**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

**MONDAY, April 3, 2023**

**approved**

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

***Public Comment***- None.

***Oral Communication:***

Senator Horst: I’m part of this National Council of Faculty Senates group and we had a meeting on Friday with about 60 tenure faculty chairs from across the country. Everyone should be aware that there are significant problems happening in Texas. For instance, they have a bill going up to try to do away with tenure. And not only do away with tenure, but I asked about the accreditation, and they said, oh yeah, we have another bill trying to say that they can determine the accrediting bodies and they can come up with their own. So, it’s something to talk to faculty chairs in these other states. Indiana, North Carolina.

Senator Blum: Basically, they are trying to fire faculty and threaten their academic freedom. It’s not so much the tenure process, it’s basically a way of creating control. And to be honest, it’s conservative political control over what is a perceived bias in higher ed. And a path that, I think, seen to doing this is to eliminate tenure then they can just start firing people.

Senator Horst: And then also EDI. So, people should be aware of what’s going on in different states. It’s really alarming.

***Status update on design development for the new housing and dining project by Vice President Johnson.***

Senator Horst: I got a request from Vice President Johnson. He wants to come to the Senate at some point and give an update on the design development for the new Housing and Dining project. Would you just want to do it May 10th? Okay.

***Distributed Communications:***

***From Academic Affairs Committee: (Information Item 04/12/23)***

***03.30.23.01 Policy 3.2.18 Oral English Proficiency (Current Copy)  
03.30.23.02 Policy 3.2.18 Oral English Proficiency (Mark Up)***

***03.30.23.03 Policy 3.2.18 Oral English Proficiency (Clean Copy)***

Senator Cline: The Academic Affairs Committee didn’t have a whole lot of time, so we looked through some of the stuff that we had to do, and we thought the Oral English Proficiency might be something kind of quick. We conferred with HR, and with Legal. If you actually read the language, it feels very legal. So, we contacted those two bodies. They confirmed that the way that is written is appropriate. The way that it is written is legal. They shared with us the legal document and it comports. So, we decided to not touch it because it is operative and legally binding and good. The one question we had is about who owns it. That was something Dimitrios also brought up and you can see his notes. It seems weird to me that it should come back to Senate because Senate is not who I would think to contact if I have a question about the Oral Proficiency requirement. But it was the feeling of Legal and the feeling of HR that it probably should come back to Senate simply because the people involved would be HR, Legal, and the Grad School, depending on who you are. And because we sort of seem like a hopper, in a sense, because not one of them is the sole owner of it. It’s maybe to defuse.

Senator Horst: Not the Provost’s office?

Senator Cline: Amy didn’t want it. We could change it to whatever people want. But HR and Legal said, well, I would leave it as it is simply because there isn’t a better answer of who would own it. Unless you want it in your office?

Acting Provost Yazedjian: I’m still new to these meetings but it seems like if it’s primarily being driven by HR and General Counsel, I don’t know why the Provost’s office, because the Provost’s office isn’t going to make suggestions to edit it. We would also go back to General Counsel or HR.

Senator Cline: Right. That’s why it sort of defaulted to, well, not one of us owns it, all three of us operate with this. So, maybe it’s better to not pin it on one person. Even though it seems weird.

Senator Horst: So, if there are questions, the chair would start contacting…

Senator Cline: Would make the referral, yeah.

***From Academic Affairs Committee: (Information Item 04/12/23)  
03.30.23.04 Policy 4.1.17 Classroom Disruption (Current Copy)***

***03.30.23.05 Policy 4.1.17 Classroom Disruption (Mark Up)  
03.30.23.06 Policy 4.1.17 Classroom Disruption (Clean Copy)***

Senator Cline: This is slightly more complicated. 4.1.17 which was Classroom Disruption, which now will be Disruption of the Classroom or other Learning Environment. This was not so easy. The way that this pathway happened is that the committee rewrote it, we made some decisions amongst ourselves bringing more student rights into it in a way that hadn’t really been there before. We sent it forward to Exec. But before Exec could see it, Legal came in and said hang on a minute, I see some issues. It came back to our committee with the issues, and we said, essentially, make some suggestions to us. And so, what they did is came back with an entirely rewritten policy that didn’t have any of our original language in it. So, Martha and I had a conversation with Ms. Barrett over the spring break to talk about how this flow can work and some of the concerns that we would have. She totally understands, and recognizes, but I think in a sense this is such a touchy issue and could get into legal issues in so many different ways, she thought it best to start over than to repackage language. So, we took her rewritten text and have made some additional changes to it and that’s what you see. But what I would say is that most of the questions you might have are really better addressed to her than to me (in terms of why she chose certain language and you see Dimitrios has a couple of questions that I think are better her responding than me.)

