Planning and Finance Committee

Date & Time: October 22, 2025

Chair: Aaron Paolucci

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 5:00 p.m. The Chair welcomed members back and noted that the meeting was being recorded for the minutes.

Attendance

Present	Absent
Senator Blanco-Lobo (CAS Faculty)	Senator Blum (Student Senator)
Senator Bonnell (MIL Faculty, Senate Chair)	AVP Polifka (VP Student Affairs Designee)
Senator Figueroa Fragoso (Student Senator)	
Senator Marshack (WKCFA Faculty)	
Senator Torry (CAST Faculty)	
Senator Porter (CS Representative)	
Senator Paolucci (WKCFA Faculty)(Committee Chair)	
Senator Stoner (Student Senator)	
Senator Pettit (Student Senator)	
VP Nelson (VPFP)(non-voting)	
Dr.Cutting (Provost Designee)(non-voting)	

Guest: Chief Information Security Officer (CISO): Dan Taube

The Chair confirmed that the meeting had quorum.

3. Approval of Minutes

Approval of the previous meeting's minutes was **deferred**. The committee agreed to consolidate and review minutes from the last and current meetings for approval at the next session.

4. Public Comment

No public comments were received.

5. Discussion Item 9.2 – IT Acceptable Use Policy (Draft 2025 Revision)

Overview

The committee continued review of the IT Acceptable Use Policy draft. The Chair noted this was a continuation of the previous meeting's discussion. Discussion items were reordered to allow certain members to leave early.

Discussion Summary

- The committee revisited prior feedback using the "red, yellow, green" priority method.
- Members clarified that "red" items indicated non-acceptable language, but no such items remained; focus was on "yellow" (needs clarification) items.
- Clarification was made regarding the policy's treatment of students vs. employees, particularly in reference to personal use and political activity.
- Discussion included whether policy sections should be divided (e.g., separate policies for email use, Canvas, or library resources) or remain unified. The group agreed that while modular policies could aid usability, the current policy should remain consolidated for consistency with university format.
- Several members raised the need for **plain-language clarity** and **readability** to improve accessibility for general users.
- The committee discussed fraudulent and unethical communication definitions. It was clarified that the language originated from OGC (Office of General Counsel) and should not be altered without legal review.
- Members raised a question about the clause "no expectation of privacy," noting potential conflicts with FERPA and GDPR. The committee agreed to flag this section for

legal clarification.

• It was also agreed to identify sections requiring **legal review** explicitly within the draft (particularly communication definitions and privacy statements).

Process and Next Steps

- **Dan** will produce a **clean revised draft** incorporating all previously addressed comments and removing redundant markup.
- The committee agreed that once finalized, the document will be reviewed by Legal Counsel and the Office of General Counsel before submission to the full Senate.
- The committee will provide a **summary sheet** comparing the 2020 and 2025 versions (highlighting key structural and policy changes) to accompany the Senate presentation.
- Outdated or duplicate versions of the draft stored in SharePoint and Teams will be reviewed and removed for clarity.
- The revised document will ultimately be sent to the University Council following committee approval.

Decision:

- Dan to finalize a clean draft version.
- Legal sections flagged for review.
- Summary of major changes to be prepared for Senate presentation.
- Committee to review the clean draft at next meeting for final vote.

6. Discussion Item – 2024–2025 Priorities Report (Follow-Up)

The Chair introduced discussion of the 2024–25 priorities report, referencing outstanding questions from the previous year related to the **College of Engineering relocation to GE Road**.

Outstanding Questions and Points of Inquiry

- 1. **Design Carryover:** Which elements of the previous John Green design will carry over into the GE Road location?
- 2. **Financial Analysis:** What financial analysis justified the change in location, and what were the projected costs?
- 3. **Transportation Costs:** What will be the annual cost and operational plan for bus service to GE Road?
- 4. **Operational Costs:** What are the projected building operating costs compared to John Green or Carter Harris?
- 5. **Space Planning:** What administrative and research functions will occupy the GE Road facility?
- 6. **Scheduling Impact:** How will block scheduling affect student movement between campuses?

Discussion Summary

- Angela noted that these questions were carried over from the previous year for continued tracking and follow-up.
- Cooper and other members agreed the committee's goal is to document **progress** reports rather than wait for complete answers.
- **VP Nelson** reported that negotiations are ongoing with **Connect Transit** to establish 20–30 minute bus intervals between main campus and the GE Road site, with estimated costs between \$200,000–\$400,000 annually.
- The committee noted that the **Provost's Office** is analyzing **block scheduling impacts**, with results anticipated in Spring 2026.
- **Discussion of space allocation** included administrative and research space planning, to be coordinated with the **Space Planning Committee**.
- **Angela** emphasized that future reports should consolidate answers and new data into the 2025–26 priorities report.

Action Items:

- **VP Nelson** to follow up with **Josh Crowder** to coordinate responses to outstanding questions.
- Identify which questions fall outside of Facilities or Finance purview for targeted follow-up.
- Chair to compile updated progress notes for the March report submission.

7. Adjournment

With no further business, a motion to adjourn was made by Marshack and seconded by Figueroa.

Vote: Motion passed unanimously.

Adjourned at: 6:50 p.m.