**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

**WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 2019**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

Senator Kalter: The President is not able to be here, I believe he’s in Texas. We have the opportunity for a really brief meeting if we want to take it. Who knows what we’ll do.

***Distributed Communications:***

***Presidential Memo: Surveillance Equipment***

Senator Kalter: First Distributed Communication is the President…

Senator Marx: Are you calling to adjourn?

(Laughter)

Senator Kalter: It’s pretty easy, I think. I don’t know. The Surveillance Equipment. Remember that last year the actual policy had very minor changes. It went through around last January but this is the notice to us that surveillance equipment is used. Any questions about that?

Senator Horst: Do we get a different kind of memo?

Senator Kalter: Not usually, frankly.

Senator Horst: Okay.

Senator Kalter: I almost never…but of course what happens is that I have the general understanding as Senate chair that a lot of the cameras are either in residential hall types of areas, or in places where there have been crime incidents. And then there are others, like we got informed about, I don’t know, 10 years ago (you might have been on Exec at the time) where the FBI can come in and surveil our place and not even our police or our President might know about it. And I think that may be part of Homeland Security changes, or it might have predated that. In any case, so I’m fairly certain that if there was a major change to the general thing, Larry would keep me apprised. And when I ask him, it’s basically, yep it’s those places. And they do say that they are… that when possible they will post it. Even in this memo it says…

Senator Marx: For example, in the underpass where they have the camera there, there are signs posted that this area is under surveillance.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. Okay. Anything else about that?

***From Student Government Association, Legal, and Student Affairs for Information Item on 9/11/19***

***08.15.19.04 Davenport Email Anti Hazing 5.1.13***

***09.13.18.09 Policy 5.1.13 Hazing And Pre-Initiation Activities Current Copy***

***08.15.19.05 Policy 5.1.13 Anti-Hazing MARK UP***

***08.15.19.02 Policy 5.1.13 Hazing LEGAL Mark-up rewrite to match code***

***08.15.19.03 Policy 5.1.13 Hazing Clean Copy***

Senator Kalter: All right. The next one. I’m happy to see this back, and, man, do I think this is a massive improvement to the Anti-Hazing policy. Any thoughts about it, as it’s coming through? I think that… let’s see we’ve got it on the agenda as an Information Item.

Senator Horst: I appreciated the table. Is this going to go to the Senate?

Senator Kalter: One of my questions was about what should go to the Senate. I didn’t have a question about the table going to the Senate. Mine was about whether we need the original markup that went from Exec down to Legal, because that got all confusing, and stuff like that. Maybe we should just give Senate the final markup, and the clean, and the current copy. But I personally think the table should go to Senate. What do other people…

Senator Mainieri: I agree.

Senator Marx: I think it’s helpful.

Senator Horst: If it does, it was a little confusing when it was going across the page. I found it a little confusing at points. Maybe they could format it a little better.

Senator Kalter: I’ll see if Wendy Smith has a lot of time on her hands.

Senator Horst: It seems like there’s all these margins, if they could stretch it out.

Senator Mainieri: Or just turn it landscape.

Senator Kalter: That’s a really good idea actually to do it that way. That’s a great idea.

Senator Mainieri: I did see just one typo, or I think it’s a typo.

Senator Kalter: Was it in the table?

Senator Mainieri: It was not in the table. It’s in the actual policy.

Senator Marx: Where are you looking?

Senator Mainieri: The clean copy in c. It’s the fourth line, “…humiliating games or events, of that encourage the illegal…” That “of” doesn’t sound right.

Senator Kalter: Oh. “Or that encourage.” Is that what your assuming?

Senator Mainieri: I’m assuming that’s what it’s supposed to be.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Anybody see anything? I had just a few similar types of questions. So I said to myself, there’s a problem with the wording order of the very last line. It seems to be saying the opposite of what they mean to say…

Senator Ferrence: It’s a violation to prevent acts of hazing.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. Right. Exactly. So that part needs to be cleaned up, because you don’t want it to be in violation to prevent them or discourage them, but you do want it in violation to be… But we can tell them this because it’s going to be an Information Item. And then there’s another line where it says something about work sessions, and I had a substantive question about that. It says now, “Engaging in such acts…” in other words, hazing is defined as, and one of the definitions is “ Engaging in any act such as paddling,” which is nicely defined here, “physical punishments, creating excessive fatigue,” and then it says, “work sessions” and it’s not clear, if you’re a person who’s forced to do a work session, you’re going to get punished, or if you’re the person forcing the other person to do the work session, you’re going to get punished. So that’s another. I mean, I think I can bring that up on the floor, right? It’s not something that we need to… And I think there are a couple of those in that same c) that were a little bit confusing.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. Just that parallel. Most of them start with a verb of some sort.