Senator Horst: This is a question for the floor, but the steps now seem to give faculty rules as to how they should handle these situations, and that wasn’t the case in the last draft. So, after I started saying they may do this, and they may do that, I thought you could just say suggested steps for responding to disruptions in the classroom or learning environment. So, as not to make it so if faculty don’t call the police for some reason, they wouldn’t be breaking this policy.

Senator Cline: Oh, I see. So, if someone’s not going through the steps they won’t be considered in violation or something like that. Yeah. I can ask Legal. I don’t see why not but let me just clear that with her.

Senator Mainieri: I think that just as an on the flip side, probably the steps are here because they don’t want people calling the police too early too. So, I don’t have a response to your suggestion, except to say, that’s probably why they’re outlining the steps. Don’t just call the police right away. Try to resolve it before escalating it. But I see your point as well. It does seem like the way it’s written the instructor has to do this, and they could let the student remain in the class but perhaps choose not to submit the form. And can they do that?

Senator Horst: And there’s always so many nuances to different situations. As a faculty member, I don’t necessarily like a policy that says I have to fill out this form. That’s kind of why I thought you could just say “suggested steps.”

Senator Mainieri: I think just changing the header maybe isn’t addressing those concerns. Maybe we need more explicit and just like a sentence that says, leave it steps, then have a sentence, ideas for how to resolve this, something along the lines of “we don’t want you to call the police right away unless you feel it’s absolutely necessary.” I don’t know how you handle that. The contact is up to the instructor.

Senator Cline: So, adding a sentence under the title rather than changing the heading?

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. We fill out what we want it to say. Right. These are suggestions; it’s up to the faculty member to decide how to navigate each situation, and don’t call the police if someone’s texting on their phone during your class.

Senator Horst: There was some conversation when COVID was happening about what should we do if people come in without a mask, and “I’ll call the cops” was what some faculty were coming back with. I do appreciate that there is this list of escalating steps. But, Tracy, that’s a great suggestion.

Senator Cline: Tracy, do you have certain terminology?

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. I’ll send them to you.

Acting Provost Yazedjian: I do have a quick question. Isn’t that really procedures though for responding rather than? What is the intent of this policy?

Senator Cline: So, it’s been a real effort of my own to remove procedure from all policy documents. If you had seen the original proposal from Ms. Barrett, I’ve taken out a huge chunk of what was really procedure. She has kept this, and we talked about this. Because of this, what do I do in this situation? This is guidance she would say, rather than steps or procedures.

Senator Blum: That would be a good adjective to use in that sentence. This is guidance.

Senator Cline: In the original policy, there was a whole paragraph that talks then at the dean level when these things happen and we removed all of that, and just giving an indicator that Student Conduct and Community Responsibilities does these sorts of reviews because that’s placing the responsibility with them rather than giving them guidelines or steps on how to review. So, I get your point. I’m like allergic to procedure in policies, but in this case she was trying to enumerate the various avenues that a faculty has. I think Dimitrios’ question is appropriate. We do say “contact Illinois State University Police for assistance”, but what if this is a study abroad program? I think this is a good conversation for Ms. Barrett to hear on the floor. She’ll have immediate responses, I think, to all of these things, and it will just allow her to work it out.

Senator Horst: But I hope your committee still has the final say in what the final language is.

Senator Cline: Yes. Don’t worry.

***From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: (Information/Action Item 4/12/23)***

***AABC AIF Report 2023***

***AIF Statement of Priorities and Guiding Principles***

***AIF Presentation Slides***

Senator Garrahy: I can tell you we reviewed our report for the AIF fund and some yahoo named Garrahy had a question about wording, so poor Dimitrios had to see Dr. Elkins. That has been fixed. The way the sentence was worded it sounded like the payouts for vacation funds are going away, and they better not, because somebody’s owed. If you are a faculty member who is in an administrative role you accrue vacation time. Faculty, in general, do not accrue vacation time. So, if you leave your position your remaining vacation hours go into an escrow account, and upon your retirement or resignation, they have to pay out those funds. The sick day payout is only for faculty members hired before 1997. So, Dimitrios just spoke with Dr. Elkins about the wording and the report is ready to go as it is. That was the only hold up.

Senator Horst: I have little things I can work with Dimitrios on like ,for instance, I can’t tell which line is which. Maybe you could have dashes or something.

Senator Garrahy: I will say, and Martha you know this, it’s very important to pay attention to the data that people use for their reports because we ended up on an ad hoc committee for five months because data was misinterpreted. We fixed all that. So, it is important that it’s readable and understandable.

Senator Horst: So, certainly people might have questions about the report. It’s always a complicated topic. Is everyone comfortable with this going to the floor? If you have editorial remarks you can work with Senator Nikolaou.

