The meeting was called to order at 12:04 p.m. by the chair, Diane Willen. The first item of business was the approval of the February 5 minutes. Gerald Gay indicated that he attended that meeting. The minutes, as amended, were approved.

The next item of business was a discussion of the Disruptive Student Behavior Policy. Dr. Willen presented the latest draft of the policy. She stated that she had been talking to many people about this policy and has heard that many people feel that the decisions regarding student disruption should reside in the college or academic unit. She made changes to the current draft based on comments and feedback she has received. The definition of disruptive student behavior has been moved to the beginning of the document. The statement that the "use of the University Mediation Center is encouraged at the first stage of a problem" was moved to the end of the first paragraph.

Dr. Willen went over sections 1 and 2 and explained why the statements in bold were added. Dr. Willen expressed concern about whether due process would be violated if, as stated in section 2, a student were to be disenrolled or suspended temporarily. Charles Marvin responded that that is a function of the Registrar's Office. Gerald Gay asked if anyone knew exactly what "disenroll" means. Discussion continued regarding removing a student from class at this point in the situation. It was suggested adding the following to section 2: "...then the instructor with the approval of his chair or director has the option at that point...". Discussion continued on the appropriate time to involve the chair. Dr. Willen suggested that the following line could be added to section 1, "if a student is asked to leave the class, the instructor shall notify the departmental chair or school director in writing" to broaden the grounds for notification. Any disruption that is serious enough to ask the student to leave would involve notifying the chair. Then in section 2, the instructor has the option, with the approval of the chair, to bar [rather than disenroll or suspend temporarily] the student temporarily from class.

The discussion turned to section 3. There was some question about whether the college can expel or suspend a student from the university. It was suggested that section 3 should end with "...including but not limited to suspension or expulsion of the student from the college or academic unit". Siva Nathan felt that more was needed here particularly if the student is exonerated. Dr. Willen stated that the chair could decide that no further action is needed and the phrase could be stated, "...including but not limited to suspension or expulsion of the student from the college or academic unit or whether the student is exonerated". Dr. Nathan added that at this point it might be a time to involve the University Mediation Center. After some discussion is was agreed to change the last line of the preamble to indicate that the University Mediation Center is encouraged at any stage of a problem rather than at the first stage. Dr. Thackenkary asked if the Ombuds Office is the same as the Mediation Center. Dr. Fennell explained the differences between the two and mentioned other offices that assist students with problems. Discussion centered on the various ways of resolving issues. There was concern that by involving the many different campus offices that assist in resolving conflicts, a disruptive class situation could turn into a dispute between the instructor and the student. Richard Miller suggested a well defined process be indicated rather than inviting the involvement of one or several different offices. Dr. Willen suggested changing the last line of the preamble to: "Use of the University Mediation Center or the Office of the Ombudsperson is encouraged at any stage of a problem". Charlotte Petrek suggested listing the Ombuds Office first and then the University Mediation Center.

Dr. Willen asked John Marshall to explain an instructor's rights regarding summoning the university police. He explained that the instructor can ask the police to escort the student out of the class. Dr. Willen reviewed section 4 and 5. It was agreed to change the word "suspend" to "bar" in section 5. John Marshall stated that it is important that the student's side of the situation be heard (rather than only received in written format) by the chair. This is a fundamental right of due process: to be heard. Discussion continued. Dr. Willen summarized the discussion by stating that section 3 should be eliminated. Instead, section 4 should be amended to read, "A student who has been removed from a class as a result of disruptive behavior but wishes to be reinstated at that point shall meet with the department chair and submit an explanation within five working days of removal from the
Gerald Gay questioned the last line in section 4. Dr. Willen stated that it would need to be rewritten. Roger Weed stated that his department's retention policy is in conflict with this policy at this point. Dr. Marshall gave an overview of how disciplinary and academic issues have traditionally been resolved at the university. Dealing with the issue of disruptive behavior may change these processes. It may require that the colleges establish their own procedures or policies for dealing with this issue. Dr. Willen moved the discussion to who makes the decision to bar the student from class. It was suggested that if the chair upholds the instructor and agrees that the student be barred from class, the chair should then send a recommendation to the dean's office and that would then bring the college into the situation. The dean's office would make the final decision and hear the appeal if there is one. Section 6 was reviewed. Dr. Marshall suggested talking with the Registrar's Office about noting the violation on the student's permanent record. Discussion continued on the issue of expulsion. It was suggested changing number 2 to "expulsion from the relevant academic unit or college or, with the approval of the Dean of Students, from the university." It was noted that there were two sections numbered "7". Section 9 was addressed. Rather than having the instructor work with the student regarding make up work, it was suggested that the department chair or his/her designee would be more appropriate. Discussion moved to the notion of record keeping. Dr. Marshall stated that there is a record keeping component in the academic dishonest policy. Dr. Willen stated she would look at that policy for appropriate language for this policy.

Section 11 was discussed. Roger Weed suggested moving this statement to the preamble. Hugh Hudson stated that it needs to be made clear that this policy, once approved by the Senate, is a university policy. Departmental policies cannot be in conflict with it. Discussion continued. Cherian Thackenkary suggested rewording section 11 to read, "The policy on disruptive student behavior will not supersede any other code governing student conduct within an individual college of academic unit." Valerie Fennell asked that the line in the preamble be changed to include the Office of the Ombudsperson only and strike the Mediation Center. Dr. Willen restated that section 11 would move to the preamble.

Dr. Willen announced two Senate joint subcommittees. One is on student outcomes and one on graduate program indicators. Dr. Willen needs two Faculty Affairs members to serve on the subcommittee on student outcomes. Roger Weed recognized the hard work of Marian Meyers on the amorous relationship policy. There being no further business, the chair adjourned the meeting at 1:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Mary Nell Stone
substitute recorder