Senator Kalter: Exactly. I said we need gerunds or something. But the other thing it brought up for me was who gets punished, which I think is a substantive question. Like is it the hazer or the hazee or both? And so we can ask them that. And then the only other thing that I found is that we don’t always need to be capitalizing the word community when we say University community, unless there’s some legal reason for that. So let’s invite both Wendy and Lisa to talk about this. But I’m really… I don’t know about you guys but I think it’s much better than it was, thanks to Wendy. And, hey that’s it except for the proposed Senate Agenda.

***Proposed* Academic Senate Meeting Agenda**

**Wednesday, September 11, 2018**

**7:00 P.M.**

**OLD MAIN ROOM, BONE STUDENT CENTER**

***Call to Order***

***Roll Call***

***Presentation: Funding Sources at Illinois State University by Vice President for Finance and Planning***

***Chairperson's Remarks***

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

***Administrators' Remarks***

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

***Advisory Items:***

***Presidential Memo: Surveillance Equipment***

***Action Items:***

***04.29.19.01 Email from Planning and Finance Committee***

***04.29.19.02 Policy 7.1.22 Foundation 2018-2019 MARK UP (From Planning and Finance Committee)
08.06.19.12 Policy 7.1.22 Foundation 2018-2019 Clean Copy (From Planning and Finance Committee)***

***12.12.16.04 - Policy 4.1.20 Final Course Grade Challenge Policy CURRENT COPY (From Academic Affairs Committee)***

***06.17.19.10 - Policy 4.1.20 Final Course Grade Challenge Policy MARK UP (From Academic Affairs Committee)***

***08.06.19.06 - Policy 4.1.20 Final Course Grade Challenge Policy Clean Copy (From Academic Affairs Committee)***

***09.13.18.07 Policy 2.1.10 Deans' List CURRENT (From Academic Affairs Committee)***

***Information Items:***

***From Student Government Association, Legal, and Student Affairs***

***08.15.19.04 Davenport Email Anti Hazing 5.1.13***

***09.13.18.09 Policy 5.1.13 Hazing And Pre-Initiation Activities Current Copy***

***08.15.19.05 Policy 5.1.13 Anti-Hazing MARK UP***

***08.15.19.02 Policy 5.1.13 Hazing LEGAL Mark-up rewrite to match code***

***08.15.19.03 Policy 5.1.13 Hazing Clean Copy***

***Consent Agenda Items:***

***Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Nikolaou***

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

***Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Crowley***

***Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Mainieri***

***Rules Committee: Senator Seeman***

***Communications***

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Horst, seconded by Senator Mainieri, to approved the proposed Senate Agenda.

Senator Kalter: Let’s see. We’ve got the presentation on the colors of money. Cera’s taking care of equipment needs for Dan Stephens on that.

Wanted to update you guys on the Dean’s List thing. The IT people in the Registrar’s office are looking into the issue that you raised and they said it’s not an issue with the Campus Solutions System. So they will be now creating Cognos reports to streamline everything for the deans. And so as long as there’s no greater policy issue there, they’ll be able to take care of that problem. It won’t reoccur and they said it will simplify the process anyway.

Senator Horst: Double majors. Is that what it was?

Senator Ferrence: Yeah. It was if you have majors in multiple colleges, you slip through the crack for the second major, potentially for dean’s list categorization.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. And I told them, you know, if you think you’ll find… they think they’re going to be able to do it by December Dean’s List time, but I just said let us know if it’s not working out or whatever. They were like, ok we’ll do that. Anything else on the agenda? Does it all look copacetic?

Senator Horst: Just fixing whatever we’re going to send forward for the Hazing.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. So are we going to take off that second mark up, do you think? Should we just not confuse people?

Senator Horst: Yes. I recommend that as well.

Senator Kalter: Yes. So we’ll just do the so called final mark up, the Legal markup, I think, is what it’s called. Great. Okay.

The motion was unanimously approved.

***POLICY REVIEW:***

***3.1.35 Acceptance of Personal Gifts***

Senator Kalter: And we have a short policy review because we have made it to the end of the five-year cycle of policy reviews. So everything is either out in Issues Pending lists, or it’s recently been updated and it’s not ready to come back to us, or I don’t know what the third one is. I think those are the two options, or it’s here. Well, there are a couple others that we have, but there are literally less than a handful. So interestingly for the Acceptance of Personal Gifts, this had actually already been determined to be a non-Senate policy back in January of 2016, but it looks to me like it never made it down to Rob Blemler’s office for the minor revisions that we identified. Like changing the name of the office to what it actually is called. So do we all agree that that’s still non-Senate?

