

**Planning and Finance Committee Meeting Agenda**  
**Wednesday, March 25th, 2026**  
**6:00 pm**  
**Founder's Suite (west side), Bone Student Center**

**Call to Order (6:00pm)**

**Roll Call**

In Attendance	Absent
Blanco Lobo	
Bonnell	
Marshack	
Cutting	
Nelson	
Pettit	
Stoner	
Paolucci	
Figueroa-Fragoso	
Polifka	
Torry	
Porter	
Senator Braden Beasley	

---

**Public Comment**

1. No public comment

---

**Order of Business**

1. Approval of Committee Minutes from 3-4-26 (minutes attached in email)
  - Approve minutes with corrections
    - i. 1<sup>st</sup> Pettit
    - ii. 2<sup>nd</sup> Figueroa-Fragoso
2. Policy 9.2 – Committee recaps latest 9.2 edits in response to senate and GC feedback. Quick discussion on strategy for chaperoning 9.2 back through the Senate
  - Main Discussion: Policy 9.2 (Section D)

- i. Presenter: Senator Beasley
- Key Concerns Raised:
  - i. Policy 9.2 may lack sufficient procedural safeguards.
  - ii. Concerns about potential Fourth Amendment violations related to:
    - 1. Searching student files (e.g., OneDrive access)
    - 2. Lack of clear authorization procedures
    - 3. No required documentation or audit trail
  - iii. Risk of misuse by university personnel due to unclear guidelines
  - iv. Concern about:
    - 1. Who can authorize searches
    - 2. When searches can occur
    - 3. How searches are documented
  - v. Add structured framework for:
    - 1. Authorization
    - 2. Documentation
    - 3. Accountability
  - vi. Additional Concerns:
    - 1. Potential misuse of automated systems (e.g., algorithm-based flagging)
    - 2. Student privacy risks due to:
      - a. OneDrive integration with personal devices
      - b. Lack of student awareness about data storage
- Committee Discussion
  - i. Debate over whether policy violates legal standards.
  - ii. Clarification:
    - 1. Some members stated current policy aligns with Fourth Amendment protections.
    - 2. Disagreement over interpretation of legal precedent.
  - iii. Concerns raised about:
    - 1. Over-reliance on legal arguments vs. policy clarity
    - 2. Whether additional language is necessary or redundant
  - iv. Key Themes:
    - 1. Trust in university procedures vs. need for explicit safeguards
    - 2. Legal compliance vs. policy clarity
    - 3. Student privacy vs. institutional authority
- Legal Review
  - i. General Counsel has reviewed updated policy language.
  - ii. Latest feedback (received same day) indicates support for revisions.
- Policy Updates Summary
  - i. Expanded to clarify user rights and university access
  - ii. Added procedural language for investigations
  - iii. Strengthened privacy protections and constitutional alignment
- Move this version of the draft to exec.
  - i. 1<sup>st</sup> Marshack
  - ii. 2<sup>nd</sup> Figueroa-Fragoso
- Next Steps

- i. Policy to be sent to Executive Committee.
    1. Planned for:
      - a. Further review
      - b. Possible placement on next Senate agenda (April 6 meeting)
    2. Current Senate presentation will remain an information item.
  - Additional Notes
    - i. Policy revision tied to audit findings; delays may result in continued compliance issues.
    - ii. Related policies (e.g., 1.7) should be reviewed for alignment.
- 

**3. Policy 1.7 (Use of Equipment for Surveillance) – Committee continues to discuss structural questions and policy revision tied to where 1.7**

Questions we examined at our last meeting 3-4-26:

- Should the policy be moved from the 1.x (campus conduct) section to the 5.x (health and safety) section?
  - Should the policy scope be transferred from Senate to non-Senate?
  - If the policy is to be transferred from Senate to non-Senate, should the current policy be updated or retired?
- 

**4. Adjourn (6:52)**

- 1<sup>st</sup> Paolucci
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Stoner