

ETHICS COMMITTEE

MARCH 17, 2003

Erickson
Pugh
Davids
Rhodes
Murphy

6:35 call to order

Roll

Mahoney - absent

- > Introduction of Members and Staff
- > Deb McKnight - history - key issues
(due process, executive session)
- > Deb reviewed chart - based upon
the rules of procedure.

— Davids — been on long time —
what did committee decide about
talking to press

Also, shouldn't all members and
alternates attend all meetings

— Pugh - Rule 10 — page 4, line 6

(2)

ETHICS 3.17.03

— Davids → shouldn't there be co-chairs vs. a vice-chair?

> Staff check

> Murphy — past practice — keep confidential until public is aware of issues, i.e., they

> Rhodes — when to discuss? are public

> Deb McKnight — reviewed DM 46

> Pugh — probable cause — if we were in courts — plus discipline — seems to be model of committee rules?

Deb — not sure — tried to recall history — sometimes there was an extensive record

Pugh — it appears practice has been to have one big hearing vs. two.

Deb responded

(3)

ETHICS

3.17.03

Dauids — we have not in my experience had two formal hearings — cited the rule No. 7. Also, what about 12g?

Deb. — comments on relevance

> Dauids — Move to adopt rules —

Pugh — possible addi

Amend — DM47 — release to public vote in executive session

Dauids — question Pugh on what would be released — vote — even though that is based upon private/secret information.

Pugh — cited Abeler —

Dauids — speak against

Rhodes — recalled Abeler case — we were like a jury in deliberation (sequestered)

(4)

ETHICS
3-17-03

David's — Re: Rhodes. Recalled different process.

Murphy — I can't recall gaining any knowledge in executive session

David's — I recall getting information

Chair → read 6.10 "to determine"

Pugh — cited some examples of when a respondent might bring in more data as a basis for

Chair — cited 6.10 and meaning of word "except"

Pugh — recalled rule 6.10 and intent

David's — question on jury deliberations — when decision is made, is jury vote public?

Pugh — responded.

Rhodes → Pugh — does jury decision have to be unanimous?
criminal — yes — civil not required

(5)

ETHICS

Rhodes - possibly committee could come back and have a roll call.

> BT - clarified Abeler procedure

→ continue to ask/clarity w/ Pugh

Pugh - case when probable cause had been found.

Vote: tie vote fail
DM 47

Vote: DM 46 Adopted

— Code of Conduct —

Deb McKnight —

Pugh — how long? 2 terms

Murphy — re: 9.01 — staff
(officers, employees) as well as
Representatives

(6)

MARCH

Chair —

→ Davids — Motion to adopt as
drafted —

Murphy — question — could committee
change code of conduct during
course of a complaint?

Del McKnight —

① not sure what status of code is
now

② if not applicable — what is
impact w/ a current complaint

Davids — need to renew approval
or do we.

— withdraw Motion —

> Murphy —

Pugh — add at line 10 —

⑦

MARCH 17, 2003
ETHICS

Daids — have chair and vice chair
work some language

Pugh — language on line 16 might
be a problem

— Chair → BT

put on next agenda — don't

recommend

Laid over