broad.
- xxi. K. Ashford asked whether a violation could be charged under each provision singularly.
- xxii. M. Horvath said that logistically they would be charged under both provisions.
- xxiii. J. Anderson said that besides naming the protected classes themselves in (d),

- there is little difference between (c) and (d). He suggested placing the protected classes in (d) into the values section and striking (d).
- xxiv. M. Battaglia said that (d) also serves as a signaling function. He said that adding a separate offense could be seen as an escalation.
 - xxv. J. Anderson said it would not make sense for a harassment violation to be examined under both provisions (c) and (d).
 - xxvi. R. Lieberwitz said that she understands the concerns raised, but (c) refers to harassment while (d) specifically refers to the discriminatory hostile environment. She said that the Working Group purposefully added (d) in response to the realities that people were facing as a result of recent events and the discriminatory hostile environment.
 - xxvii. R. Bensel said that protected statuses are assigned categories that do not rest on any ultimately fundamental distinction.
 - xxviii. R. Lieberwitz said that retaining both (c) and (d) would demonstrate that the university recognizes the historical discrimination that has taken place against certain groups.
 - xxix. M. Battaglia said that the Committee should strive to be economical with language without removing too much detail. He also said that the Committee should decide on whether to include political persuasion as one of the protected groups.
 - xxx. R. Lieberwitz motioned to add political beliefs to the categories of protected statuses in (d).
 - 1. Motion approved by unanimous consent.
 - xxxi. R. Bensel said that there is a distinction between freedom of speech and political belief.
 - xxxii. D. Barbaria said that the Committee will be sending these provisions to the University Assembly to have a wider discussion.
 - xxxiii. R. Bensel asked whether there was any discussion about holding fraternities and sororities accountable under the Code.
 - xxxiv. J. Anderson said that the committee examining the judicial process for Greek organizations seems hesitant to provide a recommendation on the Campus Code of Conduct until there is a finalized version.

IV. Adjournment

- a. Adjournment
 - i. The meeting was adjourned at 5:59pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dongyeon (Margaret) Lee
Codes and Judicial Committee Clerk



Cornell University
University Assembly

109 Day Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853
p. 607.255.3175
f. 607.255.2182
e. assembly@cornell.edu
w. <http://assembly.cornell.edu>

Minutes

Codes and Judicial Committee
University Assembly
March 6th, 2019
4:45pm – 6:00pm
Day Hall Room 163

I. Call to Order

- a. There were not enough members present for quorum. The Committee recommended minor fixes to the formatting of the UHRB applicant questions and moved into an informal discussion on the reorganized Code of Conduct regarding harassment provisions, definitions and footnotes, the educational aspect of the Code, and timeline for resolutions.


II. Approval of Minutes

- a. February 20th, 2019
 - i. Tabled to the next meeting.
- b. February 27th, 2019
 - i. Tabled to the next meeting.

III. Adjournment

- a. Adjournment
 - i. There was no adjournment of the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
Dongyeon (Margaret) Lee
Codes and Judicial Committee Clerk



Cornell University
University Assembly

109 Day Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853
p. 607.255.3175
f. 607.255.2182
e. assembly@cornell.edu
w. <http://assembly.cornell.edu>

Minutes

Codes and Judicial Committee
University Assembly
March 20th, 2019
4:45pm – 6:00pm
Day Hall Room 163

I. Call to Order

- a. The meeting was cancelled as there were not enough members present for quorum.


II. Approval of Minutes

- a. February 20th, 2019
 - i. Tabled to the next meeting.
- b. February 27th, 2019
 - i. Tabled to the next meeting.
- c. March 6th, 2019
 - i. Tabled to the next meeting.

III. Adjournment

- a. Adjournment
 - i. There was no adjournment of the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
Dongyeon (Margaret) Lee
Codes and Judicial Committee Clerk



Cornell University
University Assembly

109 Day Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853
p. 607.255.3175
f. 607.255.2182
e. assembly@cornell.edu
w. <http://assembly.cornell.edu>

Minutes

Codes and Judicial Committee
University Assembly
April 10th, 2019
4:45pm – 6:00pm
Day Hall Room 163

I. Call to Order

- a. Call to Order
 - i. There were not enough members present for quorum. The Committee moved into an informal discussion on the UHRB application review process and the reorganized campus Code of Conduct.
- b. Roll Call
 - i. *Present:* K. Ashford, D. Barbaria, R. Bensel, A. Brooks
 - ii. *Absent:* D. Geisler, K. Kebbeh, L. Kenney, R. Lieberwitz, A. Viswanathan, S. Vura
 - iii. *Others Present:* M. Battaglia, M. Lee


II. Approval of Minutes

- a. February 20th, 2019
 - i. **Tabled** to the next meeting.
- b. February 27th, 2019
 - i. **Tabled** to the next meeting.
- c. March 6th, 2019
 - i. **Tabled** to the next meeting.
- d. March 20th, 2019
 - i. **Tabled** to the next meeting.

III. Adjournment

- a. Adjournment
 - i. There was no adjournment of the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
Dongyeon (Margaret) Lee
Codes and Judicial Committee Clerk



Cornell University
University Assembly

109 Day Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853
p. 607.255.3175
f. 607.255.2182
e. assembly@cornell.edu
w. <http://assembly.cornell.edu>

Minutes

Codes and Judicial Committee
University Assembly
April 16th, 2019
4:45pm – 6:30pm
Day Hall Room 316

I. Call to Order

- a. Call to Order
 - i. There were not enough members present for quorum. The Committee moved into a closed session to review University Hearing and Review Board (UHRB) applications. All ex-officio members were allowed to stay for the closed session, but only University Assembly Chair M. Battaglia joined the session to review the applications.
- b. Roll Call
 - i. *Present:* D. Barbaria, R. Bensel, K. Kebbeh, R. Lieberwitz, S. Vura
 - ii. *Absent:* K. Ashford, A. Brooks, D. Geisler, L. Kenney, A. Viswanathan,
 - iii. *Others Present:* M. Battaglia, M. Horvath, M. Lee

II. Approval of Minutes

- a. February 20th, 2019
- b. February 27th, 2019
- c. March 6th, 2019
- d. March 20th, 2019
- e. April 10th, 2019
 - i. Approval of minutes **tabled** to the next meeting.

III. Adjournment

- a. Adjournment
 - i. There was no adjournment of the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
Dongyeon (Margaret) Lee
Codes and Judicial Committee Clerk