**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

**Monday, November 27, 2023**

**Hovey 419, 4:00 P.M.**

**approved**

***Call to Order***

Academic Senate chairperson Martha Callison Horst called the meeting to order.

***Public Comment: All speakers must sign in with the Senate Secretary prior to the start of the meeting.***

Zach Roy: I'm Zach. I'm an off Campus and Student Government. I'm kind of here to talk about the AI policy. We wrote the resolution on it. I thought I'd kind of give our input as an association into my personal guess on it. So kind of the reason why Student Government was so passionate about this policy is because also there was our first thing that Student Caucus went over and we spent a decent amount of time really consulting a lot of stakeholders talking to Doctor Magnuson and Janice with Code of Conduct and really kind of came to a conclusion that the plagiarism policy, let's do it as it is; and when that first kind of thing came up, we were really surprised by it. Because it just a complete departure from the suggestion we gave, which is to not change the Code of Conduct. The one that previously came up at the last Academic Senate meeting was one that we really had a lot of issues with. First of all, like I mentioned earlier, Student Caucus, we gave input and was completely disregarded, in our opinion. However, most importantly, you really feel like the Code of Conduct office was kind of left out of the decision making. I talked to Janice Blair and she said that during her 12 years at Illinois State University, there has never once been the Code of Conduct change that was not made from a suggestion that Code of Conduct gave. This really seems like a complete departure of precedent, and I think it's really important that we  depart from precedent to give the code of Conduct officer or whoever is affected by it an opportunity to really get consulted on it. And from my understanding, Janice really didn't seem familiar with the Academics Senate process; she was confused on the difference between Student Caucus and Academic Senate. I really think we want to make sure her opinion is taken first and foremost, because ultimately a Code of Conduct change affects the code of conduct in students first, and those were conducted in this change, in our opinion. In my personal opinion, sucking really fast. I personally felt that this change was a little reactionary. You know, AI is something that's really on a lot of people's minds right now, and I think it's really important to slow down, get a really well informed and slow decision-making process on the Code of Conduct change.

***Approval of the minutes from 10/16***

Motion by Senator Fulton, seconded by Senator Blum, to approve the minutes. The minutes were unanimously approved.

***Oral Communications:  
ISU Strategic Plan Path Through Senate?***

Senator Horst: The ISU strategic plan is about to hit the Senate, and the timing is important because they are trying to take it to a board meeting. So, my guess is that this would go to the Planning and Finance Committee, because they are looking at the mission statement. So, does the Executive Committee want to review the strategic plan for the purpose of forwarding it to the Planning and Finance Committee? Or can I just have the strategic plan task force send it straight to the Planning and Finance Committee?

Senator Cline: The Strategic Plan Task Force has already come to Planning and Finance Committee.

Senator Horst: Right, but Exec hasn’t seen the strategic plan document.

Senator Cline: Do we need to slow it down by bringing it to us before the senate? Bearing in mind that we don't make changes to the document; we only decide whether it goes to the floor or not.

Senator Mainieri: Well, we do traditionally review it and if there are comments, we record them in the minutes, right?

Senator Horst: That’s correct.

Senator Mainieri: Do we know when it's going to be ready to?

Senator Horst: The process is complicated. They’ve had these forums they've been going around, but they're trying to integrate the comments; so they want to know from me if they need to expedite the process, because I say “well, if you need it on exec calendar, this is the deadline.” So, that's what I'm trying to give them -- a statement as to what the deadline is. If it needs to go through exec, I think that can happen. We need to tell them, because it'll move the process up.

Senator Blum: Yes, I’m open to it coming to exec.

Senator Mainieri: Yes, send it to exec.

Senator Cline: I don’t think exec needs to see it twice.

Senator Nikolaou: yes, send it to exec first.

Senator Monk: yes.

Senator Blum: yes.

Senator Fulton: yes.

Senator Bonnell: I don’t think exec needs to see it.

Senator Horst: okay, majority of the vote wants to see it in exec.

