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***Call to Order***

Academic Senate Chairperson Senator Kalter called the meeting to order.

***Oral Communications:***

Senator Kalter: Welcome, everyone. And the only other Oral Communication that I have is that Cera wanted to let everybody know that all of the internal committees now have Teams sites. Do you want to say anything more about that?

Ms. Hazelrigg: It’s there so your committee members just can see what all’s on it. It’ll be updated. So, as I sent the chairs what Exec passes to the committees, I’ll send the initial email to the chair, and they can say to their members to go on the Teams site to look and see the details of the documents. And you can use it, or you don’t have to. It’s whatever fits the committee and whatever the chairs decide.

Senator Mainieri: Did we work out some of the concerns we have from last meeting about edits and versions?

Ms. Hazelrigg: I think so. So, yeah. In the email I sent to the chairs, it says to double check if you’re going to use it, double check with…because the chairs are also an owner, so they can change things, and add documents, and such. But we don’t necessarily want the members to.

Senator Marx: Right.

Ms. Hazelrigg: And, again, that can be changed too, depending on if you guys want to do like sub-committees to like parse out stuff, then I can change access to who can add stuff and change stuff. So, you just have to let me know.

Senator Kalter: So, everyone else is read-only?

Ms. Hazelrigg: Right now, everyone else besides the chairs, me, and Susan are read only.

Senator Kalter: As committee chairs, for those of you who are, don’t worry, I’m not going to be like lurking and judging what the committees are doing. Sometimes people send stuff to me, but they don’t have to. But sometimes like when Cera is out, there may be times when the Senate chair might have to go into the site. So, we decided it was probably best to have the Senate Chair be an owner.

Senator Horst: Will there still be a requirement for the material to go to Exec before noon on Thursdays, since now you have access?

Ms. Hazelrigg: Yes. Because I will need the chair to tell me what the final document is supposed to look like, what specifically they want to relay to Exec.

Senator Horst: Could they say, we want to forward this document, which is on Teams.

Ms. Hazelrigg: They’re welcome to if they want to.

Senator Ferrence: I would caution that, just because you can imagine where you get many variations. And if you’re going in and you accidently pick the wrong… if there’s more than one version it would be easy to pick the wrong when you think you’re picking the most recent. So, generally it’s probably better to send you the document directly.

Ms. Hazelrigg: Okay.

Senator Horst: You can always forward the wrong document.

Senator Ferrence: Well, you can, but at least that’s on you and not on her, right.

Senator Kalter: All right. Great.

***Distributed Communications:***

***03.02.16.03 From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Policy 6.1.37 Facilities Naming Current Copy (Information Item 02/05/20)***

***01.23.20.03 From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Policy 6.1.37 Facilities Naming Mark up (Information Item 02/05/20)***

***01.23.20.04 From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Policy 6.1.37 Facilities Naming Clean Copy (Information Item 02/05/20)***

Senator Kalter: We start with the Facilities Naming document that is coming back to us from, I think, one Information Item session, and then going back to committee.

Senator Marx: Yeah. Sure.

Senator Kalter: Or it had gone back to committee, so you know back to us from committee.

Senator Marx: It did. It did. So, there was quite a bit of concern expressed in the Senate about this policy, and also in Exec, for that matter. So, the newest markup is a completely new markup where things have been moved around a little bit. The definition of terms is now the first item, rather than the Authority item, which is now II. Previously, we had assumed that university entities, in terms of naming entities, that that would have to be approved by the Board, but that was not part of their authority. So, we were kind of granting authority when it didn’t exist. So, that no longer is there. The President has the final say as far as naming entities. There was a discussion about the idea that the naming or, you know, really just accepting donations should be in line with our core values, and so that’s been inserted in at least two locations here, one under IV. C Naming in Honor of Individuals, Corporations, or Other Entities. Where before it said that, not in this particular location, but here is where we added a sentence that says “An individual(s) or corporate entities for whom a facility or entity may be named should be representative of the University’s core values.” And then, there’s another place where it mentioned that being consistent with the Board of Trustees document, and there was just an add on, “and the University’s core values.” Finally, the notion was expressed that the entities ought to be at least informed of an impending naming, and that has been added in here in the form of consulting stakeholders in those entities. When I met with President Dietz, and discussed all of these issues, they said that there’s no practical way that an entity could have a veto power, in terms of the process because you can’t say, yes we’d like your money, but there’s still a chance that the people in the department will say, no, we don’t like your name. Okay. So, there’s no practical way to do that. What happens instead is (they describe this process) the initial vetting is done at the Foundation level, and often times they do reject donations just because there’s something at issue with who the donor is, or something like that, and they do apply the University’s core values in accepting donations in the first place. The other thing is that a lot of times these things come up from the bottom, they come from the departments, or the colleges, where you have an alum that’s already in contact with the chair or a school director, or whatever it might be, and so then it goes to the Foundation. The other thing that might happen is that as they’re discussing or developing the donation, that they may want to contact the people in the department, or the college, and say what are some things…what are your needs, really. Besides, from scholarships, they may have some other needs, like, setting up a lab, or studio, or whatever it might be. So a lot of times, those discussions happen long before the process is finalized. So, there are people that know in the entities that this is going on. I believe that covered everything.

Senator Mainieri: I just wanted to say I really appreciated the intentional insertion of the core value alignment and, obviously, we know that’s important, not just in our University but across universities that are dealing with that.

Senator Marx: Right.

Senator Mainieri: I did have one question and I felt it was just more appropriate just to ask here for my own knowledge. On page, well I’ll look at the clean copy, on page three of the clean copy, under E. Ineligible Facilities or Entities, on page three of the clean copy.

Senator Marx: Um-hum.

Senator Mainieri: The last sentence is about Facilities named for historic persons will not be renamed, and I just wonder why that appears under E and not D, which is talking about renaming? Or if there was a reason for that?

Senator Marx: Ah. That appeared in the same location in the current policy. So, it hadn’t been moved.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. Yeah I saw that.

Senator Marx: I can see why you asked the question. I think it just, in this particular case; it has to do with a different process in the case of the places that are named after historic ISU people in that. It says that it requires Academic Senate authorization to do it.

Senator Mainieri: Okay.

Senator Marx: So, otherwise it’s off the table. So, it isn’t ineligible in that sense, why I think it relates to that section.

Senator Mainieri: Okay.

Senator Marx: However, I can see where it could also be under D.

Senator Mainieri: Okay. Yeah. I just wondered because, I don’t know, we’ve seen at other campuses where some things named after historical figures, right, have come under question.

Senator Marx: Um-hum. This is specifically ISU historical persons, not…

Senator Mainieri: Oh, sure, and I think we’ve seen similar things at other campuses. So, I just, if it’s not completely ineligible, I wonder if it would be more appropriate under renaming, just to acknowledge that. Obviously, as we learn more about people, sometimes the perceptions change as society changes.

