Student Conduct Procedures for Student Groups

2023 – 2024 Academic Year

Updated September 2023

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

These Student Conduct Procedures for Student Groups ("Student Group Procedures"), which are meant to be educational in nature, are designed to provide processes to investigate and resolve alleged violations of the Code of Student Conduct ("the Code") by student groups.

2. Complaints/Reports of Information

Filing a Complaint. Written complaints alleging violations of the Code may be submitted online at CICF.brown.edu. Individuals who are unable to access or use the online form should contact the Office of Student Conduct & Community Standards at student-conduct@brown.edu or 401-863-2653. Complaints must include the name(s) of all known witnesses or others who may have information concerning the allegation of prohibited conduct and all known facts about the incident. There is no time limit by which complaints must be submitted after an incident. However, the ability of the Office of Student Conduct & Community Standards to fully investigate an incident is impacted by how much time has elapsed since an incident occurred. In addition, a complaint alleging a Code violation by an individual who is no longer a student at the University will be reviewed but may not be investigated unless that individual re-enrolls at the University. Complaints that are submitted anonymously will be reviewed; however, anonymity may limit the ability of the Office of Student Conduct & Community standards to fully investigate an incident.

Reports of Information. The Office of Student Conduct & Community Standards receives reports containing allegations of prohibited conduct from several sources, including the Department of Public Safety, Providence Police, University offices/employees, students, and persons unaffiliated with the University. All reports are reviewed before a resolution method is determined.

Preliminary Review. Some complaints/reports do not contain sufficient information to determine a resolution method upon initial review. For such cases, a Preliminary Review may be conducted to gather more information. Representative(s) of the group will be notified of the allegations and asked to meet with the Office of Student Conduct & Community Standards. Representative(s) will gather information from the group and provide a written report of information within 5 business days. Representative(s) will meet with the Office of Student Conduct & Community Standards to review the information and discuss next steps, which may involve the filing of charges, an Investigative Review, or no action. Written notification of these next steps will be provided to the representative(s)

Investigative Review. An Investigative Review is utilized when the Office of Student Conduct & Community Standards receives allegations that, if substantiated, could warrant a student group's separation from the University. The review, which includes interviews with the parties and relevant witnesses and a collection of all relevant documents and other evidence, may culminate in a comprehensive report that will be reviewed by the Director of Student Conduct & Community Standards ("the Director")[1]. If the complaint is not complex in nature, it may be reviewed by collecting statements and documents from the parties and any relevant witnesses before a summary and packet of

[1] All references to the Director of Student Conduct & Community Standards ("the Director") throughout this document will be understood to include their designee.

information are provided to the Director for review. After review, the Director will determine whether there is a basis to file charges against a student group and at what level, if any, the matter should be resolved. The possible resolution recommendations from the Director are as follows:

1. **Disciplinary, Higher Level.** Matters that may result in a community status of suspension or higher will be resolved through a Student Conduct Board Hearing or a Higher-Level Restorative Conference.
2. **Disciplinary, Lower Level.** Matters that will not result in a community status of suspension or higher may be referred to a Letter Resolution, a Student Group Administrative Review Meeting, or a Restorative Conference.
3. **Non-disciplinary Actions.** If it is determined that a disciplinary proceeding is not warranted (due to a lack of information or a determination that the alleged behavior is not a violation of the Code), the matter may be handled with a Reminder Letter, a University Directive Letter, an Expectation Meeting, or may be referred to mediation, counseling, alcohol/drug education, restorative dialogue, or other referrals as appropriate.
4. **No Action.** If there is no basis to file charges and no follow up is warranted, the Director may recommend that the Office of Student Conduct & Community Standards close the case and take no action.
5. **Withdrawal of Charges.** The Director has the authority to withdraw charges once they have been made. Reasons for withdrawing charges include, but are not limited to, situations when the information that was provided was false or misleading and should not have resulted in charges being filed.

3. Administrative Response Options

The Director may refer allegations of violations of the Code to one of the following options for resolution. The Director may reassign a matter after referral if the information or circumstances change in such a way as to warrant a different response:

3.a Non-Disciplinary Response Options

Reminder Letter. Students will receive an official written notice that specifies that a particular behavior(s) may have violated the Code and, if repeated, such behavior may be subject to the disciplinary process.

