

**Report of the Disciplinary Review Committee**

**June 2017**

## **A. Introduction**

The University's undergraduate disciplinary system has three components: a) the Honor System which governs student conduct on in-class examinations and quizzes and is overseen by the Honor Committee; b) the Title IX process, which addresses violations of the University's policies on sexual misconduct and related behaviors; and c) all other regulations governing academic work and personal conduct, overseen by the Faculty-Student Committee on Discipline (COD) and the Residential College Discipline Board (RCDB). During our review, we considered topics which have relevance or application to all components of the undergraduate discipline system, as well as to the Graduate School's discipline system. Other areas of exploration were limited to those procedures and practices unique to the COD and RCDB.

These are dynamic systems. Changes are made regularly, whether in response to suggestions from students who participate in these processes, their advisers, or relevant appellate authorities, or as an outgrowth of the experience of adjudicators and investigators within these systems. In recent years, there have been numerous examples of changes. Procedures for investigating and adjudicating allegations of sexual misconduct have been modified substantially. Notice and information procedures in RCDB cases have been strengthened. Educational "refresher" programs have been developed in order to enhance learning outcomes following academic integrity and sexual misconduct violations. Periodically, however, the University recognizes that it is healthy to undertake a broader, more comprehensive examination of our assumptions, expectations and practices. Such a broad review as this ensures that our disciplinary systems remain consistent with best practices at peer schools and reflect both the traditions and long-standing values of the institution and the changing needs and habits of students.

Vice President for Campus Life, Rochelle Calhoun, asked us to consider the questions outlined in the charge delineated below. While we make a number of specific recommendations, we also note that there is more work to be done in the year ahead. We look to the members of the Committee on Discipline, the Residential College Disciplinary Board, and other ad hoc work groups to be convened by the Office of the Dean of Undergraduate Students (ODUS), to refine some of our ideas and recommendations and make others more robust.

## **B. Charge**

In light of the University's long-standing commitment to protecting the well-being of the community and advancing its educational mission by defining and establishing certain norms of behavior, the Review Committee was tasked with examining particular aspects of the University's student disciplinary system. The committee's review was illuminated by means of the questions noted below, reviewing and assessing the following issues common to all student disciplinary policies and procedures at the University (graduate and undergraduate):

- a. Range of available sanctions. Are there additional sanctions that could be useful (a) from an educational perspective for the responsible student, (b) from a restorative perspective for a person or community impacted by the behavior, or (c) in providing additional gradations for adjudicators?
- b. Application of sanctions. How are sanctions currently determined? What is the reasoning behind current practices? What factors ought to be considered, consistent with the University's values of equity, fairness, and transparency?
- c. Recording of outcomes on student records and transcripts. What is the reasoning behind current practices? Are there other appropriate alternatives?

The committee also reviewed and assessed the following issues which pertain only to the Faculty-Student Committee on Discipline (COD) and the Residential College Disciplinary Board (RCDB):

- d. Procedures for investigating and adjudicating disciplinary cases. What is the reasoning behind current practices? Are there areas where fairness, transparency, and efficiency could be increased?
- e. Educational efforts around the undergraduate conduct policies adjudicated by the COD and RCDB. How does the disciplinary system communicate what the University values? What resources are available to help students make good choices? What more can be done?

### **C. Committee membership**

Bryant Blount, Assistant Dean of Undergraduate Students  
 Elizabeth Colagiuri, Deputy Dean of the College  
 Cole Crittenden, Deputy Dean of the Graduate School  
 Regan Crotty, Title IX Administrator  
 Kathleen Deignan, Dean of Undergraduate Students (Chair)  
 Patrick Flanigan '18, Academics Chair, USG and Residential College Adviser  
 Victoria Jueds, Senior Associate Dean of Undergraduate Students  
 Joshua T. Katz, Cotsen Professor in the Humanities, Professor of Classics  
 Carolyn Liziewski '18, Honor Committee chair  
 Susan Sugarman, Professor of Psychology  
 Mellisa Thompson, Director of Student Life, Forbes College  
 Abby Van Soest '18, Committee on Discipline and Residential College Adviser  
 Nicholas Wu '19, Faculty-Student Committee on Sexual Misconduct

## **D. Process**

In doing its work, the committee considered the University's bedrock values, including the well-being of the community, integrity in academic and residential life, confidentiality of private student affairs, transparency of administrative procedures, and the consistent and equitable application of community standards. The committee asked whether those values are properly supported by current practices, whether they could be improved, and whether they would be better addressed by contrasting practices at peer schools.

