

# BFC Student Affairs Committee 2024-2025

## Meeting Minutes

### Meeting 01

September 20, 2024

2:00 pm to 3:00 pm

[Zoom Link](#)

Meeting ID: 846 1379 1073

**SAC Charge:** The Student Affairs Committee considers such matters as establishing and maintaining the best possible student-faculty relations, receiving, and reviewing communications regarding student problems and issues, advising the various offices and agencies of the University regarding student affairs.

#### **SAC Members:**

Co-chairs:

Bryant Paul, The Media School and Catherine Sherwood-Laughlin, School of Public Health

#### **Members:**

Denvil Duncan, School of Public and Environmental Affairs

Heather Eastman-Mueller, School of Public Health - Applied Health Science

Chase Gamblin, Eskenazi School of Art, Architecture + Design

Robert Gonyea, School of Education

Marty Pieratt, Kelley School of Business

Willa Liburd Tavernier Libraries

Veronica Salama, IU Student Government Representative

Jenny Koo, GPSG Representative

#### **Ex-Officio Members:**

David Daleke, Vice Provost for Graduate Education

Lamar Hylton, Vice Provost for Student Life

Kathy Adams Riester, Associate Vice Provost and Dean of Students

Jeff Rutherford, Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs Graduate School

Libby Spotts, Senior Associate Dean of Students, Office of Student Conduct

#### **Attendees:**

Bryant Paul, Catherine Sherwood-Laughlin, Denvil Duncan, Heather Eastman-Mueller, Chase Gamblin, Bob Gonyea, Veronica Salama, Jenny Koo, David Daleke, Kathy Adams Riester, Jeff Rutherford, Anna Krause, and David Taylor

### **Agenda**

#### **Welcome and Announcements**

#### **Approval of Agenda**

Motion to Approve: Bryant Paul

2<sup>nd</sup> Denvil Duncan

Vote All in favor of the Agenda

#### **Review of SAC 2023-2024 Accomplishments**

#### **Rollover SAC 2023-2024 Assignments**

1. Reviewing the number of appeals, taking into specific consideration the length of time it can take a student to complete all appeal options.
2. Reviewing the size of the campus board of review for each case. Specifically considering the time and coordination to establish a board and how that may contribute to delays in the process for the student.
3. Establish a process for summer.

4. Explore if student members could extend beyond the groups identified in the procedures if trained appropriately.

## **2024-2025 SAC Assignments**

1. Collaborate with IUSG to explore and report on syllabus-posting policy requirements and the feasibility of a syllabus clearinghouse for students. (See [Syllabi Course Material Resolution](#))
2. Establish a working group with student leaders to create a best practice guide for how to incorporate student voices into committees that often only have one or two students representing the entire student population.
3. Collaborate with EPC and Long-Range Planning around discussions focused on re-envisioning general education, first-year experience, and experiential learning programs.

## **New Business (non-SAC Assignments)**

## **Old Business Updates (non-SAC Assignments)**

**Next Meeting** – Friday, October 18, 2024, 2:00 pm to 3:00 pm

## **Agenda Item Discussions**

### **Discussion: Updates on SAC Assignments**

*Catherine reviewed the 2023-2024 SAC accomplishments and carry over assignment for the 2024-2025 SAC to address:*

## **2023-2024 SAC Assignments**

1. Establishing a clear distinction between which campus offices have the responsibility to hear graduate and undergraduate cases. **COMPLETED**
2. Moving the graduate level cases from the VPFAA Office to the Dean of the Graduate School and VP of Graduate Education and Health Sciences Office. **COMPLETED**
3. Reviewing the [number of appeals](#), taking into specific consideration the length of time it can take a student to complete all appeal options.
4. Reviewing the size of the [campus board of review](#) for each case. Specifically considering the time and coordination to establish a board and how that may contribute to delays in the process for the student.
5. Establish a process for summer.
6. Explore if student members could extend beyond the groups identified in the procedures if trained appropriately.

### **Discussion: 2024-2025 SAC Assignments**

**Collaborate with IUSG to explore and report on syllabus-posting policy requirements and the feasibility of a syllabus clearinghouse for students.** (See [Syllabi Course Material Resolution](#))

Information Shared with Danielle DeSawal by IU undergraduate student, Leo Cavinder in an email 8/29/2024:

Simple Syllabus: <https://simplesyllabus.com/>, used at Valparaiso University

Harvard University uses Simple Syllabus and require that basic course information be available to students prior to registration of classes and that the full syllabus must be available by the first day of classes (a week before classes I would believe is ideal to cut down on the drop/add week). See their policy for faculty:

<https://infoforfaculty.fas.harvard.edu/book/course-materialssyllabi>

- Faculty must provide basic syllabus information in Canvas ahead of each registration period to help students select their courses. Faculty do not need to provide a full syllabus at the time of Registration, but should provide general information about the course that will help students decide to enroll in the course such as: format, assessment type, grading, absence, and late work policies etc. A full syllabus must be in Canvas by the start of term.
- No substantial changes in the workload or calendar of a course should be made after the open add/drop deadline at the start of term.

