

Meeting Specifics		
Purpose	Frequency	
Special Meetings	Once	
Date	Time	Location
May 8, 2025	1:00-2:00 p.m.	Zoom
Faculty Senate		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chair: Crawford, Christopher	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Design: Bergeron, Emily	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Honors: Martin, Joe
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provost Liaison: Harper, Christine	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Design: O'Bryan, Mark	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Honors: Roberts, Sherelle
<input type="checkbox"/> Trustee: Ballard, Hubie	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Education: Bennett, Stephanie	<input type="checkbox"/> Libraries: Laub, Amy
<input type="checkbox"/> Trustee: Swanson, Hollie	<input type="checkbox"/> Education: Jensen, Jane McEldowney	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Libraries: McDonnell, Andrew
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agriculture, Food & Environment: Rentfrow, Gregg	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Engineering: Anderson, Kimberly	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medicine: Hall, Sarah
<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture, Food & Environment: Teets, Nicholas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Engineering: Tagavi, Kaveh	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medicine: Thibault, Olivier
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Arts & Sciences: Bosch, Anna	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fine Arts: Alley, Becky	<input type="checkbox"/> Nursing: Biddle, Martha
<input type="checkbox"/> Arts & Sciences: Stein, Melissa	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine Arts: Kerns, Bradley	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nursing: Stith, Holly
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Business & Economics: Hapke, Holly	<input type="checkbox"/> Graduate School: Butler, John "J.S."	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pharmacy: Adams, Val
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Business & Economics: Vincent, Leslie	<input type="checkbox"/> Graduate School: Montgomery, Kathleen	<input type="checkbox"/> Pharmacy: Bauer, Bjoern
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Communication & Information: Jeong, Hyun Ju	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Health Sciences: Lowman, Joneen	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Health: Haynes, Erin
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Communication & Information: Vallade, Jessalyn	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Health Sciences: Metzler-Wilson, Kristen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Health: Ingram, Richard
<input type="checkbox"/> Dentistry: Dominguez Fernandez, Enif	<input type="checkbox"/> Law: Michael, Douglas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Social Work: Jones, Aubrey
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dentistry: Wiemann, Alfred	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Law: Murray, Michael	<input type="checkbox"/> Social Work: Ratliff, Stephanie
Standing Guests and Visitors		
<input type="checkbox"/> DiPaola, Bob	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Harmon, Camille	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Visitor: Frisby, Brandi
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Visitor: Jasinski, Jana	<input type="checkbox"/> Visitor: Tannock, Lisa	<input type="checkbox"/> Visitor:
<input type="checkbox"/> Visitor:	<input type="checkbox"/> Visitor:	<input type="checkbox"/> Visitor:

Agenda Item	Presenter/Facilitator
Discussion Regarding Feedback Collected on the Administrative Regulations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Admission to the University Community Support and Intervention The Student Experience 	C. Crawford
Next Meeting August 25, 2025 3:00-5:00 p.m. TBD	

Minutes	
Agenda Item: Discussion Regarding Feedback Collected on the Administrative Regulations	Presenter: C. Crawford
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Faculty Senate discussed the feedback collected on the Administrative Regulations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Admission to the University Community Support and Intervention The Student Experience Please see appendix A for presentation slides/report. The motion for the Faculty Senate to approve the summary provided by the Shared Governance Committee and submit it to the Office of the Provost passed with 14 votes in favor and 2 votes against. 	
Other Information	
Adjournment	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting adjourned at 2:00p.m. 	
Next Meeting	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monday, August 25, 2025, 3:00-5:00p.m., TBD 	

AR feedback for Faculty Senate discussion 5/8/25:

1 Faculty Senate summary::

2 **GENERAL**

3 Faculty consistently expressed concern about the **limited time for review and response**,
4 requesting more time to review and communicate ideas/concerns to their respective, dedicated
5 faculty senators.

6 There was widespread support for **greater transparency**, with faculty asking that future drafts
7 include **comparative documentation**. It would be very helpful if administration could release
8 both the present ARs and the previous ARs for comparison. Multiple units emphasized the value
9 of **track changes or highlighted revisions**, which would help identify meaningful progress and
10 preserve and build upon our previous efforts and resources.

