

Committee on Discipline Rules

Revised February 2019



Table of Contents

I. Purpose and Authority of the Committee on Discipline3

II. Jurisdiction of the COD4

III. Interim or Administrative Actions.....5

IV. The COD Process is Private and Internal. 6

V. Definitions 7

VI. Process for Filing a Complaint with the COD.....10

VII. Process for Choosing a Particular Resolution Process 11

VIII. Process for Respondents to Respond to the Three Forms of Complaint..... 13

IX. Hearing Procedures 15

X. Sanctioning Panel Procedures 18

XI. Sanctions 21

XII. Appeals 25

XIII. Special Procedures for Handling Sexual Misconduct Complaints.....27

XIV. Sexual Misconduct Hearing Procedures.....30

XV. Sexual Misconduct Sanctioning Panel Procedure..... 34

XVI. Special Procedures for Handling Allegations Against Former Students and Former
Student Organizations..... 36

XVII. Membership38

XVIII. Policy Questions and Revisions 40

I. Purpose and Authority of the Committee on Discipline

The Institute's mission encourages students to explore in order to advance knowledge at the highest level. It also expects its students to uphold the highest standards of respect, integrity, and civility. With this context, the Committee on Discipline (COD) was created to resolve complaints of alleged violations of policies and/or community standards by a student, former student, student organization, or residence hall in a way that is objective and educational, not legalistic or adversarial. The Rules and Regulations of the Faculty provide for the creation of a Committee on Discipline.

The COD acts with power to hear cases and to decide the appropriate Institute response, including, but not limited to, suspension and expulsion of a student from the Institute, revocation of a degree, revocation of recognition of a student group, and loss of approval for a student organization residence. In addition, in appropriate cases as described in Section VII, the COD may also make non-binding recommendations to MIT Senior Leadership in response to complaints against a residence hall, or a floor or unit within a residence hall, about group conduct that has an ongoing and/or significant impact on the residence hall or the broader MIT community.

Notwithstanding these rules, the Institute reserves the right to take any action that it deems necessary or appropriate to protect the intellectual integrity, health, safety, wellbeing, or educational or working experience of the campus community. To that end, MIT students and student organizations are expected to abide by the rules, regulations, and policies of the Institute, as well as city, state, and federal laws.

MIT's expectations for students and student organizations are outlined in the *Mind and Hand Book* and in the Handbook on Academic Integrity. In addition, students are required to comply with MIT Policies and Procedures, Housing and Dining Policies, and their Housing Agreements. This may not exhaust the policies under the COD's authority, so students and student organizations are encouraged to contact the Office of Student Conduct (OSC) with questions.

II. Jurisdiction of the COD

A. The COD shall consider any complaint brought to its attention by anyone against an MIT student or former student for conduct that occurred while the individual was a student at MIT, or against a student on leave, who seeks to return from leave, for conduct that occurred while the individual was on leave.

B. The COD shall consider any complaint brought to its attention by anyone against a student organization or former student organization for conduct that occurred while the student organization held recognized status at MIT.

C. The COD shall consider any complaint brought to its attention by anyone against an entire residence hall or individual floors or units in residence halls. In general, residence hall cases are processed in the same manner as student organization cases where the conduct at issue reflects the activity of an identifiable group of residents and the Chair of the COD determines that any potential sanctions, if responsibility is found, should be imposed collectively on the group (in addition to any sanctions that may be separately imposed on individual students). In such cases, the COD may also make non-binding recommendations to MIT Senior Leadership as described in Section VII.

D. The COD Chair may agree to resolve a complaint through informal methods through the OSC, if appropriate and agreed to by the person filing the complaint. In all cases, the COD Chair will review each complaint on a case-by-case basis to determine if the complaint is appropriate for an Institute process. If so, the Chair will determine what available Institute process is most appropriate.

E. Off-campus misconduct may be a basis for MIT disciplinary action if the Institute considers that such alleged misconduct may have violated Institute policy and expectations of civility, integrity, and respect. The Chair of the COD will determine, on a case-by-case basis, if it is appropriate to address a complaint of this kind.

F. A Complainant, in consultation with the OSC, may attempt a resolution through informal methods of dispute resolution, if approved by the COD Chair.

G. Other case resolution bodies may be empowered by the COD to resolve specific cases. These resolution bodies receive their authority from the Chair and should regularly review their functioning and cases with the COD. Unless otherwise specified, these resolution bodies will operate under the COD rules.

H. The Institute expects students to engage appropriately with the discipline process and considers sanctions assigned by the COD to be required components of the student's education. The COD and the Office of Student Conduct have the authority to place registration, transcript, and graduation holds in order to require students to attend meetings related to the COD process, enforce sanctions, respond to past due sanctions, and otherwise effect the COD's purpose.

III. Interim or Administrative Actions

At times, it is necessary for the Institute to take immediate action in order to protect the health, safety, wellbeing, or educational or working experience of students, employees, or the broader MIT community; to maintain academic integrity; to uphold Institute values; to end ongoing or prevent further misconduct; to separate individuals involved in a case; or for other similar reasons. To that end, the Institute reserves the right to take any interim or permanent administrative action that it deems necessary and appropriate under the particular circumstances. Possible measures include without limitation interim suspension of a student from the Institute, interim suspension of a student organization, temporary or permanent removal of a student from MIT housing or relocation to another room or residence hall, restrictions on student organization or residence hall activities, no-contact orders, restricting a student's access to certain campus locations, or changes to academic or work schedules.

In addition, regardless whether a complaint is brought before the COD, the Title IX office is authorized to take immediate actions that it determines are necessary and appropriate to respond to concerns related to sexual misconduct (including harassment), intimate partner violence stalking, or other forms of gender-based discrimination.

In all cases, interim measures are taken without prejudice to any other sanctions or remedies being imposed as part of subsequent COD proceedings.

IV. The COD Process is Private and Internal

A. In general, COD processes are private and confidential. With respect to complaints against individual students, only participants in the process will be allowed in a hearing or sanctioning panel and at the discretion of the COD Chair. With respect to complaints against student organizations, the COD Chair will determine appropriate hearing and sanctioning panel attendance on a case-by-case basis.

B. The COD's consideration and determination of a complaint is confidential and should not be discussed outside of the COD process by members or the OSC staff. Confidential information includes, but is not limited to, the existence and substance of the complaint, the names of complainants, respondents, witnesses, what is said in COD processes and by whom, the findings made, and sanctions imposed by the COD. Complainants, respondents, advisors, and witnesses are encouraged to use discretion in their sharing of information about the COD process.

C. Any information regarding a complaint before the COD or a decision by the COD may only be communicated to other officials of MIT in order to permit them to fulfill their professional responsibilities and only after consultation with the Chair, to the extent it is feasible to do so, or as required by law. In certain cases, the COD Chair can permit the disclosure of a decision by the COD to other third parties as necessary to implement the decision (for example, in the case of a student organization) or when required by law (for example, in cases involving sexual misconduct).

D. The COD process is not a legalistic or adversarial process. Attorneys for either party cannot participate in any part of the COD process except by serving as advisors (defined in Section V) to complainants and respondents in cases involving allegations of sexual misconduct, intimate partner violence, or stalking. Attorneys are not permitted to serve as advisors in any other type of case. Advisors may attend meetings, hearings, or sanctioning panels with their student and may give support and advice, but advisors are not permitted to serve as a witness, make arguments on behalf of or represent students, question witnesses, or author documents. The Chair may ask for an attorney for the COD to be present if the Chair decides the COD may benefit from legal advice.

E. Records maintained in the COD process are governed by MIT policies regarding privacy and release of student records. Information on these policies is available through the Office of Student Conduct.

V. Definitions

- A. Administrative Resolution:** A process for resolving complaints in which the COD Chair and OSC review documents submitted by the complainant and the respondent. In an administrative resolution regarding an individual student, the highest status sanction available is probation without a transcript notation, along with other possible sanctions to educate the respondent. In an administrative resolution regarding a student organization, the highest status sanction available is organizational probation, along with other possible sanctions to educate the respondent.
- B. Advisor:** The complainant and the respondent each may have one advisor, who may be any person of their choice except a member of the media or an attorney, with the exception that attorneys are permitted to serve as advisors to complainants and respondents in cases involving allegations of sexual misconduct, intimate partner violence, or stalking. Attorneys are not permitted to serve as advisors in any other type of case. The advisor may assist either party in preparing their case and in accompanying the party in a hearing. Both parties have equal rights to having an advisor present. Advisors may not serve as witnesses and are typically not permitted to address the COD, other parties, or witnesses. Exceptions are rarely made and are allowed only by the Chair. Parties are responsible for contacting and for arranging the participation of their advisors.
- C. Associate Chair:** A faculty member of the COD, appointed by the Chair, who is empowered to chair hearings and sanctioning panels and manage cases as designated by the Chair for a specified period of time, usually one academic year.
- D. Chair of the COD (Chair):** Faculty leader of the COD, appointed by the Chair of the Faculty.
- E. COD Hearing (Hearing):** A process that may be used to resolve formal complaints in which members of the COD review documents submitted by the complainant and respondent, as well as in person statements from those parties and their identified witnesses. In a hearing, the full range of sanctions is available. As described in Sections V(L) and XIV, special procedures will be employed for sexual misconduct hearings.
- F. Complainant:** Those who bring complaints alleging violations of MIT policy by students, former students, student organizations, or former student organizations. Typically, anyone may serve as a complainant, whether or not they are a member of the MIT community.
- G. Day (also business day or Institute day):** This is a regular day, Monday through Friday, during which MIT offices are open for regular business. A business day can be a day in which MIT has class or when there is an academic break. Business days exclude weekends and holidays that the Institute is closed.