***Distributed Communications:***

***11.16.23.08 Jim Pancrazio Academic Senate Minutes Edit***

Senator Horst: Senator Pancrazio made a communication that he didn't feel like his comments that we had passed earlier in the evening we're fully presented, and so I asked him to correspond with me and Norsule; I listened to the tape and we have now a verbatim transcript of what he said. So, we can certainly amend the minutes, and thank you to Senator Blum, who looked into how to do this. So, we will basically do this as a separate motion on the floor, and it needs a 2/3 majority. Then we'll go in the next set of minutes. And then we'll make an annotation on the approve minutes that there's amendment.

***From Tom Lucey: Faculty Affairs Committee (Information Item: 12/06/23)***

***11.09.23.01 Policy 3.3.2 Faculty Hiring Current Copy***

***11.09.23.02 Policy 3.3.2 Faculty Hiring Mark Up***

***11.9.2023 Policy 3.3.2 Faculty Hiring Clean Copy***

Senator Horst: This is coming from the Faculty Affairs Committee; Senator Lucey was actually not at the meeting when this was passed. So I actually chaired that meeting. We examined other policies for other employee classification types like A/P and Civil Service. We're wondering whether the work procedure is in there. We had an e-mail correspondence with Janice Bonneville, who clarified that “terminal faculty” is not a thing. She says there's no HR designation. When this was going through the committee, I recalled that some of the language in the AFEGC policy regarding terminal faculty was deleted. We had Craig Gatto come in and talk to us about what that classification meant, and then he clarified with Janice that it is actually not even an HR classification. So there's no separate rights for terminal faculty. That's why that is deleted. Thank you very much to all of the people who added editorial comments; I printed out the document at 1:00. And what I saw were comments that were largely editorial. Any comments?

Senator Cline: It's regrettable that there isn't a policy that outlines faculty hiring procedure in the same way that we outlined in excruciating detail hiring procedures for administrators.

Senator Horst: Any other comment? No okay.

***From Rick Valentin: Planning and Finance Committee (Information Item: 12/06/23)***

***11.08.23.01 Policy 6.1.40 Unmanned Aircraft Systems Current Copy***

***11.08.23.02 Policy 6.1.40 Unmanned Aircraft System Mark Up***

***11.08.23.03 Policy 6.1.40 Unmanned Aircraft Systems Clean Copy***

Senator Horst: I was on the committee last year when we just talked about this. So I can contact Rick and find out who we should invite because I think we need to invite. Any comments?

Senator Horst: No, Okay.

***From Student Caucus (Information Item: 12/06/23)***

***11.16.23.04 Policy 5.1.13 Anti-Hazing Current Copy***

***11.16.23.05 Student Caucus Report Anti-Hazing***

Senator Monk: Student Caucus reviewed the policy 5.1.13 of the anti-hazing; we met with the Code of Conduct since the policy mirrors the policy within the Code of Conduct. They told us that o\the current form of the policy is sufficient in its coverage of anti-hazing, so we determined there are no recommendations, I have sent the report and our current copy to legal. So we'll have to wait to hear back some more recommendations from them, but we'll be able to do that on the floor next second meeting if there are any.

Senator Horst: Thank you. Thank you for consulting with the student conduct people; Eduardo and I met this morning and I advised him that legal always likes to be in the loop; going forward, if you recall, we're going to have this Kuali form, and the intent is that every single item will have a legal contact so that people know who in the legal office to contact. If you were on Exec last year, we tried to set up this system where we would have a designated legal contact whose expertise is whatever the policy is, but that sort of broke down because they lost some of their key personnel. As their staff increases, hopefully we'll be able to do that again. So thank you for forwarding that. I printed this one out at 1:15 pm and I saw some editorial comments. Any comments?

Senator Mainieri: Have you asked HR simply because it's talking about reporting to supervisors and things like that? I feel like we've had conversations with HR in the past about being specific. So I wasn't sure, It didn't appear that HR had been consulted on this draft.