University Directive Letter. Students alleged to have participated in prohibited behavior may be sent a University Directive Letter with assigned educational terms. Failure to complete these educational terms could result in disciplinary action.

Expectation Meeting. Students will meet with a University administrator to discuss the behavior that is of concern. During the meeting, students will be informed about particular provisions in the Code that may have been or may be violated should the behavior of concern continue. As a result of an Expectation Meeting, students may be assigned Educational Terms. The administrator may also suggest additional resources for the student. Failure to attend an

Expectation Meeting or to complete any Educational Terms could result in disciplinary action. An Expectation Meeting is not a prerequisite for referral to a Disciplinary Response Option.

Mediation. Mediation is a voluntary, private means of resolving conflict. It brings the parties together with a trained mediator in an informal, neutral setting to discuss their dispute and to find a lasting solution to it. If a matter is referred to mediation, the timing/deadline requirements outlined in these procedures are suspended. If any party to a conflict is unwilling to engage in mediation or if the parties are unable to resolve the conflict through mediation, the matter may be referred to a disciplinary proceeding for resolution if it involves allegations of prohibited conduct. When parties successfully resolve their dispute through mediation, the mediator will notify the Director that the matter has been resolved.

Restorative Dialogue. Students will meet with trained facilitators for a mediated dialogue aimed at resolving conflict and addressing behaviors that may not rise to the level of a Code violation but have caused individual or community harm. Participation in restorative dialogue is voluntary and may or may not result in a formal agreement between students or groups of students.

3.b Disciplinary Response Options, Lower Level

Letter Resolution. Groups charged with minor[2] prohibited conduct may, at the discretion of the Director, have the option of either accepting responsibility and a proposed outcome or going to a Student Group Administrative Review Meeting.

Restorative Conference. Student groups that take responsibility for engaging in prohibited conduct that has caused minor harm (e.g., minor theft, property damage, community disruptions) may be offered the opportunity to participate in a restorative conference. These proceedings bring representatives of student groups who have caused harm together with harmed parties, community members, and co-facilitators to explore ways that the harm can be redressed. This process is voluntary for all parties. If the harmed party decides not to participate, the case may be referred to a Student Group Administrative Review Meeting, depending on the particular circumstances. If the responsible party decides not to participate, the case will be referred to a Student Group Administrative Review Meeting.

Procedures. Co-facilitators will conduct pre-conference meetings with all parties to review the expectations of the conference and answer questions. Dialogue during the conference will be regulated by the co-facilitators. All parties will be asked to describe their experience of the incident and its impact before the group considers ways the student group that caused harm could repair that harm. Co-facilitators will guide the conversation toward agreements that are appropriate and manageable.

[2] A determination about what constitutes “minor” or “serious” prohibited conduct or harm will be made by the Director of Student Conduct & Community Standards or their designee.

Outcomes. If parties reach an agreement, it is considered binding and the student group that caused harm will be expected to fulfill the terms of the agreement. If the agreement is not upheld, negotiated community status outcomes will be implemented and the student group may face additional disciplinary action. If the agreement is fulfilled, no official community status outcomes or further disciplinary action will result. If no agreement is reached during the conference, the case will be referred to a Student Group Administrative Review Meeting for resolution.

Student Group Administrative Review Meeting. Allegations of prohibited conduct by student groups that do not involve possible separation from the University will be resolved through Student Group Administrative Review Meetings conducted by administrators of the University. These meetings will be between one University administrator and the representative(s) of the student group under review. In general, matters involving undergraduates will be handled by designated Administrative Reviewers within Campus Life; matters involving graduate students will be handled by Administrative Reviewers from the Graduate School; and matters involving medical students will be handled by Administrative Reviewers from the Medical School.

Procedure. The Case Administrator will notify, in writing, the representative(s) of the student group of the allegation(s). The student group has the opportunity to review all evidence upon request prior to the meeting, to prepare a response, and to be heard regarding the allegations. The Administrative Reviewer will decide if the student group is responsible for violation(s) of the Code of Student Conduct.

