**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

**MONDAY, January 10, 2022**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

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

Senator Horst: This meeting is being held electronically. President Kinzy has determined that at this time while under the Governor’s disaster declaration it is not prudent, practical, or feasible to hold in person Open Meetings Act meetings on campus.

***Approval of Executive Committee minutes from 11/08/21 and 11/29/21.***

Motion by Senator Cline, seconded by Senator Garrahy, to approve the minutes. The motion was unanimously approved.

***Oral Communication:***

***Discussion of January 19 Senate meeting.***Senator Horst: I wasn’t quite sure if we were going to have an in-person meeting or not. I was very thankful you all replied to my questions over break. I was impressed that everyone could make it, but the more I started thinking about a big chunk of student senators not being able to make it, and then the COVID numbers going up, it just didn’t seem prudent or practical to have in-person meetings. I’m hoping it’s only one. And that’s the plan. Are there any reflections on the January 19th meeting?

Senator Spranger: We’re going to pilot it for SGA on Wednesday so I can let you know how it goes.

Senator Horst: Great. I did see the COVID tracker numbers just went up. We have a positivity rate of 12.6%. There’s big spike on the day that everyone returned but then it seems to be leveling off. So, we’ll see where we are in a couple of weeks. Hopefully things will not be so bad.

President Kinzy: Can I give some context? Our current county rate is 26.8%. So, it’s important to know that our campus is much lower. And I’d like to say that we’ve seen an increase in vaccination of faculty and staff, up to 97%, and an increase in our dorms by 3% as well. So, there’s been some good progress over break.

Senator Horst: Okay. Great. So, hopefully we’ll only have to do one of these. And I think I said at the beginning of the semester, Dimitrios you’re never going to have to do another roll call vote again, but here ya go. So, for every single action item, we’ll be doing a roll call vote. Cera will be letting people in on Zoom. Cera can you just talk about some of the things you’ll be doing at the meetings?

Ms. Hazelrigg: Usually throughout the meeting, I let everyone it. As you call on people, I mute and unmute because the mics aren’t openly free, in case several people accidently unmute themselves. Then if there’s anything vulgar or threatening visually, I’ll turn cameras off. So, I’m just behind the scenes monitoring everything.

Senator Horst: Great. We certainly appreciate all you did. when you weren’t with us, we found out all the stuff you were doing. So, hopefully this will be the only meeting. We will have to have Faculty Caucus and we will be doing some elections. We can talk about those later.

***Distributed Communications:***

***From Rules Committee: (Information Item 01/19/22)***

***12.08.21.01 Policy 5.1.8 Skateboarding Activities policy Current Copy***

***12.08.21.02 Policy 5.1.8 Skateboarding Activities policy Mark Up***

***12.08.21.03 Policy 5.1.8 Skateboarding Activities policy Clean Copy***

***12.08.21.04 Policy 5.1.8 Hammer and Stewart email***

Senator Stewart: This is a fairly minor update to the Skateboarding policy. As you might recall, there were a couple of incidents where people were skateboarding inside buildings in the fall semester of 2021, and it turned out that nothing in the policy explicitly prohibited that. So, we were asked to update that. We made that change saying specifically in the revised edition that no skateboarding inside buildings is allowed. We also generalized the policy a little bit so that it doesn’t just apply to skateboards anymore, but to various kinds of recreational wheeled vehicles: bicycles, rollerblades, etc., which seemed to raise a lot of the same issues.

Senator Horst: Great. And it’s gone through Legal?

Senator Stewart: Yes. They have seen the latest draft and as the email I included suggests, they agree with all the changes.

Senator Horst: Are there any questions or feedback for Senator Stewart?

Senator Nikolaou: A small one. I don’t know if the “However…” is needed in the second paragraph because it is not contradicting that it is forbidden inside all the buildings, it just adds an additional part.

And then in the second to the last paragraph where is says “University disciplinary action under the Code of Student Conduct.” So, that refers only to students, but it is possible that staff and faculty might be using skateboards or wheeled vehicles. Maybe we need to add something there or say for example. Because it gives the impression that only students are using skateboards and wheeled vehicles.

Senator Horst: You might want to get some language from Legal if there are professors who are going through on skateboards. That might be something they would have, language about disciplinary conduct that is boilerplate. Thank you for that Dimitrios.

Senator Stewart: Sure.