Senator Marx: It would still be discussed in the Senate, in that way, and it could be change via Senate process.

Senator Mainieri: Sure.

Senator Horst: At present, such facilities include thoseon the Quad?

Senator Ferrence: No, it just means “the Quad.”

Senator Marx: The Quad, itself.

Senator Horst: The Quad refers to all of the…

Senator Marx: That open space, that is the Quad. It’s not the buildings on the Quad.

Senator Mainieri: Can’t be Martha Horst Quad.

Senator Horst: Oh, okay.

(Laughter)

Senator Marx: Unfortunately.

Senator Kalter: Unless we change the policy.

Senator Mainieri: Apparently.

Senator Marx: But some day she may be a historic…

Senator Mainieri: Unless we’re naming it after Martha Horst.

Senator Horst: Okay. So it is referring to the Quad.

Provost Murphy: We could capitalize “the” like Ohio State. The Quad.

Senator Marx: Right. Right. The Quad.

Provost Murphy: I’m just saying.

Senator Marx: Oh, in the policy it should be a capital “t”? It would make sense.

Senator Ferrence: That’s how we have it named.

Senator Marx: We do call it the Quad. We don’t just say Quad. Or we say on the Quad. But “the” is still there.

Senator Kalter: (inaudible)

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. Mine where yeah, small things so that we don’t bring it up in the big meeting. So I’m in the mark up, on page one of the last sentence, just before II starts, we need to individual close the quotation marks, as an individual close the quotation mark.

Senator Marx: Oh yeah. Right. Because that was expanded from individual to individual or individuals so yes, that needs to be there.

Senator Nikolaou: And then in the third paragraph from there, where it says, “Naming of university entities will follow the protocol and procedures outlined below.” For this one I was worrying, is it protocol or is it policy? And depending on which one it is, it should be consistent with what it is on page four under D. Because it says the “same university policy and procedures,” so if we keep it policy…

Senator Marx: Ah. Consistent wording.

Senator Nikolaou: If it’s protocol, let’s keep it protocol.

Senator Marx: Policy and procedures.

Senator Mainieri: Um-hum.

Senator Marx: Yes. Okay.

Senator Nikolaou: But in the front, it says protocol, so I didn’t know if it was specific.

Senator Marx: I don’t think there’s any special reason to have protocol there. Which is preferred?

Senator Kalter: I would say policy.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. That’s what the section is named for.

Senator Marx: Sure. Okay. What else you got?

Senator Nikolaou: On page two, just before the deletion of the Definition of Terms, the last parenthesis, where it says, “ The term total may be extended to include…” do we need something over there, like to include an appointment to fill a vacancy of less than a two years duration? That one I was not clear if…

Senator Marx: I think the article is optional there.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. So that’s just that one.

Senator Marx: Am I right?

Senator Kalter: You mean the actual grammatical article?

Senator Marx: Yeah. The word “an” is optional there, I think.

Senator Kalter: Is that what your questions was?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah.

Senator Marx: The word “an” is not there. He was asking.

Senator Nikolaou: And then it is two years or two year?

Senator Marx: Less than two years duration. It’s plural.

Senator Kalter: Oh, I see what you mean. Less than two years.

Senator Marx: Right.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. Because I’m use to “than two year,” that’s why it’s just a question.

Senator Marx: You would say a two year appointment. You wouldn’t say two years appointment.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah.

Senator Marx: But here we’re specifying the amount of time, it’s plural.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. Then on page three, under B. General Names.

Senator Marx: Um-hum.

Senator Nikolaou: “University Facilities…” the facilities would be just the lowercase instead of capital.

Senator Marx: You are correct.

Senator Nikolaou: And then two paragraphs below, where it says “Any individual or corporate entity” instead of “Any individuals or corporate entities…”

Senator Marx: They’re both plural in this case. The word individuals would apply if it were just a single individual as well, I believe. So, to me it’s grammatically correct.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay.

Senator Kalter: I think it’s grammatically correct either way, but I think Dimitrios has a point, that you’re probably only going to name a facility for one individual or…

Senator Marx: One person.

Senator Ferrence: We just named the study room after two people.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. Or like the Varner.

Senator Ferrence: But they’re two individuals.

Senator Marx: Right.

Senator Ferrence: So, it wasn’t just one individual.

Senator Marx: Same with the husband and wife from the College of Business.

Senator Horst: Husband and wife. Parenthesis.

Senator Marx: It could be individual with the parenthesis around the “s,” is another thing that could be done. I don’t think that… it doesn’t change the meaning at all.

Senator Nikolaou: No. Then for the second… where it says “Donors,” same page, “Donors who wish to purse a gift-based naming opportunity,” is there a reason that the eligible is in quotation marks?

Senator Marx: That’s a hold over form the current policy, I believe.

Senator Horst: Could it be ineligible?

Senator Marx: Right. This goes back to that other section where there are things that are ineligible, eligible meaning that it’s available for naming. It doesn’t need to be in quotes no. So, we could remove the quotes there.

Senator Nikolaou: Then on page five, I guess it’s the third paragraph, or the one where it says, “the Committee to the extent it deems necessary” where you added the “University’s core values,” just to keep it consistent to say “the University’s core values,” because everywhere in this document it says the University’s core values.

Senator Marx: Ah. There is a “the” before the Board of Trustees governing document, so, the “the” could carry over for both. However, if you would prefer we can add a “the” after the and.

Senator Nikolaou: The only reason it’s because for example in the last paragraph it says, “the Board of Trustees governing documents and the University’s core values.”

Senator Marx: “And the University’s core values,” correct.

Senator Nikolaou: And then in the next page, it has something similar, so that’s what…

Senator Marx: And we can say University’s core values in the earlier one too.

Senator Nikolaou: Just to be consistent too.

Senator Marx: Consistency. Right. So, it appears in three places in this.

Senator Kalter: It would be grammatically correct to have it in that place without the “the” in front of it. So, we’d either have to have it as it is or the University’s.

Senator Marx: Yep. Right.

Senator Nikolaou: And then just before where it says it’s gone through its proposal, on page five.

Senator Marx: Uh-hum. 1. 2. 3.

Senator Nikolaou: Is there a reason it says, “…as feasible?” So, I have an option not to submit one of the three documents?

Senator Marx: Oh. “Each proposal, as feasible…”

Senator Nikolaou: Because based on the description for all three, I don’t see why it would not be feasible to submit 1 or 2 or 3. Again, I didn’t know if there was a specific reason why it says.

Senator Marx: Yeah, again, that was a holdover from the previous version.

Senator Ferrence: One reason I can throw out there, what if you had somebody who lived in the community, but hadn’t really done much with the University, and they were donating a large sum, their estate, but they really had no contribution to the University, so their contribution was the donation. Would we not accept the donation because they hadn’t had any prior contribution to the University? So, that would be maybe not feasible in that every person donating had prior contributions to the University.