Senator Ferrence: I even noticed that there are some things in the current markup that—at least according to the Ethics training I most recently took—are violations of current statue. For instance, food and drink that does not exceed $75 dollars per person per day. I thought the previous governor had zeroed that.

Senator Kalter: Interesting. Oh, has zeroed it?

Senator Horst: I believe it’s changed again.

Senator Ferrence: But it may have changed again. I don’t know.

Senator Horst: I do remember it changed. But nonetheless…

Senator Kalter: We’ll find out in October, right?

Senator Horst: This policy is very technical and it’s legal…

Senator Kalter: Yeah, it’s totally about compliance.

Senator Horst: So just for your information, we’ve been going through all these policies and deciding whether or not they’re Senate policies.

Senator Ferrence: Well, it seems to me that this one is really what the state says is the law.

Senator Marx: Right.

Senator Ferrence: So we don’t actually get to decide these things. So it’s dangerous to articulate it here because when Springfield changes something if it takes us years to act on it, then we have a discontinuity.

Senator Marx: Yeah. We just want to make sure it gets updated. Even if it’s not a Senate policy, we want to make sure… because this was 2004.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. It seems to have fallen through a crack at some point where it was supposed to have gotten routed, but then it didn’t get routed, and that was around the time that we had some staff changes. So I think that that’s probably what happened. So there’s that one, that’s non-Senate.

Senator Mainieri: I did have actually one question though. I wondered because the gift card policy does apply to students giving gifts to faculty, and it didn’t seem to me that students were covered anywhere under the five entities in that policy. But maybe I’m misinterpreting whether those type of gifts should fall under this policy?

Senator Horst: You mean student employees or you’re saying students?

Senator Mainieri: Like accepting gifts from students in our class, things like that.

Senator Ferrence: Yeah. Ironically by this we can only accept gifts from students in class if the students are employed somewhere on campus, ergo are state employees.

Provost Murphy: You’re saying student giving gifts. So “University employees may not accept or solicit any gift of any kind”… blah, blah, blah.. “from any person or entity who is seeking official action by the employee,” like grading. Wouldn’t that…

Senator Marx: Yeah, that would be a no, no.

Senator Mainieri: I just wanted to make sure that covered that.

Senator Marx: For example, I had a research student that was from outside the country, went home, and brought back some gifts for people. And I wasn’t involved in grading the student. Gave me something from their homeland, I thought that was really nice.

Senator Kalter: So it doesn’t sound like we need to send that question down with it to Rob because it’s covered by number one.

Senator Mainieri: We feel comfortable that number one is…

Senator Marx: It is covered.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. I think the reason it’s worded that way is because it’s a state thing, and so they’re not going to put students specifically in it, or something like that.

***Dist. to Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee:***

* 1.3 Americans with Disabilities Act
* 1.3.1 Reasonable Accommodations Procedures

So the next one, it has been on the Senate list because, back in 2015, we did have some problems with faculty accommodation procedures. They were discussed at length with Dr. Dietz and a bunch of other people. Also, I have down, there have been recent faculty concerns about the reasonableness of student accommodations. I was at a CTE meeting a couple of years ago (I think it was 2016) and they did an entire presentation around that, because of some issues like how many absences is too many for certain kinds of courses, and stuff like that. So we have reviewed this one before even though… for 1.3 it’s kind of the same as the Ethics policy. It’s not like we can change that law, or would want to. But we review it more for the 1.3.1 to make sure that those procedures are understood by everybody, are going well for everybody, and to the extent that we control them versus them being controlled, are they working. So we usually send this out to Administrative Affairs and Budget.

Senator Horst: Faculty Affairs?

Senator Kalter: That’s an interesting question. It could go to Faculty Affairs. Part of it is to assure smooth processes right, but I would say it’s not just faculty, right? It’s a student thing too perhaps.

Senator Marx: This says employees or applicants.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. And so it’s also staff as well as students.

Senator Horst: Which would make it an administrative review.

Senator Kalter: Yes.

Senator Horst: Okay.

Senator Kalter: All right. So that one’s good to go out to Administrative Affairs and Budget? And that could sit on its agenda, like, you don’t have to get to it quickly.

Senator Marx: Are students covered in this one? The 1.3. It’s just reasonable accommodations of any individual with a disability.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. All right. We have approved the agenda, we’ve routed things. Do we have a motion to adjourn?

***Adjournment***

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