Throughout the spring term 2017, the full committee met regularly. On occasion, specific questions (e.g. length of hearings, range of sanctions, information available to students who are appealing) were delegated to smaller groups for consideration. The Committee learned about current procedures directly from constituents of different disciplinary bodies as well as through procedural documents and data. Guests from the General Counsel's office and Counseling and Psychological Services informed the committee's consideration of various issues. Practices at peer schools were researched by members of the ODUS staff and shared with the Committee.

The committee reviewed materials including *Rights, Rules, Responsibilities (RRR)*, the Faculty-Student Committee on Discipline (COD) Member Handbook, Frequently Asked Question documents regarding the COD and RCDB processes, the 2015-16 Annual Discipline Report and disciplinary statistics, materials provided to the Princeton students during the writing seminar, and materials used in First-Year Orientation programming about academic integrity.

## **E. Discussion and Recommendations**

This report addresses the issues in the committee's charge (see page 1) in the following order:

1. Procedures for investigating and adjudicating disciplinary cases (issue d)
2. Range of available sanctions (issue a) AND Recording of outcomes on student records and transcripts (issue c)
3. Application of sanctions (issue b)
4. Educational efforts around conduct policies (issue e)

Thus, the following discussion reflects roughly the order in which these issues tend to arise in the disciplinary system.

### **1. Procedures for investigating and adjudicating disciplinary cases. (issue d)**

The committee heard from deans and DSLs about the way the Residential College Disciplinary Board (RCDB) functions and read informational materials about RCDB jurisdiction, standards, and procedures. In considering the procedures of the Faculty-Student Committee on Discipline (COD), the committee heard from deans, COD members, as well as DSLs and others who have

served as advisers to students in COD hearings about the way that body functions, and read informational materials about COD jurisdiction, standards, and procedures.

In contemplating the questions of fairness, transparency, and efficiency, the committee narrowed its discussion to the following: (i) transparency during intake interviews with DSLs, deans, and directors, (ii) transparency in the appeal process with regard to relevant precedents, (iii) the timeliness of RCDB adjudications, and (iv) the length of COD hearings.

**(i) Transparency in intake interviews.**

The committee discussed transparency and confidentiality in the intake interview process. The central question that emerged from our discussion was this: In initial interviews with a dean, DSL, or investigator, what should be done to put students on notice that voluntary disclosures of misconduct are not confidential and will be pursued?

A distinction was made between investigations undertaken by DSLs on the one hand, and deans or investigators on the other. DSLs serve in multiple roles in addition to investigation and adjudication of student conduct, particularly support and follow-up regarding student health and well-being. The role of deans and investigators is much less ambiguous. DSLs' multiple roles may lead to confusion about what can be said by a student in confidence, as a wellness matter, and what will be pursued as a disciplinary matter. In short, in initial meetings with DSLs following receipt of a report indicating possible misconduct (mostly from Public Safety but occasionally from other sources like RCAs), students may unwittingly implicate themselves in violations not the subject of the investigation, particularly around alcohol/drugs. Mellisa Thompson reported that she and her fellow DSLs are clear about their roles and goals in such conversations, but she and other committee members agreed that all investigators could benefit by a standard set of talking points to use at such times.