## Discussion

- *Not everyone uses Canvas-may refer to LMS that faculty may use*
- *IUB doesn't require Canvas to be used by faculty*
- *Concerns about posting old/previous syllabi- potential course changes*
- *How much information would students like to help them make a decision? What information should be made available to students in the schedule of classes? Is the schedule of classes the place to post this information.*
- *Summer responsibilities for faculty (10-month appointments) not conducive to get syllabus posted for fall semester*
- *IUSG Annual Data Survey-may not send out this year, but could implement a survey about what they want to know in advance to make decisions about courses*
- *Students use the grade distribution data to determine courses/professors- should the university make these data public?*
- *Semester Guidelines <https://vpfaa.indiana.edu/resources/start-of-semester.html>*

### Action Items and Responsible:

**Action Item:** *Veronica will provide a report at the next SAC meeting- progress on this resolution, review other university policies, survey*

**Action Item:** *SAC to consider the timing to post course information for student review*

**Action Item:** *What vital information do students need to make a decision?*

### Response From Executive Committee 9/24/24

**Action Item:** *Look at the wording of GPSG resolution that ended up on start of semester guide - This was done as a push from graduate students and ended up desired by undergrads*

**Action Item:** *Look at the online course requirements (may require posting syllabus on Canvas a certain number of days prior to the start of semester)*

**MEETING ENDED HERE—NO OTHER TOPICS WERE DISCUSSED-----**

**Establish a working group with student leaders to create a best practice guide for how to incorporate student voices into committees that often only have one or two students representing the entire student population.**

[Collaborating with Students](#): Student Voices Initiative

**Collaborate with [EPC](#) and [Long-Range Planning](#) around discussions focused on re-envisioning general education, first-year experience, and experiential learning programs.**

**Educational Policies Committee:** develops campus policies concerning teaching, curriculum, student information, and related areas and monitors and consults with administrative offices connected with enrollment.  
Co-Chairs: Andrea Need, O'Neill SPEA & Mehmet Dalkilic, Luddy SIC

2024-2025 Assignment: Collaborate with SAC and FAC to gather additional feedback on the OCQ Study to then synthesize recommendations in a report to the BFC.

**Long Range Planning Committee** systematically monitors the Bloomington campus environment affecting teaching, research, and faculty status and alerts the Bloomington Faculty Council to significant strategic issues that can be expected to affect faculty interests.

Co-chairs: Colin Johnson, Gender Studies & American Studies, & Vasti Torres, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education

2024-2025 Assignment: The focus of the long-range planning committee will be to take the General Education Task Force Report (Spring 2024) and explore the following questions for redefining general education at IUB.

- a. What is the right mix of GenEd-required credits and academic major requirements?
- b. How can the campus incorporate the elements for a First Year Experience from the 2030 Strategic Plan into the Gen Ed requirements?
- c. What framework and principles should guide revisions to the general education curriculum?

**New Business- none**

**Old Business-none**

---

### Supplemental Resources/Information

**Carryover from 2023-2024** (see 2023-2034 meeting minute notes below)

1. Reviewing the [number of appeals](#), taking into specific consideration the length of time it can take a student to complete all appeal options.
2. Reviewing the size of the [campus board of review](#) for each case. Specifically considering the time and coordination to establish a board and how that may contribute to delays in the process for the student.
3. Establish a process for summer.
4. Explore if student members could extend beyond the groups identified in the procedures if trained appropriately.

### Recap of SAC 2023-2024 Assignments not Resolved- Notes from Meeting Minutes

Reviewing the [number of appeals](#), taking into specific consideration the length of time it can take a student to complete all appeal options.

#### If Student Wishes to Appeal Faculty Decision/s

A student may request a review of the faculty member's decision within 7 business days after receiving a faculty member's written report sent by the Dean of Students, by submitting a request in writing to the Academic Dean of the school or unit within which the offense occurred. A student may appeal a faculty member's decision on the basis of preponderance of the evidence not being met, alleged bias, due process error, or arbitrary/disproportionate outcome. The student's written appeal must include evidence supporting their reason for appeal. The Academic Dean reviews submitted appeals and can reject any appeal that does not allege lack of preponderance of the evidence, bias, due process error, or arbitrary/disproportionate outcome. Academic Dean notifies Dean of Students that appeal received. Academic Dean discusses matters with both student and faculty member, either separately or together, at their discretion. If no resolution within 7 business days of concluding individual meetings with student and faculty member, case is considered by unit hearing board.