Senator Kalter: I’m guessing, that’s how I read it. Not exactly that way, but that in some cases they wouldn’t necessarily have contributed anything but money, or something like that.

Senator Nikolaou: And my only other one was the last page, on the website, they say it’s the Office of Facilities Planning and Construction, they don’t separate it as the Office of Facilities Planning. So, I didn’t know if we need to add the “and Construction” in that paragraph, because I can see why it stops at the Planning, because it doesn’t talk about Construction. But then, the office is not called Office of Facilities Planning.

Senator Marx: The official name should be used in the document.

Senators Nikolaou: Okay.

Senator Kalter: And I had that one too, because I didn’t understand why university was capitalized there. It makes it look like it’s always called University Office of Facilities Planning.

Senator Marx: Right.

Senator Kalter: So, I think we can decapitalize the university (inaudible) or something like that.

Senator Marx: Yeah. Right.

Provost Murphy: Take the university off, can we do that?

Senator Marx: Yeah. It doesn’t need to be there.

Provost Murphy: Did you just say that, I’m sorry.

Senator Marx: Would it be enough to say, in that final sentence, would it be enough to say that it will be maintained by that office, rather than specifying the name again?

Senator Ferrence: That’ll make editorial changes, when the office every two or three years changes titles, quicker.

Senator Marx: All right. Thank you very much.

Senator Kalter: I hate to bring everyone through that all again, but I have some others. Some of them are that level, some of them are a little bit higher. But nothing too big.

Senator Marx: Sure.

Senator Kalter: In the very first paragraph, I think natural features would really be natural feature, right. “Other physical improvements or natural,” never mind.

Senator Marx: It makes sense as it is.

Senator Kalter: Oh. I know why I thought that. “Or natural feature of the University campus,” right. In other words, you’re talking about (inaudible) I’m not sure which one is right. Now I think I might be reading that wrong. But in the next sentence down, where it starts with donor, for parallelism you want to put a “for” before a position, so that it’s “for the development of a new program, for a position, for facilities renovation…” Or otherwise link a position to development if that’s what was intended.

Senator Marx: Right. There’s a “for” in front of the others. So, that’s just to make it consistent. Okay.

Senator Kalter: In the next paragraph, I wasn’t sure if ever we have an instance where the term “center” and “institute” refer to any entity designated through IBHE processes. So, there are some for sure, that are IBHE centers, but I don’t know if we have to mention that in this policy. So, that’s a question mark, if we do, then we should say “through university-wide or IBHE processes.” And for that same sentence, I was a little bit concerned that it could be problematic wording, because it implies that once the Wonsook Kim School of Art is named, then you would also have to call it the Wonsook Kim School of Graphic Design, or Program of Graphic Design. Right.

Senator Marx: Oh.

Senator Kalter: So, in other words, I think it’s the way it’s worded but when it says, “including all programs within such entities,” it essentially means that every time you name a school or department, you’re also naming every single one of its individual programs.

Senator Marx: Oh. That’s a different way of looking at it. I see what you’re saying in, terms of the example you gave, but I don’t think that’s what was intended here at all.

Senator Kalter: That’s what I’m worried about.

Senator Marx: It’s just listing some things that are considered entities. It doesn’t mean that you name one, you name them all.

Senator Kalter: In that case, it’s redundant, because a minor or major is already named, and I can’t think of any other programs you might want to name. Certificates?

Provost Murphy: Certificates.

Senator Marx: Uh-hum. Yeah, certifications are eligible.

Senator Kalter: But if so, I would move it up, so that it says or minor, major, or other program areas, or something like that, so that it’s not included every time you rename. Like, you could rename the College of Arts and Sciences, and then you’d have to rename every single program.

Senator Marx: Well, we’ll have to give that some thought as to how that could be worded differently so that... Essentially what we’re saying there is that these are a list of possible things that may be considered entities, rather than, as you said, consider it as a group.

Senator Kalter: Considering it as an inclusive under…

Senator Marx: An inclusive group. Yeah.

Senator Kalter: Right. On the next page, I’ve got the President should be apostrophe “s,” or just an “s,” oh, I know what it was. Sorry. Before a gerund, right, in other words, a verb that has an “ing” usually it’s apostrophe “s” or “s.”

Senator Marx: Where are we in this?

Senator Kalter: I’m sorry. On the second line down. Where you crossed out, what I thought was right, and put it just President.

Senator Marx: I’m still not seeing it. “Prior to the President making…”

Senator Mainieri: “…the President’s making decisions…”

Senator Marx: “…prior to the President making decisions with regard to naming…”

Senator Ferrence: Oh I see, because otherwise you’re talking about making of Presidents as it’s reworded. President making meaning building Presidents as opposed to President’s making.

(Laughter)

Senator Marx: Oh boy.

Senator Kalter: You can look that one up, it should be on the Purdue Owl website. That’s not as important as down below. This may not be a word meaning, but where it says, “The student member shall serve a one-year term beginning in August and then the faculty representative serves a two year appointment,” I think we can change that to term to make those parallel. And then the “but” can be change to an “and.” “And may be reappointed for a maximum of three consecutive terms,” because it’s not like we’re contradicting ourselves. I will say in that paragraph when you have the thing about “term total maybe extended to include appointment to fill a vacancy less than two years,” I didn’t agree with that, so I’ll probably debate that on the floor.

Senator Marx: Uh-hum.

Senator Kalter: But I’m not sure we should have somebody serving for almost eight years on this committee, unless we really really want to. Right. So, let’s say somebody filled a term for a year and a half, and then had three more terms.

Senator Marx: Right. Yep.

Senator Kalter: Now, in some cases, this kind of a committee might want that. But I think we want to make a conscious decision about whether that’s best or not.

Senator Marx: Right. I think we were completely open to debate on that particular paragraph. So, that’s a… the committee didn’t have any strong feelings about this, so.

Senator Kalter: On page three, under IV. C, I’m kind of confused, and I think this is from the original policy, but if you can name something after pretty much anyone, why do we even name all the people you can be naming after? So, it says C. Naming in Honor of Individuals, etc. university facilities or entities may be made for donors, notable alumni, former employees, distinguished former members of the Board, public persons of Illinois, nation, and country. So, basically, anyone.

Senator Marx: Anyone, yeah.

Senator Kalter: So, why not just remove that paragraph? Why do we say that? Is it to hint to people what they might want to do?

Senator Marx: It’s to make sure that it’s all inclusive. I suppose. But that was, of course, in the current policy.

Senator Horst: Isn’t there something that you have to wait a certain amount of time for…

Senator Marx: In the case of an employee, it’s a certain time after they leave the university. I think it’s five years.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. It’s later on.

Senator Horst: So, I was thinking, they’re not part of that list.

Senator Marx: Correct. And that’s mentioned further down. That current employees are excluded from the potential names.