- H. Hearing Panel:** The COD members who participate in a COD hearing. A hearing panel consists of seven COD members, including at least two faculty members (one of whom may be the Chair), two Dean's representatives, and two student members. As described in Section XIV, special procedures will be employed for sexual misconduct hearings, including a different panel composition. Complaints of sexual misconduct, intimate partner violence, and stalking will be heard by three COD members who serve on the sexual misconduct subcommittee
- I. Investigation:** The formal process of collecting information and evidence at the request of the Chair of the COD, the Office of Student Conduct, the Office of the Chancellor, a representative of the Division of Student Life, or other appropriate Institute official. An Investigation will usually result in a written fact-finding report that is submitted to the COD for consideration at a Hearing or Sanctioning Panel, but the investigator(s) may also report the findings to other Institute officials either in writing or orally, and the report may be used to evaluate whether a complaint should be filed with the COD. If appropriate depending on the findings, an Investigation can also be used to support an Administrative Resolution or non-binding recommendations concerning a residence hall to MIT Senior Leadership. See Section XIII for special procedures for conducting investigations in response to complaints of sexual misconduct.
- J. MIT Senior Leadership:** The President, the Provost, the Chancellor, the Vice President for Research, and the Vice President for Open Learning.
- K. Office of Student Conduct (OSC):** The Office of Student Conduct is the department within the Division of Student Life that is responsible for educating the Institute community about MIT's standards of behavior, facilitating the discipline process for allegations involving students and student organizations, and serving as a liaison between all parts of the MIT community and the COD. The Director of the OSC is an *ex-officio*, non-voting member of the COD. The OSC will meet with students, faculty, and staff on behalf of the COD. OSC staff members participate in administrative resolutions. One OSC staff member may participate in hearings, sanctioning panels, sexual misconduct hearings, and sexual misconduct sanctioning panels as an *ex-officio*, non-voting member.
- L. Respondent:** A student alleged to have violated MIT policy, a former student alleged to have violated MIT policy while they were a student, a student organization alleged to have violated MIT policy, a former student organization alleged to have violated MIT policy while holding recognized status, or, for residence hall cases, the residence hall or floor or unit within the residence hall against whom a complaint is brought.
- M. Sanction:** The outcomes assigned to a respondent found responsible for violating MIT policy. Graduation and registration holds may be placed by the Registrar if sanctions are not completed by designated deadlines.
- N. Sanctioning Panel:** A panel consisting of one student member, one Dean's representative, one faculty member, and the Chair that may be convened to determine sanctions when a respondent accepts responsibility for the allegations and when the Chair determines the

incident may warrant sanctions greater than those available in an administrative resolution. As described in Sections V(M) and XV, special procedures will be employed for sexual misconduct sanctioning panels.

- O. Sexual Misconduct Hearing:** A process that may be used to resolve complaints of sexual misconduct, intimate partner violence, and stalking in which specially trained members of the COD review an investigation report that may include written statements from the complainant and respondent, as well as in person statements or interview summaries from those parties and other witnesses. In a sexual misconduct hearing, the full range of sanctions is available. Sexual misconduct hearings may take place using videoconferencing or similar technology so that the parties are not required to be in the same room together.
- P. Sexual Misconduct Sanctioning Panel:** A process that may be used in which specially trained members of the COD determine the appropriate sanction in cases of sexual misconduct, intimate partner violence, and stalking where the investigator, the Chair, the complainant, and the respondent all agree that a violation of MIT policy took place. When all parties agree that a violation took place, the members of the sanctioning panel will review the available information, deliberate, and assign a sanction to the respondent. The sanctioning panel does not meet with the parties. The full range of sanctions is available.
- Q. Sexual Misconduct Subcommittee (Subcommittee):** A group of six to ten COD members who are specially trained in issues of sexual misconduct, intimate partner violence, stalking, and the COD procedures for sexual misconduct hearings and sexual misconduct sanctioning panels. Of COD members, only members of the subcommittee will be permitted to participate in sexual misconduct hearings and sexual misconduct sanctioning panels. The subcommittee will not include any students.
- R. Student:** A person becomes an MIT student at the start of the term for which they are admitted, readmitted, or returns from leave. Regular student status is retained until graduation, unless the student takes a leave, withdraws, or is disqualified. Regular student status is also retained while the student is cross-registered at another institution or is on foreign or domestic study away. Non-Institute students who are registered at MIT fall under the purview of the COD for acts committed during their time of registration.
- S. Student on leave:** A student who is on a leave (e.g., required academic leave, personal leave, medical leave) that has been approved or required by MIT. Misconduct by a student on leave that is brought to MIT's attention may be a basis for MIT disciplinary action, including temporary or permanent denial of a request to return from leave. Decisions concerning whether misconduct by a student on leave should be addressed as a condition to returning to MIT will be made by the COD in consultation with the Committee on Academic Performance. The COD Rules in effect at the time of the request to return from leave will be used to adjudicate any allegations of misconduct by a student on leave.
- T. Student Organization:** A group of persons who have complied with the formal requirements for Institute recognition or registration. This includes, but is not limited to, fraternities, sororities, independent living groups, academic clubs, honor societies,

performance groups, athletic teams, club sports, and clubs. For purposes of these rules, a student organization does not include a residence hall or floors or units within a residence hall.

U. Student Organization or Residence Hall Representatives: In matters before the COD, a student organization may be represented in a hearing, sanctioning panel, or related meetings by a maximum of three MIT students who are members or representatives of the student organization. For residence hall cases, the residence hall, or floor or unit within the residence hall, may be represented by a maximum of three residents. These representatives act as the complainant or respondent on behalf of their organization or residence and any reference to complainant or respondent in these rules will include the designated representatives in cases involving student organizations or residence halls. Upon request of the respondent, the Chair, in its discretion in a given case, may expand the number of representatives that is permitted to represent a student organization, residence hall, or floor or unit within the residence hall.

V. Witness: Those who are not a party in a hearing and who may present information in the course of the COD process. Witnesses are not required to be eyewitnesses to the incident in question, but should have relevant information to present. Witnesses may not serve as advisors. Both parties have equal rights to have witnesses or witness statements presented. Parties are responsible for contacting and for arranging the participation of their witnesses.

VI. Process for Filing a Complaint with the COD

A. General Complaint: Any person may file a complaint alleging that a student or student organization violated any provision in *The Mind and Hand Book*, *The Academic Integrity Handbook*, or any other MIT policy. The complaint shall be submitted in writing to the Office of Student Conduct. A complaint should be submitted as soon as possible after the event takes place. The Institute itself may initiate a complaint.

- i. Prior to the submission of a complaint, a complainant may meet with the OSC to discuss the options available to resolve the complaint, the steps to follow for each option, and receive answers to any questions.

B. Sexual Misconduct, Intimate Partner Violence, or Stalking Complaint: Any person may initiate a complaint alleging that a student or student organization violated any provision of the sexual misconduct, intimate partner violence, or stalking policies by notifying the Title IX and Bias Response Office. The Institute itself may initiate a complaint. The complaint will have been deemed to have been submitted for adjudication upon completion of the initial inquiry described in Section XIII.F.i. More information about special complaint handling procedures for cases involving sexual misconduct, intimate partner violence, and stalking are described in Section XIII.

C. Faculty Letter to File: A faculty letter to file is a complaint filed by an instructor alleging a first and low-level violation of MIT's academic integrity policy that, based on the instructor's current knowledge, does not require further action by the COD. The Instructor submits this letter to the OSC.

- i. Prior to submitting the faculty letter to file, the instructor is invited to consult with the OSC to determine whether the student has had any prior violations of the academic integrity policy.
- ii. The Chair of COD may convert a faculty letter to file to a complaint if the respondent has had prior violations or the alleged misconduct warrants further action from the COD.