Senator Cline: So I think we need to table it and have Student Caucus talk to HR and talk with legal. And if they somehow magically don't have changes, that's fine. I don't have any problem with the content of the policy, but to our public commenter’s point, not talking to the right people is not a good idea.

Senator Horst: any discussion on that? OK.

***11.16.23.06 Resolution number 6 about AI***

Senator Horst: I have been on the Executive Committee, I think, the longest in the room, and I have never received SGA resolution, but we received two resolutions today; so I will turn it over to Senator Monk.

Senator Monk: So we'll be building off the commonsense Zach gave during public comment, but I do want to apologize for the suddenness of the resolution. This is resulting from the new information that we that have come to light during the last Academic Senate meeting about Janice. Is this approval of the policy. So we wanted to be able to pull together a unified stance. We want to make sure we go about this in a more professional and courteous way than student governments have gone in the past, with our resistance in the past a little disjointed, a little bit disorganized. So we wanted to pull together a very cohesive stance is an area that that students feel particularly passionate about, especially when it comes to making sure we're pulling Student Code of Conduct into these conversations. Now, Senator Nikolaou, I know that you met with Janice, and I'm curious to know how that meeting went, because that'll kind of change some of the direction depending on how that meeting went. But we just simply wanted to reaffirm our status or our stance on the Code of Conduct and the revisions being made to it; this simply put resolution isn't the express will of the student government. So this isn't, you know, a formal decision. This isn't us pressuring one way or another. This is just us putting together what our stance is with the AI policy going forward.

Senator Horst: I am just going to comment for the record that Janice Blair, Andy Morgan and Levester Johnson were forwarded the text of the proposed revision on October 31st. So they had nine days to give us their suggestions; we forward material to all kinds of offices across the university with the understanding that we're seeking their input, so it she was in the loop.

Senator Nikolaou: So the comment I'm going to make is that we did not ignore the Student Caucus suggestion. We talked about it in the meeting, and the recommendations passed unanimously. And we do have students in our committee. Also, the part that Monk just mentioned, which is the comment that was made last time on the floor -- that they were not kept on the loop. So if you remember, we had the first information session. We had all the comments. Then the next Senate meeting, we didn't bring it back because we decided, well, let's give more time to get more feedback. So at that point, the Senate represents all the divisions within the university. So the Division of Student Affairs was present.

There was pretty much a month when we asked for feedback; then the changes that were made based on the recommendation that we got from the floor, it was available to anyone within the Division of the Student Affairs. That's the one that we had again as an information item, which reflected the feedback that we got from the floor -- because several individuals were saying we needed a definition. So we create a definition then after the meeting; and that's why it is an information item. Janice Blair, she was present. She provided feedback on the spot ,as well.

So last Monday of our Thanksgiving week, we met with Dr. Magnuson. We talked about the specifics; Janice, she expressed about the definition being too complicated. This is going to reflect on in the resolution on lines 20 to 23, where it talks about deep learning techniques, neural networks, etcetera.

The definition is going to be much more simplified where it is the term generative artificial intelligence. Gen AI encompasses a variety of services that create noble conduct such as text, images, speech or video parenthesis ChatGPT.  Then we also talked about the other edition under plagiarism. We just clarified it a little bit; we moved the order of the second clause, moved it into a separate sentence. But when we talked with Janice, it's the same thing that she also mentioned on the Senate --- that there is no harm. It provides further interpretation. So, she said as long as it is clear and we can implement it; and that's why we met with her. We don't see any issue.

Senator Cline: it’s an action item but you have rewritten, She just asked you if your Committee is going to look at that new draft of the of the definition.

Senator Nikolaou: As before, we just removed the second clause and all these examples. So it's not that we rewrote the definition.

Senator Cline: If I could be so bold to our student government members. It’s great that you have a resolution that clarifies your point of view, but it also be really great if you had actual wording suggestions for the policy when it comes to the floor. It is my experience that what happens is people say “I don't like” or “I like.” And then you say well, what is your suggestion to replace it? And they kind of go white in the face. So if you had actual things that we would like for it to be said should it get to the point that it's an action item.