Senator Kalter: If people think that it’s still worthwhile to say the obvious, I’ll let that one go. Page four, very bottom, I would suggest just rearranging the sentence so it’s not passive, “any member of the university committee may submit a written proposal.” That also helps to empower, to a certain extent, the university community, because they won’t have the patience to read to the endof that long sentence.

Senator Marx: Oh. Instead of saying written proposals?

Senator Kalter: Yeah. So right now it says written proposal, blah, blah, blah, may be submitted by.

Senator Marx: So attach a person to it. Any member…

Senator Kalter: May submit.

Senator Marx: Of the University community.

Senator Kalter: And then on the next page, I was wondering if there was a missing by in 1,2,3,4 down, where it says, The President may submit a recommendation to the Board of Trustees for final approval of the naming of a faculty by a functional/general name.

Senator Marx: Yes. Or with.

Senator Kalter: A little further down that page, the third thing, where is says, “a statement of rationale,” can’t we just say a rationale? Instead of a statement of rationale.

Senator Marx: Let’s see. Where was that?

Senator Kalter: Where they ask you…

Senator Marx: Oh there. Yes. Yes. A rational articulating… it’s fine. It’s just more formal here. It’s more formal wording.

Senator Horst: A statement articulating?

Senator Kalter: It just seems more efficient to say rationale.

Senator Marx: A rationale…

Senator Ferrence: Is it just trying to reinforce that it has to be written?

Senator Marx: That’s probably what was intended here, but then it says a written proposal, and the proposal should include these things. So, yes, it’s written.

Senator Kalter: On the next page, now the wording in this policy may be an issue, but it is sort of an awkward grammatical thing to have the Vice President of University Advancement and then either a Vice President or the Director of Athletics. So, I think about whether “as well as” would work better there, in order to separate that, I’m not sure. I just wanted to point that one out. And then, on the last page, actually, oh yeah, Dimitrios got one of those, but then I was also wondering if we really need in that same paragraph everything from “functional” to “of.” So that it would instead read, “The Office of Facilities Planning and Construction will maintain an official list of all university facilities and their approved names.” Is there any reason to say it the other way?

Senator Marx: The Vice President for Advancement maintains an official list of all other university facilities and entities. So, it’s listing the ones that the Office of Facilities needs to maintain, and then anything else is maintained by Advancement.

Senator Kalter: The way I read that, because I probably missed the “other” in the second paragraph was that Facilities Planning would need to maintain a list of every single thing on campus, and then Advancement would also have a list of those that resulted from a gift, right. That seems logical. In other words, in order to draw maps, and for emergencies, and stuff like that.

Senator Marx: Oh, certainly. Certainly, they would have the names.

Senator Mainieri: So, maybe “other,” then the last paragraph should be taken out.

Senator Kalter: Right.

Senator Mainieri: So, instead of saying, “Vice President for Advance will maintain an official list of all other university facilities,” just put all university facilities that are a result of a gift to the university. I paraphrased. Or maybe just take out “other.” So, do the change that Susan suggested and then take out “other.”

Senator Marx: That will work. I believe that will work. It’s the final sentence of the paragraph about the Office of Facilities Planning that says what they’re actually doing in terms of keeping records and so forth. Of course, they’re going to have the names of all the facilities and…, well, facilities, for sure. But the entities is probably going to be under Advancement, in terms of keeping the records.

Senator Kalter: Right. Yeah. But I think that still would work without “other” there.

Senator Marx: Uh-hum.

Senator Kalter: All right. If anybody else has any comment? This is a great grammar session.

Senator Marx: Of course.

Senator Kalter: So, we’re going to move on to Program Priorities from Planning and Finance, Tracy.

***10.15.18.02 From Planning and Finance Committee: Policy 4.1.8 Program Priorities CURRENT COPY (Information Item 2/5/20)***

***01.21.20.01 From Planning and Finance Committee: Policy 4.1.8 Program Priorities MARK UP (Information Item 2/5/20)***

***01.21.20.02 From Planning and Finance Committee: Policy 4.1.8 Program Priorities Clean Copy (Information Item 2/5/20)***

Senator Mainieri: So, I tried to add a little bit of context in the reasoning behind the changes in the comments. But, I don’t know if you remember when this policy came through Exec, and we all looked at it, and we were like, hum, I don’t know what this is saying. And then we shared it with the committee, and we also said, hum, no idea what this is saying. So, that’s when we turned to Cera, and Cera did her magic that she does, and unearthed all the documents that we could find associated with this, including some random committee notes as well, which is amazing, thank you. And so, we used all those documents. We also got in contact with one person that was there in 1971 when this was passed, and he basically said…

Senator Kalter: Who was that, just so that they’re on record.

Senator Ferrence: Ted (Thaddeus) Ichniowski.

Senator Horst: (Inaudible)

Senator Ferrence: Yeah. And we asked him for clarification on what he meant on the minutes that he stated in 1971.

Senator Horst: And he remembered?

Senator Ferrence: He loved it. Yes, he had lot of…

Senator Mainieri: Yes, he did. And he said basically at that time there was concern that there could be an administration that was just moving forward about priorities without consulting, right. So that’s why this policy exists. So, in taking all that into account and speaking with the President’s office as well, these are the changes basically linking it to our bylaws, because our bylaws very clearly state what our scope is. And then, I worked with Brent Patterson to kind of rework what we found confusing about this, what is now the second sentence, but was the first sentence. We just found it confusing. Tried to make it a bit more precise, and added an “and” to the last sentence.

Senator Marx: Okay.

Senator Horst: In Article 1, Section 2 of the bylaws is all quoting the Board of Trustees governing documents.

Senator Kalter: Actually, I had it as the ISU constitution.

Senator Horst: It’s the same, so you might want to look at that.

Senator Mainieri: Okay.

Senator Kalter: I wouldn’t suggest keeping that full phrase in, but before “as outlined,” say something like, as articulated in the ISU constitution, and as outlined, or whatever. That way we don’t have to go looking up specific articles in the Constitution.

Senator Mainieri: Okay.

Senator Horst: And I was also, I don’t know if this is right or not, but I was also wondering if you at all wanted to link in the Memorandum of Understanding.

Senator Mainieri: Okay. Yeah, we looked at a couple different documents, and we just felt that that part that has the list of all the different things was like the most specific. But we can certainly look at that one again.

Senator Kalter: Anything else?

Senator Nikolaou: I have more of a question.

Senator Mainieri: Okay.

Senator Nikolaou: In the sixth sentence, which says, “As such, University Administrators shall consult the Academic Senate when making significant institutional and program priority judgments.”

Senator Mainieri: Um-hum.