D. Except in cases of faculty letters to file, complainants will be required to certify that their complaint/letter to file is their own original work and the complainant must cite sources, editors, and collaborators appropriately.

VII. Process for Choosing a Particular Resolution Process

In all cases the Chair, after reviewing the complaint and any other documentation the Chair deems appropriate, determines whether the complaint is within the jurisdiction of the COD and then the method of resolution for the complaint. The Chair may consult appropriate individuals in making the determination. The determination by the Chair on the method of resolution is final and not appealable.

In general, the COD will proceed with its process without waiting for the resolution of criminal, civil, or other legal actions arising from the same set of facts that caused a COD complaint. In very rare circumstances, the Chair may defer the COD resolution until any criminal charges or other external matters have been resolved with the exception of complaints of sexual misconduct, intimate partner violence, or stalking, which will only be deferred, if at all, for a short period of time as necessary not to interfere with a criminal investigation. (See also Section XIII (B)).

The Chair of the COD, the Office of Student Conduct, the Office of the Chancellor, a representative of the Division of Student Life, or other appropriate Institute official can request that an Investigation be conducted to determine whether a complaint should be filed and/or to assist the COD in resolving complaints. An Investigation can be requested at any time before final resolution of a complaint under any of the three methods of resolution below, including before a formal complaint has been filed.

From time to time, a complaint against a residence hall, or an individual floor or unit within a residence hall, may involve group conduct that has an ongoing or significant impact on the health, safety, wellbeing, or educational or working experience of residents, employees, or the broader MIT community. Resolution of this type of complaint may require oversight by the Institute that goes beyond the COD's traditional sanctioning model, such as closure or repurposing of a residence hall, or the removal or relocation of a significant number of students. In such cases the COD may make non-binding recommendations to MIT Senior Leadership in addition to or in lieu of making a final determination of responsibility and sanctions. To assist it in making its recommendations, the COD may consult with the Vice President and Dean for Student Life or other relevant Institute officials to gather additional information about the nature and scope of the complaint, and the COD is permitted to make such recommendations regardless of the method of resolution of the complaint (i.e., Administrative Resolution, Hearing, or Sanctioning Panel).

Methods of resolution:

A. Administrative Resolution: An administrative resolution of a complaint is determined by the Chair and the OSC. The Chair and OSC may also consult a student member of the COD. Neither the complainant nor the respondent will meet with the COD. The Chair will determine whether a violation of policy occurred as alleged in the complaint. If the Chair determines that a violation did occur, the Chair may assign sanctions. All sanctions other than probation with transcript notation, suspension, expulsion, and degree revocation for individual students and suspension of recognition, revocation of recognition, and loss of residence for student organizations may be assigned in an administrative resolution. There is no appeal to decisions reached in administrative resolution.

B. COD Hearing

- i. Complaints that may lead to probation with a transcript notation, suspension, expulsion, revocation of degree, revocation of student organization recognition, or loss of approval for a student organization residence may only be resolved in a COD hearing or via a COD sanctioning panel. These panels may also assign appropriate educational sanctions.
- ii. All hearings will be chaired by the COD Chair or Associate Chair.
- iii. See Section XIV for specific rules and procedures regarding hearings involving complaints of sexual misconduct, intimate partner violence, and stalking.

C. COD Sanctioning Panel

- i. If the respondent accepts responsibility for all alleged violations, the COD Chair may convene a sanctioning panel, which may assign any sanctions available.
- ii. A sanctioning panel consists of four members: a student, a Dean's Representative, a faculty member who can also be either the Chair or Associate Chair, and a fourth member of the COD.
- iii. See Section XV for specific rules and procedures regarding sanctioning panels involving sexual misconduct, intimate partner violence, and stalking.

VIII. Process for Respondents to Respond to the Three Forms of Complaint

In all matters before the COD, a respondent is provided all the information available to the Chair and the COD and an opportunity to respond. Refusal or failure by the respondent to participate in any part of the COD process shall not prevent the COD from resolving the complaint based upon the information available, but it may result in the Chair restricting the information a respondent can provide at a hearing.

A. General Complaint

Following receipt of a general complaint, OSC will notify the respondent(s) that a complaint has been received and will provide a list of policies alleged to have been violated.

- i. Respondent is required to meet with OSC. The purpose of this initial meeting is to give the respondent an opportunity to respond to the allegations verbally, provide an opportunity for the respondent to reflect on and learn from their behavior, and discuss the COD procedures.
- ii. Following the initial meeting, the respondent has an opportunity to submit a written statement to the COD. If the respondent chooses to submit a statement, it must be submitted to the OSC within five business days of the initial meeting with OSC. The respondent may waive the right to this five-day period to request expedited COD action. The waiver must be submitted in writing to the OSC. If an Investigation is conducted, the respondent can submit the written statement after the Investigation is completed.
- iii. The respondent will be required to certify that their written response is their own original work and the respondent must cite sources, editors, and collaborators appropriately.
- iv. Respondent's response may include the names of any witnesses or advisors or those may be submitted at a later date, should the case proceed to a hearing.
- v. Following the completion of an Investigation, if any, and submission of a written response by the respondent or the deadline to submit a response elapsing without a statement being submitted, the case will be reviewed by the Chair to determine which method will be used to resolve the case as described in Section VIII.
 - a. If the Chair determines the case should be resolved using administrative resolution, the respondent will be notified of the outcome of the case in writing following the administrative resolution.
 - b. If the Chair determines the case should be resolved using a hearing or sanctioning panel, the respondent will be notified of the date, time, and place of the hearing or sanctioning panel and an opportunity to submit statements, or other documents in advance of the hearing or the sanctioning panel. Hearings will be conducted according to the procedure described in Section IX. Sanctioning panels will be conducted according to the procedure described in Section X.

vi. Once the respondent has been notified of the charges, unless the Chair provides an exception, the respondent's academic transcript will not be released either to the respondent or to any third party pending the resolution of the complaint.

vii. The respondent will not graduate if subject to a pending COD complaint in which the Chair, after consultation with the Chancellor, determines the complaint alleges sufficiently serious allegations.

B. Sexual Misconduct, Intimate Partner Violence, or Stalking Complaint

Special complaint handling procedures are described in Section XIII.

C. Faculty Letter to File

The Chair will review any faculty letter to file (see Section VI-C) and may consult with the referring faculty member to determine if there needs to be any further action on the complaint. The Chair may direct the case to be resolved by administrative resolution, hearing, or sanctioning panel. In such cases, the letter to file will be treated as a complaint (see Section VI(C)(2)). If the Chair accepts the letter as a faculty letter to file, the respondent will have five business days to choose one of the following responses to such a letter to file:

i. The respondent may choose not to respond. If the respondent chooses this option, the faculty letter to file will be considered a finding of responsibility for the academic integrity violation specified in the complaint. No sanctions other than the notation of the situation in the faculty letter to file will be assigned.

ii. The respondent may choose to submit a written response to be maintained with the faculty letter to file. In this case, the faculty letter to file will be considered a finding of responsibility for the academic integrity violation specified in the complaint. No sanctions other than the notation of the situation in the faculty letter to file will be assigned. The response submitted by the respondent will be reviewed in the event of further allegations. The respondent will be required to certify that their written response is their own original work and the respondent must cite sources, editors, and collaborators appropriately.

iii. The respondent may challenge the faculty letter to file by requesting a COD review of the case. If the respondent chooses this option, the faculty letter to file will be considered a general complaint and the appropriate procedures will be followed.

IX. Hearing Procedures

The following hearing procedures are generally followed. The COD reserves the right to adjust these procedures as the Chair deems appropriate. As described in Section XIV, special procedures will be employed for sexual misconduct hearings.

A. The hearing is scheduled as soon as is reasonably possible after any Investigation is completed and the respondent's written response has been received by the OSC staff or after the deadline for submission has passed.

B. In cases of a student organization, the governing council responsible for that student organization shall be notified of the pending case and be invited to submit a letter to the COD about the case.

C. The OSC will notify a complainant and respondent of the hearing date and provide both parties with guidelines for submitting documents for the hearing and a date by which any documents to be presented at the hearing must be submitted.

- i. All parties are required to affirm that materials they submit to the COD are their own work. Outside collaborators, including an advisor, must be cited.
- ii. Information submitted following this date may only be included for consideration at the discretion of the Chair.
- iii. Following receipt of this information, the OSC will provide documents and distribute them to the COD panelists, the complainant, the respondent, and their advisors.

