

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Student Affairs Committee

SAC 18/19-05
February 1, 2019
12:00 p.m. - Stalker Hall 105

Approved:

Present: Derrick Bowman, Steve Hardin, Steve Stofferahn, Michelle Souza
Ex-Officio: Bailey Bridgewater, Mike Chambers, Steve Lamb, Jennifer Lawson, Braden Murphy, Brooke Porter, Rich Toomey
Guests: Katie Butwin, Steve Neiheisel

1. Call to order
 - 1.1. Vice Chair/Interim Chair S. Stofferahn called the meeting to order at 12:01 p.m.
 - 1.2. Introductions – everyone around the table identified himself/herself
2. Approval of minutes from November 28, 2018 meeting
 - 2.1. M. Souza moved, and S. Lamb seconded, approval of the minutes. The minutes were approved 4-0-0.
3. Announcements
 - 3.1. None.
4. Election of Committee Chairperson
 - 4.1. M. Souza nominated Vice Chair S. Stofferahn to serve as chair. D. Bowman seconded. He was elected unanimously.
 - 4.2. S. Hardin nominated M. Souza to be Vice Chair. D. Bowman seconded. She was elected unanimously.
5. Old Business
 - 5.1. Faculty Scholarship Update: John Liu
 - 5.1.1. J. Liu was absent. S. Stofferahn will follow up with him to see what's happening.
 - 5.2. "Free Speech" Update: Katie Butwin
 - 5.2.1. A couple of meetings ago, committee members determined we didn't know ISU's free speech rules.
 - 5.2.2. K. Butwin began by noting ISU does not have designated free speech zones. We're a public entity, so we're subject to the constitutional requirement not to restrict free speech. But actually we can contain it in certain ways. Some areas of speech are not as protected as others: fraudulent speech, true threats, "yelling fire in a crowded theater." One area the Supreme Court came up with is "fighting words." There is older case law on this. She said she doesn't know what the current US Supreme Court would do with it. Hate speech is not unprotected speech. There are arguments on both sides whether it should be actionable. In the last 20 years, many institutions set up areas on campus designated as free speech zones. All speech is permitted in those zones. Over time, all speech activity was funneled to that area of campus. There's been some pushback about designated speech zones, because they take away the idea that the whole campus is a designated speech zone. The

Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE) has been targeting designated speech zones. ISU never went in that direction; no free speech zone was designated here. Instead, we have a policy identifying different types of spaces on campus. For example, dorm rooms are private areas, so speech can be regulated there. In our traditional public spaces – like a public park – speech is permitted. That’s probably the way our fountain area has become a place for people to make speeches. We can regulate the time, place and manner of speech. For example, someone can’t use a loudspeaker at 2:00 a.m. Campuses have been successful in shutting down speech when there would be a disruption to operations. Speech that disrupts classes can be regulated. It sounds simple and easy, but none of this topic is simple and easy for anyone. She’s the lawyer; she can advise, but she’s not the decider. B. Bridgewater asked about when we have speakers targeting specific people. K. Butwin answered discriminatory actions directed specifically at a particular person can be regulated. D. Bowman asked why we let the visiting preachers call him “a fag going to hell” and make him feel uncomfortable? K. Butwin said she gets the “preacher question” a lot. We can’t have a prior restraint on speech. We can’t tell people they can’t come on campus because we think they’ll be hurtful. She said the legal answer is unsatisfactory. The reality is that a person can be on a campus and can say really offensive, awful, hurtful things. But the speech can’t be directed at a single person. D. Bowman countered that the preacher hurts him when he speaks. K. Butwin said “Brother Jed” relocated to Terre Haute a few years ago. He’s pretty sophisticated, but his trainees are sometimes not as much so. When Jed or others talk about groups in general, that’s not discrimination according to the law. That doesn’t address how people feel, though. D. Bowman said the university seemed to be trying to placate one group of students – Saudis – when a faculty member put up anti-Saudi posters - but not members of the LGBTQ community. Is it because of Saudi money that we don’t want to offend them? When the campus preachers come on campus, there’s an uptick in anti-gay incidents. Where’s the line drawn? He said he feels offended, and feels the preachers shouldn’t be here. When the Saudis felt offended, we did something; the signs against the Saudis were taken down. It’s not fair that we don’t put the same policies in effect across the board. S. Lamb said when the Saudi students started coming to SGA about the problem, he sent a letter to Staff Council, Faculty Senate and others, and told them who the faculty member was. It’s contrary to our goal of creating a tolerant environment. It’s not in the interest of the university to alienate this group of students. The professor was tenured, so there wasn’t much the university could do about it. K. Butwin said demanding that the university have a response to the hateful speech of Brother Jed is perfectly appropriate, and that’s what the First Amendment was designed to do. Sometimes the best response is more speech rather than stopping speech. We all could do a much better job of preparing our students and faculty how to manage any kind of speech situation like Brother Jed’s. Tomorrow it could be someone else. The issue is in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* every day. It doesn’t mean the university can’t respond, it just means we can’t restrain the speech. D. Bowman asked if we could have a statement from the president stating Jed does not represent ISU values. When D. Bowman gave campus tours, none of the potential students insulted came to ISU. R. Toomey said that when we know that Jed is coming, we adjust our tours accordingly. D. Bowman asked how we determine when speech is hostile. K. Butwin responded that the Office of Civil Rights and the EEOC have issued guidelines. When the speech is directed against a group, it’s protected, but that doesn’t make the members of the group feel any better. A better question is: how do we prepare people for offensive and