- **RECOMMENDATION #1: The following talking points should be circulated among DSLs for initial disciplinary interviews. (These talking points may be adapted for use by deans and the University investigator, either when they are assisting in RCDB investigations or when they are conducting interviews in COD cases).**

**Talking points for DSL interviews following a report of misconduct:**

1. Thank the student for being present. Explain that the student has been asked to meet with the DSL because of report(s) from \_\_\_\_\_ (DPS/other) suggesting possible violation(s) of RRR.
2. Explain that any questions the student chooses to answer must be answered honestly, in keeping with the Honesty in University Matters policy.
3. Explain that although the student's wellness is of paramount importance, during this conversation, the DSL is wearing a "disciplinary" hat, not a "wellness" hat. Explain that the conversation is therefore not confidential. In particular, explain that if the

- student discloses anything indicating a possible violation of RRR, including possible violations not covered by the initial report(s), the DSL will be obliged to follow up.
4. Read the report(s) to the student in full. If any other information is known but is not available in writing, explain it fully. (Student may have a copy of report if requested.)
  5. Listen to and take notes about the student's account, asking questions as necessary and appropriate to a thorough understanding of what happened.
  6. Explain next steps as appropriate (e.g., invite the student to write a statement, to provide additional information, to identify other witnesses to be interviewed; explain the timeline for information-gathering; explain the standards and procedures followed by RCDB).
  7. Follow up in writing as necessary with written charges, documents, and RCDB FAQ.

**(ii) Transparency in the appeal process.**

The committee asked a subgroup to consider the issue of transparency in the appeal process, with regard to precedential cases. The subgroup's discussion focused on appeals which arise from higher-level cases heard by the COD, particularly those which raise penalty questions. Deans involved in the COD process described such appeals: Students may appeal to the dean of the college (academic cases) or the appeals panel (behavioral cases) if (among other things) they believe that the penalty imposed by the COD is out of line with penalties imposed in previous, similar cases. When penalty appeals arise, the appellate authority may see records of relevant previous cases, but because of confidentiality concerns as reflected in University policy and federal law, the student appealing may not. It was observed that this puts the student appealing at a disadvantage in terms of information that may be relevant to the appeal.

Deans involved in the COD process described a resource that is available to COD members, which is an anonymized summary of relevant past cases. This anonymized summary allows the COD to impose a penalty which is equitable and fair. The subgroup considering transparency in the appeal process proposed that this anonymized summary could be adapted for use by an appealing student, without compromising confidentiality, and the committee agreed.

- **RECOMMENDATION #2: An anonymized summary of relevant, precedential cases will be made available to a student appealing a COD decision on penalty grounds. The deans in ODUS will provide a process which minimizes the possibility that even this anonymized summary will be used outside the appeal process.**

**(iii) Timeliness of RCDB adjudications.**

With regard to timeliness, the committee first discussed turnaround time in RCDB cases from the receipt of a report to adjudication. While RRR guarantees a "prompt resolution," the committee agreed that a 14-day norm is reasonable. Although there may be unusually simple cases that go like clockwork and can be resolved within 3-5 days after a report is received, it was observed that in general it is not reasonable to anticipate less than a 14-day turnaround, on account of essential elements of the RCDB process, including notice provisions (written

charges and documents, with several days or a week to respond) and additional fact-finding as necessary.

Responding to the committee's request for specific data, deans and DSLs shared that in AY 2015-16, after removing extreme, outlying cases with very unusual factors (DSL illness/leave, student arrest/criminal charges), there was a 17-day average turnaround. Common factors that slow down the process include:

- Overcrowded agendas such that a case which is ready for adjudication gets pushed back a week.
- Intervening term-time interruptions such as intersession, fall and spring breaks.
- Very busy times of year for chronically overcommitted DSLs, especially RCA selection time.
- DSL delays in contacting students.
- Student delays in responding to DSLs.

➤ **RECOMMENDATION #3: The following practices should be adopted at RCDB.**

1. Maintain a secure, online RCDB "docket" that ODUS deans and staff will update, and DSLs can access to keep track of their cases and note how much time has elapsed.
2. Schedule regular RCDB meetings even during busy times like RCA selections.
3. Explore a more reliable back-up system for pursuing and resolving cases when DSLs are out of the office for more than 2 days, or very busy such that their schedules don't align with students' class schedules. DSLs should be encouraged to call on associate and assistant deans in ODUS for backup.
4. Establish a 2-business-day window within which students named in reports will be contacted, following the receipt of that report.
5. Establish a clear timeline of when to send reminder emails to students and when to set a deadline for responding after which they will be charged with non-cooperation as well as the underlying alleged violation.
6. Develop a secure, efficient online process for "e-adjudications." Simple cases can be resolved online when RCDB's agenda is full. Because reply-all emails become cumbersome and confusing, partner with the ODUS IT coordinator to develop a better process.