Outcomes. The most serious community status outcome of this proceeding is 3 semesters of probation assigned with university restrictions, but other restrictions on the student group may be imposed. When determining an appropriate outcome, Administrative Reviewers will consider the nature of the incident and its context as well as any prior disciplinary findings and outcomes. Accompanying terms may be assigned as appropriate. Within five (5) days of the conclusion of the review, the Case Administrator will notify the student group's leader(s) in writing of the decisions in the case.

3.c Disciplinary Response Options, Higher Level

Higher-level Restorative Conference. Student groups that take responsibility for engaging in prohibited conduct that has caused serious harm (e.g., physical assault, serious and/or bias-related harassment, major theft or property damage) may be offered the opportunity to participate in a Higher-.Level Restorative Conference if deemed appropriate by the Director. Such proceedings will focus on the harm that was caused and ways that the student group that caused it can address and repair that harm.

Procedures. Co-facilitators will conduct a minimum of two (2) pre-conference meetings with all participants to review the expectations of the conference and answer questions. During these pre-conference meetings the co-facilitators will discuss with all parties the range of outcomes in similar incidents at Brown. The conference will be regulated by the co-facilitators and informed by the pre-conference meetings with the participants. All

participants will be asked to describe their experience of the incident and its impact before the group considers ways the student group that caused harm could repair that harm. Co-facilitators will guide the conversation toward agreements that focus on active accountability, rebuilding trust, and repairing harm.

Outcomes. Agreed upon outcomes will be focused specifically on the particular harms associated with the incident. If the agreement is fulfilled, no official community status outcomes or further disciplinary action will result. If no agreement is reached during the conference, the case will be referred to an Administrative Hearing for resolution.

Student Conduct Board Hearing. The Student Conduct Board, composed of students, faculty, and administrators, will hear matters involving prohibited conduct that may result in separation from the University. Cases before the Student Conduct Board may involve serious prohibited conduct in a single incident or a persistent pattern of less severe prohibited conduct.

Procedures. The hearing procedures will be informal, but they will be consistent with the basic rights afforded to student groups (see "Student Rights and Responsibilities"). At least seven (7) days before the hearing, the Case Administrator will provide the parties with written notice of the charge(s), the time and location of the hearing, and a redacted copy of the case materials. The hearing will be chaired by the Case Administrator, who will decide upon matters related to witnesses, evidence, and procedures. The Case Administrator may exclude from a hearing any person in attendance who disrupts the hearing. The Case Administrator may consult with the hearing panel and other University officials as necessary. At the hearing, the parties have an opportunity to be heard, and the hearing panel decides if the respondent is responsible for violation(s) of the Code of Student Conduct. The Student Conduct Board recommends an appropriate outcome to the Director.

Outcomes. If the student group is found responsible, the hearing panel will recommend a range of community status outcomes up to expulsion from the University and any terms (see 7 Outcomes), to the Director for final determination. After a determination of responsibility and prior to the recommendation of an outcome, the Case Administrator will inform the panel of any prior disciplinary findings against the student group and present them with statements of impact and mitigation. This information will also be provided to the Director. Within five (5) days of the conclusion of the hearing, the Director will notify the representative(s) of the student group, and the complainant(s) as permitted by applicable law, of the decision of the case.

For more information about procedures governing Student Conduct Board Hearings, please see section 6. Student Conduct Board Hearing Procedures.

4. Student Rights and Responsibilities

The Principles of the Brown University Community expect community members to act with integrity in all facets of University life, including involvement with matters being addressed by the Student Conduct Procedures.

Respondent Rights. Student groups are afforded the following rights in Student Conduct proceedings:

A. To be informed in writing of the charge(s) and alleged prohibited behavior.
B. To not be presumed responsible of any alleged violations unless so found through the appropriate student conduct proceeding.
C. To have an advisor during a formal Investigative Review, a hearing before the Student Conduct Board, or a Higher-level Restorative Conference.
D. To request reasonable accommodations through Student Accessibility Services to participate in these proceedings.
E. To have a reasonable length of time to prepare a response to any charges.
F. To be informed of the evidence upon which a charge is based and afforded an opportunity to offer a relevant response.
G. To be given an opportunity to articulate relevant concerns and issues, express opinions, and offer evidence before the Administrative Reviewer or Hearing Officers. (Student groups have the right to prepare a written statement in matters that may result in separation from the University.)
H. To be afforded privacy, in accordance with University practices and legal requirements.
I. To request that an Administrative Reviewer, Restorative Conference Facilitator, or member of a Student Conduct Board be disqualified on the grounds of personal bias.
J. To appeal a decision based on certain grounds.
K. To refrain from providing information that is self-incriminating.

