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Action Items: November 19, 2015 Minutes

- Changes to the Extracurricular Activities Policy

XVII. Extracurricular Activities

E. Intercollegiate Athletics Regulations

1. To be eligible for intercollegiate athletic competition, a student must satisfy the following requirements:
   a. be eligible to participate in extracurricular activities, as defined in section XVII.A;
   b. be carrying a full-time workload as defined in section VI.A.3;
   c. be making satisfactory progress toward a degree; and
   d. meet any further requirements of the NCAA or other governing organization; see the athletic director for details.
Action Items: November 19, 2015 Minutes

- **Changes to the Extracurricular Activities Policy**

  **New Proposed Section**

2. No student may be excused from regularly scheduled classes for athletic practice.

3. **Special accommodations may be made (or coordinated) for intercollegiate student-athletes whose competition schedules conflict with the first week of reading periods and final exams.**

4. No student may participate in more than two sports in intercollegiate competition in any school year, except by permission of the Division of Student Affairs. Being manager or assistant manager is counted as participation within the meaning of this rule.
Changes to the Extracurricular Activities Policy Background and Rationale

- Implementation of the changes to the Academic Calendar related to final exams and reading periods did not leave enough time for any possible changes to athletic schedules for Spring 2016.
- This will be an ongoing problem since the ACC (Atlantic Coast Conference) sets its competition schedules with some input from us, but we have no real control over it.
- Individual student-athlete travel will vary year-to-year due to the scheduling of ACC and NCAA Division I tournaments.
- Every effort will be made to accommodate the needs of the instructional faculty and the student-athletes.
- The impact of the changes to the Academic Calendar will be evaluated as we move forward, including their impact on this student population.
Action Items: January 28, 2016 Minutes

- Changes to the Class Attendance Policy

Class Attendance


A. There are no formal institutional regulations regarding class attendance at the Georgia Institute of Technology. The resources of the Institute are provided for the intellectual growth and development of the students who attend. A schedule of courses is provided for the students and faculty to facilitate an orderly arrangement of the program of instruction. The fact that classes are scheduled is evidence that attendance is important; students should, therefore, maintain regular attendance if they are to attain maximum success in the pursuit of their studies.
B. All students are responsible for obtaining an understanding of each instructor's policy regarding absences; all students are expected to attend announced quizzes, laboratory periods, and final examinations. Although it is recognized that occasionally it may be necessary for students to be absent from scheduled classes or laboratories for personal reasons, students are responsible for all material covered in their absences, and they are responsible for the academic consequences of their absences. Students should discuss planned absences with their instructors as soon as possible after the beginning of an academic term. Work missed may be made up at the discretion of the instructors.
NEW PROPOSED LANGUAGE

C. Students who are absent because of participation in approved Institute activities (such as field trips and athletic events) will be permitted to make up the work missed during their absences. Formal approval of such activities will be granted by the Student Academic and Financial Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate, and statements of the approved absence may be obtained from the Office of the Registrar. **Course instructors are responsible for establishing reasonable deadlines and/or make-up material for the missed work, and for clearly communicating this information to the relevant student(s), when absences for Institute activities are approved.**
NEW PROPOSED SECTION:

D. Students who are absent because of participation in a particular religious observance will be permitted to make up the work missed during their absence with no late penalty, provided the student informs the course instructor of the upcoming absence, in writing, within the first two weeks of class, and provided the student makes up the missed material within the timeframe established by the course instructor. Exercising one’s rights under this policy is subject to the Georgia Tech Honor Code. The course instructor is responsible for establishing reasonable deadlines and/or make-up material for the missed work, and for clearly communicating this information to the student. Students may choose to appeal to the Student Academic and Financial Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate for formal approval of this type of absence.
Action Items: February 4, 2016 Minutes

- **Changes to the Student Code of Conduct and the Code of Conduct**
  - The changes are not related to the Sexual Misconduct Policy – that is a separate policy.
  - The changes were considered by the Committee in response to the recommendations from a commission formed by President Peterson which completed its work in December of last year.
  - **The changes to the Student Code of Conduct fall under six main categories.**
Action Items: February 4, 2016 Minutes

1. **Definition and Refinement of Process.** Some language was changed in order to clarify operating procedures (Section 3a. page 4). In particular, the code now emphasizes in two places that the rules and procedures pertaining to student sexual misconduct are governed by a separate document, the Student Sexual Misconduct Policy. Further changes to the operating procedures will be further developed by OSI in consultation with the GT Office of Legal Affairs.
2. Case Investigation. The revised Code (Section D.4.a., page 9) makes it clear that the pre-charge review is limited to a determination whether the facts as alleged in the complaint or report are sufficient to initiate a conduct process. If a conduct process is initiated, the Respondent is notified and an Administrative Conference is held with the Respondent (Section 4c., page 10) prior to further investigation of the complaint or report.
3. Aggregation of Unrelated Cases. The revised code states that under certain circumstances, multiple complaints against the same Respondent might be “aggregated.”

The committee agreed to the following wording (D.4.b):
“If OSI receives multiple complaints involving the same Student, each complaint will be considered separately in determining whether a conduct process should be initiated. Multiple charges against the same Respondent will generally be investigated and adjudicated separately; however, multiple charges may be investigated and adjudicated together under appropriate circumstances, which may include, but are not limited to, consent of the parties, similar or related conduct, and the administrative burden of considering the charges separately.”
4. Appellate Rights. The original Student Code of Conduct lists 5 possible sanctions if a Respondent is found Responsible (E.1): Disciplinary Warning, Disciplinary Probation, Suspension Held in Abeyance, Suspension, and Expulsion. Due to potential problems that arise with the rights of the Respondent’s to appeal it, the new Code of Conduct eliminates the middle sanction level of Suspension Held in Abeyance. The sanctions of Suspension and Expulsion may all be appealed to the Institute President through appropriate channels.
5. Challenges to Hearing Officer Bias. The revised Code (Section D.4.e., page 10) permits a Respondent to request that the case be adjudicated by a different Student Conduct Administrator in the event of perceived bias of the initially authorized official. Reasons for appeal from an adverse finding (Section G.1, page 16) include whether the original hearing was conducted fairly. This provides the additional mechanism for consideration of perceived bias on appeal from the decision of a hearing officer.
6. Technical and Editorial Changes. The revised Code was revised to be more consistent and to update certain language. For example, the designation of the student suspected of misconduct has been changed from “Accused” to “Respondent.” References to the Dean of Students have been changed to the Vice President for Student Life and Dean of Students,” etc. The Code also clarifies that allegations of sexual misconduct are handled under the separate Student Sexual Misconduct Policy.
6., continued…

In the wording of the term Advisor (Section A.2) the Student Regulations Committee recommended that the definition be shortened to:

“Advisor” refers to an individual chosen by the Student or Organization who assists a participant with the Student Conduct Process.
Action Items: February 4, 2016 Minutes

- The differences between the two Codes of Conduct were noted and discussed.
- In the Student Organizations Code of Conduct, the technical editorial changes as outlined were made.
Action Items: February 4, 2016 Minutes

- Both Codes of Conduct are posted with the February 4, 2016 Minutes.
Action Items and Minutes

• Move to approve all action items.

• Move to approve Minutes from:
  ▪ November 19, 2015
  ▪ January 28, 2016
  ▪ February 4, 2016