May 2, 2025 3:00 PM-5:00 PM Koldus 110/Zoom Meeting



Rules & Regulations Minutes 5.2.25 NO QUORUM

1. Review and approval of Minutes for 2.7.25 | TAB 2

No changes to Feb. minutes

2. Tabled Rules for Review

a) Rule 7.2.2.10 - Attendance | TAB 3

Updates and changes to rule are much broader to cover other donations than just blood stem cell. Discussion back and forth on if this is sufficient for faculty member to excuse voluntary absence or is it already covered under 7.2.2.10. Submitter's goal is to make voluntary donor absences easier for faculty to excuse without donor being forced to go over professor's head by going to the dean. Submitter responded to a question and explained that pre-donation/donation activities are scheduled by the transplant service and verifiable documentation would come from them.

Discussion: about whether an organ donor would be absent more than the 25% attendance threshold required per semester. Other committee members don't see this as an issue. Discussion back and forth on whether this rule proposal is for too specific an activity, other comments expressed appreciation for the broader wording. No further discussion

Dr. Harrell: Requested clarification regarding committees for the Faculty Senate related to rules on quorum and voting. Concerned about action on all the rules on the agenda considering summer is here. The university rule has other ways to potentially move things forward. Also, for submitters, where does committee stand on proposed rules. Is there a way to move forward to Faculty Senate with no quorum.

Discussion: Comment was made that a digital vote would be recognized as valid. Concern raised because those not present wouldn't have the benefit of the discussion. Discussion turned to potentially changing the day and time of the meetings. In the interim, possibly devise proposal to get quorum in the summertime, or if a rule has been discussed twice and different people have heard the discussion, then consider e-voting.

Dr. Harrell: Does committee feel comfortable voting on the rules that have been heard twice since there has been committee member overlap?

Discussion: Committee not comfortable with the suggestion. Possibly follow practice of Senate and excuse absences during the summer. Committee members must notify of absence in advance so they wouldn't be counted toward the quorum for that particular meeting. Or make this a year-round practice to account for business travel.

Dr. Harrell: Shared that a Teams team will be created to have some of this discussion electronically and to share documents with the committee.

Discussion: Considering July 4th, If there is no quorum in June, these rules won't go to Faculty Senate until September.

Dr. Harrell: will schedule a special meeting in May to discuss and vote on current proposed rules, excused absence policy for committee members.

b) Rule 24.5 - Bias-Related Violations | TAB 4

Committee members are satisfied with addition of sentence at the end of the rule in place: This rule may only be applied by the office responsible for managing Civil Rights cases involving student respondents.

c) Rule 5.2.3 – Change of Curriculum | TAB 5

Submitter inquired about the process to withdraw this proposal but did not act on it. No update submitted from April meeting, not a lot of support from the committee, this seemed to be a one-off situation better handled individually rather than with a rule change.

May 2, 2025 3:00 PM-5:00 PM Koldus 110/Zoom Meeting



d) Rule 11 – Distinguished Students | TAB 6

Dr. Harrell: Invited Jule Kuder, ADA Coordinator, to address any appeals of this policy related to individuals with disabilities. She was not able to attend. A request for a statement or information on how she makes determinations was made. None was submitted.

Dr. Dulin: asked about specific federal guidance, that A&M is required to comply with, that possibly prohibits/clashes with the proposed rule change. Many other universities follow federal guidelines and are able to accommodate this wording.

Response: There would be an accommodation with the proper documentation.

Clarification on previous discussion: Going through ADA coordinator to request this accommodation is onerous on the student who has already been given accommodations through Disability Resources.

What are next best steps to get favorable wording to get this rule moved forward. Alternative viewpoint: this is an additional accommodation. it is not inappropriate for student requesting this accommodation to have to take an extra step to be considered for distinguished student with less than 15 hours.

Discussion: Submitter reached out to ADA Coordinator who was not open to an appeal on her decision. Submitter is welcome to contact the Title IX Office.

Dr. Harrell: Resulting conflict between the criteria/threshold being asked for and information (maximum hours a student is able to take) a physician is willing to give. Get Julie Kuder's perspective on this ruling. Jacob Becker would like to be part of this conversation.

e) Rule 57.6.1 – Undergraduate Academic Appeals Panel | TAB 7

The Dean of the graduate school sees no issues changing this rule from three to five days. No further questions or comments

f) Rule 8.3 – Examinations | TAB 8

No discussion/comments on this, Dr. Moore would really try to get this moving forward for fall academic calendar before faculty starts putting syllabi together and distributing to students.

Dr. Harrell: Based on the urgency of this rule proposal, as well as the other five rules that have been on the agenda for two months, a special committee meeting is needed

4.) New Business

a) Rule 24.4.25 - Stalking | TAB 9

Question: Why was this removed initially?

Discussion: At the CRT9 inception (previously CREI), all cases pertaining to sexual harassment including stalking, were handed over in the system policy. Putting it back in student rules to cover stalking that isn't covered in CRT9, applies to students who stalk faculty, staff, students, community members, based on respondent, not the complainant. The complainant does not have to be related to the university.

Changes to the proposed rule were suggested to submitter to make the citation to the regulation and to the rule for sex based behaviors read: **See this Regulation Rule...** just in case the language changes at any given time. Submitter agreed to make those changes.

b) Rule 15 – Graduation with Latin Honors | TAB 10

Discussion: comment made not in support due to less than half 120 hours. This could be viewed as a nuanced argument. A transfer student, with under 75 hours, is admissible to the university but not eligible for Latin Honors. Put it on the Academic Depts to say if you want Latin Honors you need 60 hrs at A&M. No further comments.

May 2, 2025 3:00 PM-5:00 PM Koldus 110/Zoom Meeting



c) Rule 57.4.2 and 57.6.3 - Undergraduate Appeals Panel | TAB 11

Comment: As some departments have departmental review, it is helpful include this rule change proposal. It's explicit and beneficial to students. No further comments.

5.) Other

a) Discussion on permanent date/time rescheduling for Rules & Regs Committee

- i) Dr. Harrell will have conversations with GPSG & SGA Presidents on lack of student attendance at these meetings. She was forthcoming with students regarding responsibilities on this committee. No explicit rules on how the committee is run, possibly change that
- ii) Moving it off the first Friday of the month, moving the time, put together a survey offering alternative days/times, Comment was made that there is a great deal of ambiguity when it comes to the definition of the Rules and Regulations Committee: who votes, etc. A discussion should take place with Senate/RR committee members and some RR committee members. A special task force will be formed to address this issue.
- iii) Dr. Harrell recapped: special meeting in May to discuss day/time change, conversations with SGA and GPSG to address chronic student absence, excused absence policy

Meeting adjourned 4:20pm, No quorum



May 2, 2025 3:00 PM-5:00 PM Koldus 110/Zoom Meeting

Notes/Action Items: