Present: Anderson, Boschetti, Brandt, Brewick, Caplan, Chung, Couture (Boise), Crowley (w/o vote), Dallas, Flores, Folwell, Foster, Godfrey (Coeur d’Alene), Hiromoto (Idaho Falls), Hrdlicka, LaPrath, Latrell, Murphy, Staciesiak, Stevenson for Wiencek (w/o vote).

Absent: Adams, Barbour, Brown, Jeffery, Mahoney, Nicotra, Perret, Stoll (w/o vote), Teal, Wiencek (w/o vote), Wolf. Guests: 3

Vice Chair Brandt (in Chair Teal’s absence) called meeting #24 to order at 3:32. A motion (Chung/Folwell) to approve the minutes from the March 29th meeting passed without objection.

Chair’s Report: Vice-Chair Brandt reminded Senators of the need to have an election for new Senators and send the results to Ann Thompson by April 15th. She also introduced the new Senator from GPSA, Amanda Staciesiak.

Provost’s Report: Vice Provost Jeanne Stevenson reported that Athena presented its Women of the Year awards last night. Dean Cori Mantle-Bromley received the award for Administrator, Professor Holly Wichman received the Faculty award, and Mary Stout the Staff award. It was a nice event recognizing the contributions of these women to the University. Vice Provost Stevenson announced the deadline for completing the workplace modules had been extended to the end of April. She also encouraged people to visit the renovations of the 1st floor of the Library. As a final comment she called our attention to the variety of programs and showcases on campus in April. Participating in these events provides an interesting perspective to better understand the complexity and diversity of the University.

A Senator noted that while the deadline for completion of most of the workplace modules had been extended the deadline for the “Our Inclusive Community” module had not been extended. Those who completed that module last year are not required to repeat it, but all others need to complete it in order to receive a salary increase. Another Senator asked if there was a way to know which workplace modules had been completed. There is a list by college, but as a Senator pointed out these are not always up-to-date.

Ombuds: Chair Brandt introduced new Ombuds Barbara Beatty. She comes to the UI from Texas where she was the Deputy Resolution Officer in the Department of Public Safety. Ms. Beatty expressed her delight in being at the University of Idaho. This is her 2nd day and she is trying to get settled in. She noted that the Ombuds Office at the UI is very well established. She is open to suggestions from people regarding what types of activities with which she might get involved. She reminded everyone that conversations with the Ombuds are confidential and she is here for everyone and the door is always open.

Student Code Task Force: FS-16-056: FSH 2400—Disciplinary Process for Violations of Student Code; FS-16-058: FSH 1640.93—Student Disciplinary Review Board; FS-16-058: FSH 1640.83—Student Appeal Committee. Professor Brandt noted that as co-chair of the task force (with Don Crowley) she was introducing a series of proposed revisions. The task force has been meeting throughout the year and has been considering more comprehensive revisions. However, it has become apparent that the more comprehensive revisions cannot get done by the end of this academic year. It is thought that a more comprehensive revision will be prepared by the Office of General Counsel and the Dean of Students Office over the summer and brought to the Senate next fall. The targeted changes brought forward today are designed to smooth out the current process while other changes are being considered. Professor Brandt summarized the proposed changes as follows:

- Removing the role of the Faculty Senate Leadership screening of appeals.
- Cleaning up the language for the standard of review.
- Clarifying the “preponderance of the evidence” standard.
- Implementing the Student Appeals Committee created earlier.
- Permitting the SDRB to consider cases in panels of three to be appointed by the chair.
Questions raised by Senators included:

- **Is it still the case that DOS can appeal a decision from the SDRB?** Professor Brandt noted that this is still the case and is required in Title IX cases.

- **To what extent can we ensure gender balance on the Student Appeals Committee?** Professor Crowley stated that Committee on Committee’s would be in a better position to try to achieve gender balance on the newly created Student Appeals Committee. Under the current circumstances, Senate Leadership is dependent on a smaller group of volunteers from the Senate who already have very busy schedules. Professor Brandt noted that gender balance was important in some cases, but probably couldn’t be assured in all cases.

- **Is there any mechanism for appeals past the Student Appeals Committee?** It is possible for a student to appeal to the President of the University.

- **What is the composition of the Student Appeals Committee?** The proposed revisions call for an **twelve** [N.B. correction to membership as noted is needed] person committee which would include six faculty (2 from the Faculty Senate), two staff, and three students.

- **What is the standard of review at the appellate level?** These are found in C-6-b. The Student Appeals Committee would have five grounds upon which they could grant the appeal.

- **Is there any place in which reasonable sanctions are defined?** Professor Brandt stated that the possible sanctions are laid out in detail, although it is true that it is difficult to have an objective definition of what constitutes an “excessive sanction” in any particular case.

- **A Senator stated that there doesn’t appear to be any clear way for the Student Appeals Committee to implement an “educational sanction.”** Professor Crowley noted that this is something that should be looked into in future drafts.

- **Would psychological counseling be something that could be required?** The answer was that this might be possible, but it is difficult to monitor something of this nature.

- **Could we look at allowing some flexibility, or discretion, in applying the administrative fee?** This is something that could be looked at in the future.

A Senator suggested that the standard of review offered in C-2 b-2 was inconsistent and should be revised. The proposed revision was to change this section to read “DOS’ finding of a violation of the code is not supported by the preponderance of the evidence.” A motion (Couture/Folwell) to revise C-2 b-2 in the manner stated above passed 16-0-2.

The Chair asked if the Senate was ready to vote on the proposed revisions. There were no objections to proceeding to a vote. A motion (Flores/Folwell) to approve the proposed revisions for FSH 2400 as amended passed unanimously.

It was then moved (Flores/Folwell) to approve the proposed revisions to the SDRB (1640.93). This motion passed 16-0-2. Finally a motion (Folwell/Brewick) to approve the revisions to the Student Appeals Committee (1640.83) passed without objection. [N.B. correction to total membership as noted above of twelve should be revised to eleven.]

Vice Chair Brandt thanked the Senate for their support in passing these revisions.

**Adjournment:** With no other business before the Senate a motion (Folwell/Latrice) to adjourn passed unanimously at 4:15.

Respectfully submitted,

Don Crowley, Faculty Secretary and Secretary to the Faculty Senate