Senator Monk: That would have to be included because the original recommendation by Student Caucus would do is no revisions entirely, so no language related to AI within the Code of Conduct.

Senator Cline: So I'm going to speak as a person who's involved in politics sometimes. Sometimes you know something might pass, but you still want to have an effect on it before it passes. So my suggestion to you is, if you don't think you might have the votes to kill the thing in the end, that you might be able to put the language as you like it. You might get support for the change of language, even if you don't get support for striking. Do you understand what I'm saying? So, I'm just sort of making that because I think the resolution is nice that you guys have your ideas together, but it is helpful if it passes or doesn't pass, it's done right it is. It is not revisable, but you can revise it before it passes.

Senator Horst: We're talking about the SGA resolution, about the AI language in the Student Code of Conduct. Let me give it a little road map as to how this got on the plate of the Senate. We started talking about CHATGPT in January of last year. I forwarded some articles about what was going on with CHATGPT. Remember that this was all new. That executive committee decided that the plagiarism definition would be a good place to start. So that decision was made by that Executive Committee ,and then in May of last year, we decided to assign it to the Student Caucus first and then the next step would be the Academic Affairs Committee. So that decision of how it would go through the Senate was made by last year's executive committee. Regrettably, there was only one SGA member at that meeting, but we did that decision. Itwas made by this body. So the reason that we're picking this up is that we're following the lead of many other universities who are seeing an urgent need to revise the plagiarism definition given the change in technology.

Senator Nikolaou: As I mentioned, it depends on the University. Some have it as the CIPD statements for inclusion on the syllabi. There are some that have it as an explicit statement in their respective Code of student conduct. A small number. They have it as an actual separate policy, like a university. The AI it's not only discussed for the code of the student conduct, because we also mentioned that probably we will have to review the policies that talk about research. If you have a faculty member and says write a literacy review on this topic that I'm going to incorporate into my research. That's also plagiarism for the practices of research, so it would be for 1.8 Academic Integrity for Research. So it's going to expand in different like populations within the university. So it's not like that it's only for students, it's going to be for faculty, for anyone who is doing research.

Senator Horst: I have been frustrated with the lack of leadership in revising the Code. This process has been going on for 10 years.

President Tarhule: Who should revise the code?

Senator Horst: Student Affairs. Typically, the Dean of Students does a revision of it every five years and they present it to the Senate after going through various committees. But we had an issue with hate crime, and at this committee there was a discussion of whether or not that should be included in the code. And there was this committee of 25 people that couldn't even meet. It was too large, if you remember that discussion from last year. So, I've been asking for a new code of student conduct for the three years I've been in this office. It's time. We've been doing little revisions to be legally compliant, but we haven't had a full review of the code since 2015. But it's something that's really beyond the Senate's ability to do; it has to be people who specialize in this work.

President Tarhule: What can I do to help? Can I talk to LJ and emphasize to him the significance of getting this to you quickly.

Senator Horst: Thank you, next year will be great. So you don't want to start a process in the spring with one SGA and then switch SGA's and then do it in full. So it really should come to SGA in the fall, they'll do their work and then it'll come to the Senate.

President Tarhule: Does that include the AI policy though?

Senator Horst: That's the one piece that we're doing. But the code itself is how many pages long like 90 pages?

Senator Mainieri: Just steer it a little bit back to the item that we're discussing, which is the resolution from SGA. Martha, you indicated that there's not a ton of precedents going on about having a resolution passed by SGA come to exec for consideration. So I guess I'm curious, is the Student Caucus or SGA, hoping that this would be included with the materials the next time that the plagiarism comes to the floor? or what's the procedure with the resolution itself?

Senator Monk: So if they could be provided to the Academic Senate for the next meeting, that would be beneficial. But again, this is simply just to express what student government's position is on this particular policy.

Senator Fulton: They're also representing our constituencies because at least my college, all my programs have generative AI in them. So, this policy makes me quite nervous, as you can imagine, since I have to use all Adobe products to do my job.

Senator Mainieri: Does your faculty members allow you to do that?