Senator Nikolaou: I had a question about the significance that it’s in there. So, what is the threshold for something being significant and insignificant? But also, I see that if we totally remove it, we don’t want to have that for each miniscule change that we need to make that they need to go through the Senate. If it was more like when in the future, we’ll have a case where someone’s going to say, oh, that was not a significant priority, and that’s why it was not brought up.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. You just outlined one of our many discussions about this policy very well. And this came out in sitting down with Brent Patterson and his feedback, we got feedback from the Provost office, too, right, is without putting some parameters on it, the concern was that every decision ever made would need to be run by the Senate, which obviously is not the intent of this policy. And so, we put in significant, that had a significant discussion about it, and started to make a list of perhaps examples of significant decisions, and then decided that that was… it’s hard to parse out all the possible things that could be considered significant at a particular time. And so, I think, I don’t know how to say this correctly, but I think one of the powers of this policy is that it does leave some room, depending on what’s going on to make sure that the Academic Senate is involved in the decisions that they need to. But we’d be happy to hear any input.

Senator Ferrence: Although, I would back that by saying, and Jalyn might be able to as well, because you were in some of these discussions, is that I think the word significant was intentional and intentionally vague, and exactly the scenario you brought up could happen, in that somebody could say, oh, well I didn’t think that was significant. But we decided, I think the discussions were we have to assume that we’re all trying to operate under good faith. And so, if I were to say, oh, well I didn’t think that was significant, the Senate could say, well you thought wrong. Right. There’s some dialogue there. So, it’s sort of trying to make it clear that we don’t want everything, but we don’t want to draw a firm line, because if we are working together, the landscape of what constitutes significant or not could change over time. So, we tried to keep it as short as possible, and a fair amount of discussion, which I don’t think you quite captured, but as I recall was, there was some significant discussion of whether the document, the policy, should be sunset all together. And what came out of it was that much of what this policy speaks to is already in the Constitution, bylaws, however, you need something with parity to speak from the policies to give the Senate the ease of being able to act. So, this is meant to be as short and concise as possible, that basically, it turns out, this could potentially be a fairly significant policy, even though it’s really short, because it’s basically saying Senate has the right to be involved, and, oh, by the way, it’s in the Constitution, but it’s easier for us to point to a policy, which points to the Constitution then to point directly to it.

Senator Mainieri: And one thing, because we did start to enumerate examples of significant and what that line might be. One thing that we thought by leaving it this way is that means Senate or administrators can trigger what is thought of as significant. And so, this allows either partner to say this is significant enough to be called upon this policy.

Senator Jones: And like also, if we were to list things out, say we missed something, they could easily say, well, it wasn’t listed. Like, this doesn’t fall under the realm of what we provided, so. The vagueness kind of, it offers more.

Senator Mainieri: So, that’s where our discussion went, but obviously we’re open to suggestions.

Senator Campbell: Can we define what we mean by institutional programs. Does that make sense? Like, are we looking just vaguely at like academic programs, or is it like a student life driven programs? I don’t know, does that question make sense? I’m just…

Senator Kalter: To narrow it down.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. We tried to leave it broad for that reason, right. Because we could imagine priorities in both areas you just mentioned that the Senate would want to, would call significant.

Senator Kalter: Especially since student life is part of our jurisdiction.

Senator Campbell: Right.

Senator Mainieri: But we had that exact discussion.

Senator Kalter: And I will say for the record, I don’t think this policy should ever be sunsetted, especially given the stuff during budget crisis around the state, and what just happened at Southern, and a couple of other universities looking specifically at what we think of as program priorities, in other words, are we going to cut the Languages department, or are we going to cut the, I don’t know, whatever other department.

Senator Marx: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: And that should never be a decision that’s made without shared governance input. So, I can’t imagine. And I thought you guys did a beautiful job. My only comment beyond the ISU Constitution comment is that the word judgement can be spelled either with or without an e.

Senator Marx: Yeah.

Senator Ferrence: Should we put a parenthesis around the e? (Laughter)

Senator Mainieri: Okay.

Provost Murphy: Use your best judgment.

Senator Kalter: Anybody else have anything else?

Senator Horst: Yeah. I’m interested in how this intersects with the language of the Memorandum of Understanding.

Senator Mainieri: Okay. We can take a look at that.

Senator Horst: I think it’s important because we don’t want to step on the wording in any way.

Senator Mainieri: Sure.

Senator Horst: Or narrow it here when it’s not narrow there.

Senator Mainieri: Sure.

Senator Campbell: Who is the MOU between?

Senator Kalter: It’s among the Senate, the Board of Trustees, and the President. And it has three clauses. I almost have it memorized, but I’m not going to recite that here.

Senator Campbell: Yeah. It’s really a critical document.

Senator Kalter: Basically, it says that we get to make decisions in the academic area, if they don’t agree with them they can overrule us, but they have to tell us their rationale. And I think, I want to say that it has to be in writing, and the third paragraph but I can’t remember what it says.

Senator Marx: I think so.
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Senator Kalter: All right. Religious Observances. And Dimitrios.

Senator Nikolaou: So, apparently, this policy was from 2017, and it went to the OEOA and Student Access and Accommodation office, and Legal, and they were giving feedback. We dealt with Wendy Smith, and said that we had to go through an official process in the University to clarify the accommodations that we have. And that’s why we had to create the policy and separate: these are what happens for the students, this is what happens for the employees. And one of the main differences is that for the students they have to be handled from the Student Access and Accommodations, for the employees they have to be handled from the OEOA. And if there is an appeal from the students part, then it goes to the SAAS. And when we were creating the policy there… we didn’t like the phrasing of undue hardship, but Wendy said, nope, this is the legal term. Because we were saying that, oh, what if you have something that said if it fundamentally alters the educational opportunities, and she was saying that religious accommodations are totally different from accommodations of any other nature. So, religious accommodations are short term and that’s why you need to use undue hardship. If you have, you know, if you need extra time to complete all the exams because you may have anxiety problems, then it is more of a long term, and that’s why it may fundamentally change the educational process, or the educational requirement. And that’s why she said you cannot change the undue hardship. It is the legal term. And then, the other thing, it’s for the employee religious, it explicitly says 30 days prior to when you want to have the accommodation, you need to submit the request. For the students, there wasn’t any timeline. So, I think Martha brought it up, you know, do we want to have like a week or so. So, right now we put a week, or at least seven days in advance in the policy. But I talked with the Director of the SAAS today, and they said they actually want to mirror the employee accommodations policy, and say 30 days in advance because if it is a religious accommodation, they will know ahead of time when that religious practice will have to occur.

Senator Kalter: I have an objection to that. Yom Kippur happens every year in the fall, very soon after school starts every single year. And so, I grew up in Ithaca, and so Cornell has a large Jewish student population, and so this was always part of the discourse there. So, I think that is unreasonable to ask students to email over the summer, especially with Rosh Hoshannah.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah.

Provost Murphy: I agree.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. The 30 days seemed too long. And that’s why we were thinking that seven days it would make sense, because Wendy also said that sometimes the Students Access and Accommodation, they may request documentation. So, you know, if you go two days before if you want the accommodation, and they ask you for documentation, and you cannot gather it before you want the actual accommodation, you cannot be granted.