Senator Horst: And I’ll convey this to him, but some of the work we did with the ad hoc group was really trying to figure out these definitions and the sources of the definitions. One of the things that we recommended was that each year the committee endorse the definitions that are being put forward by the Provost office, so we don’t have all these different definitions floating about. Cera, is this somewhere on the agenda?

Ms. Hazelrigg: Yes, it’s information/action.

Senator Horst: I’m hoping that somewhere on the bottom it says endorsed by 2022-2023 AABC. So, each year it gets endorsed, kind of like a policy if you will. What do other people think about that? Deb, do you want to talk about some of the work we did with that?

Senator Garrahy: Well, the biggest question and the biggest misnomer was we were hiring more non-tenure track faculty than we were. All the data we reviewed, but basically when all was said and done there was not an issue with us hiring more non-tenure track over tenure track faculty, and the data supported that. So, that’s where that whole, I guess wouldn’t you say, Martha, that was the crux of the whole gather was to go through the data.

Senator Horst: Go through the definitions. We were really tripped up because there were a lot of different definitions floating about. So, one of our recommendations was that each year the Senate says “these are the definitions.” So, instructional capacity should include this, or it shouldn’t include that. And just basically having an evolving definition of instructional capacity and its uses. Otherwise, people were getting trapped in the definition from 1996.

Senator Garrahy: And those kinds of definitions are on page three of the statements and guiding principles.

Senator Horst: So, I’m just hoping we can endorse this.

Senator Garrahy: So, Martha, are you saying, like at the bottom of page five to say endorse by?

Senator Horst: Endorse by the Academic Senate maybe or approved, like it’s a policy, reviewed and the date. Something like that.

Senator Garrahy: I think reviewed and endorsed by the Academic Senate because it’s everybody’s responsibility to pay attention to this, not just one committee.

Senator Cline: You want that to happen annually?

Senator Horst: Yes, because Dan Elkins and the Provost office might have a shifting perception of what instructional capacity dollars are used for. We should also sign off on that. Does that make sense? But just because we have a document from three years ago that says instructional capacity is this doesn’t mean that that’s what it’s used for now.

Senator Mainieri: I see your point. But on the flip side though if it’s going to be endorsed, you don’t want to spend unnecessary time if no changes have been made, let’s say from year to year. Then, how do you make it that it’s not necessarily a new discussion item when nothing has changed and it was endorsed last time, right.

Senator Horst: Like, reviewed no changes, same thing with the policies. But just basically, it’s like a policy almost now, that this is what instructional capacity means and this is how the Provost’s office is using it.

Senator Mainieri: Instead of it being a separate document, could it just be an expected appendix to the AIF report each year for AABC and then they can put a sentence at the beginning of that appendix that says no changes were made since last year’s report to these guiding documents? Or if there were, then provide a markup or something.

Senator Horst: Right. So, we could just fold it into the report.

Senator Mainieri: Because it feels weird to have it as a separate document and endorse it. It just seems like a little bit outside our typical work.

Senator Horst: Yeah. And then we endorse this thing annually anyway. So, we’re always going to be endorsing the definitions in the appendix.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. And then it continues to be a growing document, because you say in 2022-2023 Provost office and the AABC updated this definition or whatever.

Senator Garrahy: So, it’s endorsing the definition?

Senator Horst: Well, if we fold it in like, Tracy said, to the report, every year we approve the report, so well be approving the appendix with the definitions.

Senator Cline: Can I make a suggestion? I don’t think that’s necessarily a bad thing. But I also feel like when it’s in a report it’s kind of proforma and people are going to just sign off on it because that’s what exists. Can we have it both in that report annually and then put on some sort of schedule every three to five years or something to specifically direct that committee to review it? I think most years there probably won’t be that much of a difference; but I’m worried a little bit about it becoming wallpaper and not get the serious consideration that it might need. I don’t think it really needs full blown consideration every single year, in my opinion. Also, because it requires a lot of onboarding of information for the people on the committee to understand what they are really looking at. So, I feel like if there was some sort of cycle of in-depth review, but yet making it part of the report annually so people can see it. I don’t think that’s a bad idea. I just feel like I would want some other kind of instruction every three to five years or whatever that it’s part of the committee’s responsibility to reassess, start again and look at it.

Senator Horst: We can do that in the issues pending list. That’s what Exec does. Is it in the issues pending list now, Cera?

Ms. Hazelrigg: The AIF report is. I can add this in. Do you want it every three years or ever five years?

Senator Horst: As needed, if the Provost office indicates that they are changing the definitions. Every three years, every five years.