***11.29.21.01 Provost Response to Academic Senate Exec on Honors Director and Curriculum***[***3.2.13 Administrator Selection***](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/employee/3-2-13.shtml)

Senator Horst: Now we have the Provost response to the Academic Senate Exec question about the Honors Director, about the curriculum piece. Just to give a little summary, again, the Senate office received an email from Professor Kalter requesting that the Executive Committee place the topic of a permanent director position on their next agenda to discuss with the Provost and the President whether the Honors Director falls under the Panel of Ten searches as dictated by policy 3.2.13. She noted that such wording does not restrict the searches to those specifically described, but instead gives an” including but not limited to” noncomprehensive list. So, that was her comment. In that email chain, there was a response from Senator Marx, who’s been the chair of the AABC who drafted policy 3.2.13, the latest version. He commented that the AABC felt that the position of the Student Success person did fall under 3.2.13 even though it reported to Amy Hurd. He said similarly the Honors Program Director reports to Amy, and because of it and the Student Success position have very strong academic components, it should be a Panel of Ten search. So, that was Senator Marx’s comments, and he certainly is a senior member of the Senate. So, according to our bylaws, if they’re interpreting policy and if there’s a debate of interpretation of the policy, I can take such questions to the Executive Committee for a determination of the proper interpretation.

So, what we are doing is we’re interpreting policy 3.2.13 -- the part that says, “I. Academic Affairs, Searches to fill other academic administrator vacancies, such as those positions that report directly to the Provost and involve curriculum, faculty or staff evaluation or supervision for a number of colleges, may also require the participation of representatives of various constituencies.” So, last time we talked about this, we asked the Provost to clarify the curriculum component of the Honors Director, and he gave a very thorough response.

Now, we are at the interpretation part. What does the Executive Committee think about whether or not section I in 3.2.13 applies to a potential Honors Director search for Panel of Ten?  Dimitrios is shaking his head, can you elaborate please?

Senator Nikolaou: I’m fine. I asked some of the questions when we were meeting in person, but I’m okay with the response.

Senator Horst: You’re okay with the Provost’s response. So, do you think it should be a Panel of Ten search?

Senator Nikolaou: I am okay with the Provost’s response where he said it’s going to continue as a non-panel.

Senator Horst: Okay.

Senator Stewart: I don’t know. I feel conflicted about this. I certainly appreciate the Provost’s response, and yes it was very detailed and very clear, but Honors in a way does have its tentacles in curriculum, maybe not encrypted on creation, but they certainly work with faculty, right, and try to make sure there are adequate numbers of honors sections, etc. So, I don’t know what I think yet. I guess I want to hear a few more thoughts.

Senator Cline: I think I’m falling on what the Provost is arguing, which is while there is some, you know, every part of our campus touches curriculum, even in student services and others, some way, at one point or another they come in for honors experiences and other experiences. Right. It’s all over the campus. But I don’t see it as a significant part of the job necessarily, so I think I would side with the decision of the Provost that it should not be a Panel of Ten search.

Senator Otto: I’m inclined to think this should be a Panel of Ten search for the reasons that Dr. Marx laid out. And because in my talking with people who have done work in the Honor’s college, that this is a more heavily curricular position than it may at first glance seem.

Senator Miller: I’m always for a Panel of Ten because it’s more voices. I’m not very well versed on this particular issue but that’s my opinion on that.

Senator Spranger: I was on a similar page. The Honor’s Director does have a lot of things going on. So, I don’t think it would hurt to have a Panel of Ten, in my opinion. But I also don’t know.

Senator Horst: In terms of this year, I would like to mention that we do have quite a few Panel of Ten searches and then it does limit who can be chair, it gives pretty strict rules, and it ties up the Faculty Caucus getting nominees and such. So, part of my concern going forward just for the next meeting is we have two Panel of Ten searches and we don’t have a lot of volunteers at all. So, it just makes it a different beast. I don’t think that there would be an Honors Director search without representation; it just puts it under a very specific policy.

Senator Garrahy: So, to my knowledge, the Director of the Honors Program does not report obviously to the Provost and the supervisory piece. Based on those two aspects, it has not historically been a Panel of Ten search. I’m going to support the Provost’s rationale for it not being a Panel of Ten.

Senator Villalobos: I’m just reading the policy and like everyone else it took me a second to find it. I actually am not a fan of how it’s written. I think it’s not written in the best way possible given that it gives a bunch of stipulations and then still continues to say “may,” I don’t think that’s how it should be written. But going along with how it’s written, I would be inclined to agree with the Provost’s assessment.