**(iv) Length of COD hearings.**

The second question under the heading of "timeliness" was the length of COD hearings. It was observed by a number of committee members who have participated, in some capacity, in COD hearings, that such hearings can range in length from 90 minutes to several hours. It was noted that on the upper end of that range, the length of hearings is attributable not to unnecessary questions by COD members, but to choices made by the student charged, including lengthy opening and closing statements, frequent breaks, long questioning sessions with witnesses, etc.

A subgroup was formed, and assigned the task of assessing the potential for reducing the length of such hearings, and the pros and cons of possible approaches. The subgroup reported back that of paramount significance in the COD hearing process and protocol is the opportunity for the student charged to be fully heard. In practice, that means that with very few exceptions (notably, information may be excluded which is excessively prejudicial to another student or community member and entirely irrelevant to the charges under consideration), students charged may tell the COD whatever they want, may provide whatever documentation or information they want, and may question any witness they want. The subgroup observed that these sorts of contributions by the student charged are the main reason why some COD hearings can be quite long. Nevertheless, the subgroup firmly agreed that the opportunity to be heard and *feel* heard, is of paramount importance and should not be abridged. While the chair should continue to use discretion in focusing the student on relevant issues, maintaining a light touch in curtailing a student's statements or answers continues to be important. The full committee agreed with the subgroup, and instead recommended the following.

- **RECOMMENDATION #4: The following talking points should be used by the Secretary (and any Assistant Secretaries) to the COD prior to a hearing.**

**Talking points for Secretary and Assistant Secretaries prior to a COD hearing:**

1. Thank the student for being present. Explain once more the standards and procedures the Committee will follow during the hearing.
2. Describe the COD hearing process in detail, from start to finish.
3. Explain that opening statements are generally about five minutes long. If the student wishes to provide a longer written statement in advance, the Committee will give it a thorough reading.
4. Explain that closing statements are generally very brief, as all relevant information by that point will have been shared with the Committee.
5. Review once again the nature of the violation(s) charged, and the applicable policy in RRR. Explain that Committee members, when they are listening to the student's opening and closing statements, and when they are asking questions, will be bearing these factors in mind: \_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_, and \_\_\_\_ (as appropriate to the charges).
6. If the student asks whether he or she may provide a longer statement than 5 minutes, or whether he or she may provide information that goes beyond the aforementioned relevant factors, the answer is yes; however, reiterate and explain that the COD will focus on \_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_, and \_\_\_\_.

**2. Range of available sanctions (issue a) AND Recording of outcomes on student records and transcripts (issue c)**

The Committee considered whether the range of sanctions outlined in *Rights, Rules, Responsibilities* provides enough gradation to reflect marginal differences in the severity of

violations. Discussions focused on two areas of concern: (i) minor infractions which warrant a response from the University, but do not rise to such a level that they should remain on a student's permanent record, and (ii) infractions serious enough to call for a separation, but not so serious that a full year away seems appropriate.

**(i) Penalties imposed for minor infractions.**

The Committee noted that according to *Rights, Rules, Responsibilities*, disciplinary probation remains on a student's permanent record (but not on the transcript). For this reason, any violation met with a term of disciplinary probation is reportable to graduate schools and employers (with a student's written permission), no matter how minor. In this category are not only assaults or acts of vandalism or theft, but also minor acts of unauthorized entry, simple possession of marijuana, and alcohol serving violations during which no student becomes excessively intoxicated. By contrast, Dean's warnings do not remain on the permanent record and are not reportable; however, Dean's warnings are only used in response to the most minor infractions like first violations of the University's policy against sharing copyrighted music files or low risk alcohol violations (e.g. possession of alcohol in a common area).