D. The hearing usually proceeds as follows, although the Chair may vary the procedure at their discretion.

- i. The Chair reads introductions and description of the hearing procedures to the parties.
- ii. The Chair reads the alleged violation(s) and asks the respondent either to accept or deny responsibility.
- iii. The complainant may make an opening statement followed by the opportunity of the respondent and the COD to ask questions of the complainant.
- iv. The complainant's witnesses may provide statements followed by the opportunity of the complainant, the respondent, and the COD to ask questions of the complainant's witnesses.
- v. The respondent may make an opening statement followed by the opportunity of the complainant and the COD to ask questions of the respondent.

- vi. The respondent's witnesses may provide statements followed by the opportunity of the respondent, the complainant, and the COD to ask questions of the respondent's witnesses.
- vii. The Chair may call witnesses to aid the COD. The COD may recall witnesses who previously appeared for the purpose of asking further questions.
- viii. The COD may ask questions of both parties and the parties may question each other.
- ix. The complainant may make a brief closing statement, followed by the same opportunity for the respondent.
- x. The Chair makes a closing statement, including when decision is expected to be made.
- xi. The COD meets in executive session to deliberate.

E. Witnesses

- i. Witnesses may only be present at the hearing during their presentation of information and response to questions. The Chair may ask that any witnesses remain available following their presentation in case a witness needs to be recalled for additional information.
- ii. Character witnesses are not permitted.
- iii. Unless the Chair decides otherwise in unusual circumstance, expert witnesses are not allowed.

F. Chair's Role (or Associate Chair, when applicable)

- i. The Chair convenes and facilitates the hearing.
- ii. The Chair may postpone or suspend a hearing.
- iii. The Chair may call a brief recess at any time during the hearing.
- iv. At any time, the Chair determines whether certain witnesses should appear and decides whether any particular question, statement, or information will be allowed during a hearing. Formal rules of evidence that apply to civil or criminal judicial processes are not applicable.
- v. The Chair may call a particular witness.
- vi. The Chair shall warn any participant deemed to be disruptive, harassing, or intimidating to any other participant and if appropriate, excuse any individual's presence at a hearing, or take any other action deemed necessary by the Chair to ensure an orderly hearing.

G. COD Deliberations and Decision

i. Once the Chair concludes the hearing, the COD meets in executive session to reach its decision. The COD decides first, using a preponderance of the evidence standard and based on a majority, if a respondent is responsible for committing one or more violations of MIT policy or standards. If a respondent is found responsible, the COD will then decide what is the appropriate sanction or sanctions to impose. In deliberations on sanctions, the COD may review any prior findings of responsibility of the respondent. The sanctions available are described in Section XI.

ii. Except as provided in Section XII and Section XIII (C) of the Rules, or where the COD makes non-binding recommendations concerning a residence hall to MIT Senior Leadership as described in Section VII, the COD's decision is final. The Chair will usually meet with the respondent as soon as reasonably possible after the hearing. A written notice of the decision is usually provided to a respondent no later than ten business days after the hearing. This letter will be copied to MIT officials as appropriate.

iii. If the COD decides to make non-binding recommendations to MIT Senior Leadership concerning a residence hall (either in addition to or in lieu of traditional sanctions), it may consult with various stakeholders prior to making its recommendations. Recommendations to MIT Senior Leadership will be communicated directly to those officials and to the parties. MIT Senior Leadership may meet with the parties and consult with various stakeholders prior to making a final decision. The decision of MIT Senior Leadership to accept, reject, or modify the COD's recommendations will be communicated to the parties and the COD and will be final with no appeals. The COD need not make a formal finding of responsibility for a policy violation if its decision is limited to making non-binding recommendations to MIT Senior Leadership (as opposed to issuing traditional sanctions).

H. Record Keeping

i. No recording of any kind of a hearing is allowed. No electronic devices may be used during a hearing by anyone present.

ii. A documentary record of the proceedings will be kept in the files of the COD. This record should consist of: (1) the complaint and respondent's response, (2) all documents submitted at the hearing, and (3) the decision letter. This record does not summarize or otherwise attempt to preserve the hearing or deliberative discussions.

X. Sanctioning Panel Procedures

The following sanctioning panel procedures are generally followed. The COD reserves the right to adjust these procedures as the Chair deems appropriate. As described in Section XV, special procedures will be employed for sexual misconduct sanctioning panels.

A. The sanctioning panel is scheduled as soon as is reasonably possible after any Investigation is completed and the respondent's written response has been received by the OSC staff or after the deadline for submission has passed.

B. In cases of a student organization, the governing council responsible for that student organization shall be notified of the pending case and be invited to submit a letter to the COD about the case.

C. The OSC will notify a complainant and respondent of the sanctioning panel date and provide both parties with guidelines for submitting documents for the sanctioning panel and a date by which any documents to be presented at the sanctioning panel must be submitted.

i. All parties are required to affirm that materials they submit to the COD are their own work. Outside collaborators, including an advisor, must be cited.

ii. Information submitted following this date may only be included for consideration at the discretion of the Chair.

iii. Following receipt of this information, the OSC will provide documents and distribute them to the COD panelists, the complainant, the respondent, and their advisors.

D. The sanctioning panel usually proceeds as follows, although the Chair may vary the procedure at their discretion. If a witness is called for a sanctioning panel, it will follow similar procedure to witnesses during a hearing.

i. The Chair reads introductions and description of the hearing procedures to the parties.

ii. The Chair reads the alleged violation(s) and confirms with the respondent that they are accepting responsibility.

iii. The complainant may make an opening statement followed by the opportunity of the respondent and the COD to ask questions of the complainant.

iv. The respondent may make an opening statement followed by the opportunity of the complainant and the COD to ask questions of the respondent.

v. The COD may ask questions of both parties and the parties may question each other.

vi. The complainant may make a brief closing statement, followed by the same

opportunity for the respondent.

vii. The Chair makes a closing statement, including when decision is expected to be made.

viii. The COD meets in executive session to deliberate.

E. Chair's Role (or Associate Chair, when applicable)

i. The Chair convenes and facilitates the sanctioning panel.

ii. The Chair may postpone or suspend a sanctioning panel.

iii. The Chair may call a brief recess at any time during the sanctioning panel.

iv. At any time, the Chair determines whether any particular question, statement, or information will be allowed during a hearing. Formal rules of evidence that apply to civil or criminal judicial processes are not applicable.

v. The Chair shall warn any participant deemed to be disruptive, harassing, or intimidating to any other participant and if appropriate, excuse any individual's presence at a sanctioning panel, or take any other action deemed necessary by the Chair to ensure an orderly sanctioning panel.

F. COD Deliberations and Decision

i. Once the Chair concludes the sanctioning panel, the COD meets in executive session to reach its decision. Because the facts are agreed and the respondent has accepted responsibility for violating Institute policy, a formal finding of responsibility is entered and the only question during deliberation is the appropriate sanction. The COD will decide what is the appropriate sanction or sanctions to impose. The COD will make decisions based on a majority vote. In the event of a tie, the sanction voted for by the Chair will prevail. In deliberations on sanctions, the COD may review any prior findings of responsibility of the respondent. The sanctions available are described in Section XI.

ii. Except as provided in Section XII and Section XIII (C) of the Rules, or where the COD makes non-binding recommendations concerning a residence hall to MIT Senior Leadership as described in Section VII, the sanctioning panel's decision is final. The Chair will usually meet with the respondent and complainant as soon as reasonably possible after the hearing. A written notice of the decision is usually provided to a respondent no later than ten business days after the hearing. This letter will be copied to MIT officials as appropriate.

iii. If the COD decides to make non-binding recommendations to MIT Senior Leadership concerning a residence hall (either in addition to or in lieu of traditional sanctions), it may consult with various stakeholders prior to making

its recommendations. Recommendations to MIT Senior Leadership will be communicated directly to those officials. MIT Senior Leadership may meet with the parties and consult with various stakeholders prior to making a final decision. The decision of MIT Senior Leadership to accept, reject, or modify the COD's recommendations will be communicated to the parties and the COD and will be final with no appeals.

G. Record Keeping

- i. No recording of any kind of a sanctioning panel is allowed. No electronic devices may be used during a sanctioning panel by anyone present.
- ii. A documentary record of the proceedings will be kept in the files of the COD. This record should consist of: (1) the complaint and respondent's response, (2) all documents submitted at the hearing, and (3) the decision letter. This record does not summarize or otherwise attempt to preserve the hearing or deliberative discussions.

XI. Sanctions

The COD has the authority to impose any sanction it deems appropriate, including but not limited to the following:

A. Letter to File (Warning Letter)

- i. A notation of the finding of responsibility is kept in the respondent's file.