Senator Small: I’m obviously not super well versed in all of this but I would agree with what Chloe and Avery just said, that it’s always beneficial to have more voices. But also like you said, if there aren’t a lot of volunteers that’s a little more difficult if there aren’t already enough volunteers for an existing Panel of Ten search. So, I’m not totally sure.

Senator Horst: Avery have you gone yet? The Hollywood squares shifted on my screen and I was going in order of who was on my screen.

Senator Spranger: I’m ambivalent. If we won’t be able to fill it up, then probably we should take the practical route. But I’m neutral.

Provost Tarhule: The only thing I would say is we’re not trying to restrict participation at all as you have seen in all of the searches we have conducted. This is not about restricting participation, its about… a Panel of Ten has a specific meaning. It means we have to wait for the Academic Senate to nominate people to make that panel and then we have four people.

With this position, it’s not designing any curriculum. What it does is people have courses already and it is the job of the director to find those courses that fit with the program of the Honors Program. So, the Honors Program does not design the curriculum and find people to teach it. The Honors Program takes curriculum that exists that fits in with what it is they’re doing. So, there’s no role in curriculum design. If I might say extremely little just to give that creative room for magic. That’s one.

The other is the composition of the committee changes. In this case, what we’re looking for would be a lot of people on the staff side who have roles to play in student success. We need a lot more of those people on this committee. Advisors, the people who support students in career services and those types of things, then faculty, because it is those success measures that are actually more important than the Honors Program than the curriculum part, which is where we would need faculty. So, that was part of the rationale in the way that we described this. I’m always, as everyone has said, in favor of getting as many voices as possible. I remember there were faculty as well, it’s a matter of how many and who chairs the committee, those types of things. That’s the only thing that will be different in this case.

So, for me the other consideration was work input versus return on investment. If I think about how many different faculty time would be committed to this just because the word curriculum is mentioned. What is the work commitment for the faculty versus the return on investment, if you will? So, when we put all of those together, again, given the fact that this person doesn’t report to me. If you look at the criteria that is listed in that policy, how many of those are met by this program? Really, maybe one, or half of one, because curriculum is mentioned. Otherwise, everything else that is mentioned as a criteria for getting a Panel of Ten here doesn’t apply to this position.

So, again, if this group were to determine that we needed to do that, I would happily do it. I just think that it’s only very marginally, tangentially, if at all touches on anything to do with curriculum and I think it’s really just not a very efficient use of time for the types of input we’re looking for.

Senator Horst: Thank you. I’m also going to read that it says here: “If in the judgment of the Provost and/or the appropriate shared governance body the numbers above need adjustment, an ad hoc committee structure may be arranged.  For all ad hoc committees, the structure must maintain a minimum of four T/TT faculty, of two staff, and of one student (when the Provost and the Academic Affairs Committee agree that students are an appropriate constituency), in addition to the committee secretary and chairperson chosen from the Panel of Ten.” So, there’s a little bit of wiggle room but the chair certainly would have to be from the Panel of Ten. President Kinzy, do you have anything to add?

President Kinzy: Engagement versus administrative burden is a really important one, and we always consider that. I think this is a particularly important time for that and decisions we make now impact the future. Having looked very closely at the Honors college, because I’m going to submit a class for it, I think that’s the only thing I literally saw that has anything to do with curriculum, which is simply those course options they offer where people apply to teach them. We want to be efficient. We want to get the position filled and we want to have the best experts that will make this person successful on the committee. If that were what a Panel of Ten asks for that would be fine; it just seems like the purpose of that is at a very different level at the institution by my read of the document. I support the Provost position.

Senator Horst: Thank you. I’m just going to conclude by saying I talked with the two previous Honors Directors who didn’t think it was a Panel of Ten search, and they echoed what the Provost said about the curriculum component.

It was decided that the Honors Director position should not be a Panel of Ten search by roll call vote, 8-2.

