

## Fall 2013 Policy Campus Review Comments

October 21 – November 4, 2013

### General:

1. (Faculty) I like the new language, and agree with the policy/procedure changes.
2. (Faculty) The proposed changes to the policies seem logical to me.

### 2.15 and 2.15.1 Student Stipends:

1. (Faculty) I have concerns about the new policy/procedure regarding stipends for students. Traditionally, we have had a difficult time recruiting students (especially since most of our paralegal students are evening students) to serve as a student senate representative. The job is time-consuming (they must attend all the Senate meetings) and during the day when most of our paralegal students work. I have found success in using a one credit stipend as a carrot to entice students to serve in that role. Under the revised policy, it doesn't appear that I will be able to continue to do this since because of the event organizing requirement. This really should be reconsidered. I would argue that student senate representatives actually devote more time to the college than a club president might.
  - a. We modified the language to include other activities (other than events) that impact students.
2. (Faculty)
  - a. 2.15 – None
  - b. 2.15.1: Subpart B – What are the other college eligibility requirements... Stated, but not defined.
  - c. 2.15.1 – Subpart C – Capitalize Stipend Credit Ad Hoc Committee (#3); item #4 Ad Hoc Committee
  - d. 2.15.1 – Subpart D – Student Senate Executive Board (#1)
  - e. Overall – Just make sure the capitalization is consistent throughout
  - f. Corrections made throughout the procedure as suggested above.

### **3.6 and 3.6.1 Student Conduct:**

1. (Faculty) One of the points to policy revision, was “cleans up some of the Language” . While I realize that was the intent of clarifying the articulation of the policy, I am concerned about what I hear from some students about the lack of “clean Language” from professors during class time. Is there a policy about faculty using foul language in the classroom? I cannot give you names or times when this occurred, but I would guess that many faculty are aware that it goes on in the classroom. For some students it is perhaps the language they are used to hearing all the time, but for others I know it is very offensive. As a nursing faculty, I believe I can speak for all of us, that we try to be really exemplary in our speech to model the expectations of a professional nurse. Why should it be any different for others?? Thanks for listening. I would hope it can be brought forward in positive ways to raise the bar for faculty professionalism.
  - a. Forwarded comment to Jane Reinke. Deanna will bring topic to a future faculty meeting.
2. (Faculty) Hi -- I read the student conduct section only and it looks very detailed. I am not sure what Deanna's reservation is, but it looks ok to me. I think we need to protect ourselves --- and of course we would not always use these measures but they would be in place if we needed them. My two cents.
3. (Faculty)
  - a. Overall: What happens to the complaint once it is filed? I could not find a place in the document that stated directly what happens to it. Is it a part of the student’s permanent record?
    - i. Files are part of the student record. Notations only go on the transcript if the student is suspended or expelled. Added language to the procedure to reflect this.
  - b. Reconsider the inclusion of parking lots in Subpart E... it was my understanding that parking lots were something that we could not regulate.
    - i. Parking lots are college property, so incidents that occur in the parking lot are covered under the code of conduct.
  - c. Also, I don’t know what the fix is, but I have an issue with the tone of the procedure. It seems like it is a laundry list of everything that a student can do wrong..
    - i. Added two statements about the college philosophy in regards to code of conduct. One in the policy and one right before the sanction section. Our philosophy is that we treat conduct violations as developmental, or learning opportunities. The code of conduct is not meant to be only punitive.
  - d. What role does the other Discipline committee play in this process (This is the Behavioral Review Board). No mention is made of this committee. Should the committee also play a role?
    - i. The Behavioral Response and Concerns Team (BCRT) is meant to look at situations that might result in harm to the student or to someone else on campus. BCRT cases may be conduct-related and they may not be. For instance, a student with suicidal ideation is a matter for the BCR team, but if the student hasn’t done anything, it is not a conduct violation. We added a line

under possible sanctions to say that conduct violations may result in referral to the BCR team, but BCRT is not otherwise part of the conduct policy/procedure.