Complainant Rights. Students serving as complainants in University proceedings are afforded the following rights:

A. To be informed in writing of the charge(s) and alleged prohibited behavior for Student Conduct Board Hearings or Higher-level Restorative Conferences.
B. To have an advisor during a formal Investigative Review, a hearing before the Student Conduct Board, or a Higher-level Restorative Conference.
C. To request reasonable accommodations through Student Accessibility Services to participate in these proceedings.
D. To have a reasonable length of time to prepare for a proceeding.
E. To be given an opportunity to articulate relevant concerns and issues, express opinions, and offer evidence before the Administrative Reviewer or Hearing Officers.
F. To be afforded privacy, in accordance with University practices and legal requirements.
G. To request that an Administrative Reviewer, Hearing Officer, Restorative Conference Facilitator, or member of a Student Conduct Board be disqualified on the grounds of personal bias.
H. To appeal a decision in cases of *D.9 Harassment* or *D.10 Harm to Person(s).*

Witness Rights. Students serving as witnesses in University proceedings are afforded the following rights:

A. To request reasonable accommodations through Student Accessibility Services to participate in these proceedings.
B. To have a reasonable length of time to prepare for a meeting with an investigator or hearing body.
C. To be given an opportunity to articulate relevant concerns and issues, express opinions, and offer evidence to an investigator or hearing body.
D. To be afforded privacy, in accordance with University practices and legal requirements. Information you share with an investigator or hearing body may be shared with the respondent and complainant, if appropriate.
E. To refrain from providing information that is self-incriminating.

5. General Provisions for Disciplinary Procedures

All non-restorative disciplinary proceedings will be conducted in accordance with the following:

1. **Closed Proceedings.** All Student Conduct Board Hearings and Student Group Administrative Review Meetings will be closed to the public.
2. **Privacy.** Except as permitted or required by law (for example, in response to a lawfully issued subpoena or court order), information disclosed during these proceedings will remain private unless there is a need to disclose it to others within the University (e.g., Residential Life in the case of a housing relocation, Student Activities Office, Department of Athletics).
3. **Qualification and Responsibilities of Hearing Officers.** Student members of hearing bodies must be currently enrolled and in good standing, that is, not on academic warning or currently on any community status. All administrative and faculty members will be full-time employees of the University. All Hearing Officers will be required to maintain privacy related to all aspects of the proceedings. The Director is responsible for removing any Student Conduct Board member who violates privacy and may refer the matter for disciplinary action. If the specific member(s) of a Student Conduct Board panel cannot be identified, the Director may recommend to the Dean of Students[3] that the panel in question be disbanded.
4. **Qualification and Responsibilities of Administrative Reviewers.** All Administrative Reviewers will be full-time employees of the University and will be required to maintain privacy related to all aspects of their proceedings. The Director is responsible for handling any violations of privacy by Administrative Reviewers.
5. **Disqualification and Exclusion.** Any member of a hearing body who believes that they are prejudiced by association with the case, the participants, or by information or belief will disqualify themselves from hearing the case. A respondent or complainant may request, in writing, that a member of a hearing body be disqualified from hearing a case. The request will be made to the Case Administrator by 9:00 AM no more than two (2) days after receiving the

[3] All references to the Dean of Students throughout this document will be understood to include their designee.

charge letter and will include an explanation as to why the member is unable to render an impartial decision in the case.