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

***Proposed* Academic Senate Meeting Agenda**

**Wednesday, January 19, 2022**

**7:00 P.M.**

**VIRTUAL MEETING per state law and Governor Pritzker’s Executive Order**

**Zoom Link: TBD**

*Request to make public comment at the meeting should be sent via email to* [*acsenate@ilstu.edu*](mailto:acsenate@ilstu.edu) *no later than 6:55 p.m. on the day of the meeting.*

***Call to Order***

***Roll Call***

***Public Comment***

***Approval of the Academic Senate minutes of 12/08/21***

***Chairperson's Remarks***

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

***Administrators' Remarks***

* ***President Terri Goss Kinzy***
* ***Provost Aondover Tarhule***
* ***Vice President of Student Affairs Levester Johnson***
* ***Vice President of Finance and Planning Dan Stephens***
* ***Update from Janice Bonneville regarding*** [***3.1.12 Federal Family and Medical Leave***](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/employee/3-1-12.shtml)

***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.)***

* ***Mennonite College of Nursing:*** [Doctor of Philosophy in Nursing: BSN to PhD Sequence](file:///C:\Users\mchorst\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\INetCache\Content.Outlook\CAJP90AU\%7b%7bf:45567247%7d%7d)
* ***Mennonite College of Nursing:*** [Doctor of Philosophy in Nursing: Post Master's Sequence](file:///C:\Users\mchorst\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\INetCache\Content.Outlook\CAJP90AU\%7b%7bf:45567248%7d%7d)
* [10.21.21.18 Policy 3.2.17 Creation of Academic Policy Current Copy](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/CA01%20-%2010.21.21.18%20Policy%203.2.17%20Creation%20of%20Academic%20Policy%20Current%20Copy.docx)
* [10.19.21.14 POLICY RENUMBER\_Policy 10.2 revised from 3.2.17 Creation of Academic Policy](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/CA01%20-%2010.19.21.14%20POLICY%20RENUMBER_Policy%2010.2%20revised%20from%203.2.17%20Creation%20of%20Academic%20Policy.docx) Mark Up
* [10.21.21.19 POLICY RENUMBER\_Policy 10.2 Creation of Academic Policy CLEAN COPY](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/CA01%20-%2010.21.21.19%20POLICY%20RENUMBER_Policy%2010.2%20Creation%20of%20Academic%20Policy%20CLEAN%20COPY.docx)

***Action Item:***

***From Academic Affairs Committee:***

***11.04.21.06 Policy 7.7.2 Financial Aid Distribution Current Copy***

***12.01.21.03 Policy 7.7.2 Financial Aid Distribution Mark Up***

***11.18.21.06 Policy 7.7.2 Financial Aid Distribution Clean Copy***

***From Planning and Finance Committee:***

***09.13.18.10 Policy 3.1.11 Leave of Absence Current Copy***

***01.06.22.03 Policy 3.1.11 Leave of Absence Mark Up***

***01.06.22.02 Policy 3.1.11 Leave of Absence Clean Copy***

***From Planning and Finance Committee:***

***11.18.21.14 Policy 3.1.11 LoA MILITARY portion only Current Copy***

***11.18.21.15 Proposed NEW Policy 3.1.50 Military Service Mark Up***

***11.18.21.02 Proposed New Policy 3.1.50 Military Service Leave of Absence Clean Copy***

***Information Items:***

***From Academic Affairs Committee:***

***09.14.21.03 Policy 7.7.8 Tuition and Fee Waivers Policy Current Policy***

***11.18.21.15 Policy 7.7.8 Tuition and Fee Waivers Policy Mark Up***

***11.18.21.05 Policy 7.7.8 Tuition and Fee Waivers Policy Clean Copy***

***From Rules Committee:***

***12.08.21.01 Policy 5.1.8 Skateboarding Activities policy Current Copy***

***12.08.21.02 Policy 5.1.8 Skateboarding Activities policy Mark Up***

***12.08.21.03 Policy 5.1.8 Skateboarding Activities policy Clean Copy***

***12.08.21.04 Policy 5.1.8 Hammer and Stewart email***

***Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Cline***

***Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Senator Smudde***

***Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Nikolaou***

***Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Vogel***

***Rules Committee: Senator Stewart***

***Communications***

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Cline, seconded by Senator Spranger, to approve the proposed Senate agenda. The motion was unanimously approved.

***11.18.21.07 Marx Email Rescinding Titles (Dist. to Faculty Caucus or Faculty Affairs Committee)***

[*3.3.5 Distinguished Professors*](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/employee/3-3-5.shtml)[*3.3.14 University Professor*](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/employee/3-3.shtml)

Senator Horst: I was mentioning to Senator Marx that we are working on language regarding the emeriti faculty and whether or not we could strip that title, and I’m still hearing back from Legal (they wanted to revise that language). So, we’re working on that for that policy. He suggested that similar language could be added to 3.3.5 Distinguished Professor policy and 3.3.14 University Professor policy. I looked at the Distinguished Professor policy today and I saw in that it says, “Distinguished Professors may hold the title throughout their years of service to Illinois State University, unless disciplinary action involving the removal of honors has been imposed.” So, there is already that in the Distinguished Professor policy. There’s nothing that I could find in the University Professor policy. But we can certainly forward this question, particularly about the University Professor policy to some sort of body, if you would like to. And then the question is which body? For some context, the last time we did the DP policy it went through the Faculty Caucus. There was a subcommittee to work on the University Professor policy that did not finish their work because of COVID. I was part of that group and we just stopped working on it. So, would you like to forward this to a committee, and if so which one?

