University Senate

April 28, 2016

Members Present

Members present at the meeting: 79

Call to Order

Senate Chair Brown called the meeting to order at 3:17 p.m.

Approval of the April 20, 2016, Senate Minutes (Action)

Chair Brown asked for additions or corrections to the minutes of the April 20, 2016, meeting; hearing none, he declared the minutes approved as distributed.

Report of the Chair

Committee Volunteer Period

Chair Brown reminded Senators the committee volunteer period is currently open on the Senate website. The deadline to volunteer is in just two days, April 30th. I strongly encourage you to volunteer to serve on a committee if you have not already done so.

Outgoing Senators

This meeting is the final meeting for any outgoing senators. I would like to take a moment to thank all of you for your work on the Senate and your commitment to shared governance. Your engagement on the Senate provides a valuable perspective for President Loh as he considers policies that help shape the future of the University. I would like to ask all the outgoing senators to please stand and be recognized for your service.

Chair-Elect Goodman moved that each member will be given two minutes to discuss any action items on the Senate agenda. A member may only speak a second time once everyone else has had an opportunity to speak.

The motion to limit the time of each speaker was seconded.

Chair Brown called for a vote on the motion. He noted that the motion required a 2/3 vote in favor to pass. The result was in 55 favor, 9 opposed, and 3 abstentions. **The motion to limit the time of each speaker passed.**

Review of the Interim University of Maryland Non-Discrimination Policy and Procedures (Senate Doc. No. 15-16-28) (Action)

Stacey Sickles Locke, Chair of the Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) Committee, presented the Review of the Interim University of Maryland Non-Discrimination Policy and Procedures and provided background information.

A verbatim recording of the meeting is on file in the Senate Office.

Chair Brown opened the floor for discussion.

Hearing none, Brown called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 65 in favor, 3 opposed, and 2 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Review of the University of Maryland Disability & Accessibility Policy and Procedures (Senate Doc. No. 15-16-29) (Action)

Sickles Locke presented the Review of the University of Maryland Disability & Accessibility Policy and Procedures and provided background information.

Chair Brown opened the floor for discussion.

Chair-Elect Goodman motioned to amend this proposal as follows below in **pink**:

If the student is a graduate student**, including graduate assistants**, the DSS shall request review and resolution by the Associate Provost and Dean of the Graduate School or designee. The **Office of the** Provost~~'s Office~~ will make good faith efforts to review and respond to concerns within ten (10) business days of notification.

The motion was seconded.

Chair Brown opened the floor for discussion of the amendment.

Senator McClure, exempt staff, introduced Dr. Ana Palla-Kane, Lecturer, Kinesiology, School of Public Health (SPHL); Director, TerpAccess Disability Network; and Interim Chair, President's Commission on Disability.

Palla-Kane stated that the President's Commission wanted to make clear that graduate assistants were included as students in the Disability Policy.

Senator McClure introduced Stephanie Cork, third-year PhD student and Graduate Assistant in SPHL and Chair of the Graduate Student Advisory Council.

Cork stated that graduate students may require different accommodations in the classroom as instructors than as students and expressed a desire for more clarification on the available options for graduate assistants.

Hearing no further discussion, Brown called for a vote on the amendment. The result was 53 in favor, 8 opposed, and 2 abstentions. **The motion to approve the amendment passed.**

Chair Brown opened the floor for discussion on the proposal.

Senator Lathrop, faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, asked about the financial implications of the proposal.

Sickles Locke responded that the committee did not conduct an analysis on the financial implications of the implementation of the proposal.

Hearing no further discussion, Brown called for a vote on the proposal as amended. The result was 59 in favor, 9 opposed, and 3 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Revisions to the University of Maryland Sexual Misconduct Policy (Senate Doc. No. 15-16-30) (Action)

Sickles Locke presented the Revisions to the University of Maryland Sexual Misconduct Policy and provided background information.

Chair Brown opened the floor for discussion.

Senator Kenny, exempt staff, motioned to amend the policy as noted below in **pink** to remove the Student Legal Aid Office from a list of confidential resources, as the Student Legal Aid Office does not consider themselves a confidential resource.

~~**Student Legal Aid Office**~~

~~**Undergraduates 301-314-7756; Graduate Students 301-405-5807**~~

~~The Student Legal Aid Office, located in **the** South Campus Dining Hall, provides free, confidential legal advice to any University student.~~

The amendment was seconded.

