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**Approved**

***Call to Order***

Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

***Oral Communications:***

Senator Kalter: I want to start with an oral communication. Right now, Educating Illinois task force is scheduled to come to the Faculty Caucus, but we accidentally told them to come at 7:00pm because I think I thought that maybe we would be canceling the Senate meeting. I just want to confirm that that’s where we want them, rather than coming to the full Senate, because essentially what they are doing is going back to the focus groups that they went around to see before. So obviously this crunches Faculty Caucus time, which I’m not that enthusiastic about given that we are trying to get stuff done, but it seems like if SGA, you guys have, I think, a meeting with them on Thursday of that week, or something like that, for your focus group. So I mean we could do it as a combined Senate/ Caucus, but it might be better to do it as the separate focus groups.

Senator Grzanich: I believe we are on the 18th.

Senator Kalter: Of October, so that’s…

Senator Marx: That’s a week after…

Senator Kalter: Yeah. In some ways I kind of liked the fact that they came to us separately so you could get an all faculty point of view and an all student point of view, rather than an all Senate point of view. So we’ll probably leave that as is, is that good? Ok, all right, great.

***Distributed Communications:***

***From President Dietz: Surveillance Equipment Memorandum***

Senator Kalter: We are actually going to go in order because we had time to order the agenda last week so we’re going to go in order. The first thing is President Dietz’s Surveillance Equipment memorandum and I just wanted to express a little bit of a concern about this. It seems as though the memo has changed a bit and it used to mention that the Senate Chair is always informed, or is supposed to be, at least be informed by policy of where things are, if possible. Because apparently if Homeland Security or FBI comes in maybe even you (President Dietz) might not know.

President Dietz: Right.

Senator Kalter: But I was a little concerned about that being taken out of what looks like a revised memo. I think it’s been in there for…

President Dietz: Let me look at that.

Senator Kalter: Ok. That would be great.

President Dietz: That was not my intention.

Senator Kalter: At some point, this was a while back, we actually narrowed it down from the Executive Committee to just the Senate Chair. So then taking it off all together makes me a little bit nervous there. David, I think that you said when Dan was chair, there was only one that was not a, one of those ones that you would post signs saying that “you’re on camera.” In the residence halls, we say “you’re on camera.”

Senator Marx: Right. Some identification.

Senator Kalter: We post it because it’s sort of an ongoing thing. But if it’s a crime type of thing we…

President Dietz: We don’t use that. Bomb threats. If we’re trying to find somebody that…

Senator Kalter: We’re not going to tip them off.

President Dietz: But I’ll go back to that other memo and see (inaudible) reword that.

Senator Kalter: That would be great.

Senator Marx: So my understanding is that this is an annual letter, annual memo to us. But it’s not triggered by anything specific, necessarily.

Senator Kalter: Right.

President Dietz: No. This is just to let you know that this may happen at some point during the course of the year. All those come to me for approval, with a background of what they’re trying to accomplish and that’s always security, theft, or something of that nature.

***06.06.17.01 Email from Senate Chairperson, Items for Exec (Dist. to Rules Committee)***

***06.06.17.02 Current Policy 1.2 Anti-Harassment and Non-Discrimination - Current Copy (Dist. to Rules Committee)***

***06.06.17.03 Policy 1.1 Equal Opportunity -Non-Discrimination Statement and Policy - Current Copy (Dist. to Rules Committee)***

***06.06.17.04 Policy 1.17 Code of Ethics - Current Copy (Dist. to Rules Committee)***

Senator Kalter: Terrific. So the next thing is… this is actually another carryover from last time. I had put this on our agenda to ask, not necessarily to direct this to the Rules Committee but to ask if we should. Somebody found this phrase in our Code of Ethics that refers to “all evaluative activities” have to follow the Code, could potentially chill shared governance if people decide that the people sitting at this table can’t criticize our Vice Presidents or our Provost or our President or what have you. I wondered if on the one hand that needs to be looked at in the Code and clarified. So that’s one question and then the second one had to do with how our Code of Ethics mentions Policies 1.1 and 1.2 which are the anti-discrimination, anti-harassment policies. But then our judicial processes forbid the AFEGC, for example, from hearing cases that have to do with those because they are supposed to go through the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access instead. So does it, is the way that this is written confusing to people? Because what happens frequently is that the AFEGC will get complaints that then they have to redirect towards OEOA. So the questions was, is it a problem with the actual policy, in either case, where it might need more clarification, or does it have to do with the enforcement, implementation and communication and direction of the Code?

Senator Horst: Maybe some language belongs in the AFEGC? That says “Code of Ethics note: these kinds of issues that are in the Code of Ethics do not go to the AFEGC.”

Senator Kalter: Yeah. It is already in that policy but not as clearly as it could be.

Senator Horst: Yeah, but I do like it being on the list of ethical behaviors.

Senator Kalter: Yes, and that’s the thing. If you take it off the list, then it becomes only a legal issue. Did it rise to the level of breaking federal law, for example, rather than a collegial issue, so to speak. Let me read out the other one, number 11 on the second page of the Code says “Maintain confidentiality, objectivity, fairness, and impartiality in all evaluative activities involving students and colleagues.” So you can imagine how, when people are filling out things about their… I don’t know which way to go, let’s start with the deans, go down to the chairs, up to the Provost, up to the President…

Senator Marx: Oh, you mean the annual evaluations?

Senator Kalter: Yeah when they are doing that they’re not necessarily fair, impartial, objective, or confidential, right? (Laughter) Students when they are filling out how they think of us as professors are not necessarily always fair, impartial, objective, or confidential.

