

UOSA Honor Council
Case Discussion Procedures
November 11, 2008

1. Advisory role. As part of routine duties, the UOSA Honor Council will hold meetings to discuss pending cases as deemed appropriate by the Provost. In cases where guilt has been established, the Provost will make every reasonable effort to obtain the Honor Council's recommendation on appropriate institutional penalties. Other aspects of pending cases, e.g. procedures, appeals, and the like, may also be discussed in the interest of justice and to illuminate systemic issues and concerns in the misconduct system.
2. Discussion procedures.
 - A. Cases may be discussed at any meeting where a quorum is present.
 - B. Discussion of a case will be based primarily on the case file except as provided below. When reasonably possible, case files will be made available to Honor Council members before the meeting at which they are to be discussed. During the meeting, the case file will be circulated among Honor Council members.
 - C. Either the Provost or an Honor Council member familiar with the case file will lead the discussion.
 - D. Only the Provost advisor and Honor Council members may be present during discussion of cases, except in extraordinary cases for good cause, as determined by the Provost advisor in consultation with Honor Council officers.
 - E. The Honor Council's recommendation may be provided by consensus, by vote, by taking individual recommendations, or otherwise as the Honor Council deems appropriate.
3. Personally-identifiable information. Honor Council members are agents of the University of Oklahoma and are bound by the terms of membership to keep confidential all information received in the course of their service. Personally-identifiable information in case files shall ordinarily not be redacted prior to review or discussion by Honor Council members. An exception shall be made for any case involving a student so well-known to Honor Council members that disclosure of the student's identity would impair the Council's ability to provide an unbiased recommendation. Such cases shall be identified prior to the meeting by the Provost advisor in consultation with the Honor Council chair or other officers as appropriate. Such cases will be discussed on the basis of a case file from which personally-identifiable information has been redacted, or a written or oral summary as circumstances reasonably dictate.
4. Recusal. An Honor Council member should not participate in discussion of any case that involves the following persons in any significant capacity
 - A. himself or herself

- B. a spouse or family member (parent, offspring, sibling, cousin, or any other relative who would be covered by the definitions of affinity and consanguinity in the University's nepotism policy)
 - C. any other person whose relation to the member is so close as to create the appearance of a conflict of interest. (Examples include, but are not limited to, dating relationships, friendships, mentor or advisor relationships with professors, etc.) An Honor Council member who has any question whatsoever about the appropriateness of participation in the discussion shall disclose the relationship prior to the discussion and shall abide by the decision of the Provost advisor in consultation with the full Council.
5. Limited recusal. An Honor Council member who served as a hearing panel member shall not participate in the discussion or recommendation in the case except to make a statement or answer questions about matters that arouse in the hearing.
6. Information not in the case file. When an Honor Council member has or receives information about a case from any source other than the case file, it is preferable for the information to be shared with the Provost advisor or with an officer prior to the meeting or privately at the beginning of the discussion so that a decision can be made regarding the appropriateness of sharing such information with the Honor Council as a whole. This decision should be based on the relevance of the information balanced against the potential for the information to distract or prejudice the Council. Information regarding the innocence of a student adjudged guilty should be shared with the Provost advisor but is not ordinarily relevant to deliberations on appropriate sanctions. The Honor Council should not substitute its own judgment on guilt or innocence for that of a hearing panel.
7. Record of discussion. Following discussion, the Honor Council's final recommendation shall be recorded and provided to the Provost. The Honor Council secretary may make records of the discussion as appropriate. The Honor Council recommendation and any records made by the Secretary are university documents subject to FERPA and Open Records. Individual members are discouraged from making personal notes regarding cases.
8. Breach of the provisions.
- A. Any Honor Council member who participates in a discussion in violation of the above provisions, or who has a reasonable suspicion of such a violation, should promptly disclose that fact to an officer or the Provost advisor. Intentional violations that significantly impact the integrity of a recommendation shall be considered a serious violation of Honor Council rules.
 - B. Breaches shall be cured by disclosure of the breach to the Honor Council, plus a second discussion of the case, of rescinding the Council recommendation, or other relief as appropriate.