Senator Cline: Not to enrage my fellow colleague in Faculty Affairs but I think it might be smarter to put it through a committee structure that has a process that can work with Legal and others and then send it to the Senate for approval. Obviously, the faculty will get to look at it. But I don’t know, something sort of feels wiser to me to send it to Faculty Affairs.

Senator Horst: But Faculty Affairs doesn’t do things for the Faculty Caucus.

Senator Cline: I understand. The Faculty Caucus are all in Senate so Senate will get a chance to look at it. But it’s a little bit more of a fast-moving deliberative body, so to speak, than the Senate as a whole. So, that’s my preference.

Senator Horst: So, you’re suggesting that we send it to Faculty Affairs and then the Senate?

Senator Cline: That seems smarter to me, but that’s just one opinion.

Senator Nikolaou: For the University Professor, for example, we would only be focusing on that aspect, right? Or would we be reviewing the whole policy?

Senator Horst: It was last updated in 2009.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. So, we would be reviewing the University Professor policy then. Okay.

Senator Horst: And we did a lot of work trying to come up with different structures. We did a lot of historical work. This policy is problematic, and if you do work on it, we can have a meeting.

Senator Nikolaou: That’s fine. But heads up, it will not be happening this year.

Senator Horst: Right. And that’s why we had a working group from the Faculty Caucus last time we did it. We had a working group working just on the University Professor policy, with the intention of sending it to Faculty Caucus. But we can send it to Faculty Affairs. Todd, correct me if I’m wrong, but I don’t think the bylaws say that the Faculty Caucus works on this policy, right?

Senator Stewart: I don’t recall off the top of my head.

Senator Horst: I think it should be housed with the Faculty Caucus eventually, and the bylaws committee might have plans to make that happen, but right now I don’t think we have that. So, would people like to send it to Faculty Affairs?

Senator Villalobos: I guess I’m confused what are we forwarding exactly? We’re forwarding what specific question? I know what topic.

Senator Horst: There’s one item about the University Professor policy, whether or not you can strip the title.

Senator Villalobos: So, just that broad question is what we’re sending?

Senator Horst: But then the whole policy is up for debate. The whole policy has a lot of problems. It’s hard to work on because you start getting into language about what distinguishes the University Professor from the Distinguished Professor, and you literally have people knocking on your doors (which I did have when I tried to work on this policy about six years ago). So, its thorny. And then you try to distinguish who’s eligible for University Professor, should it stay as something only administrators can get, should it be a recruiting tool, should we open it up. We tried to come up with a system where it would be… like open it up for like a service university professor and teaching university professor. We tried to come up with that kind of concept, and the previous Provost didn’t like it so much. So, it’s very tricky to work on. And it’s really a faculty issue. But we can send it to Faculty Affairs.

Senator Horst: I think the Distinguished Professor one can pause for now. It has been revised recently and that one already has language in it.

It was unanimously decided by roll call vote to send the University Professor policy to Faculty Affairs.

***12.09.21.03 Dates available for Senate Orientation***

Senator Horst: This was an issue that was brought up in the spring of last year. People were wondering if there were alternate dates to having the Senate Orientation, as opposed to the night of the election of the officers, for instance. Cera looked into it. She informs me that the only day that SGA requires that their members be available is Wednesday. So, there’s that restriction. Given the timing of the elections, the two possible dates that we could have Senate Orientation would be April 6, the next Wednesday is when SGA would have a meeting, and the April 20, which is our tradition. If we push it to April 6. According to Cera, we may not have all the elected senators.

Senator Villalobos: Also, I know there were discussions about the student elections being pushed back as a result of the first two weeks. So, I would anticipate that whatever they had in mind, which wasn’t published, but whatever they had in mind is now going to be pushed back even further, and they still haven’t given that information out. So, we don’t even know when it is, and when we might have thought it was going to be, it’s going to be a little bit further than that. So, I think that’s something we should probably consider as well.

Senator Horst: So, realistically Rodrigo, when do you think the students are going to be seated?

