

Student Rules & Regulations Committee

November 1, 2024
3:00 PM-5:00 PM
Koldus 110/Zoom Meeting



November 1, 2024 Minutes

Approval of 10.4.24 minutes

Move to accept minutes by Chris Cherry, seconded by Brandon Rea, motion passes with clear majority by a show of hands

Voting members in attendance: Eshani Yeragi, Jacob Becker, Chris Cherry, Rob Rahm, Delisa Falks, Brandon Rea, Kendyl Turner, Angie Hill Price, Trent Smith, Corbitt Armstrong, Reese McDonald, Katherine Holder subbing for Jennifer Lightfoot, Heather Klein, Grace Townsend

Non-voting members in attendance: Blair Alvarado, Neil Golemo, Lori Moore, Shelby Hearn

Dr. Harrell updated status of Rules 18.1.5, 7.3.1.1, 7.3.1.5. Approved on October 14th FS meeting to move forward through Provost Office to the President's Office. When signed and we receive notification, will update on the student rule site.

Rule 14.2: Degree Requirements: Clarification by Trent Smith regarding this portion "to fulfill degree requirements taken at another college or university must be provided to **the office of the registrar**" of the student rule. Trent Smith spoke with Ben Milum, from Registrar's Office, and in very rare instances will this apply to a graduate student. Opting to leave it as the "**office of the registrar.**" If a graduate student situation occurs, the Registrar's Office will forward to the Office of Graduate and Professional Studies.

Grammatical change: "student being removed" to "removal of the student"

Discussion regarding the need to indicate a time frame in the last sentence: comments for and against, no decision made, will go back to submitter for approval or not.

Discussion regarding "deadlines set in this student rule." Is this talking about 14.2 or somewhere else in Rule 14? Comment made to request specific rule number.

Decision: Appears to be bigger issues for discussion. Moved to table until next month's meeting by Chris Cherry, seconded by Jacob Becker. Motion carried by a show of hands.

After discussion of Rule 20 began, Trent Smith shared 14.5 is the rule that indicates the deadline when students must have all grades entered.

Rule 20: Academic Misconduct, Not voting on this today because more work is needed

Discussion: Conversation turned over to Heather Klein to update full committee regarding discussion of subcommittee and any philosophical issues that need input from full committee.

Heather Klein gave the floor to the submitter to provide updates on this rule.

Submitter stated that many of the edits were capitalization, and verbiage when referring to graduate or undergraduate students. These edits did not change the rule but provided clarity.

Shift of conversation to philosophical issues over grammatical edits.

20.1.1.2: Initial conversations with full committee related to **the staff involvement and clarifying the role of staff within the Honor Council.** Added clarifying language: HSO staff may serve as non-voting committee chairs. Submitter will make the change.

Student Rules & Regulations Committee

November 1, 2024

3:00 PM-5:00 PM

Koldus 110/Zoom Meeting



20.1.1.4: Minimum syllabus requirements, Initial conversations with full committee regarding putting the burden of proof on faculty pertaining to academic dishonesty.

Heather Klein is still of the opinion this is not an appropriate place for instructions to faculty. But where else would it go? Possibly things in progress for it to exist on VPSA website.

Rob Rahm concurs with Heather Klein, but a broader concern he has is this: is it common for instructions to faculty to exist within student rules? If so, he is not a proponent of that. R&R Chair stated it is common to provide expectations/boundaries for students in multiple places. Rob Rahm feels this is different in that it is a specific instruction to a faculty member about what goes in the syllabus. He feels there are other channels for that and that student rules platform is not it.

Decision: Not voting on this but submitter wants it in the rule, the Rules & Regs committee expresses concerns with it being in this rule. The Faculty Senate will weigh in on it, Provost Office and President will determine how to interpret it. Comment made on red-line document: **members of the committee wish for this portion of the proposed rule to not be included.**

20.1.2.2.1: Should the use of Chat Gpt or other AI services be explicitly mentioned, this connects with

20.1.2.2.2: There are two primary vocabulary terms **large language models and generative AI,**

Decision: both terms were included in 10.1.2.2.2 Fabrication

20.1.4.7: To what GPA does this refer?

Decision: Language edited to say "All applicable GPAs"

20.2.3.3: First bulleted point, What is meant by "except for the initial appointments?"

Decision: Removed phrase in question from the rule to make it read "**Members' terms are two years.**"

20.2.4.2: Question regarding **waiting period if the allegation is delivered on paper (no wait period) vs email (waiting period of 5 days for a response),** needing clarification.

Decision: Language edited to make sure everybody understands the written communication is email. This also applies to 20.2.4.3 where "in writing" implies faculty is handing them paper vs email.

20.2.4.3 Step 8: Honor Council hearing panel consists of 2 students and 2 faculty staff.

Decision: Clarified the staff role

20.2.5.2: clarification needed regarding "in writing" vs email notification..

Decision: Email is considered written communication.

20.2.5.3: Question regarding the sentence that says "...findings of responsibility and sanctions that do not include separation..." this section is for appeals where separation is the only sanction

Decision: The sentence in question will be removed since the title of this section is Appeals of Separation from the University.

10.2.4.1: Discussion with submitter regarding the advisor section of the rule about parents who are attorneys: committee had asked for that language to be added and the submitter wished for that language not to be present. Concern that students whose parents are attorneys could be at an advantage, when in fact, the process should be equitable no matter the occupation of the advisor.

Decision: Comment made on red-line copy of rule stating the above. Submitter clarified that a family member, who is an attorney, could still serve as an advisor.

Student Rules & Regulations Committee

November 1, 2024

3:00 PM-5:00 PM

Koldus 110/Zoom Meeting



Subcommittee will go through remainder of Rule 20, submit the red-line copy by Friday, November 22 so that the entire committee has time to review for the December 6 meeting. Dr. Harrell thanked subcommittee for their work on helping to clean up Rule 20.

Eshani Yeragi submitted/suggested the possibility that closed book, in-person exams/quizzes proctored by the professor would eliminate the majority of academic misconduct. Academic misconduct affects more than just exams. Discussion back and forth regarding using resources and that knowledge about how to use resources is essential. The challenge is complex involving all participants: Faculty, students, staff. Submitter added that Student Rule 20 is written in such a way that students know that all works will be completed individually unless otherwise noted by the instructor.

Heather Klein moved to adjourn. Seconded. Meeting adjourned at 3:50 pm.