4. (Faculty)

- a. "Disrespectful behavior" is so loose, it's just open to abuse
  - i. Changed to Disruptive Behavior.
- b. There is no clear distinction between issues that could benefit from intervention from the behavioral team before elevating to a code of conduct issue, and issues that clearly are code of conduct issues; we should be encouraging the use of the behavioral team before things elevate to a code of conduct, especially for most forms of "disrespectful behavior"
  - i. See above statement on the BCR team.
- c. There is nothing in the policy that states that a student is expelled after three code of conduct violations (although I understand this to be our practice).
  - i. The "three code violations and you're out" practice is not the case at NHCC. Each case is looked at individually. A severe case (firearm on campus, etc) could result in suspension/expulsion immediately, whereas a series of more than 3 violations doesn't necessarily mean the student is suspended/expelled.

5. (Faculty) Part 3 # 4 listed below..

- a. Part 3. Investigation and Informal Hearing Process
  - i. The alleged student must be informed that a code of conduct report is being submitted against them prior to the report submission, with exception for situations when the health and/or safety of a community member or the college is considered to be in danger.
    1. Added language, "Or in cases where notification would escalate the situation." The intent is that the student should, in most cases, know that they are being referred for a code of conduct violation. We do not want the student to hear for the first time that they violated the code of conduct policy when the judicial affairs officer contacts them. We will work on providing training for employees to know how to handle notification.
  - ii. I believe that having to inform a student that a code of conduct report is being submitted against them prior to the report submission renders the conduct report fairly ineffective, especially regarding class conduct and behavior towards instructors. Informing the student prior should be somewhat anonymous, if need be. Informing the student prior offers the student time to react in a negative fashion before a report is even filed. Just my thoughts there.
    1. See previous statement.

6. (Faculty)

- a. Boy, I must say that the Student Conduct Policy/Procedure is thorough. I felt like I was watching Law and Order as I read through it. I do have one issue and that is the definition of the student advocate as someone who may attend a hearing but may not speak. If the entire 6 person panel reflecting the college is allowed to speak and

question witnesses, I feel that the student advocate ought to be able to do the same. An advocate is someone who advocates for someone, I am not sure how that is done if they cannot speak. I would like to see the definition modified to the effect that the student advocate is allowed to participate along the same lines as the rest of the panel and maybe even speak for the student if the student is not comfortable doing so for him/herself. Maybe I am splitting hairs, I don't know. And maybe there is some precedent for the definition as it stands now, I don't know where it came from. But it sure seems like the student is overwhelmed with college presence and participation, whereas the student is very limited by being alone or with a silent advocate. This part of the policy/procedure was really the only part that struck me as unreasonable.

- i. Added a definition of an advocate to explain that the advocate is not a lawyer. Did add that they can talk during the proceeding, but for clarification purposes.
    - ii. Also, if the student shows up with a lawyer to the formal hearing, the hearing is immediately postponed until a MnSCU lawyer can be present. The hearing is not a legal proceeding.
  - b. One other point, from reading the procedure of the informal hearing it appears that that occurs only with the Conduct Officer and the student. I think that this should be made explicit in its own separate bullet point. If this is not the case, then who attends the informal hearing needs to be clarified much more than it is now.
    - i. Changed the language to say, "may include the complainant." However, having the complainant present is not required.
  - c. I would like some response from the committee or you to my two points above. That the committee is either changing the policy and how or leaving policy as is. I have been finding lately that requests by committees, admin, union for feedback are frequently then leaving people hanging without letting them know the outcome as a result of the feedback. Feels like the feedback goes into a black hole.... J
    - i. This is the third semester that feedback has been obtained from the campus community regarding policies under review. In each semester, the feedback was used to modify the policies/procedures. Going forward, the Policy Committee will provide a summary document like this one and add comments about what changes were or were not made. The document will then be sent back to the community.
7. (Faculty) I do believe it is fair to everyone involved. I'm curious to know which areas you feel are not fair to students. Thank you for checking with everyone and not assumed your opinion represents that of all of the other faculty.
8. (Faculty) I agree with you on all points. Thankful watchful eyes are looking over this...cast my voice in the pile.
  - a. I'll specifically say that subjective areas such as "a passionate argument in class" should indeed be monitored very carefully. We've all been the passionate speaker once, right? And then to hear the person say, "Well Todd yelled at me to do this or that"...ha ha, wait a second...do you want a dictionary to look up the word "yelling"!?!? :)