Chair Brown opened the floor for discussion of the amendment.

Hearing none, Brown called for a vote on the amendment. The result was 57 in favor, 7 opposed, and 9 abstentions. **The motion to approve the amendment passed.**

Chair Brown opened the floor for discussion on the proposal as amended.

Senator Stanley, undergraduate student, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences proposed to amend the policy to add a section on prevention as noted below in **pink**. He explained the importance of prevention due to the large numbers of sexual assault on campus.

XIII. PREVENTION

Prevention is a priority of the University. Beyond compliance with state and federal law or guidelines, it is a moral issue to the University and aligns with its mission. The University takes strong steps to prevent sexual misconduct, in conjunction with its efforts to react to cases that have occurred.

Prevention efforts shall be driven by a proactive holistic long-term strategic plan, developed with diligent attention and resources. The plan includes, but is not limited to, establishing a guiding principle, setting a goal from that principle, and then outlining the measures that will lead us to that goal.

The causes and enablers of sexual misconduct are pervasive and complex. Sexual misconduct will be present for generations; It is not a temporal issue. Education on the issues of sexual misconduct prepares our students for the world and to be the global citizens we equip them to be. The prosperity of students in the campus environment depends on the education being early in their university career. All incoming freshmen will receive education on sexual violence and rape culture at Orientation and UNIV 100 (or equivalents), as well as, training during move-in weekend.

The motion was seconded.

Chair Brown opened the floor for discussion of the amendment.

Sickles Locke read the full amendment.

Chair Brown recognized Catherine Carroll, Title IX Officer, Office of Civil Rights and Sexual Misconduct (OCRSM).

Carroll stated that OCRSM is responsible for overseeing the prevention programs on campus. She stated the University is doing much of this work already with the Care to Stop Violence Office, training at orientations, and training in UNIV100 classes. She supports a comprehensive prevention program, but noted that this is not the appropriate document for that. She explained that this document is for complaints of sexual misconduct and not for prevention.

Sickles Locke stated that the amendment should encompass faculty and staff.

Senator Stanley introduced Benjamin Douek, undergraduate student, College of Arts and Humanities.

Douek stated his support for the entire bill and importance to him and the campus.

Senator Stanley introduced Roxy Young, undergraduate student and Chair of the Student Government Association (SGA)'s Communications Committee.

Young stated the importance of prevention and gave her support for the amendment.

Senator Stanley introduced Maya Spaur, undergraduate student, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Spaur repeated the importance of prevention to students and noted that the amendment will support other programs on campus.

Senator Stanley introduced Scott Kivitz, undergraduate student, A. James Clark School of Engineering.

Kivitz stated his support for this amendment and noted that this would help students be active bystanders.

Chair Brown asked comments be reserved for things that are unique.

Senator Kenny introduced Fatima Taylor, Coordinator, Care to Stop Violence Office.

Taylor cautioned against doing training during move-in weekend given the other activities that are already taking place at that time.

Senator Kaplan, faculty, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, stated his support for prevention training, but noted that this was not an appropriate time for this amendment. He supported creating a prevention document in the future.

Senator Bock, undergraduate student, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences stated that he talked to students and there is overwhelming support from

undergraduate students. He felt it was important to change the document from reactionary to proactive which is accomplished by this amendment.

Senator Yale, undergraduate student, School of Architecture, noted that the Sexual Misconduct Policy is not a holistic solution and this amendment allows the entire University to support prevention.

Senator Stanley noted that resources have not been committed to give the staff the ability to create a prevention program, asked where else it would be looked at, and asked for a timeline of when this would be completed.

Chair Brown noted that if the amendment is voted down, it can be introduced as a proposal in the future.

Carroll noted that there have been a lot of concrete steps done in the past two years on campus and that they are in the planning stages of developing a prevention plan to make sure it is done in a meaningful way.

Senator Yale noted that the amendment ensures prevention.

Hearing no further discussion, Brown called for a vote on the amendment. The result was 32 in favor, 35 opposed, and 6 abstentions. **The motion to approve the amendment failed.**

Chair Brown opened the floor for discussion on the proposal as amended.

Senator Yale motioned to amend the policy to increase transparency as noted in **pink** below.

XIV. TRANSPARENCY, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND IMPROVEMENT

In adherence to the University's mission and the fulfillment of state and federal laws or guidelines, the University shall strive to provide an excellent process and continually be in a position to make improvement. Improvements are enhanced and best facilitated when the situation is better understood and there is more information available.