Senator Laudner: But they’re supposed to be right?

Senator Haugo: It’s an ideal, right? It’s something to strive for.

Senator Horst: I think it’s a good ideal, Susan.

Senator Kalter: So can it be punished if it’s not followed through on, is the question?

Senator Haugo: That’s the concern about it “chilling?”

Senator Kalter: Yes.

Senator Marx: You’re suggesting that the faculty member could make a comment on one of these annual evaluation forms, then subsequently be held accountable for that statement?

Senator Kalter: Or let’s say, make a comment and then talk to their colleague about how they made similar comments, negative comments, about somebody. In other words, so a good way to think about this is it’s almost impossible in academia to have a vote of no confidence—which we’ve had in many different arenas in the academy, from our Provost way back when before I was hired, to chairs, to, I think, a dean got one once—if people are not talking to each other, right? And if they are evaluating up, they’re likely not to be necessarily fair or impartial, right? Yes, it’s an ideal but on the other hand is it possible to get turned around and chill an environment where it’s needed to have that kind of a vote.

Senator Hoelscher: So this really struck home in my department recently. I don’t want to get too much into it but the question was, “was it wrong to lobby?” Which is sort of what you’re saying. I have a problem; I want to talk to you about it, then I want to talk to you about it, then I want to talk to you about it, to get you on my side. Was that wrong? Should we have kept it to ourselves? And I don’t, I mean I wasn’t a privy to the whole thing I just know there was some difficulty there. So it’s a very interesting question because if you don’t lobby. Because in effect your spreading information. That’s what you’re trying to do. You’re trying to disseminate information and I don’t think it would be reasonable to think that you’re going to do it fairly and impartial. Everyone has a bias, has an opinion and has a bias. So if you stifle that, what are the consequences to that? If you don’t stifle that we’ve seen the consequences of that because it fractures a department. So very interesting question. I tried real hard to frame that without actually exposing what I really feel.

Senator Haugo: Is, I mean this is…

Senator Kalter: Evaluative activity.

Senator Haugo: Is a vote of no confidence an evaluative activity? I don’t know that a vote of no confidence situation necessarily fits under evaluative activities. It’s almost outside of the evaluative process, is it not?

Senator Kalter: I guess I wouldn’t say so.

Senator Hoelscher: Yeah if it’s not, I don’t know… I think we would need to define evaluative so that we excluded it. I see it as very evaluative.

Senator Laudner: See, I do too.

Senator Haugo: OK. It’s not part of the process of evaluation.

Senator Laudner: But I see the back door conversations, lobbying, leading up to that as not.

Senator Haugo: As not.

Senator Horst: But I think this is addressing your rouge DFSC who for some reason starts going after a faculty member and is completely unfair and it starts getting exposed, and…

Senator Kalter: In other words that the spirit of the Code of Ethics sentence is to protect the person not as much in power.

Senator Horst: Yes.

Senator Kalter: The student who evaluates the professor or the faculty member who the DFSC is evaluating, rather than vice versa.

Senator Horst: Well, but also your evaluating your chair. Maybe you got mad at him a couple of years ago, but you’ve got to remember you should be fair. I think it’s important that it’s on the list, and the application is another sort of problem. That’s where the AFEGC steps in.

Senator Kalter: To the discretion of committee to…

Senator Hoelscher: I think it’s a question that really bears some thought because I see a lot of different sides to it and I see consequences for that behavior being deemed acceptable, and being deemed unacceptable. That’s probably something we should have a conversation about. Not necessarily us, but somebody.

Senator Horst: So the problem is the word, “confidentiality” and then the word “all evaluative activities?” That everything is deemed confidential. Not necessarily objective, fairness and impartiality but the problem is the confidentiality, with your lobbying scenario.

Senator Haugo: Well, you said fairness though too.

Senator Horst: But shouldn’t we all be fair?

Senator Hoelscher: I think it helps to go back to a general scenario of how this happens if someone is unhappy and they have a conversation with two or three of their colleagues, and then that conversation moves up. There’s no confidentiality there.

Senator Laudner: But I don’t think that is an evaluative activity.

Senator Haugo: That’s what I’m saying. The process that usually lead to a vote of no confidence or leads to that kind of situation is not part of an evaluative activity. It’s usually outside of the evaluation process.

Senator Hoelscher: Alright. So the evaluative part is either what the DFSC… I’m asking, what the DFSC does or the actual vote of no confidence?

Senator Kalter: At the risk of sounding like the anti-Jim Pancrazio, I wonder about whether the word “formal” needs to be there.

Senator Laudner: Yes, that’s exactly right. That’s the way I read it. They are talking about the formal evaluations.

Senator Kalter: Right. These four things are good to expect but that we don’t want them to chill the ability for a student to rant and rave about how terrible their professor was. That’s not necessarily fair, it’s not necessarily objective. We shouldn’t be closing down their ability to talk to each other about how terrible that person was.

Senator Haugo: True.

Senator Kalter: And same for administrators, and etc., but we want something in there to say okay at a certain point, when there’s a power relationship involved it goes the other way, chill out and remember that you’re here to do University business.

Senator Hoelscher: I think the word “formal” clarifies a lot, because I immediately understand what you’re saying.

Senator Kalter: So it sounds like we should send that one to Rules. And this is for the long term, by the way, Martha, it doesn’t have to be talked about immediately.

Senator Horst: Okay.

Senator Kalter: And then it sounded like for the intersection between OEOA vs. AFEGC, that’s only AFEGC policy or should we… because it’s also possibly student judicial committees. So should we ask Rules to look at how those things intermingle and find those policies where it needs to be clarified?