Senator Garrahy: I would go as needed that under advisory from the Provost office if there are changes that the Provost’s office would communicate that to us. It sounds to me like if you say every three to five years it’s a policy. Whereas under advisement from the Provost’s office, you know, to me that’s more of a shared government—hey, here is a heads up, this is changing, here’s why, let’s chat about it.

Senator Cline: So, there is some kind of notation that there are times that it will be kind of proforma but there are times that you might really need to dig in.

Senator Horst: I wish Dimitrios was here.

(Dimitrios Nikolaou enters the room.)

Senator Horst: Hello, Dimitrios. We are looking at your report.

Senator Nikolaou: I think Deb was going to take over it.

Senator Garrahy: I did. I don’t think I messed it up, but you know everyone has ideas.

Senator Horst: We’ve been talking about the definitions, and we’ve been talking about the work that the ad hoc committee did. And Senator Mainieri had a suggestion that we make it an appendix to the report so annually it’s reviewed by the committee, and the committee and the Provost’s office communicates what the standing definitions are, and then approve everything as a whole report. Lea was advocating for a sort of cycle of review every three to five years, or as needed. Deb was advocating for just if the Provost’s office changes…

Senator Garrahy: Under advisement from the Provost’s office.

Senator Horst: On the other hand, maybe the committee… I don’t think we really would have the capacity or authority to change the definitions.

Senator Nikolaou: And I think Dan, he gives the definitions every time when he gives us the presentations. So, it is part of that. It’s not that we’re requesting the definitions separately, he gives it. And then if we want to include it as… And that’s why I handed in all three of them, because I was thinking we would share all three documents with the Senate. The actual report, the definitions, and the slides that Dan presented in our committee.

Senator Horst: And I was just advocating for including some sort of language like reviewed and endorsed by the Academic Senate and a date, so that we understand that we are signing off on these definitions because they are part of the work that Deb and I did on that committee was we reviewed the definitions as they evolved. And our committee became very confused as to what the actual definition of instructional capacity was. So, that’s why our report suggested that your committee annually, or some other cycle, review the definitions. What do you think, Dimitrios, is the best way to handle…

Senator Garrahy: Well, let me ask this question. So, what happens if down the road the Academic Senate doesn’t endorse the definitions of this?

Senator Horst: So, for instance, at one point it included general education in instructional capacity. So, there have been some evolving definitions of what instructional capacity is and how that money is used. That’s why I’m saying it needs to be a conversation.

Senator Mainieri: Can I ask what the issues pending item reads for this AIF report?

Senator Nikolaou: The actual instructions. Oversee Academic Impact Fund (tenure line), NTT AIF, and make recommendations.

Senator Mainieri: So, it doesn’t actually say anything about the report. We could just tack onto that, the report should include a statement on whether changes have been made to Appendix 1, each year.

Senator Cline: I think that makes sense. Once it gets onto the issues pending, I’m fine. I just don’t want it to dissolve away. So, if it’s on the issues pending, and specifically outlined.

Senator Horst: I think that’s what was happening. There was this sort of disconnect between some of the Senate language and the Provost’s office language and what these terms mean.

Senator Garrahy: My question is because I don’t know if I’m blurring the lines or we’re blurring the lines, but what if the Provost’s office down the road has to change the definition of something and it’s sounding to me like the Academic Senate would have the right to say yes, we approve that or no we don’t. But do we have the ability to say no we don’t approve that definition of whatever that term is?

Senator Horst: I’d have to look into that, Deb.

Senator Garrahy: Okay.

Senator Horst: Because this document was some sort of agreement between the Provost in the 1990s and the Senate, and it was done in conjunction with the Senate. So, I’ll have to look into that. But let’s not open that, if you don’t mind.

Senator Garrahy: Right, but when we say endorse by, that to me means, well what happens if it’s not endorsed? Whereas I don’t know if it’s just a case of semantics where we’re reviewing it every so often, I think the Senate can review anything. But when I hear the word endorsed, what happens when we don’t endorse it? So, the option is there.

Senator Mainieri: So, would you advocate not doing it as an appendix in the report, having it separate, adding it to issues pending to be reviewed every three years or something?

Senator Garrahy: Yeah. I don’t know if I’m just getting hung up on terms.

Senator Nikolaou: I mean, it could appear as an advisory item. Where we just say, these are the changes that we made. We’ll keep you updated, especially if there is something that changes in the instructional capacity. We do want to know about that part. Or if it is about how the pay outs are going to happen. We do want to know about all those things. But if we are worried about endorsement, but we do want to keep the Senate informed.

Senator Garrahy: I like the advisory idea. And I absolutely want to keep the senate informed. But I was getting hung up on when we say we’re endorsing it, it means we approve it. But what if we don’t approve of it.