The information below will be regularly disclosed to the public on a semesterly basis. It shall be collected, stored, and distributed in manner that does not use or connect personal or identifying characteristics to categorical figures.

- **How many cases currently are going through the procedure in total, in the investigation, adjudication, sanctioning**
- **How many business days it took to complete the whole procedure, the investigation, adjudication, & sanctioning and what semester did the case start/end.**
- **Categorical reasons for extensions, the extensions durations, and the number of extensions that would occur in a case qualified by their categorical reason. Categorical reasons shall include insufficient funding or resources that would have been achievable in the course of normal business.**
- **Percentage of how many cases were completed in the time parameters**

The motion was seconded.

Chair Brown opened the floor for discussion of the amendment.

Carroll responded that OCRSM administers how the investigations work. She noted that OCRSM's data management systems are kept internally and that a policy document is not an appropriate place to put this type of regulation. She added that regular updates are provided to all respondents and complainants on a regular basis. She underscored the need to maintain confidentiality and privacy interests.

Senator Singer, faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, asked about the relationship between the Title IX Office and other offices on campus and the independence of the Title IX Office.

Sickles Locke noted the process was efficient in her personal case and noted that the committee discussed the timeframe of the resolution. The committee felt comfortable with the 60 day timeframe.

Senator Stanley noted the important part of the amendment is the public release of the information to ensure the Title IX Office gets sufficient resources.

Senator Yale noted that her investigation phase has taken five months and has not been informed regularly of the status.

Senator Blase, undergraduate student, School of Agriculture and Natural Resources, noted the importance of keeping the data anonymous and believes that the public and prospective students should be given information regarding the length of claims.

Senator Harris, faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, introduced Bob Infantino, Associate Dean, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences.

Infantino stated that he volunteered to be trained as a member of the Standing Review Committees (SRC) and noted that a public display of an account of days appears to be insensitive to the fact that the University is interested in doing a thorough job and the difficulty that is caused by the complainant and the respondent. He noted that there are a lot of intricacies in these cases.

A Senator motioned to call to question. The motion was seconded.

Chair Brown called for a vote on the call to question. The result was 50 in favor, 22 opposed, and 4 abstentions. **The motion to call to question passed.**

Brown called for a vote on the amendment. The result was 32 in favor, 37 opposed, and 7 abstentions. **The motion to approve the amendment failed.**

Chair Brown opened the floor for discussion on the proposal as amended.

Carroll noted that the spirit of the amendment would be addressed in the annual report produced by OCRSM.

Hearing no further discussion, Brown called for a vote on the proposal as amended. The result was 59 in favor, 10 opposed, and 4 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Review of the Interim Sexual Misconduct Faculty Procedures (Senate Doc. No. 14-15-27) (Action)

Chair Brown stated that the next three items on the agenda are the Sexual Misconduct Procedures for faculty, staff, and students. The Faculty Affairs, Staff Affairs, and Student Conduct committees reviewed their respective procedures and tried to keep the language aligned when possible. In order to streamline the presentation, we have decided to have one broad overview of the process for all three procedures and then individual presentations on the major substantive changes in each, followed by a separate vote on each set of procedures.

Chair Brown explained that the faculty and staff procedures are similar and would be presented individually, but the Senate would hold a joint discussion on both sets of procedures.

KerryAnn O'Meara, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, presented the Review of the Interim Sexual Misconduct Faculty Procedures and provided background information.

Brandon Dula, Chair of the Staff Affairs Committee, presented the Review of the Interim Sexual Misconduct Staff Procedures and provided background information.

Chair Brown opened the floor for discussion of both the faculty and staff sexual misconduct procedures.

Hearing no further discussion on the faculty procedures, Brown called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 65 in favor, 1 opposed, and 3 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Review of the Interim Sexual Misconduct Staff Procedures (Senate Doc. No. 14-15-26) (Action)

Senator Jacobson, exempt staff, moved to amend the policy to mirror the language in the faculty procedures as noted below in **pink**:

The final investigation report and the recommended finding will be automatically reviewed by a Standing Review Committee (SRC). Each SRC is composed of three (3) individuals (faculty, staff, and/or students), with at least one staff member. SRC members shall be members of the University community who have had no previous involvement with the case, and have been trained to review such cases. SRC members are obligated to disclose to the OCRSM any known conflicts prior to participating in any specific SRC review. Conflicts or familiarity with the individuals involved in the matter that are disclosed to the OCRSM will automatically disqualify an individual SRC member from participation in any particular review.