Senator Horst: But now there is this scenario that the AFEGC does not belong to Rules, for instance.

Senator Kalter: Oh right. Well, yeah exactly, it depends on how you look at that, but yes, we’ve been moving in that direction, for sure.

Senator Horst: So if we’re talking about revising and fine tuning the AFEGC language…

Senator Kalter: It would go there.

Senator Haugo: It would not go to Rules.

Senator Horst: It would go to Faculty Caucus.

Senator Kalter: So let’s ask then, where is that bullet point in… Oh, here it is, number 9 in the Code of Ethics. We’re basically saying this does not need to change here, right?

Senator Marx: Right.

Senator Kalter: “Treat colleagues and students fairly, without exploitation and without discrimination based on irrelevancies…” Just keep that in the Code and clarify it where it needs to be in other policies.

Senator Marx: I would point out that the Code of Ethics applies to all university employees not just faculty. That’s why it’s not AFEGC.

Senator Horst: Right and that’s the problem of changing this, and then we’re looking at the AFEGC policy in relation to this.

Senator Kalter: Okay. We’ll do that. For AFEGC… and actually now that you say that perhaps student judicial committees is not relevant because they’re not under this Code. They are under the Code of Student Conduct.

Senator Marx: Correct.

Senator Kalter: So that as long as it’s clear there where things go, it will be fine. So we’ll send number 1 to Rules but number 2 we’ll take care of in other ways, by addressing other policies. Okay, great.

***09.20.17.01 From Jim Pancrazio et al, Email from Jim Pancrazio***

***09.20.17.02 From Jim Pancrazio et al, Proposal for Sense of the Senate Resolution on DACA***

Senator Kalter: We are going now to Jim Pancrazio: the proposed Sense of the Senate Resolution. So an update about this, I got feedback from Martha and David and then read through the statement and emailed Jim and the group on Friday just letting them know that it appeared to me that we may be running into the issue that we found last year after the election of a potential non-bipartisan or a partisan statement. Left it to them to decide what to do. I’m not sure exactly where they are with this. Jim suggested to the group that they just pull it, pull the Sense of the Senate and have a statement that supported what Dr. Dietz has already said, so that may happen. I don’t know if you’ve heard from Billy because he was one of the…

Senator Grzanich: I was just going to say that Sarah is not a student Senator anymore.

Senator Kalter: Sarah Aguilar.

Senator Grzanich: Yeah, she was a former Senator, last year. So I don’t know where the miscommunication was but probably better if her name wasn’t on the bill.

Senator Kalter: Okay. She can be on the group that sent it but not necessarily as a Senator sponsor.

Senator Grzanich: Sure. Just putting that out for clarification.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, that would leave Daniel Munoz, Billy Stripeik and Jim Pancrazio as people of who might possibly be bringing something to the floor. Obviously we don’t put these on the agenda. At the time we received this, I emailed the whole group, not just Jim, and said we have two things you can do: one is to just bring it to the floor, but explained to him that we had a ton of stuff to do that night and we were going to try for a hard stop time at 8:15 p.m. So they decided to send it through Exec. So then we sent it to you all early so that you could read it and think about it. But, of course, explaining to them that Exec is just giving them advice about it. I’m not sure exactly where they are, but what we can do is give more advice than they’ve already got, reconfirm that advice that they’ve already got, wherever it goes, whatever you think is best. So right now they have, David, you already sent yours to everyone basically, the thing about where to send it. Martha had sent something about not having acknowledged that Dr. Dietz’s has already done something, and then my feedback was about places in the document where I thought that trigger words or potentially, things were in there that could potentially be perceived as partisan. Rather than looking like a University concern, an academic concern, that it might look like it’s trying to get people on one side of the aisle or the other. Did anyone else have any thoughts?

President Dietz: This last sentence to me is a bit problematic given what you just said here because I’ve already gone on record. So “We urge our administration… to join us and support.” We’ve already done that 4 times, (inaudible) professional associations with a statement, and again under a different format two Presidents, the University of Illinois President and myself, sent another one out last week that formalized all of that and made it much more… there was a zillion “whereases’” in this one. So I think we’ve been… the administration part has been pretty active with that.

Senator Grzanich: I also went on record for Student Government Association with my own letter as well, and we did host an event to voice support of DACA as well. So from the student side as well… I don’t know…

Senator Horst: We stand with administration as they voice their concern...

Senator Haugo: As support. A statement of support.

Senator Kalter: That’s kind of where they were going is saying thank you to Dr. Dietz. I think the way he said it was a Sense of the Senate that would be about gratitude for what Dr. Dietz had put out there.

Senator Haugo: And maybe for the SGA.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, I didn’t know about that, so that would be something to add as well.

Senator Hoelscher: I just can’t help but think of a Twitter war.

Senator Kalter: Over this?

Senator Hoelscher: Yeah. Surely we’re not that important.

Senator Kalter: What I was thinking about was the number of times on the Senate floor last year that, I’m trying to remember the student Senator’s…Kinross…felt really put upon every time he spoke, like he would have one of the faculty… He felt like that person was jumping down his throat.

Senator Grzanich: To a certain extent he was though.

Senator Kalter: To a certain extent he was though. I know that that feeling was more widespread then Senator Kinross. So when I read it, I was like, well. There is, for example, the language of the “most recent declaration by the President” sounds a little but more like you think the President is a fascist than if you said something like “the decision by the President,” which is more neutral. So I gave them some of that but I think it may be just deciding to change the memo, or change the Sense of the Senate to something simpler or something like that.

Senator Laudner: And you think that’s the direction they are going now?