Committee members agreed that certain offenses should be met with a penalty but that it would be preferable to provide greater flexibility with regard to the permanent record and reporting. The Committee discussed the penalty structures in place at a number of our peer institutions (notably Dartmouth, Penn, and Columbia), which provide a sanction in between a warnings and disciplinary probation in Princeton's system. To this end, the Committee recommended the implementation of a new sanction at Princeton called a "Reprimand." A Reprimand would not be a part of a student's permanent record *unless* the student was found responsible for a subsequent violation; in such a case, the penalty would convert to a permanent notation. While the Committee deferred to RCDB to determine which violations would result in a Reprimand, members envisioned that this new penalty could be used to address low-level offenses, such as those that currently result in 3 months of disciplinary probation.

Supplementing our array of responses to infractions with the option of a Reprimand and moving both Reprimands and Warnings out of the list of *formal* sanctions would allow Princeton to report truthfully (when authorized by the student) that the student who committed only a minor violation has a clean disciplinary record. While Reprimand would be available to the Committee on Discipline, the RCDB would handle the vast majority of cases for which this penalty would be appropriate. It would provide RCDB with greater flexibility in addressing students who were found responsible for very minor offenses and subsequently stayed clear of any future violations. It also provides an additional incentive for students who receive this sanction, to avoid future violations.

- **RECOMMENDATION #5: New language should be added to *Rights, Rules, Responsibilities* at 2.5.5 (for undergraduates) and in 2.6.7 (for undergraduates),**

including new language about “Reprimand” and describing both “Dean’s Warning” and “Reprimand” in the opening paragraph as informal responses prior to the list of formal penalties. 2.5.5 would read as follows:

### **2.5.5 Range of Penalties for Undergraduate Students**

Minor violations of University rules of conduct by undergraduate students may be met with informal responses. A **Dean’s Warning** is an informal admonition that does not become part of an individual’s permanent record, but that may be taken into account in judging the seriousness of any future violation. A **Reprimand** is a stronger informal admonition than a Warning, intended to signal that the student has committed a minor infraction, conveying that the student must be vigilant against future infractions, and providing a disincentive against future infractions in that a Reprimand will not become part of the student’s permanent record unless there is a subsequent infraction, at which point the Reprimand would be formally recorded. Both a Dean’s Warning and a Reprimand may be taken into account in judging the seriousness of any future violation.

For more serious violations, undergraduate students may be subject to the following formal penalties:

#### **1. Disciplinary Probation**

A more serious admonition... *etc.*

#### **(ii) Duration of separations from the University.**

The Committee then turned its attention to penalties that amount to temporary separations from the University: suspensions and suspensions with conditions. Currently, because of curricular constraints, students who take time off for any reason—whether voluntarily or because they are required to do so for disciplinary or academic reasons—generally must be unenrolled for two semesters and must return “in sequence,” that is, to re-commence the semester (fall or spring) that was interrupted by the absence.

Committee members took note of the sentiments of those who have participated in the COD process, those who have worked with students appearing before the COD, and students who can easily empathize on this issue, that the ability to impose a one-semester suspension would provide welcome flexibility in the system. It was noted that COD members have often wished for the ability to make finer gradations in penalties, particularly for academic infractions that call for a separation but which do not seem to warrant a full year’s absence. It was noted that the Office of the Dean of the College (ODOC) is exploring ways to create greater flexibility in the duration of leaves of absences and other withdrawals. The Committee endorsed this exploration.

Furthermore, until and unless a one semester absence becomes available for all undergraduates, the Committee recommended that ODUS work with ODOC and the Registrar's Office to provide a mechanism for the COD to impose a one-semester suspension option which would be followed by a one-semester leave of absence. While, in most cases, the time a suspended student would be away from the institution would continue to be two semesters, where appropriate to the violation, the record would indicate that the formal suspension was one semester.

- **RECOMMENDATIONS #6 and 7: Endorse the exploration by ODOC of one-semester absences by undergraduates; meanwhile, a mechanism should be developed for the COD to impose one-semester suspensions followed by one-semester leaves of absence. Transcript notations should be developed as follows:**

*One-semester suspension option:*

One-semester suspension 3/22/17  
One-semester leave of absence 9/15/17  
Readmitted 2/5/18

*One-year suspension option:*

One-year suspension 3/22/17  
Readmitted 2/5/18

### **3. Application of sanctions (issue b)**

The Committee reviewed the way in which sanctions are currently determined and what factors are considered, consistent with the University's values of equity, fairness, and transparency. *Rights, Rules, Responsibilities* gives clarity to those bedrock values essential to the functioning of the University community and those responsible for maintaining those values through the enforcement of standards of conduct pay careful attention to this language in applying sanctions for misbehavior.