Senator Horst: Say, the hour before the test you’re asking for religious accommodation. What’s the window that’s reasonable.

Senator Marx: Oh.

Senator Mainieri: And they don’t allow retroactive accommodations?

Provost Murphy: No, they don’t.

Senator Nikolaou: No. They said it cannot happen after the event.

Senator Mainieri: It seems like seven days would be enough time.

Senator Nikolaou: So, we were actually thinking that when we called the office they tell us, a no within two days, we can do it. And so we’re saying seven days is going to be our long window, and they may tell us five days, four days, three days.

Senator Horst: She thought seven days was okay. Wendy.

Senator Nikolaou: Wendy thought that seven days was fine. But yeah, 30 days when, today when she told me.

Senator Mainieri: What was their reason for saying 30 days?

Senator Nikolaou: She only said that they want to mirror the employee, and because of the documentation of it. Some students may take much longer to gather all the proper documentation.

Provost Murphy: I wonder what you document. You know. Besides this is the date, and, I mean, I really, that is a questions question, I’m not… I’m really wondering what it is we would ask a student to provide that says….

Senator Marx: Right. To prove that you’re Jewish. Prove that you’re Muslim.

Provost Murphy: Yeah. I don’t know.

Senator Horst: She had this case of a wedding that she had to research whether a wedding was a religious accommodation.

Senator Marx: A wedding counts as a religious accommodation.

Senator Horst: It didn’t. She had to do research, because that was one that needed documentation and research, as opposed to I’m Jewish and need an accommodation. So, some accommodations are up for debate.

Senator Marx: Sure.

Senator Campbell: What if we kind of kept this as like the seven days in advance, but it’s recommended we could, like it’s recommended to start as soon as possible due to the documentation that’s required. Because like 30 days in advance, sometimes you don’t know even who your professor is 30 days in advance.

Senator Marx: This is true.

Senator Campbell: So, I think that is problematic and I think that the work that, specifically, like SAAS, and those folks do can be turned around quickly. But I also understand the office wanting that to happen at a more spaced out rate so that they can approve them and get the documentation. And it is like you want students to know that there’s going to be something that you have to show. Because it can be problematic, right, to have to prove something you might not necessarily have that like in order that you were prepared to prove whatever it is that you needed to document. So, I think that if we added something in there that is like recommended to start as soon as possible, but seven days is like a standard turn around. I don’t know if there a way to phrase that might...

Senator Nikolaou: So, say something and students seeking religious accommodation must request the accommodation as soon as possible but at least seven days in advance, preferably by filing.

Senator Mainieri: Yep.

Senator Kalter: I get the heebie-jeebies out of asking anybody to approve what their religion is. I don’t think we should encourage that. I think it should be, hi, I am observing Yom Kippur this year, and just wanted to let you know, could you please notify all of my professors. No, documentation. I don’t care whether there are students that abuse it, frankly.

Provost Murphy: I agree.

Senator Marx: I agree with that.

Senator Mainieri: I wonder, and this might just be a question directly to SAAS, not necessarily for your committee, but you know our current… On SAAS’s website, I double checked one more time before the meeting, the syllabus statement still does not say anything about religious accommodations.

Senator Kalter: Not even on the CTLT website, where you can pull stuff off?

Senator Mainieri: No, because they pull it directly from SAAS. So, because CTLT, SAAS is the one that does that statement, and the statement says, you know, any documented disability or medical condition, but it’s not updated with religious. And so, I would hope that we could update that statement so that faculty across campus are putting that in too.

Senator Nikolaou: Maybe they’re waiting for… Because I also asked Wendy whatever they have on the website, it’s not the same as what we have in the policy. And she said they are going to update all this stuff once we have the policy.

Senator Mainieri: Okay.

Senator Nikolaou: So they are going to change, for example, the four weeks out.

Senator Mainieri: Okay.

Senator Nikolaou: And what they state right now, for when they have to get the accommodations, or the appeals process.

Senator Mainieri: Just as long as there’s some way for us to follow up that that gets updated. That’d be great.

Senator Kalter: So, I had a couple things on this. One just to go back in the history, my recollection is that Rick Lewis has brought this to our attention, so we’re going to want to go back and find out what his question was. Just to make sure that this has covered whatever that question was. I can’t quite remember it off the top of my head. On the first page in the statement that ends with undue hardship, I wrote on who or what. So, what is the hard… who, is it on the student, is it on the University. What exactly is that about? And then, for a student, what would this be, because it could apply to classes, housing, RSOs. There’s all kinds of things that this policy could apply to. So, we would probably want to be somewhat more specific about that particular area. Like, who does it apply to? And how many people, it could be the University or the students.

Senator Marx: Good catch.

Senator Ferrence: I just said undue hardship. When I read it, it goes for the faculty.

Senator Marx: Right.

Senator Kalter: That’s what I’m worried about is that faculty might decide that it’s…

Senator Marx: Were you able to get examples of the undue hardships that are being described here? While you were looking at this? What would be one example of this?

Senator Kalter: What did you say, Jan?

Provost Murphy: I said undue hardship will be interpreted by some to mean extra work. I mean, it is extra work, so what is it. I agree. Undue hardship, what is it. I’m worried that…

Senator Horst: You’re scheduled to be the concertmaster in an orchestra, and you say you can’t do the concert. And you’re the concertmaster, and you say you can’t do it because of a religious accommodation. Would that be an undue hardship? I’m just throwing out a music example here.

Senator Ferrence: Because of all the people that it affects.

Senator Marx: Right. you’ve effectively cancelled….

Senator Horst: You’re the Graduate Assistant, and you’re supposed to conduct a concert, and it’s on a specific date. You say, I can’t do that because of religious accommodations, but there’s no way it can be rescheduled. Maybe.

Senator Marx: Right.

Senator Nikolaou: In our previous draft, it said on the University. It’s not on the student.

Senator Marx: Ah.

Senator Kalter: That’s what I would have guessed because that’s what it is in disabilities policy, right.

Senator Marx: Right.

Senator Kalter: Or disability law. It would cause an undue hardship for the university but that… we also don’t want faculty interpreting it the way you just did.

Senator Ferrence: Most of us would.

Senator Kalter: Right.

Senator Mainieri: That’s part of the reason why SAAS would be involved, right. It actually wouldn’t be up to the faculty member.

Senator Horst: Right.

Senator Mainieri: But at least the student would have recourse if the faculty member went against the recommendation of SAAS.

Provost Murphy: I’m trying, I can’t think of the number of the policy, but it’s the policy that allows students with permission to do university…

Senator Kalter: University Sanctioned Activities.

Provost Murphy: Yeah. Thank you. And there… it’s been so long since I’ve looked at that, but I feel like there’s more specific language in there. I could be wrong though. But, for example, if an athlete’s going to miss an exam, they don’t have to make it a drop exam, they have to be given the opportunity. So, I feel like we’re very directive in that.