Senator Horst: Yeah. The backstory on this is rich. Okay. So, we are going to have this as an advisory item. And we’re going to add to the issues pending list annual review of statement of priority and guiding principles in conjunction with the Provost’s office, Associate Vice President for Fiscal Management, annual review of that document.

Senator Nikolaou: Based on what you said before I came, do you want to add something at the end when these definitions were revised? I can talk with Dan.

Senator Horst: At least a date. And we don’t have to put reviewed and endorsed.

Senator Nikolaou: When is the last time the definitions were adjusted, something like that?

Senator Horst: Okay. And it’s going to be an advisory item. And I had a little bit of suggestions that we can meet separately on. Any other comments about the AIF report and the definitions (which will be an advisory item)? Okay. And the slides.

***From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: (Advisory Item 4/12/23)***

***Academic Facilities Priorities Report***

Senator Nikolaou: This is the report. We thought it was pretty detailed about the numbers and what people need so we didn’t have any recommendations compared to one of the other reports that you don’t see here.

Senator Horst: And this also went to Planning and Finance separately. I confirmed that with Senator Valentin. So, this was a little confusing that they are not working together, the committees.

Senator Nikolaou: It seems that it is one of those where it is reviewed by both. Similar with the Athletics Council, which is also with SGA.

Senator Horst: I’m wondering if they can do it together. For instance, they do the budget together.

Senator Nikolaou: We can coordinate to try and have everything.

Senator Horst: Because if one committee has some recommendations, and another has different ideas, it’s odd.

Senator Mainieri: Do they both need to review it?

Senator Horst: We made a big stink about it a couple years ago.

Senator Mainieri: Okay.

Senator Horst: I don’t think so, personally, but somebody else did. So, yeah, do both committees need to review this?

Senator Mainieri: I don’t see why we would have two committees reviewing the exact same thing.

Senator Garrahy: Yep. I agree.

Senator Mainieri: Particularly when we are already overloaded.

Senator Cline: And they present what their findings are to the whole Senate, so everyone has the change to see it.

Senator Nikolaou: Unless we do it jointly, similar to how we do Dan Stephens presentation, then it’s fine. Otherwise, it seems partly a waste of time for the two committees when they could be doing other policies or issues they could be working on.

Senator Horst: I think it’s hardcoded into the Appendix II charge, so that would take an Appendix II change, because we added this specifically.

Senator Cline: Luckily, Appendix II is not approved yet.

Senator Horst: Yeah, but I don’t think we can do it… I’m going to suggest that next year it be done jointly. The Rules Committee can certainly revisit whether or not both committees need to review it. Okay. I would point out that almost half of the Senate has already reviewed this report.

***From Student Government Association:***

***03.31.23.01 Email\_Student Caucus of the SGA***

Senator Horst: Senator Holmes brought up some language, and about an hour ago Cera put it into a sort of markup form. We’ve been having extended discussions about how to handle the Student Caucus. At one point, we had a meeting. This is still evolving. I’m going to suggest that this particular charge, because Rules Committee is about to wrap up and they have to do their external committee slate, I suggest this come directly from the Executive Committee; because we have been working on it with the subcommittee.

Student Caucus of the Student Government Association. Membership. President of the Student Body. And then we looked at our notes from our meeting, 20 seated SGA student senators (elected and appointed). Take out the student Trustee, Correct?

Senator Holmes: Yes.

Senator Horst: Jurisdiction, student problems and concerns, student elections to external committees. Do we still want to leave that?

Senator Myers: Yeah. That’s Grant’s appointments.

Senator Horst: You facilitate that.

Senator Holmes: But Grant does it. Not the Student Caucus.

Senator Horst: Right. So, I’m going to say we just take that out.

Senator Holmes: Yeah.

Senator Walsh: Would that still be granted though to the Student Body Vice President?

Senator Horst: We’ll think about that.

Senator Blum: Is the Dean of Students part of the Caucus?

Senator Horst: We’ll take the liaison out, correct?

Senator Holmes: Yeah, because they’re not a voting member.

Senator Horst: Do you want to make them ex-officio non-voting.

Senator Holmes: I guess we could.

Senator Walsh: I think we should do it for the Student Trustee too, because he’s present at Academic Senate. Can we make the Dean of Students and the Trustee ex-officio non-voting members?

Senator Horst: Um-hum.

Senator Holmes: But what if we made the rest of SGA non-voting members?

Senator Horst: No. Okay. So, we have two ex-officio non-voting members, and we have the President of the Student Body and 20 seated SGA student senators, elected or appointed. Jurisdiction, student problems and concerns. And then I’m just going to propose that the Student Body President shall serve as chair, all of that go above the functions. All right.

Senator Holmes: That’s fine.

Senator Myers: Yeah.