Senator Kalter: I think so. I don’t know. I mean it’s not really up to me. I mean obviously my concern as I’ve expressed it to them, we have Senators, both faculty and students, who may not want their political views known, right? That they feel it’s not ethical for your student to know where you stand on certain issues, or vice versa, where the student doesn’t want to feel like if I take a stand on this and it gets back to my professor they might grade me down, or what have you, or where they feel uncomfortable with the Senate going in a direction that’s perceived as being either very pro-democrat or very pro-republican, right? So I was trying to give them that sort of perspective, that as written this particular one could come off that way. There are probably ways to write it that wouldn’t but… I’m not exactly the person to ask. So maybe consulting with the College Republicans might be a good idea on this one, right? I don’t know that I’m going to necessarily be able to catch everything that everyone else is going to see as either… as partisan in one way or another.

President Dietz: I think that is why we were very careful in crafting my letter and we had Legal look at that. We had a lot of communication folks look at that, and our point was not a partisan point at all. Just like our job here is not to determine who’s a citizen and who is not. Our job is to educate people admitted via admission standards and that’s it, and the same is true for the people we employ. Our job is not to determine in the institution whether or not they should be here or they shouldn’t be here. But as long as they are here and they are doing a good job, we want to support the people that are here whether that’s faculty, a staff member, or whatever. So we kind of stayed out of that political…

Senator Kalter: Yep.

Senator Hoelscher: And I think that it’s such a personal issue to ISU that that’s appropriate. So we might need to work a little on it to try to make it as non-partisan as possible but I think it is very possible to address this issue in a non-partisan way. It is, it’s just so key to our mission that I think we appropriately need to address it.

President Dietz: I’d be happy to share language with all these things that I’ve signed, related to this, with Jim. If he wants to borrow some of that…

Senator Kalter: Yeah, maybe what I’ll do is direct him toward your language.

Senator Horst: But you know we are an Academic Senate.

Senator Kalter: Right.

Senator Horst: We’re not a political body.

Senator Kalter: That is what I said to them in so many words, was we are not elected by our constituents on a party or partisan basis. We are supposed to represent the heterogeneous views of the faculty if we are elected by faculty, or the students, and we don’t want the Senate to seem to become detached from the campus culture. I can send what I sent to all of you. I was doing it, I was trying to prep for this meeting on Friday and I usually do it over the weekend so I didn’t think to send. But yeah, that’s essentially what I said. We are an Academic Senate and we hope that our Senses of the Senate are clearly about academics and clearly phrased in that way, rather than as though we are a Senate of the legislative, of the other legislative type. Any other feedback for them about any of that?

***06.27.17.03 From Academic Affairs, Policy 2.1.21 Academic Standing, Probation, and Reinstatement Policy mark up (Information item 10/11/17)***

Senator Kalter: So we’ve got our policy that’s going to be an information item, two policies actually so we’ll start with the Undergraduate… Well, it’s going to be, proposed to become, the Undergraduate Academic Standing, Probation, and Reinstatement policy. Does anybody see anything? I know most of you are on the committee that looked at this so…

Senator Horst: So then there’s going to be a Graduate Academic Standing, Probation, and Reinstatement policy?

Senator Kalter: That’s a great question. I wondered about that. I have that exact question written on mine.

Senator Haugo: That question did not come up at Academic Affairs.

Senator Marx: It did not.

Senator Kalter: Do you know how that works, Dr. Dietz?

President Dietz: I think you just ask the question on the floor.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, on the floor. Kevin, do you happen to know how graduate reinstatement, standing, or probation works? Is it department by department? Is it the Grad School?

Senator Haugo: The Grad School?

Senator Laudner: I think it’s by department.

Senator Kalter: It’s the department?

Senator Laudner: Yeah, I think so.

Senator Kalter: Okay. That’s what I would imagine, that there’s no standing rule anywhere except at a local level. Okay. Anybody else see anything there that needs to be addressed before it goes to the floor?

President Dietz: Maybe they’re trying to get this undergrad under their belt with some success before they tackle the…

Senator Haugo: the grad?

Senator Kalter: Actually, I think the idea was that because it doesn’t apply to graduates, let’s clarify that. This may have actually come originally from Amy Hurd to say this doesn’t apply to the students in the grad programs…

President Dietz: It really cleans it up seems like…

***09.28.17.01 From Rules Committee, UAS Draft Policy and Procedures v5 (Information item 10/11/17)***

Senator Kalter: Then there’s the UAS policy, fondly known as the Drone policy. Martha, I’m a little curious about whether and what your committee might have changed, because I think there was a little bit of change from when it came to you as version 5 and then it came to us. Was there anything large?

Senator Horst: A lot of it is just formatting and we added definitions. They would introduce the term Remote Pilot but they didn’t put it in the definitions. You know, having it be organized a little better. It was just a lot of that kind of stuff. None of the…

Senator Kalter: Nothing substantive?

Senator Horst: I asked for land… it’s property owner and landowner. They were mixing the terms up. I mean I had a list of… I basically just went through and fine-tuned the language, I didn’t really change the content. The committee specifically added some language up in the scope. They felt the scope language needed to be refined, so we wrote some of that.

Senator Kalter: Great.

Senator Grzanich: Glad we got the Redbird Rising drone flyover before the policy went into effect.

(Laughter)

Senator Kalter: That’s what I said to Dr. Dietz right after the State of the University. It’s a good thing we got that policy in place.

(Laughter)

President Dietz: Planning is everything, right.

(Laughter)

Senator Horst: You know, it would say things like you need to have permission… who and where? So then they put in the language, and you can go to this link to find it.