B. Probation (with or without transcript notation)

- i. A specific period during which a respondent is encouraged to be especially thoughtful in their decision-making, as a further violation of policy will likely result in more serious sanctioning.
- ii. The running of the probationary period occurs for the period in which the respondent is formally enrolled and attending classes at MIT or for a designated period for student organizations.
- iii. For individual students, probation can be with or without transcript notation. If the sanction of probation includes a transcript notation, the following dates should be included in the sanction:
 - a. The earliest date on which a respondent may petition the COD Chair to remove the disciplinary notation from the official transcript and internal grade report. This time limit cannot be later than the end of the probationary period.
 - b. The date on which the disciplinary notation of probation will be removed automatically. This date cannot be more than ten years from the date of the sanction.

C. Suspension

- i. Removal of a student from the Institute for a defined period of time. A student on suspension may not be on campus or participate in any aspect of Institute life, including but not limited to classes, extra-curricular organizations, research, campus events, on-campus and affiliated living, and employment.
- ii. Suspension is noted on a respondent's transcript and internal grade report, but not on the end-of-term grade summaries.
- iii. In issuing a suspension, the decision will include the following conditions:
 - a. The COD may require the respondent to complete certain conditions before a transcript notation of suspension will be removed. In choosing this option, the COD must set the earliest date by which a suspended student may petition the COD Chair for the notation to be removed based upon completion of those

sanctions.

b. The COD may determine that, after a designated time period of less than 10 years, a suspension notation may be automatically removed.

c. The COD may determine that a notation of suspension on a transcript is permanent.

d. At the end of a suspension period, a suspended student must apply for readmission through the OSC, demonstrating all requirements of the suspension have been satisfied. The Chair will decide whether or not to grant the readmission request and may confer with other COD members regarding this decision. If this petition is approved, the OSC will notify the Registrar that the respondent is eligible to return.

D. Expulsion

i. The permanent separation of a student from MIT. If expelled, an individual is not permitted to re-enroll as a student at any time, in any capacity.

ii. Expulsion is noted, permanently, on a respondent's transcript and internal grade report, but not on end-of-term grade summaries.

E. Degree revocation.

i. The permanent revocation of an earned degree and the permanent separation of an individual from the MIT community. A former student whose degree is revoked may not be on campus or participate in any aspect of Institute life, including but not limited to enrollment in future academic programs or classes, alumni events or organizations, extra-curricular organizations, research, campus events, on-campus and affiliated living, and employment.

ii. Degree revocation will be noted on the transcript and other appropriate MIT records permanently.

F. Suspension of student organization recognition

i. The temporary termination of the Institute's recognition of a student organization. While a student organization is suspended, it may not exercise any of the benefits of recognition, including the use of Institute facilities, the use of the Institute's name or logo, the use of the Institute's electronic resources (including web hosting), access to Institute funds or banking, bulletin board and room reservations, etc. While a student organization is suspended, the COD may also sanction the organization to loss of approval for student organization residence.

ii. The COD may mandate communication of the student organization's suspended status to all student members of the organization and to prospective organization

members. In all cases, notification of the suspension will be sent to the appropriate governing groups (e.g., Association of Student Activities, Interfraternity Council, Graduate Student Council, national headquarters for organizations which are local chapters, etc.).

iii. The COD may specify conditions that the student organization must meet before being eligible to petition for a return to recognized status and may also specify conditions which must be met upon return to registered or recognized status. These conditions will be in addition to the recognition requirements that any other prospective student organization would be required to complete before achieving registered or recognized status.

iv. At the end of a suspension period, a suspended student organization must petition for permission to return to registered or recognized status through the OSC, demonstrating that all requirements of the suspension have been satisfied and that there have been no additional violations. The Chair will decide whether or not to grant the request and may confer with other COD members regarding this decision. If the petition is approved, the suspended organization must also complete the standard recognition or registration process that is in place for student organizations of its type at the time of return. Depending on type of organization, this standard process may include approval from national organizations of which the student organization would be a local chapter; securing approval from the Association of Student Activities, the Interfraternity Council, the Panhellenic Council, or other relevant governing body; securing a faculty or staff advisor; obtaining the permission of the Dean of Student Life or other relevant officials; or other process that is in place at the time of the petition. A student organization can only return to registered or recognized status after the COD has approved a petition to return and all the normal criteria for achieving registered or recognized status are achieved.

G. Revocation of student organization recognition

i. The permanent termination of the Institute's recognition of a student organization. If recognition is permanently revoked, a student organization is not permitted to return to recognized status at any time, in any capacity. After a student organization has recognition revoked, it may not exercise any of the benefits of recognition, including the use of Institute facilities, the use of the Institute's name or logo, the use of the Institute's electronic resources (including web hosting), access to Institute funds or banking, bulletin board and room reservations, etc. Revocation of recognition also necessitates a loss of approval for student organization residence, if applicable.

H. Loss of approval for student organization residence

i. For student organizations that operate Institute-approved housing for their members, loss of approval for student organization residence means the temporary or permanent termination of Institute-approved housing status and will require all active members to move out of the organization's formerly approved housing. The COD shall specify the duration of the temporary prohibition or indicate a permanent loss of approval for organization residence.

ii. Following the loss of approval for residence, the Institute may permit the structure to be operated as Institute-approved housing for students and student organizations if:

a. No members, former members, or alumni members of the sanctioned student organization reside in the facility or have any access whatsoever to the facility (except for members of the house corporation or similar body for execution of standard duties to maintain the facility, collect rent, etc.), beginning on a date specified by the COD;

b. No external indication (signs, etc.) of the sanctioned student group appears publicly at the property;

c. The property is operated according to the guidelines set by the Senior Associate Dean for Housing and Residential Services; and

d. The arrangement has the approval of the Dean for Student Life and the Chair of the COD.

I. Additional Sanctions

i. Additional sanctions may be imposed such as restitution, removal from activities, suspension of organizational activities (e.g., social events), removal from housing, and other educational sanctions as the COD deems appropriate.

ii. When the COD finds a graduate responsible for misconduct occurring prior to the individual graduating from MIT, the COD can permanently revoke the individual's degree.

iii. A temporary transcript notation of disciplinary action is available for circumstances in which a former student is found responsible by the COD.

J. Recommendations to MIT Senior Leadership

i. The COD may make non-binding recommendations to MIT Senior Leadership concerning a residence hall (either in addition to or in lieu of traditional sanctions) as described in Section VII. MIT Senior Leadership may meet with the parties and consult with various stakeholders prior to making a final decision. The decision of MIT Senior Leadership to accept, reject, or modify the COD's recommendations will be communicated to the parties and the COD and will be final with no appeals.

XII. Appeals

A decision by a COD hearing panel, or sanctioning panel to suspend or expel a student, revoke a degree, revoke recognition of a student group, or terminate a student organization residence may be appealed by the respondent to the Chancellor. In all other cases, the COD decision is final, unless otherwise specifically noted (see Section XIII (C) for special rules regarding appeals in cases involving sexual misconduct, intimate partner violence, and stalking).

All appeals must be submitted in writing to the OSC staff by the appealing party (usually the respondent, see Section XIII (C) for situations when the complainant may appeal) within five business days of the date the appealing party received the letter advising them of the decision of the COD.

A. Appeals may only be made on one or more of the following grounds:

- i. there exists substantive and relevant information that was not available at the time of the decision;
- ii. there was a substantial departure from the COD rules and procedures that significantly affected the fairness of the process;
- iii. a material finding that formed a basis for the COD's decision was substantially against the weight of the evidence that was before the COD when it made the decision; or
- iv. the sanction is at significant variance with the range of sanctions appropriate in the situation.

B. The Chancellor makes a decision based upon the written appeal(s) providing the ground(s) on which the party is relying for appeal, and as much of the record of the COD hearing or sanctioning panel of the case as the Chancellor determines it is appropriate to consider.

C. The Chancellor will consult with the Chair on all appeals. The Chancellor may also confer with other participants of the hearing or sanctioning panel.

D. Before modifying or overruling a decision of the COD, the Chancellor will meet with available members of the COD who decided the case, and will make a final decision after consulting with them.

E. The final decision will be communicated to the same people who received notice of the COD decision, and to any other officials of MIT who need to be aware of it in order to permit them to fulfill their professional responsibilities. When it is reasonable, a member of the OSC staff shall meet with the parties regarding any appeal decision.

F. This appellate decision by the Chancellor is final.

G. If the COD decision imposes a sanction of suspension or expulsion to take effect before the time for the respondent to file an appeal has expired, or while an appeal is under consideration,

the respondent may request in writing from the Chair a postponement of the effective date of the sanction. The Chair may approve the request, with or without conditions relating to the respondent's remaining at MIT, while the appeal is pending. If the Chair denies the respondent's request for a postponement of the effective date, the respondent may request the postponement from the Chancellor, who may approve the postponement, with or without such conditions, after discussing with the Chair the respondent's request and the reasons the Chair denied the request.