Senator Horst: So, all of that’s going to go up. And then we’re going to say Functions: the Student Government Association will: 1) follow the procedures; 2) keep reasonably detailed minutes; 3) review any issues related to student academic affairs; 4) make recommendations—and this is all what SGA is charged with now formally anyway—5) monitor the Academic Progress Alert System (maybe that will go away); 6) (this is what Senator Holmes and I were talking about) technically the VP of the Student Body is the person who is charged with doing the seating in their bylaws. So, we’re wondering if we can say, “work with the Vice President of the Student Body to seat students on external committees of the senate.”

Senator Holmes: I just want to make sure that there is no change to the way that it’s done. I just want to make sure that it doesn’t have to run through the Student Caucus once an appointment is made. Does that make sense? Like, it doesn’t have to be approved by them. It’s just the Vice President’s job to just appoint.

Senator Horst: We could take it out. But you have here, maintain the power. Maintain external committee appointment power. That’s a little odd for a function. So, we could just take it out.

Senator Blum: My question is does the caucus actually do this?

Senator Walsh: No. It’s the Vice President of the Student Body who is not in the Caucus technically.

Senator Blum: Yeah. So, I’m going to suggest that it be stricken if that’s the case.

Senator Walsh: Would we still be guaranteeing though, since the Student Body Vice President isn’t part of the Academic Senate, that they would still have the ability to appoint to these committees?

Senator Horst: I have to look at the documents on that.

Senator Myers: I want to say something that could fix this is to make the Student Body Vice President ex-officio non-voting member. How do we feel about that?

Senator Horst: No, then it’s not an internal committee. Craig is shaking his head no.

Senator Holmes: Can we put elsewhere in the bylaws that it is the student body vice President’s role to make appointments?

Senator Blum: Isn’t it in your bylaws?

Senator Holmes: It’s in ours. We just don’t want in the future for that not to be given to that individual.

Senator Blum: How could it not be unless you remove it from your bylaws?

Senator Holmes: Because it’s an external committee of the Academic Senate. We wouldn’t want it to be, five years from now, the Academic Senate says somebody else appoints to the external committees.

Senator Horst: We could just leave it at work with the VP. So, you work with him to make sure he does it.

Senator Holmes: I think that’s probably fine.

Senator Mainieri: Could you instead shift it a little bit to communicate all student appointments made by the vice president to the Academic Senate office? So, that the function is to communicate it.

Senator Blum: Wouldn’t communicate be a person. I don’t understand. It wouldn’t be a collective responsibility, right?

Senator Walsh: I think what Tracy was saying is it would be all Academic Senate external committee appointments made by the Student Body Vice President would be communicated with the Student Caucus to the Academic Senate.

Senator Myers: I also do have a question. I guess I’m just running through the logic of it. Why would that make Student Caucus not an external committee of the Senate if the Vp is made ex-officio non-voting member.

Senator Walsh: She’s saying we have to maintain our internal committee status, and the vice president isn’t listed as part of the internal committee. But if we add the vice president as an ex-officio non-voting member then it’s not.

Senator Myers: I’m still a little bit lost.

Senator Mainieri: If you add them, they have to come, right?

Senator Blum: Yes, if you add them, they have to come. And I don’t think you want to list them if they’re not going to come.

Senator Holmes: The way it’s laid out currently, the Student Caucus meets directly prior to the Student Government. Or do you mean come to Academic Senate?

Senator Blum: Alright, these people on this list are supposed to come.

Senator Myers: Right. But in the future if we put it down, I don’t think the vice president would mind coming.

Senator Horst: But then it’s a mixed committee again, it’s not internal.

Senator Walsh: I’m going to say to not have the VP as an ex-officio member. I liked Tracy’s language of communicating… Tracy, can you say that again? You said it so well.

Senator Mainieri: Communicate all student appointments made by the Student Body VP to external academic senate committees to the Academic Senate office.

Senator Horst: Okay. Communicate all student appointments to external committees made by the VP of the Student Body to the Academic Senate office. Something like that.

Senator Walsh: I think it’s perfect like that.

Senator Horst: And then appoints students to any committee for which a request has been made for Academic Senate student representation. Take that out?

Senator Walsh: Yeah.

Senator Horst: Conduct a review of the Code. Review, upon written request of students or University offices, the rules and regulations affecting students, monitor and receive reports, perform tasks as needed, other tasks as assigned.

Senator Walsh: I like it.

Senator Myers: Awesome.

Senator Horst: Okay. So, this can come from the Executive Committee, and then the question is part of the reason I pulled Article III is because there was language that was almost identical to it in Article VI, and if we haven’t approved this, then it’s awkward to approve other parts of the bylaws that actually say Student Caucus of the SGA, right. So, should we have it all go up at once, Craig? Because this hasn’t gone up as an information item. So, we could have this go up.