C. SRC Appellate Body

The Standing Review Committee (SRC) **Appellate Body** is the designated ~~A~~**a**ppellate ~~B~~**b**ody for all ~~cases involving allegations of sexual misconduct by staff~~ **appeals of findings under these Staff Procedures**. The SRC **Appellate Body** is composed of three (3) members

(faculty, staff, and/or students), **with at least one staff member**. **SRC Appellate Body members shall be members** from the University community who have had no previous involvement with the case, and have been trained to review such cases.

The amendment was seconded.

Chair Brown opened the floor for discussion of the amendment.

Hearing none, Brown called for a vote on the amendment. The result was 63 in favor, 2 opposed, and 2 abstentions. **The motion to approve the amendment passed.**

Brown called for a vote on the proposal as amended. The result was 65 in favor, 2 opposed, and 0 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Review of the Interim Sexual Misconduct Student Procedures (Senate Doc. No. 14-15-16) (Action)

Ed Kenney, Chair of the Student Conduct Committee, presented the Review of the Interim Sexual Misconduct Student Procedures and provided background information.

Chair Brown opened the floor for discussion.

Senator Stanley made a motion to amend the procedures as noted below in **pink**:

Amendment #1

V. RESOLUTION PROCESSES

A. Timeframe for Resolution

Consistent with the goal of maximizing educational opportunities, remedying the effects of Prohibited Conduct and promoting campus safety while minimizing the possible disruptive nature of the process, the OCRSM and **the** OSC will strive to resolve all complaints within sixty (60) business days of receipt. In general, the investigation phase may last approximately four to five weeks and the adjudication phase may last approximately another four to five weeks. Good faith efforts will be made to complete the process in a timely manner by balancing principles of thoroughness and fundamental fairness with the importance of resolving complaints in a timely and expeditious manner. The Title IX Officer may extend the general time frames for the completion of required actions. If such an extension occurs, the parties will be notified in writing**, and given the reason(s) for the extension,** by the OCRSM or **the** OSC.

Amendment #2

2. Preliminary Meeting

Prior to an investigation, the OCRSM and/or **the** OSC will notify both parties and require their attendance (separately) at a preliminary meeting with **the** OSC. **The parties will be informed of the purpose of the meeting.** The purpose of the meeting is to ensure students are provided adequate information about the investigation and adjudication process, and have an opportunity to ask and receive answers to any questions they may have. When a party does not attend the preliminary meeting with **the** OSC, the University shall proceed with an investigation, noting the party's lack of attendance at the preliminary meeting.

Amendment #3

VI. ADJUDICATION

A. Meeting with Director of Student Conduct

The Director of Student Conduct will meet separately with each party to explain next steps and provide each party with a confidential copy of the final investigation report, including all attachments.

When an investigation concludes with a recommended finding of a ~~p~~**P**olicy violation, and **the Director of Student Conduct determines that** **either** expulsion or suspension is a possible sanction, the matter will be referred automatically to the Standing Review Committee (SRC) for an administrative determination of the initial outcome.

- **When an investigation concludes with a recommended finding of a Policy violation, and the Director of Student Conduct determines that neither expulsion nor suspension is a possible sanction, the OSC will resolve the Complaint by facilitating a Disciplinary Conference.**
- ~~For all other recommendations, including those of~~ **In all cases when an investigation concludes with a finding of** no ~~p~~**P**olicy violation **and the Director of Student Conduct concurs with the finding**, the **Director of Student Conduct** ~~OSC~~ will **meet separately with both parties to discuss next steps** ~~resolve the Complaint by facilitating a Disciplinary Conference~~.
- **In all cases when an investigation concludes with a finding of no Policy violation and the Director of Student Conduct does not concur with the finding, the Director of Student Conduct may request additional investigation and/or determine the appropriate next steps.**
- ~~Determinations by the SRC or by OSC in a Disciplinary Conference shall be based on the preponderance of the evidence.~~

At the meeting, the Director of Student Conduct will explain the relevant process to each party, and inform each party of the date and time of the SRC Conference or Disciplinary Conference**,** **if applicable**.

