Minutes for Rules Committee Meeting 12-09-2020

Meeting called to order at 6:01 pm

Attendance: Martha Horst, Wade Nichols, Gregory Braswell, Todd Stewart, Sam Catanzaro, Kyle Smith, Rachel Hockenberry, Jalyn Jones, Bahae Samhan, Rodrigo Villalobos

Guests: Carla Birckelbaw, Craig Jackson

**1. Approval of November 18th 6-0**

**2. Reinstatement Committee Policy:** A few revisions were under consideration with the most significant being the removal of three student members. Catanzaro raised the point that the sensitivity of issues and timeliness of decisions were main reasons behind recommendation. The committee composition is similar to Leave of Absence Committee. Both deal with sensitive/personal information. Stewart asked if similar committee compositions are found on other committees that deal with important matters, such as the Hearing Panel. Catanzaro offered that no other committees are truly comparable because these two committees deal with sensitive issues like finances, health, and personal issues beyond campus conduct while the other committees tend to evaluate on-campus conduct. Horst pointed out that the Review and Reinstatement Committee sometimes deals with matters that involve police reports which seem highly personal and Braswell agreed that it seemed to be a fair comparison.

Other revisions that were discussed and considered included:

Change name in title (University College) Retention Services- Amy Rosen

Change Fine Arts to Wonsook Kim College of Fine Arts

Propose to add two ex officio members with understanding of admissions process, presumably academic advisors

Clarifying language about what the committee responsibilities and functions

After discussion, the proposed revisions were to keep the existing number of students on the committee, to clarify the committee functions, and to add two academic advisors. Vote: 8-0

**3. Mass Communications Policy:** Craig Jackson and Carla Birckelbaw were present to answer questions

The general structure of the policy was discussed, followed by a section-by-section review

Policy Statement serves as a general overview of the policy, the Procedures section is more specific with respect to how communications may occur, and the Purpose section makes clear that the changes only applied to email mass communications

Stewart asked if limiting policy to email mean that we limit other forms of mass communication and Jackson replied that the policy does not restrict how instructors communicate with current students; the policy is only about mass communications by University. No intention of impeding academic function

Scope-defines mass communication. One email getting out to a large group at one time. The revision of the policy also afforded an opportunity to clean up language that does not apply to current system.

Horst asked if people from President’s Office in the loop. They initiated revision of the policy, but their language was not used.

Part III change wording to make parallel. Add link to cited policy. Capitalize Policy consistently

Horst asked who decides who is on Mass Communications Guidance Council. Jackson stated that those are listed in Audience of section of procedures. Sometimes a mass communication needs to go to multiple groups, so multiple people with authority need to approve. VPs and President appoint people to council. Designee communicates with appropriate groups about decision if mass communication is warranted in each situation. Council is operational group to assure consistency in decisions. Horst also asked how the policy distinguish between faculty and instructors. Jackson said that Faculty means tenured and tenure track and Instructors means anyone else who teaches courses. Horst offered that it seems a bit vague in the policy and should be worded to reflect description given. A brief discussion regarding why communication with parents was under the Students section of the policy. This is because parents would be contacted regarding matters that affect students. Students could choose not to enter parental contact information if they want. There are separate policies for mass communications using information from the database and appropriate use and access to the database itself.

New Part IV-Campus Emergency Notification. Jackson indicated that this clarifies

the definition of Campus Emergency. Horst suggested adding the policy number for the Policy on Emergency Alert and Response (5.1.15).

Part V: Smaller Campus Community Audiences. Jackson said that this portion of the policy allows for smaller populations not previously defined to be ascertained from data and reached as a group as situations demand. For example, students of a college. Horst offered that Targeted audiences may be a more precise term.

Parts VI & VII:

Part VI clarifies situations with instructors communicating with students. Tech solutions would like to have discussions about instructors with large classes on options for group communications. Section VII is in regards to opting out of surveys under discussion.

Jackson clarified that current University policy is everyone is automatically in and there is no opt in or out.

Parts VIII, IX, X:

Horst suggested making the URL an active link. In complaints, it seems like CIO handles complaints. Will Council be involved in the process. Jackson clarified that CIO could send it to Council for input/approval.

At the end of the discussion it was decided that both groups would consider revisions and have a follow-up discussion before a vote.

**4. CGE Committee Revisions:**

Horst reminded committee members of proposed wording provided to the committee by Stewart and asked if Nichols had wording for his informal suggestion of a supermajority vote to approve non-faculty committee chairpersons. Nichols explained that he no longer held that view and withdrew his suggestion for a supermajority vote standard.

Meeting Adjourned at 6:54 pm