6. **Standard of Evidence.** In determining whether or not an offense has been committed, the Administrative Reviewer or Hearing Officers will base determinations on the standard of preponderance of the evidence (more likely than not).
7. **Case Administrator.** A Case Administrator is a University official designated by the Director to manage these procedures. Additionally, the Case Administrator will respond to requests from respondents and complainants during the pre-hearing phases of the student group conduct procedures and will chair any higher-level hearings. As the chair of higher-level hearings, the Case Administrator will participate in the deliberations but will not have voting rights.
8. **Investigator.** For most cases in which allegations could result in a separation from the University, as determined by the Office of Student Conduct & Community Standards, the University will use an investigator model to conduct an Investigative Review of allegations. This will include interviews with the complainant(s), respondent(s), and any relevant witnesses. These interviews may be conducted by Student Conduct & Community Standards Deans or an appointed investigator if deemed appropriate by the Dean of Students. Complainant(s) and respondent(s) will have an opportunity to provide information to the investigator. If the complaint is not complex in nature, it may be reviewed by collecting written statements and/or any relevant documents from complainant(s), respondent(s), and any relevant witnesses. The Director will decide, based on the severity of the behavior, relevant circumstances of the case, and resources available, how a case will be investigated.
9. **Respondent.** The respondent is the charged student group, representatives of which are entitled to be present during the course of any disciplinary proceeding. These representatives will not be present during other meetings designed to gather information from complainants or witnesses. The Administrative Reviewer or Hearing Officers may decide to hold a proceeding even if a representative(s) fails to appear despite proper notification. In restorative proceedings, the respondent will be referred to as the responsible party.
10. **Complainant.** The complainant is the person who has filed a complaint. The complainant is entitled to be present during the course of the hearing concerning their complaint for higher-level hearings. The complainant will not be present during other meetings designed to gather information from the respondent(s) or witnesses. For matters heard by the Student Conduct Board in which there is no complainant, a University official other than the Case Administrator will serve in that capacity. For lower-level proceedings, the complainant will not be present during a respondent's Student Group Administrative Review Meeting but may have a separate meeting with the Administrative Reviewer. In restorative proceedings, the complainant will be referred to as the harmed party.
11. **University Representative.** In cases for which there is no complainant, a University official may participate in the hearing process as the complainant at the discretion of the Case Administrator.
12. **Attorneys.** For Title IX-related allegations only, the respondent may be accompanied by an attorney to serve as the respondent's advisor, but the attorney may not participate in the hearing or meetings.
13. **Witnesses.** Members of the University community, including respondents, are expected to appear at a hearing or participate in an investigative review if they have knowledge or

information regarding the incident in question and they have been notified to appear. Individuals who are not members of the University community will generally be permitted to appear at a hearing only if they have direct knowledge or information regarding an incident that is not otherwise available. Members of the University community who may have knowledge or information regarding an incident or complaint may be asked to meet with a University official to share information or with the Administrative Reviewer or Hearing Officers to inform the outcome of a disciplinary proceeding.

14. **Amnesty for Personal Ingestion of Alcohol or Other Drugs.** Brown University generally will offer amnesty to a reporting student, whether as a complainant or a witness, for the personal ingestion of alcohol or other drugs in violation of the Code. Please refer to the Alcohol and Other Drug Policy for more information.
15. **Appeals.** See 8 Appeal Process.
16. **Timing and Deadlines.** "Days" in these procedures refer to business days, not weekends or University holidays. Any requirement in these procedures must be completed by 3:00 PM on the day specified, unless otherwise noted in writing. A hearing or deliberations may be conducted on a Saturday, Sunday, or University holiday, if necessary.
17. **Advisors.** Student groups are entitled to have an advisor during Investigative Reviews and higher-level hearings. Advisors must be full-time faculty or staff members of the University but may not be attorneys unless there are Title IX-related allegations under consideration. Advisors may accompany representative(s) of a student group to any meeting or proceeding outlined in the Student Group Conduct Procedures.
18. **Statements of Impact and Mitigation.** A person making a complaint shall have the right to submit an impact statement to the Administrative Reviewer or Hearing Officers to be considered after a finding of responsibility but prior to a determination of outcome(s). A respondent in a higher-level proceeding may submit a statement of mitigation. Impact and mitigation statements shall not be considered as evidence that the incident in question was in fact committed, and shall not be the basis for examination in any proceeding. However, the Administrative Reviewer or Hearing Officers may consider the impact and mitigation statement in making a determination as to the appropriate outcome to be imposed upon a finding that the Code has been violated.
19. **Emergency Separation.** For matters in which a student group poses a danger to the immediate safety or well-being of the University community, the President, the Vice President for Campus Life, the Dean of the College, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Dean of Medicine and Biological Sciences, and the Dean of Students or their designees have the authority to separate the student group from the University and to impose any additional conditions deemed necessary.
20. **Interim Measures.** The University may authorize interim measures, which include but are not limited to no contact orders and housing relocation, prior to and following the resolution of a matter under these Procedures.
21. **Criminal/Civil Charges.** University disciplinary proceedings may be initiated and proceed in cases involving conduct that potentially violates both criminal and/or civil laws and the Code, even though a legal investigation or court proceeding might be pending. University proceedings may occur before, during, or after the criminal/civil court process.