H. No appeal is available for the decision of (i) the COD to resolve a complaint, either in whole or in part, by making recommendations to MIT Senior Leadership, or (ii) MIT Senior Leadership to accept, reject, or modify a recommendation of the COD under Section XI.J.

XIII. Special Procedures for Handling Sexual Misconduct Complaints

Due to the special nature of these cases and in compliance with federal law, the COD has certain special procedures unique to the resolution of complaints alleging violation of MIT's sexual misconduct, intimate partner violence, and stalking policies. These procedures supplement and modify the general COD procedures in handling complaints of student misconduct, intimate partner violence, and stalking. In the event that there is any inconsistency between these special procedures and the general procedures of the COD, these special procedures prevail.

A. Informal resolution methods, such as mediation, are not available for complaints alleging sexual assault or other violence.

B. The COD will usually not stay a complaint of sexual misconduct, intimate partner violence, or stalking if there is an external criminal investigation or other outside proceeding until the conclusion of the outside proceeding. The COD may defer proceedings for a short period of time as necessary not to interfere with the evidence-gathering stage of a criminal investigation.

C. In cases of sexual misconduct, intimate partner violence, or stalking, or other gender-based misconduct, both parties have a right to appeal the decision of a COD sexual misconduct hearing panel or a COD sexual misconduct sanctioning panel, regardless of the finding of responsibility or the assigned sanction, except that a finding of responsibility cannot be appealed after a sexual misconduct sanctioning panel.

D. Notice of outcomes relating to allegations of sexual misconduct, intimate partner violence, or stalking will be provided to both the complainant and the respondent.

E. In general, complaints of sexual misconduct, intimate partner violence, and stalking will be only be heard by members of the sexual misconduct subcommittee of the COD (the subcommittee). The Chair has final authority to determine which process will be used to resolve any particular case.

- i. The subcommittee consists of six to ten COD members who have been specially selected for this subcommittee and received additional training. See section XVII (D). The subcommittee will not include any students.

F. Procedures for responding to complaints assigned to the sexual misconduct subcommittee

- i. After MIT receives notice that a student is alleged to have engaged in sexual misconduct, intimate partner violence, or stalking, and after determining that the complainant wishes to pursue a complaint and/or that the initial allegations are sufficiently serious, the Title IX Office or the COD will direct a trained, professional, impartial investigator who has no conflicts of interest ("investigator") to conduct an inquiry. The inquiry consists of information gathering to determine as a preliminary matter whether an allegation warrants further, formal review. The inquiry shall, at minimum, include meeting with the complainant or reviewing material information and providing an opportunity for the respondent to meet with the investigator.

- ii. At the conclusion of the inquiry, the investigator makes a recommendation about the initial status of the complaint.
 - a. If the investigator believes that the conduct alleged would constitute a violation of MIT policy if it were true, the investigator conducts a full investigation.
 - b. If the investigator believes that the conduct alleged would not constitute a violation of MIT policy even if all allegations in the complaint were assumed to be true for the sake of this analysis, the investigator presents a written summary of the case to the Chair and recommends dismissal.
 - 1. If the Chair accepts the investigator's assessment that even if all of the allegations were true, there is no policy violation, the Chair dismisses the case. There is no further investigation. The Chair's decision to dismiss a case is final; there is no appeal.
 - 2. If the Chair does not accept the investigator's assessment or feels that more information is needed, the Chair directs the investigator to conduct a full investigation.
- iii. The investigator conducts a full investigation. A full investigation is a neutral fact-finding and information gathering process that is designed to examine all of the facts and circumstances that shed light on the allegations. An investigation includes, at minimum, the respondent receiving written notice of the situation and both the complainant and the respondent having an ability to meet with the investigator, an opportunity to submit written statements, and an opportunity to respond to the facts and statements gathered during the investigation. The investigator will also typically meet with any relevant witnesses.
 - a. During the investigation, all parties are required to affirm that materials they submit to the COD are their own work. Outside collaborators, including an advisor, must be cited.
 - b. Participation in the investigation is optional, but the investigation will usually proceed without the participation of a party and failing to participate in the investigation generally forecloses the possibility of participating during later COD proceedings in the same case.
- iv. At the conclusion of the investigation, the investigator creates a written report and makes a recommended finding of responsibility based on the report. The investigator's recommendation is not binding.
- v. The complainant and the respondent will have an opportunity to view the report by coming to the Title IX Office or the Office of Student Conduct, but in general, copies of the report will not be distributed.
- vi. Upon reviewing the report, the complainant and the respondent will each have the opportunity to accept the investigator's recommended finding of responsibility or reject it.

- vii. The investigator will then present the report, and the acceptance or rejection of the recommendation of both the complainant and the respondent to the Chair. The Chair will review the case and determine which COD method to use to resolve the case.
 - a. If the Chair determines that suspension, expulsion, or degree revocation for a student or suspension of recognition or loss or recognition for a student organization is not appropriate even if the allegations in the report are true, the Chair will adjudicate the case as an administrative resolution. Administrative resolution may be used regardless of whether or not the parties agree with the recommendation of the investigator. The Chair will use the normal process for administrative resolutions specified in Section VII (A), except that no students shall be involved in adjudicating the case.
 - b. If the Chair determines (i) that suspension, expulsion, or degree revocation for a student or suspension of recognition or loss or recognition for a student organization is possible, (ii) the investigator's recommended finding is responsible, and (iii) both the complainant and respondent accept the finding of responsibility, the Chair will assign the case to a sexual misconduct sanctioning panel. The procedure for the sexual misconduct sanctioning panel is described in Section XV.
 - c. If the COD Chair determines that (i) suspension, expulsion, or degree revocation for a student or suspension of recognition or loss or recognition for a student organization is possible and (ii) either the complainant or the respondent do not agree with the investigator's recommended finding of responsibility, the Chair will convene a COD sexual misconduct hearing. The procedure for the sexual misconduct hearing is described in Section XIV.
 - d. If a sexual misconduct complaint is submitted against a residence hall, or an individual floor or unit within a residence hall, the COD may make non-binding recommendations concerning the residence hall to MIT Senior Leadership (either in addition to or in lieu of traditional sanctions) in accordance with Section VII.

XIV. Sexual Misconduct Hearing Procedures

The sexual misconduct hearing is the appropriate COD case resolution method to use in cases alleging sexual misconduct, intimate partner violence, or stalking when (i) either the complainant or the respondent do not agree with the investigator's recommended finding of responsibility and (ii) suspension, expulsion, or degree revocation for a student or suspension of recognition or loss of recognition for a student organization is possible if the respondent is found responsible. A sexual misconduct hearing involves an initial hearing for the purpose of determining whether the respondent is responsible for a policy violation and, if necessary, a subsequent optional post-hearing sanctioning panel to determine an appropriate sanction.

The following hearing procedures are generally followed. The COD reserves the right to adjust these procedures as the Chair deems appropriate.

A. The sexual misconduct hearing panel shall be comprised of three members of the sexual misconduct subcommittee. The Chair or Associate Chair and at least one Dean's representative must be on the panel; the third representative can be any member of the sexual misconduct subcommittee.

B. The scope of the sexual misconduct hearing is limited to the points in dispute that have relevance to the determination of whether or not a policy violation occurred. The sexual misconduct hearing is not a venue where the parties are expected to re-tell their narrative of the events that resulted in the complaint or reiterate points already made in interviews or written statements submitted to the investigator. The purpose of the investigation is for a trained and unbiased professional to assemble and present all of the relevant information. The purpose of the sexual misconduct hearing is to use the information in the investigation report and the statements of the complainant and respondent to determine whether or not a policy violation occurred.

Accordingly:

- i. In general, documents that have not been submitted during the investigation and included in the investigation report may not be presented to the COD prior to or at the sexual misconduct hearing.
 - a. The Chair may permit documents to be submitted that were not part of the investigation upon a showing of good cause.
 - b. All parties are required to affirm that materials they submit to the COD are their own work. Outside collaborators, including an advisor, must be cited.
 - c. If such documents are permitted, the OSC will provide access to submitted documents to the COD panelists, the complainant, and the respondent.
- ii. In general, a complainant, witness, or respondent who had the opportunity to participate during the investigation but elected not to participate will not be permitted

to participate verbally in the hearing or submit documents prior to the hearing.

a. The Chair may permit a complainant, witness, or respondent who did not participate in the investigation to participate in the hearing upon a showing of good cause. Exceptions of this nature are expected to be rare. The possibility of pendency of a law enforcement investigation or criminal court proceedings will generally not be considered good cause for an exception. Such request must be made at least three business days before the sexual misconduct hearing.