Senator Kalter: Yes.

Senator Horst: Specifying how things are done.

Senator Kalter: I like it that even though we don’t have to vote on the procedures, we’re going to send the procedures through so that people can comment on whether those are clear and all of that.

Senator Horst: Because it’s a new policy. It was tricky.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. This was a committee. It was Ryan Powers, so this must have been 2 years ago, I think. Is that right? Yeah, two years ago. Ryan, myself, Alice Maginnis from Legal, Brian Beam, John Baur, Environmental Health and Safety, the Police and the Athletics group, seems like there was somebody else who sort of batted the policy out, figured out what needed to be in it.

Senator Laudner: There was no one from Ag?

Senator Kalter: Yes, Aslihan Spaulding was in it, was on that committee. In fact, that’s how I first met her. She may have been the only other faculty member. I’m trying to remember if there was other faculty there, but terrific group.

***09.28.17.02 From Academic Affairs, Email from Academic Affairs***

***05.01.17.01 From Academic Affairs, UCC Annual Rep 2016-2017 (Advisory item 10/11/17)***

***05.01.17.02 From Academic Affairs, UCC 2016-2017 Annual Report to Academic Senate incl Four Out (Advisory item 10/11/17)***

***09.28.17.03 From Academic Affairs, ReggieNet\_Survey\_Overview090817 (Advisory item 10/11/17)***

***05.26.17.01 From Academic Affairs, ULC Report June 2017 (Advisory item 10/11/17)***

Senator Kalter: The next thing is really de rote, I think. It is just the reports that Academic Affairs are sending through for the agenda, which is the UCC report, the ReggieNet survey, and the University Library Committee report. The only observation that I had was that Jim Pancrazio in his email to us says about the ReggieNet survey that it indicates that user satisfaction is high. I’m not sure I would agree fully with that. In the sense that when it comes to near the last pages where they say, “I never had a serious problem using ReggieNet” or “It’s reliable” or “easy to use.” There seems to be more dispute about that. And then there’s a note that says, well, some people think that ReggieNet is everything, which I take to heart but I think that’s also a good way to explain really bad results of your survey, right? Like when they say, “I’ve never had a serious problem using Reggienet” and only 8% strongly agree and only 28% agree, almost half of the people are neutral or disagree, or where “It’s reliable” is only 38% who agreed. That might need some…

Senator Hoelscher: As a regular user of Reggienet though, it is so much better than it was 3 years ago.

Senator Kalter: Yes.

Senator Hoelscher: I would… I didn’t fill anything like this out, but I would have filled it out with fairly high marks because I’m just so much happier that… But, you know, as a professor, my standards are different. It has to be consistently dependable. If it is consistently dependable, then I can forgive and look over almost anything else. And so, if I were to critique it, I would have some things to say, but it makes the bar. It’s consistently dependable and for that I give it a passing grade.

Senator Haugo: Is the email from Academic Affairs also going to be distributed with the…

Senator Kalter: I think we can take that out… where is my agenda?

Senator Haugo: I’m just wondering because we did talk at committee about the loss of tenure track positions in Milner and he mentions that in the memo, and I don’t know if that’s something we want to carry forward for the full Senate.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, that’s a really good question. We could put that on because it is obviously a concern, and I know that they are having conversations over there about that. My understanding from talking to people is they are… the way HR looks at the library there are very, very fine lines between all of the job descriptions over there, so they can barely tell what’s the difference between faculty member, tenured, tenured-line, non-tenure track, AP, a Civil Servant and that needs to be clarified. Partly just because of the state’s Civil Service system, but also for other reasons.

Senator Haugo: I think the report says that they’re down to 14 from 28. So it’s cut in half, in a decade and a half.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. So should we add Jim’s memo to the…

Senator Haugo: I would like it to be added, if that’s possible, so that that comment comes through to the full Senate.

Senator Kalter: Should we specifically add it next to the ULC report?

Senator Haugo: Sure.

Senator Hoelscher: If you’re going to add it, that’s where you add it…

Senator Kalter: Add it right there, okay.

***\*\*Approval of Proposed Senate Agenda\*\****

**Academic Senate Meeting Agenda**

**Wednesday, October 11, 2017**

**7:00 P.M.**

**OLD MAIN ROOM, BONE STUDENT CENTER**

***Call to Order***

***Roll Call***

***Chairperson's Remarks***

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

***Administrators' Remarks***

* ***President Larry Dietz***
* ***Interim Provost Jan Murphy***
* ***Vice President of Student Affairs Levester Johnson***
* ***Vice President of Finance and Planning Dan Stephens***

***Advisory Items:***

***05.01.17.01 UCC Annual Rep 2016-2017 (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***05.01.17.02 UCC 2016-2017 Annual Report to Academic Senate including Four and Out (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***05.26.17.01 ULC Report June 2017 (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***09.28.17.03 ReggieNet\_Survey\_Overview090817 (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***Action Items:***

***08.23.17.01 COE Bylaws MARK UP (Rules Committee)***

***05.31.17.02 COE Bylaws revisions CLEAN COPY 5-30-2017 (Rules Committee)***

***11.06.15.13 Policy 1.18 ISU Compliance Program Policy (Rules Committee)***

***05.28.13.01 Illinois State University Compliance Principles Statement (Rules Committee)***

***Information Items:***

***06.27.17.03 Policy 2.1.21 Academic Standing, Probation, and Reinstatement Policy mark up (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***09.28.17.01 UAS Draft Policy and Procedures v5 (Rules Committee)***

***Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Pancrazio***

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

***Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Liechty***

***Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Marx***

***Rules Committee: Senator Horst***

***Communications***

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Marx, seconded by Senator Hoelscher, to approve the agenda.