6. Student Conduct Board Hearing Procedures

SCB Membership. The membership of the Student Conduct Board will consist of faculty members, undergraduate deans, graduate deans, deans from the Division of Biology and Medicine, School of Engineering, School of Professional Studies, and School of Public Health, other University administrators, undergraduate students, graduate students, and medical students. The appropriate student governance bodies will appoint student members for the upcoming academic year. If a student governance body fails to appoint sufficient members, the Director may select students to fill the positions. If there is a vacancy among the members of the SCB or if an additional member or members are needed to hear a case, the Director may appoint a temporary member. All student members are subject to the approval of the Director.

Hearing Panels. The composition of the hearing panel will correspond, in general, to the University status (undergraduate, graduate, and medical) of the respondent(s). Each panel will consist of three members - one must be a student while the other two panel members may be deans, administrators, or members of the faculty.

The Case Administrator. The Case Administrator organizes the hearing procedures, including recruiting the panel, communicating to all parties about hearing date and time, and distributing case materials to all parties. The Case Administrator also chairs higher-level hearings and is responsible for conducting the hearing and deciding upon matters related to witnesses, evidence, and procedures. The Case Administrator may exclude from a hearing any person in attendance who disrupts a hearing. The Case Administrator may consult with the Student Conduct Board and other University officials as necessary. As the chair of higher-level hearings, the Case Administrator may ask questions at the hearing and will participate in the deliberations but will not have voting rights.

Notice. At least seven (7) days before the hearing, the Case Administrator will provide the respondent(s) and complainant(s), if applicable, with written notification of the charges, the time and place of the hearing, and a copy of the case materials.

Expedited Hearing(s). If the Director determines that an expedited hearing is necessary (e.g., end of the academic year), deadlines may be shortened.

Requests for Witnesses. The respondent(s), complainant(s), and hearing officers will provide the Case Administrator with a written list of witnesses they would like to appear at the hearing at least four (4) days prior to the hearing by 9:00 AM. For cases in which an investigator is not used, all witnesses will provide a written statement and/or any relevant documents at least four (4) days prior to the hearing by 9:00 AM. If, after the four-day deadline, either party believes that there is new information which may substantially influence the outcome of the hearing, they will request of the Case Administrator that the information be admitted to the hearing. The Case Administrator will also notify the parties of any other witnesses who have been called to appear at the hearing. The Case Administrator will make all decisions about witnesses appearing at the hearing.

Hearing Outline. Student Conduct Board Hearings proceed as follows:

1. The Case Administrator (and chair of the hearing) reads the charge(s) and informs the respondent(s) of the right to remain silent.
2. The Case Administrator is available to answer questions about the case materials.
3. The respondent or their advisor may make an opening statement.
4. The complainant or their advisor may make an opening statement. A University Representative may fulfill this role if there is no complainant.
5. The Hearing Officers examine the evidence and the testimony of any witnesses, including the respondent, complainant, and the Investigator, if applicable. The respondent(s) and the complainant(s) may submit written questions to the Case Administrator in advance of the hearing. Additional questions may also be submitted during the proceedings. The Case Administrator will determine what questions to put forth and how to present them during the proceeding. At the discretion of the Case Administrator, witnesses may be recalled.
6. The complainant or their advisor may make a closing statement.
7. The respondent or their advisor may make a closing statement.

Deliberations. Following the closing statements, the Hearing Officers adjourn into closed session (1) to determine if the respondent(s) is responsible for violation(s) of the Code and, if so, (2) to recommend a range of appropriate community status outcomes up to expulsion from the University and any terms (see 7 Outcomes) to the Director. After a determination of responsibility but prior to the recommendation of outcomes, the Case Administrator informs the Hearing Officers of any prior disciplinary finding(s) against the respondent and shares any impact or mitigation statements with them. Decision(s) of the Student Conduct Board will be made by majority vote and will be forwarded to the Director. As the chair of higher-level hearings, the Case Administrator may ask questions at the hearing and will participate in the deliberations but will not have voting rights.