Senator Mainieri: Um-hum.

Provost Murphy: And I’m not saying we need to be more directive. But I wonder if there’s, I don’t know, if there is some examples.

Senator Nikolaou: So, actually, before we talked with Wendy, we looked at this specific policy.

Provost Murphy: Okay.

Senator Nikolaou: And a policy, which is for, I think, when you are called to go back to the Army.

Senator Kalter: Yeah.

Provost Murphy: Oh, sure.

Senator Marx: Military Service, yes.

Senator Nikolaou: And the introduction is exactly the same. So, it had specific examples as we said, you know, making up exams, missing exams, grades, but then Wendy said, nope. The Religious Accommodation, it is totally different.

Provost Murphy: Okay.

Senator Nikolaou: You cannot link it with any of the other existing policies that we have. And that’s why even the paragraph where we have Instructors may provide students that may include but not limited to completion of exams, quizzes, and other required work. She said keep it as broad as possible. Do not give specifics, because then we’re going to be in trouble. So, I think, ideally she would want us to remove that whole paragraph over there. But in putting the included but not limited to was… she said, okay, we can work with that.

Senator Marx: Um-hum.

Senator Kalter: My only other thing on that page is we have to specify if it is calendar days or business days, seven days. Is that including weekends or is it business days? I’d assume it’s calendar days, but we should specify.

Senator Nikolaou: I was thinking that if we go based on the bottom one, the other one also doesn’t say, it says 30 days.

Senator Kalter: Right. There are two actually. I only just noted that just as we were talking.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. But then, for the appeal, it says ten business days, for example. The last sentence.

Senator Kalter: So, if we can just specify the 30 and the seven, whether that’s business or calendar. And I, for one, agree with them, insofar as I think that employees should get less time to… I don’t think 30 days for an employee is reasonable either, but I don’t know if there is room to maneuver on that. But it seems to me that all the staff and faculty should be able to have seven days also. I don’t know why it has to be different and I wouldn’t have gone to 30, where everyone would have gone to the seven for everybody. And the Provost, just put on the record as nodding her head to that.

Provost Murphy: Yeah. Oh, no, you know, I think so. And, you know, I’ve had years… I was back in the classroom full time for two years, as recently as four years ago. I probably had 400 students a semester; I’ve never had anyone abuse this.

Senator Kalter: Right.

Senator Marx: Correct.

Provost Murphy: I just haven’t. You know.

Senator Kalter: It’s lucky if they even know about it.

Provost Murphy: Yeah, I can’t imagine a student coming up… I did have a question though, under students we say the appeal to SAAS using the appeals process is capital letters. Will a student know what that is, or how to find that?

Senator Mainieri: There’s a link.

Senator Nikolaou: There is a hyperlink.

Provost Murphy: There is a hyperlink. Okay. Thank you.

Senator Nikolaou: And it takes you to the whole description for the process.

Provost Murphy: And that’s a different process than the employee, which says they appeal in writing to OEOA?

Senator Nikolaou: To OEOA.

Provost Murphy: Okay. Good enough.

Senator Mainieri: So, that reading the appeals actually triggers something in terms of the timing, right. So, like a student, if they submitted seven days before, they’re within the policy. It takes the office three days to process it, and then they say no, and then they want to appeal, then we’re right up against the date that they’re asking for the accommodation. So, I wonder if that is part of the 30 day thing. Because an employee has up to 10 business days to submit an appeal. But I wonder, I mean, I still think seven days is reasonable, but then, if the student wins the appeal, SAAS would have to break its rule about not doing retroactive accommodations.

Senator Campbell: Well, what would you consider retroactive? Because they submitted beforehand? I wonder should we ask SAAS and OEOA that.

Senator Mainieri: My interpretation of, because I’ve asked them a couple times on different things, is it’s whatever the accommodation is for is in the past. Not when it was submitted.

Senator Campbell: Okay.

Senator Horst: Wendy also did, for the 30 days, she mentioned the scenario of, like, shifts that you would have to allocate the schedule two weeks in advance. That was part of her rationale for thinking a 30 day window was more appropriate for employees, if I recall, Dimitrios.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah.

Senator Mainieri: And then I wanted to follow up on something you said, Susan, about applying this beyond class, because you could see RSOs and things having requirements that might fall on days that they might want accommodations and, am I misinterpreting, that as far as I know other accommodations, do they apply outside the classroom?

Senator Kalter: I think they could. Housing for sure, right. If you needed to have a disabled room. For dining, you might need to have certain kinds of meals.

Senator Mainieri: Okay.

Senator Kalter: Either, whether you have a disability or whether you have a religious accommodation, I can’t remember what was in my head with the RSOs, but I would hope so.

Senator Mainieri: No. It’s really good to know. I mean, I feel like, again, I’m thinking about the syllabus statement that all faculty should have in their syllabi, and I’m thinking it’d be nice in that statement just say for accommodations for classes or other campus services, right. Because that would just be another place where students recognize that they have support available if they need it. But that’s again off topic of the policy.

Senator Kalter: Are we, by the way, planning to link that appeals process into this?

Senator Nikolaou: It is hyperlinked.

Senator Campbell: It is already.

Senator Kalter: It is. Okay. Great. It’s just hard to read that…

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. It does show in the clean copy that it is hyperlinked.

Senator Kalter: We’re just about at 5:00. Does this policy, is it ready for the Senate floor? Because I have some more things on the back, and I’m just wondering. Or maybe we should carry it over to the next Exec meeting so that we can get through Tracy’s statement, go on to the approval of the agenda, and then maybe come back to it in two weeks. Is that, since it’s been waiting since 2017, do we need to put it on the floor right away? I think mine are small but since we’re at 5:00…

Senator Mainieri: I mean, I feel like these same questions would come up on the floor. So, we might as well figure out how to deal with them.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah, and when we met with Wendy, she didn’t give us indication that there is something that is missing, or there’s something else that we can do for the policy.

Senator Kalter: So, well, let me read my other stuff, and then we can decide whether we want to talk about it now, or defer the conversation into the next Exec, to put it on the next agenda. One of them was in the first sentence on the second page in the mark up, I wrote what about a change to when something is performed or even whether it is performed. Also, at the undue hardship on Illinois State University business, I said why not just ISU, is there a reason for that. And then, the 30 day thing. And then, I thought that the second to last sentence was inconsistent with the first sentence of the paragraph. Do we want to talk about it now, or talk about it in the next Exec.

Senator Mainieri: Next Exec.

Senator Kalter: All right. We’re going to move on, and we won’t have to do that one for next Senate. We move on now to the statement from Planning and Finance about diversity and inclusion.