Amendment #4

C. Sanction Considerations

The imposition of disciplinary sanctions is designed to eliminate Prohibited Conduct under the Policy, prevent its recurrence, and remedy its effects, while supporting the University's educational mission and federal obligations. Disciplinary sanctions may include educational, restorative, and rehabilitative components, such as completion of an educational project, removal from University housing, removal from specific courses or activities, and disciplinary probation. Some behavior, however, is so egregious in nature, harmful to the individuals involved, or so deleterious to the educational process that it requires more severe sanctions, including suspension or expulsion from the University.

The Director of Student Conduct will determine the appropriate disciplinary sanction in every ~~s~~**S**exual ~~m~~**M**isconduct case. In reaching this determination, the following factors will be considered:

- The nature and degree of violence of the conduct at issue;
- The impact of the conduct on the Complainant;
- The impact or implications of the conduct on the community and/or the University;
- Prior relevant misconduct by the Respondent, including the Respondent's relevant prior discipline history;
- **Breach of a prior Alternative Resolution agreement;**
- Respondent's acceptance of responsibility for the conduct;
- Maintenance of a safe and respectful environment conducive to learning;

- Protection of the ~~campus~~ **University** community and the University; and
- Any other mitigating, aggravating, or compelling circumstances to reach a just and appropriate resolution in each case.

Chair Brown called for a second on amendment #1.

The motion was seconded.

Chair Brown opened the floor for discussion on the amendment.

Hearing none, Brown called for a vote on amendment #1. The result was 55 in favor, 5 opposed, and 7 abstentions. **The motion to approve the amendment passed.**

Chair Brown called for a second on amendment #2.

The motion was seconded.

Chair Brown opened the floor for discussion on the amendment.

Hearing none, Brown called for a vote on amendment #2. The result was 60 in favor, 3 opposed, and 3 abstentions. **The motion to approve the amendment passed.**

Chair Brown called for a second on amendment #3.

The motion was seconded.

Chair Brown opened the floor for discussion on the amendment.

Senator Yale explained that the procedure exists in the way it is being changed and the change in wording is to clarify the procedure.

Carroll noted that OCRSM is in support of this amendment as it clarifies the process.

Chair Brown recognized Andrea Goodwin, Director of Student Conduct.

Goodwin stated that she is in favor of this amendment and gave clarification on what happens.

Senator McClure noted that titles change over time. It was noted that this change could be made later if the title does change.

Hearing no further discussion, Brown called for a vote on amendment #3. The result was 61 in favor, 2 opposed, and 3 abstentions. **The motion to approve the amendment passed.**

Chair Brown called for a second on amendment #4.

The motion was seconded.

Chair Brown opened the floor for discussion on the amendment.

Hearing none, Brown called for a vote on amendment #4. The result was 55 in favor, 4 opposed, and 6 abstentions. **The motion to approve the amendment passed.**

Senator Stanley made a motion to amend the procedures as noted below in **pink**:

Amendment #5

V. RESOLUTION PROCESSES

Timeframe for Resolution

Consistent with the goal of maximizing educational opportunities, remedying the effects of Prohibited Conduct and promoting campus safety while minimizing the possible disruptive nature of the process, the OCRSM and the OSC will strive to resolve all complaints within sixty (60) business days of receipt. In general, the investigation phase may last approximately four to five weeks and the adjudication phase may last approximately another four to five weeks. Good faith efforts will be made to complete the process in a timely manner by balancing principles of thoroughness and fundamental fairness with the importance of resolving complaints in a timely and expeditious manner. The Title IX Officer may extend the general time frames for the completion of required actions. If such an extension occurs, the parties will be notified in writing by the OCRSM or the OSC. **All extensions of required actions shall be attributed to categories of causes/reasons(s). These must be logged in a database that does not house or connect personal or potentially identifying characteristics with the categorical reasons. This database is for use in a review of the sexual misconduct procedure effectiveness.**

Amendment #6

B. ~~In some cases, the Complainant may seek Alternative Resolution in lieu of investigation and adjudication.~~ Alternative Resolution is a process whereby remedies and interventions may serve to address the alleged Prohibited Conduct without proceeding to an investigation **and adjudication**. Alternative Resolution is not appropriate for complaints involving ~~s~~**S**exual ~~v~~**V**iolence, including ~~s~~**S**exual ~~a~~**A**ssault. **Neither party is required to accept responsibility for the alleged Prohibited Conduct in order to proceed with Alternative Resolution.** ~~The parties~~ **Either party** may decide not to proceed with Alternative Resolution and may request an investigation and adjudication at any time. **Alternative Resolution is not a waiver one's right to adjudication. This can be initiated/invoked after agreement or completion of Alternative Resolution.**

Senator Falvey, faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, made a motion to extend the meeting by 20 minutes to 5:20 p.m.