C. The sexual misconduct hearing is scheduled as soon as is reasonably possible after the investigator's report and the responses of the complainant and respondent accepting or rejecting the investigator's recommended finding are received.

D. In cases where a student organization is the respondent, the governing council responsible for that student organization shall be notified of the pending case during the investigation and be invited to submit a letter about the case during the investigation.

E. The OSC will notify the complainant and respondent of the sexual misconduct hearing date, time, and location in writing.

F. Sexual misconduct hearings will usually be conducted using videoconference or other distance method so that the parties are not in the same room simultaneously at any time during the hearing. Both parties will be permitted to participate in the hearing (e.g., watch the testimony of others, ask questions of witnesses, etc.) remotely using technology.

i. The Chair may permit the hearing to be held in a way that both parties are present in the same room for the duration of the hearing upon a request from both parties. Such request must be made at least three business days before the sexual misconduct hearing.

G. The sexual misconduct hearing usually proceeds as follows, although the Chair may vary the procedure at their discretion.

i. The Chair reads introductions and description of the hearing procedures to the parties.

ii. The Chair reads the alleged violation(s) and asks the respondent either to accept or deny responsibility.

iii. The complainant may make an opening statement followed by the opportunity of the respondent to submit questions to the COD Chair to be asked of the complainant. The Chair will only ask questions of the complainant submitted by the respondent that the Chair determines are relevant. Then the COD sexual misconduct hearing panel will have the opportunity to ask questions of the complainant.

iv. Any approved complainant's witnesses may provide statements followed by the opportunity of the complainant and the respondent to submit questions to be asked of the witness by the COD Chair. Then the COD sexual misconduct hearing panel will have the opportunity to ask questions of the witnesses.

- v. The respondent may make an opening statement followed by the opportunity of the complainant to submit questions to the COD Chair to be asked of the respondent. The Chair will only ask questions of the respondent submitted by the complainant that the Chair determines are relevant. Then the COD sexual misconduct hearing panel will have the opportunity to ask questions of the respondent.
- vi. Any approved respondent's witnesses may provide statements followed by the opportunity of the complainant and the respondent to submit questions to be asked of the witness by the COD Chair. Then the COD sexual misconduct hearing panel will have the opportunity to ask questions of the witnesses.
- vii. The COD sexual misconduct hearing panel may ask questions of both parties and the parties may submit any final questions to be asked of the other party. The Chair will relay any relevant questions.
- viii. The complainant may make a brief closing statement, followed by the same opportunity for the respondent.
- ix. The Chair makes a closing statement, including when decision is expected to be made.
- x. The COD sexual misconduct hearing panel meets in executive session to make a determination as to whether the respondent is responsible for a policy violation.

H. Witnesses

In general, because they have already been interviewed and their information incorporated into the investigator's report, witnesses who participated in the investigation will not be permitted to appear in person at the sexual misconduct hearing.

- i. The Chair may permit a witness to appear in person at the hearing upon a showing of good cause. Such request must be made at least three business days before the sexual misconduct hearing.
- ii. The Chair may request a witness to appear in person without a request from either party if the Chair believes the presence of such witness will be useful to the COD subcommittee members involved in the case.
- iii. Any witnesses who are permitted to participate in the hearing may only be present at the hearing during their presentation of information and response to questions. The Chair may ask that witnesses remain available following their presentation in case a witness needs to be recalled for additional information.
- iv. Character witnesses are not permitted.
- v. Unless the Chair decides otherwise in unusual circumstance, expert witnesses are not allowed.

I. Chair's Role (or Associate Chair, when applicable)

- i. The Chair convenes and facilitates the hearing.
- ii. The Chair may postpone or suspend a hearing.
- iii. The Chair may call a brief recess at any time during the hearing.
- iv. At any time, the Chair determines whether certain witnesses should appear and decides whether any particular question, statement, or information will be allowed during a hearing. Formal rules of evidence that apply to civil or criminal judicial processes are not applicable.
- v. The Chair may call a particular witness.
- vi. The Chair shall warn any participant deemed to be disruptive, harassing, or intimidating to any other participant and if appropriate, excuse any individual's presence at a hearing, or take any other action deemed necessary by the Chair to ensure an orderly hearing.

J. COD Sexual Misconduct Hearing Panel Deliberations and Decision

- i. Once the Chair concludes the hearing, the COD sexual misconduct hearing panel meets in executive session to reach a decision whether the respondent is responsible for a policy violation, using a preponderance of the evidence standard and based on a majority.
- ii. If a respondent is found not responsible, the COD sexual misconduct hearing panel is over. The Chair or the OSC will offer to meet with the respondent and complainant, and the Chair will send a written letter notifying both parties of the decision as soon as is reasonably possible after the hearing. This letter will be copied to MIT officials as appropriate.
- iii. If a respondent is found responsible, the Chair or the OSC will offer to meet with the respondent and the complainant, and the Chair will send a written letter notifying both parties of the decision on responsibility as soon as is reasonably possible after the hearing. Neither the complainant nor the respondent will be permitted to appeal the finding of responsibility (see Section XIV.K.) until after a decision on sanctions is also reached.
- iv. After a decision finding the respondent responsible, the complainant and respondent will each be invited to submit a letter, not to exceed five double-spaced pages, to the hearing panel. This letter is an opportunity for each party to comment on the impact of this situation on them, any aggravating or mitigating factors they believe should be taken into consideration, and any sanctions they would like to recommend. Both parties will be given three business days to submit this letter after receipt of the initial decision letter from the Chair. No additional material may be submitted at this time.

- All parties are required to affirm that materials they submit to the COD are

their work. Outside collaborators, including an advisor, must be cited.

- v. The Chair will also offer the complainant and respondent the opportunity to participate in a limited post-hearing sanctioning panel, before the same sexual misconduct hearing panel that reached the decision on responsibility, limited to the question of the appropriate sanction. The post-hearing sanctioning panel cannot be used to revisit or reargue issues that were addressed during the initial hearing. The COD will schedule the post-hearing sanctioning panel as soon as is reasonably possible after receipt of any written statements from the parties.
- vi. Submission of a written statement and/or participation in the post-hearing sanctioning panel are optional for both parties. If a party chooses not to submit a written statement within the deadline or chooses not to participate in the post-hearing sanctioning panel, the COD will make its sanctioning decision based on the available information before it.
- vii. Once the Chair concludes the post-hearing sanctioning panel (or both parties decline the option to participate in a post-hearing sanctioning panel), the COD sexual misconduct hearing panel meets in executive session to decide what is the appropriate sanction or sanctions to impose. In deliberations on sanctions, the COD sexual misconduct hearing panel may review any prior findings of responsibility of the respondent. The sanctions available are described in Section XI.
- viii. The Chair or the OSC will offer to meet with the respondent and complainant, and the Chair will send a written notice of the sanctioning decision to both parties as soon as is reasonably possible after the post-hearing sanctioning panel. This letter will be copied to MIT officials as appropriate.

K. Either the complainant or the respondent may appeal the decision reached at a sexual misconduct hearing, regardless of the finding of responsibility or the severity of the sanction. The appeal procedure is described in Section XII.

L. Record Keeping

- i. No recording of any kind of a hearing is allowed. No electronic devices may be used during a hearing by anyone present.
- ii. A documentary record of the proceedings will be kept in the files of the COD. This record should consist of: (1) the investigation report, (2) all documents submitted at the hearing, and (3) the decision letter. This record does not summarize or otherwise attempt to preserve the hearing or deliberative discussions.

XV. Sexual Misconduct Sanctioning Panel Procedure

The sexual misconduct sanctioning panel is the appropriate COD case resolution method to use in cases alleging sexual misconduct, intimate partner violence, or stalking when (i) the investigator's recommended finding is that the respondent is responsible, (ii) both the complainant and the respondent accept this recommendation, and (iii) the possible sanction is suspension, expulsion, or degree revocation for a student or suspension of recognition or loss or recognition for a student organization.

The following sexual misconduct sanctioning panel procedures are generally followed. The COD reserves the right to adjust these procedures as the Chair deems appropriate.

A. The sexual misconduct sanctioning panel shall be comprised of three members of the sexual misconduct subcommittee. The Chair or Associate Chair and at least one Dean's representative must be on the panel; the third representative can be any member of the sexual misconduct subcommittee.

B. The sexual misconduct sanctioning panel is scheduled as soon as is reasonably possible after the investigator's report and the acceptances of responsibility of the complainant and the respondent are received.