Senator Fulton: Yeah, they currently do and they have it within their syllabus. But I just worry as a new student coming in, you look at like the code of conduct and you're like, OK, that's the law. You can't break the law. And so you don't realize there's processes where it's up to your professor to report it. And so I just very much worry that we're going to have a situation where either a new faculty doesn't realize that they don't necessarily have to always follow that. It's also up to their discretion. So, when you have a professor not teaching courses in a way that lines up with the actual industry, where most of my design industry is going to be some type of generative AI system, where a lot of my workload is going to be taken for that -- that's just where my industry is heading. ISU of big institution there's a lot of rules and a lot of procedure that people aren't always aware of. If they're not a part of Academic Senate or SGA, that kind of can get lost in communication.

Senator Horst: So you're saying the faculty member would not know about the new language in the code?

Senator Fulton: They would assume that because that is ISU's code that therefore they also have to follow it in terms of how they lay out their syllabus, not realizing that that do their own thing.

President Tarhule: Where do these intersect so that we make sure everybody's perspective is represented in the policy that we develop?

Senator Horst: The senate and committee. The committee initially passed this unanimously --students and faculty.

Senator Nikolaou: And after the last meeting, we met with Janice Blair just to make sure that vision of the Student Affairs --- they are also OK with that. And that was the word that there is no harm, including it. As long as it is written in a way that I can implement it. Because he gave us the example where he said if someone is accused of plagiarism, one of the mitigations that they have is they tell the student, OK, look at item C the definition of plagiarism and then tell us in your own words or give us an example of what you think this means. That's where there was this legal clause included about the cooperative material. We said, “OK, let's move it around where it still has the same meaning.” But now it is much more clear for a student who might need to go and look at it directly. And that's why the Gen AI is included as well.

Acting Provost Yazedjian: If I could just speak to the issue of faculty. I certainly understand your perspective, but I think it's the role of academic affairs to make sure that faculty also understand our policies. And that's why we have new faculty orientation, you know, so all new faculty come to that. AI is certainly going to be a part of the training, both in terms of what freedom the faculty member has to use it; because the other side of it, is we really do want to be preparing students, right? That's our first and foremost goal. Industry does use generative AI, but there are also times where generative AI it's not appropriate. So in your field, it might be appropriate. But in other instances or in other classes, even in your field, they may not be appropriate, and so that's why we're talking about the policy here. But on the faculty preparation side, our faculty socialization side, we are definitely going to take care of that. The code doesn't have to take care of that.

***\*\*Approval of Proposed Senate Agenda– See pages below\*\****

Motion by Senator Mainieri, seconded by Senator Fulton, to approve the agenda. The agenda was unanimously approved as amended. See below.

***11.16.23.07 College of Engineering Bylaws Initial From Tom Keyser***

Senator Horst: We have the College of Engineering bylaws finally came in. Senator Blum and I did meet with them. They submitted a draft, and we gave them some advice as to some things they might change. So, this is now their second draft. So, are there any comments that we could share with the team working on this? This goes to the Rules Committee.

Senator Mainieri: Page 2, item 2.1 It talks about all 10 year track-tenure faculty serving on college council. So, and it's talking about at the foundation, right. And so we're assuming that there will not be NTT faculty members at the foundation, and that's why they're not included?

Senator Horst: That's what they assume. I've talked to them a bunch about this. I said you might have NTT faculty. Maybe somebody takes the leave, but they do not conceive of that. And my other question is, what is in the foundational years?  That's a little vague.

Senator Mainieri: Because I guess my concern would be if things change and they have to hire NTT faculty or they need to fill a specialty, then there's no structure for their inclusion.

Senator Blum: That's the general thing they’re thinking about now. How things are now. And it's a little hard, I think, for the vision. And the other thing is, what bylaws will be revised over five years? It's amazing how bodies get into habits. And things just get stuck there in the bylaws and then they don't ever get changed.