The motion was seconded.

Chair Brown called for a vote on the motion to extend. The result was 45 in favor, 16 opposed, and 3 abstentions. **The motion to extend the meeting passed.**

Chair Brown called for a second on amendment #5.

The motion was seconded.

Chair Brown opened the floor for discussion on the amendment.

Carroll noted this was not necessary as OCRSM produces all this information in its annual report and it is an internal issue regarding data tracking.

Hearing no further discussion, Brown called for a vote on amendment #5. The result was 25 in favor, 37 opposed, and 5 abstentions. **The motion to approve the amendment failed.**

Chair Brown called for a second on amendment #6.

The motion was seconded.

Chair Brown opened the floor for discussion on the amendment.

Senator Kaplan asked if adjudication meant on-campus adjudication and if the intent of the amendment was to limit the right to wave alternative resolution as a form of adjudication.

Senator Stanley clarified that it is for on-campus adjudication and that it gives students that right to adjudication at any time, even after alternative resolutions have been invoked.

Goodwin stated that she does not understand the reason for the amendment because student voluntarily engage in alternative resolution and alternative resolution is not used in cases of sexual violence and sexual assault. Students who agree to alternative resolution can stop it at any time in the process until the alternative resolution is signed and agreed upon. If a breach of the alternative resolution occurs, students can file a new complaint.

Senator Jacobson asked how this amendment was different since adjudication can be requested at any time in the process.

Senator Yale stated that the purpose of the amendment is to provide the complainant with the ability to investigate and adjudicate after the alternative resolution process is completed and in place.

Brown called for a vote on amendment #6. The result was 18 in favor, 41 opposed, and 5 abstentions. **The motion to approve the amendment failed.**

Hearing no further discussion, Brown called for a vote on the proposal as amended. The result was 62 in favor, 3 opposed, and 0 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Proposed Policy on Excused Absence (Senate Doc. No. 14-15-21) (Action)

Charles Delwiche, Chair of the Academic Procedures and Standards (APAS) Committee, presented the Proposed Policy on Excused Absence and provided background information.

Chair Brown opened the floor for discussion.

Senator Harris made a motion to amend the policy as noted below in **pink**:

I. Policy

An excused absence is an absence for which the student has the right to receive, and the instructor has the responsibility to provide, ~~reasonable~~ **academic** accommodation.

III. Academic Accommodations

In keeping with the USM III-5.10 Policy Concerning the Scheduling of Academic Assignments on Dates of Religious Observance, "Students shall not be penalized because of observances of their religious holidays and shall be given an opportunity, whenever feasible, to make up within a reasonable time any academic assignment that is missed due to individual participation in religious observances." For all other excused absences, the student must be provided ~~reasonable~~ **academic** accommodation. The accommodation provided should, within reason, neither advantage nor disadvantage either the student or the rest of the class.

The motion was seconded.

Chair Brown opened the floor for discussion on the amendment.

Delwiche noted that committee was in favor of the amendment.

Hearing no further discussion, Brown called for a vote on the amendment. The result was 53 in favor, 1 opposed, and 2 abstentions. **The motion to approve the amendment passed.**

Senator McKinney, full-time lecturer, called for a quorum check. The result was 60 Senators in attendance. **Quorum was affirmed.**

Chair-Elect Goodman made a motion to extend the meeting by seven more minutes to 5:27 p.m.

The motion was seconded.

Brown called for a vote on the motion to extend. The result was 46 in favor, 11 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

Hearing no further discussion, Brown called for a vote on the proposal as amended. The result was 57 in favor, 1 opposed, and 0 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Revisions to the Smith School of Business (BMGT) Plan of Organization (Senate Doc. No. 14-15-37) (Action)

Jess Jacobson, Chair of the Elections, Representation, and Governance (ERG) Committee, presented the Revisions to the Smith School of Business (BMGT) Plan of Organization and provided background information.

Chair Brown opened the floor for discussion.

Hearing none, Brown called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 54 in favor, 2 opposed, and 1 abstention. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

New Business

There was no new business.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:24 p.m.