Senator Villalobos: I would probably not be comfortable with this April 6 idea. If it were one of the two it would be April 20, but even that one, I don’t know. These two as opposed to the other option we did this last time just doing it the same night as officer election.

Senator Horst: That’s the April 20.

Senator Villalobos: Okay.

Senator Horst: Because then we have the meeting coming up when the faculty members are elected by the new Senate. So, April 20 is really the last day.

Senator Villalobos: Yeah. If it had to be one of them then I would say that one. I wouldn’t think it would be prudent based on the information that I know for it to be April 6.

Senator Horst: Okay. Avery is nodding. Any other comments?

Senator Cline: When is the last Senate meeting?

Senator Horst: Cera, do you know that?

Ms. Hazelrigg: The first Wednesday in May is when the new Senate meetings.

Senator Horst: So, this is the meeting before that. We elect the Faculty Caucus Exec candidates, the secretary and the chair candidate. And then the new Senate approves all of that. It has to be on a Wednesday because that’s the only day that they are requiring them to be available, and it can’t be on an SGA meeting night.

Senator Spranger: It could be if we really needed it to be.

Senator Nikolaou: I was going to ask if it needs to be on an actual Senate Wednesday? Because for example would it be possible to be April 13?

Senator Horst: But that would be earlier, and Rodrigo was saying that…

Senator Nikolaou: Or the 27th.

Senator Spranger: The only issue is that we would have to either cancel our assembly or any onboarding we were going to have. But that could potentially be rearranged if it really needs to happen.

Senator Horst: We could do the orientation before the SGA meeting on the 27th?

Senator Spranger: We could cancel our committees that day or something if needed, and then have a late start GA. I’d feel bad not having a determined time to start though just because we have people that are in SGA that aren’t in Senate. So, I don’t know. If we say it’s only going to last an hour, from 6-7, I think that could work easier than saying we don’t know when we’re going to start but please be available.

Senator Horst: I think it is generally no more than an hour.

Senator Spranger: Okay. So that is potentially an option. If you want to take up the committee time, we could probably do that. Is the complaint that it is just a long night? Or it takes a long time? What was the issue?

Senator Nikolaou: Tracy was asking about that part. I think her argument was that if the orientation is the same day as when we do the elections for the secretary and chair a new person does not have time to fully understand what’s going on, and then they are immediately thrown into, okay, now you are going to nominate someone for secretary, Exec or chair. That was the main concern. Is there a way to kind of space them out?

Senator Horst: We could do an orientation for the faculty. Cera, can you tell us a little bit about the elections of the faculty? Are they earlier?

Ms. Hazelrigg: I send out reminder memos to the dean beginning of January to hold elections the last week of February, but I don’t get results until early April.

Senator Horst: So, we could separate them.

Senator Spranger: I’m going to vote to leave it how it is. I don’t know if we’re ready to be done discussing but I think we should just leave it.

Senator Cline: And by leave it, where does that leave it?

Senator Horst: On the same night as the elections of the officers of Exec.

Senator Garrahy: Do you foresee, again, my biggest concern has always been that names are thrown out there, but sometimes even standing members of the Senate don’t know enough about someone who has either been nominated or is self-nominating. Do you foresee us having little blurbs again that perhaps could go in advance of that meeting?

Senator Horst: I personally thought that the little introduction statements were nice. I thought that was a nice addition that we could actually say who we were and why we were interested in the position. Again, I really think it’s kind of the dynamics of who is in the room, and I think if we get a little too formal about it you might not… and you have to do it in sequential order because you don’t know who is going to be secretary, and you can’t figure out who’s going to be on Exec until you know who the officers are, and that kind of thing. What do other people think?

Senator Cline: I was the one who asked for those introductions. I understand the risk; before long people will be making posters and multimedia presentations. But I like having some introduction -- especially for the new Senators. Because, you know, many of you have been on Senate for a long time. For me, I was brand new last year, so it was like, “What is happening?” I don’t know who these people are, especially across campus, and individuals I don’t interact with for my teaching life. So, I think it’s important to have something. But if you want to regulate it, you know, once you’ve been nominated to have no more than five sentences, or something. Just something that is a minimum introduction that would also keep it in check and not make too much work for anybody. I still think it’s a really invaluable thing to do to acknowledge that new people will want to make informed decisions.