Decision Notification. Within five (5) days of the conclusion of the hearing, the Director will notify representative(s) of the respondent student group, and the complainant(s) as permitted by applicable law, of the decision in this case.

Appeals. Please see 8 Appeal Process.

7. Outcomes

A finding of responsibility will result in appropriate outcomes being assigned. These outcomes may include community statuses and/or terms.

Community Status. Violations of the Code may result in one or more community statuses. When determining whether a community status is appropriate, the Administrative Reviewer or Hearing Officers will consider the nature of the incident and its context as well as any prior disciplinary findings. All community statuses may include accompanying terms as appropriate. Violation of any community status or term will warrant a review by the Director and may result in forwarding the matter to the Student Conduct Board.

Probation. Probation is a designated period of time during which the student group is given the opportunity to demonstrate the ability to abide by the community's expectations of behavior articulated in the Code. Conditions regarding participation in University-sponsored activities may be imposed. Student groups on this community status are considered to not be in good community standing.

Suspension. Suspension is de-recognition from the University for a designated period of time, after which the suspended student group may petition the Dean of Students for re-recognition by the University. The petition must demonstrate that the student group has satisfied any terms of the suspension. A student group that has been suspended has lost all rights and privileges associated with being a recognized student group at the University. This includes, but is not limited to, hosting and sponsoring events, meeting as a group, recruiting new members, receiving University funding, and reserving space as a group on or off campus. For all intents and purposes, a student group does not exist in the Brown community when it loses recognition.

Expulsion. Expulsion is permanent de-recognition from the University. A student group that has been expelled has lost all rights and privileges associated with being a recognized student group at the University. This includes, but is not limited to, hosting and sponsoring events, meeting as a group, recruiting new members, receiving University funding, and reserving space as a group on or off campus. For all intents and purposes, a student group does not exist in the Brown community when it loses recognition.

No Community Status Assigned. In cases where no community status is assigned the student group's letter of responsibility and outcomes will serve as a written notice that the Code has been violated. In these cases, the student group is still considered to be in good community standing.

Terms. The Administrative Reviewer or Hearing Officers may assign terms designed to ensure responsible behavior and the well-being of the University community, help the responsible student group learn from the experience, and ameliorate the effects of the conduct on the aggrieved community member(s). Examples of terms include, but are not limited to, restitution, educational projects, letters of apology, restorative dialogue, attending or presenting educational programs, or referrals to other offices and resources on campus.

Additionally, the Administrative Reviewer or Hearing Officer(s) may impose university restrictions. Examples of university restrictions include, but are not limited to, removal from or reassignment of housing, restriction from representing the University for a period of time, revocation of social privileges, loss of social spaces, and/or limitation of access to University sanctioned events.

8. Appeal Process

Deadlines. Within five (5) days of notification of any non-restorative proceeding outcome, the respondent may appeal, in writing, the decisions in the case, setting out the reason(s) for the appeal.

Grounds for Appeal. Appeals will normally be considered only when: (1) there is relevant new evidence that was not reasonably available to be presented to the original Administrative Reviewer or Hearing Officers and that in the judgment of the appeal officer the introduction of the information may have changed the finding by the original Administrative Reviewer or Hearing Officers; or (2) when a substantial procedural error by the University, Administrative Reviewer, or Hearing Officers is demonstrated and in the reasonable judgment of the appeal officer such error is sufficient enough that it may have affected the decision of the original Administrative Reviewer or Hearing Officers. If it is determined that the appeal has merit, the appeal officer may reduce the severity or terms of an outcome or may remand the matter to an appropriate Administrative Reviewer or Hearing Officers.

Complainant Appeals. For proceedings involving Title IX-related charges or charges under *D.9 Harassment* or *D.10 Harm to Person(s)*, the complainant shall have the right to appeal on the same terms as the respondent. If it is determined that the complainant's appeal has merit, the appeal officer may increase the severity or terms of an outcome or may remand the matter to an appropriate Administrative Reviewer or Hearing Officers.

Appeal Review. All Student Group Administrative Review Meeting appeals will be heard by the Director. Appeals for higher-level hearings will be heard by the Dean of Students.