*Rights, Rules, Responsibilities* signals in various places the relative seriousness of certain infractions. The COD and the RCDB follow those instructions where specific (e.g. suspension in cases of academic fraud; progressive discipline in case of alcohol or minor drug violations, etc.) and interpret *RRR*'s general guidance that a violation will be regarded as a "serious offense" (e.g. personal safety) in accordance with the facts of each case.

These bodies also consider precedent an important factor in maintaining fair and even-handed sanctions for cases that are comparable in nature. Similar violations, therefore, result in comparable sanctions.

In discussing this topic, the Committee met with University Counsel, Sankar Suryanarayan in order to better understand the University's legal obligations with respect to disciplinary

processes and outcomes. Mr. Suryanarayan emphasized the importance of fairness in applying sanctions. It is important for the adjudicating bodies to refrain from outcomes that may seem arbitrary or may appear to discriminate or indicate bias against or in favor of individuals based on personal characteristics (e.g. gender, race, religion, disability, etc.). The Committee discussed the difficulty of responding differentially to students who attribute their infractions to stress, emotional difficulties, personal circumstances and the like. Applying sanctions based upon the seriousness of the student's behavior and the established facts of the case assures, to the greatest extent possible, the fairness of our student conduct system.

Rather than attempting to modify sanctions based on stress or other mental health factors, the Committee recommends that we redouble our efforts to publicize and encourage students to access support resources.

#### **4. Educational efforts around conduct policies (issue e)**

The committee looked first at (i) efforts to educate students about University rules and expectations, and then at (ii) University resources available to support students in making good choices.

##### **(i) Education about University rules and expectations.**

The Committee considered current efforts to educate students around both Princeton's rules and expectations of conduct, as well as the philosophical underpinnings of the values that drive those regulations. While the group was able to identify a number of "built-in" checkpoints that bring students into contact with our community standards (regular communication of *Rights, Rules, Responsibilities*, signing the Honor Code pledge, or mandatory training modules alcohol.edu and "Not Anymore"), the group identified opportunities for improvement in terms of ongoing education around the values of our academic and residential community.

- **RECOMMENDATION #8: ODUS should form a working group to continue the exploration of other opportunities for students to further develop a culture of values around what matters at Princeton.**

Committee members agreed that there is the opportunity to leverage Princeton's wide range of student leaders to develop more broad-based investment in and pride around academic integrity and other values. To this end, the Committee suggested working to help students reflect on how and why academic integrity matters to them personally, and to their peers at Princeton. The committee suggested that a working group explore ways to connect with other student leaders and influencers to help build this culture. By leveraging the influence of athletic team captains, presidents of organizations, and RCAs as partners, we could help foreground a principle that has long been the pride of our institution.

- **RECOMMENDATION #9: Investigate the availability of online courses, training modules (in the vein of alcohol.edu and “Not Anymore”), that will provide students with periodic “booster shots” around the ideals of academic integrity.**

The committee noted that as of fall 2016, First-Year Student Orientation has been greatly improved, now delivering a unified, comprehensive, and intentional message about academic integrity among other topics. Still, undergraduate exposure to these values is most explicit in the early days of their time on campus. The group suggested that because so many different trainings are required of students in those initial weeks, a working group explore additional programs or appropriate opportunities to offer “booster shots,” or “AI refreshers” to students, particularly as they approach junior and senior independent work. These online modules could provide the added benefit of being more flexible, interactive, and rooted in practical examples that would help instruct students on the most important aspects of academic integrity.

- **RECOMMENDATION #10: ODUS should develop more visible outreach, (e.g. social media messaging, infographic communication) to more regularly and effectively communicate the institutional values and principles, and corresponding obligations of students. We should also connect students to the resources that will support them.**

The group felt that a crucial component of the success of any of these recommendations would hinge upon an ability to effectively communicate and raise awareness of their existence. To this end, ODUS should coordinate an effort to build and employ strategies to more effectively message around these topics. That work is encouraged to consider graphical and digestible messages, connect students to networks that have a shared experience and can carry a more personalized message, and help remove other barriers, real or perceived, to taking advantage of these resources.