#### If Student Wishes to Appeal Dean of Students Sanction to Campus Review Board

Scope: disproportionate sanction

Decision: uphold/overturn/modify

Student submits written request for appeal within 7 business days of receipt of Dean of Students decision to Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs or Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education  
Campus Review Board considers whether sanction is warranted - may uphold or impose lesser sanction  
Decision is final

#### Discussion-December 6, 2023, Meeting:

- 3 appeals across the entire process- at each level- 2 at the academic unit level, and 1 at campus appeals board Decision, then 1<sup>st</sup> appeal- re-hearing of the case, 2<sup>nd</sup> appeal- review- procedures followed (rarely used)
- Is it necessary to have 3 levels of appeals?
- Lag time in the summer
- Do we like the new problem we created or like the problem we have
- Timeline, multiple phases in the process
- Model 1: Could do the entire process in the academic unit, campus representation at the unit level and part of the hearing process- scope of the academic unit level increases- responsible and sanction, academic unit asks- should the student be separated from the campus? Concerns about consistency across units?
- Model 2: Entire process is conducted through the Student Conduct Office- is the faculty finding appropriate? 2 appeals, then done; content expertise and conduct office staff making decisions,
- Shifted the student standard process to referring 1<sup>st</sup> time offenses to the AI seminar, instead of requiring them to meet with Conduct staff first. No record don't create a record. Very few appeal the first offense. Discussions with students by Conduct staff- can help lead to referring them to other campus resources- would lose this if referring to students to AI on 1<sup>st</sup> offense. Learning outcomes from the AI seminar collected.

#### **Number of Students and Faculty Serving on [The Campus Review Board](#)**

During the March 19<sup>th</sup> BFC meeting, Bill also presented the SAC approved changes related to the number of faculty and students that comprise the hearing board. The SAC recommendation was to change the number of faculty from 3 to 2, and the number of students from 2 to 1, leading to a hearing board committee comprised of 3 members. The BFC was overwhelmingly (culminating with an unofficial vote at Bill's request) opposed to changing the Faculty/Student numbers for hearing boards. Link to the [General Principles](#) in the IUB Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, & Conduct

Discussion: Jane said it may be difficult to change the board from 5 to 3. A few others spoke up at the BFC meeting and shared their concerns about the reduction in the number serving on the board. Further discussions at the BFC meeting were focused on the need for faculty to step up and serve on these boards if the consensus is to have 5 members.

Kathy suggested gathering input from faculty that serve on 3-person hearing boards- their experiences and outcomes with 3 members. Consistency is important across all boards.

Libby discussed the outcomes for each type of board and the number of people on the boards. The Academic Review Boards are the largest of the boards.

This item will be on the SAC 24-24 AY agenda as an action item carried over from the 23-24 AY.

Motion: Approve the change from 5 committee members (3 faculty and 2 students) to 3 committee members (2 faculty and 1 student) to be consistent with other process decision making boards (For both the Academic Fairness Committee and the Academic Misconduct Review Board).

Motion to approve this change in the Student Code of Conduct made by Charlesworth  
2<sup>nd</sup> Ruffner

Vote by committee: 5 Yes 2 No (Students and IU Administrators did not vote, only SAC members)

**Establish a process for summer. Tabled until 2024-2025 AY**

**Explore if student members could extend beyond the groups identified in the procedures if trained appropriately.**

Current Language: Campus Review Boards

The Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education may maintain a standing Campus Review Board or appoint a new board to hear each appeal. In either case, the members of the Board shall be chosen from a list of faculty provided by the Bloomington Faculty Council and a list of students provided by the Bloomington campus student body president and graduate and professional student moderator. Any members who are initially appointed and become unable to serve on the Board should be replaced by the Vice Provost by others from these lists.

A Campus Review Board must consist of five members, including three members of the faculty and two students. The board must not include any faculty or students from the department in which the misconduct allegedly occurred.

The presiding officer of the board is appointed by the Vice Provost and must be a member of the faculty.

The Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education will establish the procedures for Campus Review Board hearings, which must be consistent with the General Principles in these Procedures.

Discussion: Ensure, once trained, an appointed person can continue to serve, prior members if left the Board, they can still serve. Do they have to be reapproved every year. An IUSG question for Katie- if on Supreme Court, reaffirmed/appointed every year and can continue to serve- they don't reapply- make sure these students can continue to serve in a new academic year. Katie- get something in writing from IUSG- doesn't go in the Code.

**Recap of SAC 2023-2024 Assignments Resolved**

**Outcomes:**

Establishing a clear distinction between which campus offices have the responsibility to hear graduate and undergraduate cases. **COMPLETED**

Moving the graduate level cases from the VPFAA Office to the Dean of the Graduate School and VP of Graduate Education and Health Sciences Office. **COMPLETED**

Bill Ramos presented the changes previously voted on by our group at the BFC meeting, as a 1<sup>st</sup> reading, on Tuesday, March 19<sup>th</sup>. There was discussion around the title of the office that oversees graduate academic misconduct cases should be Office of the Vice Provost of the Graduate School and not Office of the Vice Provost of the Graduate School and Health Sciences. The SAC committee was sent the revised redline version in an email on March 20, 2024, for a vote to use the revised office title by March 22, 2024, at 5 pm. The results of the vote were to accept the change from the Office of the Vice Provost of the Graduate School and Health Sciences to Office of the Vice Provost of the Graduate School. This change was presented at the 2<sup>nd</sup> reading of the SAC recommendations at the BFC meeting on April 2, 2024, and was passed. The next steps are to ensure this change is consistent throughout the IUB Student Code of Conduct and communicated with all academic units on the IUB campus.