Senator Mainieri: Then in the same section, my question was whether how chairs play into the makeup. Because they are faculty. If they're included within that or if they are view differently in the membership of the Council; because Deans and associate Deans are listed separately as officio, and so I wasn't sure how the chairs of the departments will be interacting with college councils.

Senator Horst: The Executive Committee, they've already set it at two faculty members from one and two from the other. They might want to think about more representation on the Executive Committee. The Dean is appointing the tenure line faculty to chair a search committee for 9.3. That's for the members of the Associate Dean search committee. They might want to look to see what other colleges are doing for that. We want to look at the chair valuation policy -- make sure that's aligned with that. Because it's a new set of bylaws, there's a lot of things.

***Possible revision to Academic Integrity Policy 1.8 and Generative AI (Faculty Affairs Committee)*** [*1.8 Integrity in Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities*](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/conduct/1-1-8/)

Senator Horst: Makes sense to have it go to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Senators: Yes.

***Discussion of the Senate Timing Survey***

***11.16.23.01 Academic Senate Timing Survey Results (To be distributed at meeting)***

***11.16.23.02 Resolution number 7 from SGA (Eduardo Monk)***

***11.16.23.03 Excerpts from Executive Committee meeting discussions regarding survey from Martha Horst***

Senator Horst: It was a complicated survey and it closed the Friday before Thanksgiving. Norsule and I did put together a draft, but we wanted Tracy to look at it. Tracy just sent us her comments and we don't want to rush that. So I don't have anything to distribute. The one thing I do have to distribute to everybody was why we're doing this survey. This was discussed, I think, four times last year and exec. It also was discussed when I had a meeting with the deans, and I conveyed to them that we don't have a lot of faculty volunteering for this. They said, well, why don't you guys do a survey to find out what's going on with the times? The deans asked for a survey. The Executive Committee of last year discussed it, and this year's Executive Committee discussed it as well. So all we're doing is gathering data. Senator Monk would like to touch on this resolution?

Senator Monk: This resolution I can touch on it, but you know, since we are not making any changes, we are not in opposition of collecting data or sending out the survey. We're simply reaffirming the student government's position that we would like to keep the Academic Senate time where it is. But obviously that's a debate that we would have if it would ever come as an information item. So there's not much of a conversation to be had.

***Policy Review***

***Policy 1.16*** [***Recruitment of Service Members***](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/conduct/1-16/) ***(Dist. to Academic Affairs Committee or University Policy Committee) (Acting Provost Yazedjian)***

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator, seconded by Senator Fulton, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.

***Proposed* Academic Senate Meeting Agenda**

**Wednesday, December 6, 2023**

**7:00 P.M.**

**OLD MAIN ROOM, BONE STUDENT CENTER**

**Hard Stop 8:45 P.M.**

***Call to Order***

***Roll Call***

***Public Comment: All speakers must sign in with the Senate Secretary prior to the start of the meeting.***

***Presentation: Information Security Strategy (Data Governance Executive Council) (Charles Edamala, Assoc VP Tech Sol Chief Info)***

***Approval of the Academic Senate minutes of 11/08 and 10/25***

***Amendment to Minutes of 9/27***

***Chairperson's Remarks***

***Student Body President's Remarks***

***Administrators' Remarks***

* ***Interim President Aondover Tarhule***
* ***Acting Provost Ani Yazedjian***
* ***Vice President for Student Affairs Levester Johnson***
* ***Vice President for Finance and Planning Dan Stephens***

***Consent Agenda: (All items under the Consent Agenda are considered to be routine in nature and will be enacted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion of these items.)***

* ***Educational Administration & Foundations:*** [***Post-Baccalaureate Teacher Leader Certificate***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/Curriculum%20Forms%20Delete%20Program.pdf)
* ***Educational Administration & Foundations:*** [***Teacher Leader Sequence (M.S & M.S. ED.)***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/Teacher%20Leader%20Sequence%2011.07.23.pdf)
* ***School of Communication:*** [***Sports Communication***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/New%20Program%20Sports%20Communication.pdf)

