

**COMMITTEE ON CHARGES
MINUTES
NOVEMBER 4, 2022**

PRESENT:

CHAIR, Evangelos Christidis
Jennifer Merolla
Amit Roy-Chowdhury
Amy Kroska
Marta Hernandez Salvan
Amir Moradifam
Karine Le Roch

ABSENT:

Ashutosh Prasad

WELCOME INTRODUCTIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Christidis welcomed members and asked for introductions from member not available at the first meeting.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

The Committee reviewed the meeting minutes from October 7, 2022 and approved by a vote of +5-0-1.

Academic Complaint – Initial Review

The VPAR transmitted an academic complaint on October 27, 2022 listing numerous alleged APM-015 violations against a Faculty Respondent. As per bylaw 8.7.3.2, the Committee considered whether the allegations in the complaint, if true, would constitute a violation of the designated University policy regulating individual Faculty conduct, in which the committee answered affirmatively (+4-0-3). The Committee will conduct an inquiry before its determination on probable cause by requesting a response and documentation from the Faculty Respondent, in addition to requesting clarifying information from the VPAR.

Discussion Preparation for Future Meeting with VPAR Brisk

The Committee discussed future topics proposed by VPAR Brisk and noted the following:

Regarding Appendix 5.3.9: Under what situations would the Charges Committee choose to review a case that has a no probable cause determination for being groundless and malicious? Is it permissible for a Respondent, or perhaps the Administration, to request a review from the Committee on Charges following a no probable cause determination, whether the allegations are groundless and malicious?

Members commented that the bar for such a determination would have to be high and that the committee may want to allow the Respondent to make such a claim rather than it being initiated by Charges.

Regarding Appendix 5.3.2: How to reconcile the clause with Appendix 5.3.2 that provides the respondent with the right “to be heard at each step in the progress of the case”

Members commented that the Respondent should be asked to provide a response and/or documentation following a determination on IF TRUE per Bylaw 8.7.3.2 as the committee is only reviewing the allegations and not evidence.

For members from last year, if the VPAR’s three referrals/cover memos were appropriate in terms of striking a reasonable balance in tone, or if there was any concern that VPAR’s referrals were biased in any way?

Members commented that it was confusing regarding which document committee was supposed to focus on – Academic Complaint signed by Complainant or VPAR cover memo; would be helpful for VPAR memo to include description of 21-day efforts at resolution; note the specific sections of APM-015 that are alleged to be violated.

Additionally, the Committee questioned whether the VPAR can introduce additional evidence outside of what Complainant provided and whether this was appropriate.

Minutes approved on: December 2, 2022