**Planning and Finance Committee Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, March 27, 2024**

**6:00 P.M.**

**Spotlight Room**

**Call to Order**

**Roll Call**Jeff Helms, Jimmy Holmes, Carl Palmer, Rick Valentin, Wendy Polifika, Zach Roy, Lea Cline, Vishal Midha, Dan Elkins

**Absent**Paige Hofstetter

**Public Comment**

**Approval of Committee Minutes**

Approved.

**Chairperson’s Remarks**

**Rick Valentin:** We only have one regular meeting left, so we have these policies pending left and we will see where we are at after that. First thing we have 3.5.17 going up as an information item where we have some comments from the exec committee.

**Order of Business:**

1. Issues Pending
	* *5.1.7 Smoke and Tobacco-Free Campus Policy*

**Rick Valentin**: So, we have a comment on the question about adding exceptions to theatrical performances which comes from the smoke free campus act. That’s why those exceptions are not there. I asked the chair of the school of theater and dance, who said they do not need an exception to the policy as they use steam based fake cigarettes.

Then there was the question about state law dictating parking rules and the policy follows the state law.

Jeff Helms: Under the definition of the policy, the actor’s cigarette technically fits the definition of this.

 Lea Cline: It would not be a tobacco-based thing and that it is not an electronic cigarette, there is no chemical or inhaling going on.

Rick Valentin: This is what is being used everywhere.

Jeff Helms: I just point this out as we have had sometimes where we ignore areas instead of making it not a violation of the policy.

Lea Cline: I think we might be saved under definition under smoking which talks about the types of things being smoked, as it is water it might be okay.

Jeff Helms: The later part might have some language that creates issue.

Rick Valentin: It could be arguable on a state level, this would be an issue to take with the state.

Rick Valentin: Then we have the question about compliance, my realization is that we should probably hack that entire section, I feel that maybe we don’t need this as it is an artifact of the initial implementation of this policy.

Vishal Midha: I support removing this.

Rick Valentin: I will mention that as a change when it comes as an information item. Let’s do a quick vote on this.

Motion by Jimmy Holmes

All in favor

Moving on we will look at 5.1.1 Concealed carry and Prohibited Weapons Policy

* + *5.1.1 Concealed Carry and Prohibited Weapons Policy*

Rick Valentin: This was returned from exec and not put on the agenda as an information item.

Lea Cline: Some of it was the multiple typos and things of that nature, additionally there was repetitive sentences, exec can make some changes but there are some things that have to make it go back to committee, there was not any catastrophic. We do probably need the law people to come and talk about this, as I was not clear about the things that legal said we have to state in this way, versus the ones that are legal requirement. Maybe getting Alice to highlight the things that must be there might be good.

Rick Valentin: I do feel that some of the questions that came up are things that did come up with legal, specifically stuff like restricted areas, and other areas.

Lea Cline: We do need to make sure that the things are not copy pasted from the law and can’t be changed.

Rick Valentin: The question is about the firearm and its ammunition be concealed and the language around that,

Lea Cline: I agree but I wonder if that is permissible to change, I do think there are a lot of things we could change that make it better, but do not know if we are allowed to make these changes.

Rick Valentin: What is the question about the legal things? What is the question about what we can change?

Jeff Helms: The concealed carry act seems to use or for every instance and not and.

Rick Valentin: I can run this by legal.

Lea Cline: I might just recommend running this by Alice and seeing if the changes they are wanting are allowed and get this done in one grouping.

Rick Valentin: I can check this change. That’s the thing in regard to the violence policy as well, where legal said look good and no specifics. There was also another question on this.

Lea Cline: We also had the language around clear and present danger, which I am thinking we might change this language to make it more person based. As long as it is not a problem.

Rick Valentin: We then have a question about a section referring only to students, where we have a state and federal law thing that has a student needing a report within 24 hours, this reporting condition is also based around students, and not reporting and general. That is why this refers only to students. This is not excluding reporting other people; it might be a good idea to talk to legal and see a way to reword this to make sure people know it is required.

Lea Cline: Is it both state and federal law?

Jimmy Holmes: The section says state and federal law. Although it doesn’t cite to a federal law, we could do that.

Lea Cline: I do think its clear that we might want to have legal or chief woodruff here when this is up as an information item.

Rick Valentin: Alright I will run this by legal again.

* + *5.1.19 University Violence Policy*

Rick Valentin: Moving on let’s talk about the violence policy, as you may remember when this came up as an information item there was questions about the violence definition. Legal said this was good. We do have an email that says this definition of violence is based on statute. So, Tom Lucey sent a link to a book about mobbing, in higher education. Whether or not that can be connected to violence is the question, the general question about indirect violence. As I am rereading this definition, I think that more indirect forms of violence would fall under this definition. The argument could be made that any of these indirect forms of violence would fall under the word activity.

Jimmy Holmes: Why is there a difference between the languages?

Rick Valentin: Yep, I think that is a suggested change, the question is the and or thing or the or?

Jimmy Holmes: I feel that it is intended to be or.

Lea Cline: What is the broader definition or would be more permissible than and looking at the broader definition.

Rick Valentin: Looking at this as logic, making this or would be good.

Lea Cline: Taking the and/or away and just making it or would be good.

Wendy Polifka: I feel that this is late in the comments, but I do know that some policies talk about violence onto oneself, as this could put fear into other people, and be disruptive to campus.

Rick Valentin: This could be interpreted under the current definition.

Jimmy Holmes: I would like to stay away from this.

Wendy Polifka: There are some areas where this is needed and is in other policies.

Lea Cline: Do we think it is covered in that when it says if any person.

Jimmy Holmes: I feel in the situation where this covers it would fall under that, and this doesn’t even specify who the mental anguish targets.

Rick Valentin: The idea of specifying mental anguish.

Jeff Helms: We could specify that we are using the legal definition,

Jimmy Holmes: Even saying the legal definition of mental anguish would not be specific enough.

Wendy Polifka: Could it be made mental anguish being vague on purpose?

Jimmy Holmes: There is a line you have to tow with laws being vague and not being too specific.

Rick Valentin: That is my question, is the admittedly vague definition of violence address all of the situation. The definition in the glossary from the NIH has very large sets of definitions. Looking at the generalized definition it seems a little more inclusive of more things. The WHO has its oneself as well.

Jimmy Holmes: Violence against a community is an interesting concept which is not caught in this either.

Jeff Helms: I like the idea of specifying all of this.

Rick Valentin: What do we think about stealing that definition and running it through legal.

Jeff Helms: I like it.

Jimmy Holmes: I don’t mind it.

Rick Valentin: I am going to run this definition through ISU PD and General counsel. What I am worried about is changing the definition as it changes the violence prevention plan. Any changes to this policy will change this.

**Adjourn**