Senator Nikolaou: I think it worked nicely last time. When we nominated different individuals, it took like two-three minutes for each person to just give an idea of what they have done in the past. And even when I was in that meeting, I could still get a refresher about what some of the individuals on the Senate have done, but I may not recall at that specific point when I had to vote.

Senator Horst: Any discussion on this? It sounds like we’re going to keep it the way that it is. I’m just going to say that the Senate I was on at ECU had a formal nominating committee; each person that wanted to be chair gave a statement in front of the entire Senate. So, it can go different directions. The direction ISU has gone is interesting. But we’ll just keep with it for now. Yes?

It was decided unanimously by roll call vote to keep the Senate Orientation the date it’s traditionally been.

***From Minors Activity Compliance Committee: (Dist. to Faculty Affairs Committee)***

***01.03.22.02 Policy 1.19 Minors Policy Current Copy***

***01.03.22.03 Policy 1.19 Minors Policy Mark Up***

***01.03.22.01 Policy 1.19 Minors Policy Clean Copy***Senator Horst: The next item comes from Alicia Lange, John Goodman, Wendy Smith, and Roberta Trites, the Minors Activity Compliance Committee. They submitted a revised Protection of Minors policy. I spoke with Roberta today. She said they did some reorganization. The main thing that this adds is that it requires DCFS training for all adults, including those who work for subcontractors. So, for instance, if somebody starts a golf clinic in the summer and then they hire students, currently they wouldn’t have to do training, and this would require it. Roberta did also comment that she is leaving on June 30, and she recognizes that the committee that works on this might not be able to fully work on it this year; but perhaps she could have an initial conversation with whatever committee we pick to work on this policy before she leaves. She did a lot of work on the draft, and she won’t be available after June 30. I believe this went to Academic Affairs last time. She threw out the idea of it going to Rules this time since she’s on the Rules Committee. It could go to Faculty Affairs. It could go to Academic Affairs.

Senator Nikolaou: Are the proposed changes coming from the compliance committee or do they come from an actual law that changed and we are just incorporating it in the policy?

Senator Horst: Are you asking if there are legal changes?

Senator Nikolaou: Yes. Because there are several additions. So, for example, where they say “child abuse or neglect is defined as…” or “outside groups sponsored university affiliated programs…” are these definitions that this compliance committee came up with or are these definitions that they took from a specific law and they’re incorporating it? Because it’s going to make a difference. If all the additions come from the compliance committee, but not necessarily a state law, it’s going to take much more time for whichever committee we’re going to send it to.

Senator Horst: Maybe the Provost has more information, but I don’t think there’s been a law change. I asked her if this was urgent, and she said no. I think the main thing that they’re doing is closing this loophole. So, for instance on page four, they added, “any university program or activity registered under this policy involving minors that utilizes volunteers will require that volunteers will complete an education program.” I think currently it’s not being done. And then on page ten, “outside groups if they work with minors, they have to complete this education program.” I think the other parts of the draft were done by the Minors Activities Compliance Committee. I don’t think, Dimitrios, they are motivated by some law change. I don’t know. Whoever will work on the draft, the first thing they might want to do is to meet with them and Wendy Smith.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay.

Senator Horst: It’s clear that it’s going to be a lot of work and it’s not going to be probably something we’re going to get done this year. So, I think our job right now is to think of the kind of questions it’s asking, and which committee would be best able to tackle it. But they might just want to have one meeting with Roberta before she leaves. So, do people have any thoughts as to which committee should look at it? Todd?

Senator Stewart: Not really. It’s certainly fine to route it through Rules. I’d be happy to meet with Roberta to leave notes for Rules next year. Yeah, I don’t think Rules could do anything more than that with it this year. We’re so far behind.

Senator Villalobos: I have nothing new to add.

Senator Cline: It has to do with compliance issues as it relates to research. So, I’m not really sure of its home. It feels like its home would be with Faculty Affairs. But I think we’re all in the same position; we have a lot to do this year, so no matter what it’s not likely to be seen until next year. But philosophically, it feels like it’s about faculty driven research, right, and research compliance and I think that’s best under Faculty Affairs. Although if the group feels otherwise, I’m happy to put it on our docket and do as Todd said, have a meeting with Roberta before she goes.

Senator Horst: But there’s also this component about these outside groups: cheerleading clinic, they have some volunteers, and they’re working with all these minors and there’s no… I hate to say it but it’s kind of like the Alcohol policy. It’s like rules for how to do this kind of work.