Senator Kalter: Adding that, do we see anything else we want to change here? We’ve got all the usual and then we’ve got three advisory items, the College of Education Bylaws, the Compliance Program policy for action items, and then the Drone policy and the Academic Standing, Probation and Reinstatement policy as information items.

Senate Horst: And some members of the Drone committee will be there?

Senator Kalter: Well, John Baur sits on the Senate so he would be fine, I think. Yeah, he knows all about it.

President Dietz: If I could go back again to the Milner Library tenure issue for a second, are we sure that’s the case?

Senator Kalter: That is from… that actually came from me. So I was sitting in on Library Committee meetings last year, and they started having this conversation. I was basically sitting back and listening, but they wondered… they were trying to figure out what was going on and I filled in the blank because I knew the numbers. So we’ve had… we have AIF reports that actually for the most part have a blank on Milner because for a long time PRPA was running the numbers without Milner because they were only running tenure-line numbers based on courses taught rather than tenure-line faculty. I’m trying to remember where… the 28 number comes from an old report, and then there’s a big blank, and then today’s number is about 14 of tenure-line faculty with about that many… the difference is almost entirely made up by non-tenure tracks. So there’s like 14 and 14.

Senator Haugo: And Kathleen is on Academic Affairs and she corroborated that in the meeting that it’s…

President Dietz: That’s surprising to me. I don’t know the rationale behind… or anything. It sounds like it’s a long term kind of issue.

Senator Kalter: We’d been trying to address it through Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee for several years, by saying Milner needs to have its own criteria. In other words, if allocation of faculty positions in all of the other departments can be partly based on credit hour production and number of majors and that kind of thing… I mean obviously there are many other things that go into it. Then we can’t measure Milner that way. We have to figure out… and so we were recommending to the Provost’s office at the time to work with Milner on how to come up with a different metric but I don’t think that ever really happened.

President Dietz: What if there is a market issue there as well? I don’t know. When you just look at the numbers without any context around, it’s pretty… course this… the verbiage doesn’t include numbers but I am interested into why that happened and I don’t know.

Senator Kalter: I think there are a number of factors, as far as I can tell.

President Dietz: We’ll leave it at that.

Senator Kalter: I’ll put it on the list for our next meeting but I think there are a number of factors going on there. It’s complicated.

Senator Dietz: Okay.

Senator Marx: If this is going to be discussed, do we want to invite someone from the Library to address those questions?

Senator Kalter: Given that this is an advisory item…

Senator Marx: Rather than having us guess at the reasons, why not have someone tell us what’s going on?

Senator Kalter: I guess what I would say it that they are in a transition period right now, and maybe we should give them some space.

Senator Marx: No, this is historical. It is what has led up to today not what the future is. What has led to the change in the staffing at the library?

Senator Kalter: We’d have to bring in our old Provosts, all of them, from Presley to Everts to…

Senator Horst: Could we just suggest to the committee though to look into the problem? Right, we have a Library Committee. Could we ask them to pursue why this is happening? Why it happened?

Senator Haugo: Or should we wait until Susan has a conversation?

(Laughter)

President Dietz: I personally would prefer that.

Senator Kalter: I don’t want to put them on the spot. There are a number of issues going on…

Senator Marx: Yes, have the conversation.

Senator Kalter: There are a number of facets to it.

The motion to approve the agenda with the addition of Senator Pancrazio’s email was unanimously approved.

***09.18.17.01 From University Curriculum Committee, AMALI Recommendation (Dist. to Academic Affairs)***

Senator Kalter: The next thing is just letting you know that the AMALI recommendation from the UCC is on its way to… actually in April, was on its way to Academic Affairs. Anyone have any comments on that?

Senator Horst: Is this proposal going to go in front of the Senate this year, you think?

Senator Kalter: Great question. Great question. I have no idea. Why do you ask?

Senator Horst: It’s an interesting, complicated proposal.

Senator Kalter: It is an interesting and complicated proposal. It is, I think Jim, as the chair of Academic Affairs, has a couple of things that will take some time to work through like the two things that he’s mentioned to me are the learning outcomes and having a committee that approves courses under AMALI, basically. So that’s why I’m not sure, because that could take some time.

Senator Horst: I’m almost wondering if it would be interesting to just get it in front of the Senate for feedback, before it goes to a subcommittee.

Senator Haugo: To do an information item before it goes to subcommittee?

Senator Horst: Yeah, I mean, it’s so controversial and there’s going to be so many opinions. I don’t know what to do with this. I can’t… it’s going to be difficult when this goes in front of the Senate.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, this is the one I’m going to hand off to Beau.

Senator Grzanich: Really? I’ll take it.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, I can’t stay impartial on this subject.

Senator Grzanich: Really?

Senator Kalter: I’m fairly adamantly against the proposal.

Senator Grzanich: That’s exciting. I’m going to have the Robert Rules hammer for a while.

(Laughter)

Senator Horst: (Laughter) That’s your third statement, Senator Kalter you’re out of line.

Senator Kalter: (Laughter) Somebody should have been saying that all along.

(Laughter)

Senator Kalter: I think maybe it would be good for Academic Affairs to look at it and direct any conversation on the floor, right? To sort of narrow down the…

Senator Horst: Are they… is this specific language on page 14, is there catalog language that is going to result? Or is your committee going to do that?

Senator Kalter: What my understanding is is that there are two different proposals in here that are not consistent with one another. So the one that you are pointing at is not actually the proposal. It’s the one, I think, on page 2. And then there is a different one on page 14 that was an older one.