Senator Blum: No, not exactly like this it hasn’t. So, when I wasn’t there last week, they did everything, but Appendix II didn’t have this or these other changes as well, of course. And so, it was referenced in the other parts, Article III and Article VI that was updated.

Senator Horst: Right. When I was doing Rules for you, I had them change all of it to Student Caucus of the SGA. But what I’m wondering is if we have this go up as an information item on April 12 and then on April 26, we can do everything as an action item?

Senator Holmes: I could just make a motion on April 12 to pass it as an action item on the same night. Or is that not something you want to do?

Senator Horst: We could do that too. So, we would have this go up as an information item first, and if it doesn’t move over to an action item… We are moving a lot of items to action items. I’m going to channel former Senator Gizzi who used to really freak out when we did that because part of it is you’re supposed to have this opportunity to discuss things with your constituents. Right. So, like the dismount zone policy was a good example of something people really needed to talk to people about, and say “hey, you know, we’re doing this. Even though I appreciated that motion, that’s a good example of something that really needed to gestate a little bit.” We can always do that. I’m fine either way.

Senator Blum: We get everything else approved except this.

Senator Horst: We can’t approve the other stuff unless we do this part. It doesn’t make sense. That other stuff includes this.

Senator Walsh: I wouldn’t want to jump the gun with this. My only thing is that this will be this Student Government Association’s last meeting. So, if we put it to action and it goes to the first meeting of this new association, I can guarantee they are going to have countless and understood questions. We’ll probably have some returning members, but the President will be a new member who won’t have seen this before.

Senator Myers: We would have new exec officers.

Senator Horst: So, you guys switch over on the 19th?

Senator Walsh: Yeah. The 19th.

Senator Blum: I think we should ask for his to be moved to action if we can. I guess kind of a backup, if Senate feels they need more time to look at this, we could actually just change the top Student Caucus of, ask if that is the only change. That would make everything align.

Senator Horst: No, because parts of it say SGA. In Article VI, everything says SGA. I’ve changed everything to Student Caucus of the Student Government Association. So, we can do this as an information/action item and then once we pass this then we can pass everything else, if you are ready. Happy? Okay.

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

***Proposed* Academic Senate Meeting Agenda**

**Wednesday, April 12, 2023**

**7:00 P.M.  
Old Main, Bone Student Center**

***Call to Order***

***Roll Call***

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

***Approval of the Academic Senate minutes of March 8, 2023.***

***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-Excused***
* ***Associate Vice President for Human Resource Janice Bonneville***

***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.)***

* ***Interdisciplinary Studies:***
  + [***Data Science Major***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/2023-03%20Data%20Science%20Major.pdf)
  + [***Data Science, Individualized Plan of Study Sequence***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/2023-03%20Data%20Science%20Individualized%20Plan%20of%20Study%20Sequence.pdf)
  + [***Big Data and Computational Intelligence Sequence***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/2023-03%20Big%20Data%20and%20Computational%20Intelligence%20Sequence.pdf)
  + [***Major in Data Science, Population Health Sequence***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/2023-03%20Major%20in%20Data%20Science%20Population%20Health%20Sequence.pdf)
  + [***Major in Data Science, Social Demographic/Public Policy Analysis Sequence***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/2023-03%20Major%20in%20Data%20Science%20Social%20Demographic_Public%20Policy%20Analysis.pdf)
  + [***Major in Data Science, Business Analytics Sequence***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/2023-03%20Major%20in%20Data%20Science%20Business%20Analytics%20Sequence.pdf)
* ***Accounting:***[***PROPOSE DELETION B.S. Accountancy - Career Specialty Sequence***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/2023-03%20DELETION%20B.S.%20Accountancy%20-%20Career%20Specialty%20Sequence.pdf)

***From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee:***

***Academic Facilities Priorities Report***

***From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee:***

***Information/Action Item: AABC AIF Report 2023***

***AIF Statement of Priorities and Guiding Principles***

***Supporting Documents: AIF Presentation Slides***

***Action Item:***

***From Rules Committee:***

***Graduate School Bylaws***

***Information/Action Item:***

***From Executive Committee:***

***04.03.23.01 Student Government Association Charge\_ASBylaws\_Current Copy***

***04.04.23.02 Proposed Student Caucus of the Student Government Association\_AS Bylaws\_Mark up***

***04.04.23.01 Proposed Student Caucus of the Student Government Association\_AS Bylaws\_Clean Copy***

***From Academic Affairs Committee:***

***03.30.23.01 Policy 3.2.18 Oral English Proficiency (Current Copy)  
03.30.23.02 Policy 3.2.18 Oral English Proficiency (Mark Up)***