11 There is a strong sentiment that the **ARs are vague and ambiguous** regarding who holds the
12 decision-making power. Entities are sometimes clearly identified (i.e, named) while other times
13 are omitted or replaced with general descriptors (i.e., administration of the college), and the role
14 of the Faculty in decision making is left unclear.

15 A broader concern was the lack of **administrative response to faculty input**, particularly
16 regarding previously submitted comments: I am concerned that if we don't receive feedback
17 indicating that our voices were heard, we are going to start losing faculty interest in commenting
18 at all on these. It would be nice to receive ARs with line numbers to ease the reviewing.

19 **Inconsistencies and confusing terminology or contradictions** are present throughout the ARs
20 and make the documents unclear, creating confusion regarding rights and responsibilities of all
21 parties on campus.

22

ADMISSION

Vagueness and Ambiguity of Authority Several colleges flagged unclear language regarding who holds decision-making power. Phrases like “in conjunction with” were described as “deliberately vague,” with concerns that authority defaults to the Provost. “There is no such thing as joint authority... you are really saying the Provost has the power.” “Is ‘college’ the Dean? If so, that seems inappropriate... admission requirements are clearly an academic matter.”

Does adding a sentence on the components of administrative items versus individual authority in decision-making? And is there a need to reference the college rules to emphasize the role of faculty committee in decision-making.

Faculty Governance and Academic Oversight There is deep concern about the **erosion of faculty authority** in determining admissions criteria, particularly at the graduate and professional levels. “Faculty oversight must be restored to maintain academic integrity.” “Admissions criteria must be developed and approved by faculty within academic units.”

Inconsistencies and Confusing Terminology Multiple comments pointed out internal contradictions and undefined or misused terms: “It is not exactly clear who is responsible for final decisions.” “What does ‘maintain’ mean — stick documents in a safe?”

Appeals, Due Process, and Documentation The admissions reversal process was seen as underdeveloped: “Any recourse if a reversal occurs?” “Require transparent, documented rationale for denials.”

Equity, Holistic Review, and Access Many faculty emphasized the need for structured, consistent holistic review criteria and **more explicit equity commitments**. “Without standard rubrics and training, this may result in subjective or inequitable evaluations.” “All admissions decisions shall reflect the University's commitment to identifying and supporting students whose potential has been demonstrated in varied contexts...”

Concerning Wording and Public Messaging Some found the document’s tone and content troubling: “The document about Admissions is frankly quite scary...” “The sentence linking socio-economic status and criminality needs re-writing.” “This document tries to state both positions...that admission is both merit-based and guaranteed upon meeting minimum requirements.”

Admission Decision reversal.

Consult with Ombud and UK legal to make sure they are consulted on the writing of this passage in this AR. Make sure we align with current practice.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT AND INTERVENTION

Lack of Definition and Transparency in Key Processes Faculty were alarmed by the absence of detail around how referrals are made, evaluated, and by whom. “It isn’t clear how referrals are evaluated.” “‘Risk’... Do we call the police instead? Use a different word or define it better.”

Involuntary Withdrawal and Student Rights The regulation was criticized for inadequate due process protections. “How does this comply with the ADA and Section 504?” “Is there an appeal process? Due process?”

Composition and Operation of the Community of Concern Team Faculty requested explicit membership and clearer function. “Why not list psychologist, clinicians, counselors, and police officers?” “Opaque sentence, what are we talking about?”

Mandatory Reporting and Student Confidentiality Multiple colleges questioned requiring students to report on peers and sought clarity on FERPA implications. “Why must students report on each other?” “What constitutes an ‘emergency’?”

General Vagueness and Reduction of Detail from Previous Policy One faculty member asked: “Why is this version so much less detailed than AR 4.1?”

Classroom Decorum. No help or discussion on student’s expectation/ civility/ actions in the classroom? A statement to support class syllabus and college processes (e.g. code of conduct or honor code) would be great.

“Elements of these ARs are sometimes informative rather than policy”.

STUDENT EXPERIENCE

Overemphasis on Control; Lack of Developmental Framing Faculty criticized the regulation for treating student life as administrative rather than educational: “This regulation emphasizes administrative control without articulating the developmental purpose of student life.” “Add language to reflect the role of student life in leadership, civic engagement, and identity development.”