***Action Items:***

***From Kate Sheridan: University Policy Committee***

***10.29.23.11 Policy 3.1.52 Personal Plus Time (Mark Up)***

***10.29.23.12 Policy 3.1.52 Personal Plus Time (Clean Copy)***

***09.28.23.04 Policy 1.15 Whistleblower (Current Copy)***

***10.27.23.24 Policy 1.15 Whistleblower (Mark Up)***

***10.27.23.25 Policy 1.15 Whistleblower (Clean Copy)***

***10.27.23.26 Policy 1.15 Whistleblower UPC Memo***

***From Dimitrios Nikolaou: Academic Affairs Committee***

**10.27.23.01 Policy 2.1.23 Transcripts (Current Copy)**

**10.27.23.02 Policy 2.1.23 Transcripts (Mark Up)**

**10.27.23.03 Policy 2.1.23 Transcripts (Clean Copy)**

**10.27.23.04 Policy 4.1.6 Grading Practice (Current Copy)**

**10.27.23.05 Policy 4.1.6 Grading Practice (Mark Up)**

**10.27.23.06 Policy 4.1.6 Grading Practice (Clean Copy)**

**10.27.23.07 Policy 4.1.15 Sales/Solicitation of Academic Assignments (Current Copy)**

**10.27.23.08 Policy 4.1.15 Sales/Solicitation of Academic Assignments (Mark Up)**

**10.27.23.09 Policy 4.1.15 Sales/Solicitation of Academic Assignments (Clean Copy)**

***10.27.23.27 Code of Student Conduct (Current Copy)***

***10.27.23.28 Code of Student Conduct (Mark Up)***

***10.27.23.29 Code of Student Conduct (Clean Copy)***

***09.30.23.01 Student Caucus Report***

***11.16.23.06 Resolution number 6 about AI From SGA***

***11.30.23.01 Timeline of Revisions to the Code of Student Conduct Plagiarism Definition From Academic Affairs Committee***

***From Craig Blum: Rules Committee***

**10.27.23.18 Memo regarding Disbandment of Honors Council**

**10.27.23.19 Honors Council Minutes 02.03.23**

**10.27.23.20 Memorandum from Rules**

**10.27.23.10 Bylaws 6.8 Honors Council Deletion (Current Copy)**

**10.27.23.11 Bylaws 6.8 Honors Council Deletion (Mark Up)**

**10.27.23.12 Bylaws 6.8 Honors Council Deletion (Clean Copy)**

**10.27.23.13 Appendix II B Honors Council Deletion (Current Copy)**

**10.27.23.14 Appendix II B Honors Council Deletion (Mark Up)**

**10.27.23.15 Appendix II B Honors Council Deletion (Clean Copy)**

**10.27.23.16 Appendix II Honors Council charge Deletion (Current Copy)**

**10.27.23.17 Appendix II Honors Council charge Deletion (Mark Up)**

***Information Items:***

***From Tom Lucey: Faculty Affairs Committee***

***11.09.23.01 Policy 3.3.2 Faculty Hiring Current Copy***

***11.09.23.02 Policy 3.3.2 Faculty Hiring Mark Up***

***11.9.2023 Policy 3.3.2 Faculty Hiring Clean Copy***

***~~From Rick Valentin: Planning and Finance Committee~~***

***~~11.08.23.01 Policy 6.1.40 Unmanned Aircraft Systems Current Copy~~***

***~~11.08.23.02 Policy 6.1.40 Unmanned Aircraft System Mark Up~~***

***~~11.08.23.03 Policy 6.1.40 Unmanned Aircraft Systems Clean Copy~~***

***~~From Student Caucus~~***

***~~11.16.23.04 Policy 5.1.13 Anti-Hazing Current Copy~~***

***~~11.16.23.05 Student Caucus Report Anti-Hazing~~***

***Internal Committee Reports:***

* ***Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Nikolaou***
* ***Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Senator Mainieri***
* ***Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Lucey***
* ***Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Valentin***
* ***Rules Committee: Senator Blum***
* ***University Policy Committee: Senator Sheridan***

***Communications***

***Adjournment***