Resolution Number: 206-2021

Title: Amendment to Current Statement on Position or Policy E-1 Due Process

Reference Committee Assignment: Membership and Education

- 7 Sponsor(s):
- 8 Michael J. Rosales, Roseman University (RU) C/O 2022
- 9 Olivia Kalloo, RU ASDA Legislative Liaison, RU National Student Research Group President
- 10 Jonathan Wong, RU ASDA President
- 11 Priscilla Leung, RU ASDA Vice-President
- 12 Richelle Castro, RU ASDA Pre-Dental Chair
- 13 Danny Huynh, RU C/O 2021
- 14 Hazel Williamson, RU C/O 2022
- 15 Joshua Kabins, RU C/O 2022
- 16 Jennie Oh, RU C/O 2022
- 17 Ayrton Sanguino, Council on Communications, Video Production Manager

19 Financial Impact: None

Board of Trustees Comments: None

Reference Committee Comments: The reference committee recommends a yes vote.

Background: ASDA's Due Process policy is designed to provide additional protection to students facing disciplinary charges. Without a standard of review, a due process policy lacks meaning. A standard of review sets forth the requirement for the level of evidence required to establish fault with one party or another. If there is no standard of review, there is no framework to establish the level of certainty needed to find a student at fault.

There are two commonly used standards of review used in dental schools: 1) Preponderance of the Evidence, and 2) Clear and Convincing. The Preponderance of the Evidence, or "more likely than not" standard only requires that the certainty that a student committed an alleged act is 51%. This means that to be found at fault, a student only needs to be found more likely than not to have committed the charged act. Any time a student is found at fault, the student risks losing their position in dental school and their potential future. With the average dental student graduate debt surpassing \$288,000, and the number of years a student invests into becoming a dentist, a higher standard should be used.

The Clear and Convincing standard requires that the judicial body be reasonably certain that a student committed a punishable offense. At a base level, it would be recommending that some schools go from a "more likely than not" standard to a "substantially likely" standard. The Clear and Convincing standard would balance the certainty of a decision with the potential loss of the student's future than the Preponderance of the Evidence standard.

 Currently, ASDA does not recommend a standard of review. Therefore, where a student is facing a disciplinary charge, a Clear and Convincing standard of review should be applied by the judicial body when making decisions to adequately protect the student's investment and future interests.

In addition to establishing a standard, some additional language has been included for clarity. Other language has been edited for consistency. ASDA should amend its current E-1 Due Process policy to recommend the Clear and Convincing standard of review. Therefore, be it

RESOLUTION

Resolved, that the Current Statements of Position or Policy E-1 Due Process be amended to read as follows:

The American Student Dental Association endorses the concept of due process for dental students in U.S. CODA-accredited dental schools. Dental schools should develop and publicize a clear definition of its procedures for the evaluation, **discipline**, advancement, and graduation of students to its faculty and students.

Subject to applicable law, Dedental school due process procedures should encompass the following:

a. Prior to discipline, a student has the right to a hearing. Hearings should include student members. No student or faculty member involved in the case should be allowed to be a member of the judicial body.

b. The accused student should must be informed of charges in writing and be given adequate time to prepare for the hearing. The content of all charges against the student should must be clearly outlined.

c. The student charged must be given the opportunity to select an advisor of his or her choice for assisting in his or her defense.

d. The burden of proof must rest upon the party bringing the charge. The student charged is considered innocent until proven guilty by clear and convincing evidence. If clear and convincing evidence is not established, student should be acquitted of charges.

e. The student charged must be given the opportunity to—present introduce evidence, and witnesses and to hear and question adverse witnesses. call witnesses, and cross-examine adverse witnesses. Notice of any items or witnesses intended to be introduced as evidence or called to testify should be presented to the opposing side at least three days prior to the hearing.

f. All matters upon which the decision is based should be entered as evidence before the judicial body.

- g. The student has the right to appeal the decision of the judicial body.
- 9394 Action: The Chair moves 206-2021 with the recommendation of a yes vote.

92