Limitations on Student Organization Naming and Expression Naming restrictions (e.g., use of “UK”) were flagged as potentially marginalizing: “Limiting the use of ‘UK’...could delegitimize affinity and advocacy groups.”

Unclear Oversight and Governance Structure Faculty asked for clarification on who is eligible to serve on student affairs committees and for more specificity in the draft. “Should faculty be able to serve on this team?” “It does not list specific required representatives, the chair, or appointment terms.”

Fundraising and Viewpoint Neutrality Calls were made for greater transparency in how student group fundraising and event approvals are handled: “Clarify fundraising approval criteria. Policies should remain viewpoint-neutral and transparent.”

General Recommendations for Framing “Student life is central to fostering leadership, civic engagement, identity exploration, and campus community.”

“Elements of these ARs are sometimes informative rather than policy.”

GENERAL

faculty would appreciate if administration could provide more time to review and communicate ideas/concerns to their respective, dedicated faculty senators (thank you, y'all, for your time, hard work, and attention). In addition to having more time to review and respond, in the future, it would be very helpful if administration could release both the present ARS and the previous ARs for comparison so faculty can make a more informed assessment of the proposed changes.

ADMISSION

- BUSINESS: AR draft document (Admissions) appears to be a higher-level policy focusing on general principles, clarifying decision-making authority and processes, emphasizing holistic review potential across all levels, introducing formal appeal and reversal processes, and possibly streamlining or delegating specific requirements for categories like non-degree students compared to the detailed operational rules found in the older document. The older AR contains many specific details on admission requirements for various student types (undergraduate, transfer, international, graduate, etc.) and procedures (deadlines, transcripts, precollege curriculum, etc.) that are not present in the draft.
- Engineering: One comment on the admissions one is that authority for admission requirements seems deliberately vague. It's unclear what "in conjunction with" means, and therefore who actually has decision making power. There is no such thing as joint authority, so when you say it this way you are really saying the provost has the power. I also don't know what "the college" means – is that the administration of the college, i.e. the Dean? That would seem inappropriate, because admission requirements are clearly an academic matter, and faculty should have primary responsibility over academic matters. There should be a reference to college faculty as opposed to the college generally.

The second paragraph contradicts itself. The first sentence says "The VPSS, the Grad School, and the [Deans of colleges with professional programs] shall maintain policies and procedures ..." The next sentence says "The policies and procedures shall be maintained by the VPSS." Suspect they intended to use different verbs.

In that paragraph it is not clear what "maintain" means. Stick documents in a safe? Are the "policies etc." to be public? One would certainly hope so, but there's nothing in this academic REGULATION that prevents keeping them secret. I suspect the intended meaning of the second instance of "maintain" was "publish". It is not exactly clear who is responsible for final decisions regarding admission. Is it centralized or distributed/delegated? (Currently we have an office of "enrollment management", but that's not mentioned anywhere.)

Somewhere it needs to define the precedence among the College and "standard University" admissions criteria, otherwise continual conflict will result. (And we will need to hire a half-dozen more administrators to handle it.) Can Engineering impose additional requirements over the "standard" ones? Can a College lower those standards? Same comment with respect to "automatic admissions criteria" in section III.A. It's not clear to me how a process that includes both "automatic" admissions AND "a holistic review process" can be shown to be consistent and fair if challenged.

Note from Engineering: While this has nothing to do with these AR's, I am still getting comments and concerns about the academic freedom AR. Have we heard anything about whether our comments were incorporated and changes made? I am concerned that if we don't receive feedback indicating that our voices were heard, we are going to start losing faculty interest in commenting at all on these.

- DESIGN:

- Statement on Criminal History and Socioeconomic Status (Section I)
"Socioeconomic status, ability to pay and criminal history do not prohibit admission to the University." Clarify that while criminal history does not bar admission, it *may* affect participation in certain programs or professional pathways, depending on external licensing or other requirements.
- Admission Decision Reversal (Section VI) *"...discovery of prior academic or disciplinary violations not disclosed..."*
Do all applications require disclosure? If the students aren't explicitly asked — could be challenged as arbitrary. Any recourse if a reversal occurs?
- Documentation and Transparency (Section III.B)
"Committees are required to document their decision-making processes..."
What form will this documentation take? How will it be preserved for transparency, consistency, or appeals (records retention policy)?