Provost Tarhule: If I may chime in. It’s not just faculty research, it’s all people who work with minors. And with respect to the question that Martha asked before, again like Martha, I don’t completely recall, it’s been a while since Roberta discussed this with me, but my recollection is that it was a loophole that needed to be closed as opposed to being in response to a new law that has come up. But it’s been a while so I may be misremembering. But it’s not just faculty; it’s if somebody were to organize an event on our campus and they have to work with minors. In the current system, they’re not required to have some training related to how to effectively work with minors. So, I remember Roberta saying this is a lawsuit waiting to happen. If we allowed someone to work with minors on our campus and they find out that they did something inappropriate, the University could be liable for some of the cases. So, that’s the loophole that they’re trying to close.

Senator Cline: The way you describe it then, Provost Tarhule, it sounds like Rules.

President Kinzy: I want to say that anywhere else I’ve been this would already be the policy. It is absolutely a best practice. It sounds like something that was just missed. I do think it’s important to the institution. It was less important last year when we weren’t having camps and things, but it is a high liability. It’s also we want to do best by young people that come to campus.

Senator Otto: Following up on what President Kinzy said, it’s merely extending the reach of a policy we already have. So, to close this loophole, as you said, so it’s not really a radical shift. But it’s breadth of constituents seems like it would be best served by Rules, to me.

Senator Horst: I’m actually thinking Rules too, at least the way it’s defined now in the bylaws. The university policy committee would do well with it.

Senator Stewart: That’s fine.

Senator Nikolaou: I also see it in Rules. But, Martha, if you were worried about the research part, I can also go when Todd sets a meeting with Roberta. I can also join if we want both committees to look at it at the same time. That’s also a possibility.

Senator Horst: We could also do that too. That’s a good idea, Dimitrios. We could have Rules look at it then Faculty Affairs. Of course, this is going to take a long time. But do people agree with that? With the idea that once Rules works on it, Faculty Affairs can expedite their review of it, so it doesn’t take three years? Okay. Is that the plan? We’ll send it to Rules, they’ll have a dialogue with Roberta Trites before she leaves, and then they’ll complete their review of it (hopefully next year) and then forward it to Faculty Affairs?

Senator Nikolaou: Or a joint meeting.

Senator Horst: Or a joint meeting once they do the heavy lifting of the wording and everything?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah.

It was decided unanimously by roll call vote to send policy 1.19 Protection of Minors proposed revisions to Rules Committee and Faculty Affairs Committee.

***From Janice Bonneville: (Dist. to Faculty Affairs Committee)***

***10.21.21.12 Policy 3.2.3 Academic Notice of Appointments Current Copy***

***11.30.21.01 Policy 3.2.3 Academic Notice of Appointments Mark Up***

***01.06.22.01 Policy 3.2.3 Academic Notice of Appointments Clean Copy***

Senator Horst: This might look familiar. After we passed it, Janice Bonneville came up with additional wording that she wanted to include. We asked her to submit it to us again. Last time it went through Faculty Affairs. Are there any comments about the material that’s been submitted?

Senator Nikolaou: No. It seems that it’s more about clarification.

It was unanimously decided by roll call vote to send policy 3.2.3 Academic Notice of Appointments to Faculty Affairs Committee.

***Policies up for policy review:***

* [3.5.2 Laboratory School Continued Service - Faculty Associate](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/employee/3-5-2.shtml) (Dist. to Faculty Affairs Committee)
* [4.1.14 Laboratory Schools](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/facilities/6-1-2.shtml) (Dist. to Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)
* [2.1.17 Residency Status](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/students/2-1-17.shtml) (Dist. to Academic Affairs Committee)

The discussion of these items was postponed.

***Adjournment***

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

**Attendance**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SENATE**  **REPRESENTATIVES** | **Attendance** | **MOTION:** | **MOTION:** | **MOTION:** |
| Name |  |  |  |  |
| Cline, Lea | Virtual |  |  |  |
| Garrahy, Deb | Virtual |  |  |  |
| Horst, Martha | Virtual |  |  |  |
| Kinzy, Terri\* | Present | NV | NV | NV |
| Miller, Chloe | Virtual |  |  |  |
| Nikolaou, Dimitrios | Virtual |  |  |  |
| Otto, Stacy | Virtual |  |  |  |
| Small, Maddy | Virtual |  |  |  |
| Spranger, Avery | Virtual |  |  |  |
| Stewart, Todd | Virtual |  |  |  |
| Tarhule, Aondover\* | Virtual | NV | NV | NV |
| Villalobos, Rodrigo | Virtual |  |  |  |