- b. Totally agree also that students should not be forced to pay a fine for such things. While you don't have an issue with restitution, I do if it involves anything akin to our judicial system. Forced community service hours, anger management, anything external in my mind should be avoided. Keep it internal...make them research plagiarism and give a speech about it, redo an assignment, or penalize their grades...but I am not a fan of having them "do something" outside of NHCC to atone for their sins.
    - i. **Sanctions are internal. For instance, community service hours would be on campus community service unless the student opts to do external service. The goal of sanctions is to have the student learn from their mistakes and not just punish them. The exception is if the student is suspended. There may be conditions they must complete in order to come back to NHCC.**
9. (Faculty)
- a. Under academic dishonesty 1(i): "engaging in any behavior ... prohibited... in the course syllabus." That is too broad, I think, since some syllabi say "don't come late" or "don't use your cell phone in class" – and while I think the code of conduct applies to these situations, it doesn't really belong under "cheating." Or I'm just being too picky. This has been known to happen.
    - i. **Changed the wording to be "engaging in any academic behavior..."**
  - b. Subpart (B) (computer/tech): #6 – really? So if I buy a PDF online and download it, that's going to get me in trouble? See disclaimer above. And that is all I have time for at the moment. If I get a chance, I'll keep reading.
    - i. **Added the word "illegally." The intent of the language is to say that illegally downloading or distributing copyrighted material using campus technology resources is a violation of the code of conduct. If a person buys something legally, there would be no issue (unless they then distribute it illegally).**
10. (Faculty) I looked at the Code of Conduct information, and think that it's alright as worded. Our building in particular has had problems with students bringing former students or visitors in to work out or participate in open gym, thinking that it's just fine. These "guests" sometimes caused disturbances and were not an asset to the campus. Thanks for listening!
- a. **The Policy Committee will be looking at a visitor policy in the spring semester.**
11. (Faculty) My only feedback is as follows for Policy 3.6.1. Student Conduct Procedure
- a. Comments regarding Part 1 Subpart A g: submitting substantial portions of work for credit in more than one course, without consulting the faculty. Every student has reused a paper/project from one course in a different course. It seems extreme to require the student to consult faculty in regards to this. If the student fails to edit/alter the old assignment's content enough in order for it to fit with the current assignment's objectives, then the student fails that assignment. I don't think this is academic dishonesty as much as it is laziness.
    - i. **This subpart has been deleted entirely.**
12. (Staff) I have one initial comment. I think that the adjective "knowingly" in the clause "providing false or inaccurate information" of the Student Conduct Procedure is very important. We enroll some students who have an 8<sup>th</sup> grade reading level in English and who just moved to the US

from another country. These students might incorrectly provide information for the simple fact that they don't understand the question. Even though intent – or what someone was thinking when he/she acted – is difficult/impossible to prove from an investigative perspective, I think we need to focus centrally on intent – like has been drafted in this procedure. Good job to the committee.

13. (Staff) Hi Landon, I know I mentioned this to Chad, but should we have a policy statement about concerning appropriate uses of recorded classroom content? I know this came up at the state DS directors meeting. - Something like” students may only use recorded content for learning purposes” (i.e. not edit and post to youtube). Just a thought.
  - a. Refer to Part 1, subpart A.1.h. This is the catch all for other language in the syllabus.

**6.13 and 6.13.1 Election Activity:**

1. (Faculty) None.