AR feedback for Faculty Senate discussion 5/8/25:

• COMMUNICATION & INFORMATION:

- In all ARs, we again propose that track changes or highlighting key changes be included to clearly demonstrate what has been improved compared to previous ARs. This will help identify meaningful progress and preserve and build upon our previous efforts and resources.
- It would be beneficial to include more specific details overall. While the role of the Provost's Office is emphasized, there needs to be a clearer explanation of the overlapping vs distinctive roles of other offices in the admission decision-making process—particularly the International Office regarding international student admissions and the Graduate School concerning graduate admissions.

COLLEGE OF MEDICINE:

- Some inconsistencies are noted. Why is it the Provost and the Vice President for Student Success for certain categories (undergraduate admission), or Deans and the Provost (graduate admission and postbac)? Is this a mistake? Shouldn't the Vice President for Student Success be in all these decision making bodies for admission?
- In I. Deans are clearly named as representatives of colleges. But in subsequent sections (II.A. first bullet; II. B. first two bullets) we see the words "colleges" or "college leadership". Just replace with Deans. Inconsistencies make the document messy.
- In I. we are told that applicants are evaluated *solely* on 3 things. But in III. A. another evaluation criterion is listed (alignment with UK's mission). So not solely 3 things. And, alignment is a very loose term, ill-defined, is 75% alignment as good as 100% alignment. Why this vagueness?
- In II.A. bullet #2, The Vice President for Student Success has the responsibility for setting procedures... but bullet #1 says in conjunction with the Provost and the Vice President for Student Success. So which is it? Application components in bullet #2 is not the same thing as requirements in bullet #1? I recommend combining those 2 bullets into one.
- Again, as last time, an overwhelming sense of vagueness prevails.

College of Fine Arts:

Admission to the University The draft regulation restructures admissions authority by consolidating decision-making under the Vice President for Student Success and the Provost. This shift removes formalized faculty governance in setting or revising admissions criteria, including at the graduate and professional levels. Faculty oversight must be restored to maintain academic integrity and discipline-specific alignment.

Recommendations: • Reestablish shared governance in admissions policy formation, including formal roles for faculty and academic councils. • Clarify that graduate and professional program admissions criteria must be developed and approved by faculty

within academic units, with administrative offices in a facilitative role. The regulation permits a holistic review but lacks criteria for consistent implementation. Without standard rubrics and training, this may result in subjective or inequitable evaluations.

Recommendations: • Define structured, documented holistic review processes, including evaluation rubrics and reviewer training. • To guide equitable review, include specific, context-based indicators (e.g., geographic, linguistic, financial, or educational adversity).

Appeals procedures are vaguely outlined. The statement that admissions decisions are "final" lacks due process standards, including the composition of review committees and clear appeals pathways. Recommendations: • Establish a two-tier appeals process. •

Require transparent, documented rationale for denials and committee review structures with cross-functional representation. The draft contains no reference to educational access or inclusive admissions practices. Given the current federal pressure on DEI initiatives, it is critical to embed inclusive values without relying on contested terminology.

Recommendation for Revised Language (Section III. A): All admissions decisions shall reflect the University's commitment to identifying and supporting students whose potential has been demonstrated in varied contexts, including those shaped by economic, regional, social, linguistic, or educational disparities. Admissions review processes should consider contextual evidence of resilience, contribution, and academic promise. Finally, the regulation references the Board of Trustees' authority in setting "standard criteria" without describing what those entail or how changes are communicated to academic units.

Recommendation: • Define what constitutes "standard criteria" and clarify review and approval processes. Summary: This regulation centralizes authority, reduces transparency, and weakens faculty input. It must be revised to restore governance balance, define equitable practices, and safeguard access in admissions. II. Administrative Regulation:

Community Support and Intervention This regulation grants broad authority to the Vice President for Student Success to manage referrals, interventions, and involuntary withdrawals without clearly defining oversight mechanisms or procedural safeguards. Key Issues and Recommendations: • Lack of team definition: The "Community of Concern" team should include licensed clinicians, legal counsel, and student support professionals.

