Student Regulations Committee

Fall Meeting

Faculty, Faculty Senate, & Academic Faculty Senate

Tuesday, October 21, 2014

3:00-5:00 PM

Student Center Theatre

Report, Action Items, Minutes

- Presented by:
  - Dr. Charles Parsons
- 2013-2014 Annual Report
- Action Items
- Minutes for Approval

Annual Report
2013-2014 Membership

Barke, Richard	Public Policy
Begovic, Miroslav	ECE
Chang, Young-Hui	Applied Physiology
Choi, Jung	Biology
Ferri, Al	ME
Parsons, Chuck	Business
Pikowsky, Reta	Registrar
Schafer, William	VSPA
Jones, Greg	U Student
Shoemaker, Mary	U Student
Winarski, Becca	G Student
Hernandez, Rigoberto	Executive Board Liaison

Annual Report

- The Student Regulations Committee met 5 times during the 2013-2014 year. Meeting dates were 8-29-13, 10-11-13, 11-8-13, 2-14-14, and 4-9-14. The Spring meeting schedule was disrupted by campus closures due to weather.

- Dr. Charles Parsons served as Chair of the Committee. Dr. Richard Barke served as Secretary of the Committee.

- The business of the Committee is related to academic policy matters as described in the Rules and Regulations section of the *Catalog*.

Annual Report: Policies Addressed by the Committee

- Sexual Harassment and Misconduct Policy (see October 11, 2013) Minutes for details about the initial discussion.

- Student Code of Conduct as it pertains to the Sexual Harassment Policy.

- Policy regarding campus organizations was discussed with regard to student membership. The SGA policy has been changed; this change was brought to the Student Regulations Committee as a point of information; no action was required.

- The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee has approved creation of GT 2100, a course designed to help students readmitted after an academic drop succeed. The regulations in the *Catalog* were amended as needed. See the November 8, 2013 Minutes for details.

Annual Report: Policies Addressed by the Committee

- The Registrar raised a question about requests for "class rank" and how they have been handled in the past.

    - The Committee asked that more research be done and that the issue be brought back once we have a better sense of how other institutions are handling it for the larger context.

    - For now, the discussion ended on handling rank as something each major would determine. That would not be official in the way that the Registrar's ranking would be, but would provide a means for the academic unit to provide some kind of information to students.

- The policy on Academic Standing was reviewed for new wording suggestions that would make it clearer, but that would not change how it operates. See the November 8, 2013 Minutes for details.

- The Committee once again discussed the meaning of the term "in residence" for the Grade Substitution policy, but again came to no conclusion. This will be left on the list of items that need further discussion.

Annual Report: Policies Addressed by the Committee

- The Unit of Credit definition that exists on the Registrar's Office web site was reviewed for inclusion in the *Catalog*. See the November 8, 2013 Minutes for details.

- The policy on Extracurricular activities was reviewed to correct some inconsistencies in the language. A change that was made last year was not carried through to all sections of the policy as needed. See the November 8, 2013 Minutes for details.

- The regulation concerning Graduation with Distinction was reviewed to clarify how tentative honors announced at commencement are determined. See the February 14, 2014 Minutes for details.

Annual Report: Policies Addressed by the Committee

- The Committee responded to a request to answer some questions about workload, possible mission redundancy, etc.

- The Committee reviewed the Policy on Student Sexual Misconduct.

  - The Committee was asked to consider revisions to existing policy, based on responses to a federal compliance mandate (Campus SaVE) and Clary Act, as well as Title IX and DOE letters to clarify needed actions, and coordination with best practices and benchmarking from 28 peer and aspirational universities. A Georgia Tech committee of more than fifteen staff, faculty, and students developed the revisions.

    - See the April 9, 2014 Minutes for details.

- The Committee reviewed the current sanction model at the request of the Office of Student Integrity. See the April 9, 2014 Minutes for details.

Action Items

From the September 16, 2014 Minutes:

- Changes to the Tech policy on Student Sexual Misconduct:
  - The change is in the usage of the term "impaired" versus the term "incapacitated."
    - Proposed change #1: Definition of Consent

Action Items

From the September 16, 2014 Minutes:

- Changes to the Tech policy on Student Sexual Misconduct:
    - This relates to the use of the term "impaired" or "impairment" or the term "incapacitated" or "incapacitation."
        - Proposed change #2: Definition of Coercion

Changes to the Tech policy on Student Sexual Misconduct

"*Consent*" consent means informed, freely and actively given, mutually understandable words or actions which indicate a willingness to participate in mutually agreed upon sexual activity. Consent is not effectively given if the agreement results from the use of physical force, threats, intimidation, or coercion. Consent is absent when a person has sexual contact with another when the initiator knew, or reasonably should have known, that the other person(s) is *incapacitated* *(changed from "impaired").*

Changes to the Tech policy on Student Sexual Misconduct

Coercion: The intentional use of force or intimidation (i.e. threats) to obtain compliance for an otherwise unwanted act. Coercion may be determined by the repetition of the activity beyond what is reasonable, the degree of pressure applied, or environmental factors such as isolation or the initiator's knowledge of incapacitation (changed from "impairment") by alcohol and/or other drugs.

Examples may include, but are not limited to:
- Repeatedly providing alcohol drinks to a victim or potential victim
- Isolating a victim or potential victim
- Providing false information to entice a victim or potential victim

Changes to the Tech policy on Student Sexual Misconduct

- The committee discussed the differences between the legal standards for incapacitated *versus* impaired, and why the legal definition of the word impaired made it inappropriate as it was being used in the originally worded policy.

- It was emphasized that incapacity was a special case within the broader issue of non-consent. If a victim is found to have been incapacitated, than it is clear that there was no consent and the accused will be found responsible. However, even if the victim is not incapacitated, it may still be the case that there was no consent. The issue of whether the victim and/or the accused are impaired by drugs or alcohol may be relevant to the investigation, but is not a deciding factor in the determination of culpability.

Motion

- Move to approve all action items and the minutes from:
  - September 4, 2014
  - September 16, 2014

- Note: The meeting originally scheduled for October 2, 2014 was cancelled.