C. The complainant and the respondent will each be invited to submit a letter, not to exceed five double-spaced pages, to the sexual misconduct sanctioning panel. This letter is an opportunity for each party to comment on their acceptance of the investigator's recommendation, the impact of this situation on them, any aggravating or mitigating factors they believe should be taken into consideration, and any sanctions they would like to recommend. Both parties will be given three business days to submit this letter. No additional material may be submitted at this time.

- i. All parties are required to affirm that materials they submit to the COD are their own work. Outside collaborators, including an advisor, must be cited.

D. In cases where a student organization is the respondent, the governing council responsible for that student organization shall be notified of the pending case and be invited to submit the letter described above to the COD.

E. The Chair will also offer the complainant and respondent the opportunity to participate in a limited sanctioning panel hearing, limited to the question of the appropriate sanction. The COD will schedule the sanctioning panel hearing as soon as is reasonably possible after receipt of any written statements from the parties.

F. Submission of a written statement and/or participation in the sanctioning panel hearing are optional for both parties.

G. Once the Chair concludes the sanctioning panel hearing (or both parties decline the option to participate in a sanctioning panel hearing), the sexual misconduct sanctioning panel will meet in an executive session to review the case and determine an appropriate sanction. The panel

will review the investigator's written report, any letters submitted by the parties, the respondent's disciplinary history, and the respondent's transcript.

Because the facts are agreed and the respondent has accepted responsibility for violating Institute policy, a formal finding of responsibility is entered and the only question during deliberation is the appropriate sanction. The COD sexual misconduct sanctioning panel will decide what is the appropriate sanction or sanctions to impose. The COD sexual misconduct sanctioning panel will make decisions based on a majority vote. In deliberations on sanctions, the COD sexual misconduct sanctioning panel may review any prior findings of responsibility of the respondent. The COD sexual misconduct sanctioning panel is empowered to impose any sanction, including suspension, expulsion, degree revocation, suspension of student organization recognition, and revocation of student organization recognition. The sanctions available are described in Section XI.

H. The Chair or the OSC will offer to meet with the respondent and complainant, and the Chair will send a written notice of the sanctioning decision to both parties as soon as is reasonably possible after the sanctioning panel hearing. This letter will be copied to MIT officials as appropriate.

I. Either the complainant or the respondent may appeal the decision reached at a sexual misconduct sanctioning panel, regardless of the severity of the sanction. The appeal procedure is described in Section XII.

J. Record Keeping

i. No recording of any kind of a sexual misconduct sanctioning panel is allowed. No electronic devices may be used during a sexual misconduct sanctioning panel by anyone present.

ii. A documentary record of the proceedings will be kept in the files of the COD. This record should consist of: (1) the investigation report and the acceptances of the investigator's recommendations by the complainant and respondent, (2) all documents considered at the panel, and (3) the decision letter. This record does not summarize or otherwise attempt to preserve the hearing or deliberative discussions.

XVI. Special Procedures for Handling Allegations Against Former Students and Former Student Organizations

A. The Chair of the COD will conduct an initial review of each complaint to determine whether, based on the allegations presented on the face of the complaint, it is appropriate to move forward with an internal investigation or a COD resolution of the case.

In order to be eligible for internal investigation or COD resolution, a complaint against a former student or student organization must:

- i. Allege conduct that occurred while the respondent was a student or a registered or recognized student organization and that was against MIT policy at the time of the alleged conduct.
- ii. Allege conduct that would have resulted in a consideration of expulsion if the complaint had been submitted while the respondent was a student, or that would have resulted in the consideration of permanent loss of recognition for a student organization.
- iii. Not allege misconduct of which the COD had sufficient knowledge in time for the COD to have a reasonable opportunity to adjudicate prior to the student's graduation. The Chair of COD can waive this limitation upon their determination that good cause exists to do so.
- iv. Have occurred within the following time frame:
 - a. For allegations of academic misconduct, there shall be no time limit.
 - b. For allegations of all other misconduct, the COD will generally not consider complaints that allege misconduct that occurred more than two years prior to the date the complaint is made. The Chair may waive this limitation upon a petition from the complainant documenting that good cause exists to do so.
- v. Have a compelling and current nexus to MIT (this can include, without limitation, any ongoing status of the respondent at MIT; MIT's need to maintain a safe campus; the ongoing status of the complainant, witnesses, or other people involved in the case at the Institute; MIT's need to maintain integrity in academic programs; the need to correct ongoing misconduct; and other similar criteria) or in the judgment of the COD Chair raise an issue of significant importance to the Institute. In determining this point, the Chair shall consider the case holistically and shall have wide discretion.

B. As a result of this initial review, the Chair can choose to:

- i. Request an internal investigation and, at the conclusion of the investigation, conduct an adjudication of the case per normal COD Rules.
- ii. Determine that the case will not move forward.

C. The Chair's decision on whether to permit a complaint against a former student or student organization to be investigated or resolved by COD is final and not subject to appeal.

D. If the preceding conditions are met and the COD finds a graduate responsible for misconduct occurring prior to the individual graduating from MIT, the COD can revoke the individual's degree. It is expected that the sanction of degree revocation will be reserved for the most serious policy violations.

E. Whether or not the COD process leads to a sanction of degree revocation, the COD has the authority to implement sanctions short of degree revocation if the preceding conditions are met and it finds a graduate responsible for misconduct that occurred while the graduate was a student. Such sanctions include without limitation: temporarily or permanently banning a graduate from being on campus, participating in Institute-sponsored programs, or returning to MIT in the future for further study or employment; transcript notation of disciplinary action; restitution; and any other sanctions that the COD determines are appropriate.

F. All other components of the COD Rules that are not specifically modified by this section, including the appeal options, remain in effect and will be applied to a case of degree revocation.

D. Membership

A. Composition and Appointment

Per the Faculty Rules and Regulations, the COD consists of six elected members of the Faculty, three undergraduate and two graduate students, the Dean for Undergraduate Education, the Dean for Student Life, and the Dean for Graduate Students, ex officio, or representatives as designated by the Deans. Faculty members serve terms of three years, consistent with the Rules and Regulations of the Faculty. Deans' Representatives serve a term of five years. Students may continue their service until degree completion. Past members who have completed their terms may, for a period of three years thereafter, be called to complete a panel for a particular hearing, only one such member to serve in a given hearing.

The COD is unique among Institute committees in that it requires skills and knowledge that are not inherent to a person due to their membership in the MIT community. Accordingly, COD members should be chosen based on their qualification to serve and their willingness to commit to the extensive amount of time required.

The COD Chair should advise the Committee on Nominations (CON) on the qualifications needed for COD members and collaborate with CON in an advisory capacity.

The COD Chair should further advise the Undergraduate Association, Graduate Student Council, and the Deans for Student Life, Undergraduate Education, and Graduate Education of the qualifications needed for COD members and shall interview all nominees to serve as Dean's representatives and all student nominees prior to their appointment to COD. The COD Chair is not required to accept any nominee for membership to COD who is not sufficiently qualified in the judgment of the Chair.

B. Ethics and Confidentiality

The COD members are required to maintain confidentiality of information presented in COD cases and to agree to other ethics rules specified by the Chair. No member of the COD who had any involvement in the events relating to a particular case will participate as a COD member in the COD resolution of that case.

C. Training

Before having access to case information or participating in the resolution of a complaint, a member must complete the current COD briefing, as developed by the OSC and the Chair.

D. Sexual Misconduct Subcommittee

Each year, the Chair shall select six to ten members from the COD to receive special training and adjudicate cases involving sexual misconduct, intimate partner violence, and stalking. The subcommittee will consist of three faculty members (including the Chair or Associate Chair) and three Dean's representatives. Students will not serve on the subcommittee.

Participation on the COD sexual misconduct subcommittee should be recognized as a substantial commitment, and subcommittee members should receive a tangible reduction in other work commitments or other appropriate arrangement that would ensure adequate time for the task.

All subcommittee members must attend and complete additional modules of training regarding sexual misconduct, intimate partner violence, and stalking over the course of the academic year. This training is in addition to the standard COD training for all COD members.

E. Additional Subcommittees

The Chair of COD may appoint additional subcommittees as necessary to study or take action on issues relevant to COD. The Chair may include COD members and experts external to COD on these subcommittees.

E. Policy Questions and Revisions

A. Consistent with Faculty Rules and Regulations, section 1.73, the COD resolves cases within the framework of Institute policies. Revisions to such policies are properly the concern not of the COD, but of the office or committee that is responsible for considering changes in the policy.

B. In connection with its consideration of a particular case, the COD may seek an interpretation or clarification of an Institute policy relevant to that case through the Faculty Policy Committee.

C. Except when an amendment would violate the Rules and Regulations of the Faculty, the COD, after consultation with the Faculty Policy Committee, may from time to time amend these rules.