• Involuntary withdrawal: The process must include independent clinical evaluation, ADA/504 rights notification, and a precise appeal mechanism. • Emergency contact notification: Require FERPA-aligned language and documentation standards for when and how notification occurs. • Systemic factors: Add language that acknowledges broader contributors to student distress (e.g., financial insecurity, housing, discrimination) and outlines a cross-campus support approach. Summary: This AR focuses on safety and risk but lacks balance, transparency, and due process protections. Revisions should emphasize clinical accountability, student rights, and broader institutional responsibility.

III. Administrative Regulation: The Student Experience The regulation provides administrative oversight for student organizations, housing, and dining, but presents student life as transactional and overregulated. Key Issues and Recommendations: •

Naming restrictions: Limiting the use of "UK" or similar identifiers in student organization

names could delegitimize affinity and advocacy groups. Consider a policy that permits institutional affiliation language when use is responsible and not misleading. • Fundraising and approval: Clarify fundraising approval criteria. Policies should remain viewpoint-neutral and transparent. • Missing educational framing: Add language to reflect the role of student life in leadership, civic engagement, and identity development. Recommendation for Introductory Language: Student life is central to fostering leadership, civic engagement, identity exploration, and campus community. The University affirms the educational value of student-led organizations and co-curricular involvement. Summary: This regulation emphasizes administrative control without articulating the developmental purpose of student life. A revised draft should affirm student autonomy, educational value, and inclusive engagement across student communities.

The document about Admissions is frankly quite scary - it appears to argue that anyone who has completed UK's academic requirements will be admitted, even if they are unable to demonstrate that they can contribute to the UK community on any way. The sentence linking socio-economic status and criminality needs re-writing. If UK is now promising to provide adequate financial aid to all admitted students, the current sentence is OK, but if not, it should say something like "the application process is "need blind"", so that an applicant's need for financial assistance will not be considered.

Either UK considers factors such as leadership, potential for success, and noteworthy achievements or it considers only academic credentials - this document tries to state both positions. I gather that someone wanted to signal to the public that neither children of alumnae, or applicants adding ethnic, cultural or economic diversity to the incoming class would be given preference. Of course, athletes, inventors and artists would also be on equal footing with students who simply earned a certain GPA. The new statement is trying to conform to a view of a university degree as a right rather than a privilege to be earned through hard work.

COLLEGE OF LAW:

(1) We note the ambiguity and vagueness of the use of two terms, “collaboration with” and “in conjunction with.” Are these historical terms with a known meaning at UK? If we had to choose one, which term would be better for units to have a role in setting admission standards?

(2) Our role as the Faculty Senate is to advise the Provost. We have **two options**: We can point out that it is confusing to use two different terms, and we don’t like the vagueness

and ambiguity of either term. Could the Provost settle on one term that is a more clear and specific term.

OR we could communicate: The Faculty Senate construes “collaboration with” to mean the same thing as “in conjunction with,” and the Senate construes both terms to mean that the Provost (and the Vice President for Student Success with regard to undergraduate programs) will not act to make or alter admission requirements and procedures without consulting with and receiving the input of the faculty of the colleges communicated through the colleges’ leadership.

(3) With respect to specific requirements for Post-Baccalaureate Professional programs, we would like it to be clear that the colleges have a clear role in setting admissions standards and requirements, so we would like our AR line item to borrow from the Graduate line item the following text: **“Individual colleges and programs determine the admission requirements to their colleges and programs.”**

College of A&S:

two groups charged with maintaining; no specification of division between VPSS, GS, and ProfPrograms

II A, B have different orderings of bullet points

COMMUNITY SUPPORT AND INTERVENTION

- **BUSINESS:** AR 4.1 provides extensive details on procedures for registration, managing violations, use of university facilities, rules for posters, handbills, chalking, and yard signs, and other limited privileges such as tax exemption, insurance, use of university marks, and agency accounts. The draft regulation, while covering key rules and prohibitions for student organizations, is significantly less detailed regarding these specific procedures and policies compared to current AR4.1. Why?
- **DESIGN:**
 - Referral Mechanism (Section I) “...should submit a referral to the Vice President for Student Success.” It isn’t clear how *referrals* are evaluated.