***03.30.23.03 Policy 3.2.18 Oral English Proficiency (Clean Copy)***

***From Rules Committee:***

***02.23.23.23 Article III\_Section 5 Vacancies and Absences \_Academic Senate Bylaws\_Current Copy***

***02.23.23.24 Article III\_Section 5 Vacancies and Absences \_Academic Senate Bylaws\_Mark Up***

***02.23.23.25 Article III\_Section 5 Vacancies and Absences \_Academic Senate Bylaws\_Clean Copy***

***03.24.23.01 Summary of Academic Senate Bylaws Changes\_Article VI and App II***

***02.23.23.26 Article VI\_Academic Senate Bylaws\_Current Copy***

***03.24.23.03 Article VI\_Academic Senate Bylaws\_Mark Up***

***03.24.23.02 Article VI\_Academic Senate Bylaws\_Clean Copy***

***02.23.23.20 Appendix II Academic Senate Bylaws\_Current Copy  
03.24.23.06 Appendix II Academic Senate Bylaws\_Mark Up***

***03.24.23.05 Appendix II Academic Senate Bylaws\_Clean Copy***

***From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee:***

***03.10.23.04 Policy 3.1.1 Categories of University Staff (Current Copy)  
03.16.23.02 Policy 3.1.1 Categories of University Empolyee (Mark Up)***

***03.10.23.05 Policy 3.1.1 Categories of University Employee (Clean Copy)***

***03.10.23.06 PROPOSE DELETION\_Policy 3.2.1 Academic Personnel\_Current Copy***

***From Faculty Affairs Committee:***

***01.26.23.07 Policy 3.2.14 Assignment of Person Holding Faculty Rank\_Current Copy  
02.23.23.30 Policy 3.2.14 Assignment of Person Holding Faculty Rank\_Mark Up  
02.23.23.31 Policy 3.2.14 Assignment of Person Holding Faculty Rank\_Clean Copy***

***From Faculty Affairs Committee:***

***01.26.23.09 Policy 3.3.10 Termination Notification of Faculty\_Current Copy  
02.23.23.32 Policy 3.3.10 Termination Notification of Faculty\_Mark Up  
02.23.23.33 Policy 3.3.10 Termination Notification of Faculty\_Clean Copy***

***Information Items:***

***From Academic Affairs Committee:   
03.30.23.04 Policy 4.1.17 Classroom Disruption (Current Copy)***

***03.30.23.05 Policy 4.1.17 Disruption of the Classroom or other Learning Environment (Mark Up)  
03.30.23.06 Policy 4.1.17 Disruption of the Classroom or other Learning Environment (Clean Copy)***

***From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee:***

***02.23.23.13 MCN Dean Evaluation Form\_Current Copy***

***02.23.23.14 MCN Dean Evaluation Form\_Mark Up***

***02.23.23.15 MCN Dean Evaluation Form\_Clean Copy***

***Absent***

***From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee:***

***03.09.23.02 Policy 1.11 Academic Calendar (Current Copy)  
03.17.23.01 Policy 1.11 Academic Calendar (Mark Up)  
03.09.23.03 Policy 1.11 Academic Calendar (Clean Copy)***

***From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee:***

***03.10.23.07 Policy 3.2.2 Search Committees (Current Copy)  
03.16.23.03 Policy 3.2.2 Search Committees (Mark Up)  
03.10.23.08 Policy 3.2.2 Search Committees (Clean Copy)***

***Internal Committee Reports:***

* ***Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Cline***
* ***Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Senator Nikolaou***
* ***Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Smudde***
* ***Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Valentin***
* ***Rules Committee: Senator Blum***

***Communications***

***Adjournment or Hard Stop 9:30 p.m.***

Motion by Senator Holmes, seconded by Senator Mainieri, to approve the amended agenda. The motion was unanimously approved.

***Adjournment***

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

***Attendance:***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Martha Horst***- Chairperson- WKCFA Faculty | Present |
| ***Patrick Walsh-*** Vice Chair and Student Body President | Present |
| ***Dimitrios Nikolaou-*** Secretary-CAS Faculty | Present |
| ***Craig Blum-*** COE Faculty | Present |
| ***Lea Cline***- WKCFA Faculty | Present |
| ***Deb Garrahy***- CAST Faculty | Present |
| ***Tracy Mainieri***- CAST Faculty | Present |
| ***Zoe Smith-***Secretary of the SGA Assembly | Absent |
| ***Braxton Myers***- President of the SGA Assembly | Present |
| ***Interim President Aondover Tarhule***- Ex-officio non-voting | Excused |
| ***Acting Provost Ani Yazedjian***- Ex-officio non-voting | Present |