disgusting speech? How do we deal with it? We have our personal response and our more activist kind of response. ISU is investigating how we can change the educational opportunities at the beginning of the academic year. B. Bridgewater asked if in the announcement Public Safety sends out, could they include information about Title IX or other resources if you're angry? R. Toomey noted the impact is different for students who are just visiting. We can't do counter programming in that case.

5.3. Admissions Standards proposal: Steve Neiheisel

5.3.1.S. Neiheisel said the assumptions and facts listed in the document sent to the Committee are similar to those presented in the SEM presentations. He knows the committee was spooked about the possibility of analyzing admissions standards. This proposal requires us to take a step back and look at what we're doing. We have a cumbersome admission process. The idea is that we'll admit the students that we can get as best we can. Why spend resources ahead of time to filter them? Instead, we should spend the resources to better serve them. Why go through a bureaucratic policy of admissions at all? We know we have problems with conditional admits, so let's replace that approach with a comprehensive Ivy Tech partnership in which students can enroll and take advantage of ISU college life. That needs to be developed. Expand the placement of support; determine which groups need more support. Put our resources less into screening and more on better taking care of the students once they're here. D. Bowman asked S. Neiheisel to pass along to Dr. Maule and Dr. Powers that the assessments must be proctored. R. Toomey said D. Bowman has a good point, but that would mean a significant investment; we no longer have computer labs. S. Neiheisel pointed out there are all sorts of online assessment technologies available. So the proposal is that's the direction we begin to explore. At some point, you need to know incoming students' math, English, social, and time management skills and make sure they're put with students with similar needs. The partnership with Ivy Tech doesn't exist yet. You want your students placed in the right course. It starts the retention process. S. Lamb said that when he mentioned these proposals to the student senate, there was concern that it would negatively impact diversity. Many of our conditional admits are minority students. They were very upset and said the university doesn't care about giving access to these students. S. Neiheisel said the group that fails is actually very diverse. The proposal is designed to set them on a track with a better opportunity to succeed. We're creating an alternative route with a much better chance for them to succeed. B. Bridgewater reiterated D. Bowman's point about the need for proctoring. R. Toomey said the technology for that does exist; some packages include video monitors. B. Bailey said she understood that Ivy Tech is moving to quarters – how will that affect us? R. Toomey responded that ISU gets transfers from various systems – it's all convertible. S. Neiheisel said SEM isn't asking SAC to explore alternative approaches.

5.4. Non-Degree Admissions Proposal: Steve Neiheisel

5.4.1.S. Neiheisel said current policy requires non-degree students to submit a brand-new application every semester. It sets up automatic bureaucratic process. This proposal is to eliminate that requirement. If a student stops out for two years, it requires a re-admission process. R. Toomey said he is in favor of the proposal from a processing standpoint. He would prefer there be conversations on who follows up with those students. S. Neiheisel said if students drop the class, they must withdraw from the university. R. Toomey said the proposal makes sense, but how do we as an institution restructure our advising structure?

S. Hardin moved, and D. Bowman seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0-0. It now moves to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. S. Stofferahn suggested that R. Toomey be available to speak on the policy's behalf.

6. New Business

6.1. Electronic vote

6.1.1. In an email dated February 28, 2019, S. Stofferahn requested a vote on the following question:

"Shall the undergraduate catalog language regarding the use of standardized exams for admissions decisions be adjusted to read as follows:

'Test Sores

SAT and ACT test scores are optional for applicants. Test scores may be used for academic placement purposes, to assist in academic advising, and for some scholarships."

The measure was approved, 4-0-2.

6.2. Next meetings March 1, April 5, May 3 if needed

7. Adjournment

7.1. The meeting adjourned at 1:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve Hardin, Secretary