AR feedback for Faculty Senate discussion 5/8/25:

- Emergency Contact Communication (Section II & V) *"The Dean of Students...will coordinate any engagement by other University employees." "...communication may be initiated with the student's emergency contact."* What constitutes an "emergency" that allows breaching a student's confidentiality. FERPA implications?
- Involuntary Medical Withdrawal (Section IV) *"...may initiate an involuntary medical withdrawal."* How does this comply with the ADA and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act? Is reasonable accommodation defined somewhere? Is there an appeal process? Due process?
- Authority and Role of "Community of Concern Team" (Section III) *"The team...will be trained in threat assessment..."* How does this team operate? How are decisions made? Is there any transparency on this as this is the group can initiate involuntary withdrawal?

COLLEGE OF MEDICINE:

- On I. Referrals. "risk" a student is doing something risky to or in the campus community and is endangering himself or others, we need to submit a referral to the Vice President for Student Success? Perhaps we should call the police instead. Use a different word that risk or define it better.
- On III. Community of Concern team. "comply with industry standards". Opaque sentence, what are we talking about? No effort it made to describe the processes that are listed. Definition and deeper characterization of processes are needed. Team is made up of people who can help with the well-being, success, and safety of students. Why not list psychologist, clinicians, counselors, and police officers?
- On VI. Mandatory reporting. Why must students report on each other?
- General feedback is that the rules are made vague on purpose.

College of A&S:

links can change and are not as permanent as this document
ambiguity whether UKPD, VPSS, or Dean Students has authority to contact the
VII is info, not policy

379 STUDENT EXPERIENCE

380

381 • BUSINESS: Should faculty be able to serve on this team? The draft document is less
382 specific about the composition of the team, stating that the VP for Student Success will
383 appoint a team of *employees* with demonstrated experience. It adds that the team will be
384 **trained in threat assessment** and comply with **industry standards**, details not mentioned
385 in the effective regulation's composition section. It does not list specific required
386 representatives, the chair, or appointment terms.

387 • What is the Equal Dignity regulation?

388

389 • DESIGN:

390 • Freedom of Association and Viewpoint Discrimination (Section I.B.1) Does UK
391 follow an "all-comers" policy or does it allow belief-based membership criteria for
392 mission-centered RSOs.

393 • Fundraising Restrictions (Section I.B.3) *"Any fundraising requires approval of the*
394 *Vice President for Student Success."* Is this just on-campus fundraising? Or
395 fundraising that uses University resources?

396 • All Members Must Be Students (Section I.B.4) *"All members of an RSO must be*
397 *enrolled students..."* What about alumni mentoring clubs or religious groups with
398 community advisors — in non-voting or advisory roles

399 • Hazing Reporting Requirement (Section I.B.5) *"Any member of the University*
400 *community...must report..."* Is reporting confidential?

401 • Appeals Process (Section II) *"Students who would like to appeal...are referred to the*
402 *Housing and Dining Appeals Committee."* Reference specific policies for the
403 appeals process?

404

405 • COMMUNICATION & INFORMATION: "All student organizations must be non-profit in nature
406 and any fundraising requires approval of the Vice President for Student Success." --- What if
407 student orgs co-host fundraising events with other local chapters and other university
408 chapters? It will be helpful to provide clarification on procedures and boundaries for such
409 joint fundraising events, possibly by specifying whether approval is needed from all involved
410 chapters and outlining how shared responsibilities are managed.

411

412 COLLEGE OF MEDICINE:

413 • This title does not describe the student experience, unless one defines the whole Student
414 Experience by eating, dinning and being prohibited to do certain things with respect to RSO.

AR feedback for Faculty Senate discussion 5/8/25:

- 415 • On B. Prohibitions, “The university will not obstruct” please consider that this wording (“not
416 obstruct”) can read as support, guide, engage, or even prefer. How can one obstruct or not
417 obstruct the defining of something? The University will not *influence* could be better.
- 418 • General sense that again, these ARs are waffley and vague and continue to treat our students as
419 “non-adults”.

420

421 College of A&S:

422 prohibition without statement of consequences or reference to policy.

423 "there are a variety of dining options..." paragraph is info, not policy

424

425

426