Senator Horst: And this is catalog language, page 2?

Senator Kalter: I don’t actually think that they have. I’m not sure. I haven’t checked this against the catalog itself, so I’m not sure if this is catalog language at this point. I’m not really sure about that.

Senator Hoelscher: This is so far out of my realm of expertise that I’m looking to y’all.

Senator Kalter: I would recommend that we send it to Academic Affairs and if they want to have a session where they get feedback at the Senate and then go back into the committee, I think that’s fine, but I don’t think it’s a good idea for us to put it out there without them guiding it.

Senator Haugo: I think there has already been a feedback loop to the faculty too with a survey that was done, right? So we have faculty and student input already, outside of the UCC on the issue that we can consider.

Senator Kalter: My biggest concern about this is, coming on the heels of the Campus Climate Task Force and the feedback that we got was that students of color do not see themselves in the curriculum. So what we’re going to do now is make that even more the case? So I’m pretty disturbed about that and it’s pretty much against my whole career of teaching and research to do that. So that’s why I think the committee should have some guidance about that before we put it on the floor… and conversation with OISP, the Office of International Studies and Programs.

Senator Grzanich: Works for me.

(Laughter)

Senator Haugo: You just want the gavel in your hand.

(Laughter)

Senator Kalter: I will willingly hand it over for that. So we’re going to distribute that to Academic Affairs.

***09.22.17.01 From Ajay Samant, College of Business Bylaws (Dist. to Rules)***

Senator Kalter: We’re going to distribute the College of Business Bylaws to Rules. Does anyone see anything that Rules needs to particularly attend to? It’s nice and short.

Senator Hoelscher: We’re pretty curt over there.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, it’s refreshing.

Senator Grzanich: Business language.

Senator Kalter: The only major thing I saw was, in Article X, we should have in Section 2 that reminds them they have to send it to Senate whether they change it or not. Like, please make sure that your Senate is periodically reviewing this.

Senator Horst: And the problem with the students not being on search committees for chairs, right?

Senator Kalter: I don’t know about that. I think that you have to look into that question because I know Legal has some weigh in on that too about, in the best practices and all of that. That’s the one that’s a college level policy, right?

Senator Horst: Well, there’s a university policy on the search and it says all stake holders. It has some sort of language in that.

Senator Kalter: Yes, but the Administrative Selection Policy does not give the power of who’s on the committee to the Senate. It gives it to the college.

Senator Horst: Yes.

Senator Kalter: But has that language in it that asks for stakeholders.

Senator Horst: Yes. And they are the only college that does not have students on search committees for chairs.

Senator Kalter: And I think the reason Marie was interested in this is because they also don’t have staff or non-tenure track faculty on recruiting and search committees for chairs.

Senator Horst: Okay.

Senator Kalter: Whereas most other colleges do have both non-tenure track and staff on search committees for chairs… and students.

Senator Hoelscher: I don’t remember seeing a non-tenure track on any of the committees that I’ve served on. So I would say not only is it not in here, it’s not practiced.

Senator Horst: Well, and also, it’s a possibility that students could get elected but the way I understood it, it was appointed by the dean.

Senator Kalter: That, I agree. I think that could use a little bit of clarification. How does this election versus appointment process exactly work? If 45 people volunteer to be appointed, how does the dean, or the team, decide who’s going to be on the team, on the coordinating team? So you’re right, that could be clarified.

Senator Laudner: I think some colleges leave that a little open-ended so then when they see that okay the ones that are elected fit this criteria, then now when I’m choosing my students I can pick in other areas.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, because the other thing that I saw that was a little bit of concern to me was that the actually College Coordinating Team, which is essentially their council, could conceivably have no members from three of their four departments, right? Because all of the chairs of the other teams could be from the same department and so then you have, because that College Coordinating Team is made up of the chairs of those teams, you end up with a situation where that might not be a representative body and it has no appointees actually. But I see what you’re saying, Kevin, that they may like that appointment process the way it is because it gives them flexibility, like, to get diversity on a committee or to get people from a different department if department members are not…

Senator Laudner: Represented.

Senator Kalter: Yeah.

Senator Horst: I can’t remember what it said about curriculum committees but also…

Senator Kalter: One member from each department and up to three members appointed by the dean. Now that could also work in the opposite direction if you have somebody that tries to stack a curriculum committee with everybody from the Finance, Insurance, and Law department, right? Sort of overload. So it could be a little too loose, in a sense. But the question is whether we should determine that or whether the college should.

Senator Horst: I have all of the bylaws of all the colleges now in a binder, and all of the curriculum committees, I believe, have a student representative.

Senator Laudner: They’re supposed to.

Senator Horst: They’re supposed to based on?

Senator Laudner: Isn’t that a university policy?

Senator Kalter: I don’t think so.

Senator Horst: I don’t think so. It makes sense.

Senator Kalter: I don’t think for the curriculum committees it is. It is for the ones that we have jurisdiction over, like UCC. We put it in there, but I don’t think we tell the colleges or departments that they have to.

Senator Laudner: I thought we always had to default to the university?

Senator Kalter: Well, it doesn’t specifically say that curriculum committees have to have students. I mean, we could have that happen and actually Rules would be the one to write that into a policy, right? To say you have to follow certain kinds of guidelines when you’re creating this kind of committee or this kind of committee or what have you. Would you like to recommend that be discussed by Rules?

Senator Laudner: No.

Senator Kalter: No.

