I. SUMMARY OF ADDITIONS AND CHANGES
As a result of the feedback we have received regarding previous draft versions (special thanks to Bryce Farrington from the A.S. Office of Student Advocacy), discussions within the SCWG, feedback from the University of California Office of the President, and benchmarking with peer institutions, we have developed “Version 3.0 PLUS” of the Draft Revised Code. Some of the changes and additions to this draft include:

- **Administrative Resolution** – We made an adjustment to the resolution process by changing the “Administrative Review” to an “Administrative Resolution”, which would be an opportunity for the respondent to take responsibility for the charges without going to a “formal” review. Without this change, all meetings under the Code would be “formal” in nature (per UCOP 103.11) which drastically changes the nature and tenor of resolving cases, especially lower level cases originating in the residential areas.

- **Advisors** – We clarified the definition of the term advisor to alleviate confusion. Under this definition, a student may have an A.S. Student Advocate, a member of the University community (faculty, students, staff), or an attorney serves as an advisor. However, only A.S. Student Advocates may speak on behalf of the student in an Administrative Resolution meeting or Conduct Board Review.

- **Authority, Jurisdiction, and Interpretation of Regulations & Applicability** – These sections were reworked to provide greater clarity of the Code’s application. Specifically, the group agreed to add a statement noting that the University does not routinely invoke the disciplinary process over off-campus behavior while also providing specific examples of the types of incidents where off-campus jurisdiction may be exercised. We added language which provides students, faculty, and staff with resources concerning the administration, application, and/or interpretation of the Code. Also, per UCOP suggestion, we added direction as to how incidents that occur prior to the implementation of this Code are processed.

- **Consolidation of Review Procedures** – To provide greater clarity, we consolidated “General Provisions for All Reviews” into the “Conduct Board Review Procedures” and “Administrative Resolution sections (when applicable).

- **Conduct In Violation of Community Standards** – In order to more effectively mirror the UCOP Standards of Conduct, we revised and/or added standards of conduct relating to misrepresentation of information, housing policies, harassment, hazing, disorderly or lewd conduct, failure to comply, unwanted personal contact, and violations of other University policies.

- **Definitions** - We added the following definitions to help enhance understanding of the Code: multi-area incident, reckless disregard, Student Conduct Regulations, and Student Conduct Standards Group.

- **Disciplinary Records** – Based on Clery Act record keeping requirements, the workgroup voted to change the time period for maintaining student disciplinary records from three years from the student’s last quarter of enrollment to seven years from the incident.

- **Interim Actions** – We received feedback about the need to provide a clear process for Interim Suspensions. Version 3.0 PLUS provides such a process based off benchmarking of other institutions with well developed processes, including UCLA, UC Irvine, and Loyola Marymount. Without such a process, students would not have a clear understanding of what happens when they are placed on Interim Suspension and the University could be vulnerable to a lawsuit for not clearly establishing its policies in this area.

- **Notice of Inappropriate Conduct (NIC)** – This “informal” warning, widely used under the current Code, was reinserted to provide notice to students that even though disciplinary proceedings may not be commenced, any further incidents will allow for the NIC to be introduced in subsequent proceedings.
• **Student Organization Reviews** – Due to changes described above, student organizations will begin with an Administrative Resolution meeting with the Assistant Vice Chancellor-Student Life. If they do not accept responsibility, they will have a Conduct Board Review with the Community Standards Board. All student organization appeals will be reviewed by the Vice Chancellor – Student Affairs. We also ensured that due process provisions set forth for individual students were mirrored for student organizations.

• **Witness Statements** – An issue under the current Code is the use of witness statements at formal reviews. Per UCOP 103.11, because respondents have the right to question witnesses, use of witnesses statements when the witness does not appear at the review will not be allowed.

II. NEXT STEPS

• The accompanying Version 3.0 PLUS draft has been distributed to all SCWG members and greater campus community for their review and feedback.

• Once feedback has been collected and reviewed, the final version of the revised Student Conduct Code will be developed and forwarded to the Vice Chancellor – Student Affairs (VCSA) for approval. If the VCSA approves the document, it will be forwarded to the Chancellor for final approval and implementation.

• An “Implementation Team”, consisting of SCWG members, has been formed to guide the Code through the process of implementation for Fall 2012. Once the final version has been forwarded to the VCSA, the team will begin working on the overall implementation plan.