**(ii) Resources for student support.**

The Committee recognized the increasing frequency with which students make appointments with therapists and psychiatrists at Counseling and Psychological Services (CPS), and agreed that student well-being is an increasingly important area of focus in campus life. Two prominent themes emerged in our conversations. First, Committee members discussed the critical role of communications in this area; the University needs to continue to ensure that students are made aware of the many sources of support. Committee discussions were illuminated by a visit from Dr. Hilary Herbold, CPS psychologist. While CPS has a long-standing policy of not intervening in disciplinary matters, they are able to direct students to the proper resources and supports in advance of students making poor choices. Dr. Herbold acknowledged that CPS staff have full appointment schedules, but she also emphasized that staff members are able to triage mental health cases and will support students in crisis whenever they present themselves.

In addition, the committee was struck by the degree to which students report general unwillingness to reach out to sources of support for any reason, even when under pressure. Despite considerable effort from residential college, Campus Life and ODOC staff to dispel any

sense of “stigma” around accessing sources of support, that stigma persists, and was cited by students as discouraging. The Committee recommend that ODUS, CPS and other Campus Life staff continue to work with partners to share clear, transparent and accurate information on mental health resources, and that ODOC and academic departments be encouraged to message consistently around academic support, including extensions. Princeton is organized around strong residential communities that provide substantial academic and counseling resources, advocacy and advice to and for students. The residential colleges in particular, in addition to advising students on how to meet their academic obligations, are well versed in helping students navigate extension requests in their coursework, even when the ultimate decision rests with the faculty member.

- **RECOMMENDATION #11: The Committee recommends that ODUS, ODOC and the residential colleges redouble their efforts to help strengthen the student body’s understanding of and relationship to these sources of support. A better explanation of the policies and expectations of CPS, as well as clear articulation of academic resources through the residential colleges and academic departments (e.g. extensions), would help bolster student confidence and help them through difficult times.**

## **5. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. **RECOMMENDATION:** A number of formalized talking points should be circulated among DSLs for initial disciplinary interviews. (These talking points may be adapted for use by deans and the University investigator, either when they are assisting in RCDB investigations or when they are conducting interviews in COD cases).
2. **RECOMMENDATION:** An anonymized summary of relevant, precedential cases will be made available to a student appealing a COD decision on penalty grounds. The deans in ODUS will provide a process which minimizes the possibility that even this anonymized summary will be used outside the appeal process.
3. **RECOMMENDATION:** A number of practices intended to expedite the timeliness of RCDB adjudications should be adopted by the Board.
4. **RECOMMENDATION:** A number of formalized talking points should be used by the Secretary (and any Assistant Secretaries) to the COD prior to a hearing.
5. **RECOMMENDATION:** Add “Reprimand” as an additional sanction.
6. **RECOMMENDATION:** Consider “Warning” and “Reprimand” as informal penalties.
7. **RECOMMENDATION:** Endorse the exploration of one-semester departures; as an interim measure note “One-Semester Suspension” followed by “Leave of Absence” on the transcript.
8. **RECOMMENDATION:** Identify other opportunities for students to further develop a culture of values around what matters at Princeton.

9. RECOMMENDATION: Investigate the availability of online courses, training modules (in the vein of alcohol.edu and “Not Anymore”), that will provide students with periodic “booster shots” around the ideals of academic integrity.
10. RECOMMENDATION: ODUS should work closely with campus community members to develop more accessible policy communications, social media messaging, or infographic communication to more regularly and accessibly communicate the principles, institutional values, and corresponding obligations of students. We should also provide or connect students to the resources that will support them.
11. RECOMMENDATION: ODUS should help to better communicate resources currently offered to students in the vein of Counseling and Psychological Services and academic support and advising. A better explanation of the policies and expectations of CPS, as well as clear articulation of academic resources through the residential colleges and academic departments (e.g. extensions), would help bolster student confidence and help them through difficult times.