Senator Horst: I mean, at this point, our main tool is to point out how their policy is not in line with the current practice that resembles our shared governance system that we have.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. I think that the powerful message is to take that binder to them and to say okay so six of the other seven colleges have this kind of a structure, yours seems to be an outlier. Do you have a good reason for that? And then send it back to the College of Business to decide if that’s the way they want to keep doing it. We’re almost dancing a fine line between, you know, you have to do this because it’s in policy and you’re not ordered to do this because we don’t have that kind of power over you, nor would we want it necessarily. They might come back at you and say how come you let your search committees have anybody but tenure track faculty on them? You never know.

Senator Hoelscher: It is funny when we start to get out of our bubble because so many things we do, we do because that’s the way we’ve always done it. It never once occurred to me until we had this discussion that all selection committees aren’t run exactly this way, because I’ve got 15 years of experience running them this way, ya know. I don’t know that I have any preference.

Senator Kalter: Just having a conversation.

Senator Hoelscher: It’s the way it’s always been.

Senator Kalter: Alright, so that one’s going to Rules.

***09.26.17.01 From Academic Planning Committee, Academic Planning Committee Charge Revisions 2017 (Dist. to Rules)***

Senator Kalter: The other one is also going to Rules. It’s not an urgent thing. We’re trying to ask all of the, not all of them, but a number of the external committees that haven’t updated their charge recently to update their charge and this one, Academic Planning Committee was… it was one of those charges where the committee members were like, “We’re supposed to do this? We are? Isn’t this somebody else’s job?” So it has been rewritten.

Senator Horst: And so we can do that while we’re doing the bylaws, right?

Senator Kalter: Potentially. That’s an interesting idea. There’s going to be one potentially coming from Council for Gen Ed and I can’t remember who else we asked. Because Cera did this over the summer, some of this, but we asked a bunch of people, do you want to update your charge. Alright.

President Dietz: Just an observation, I want to go back to the University Curriculum Committee annual report. I find this so refreshing in that I was in Chicago this morning, drove up and back, and met with a representative up there who was really supportive of higher education. We’re going to be in a time where we’re going to be fighting a lot of the battles that we’ve been fighting for the last two years over the budget impasse very quickly. Matter of fact, there’s some proposals that are making their way into bills with the presumption that if you want a degree in this discipline that we’re going to restructure higher education and you’ll have to go to this institution because that’s their specialty. Nobody else will be offering that. I think it’s a terrible idea. And another bill has another component connected with it that if you have a given grade from a high school you can get into any university, into any particular program that you want to get into, which is so simplistic and will be such a disservice to students. But the idea, and I talk about this all the time, that we do our own review. We have a vibrant curriculum because we do our own review. We tweak, we add to, we delete. You know, all the different permutations and combinations of that and here’s a prime example of this. So this is another thing that I may be wagging around with to say “we are a vibrant university because the faculty are engaged in these things, and here’s the latest result of that.”

Senator Kalter: And you might just mention to them that this is only, not even half or a third of what UCC does. I mean, this is not including the programs that go on our consent agenda, all of the other stuff that they do.

President Dietz: Some of the stuff that’s coming out now, is just frankly positioning for a reelection and it’s a popular thing that they’re trying to get some sense “well, look what I’m doing.” And it’s more of an emphasis on doing something then it is whether or not the thing that’s being done, or being suggested, has any merit or not.

Senator Kalter: I hope that… you know David is a Provost office intern right now working on interdisciplinary initiatives, and if they start doing this thing that they decide that that school, you know Eastern is going to do this and this school over at Western is going to do that, they essentially, it’s like taking a company or something and pulling it apart into its constituent components and saying you can never innovate anymore, right?

President Dietz: Right.

Senator Kalter: You get to stay in the same track that you’ve been in for the last 45 years, and you’re going to get out-competed by China, India, Russia, etc. Or you can let the people who know what they are doing, do the work. They also might want to talk to Justice Frankfurter about that.

(Laughter)

President Dietz: Thanks. This is yet another thing that I’ll be (inaudible)

Senator Hoelscher: Not to make it any longer but Kevin just whispered something in my ear and I finally figured out what he was talk about. We handled a policy on searches but I think it was at the administrator level.

Senator Laudner: Yes, it was for the Grad Director.

Senator Hoelscher: And beyond, right?

Senator Kalter: That policy that you’re talking about is 3.2.13, I think, Administrative Selection and…

Senator Grzanich: Look at that memory. (Laughter)

Senator Kalter: …and it covers the Provost, all of the VPs, Deans, and it has some language about chairs and directors, and it also has people in the Provost office who have some sort of connection to curriculums and stuff like that, and other academic issues.

Senator Hoelscher: The question is, does it inform..

Senator Kalter: The bylaws?

Senator Hoelscher: The College of Business bylaws at all? And it may not because we are talking faculty here, and it may because we’re talking about administrators.

Senator Kalter: That’s what Martha was pointing out, was that there is some language in there that would seem to suggest that students should be on those committees. But it’s not, it doesn’t specifically say that. I can’t remember the phrasing that you used was…

Senator Horst: Interested parties.

Senator Kalter: Interested parties.

Senator Hoelscher: I have been on several committees and I don’t think that any of them provide for students. I mean, and I’m thinking practice now, not what the bylaws say, but practice. I don’t think it ever includes students. It may include NTTs when you get into the administrators, but not for faculty for sure. I don’t think for department chairs either. So anyway, that was just, I figured out what Kevin was talking about, and I thought I’d bring that up so that we can all think about it and…

Senator Kalter: Yep, because it will be a while before that comes back. I’m sure Rules will take care of that conversation anyway.

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Hoelscher, seconded by President Dietz to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.