***01.23.20.02 From Planning and Finance Committee: Diversity and Inclusion Committee Statement***

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. So, the committee really appreciates the input that Exec gave. And we made the recommended changes to the Engineering, but just to be efficient, the Engineering paragraph to be efficient I’m going to focus in on the first main paragraph which talks about facility decisions. Your feedback highlighted to us that the way that we were phrasing that paragraph wasn’t highlighting what we were intending for people to hear from this statement. So, you can see that we’ve taken out any specific mention of Multicultural Center, because really what we wanted to highlight was as decision changes, and designs, and renovations happen, that these values of diversity, and commitment to inclusion, are incorporated in those decisions moving forward. So, that, again, we can speak to what the students were asking for which was kind of proactive approach to diversity and inclusion. So, that’s the primary change is that paragraph. We envision this being read during out Committee Reports at the Senate. You can see that we did a vote on it, and all of our committee members voted in the affirmative, and all of our ex-officio members supported this statement as well. Oh, one final thing, by redoing that paragraph and not talking about Multicultural Center, one of the recommendations was to hear from John Davenport about Multicultural Center processes. And by taking out the Multicultural piece, because that wasn’t what we were trying to focus on, we felt that that covered that concern that we needed that input on that particular piece.

Senator Horst: What made you chose not to, for instance, put this in your final report? Because my understanding, I’ve never been on this committee, but my understanding is the report feeds them, and the administration has to give feedback on what was in the report. And if you’re making a long range planning document and you put up front all of this long range planning shall include this principle of diversity, then the administration would then have to respond and give feedback to that report. But if you just read it, it might not be as powerful.

Senator Mainieri: We wanted 1) I think timing was something we wanted to make sure that we were trying to get this, honestly, before Christmas to respond more quickly. Again, this was more of a debrief session, so we wanted our debrief with the scope of our committee to be as close to when that discussion happen. And then, we are going to incorporate these things into our own committee work. So, our current priority, for example, we are considering issues of diversity and inclusion as we consider that priority in our own work. So, that was the primary reasons.

Senator Horst: Okay.

Senator Kalter: Let me clarify that last part. So, in addition to doing a committee statement on the floor of the Senate, you’re also going to have it as a sort of new priority to add to other priorities that you’re prioritizing?

Senator Mainieri: Well, it’s been on our priority list. But what I’m saying is every priority from here on out, that we consider, like right now, we’re talking about enabling more students to get into desired majors, we’ve been asking questions like, are there certain groups of students that are more impacted.

Senator Kalter: That’s what I wanted to clarify. So, the existing priorities that came out, like a year or two ago, that you’re now working on, you’re now going to infuse each and every one of those with diversity and inclusion consciousness, if it wasn’t already there before.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. And I think that’s, again, highlighting that more…

Provost Murphy: I think that makes more sense, then saying respond to this statement alone. I think it’s how do these things apply to the individual priorities.

Senator Mainieri and Marx: Uh-hum.

Provost Murphy: Because to respond to this, we’d say, okay we’ll do that. I mean, how do you... But if you’re talking about, okay, here’s a priority, let’s say Engineering. Okay, now, how are you are…. That will be helpful.

Senator Mainieri: Sure. These two item themes that came out, so when we had this debrief, there were lots of things that came out of that debrief that applied to our committees work, that we added to our committee’s growing list of priorities list for us to consider. These two were kind of bigger and more broad than anything, like… the facility renovations, that not necessarily specific priority that our committee would take on, that’s a message that we wanted to hear. Or the Engineering program has already gone through our committee, it’s passed on to…

Senator Kalter: It started there.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. It started in the committee, so it’s been passed on to different entities. So, that’s not a priority that we would pick up, though it does relate to the scope of our committee. So, these were two items that didn’t fit on our list of priorities for us to consider in the future, but we still felt that they were important, and that’s why we chose this approach. Does that make sense?

Senator Ferrence: I think, since I’m on the committee, I don’t want to, you know, turn it the wrong way, but I think we had also talked about that we felt that there was merit in having when we work through a major priority a succinct statement that could be read out within Senate so that the Senators are actually aware, and there’s something there. Because traditionally there’ve been a bunch of priorities that get condensed into an annual report, and so you don’t want an annual report that’s 40 pages long, say. And so each statement like this gets reduced to a couple sentences, and so that which is communicated to the administration has some specific things, but kind of misses sometimes the broader essence. And so we wanted to be able to put it formally, so that a lot of conversations were invited a fair number of people and went round and round, got captured in a way that it just didn’t evaporate; that is would be read out in front of Senate and it would be there as part of the record, so that somebody else when they’re looking at it again, could go back to the record and say this is succinctly what was talked about. Because, typically, if you go back to say, if I asked you, you know, 10 years ago give a synopsis of the discussions on the Planning and Finance Committee. I think you’re going to have a hard time finding detailed notes, because minutes tend to be pretty shorthand. But this is sort of after it’s all done a nice capture, which is different than asking the administration to respond, but it’s kind of saying this is where a whole bunch of people kind of converged on this certain area of dialogue, and we want that in the formal record. Is that reasonable?

Senator Horst: Elaborated minutes as a group?

Senator Mainieri: On a very… yeah

Senator Ferrence: Yeah, but not minutes, actually a summary statement of where we…

Senator Mainieri: Of the discussion.

Senator Horst: Did you articulate maybe the fact that you do want the Planning and Finance Committee in the future to really consciously be folding these into the priorities report?

Senator Mainieri: My thought was when I did my committee report, I could give like a minute, like here’s how this statement came to be. Just like what I just did. We had a debrief session, we came up with a bunch of themes, there were two themes that we thought were more appropriate for this venue, the other themes are on our other list of priorities for future consideration by the committee; something like that. And then here’s the statement.

Senator Marx: So, I was just going to make a general comment. You’ve picked one of the University core values and it seems to me that everything we do on campus is guided by the ECE document.

Senator Mainieri: Um-hum.

Senator Marx: And within that we have our core values and then we have goals and so forth. And anytime anybody’s planning to do something or anything that we do, we point to things in that document.

Senator Mainieri: Sure.

Senator Marx: And here we’re highlighting one of the core values. I would hope that we’re, in our planning processes, we’re including all of our core values, not just diversity and inclusion, but also things like respect in our scholarship, in the way in which we work with students. All that kind of stuff that we have in our core values. It ought to be in the core of everything that we do, right.

Senator Mainieri: Absolutely. But I think we heard…

Senator Marx: So, here we’re highlighting on one thing that has come out and we want to be more focused on and be aware of, I think that’s what you’re trying to do.

Senator Mainieri: Right. Yeah.

Senator Marx: Because in the bigger picture I think we should be…

Senator Mainieri: Because I think that we heard on October 9th that there are members of the community that don’t think that this topic…

Senator Marx: Right. Understood. Understood where it comes from, but now you’re talking about going forward, and including that in all of the priorities that you do, but this is why my comment comes out, because we’re not just going to include diversity and inclusion in our policy planning, whatever, but all of those.

Senator Mainieri: Sure. And I think that has always been the case, but I think we can be more intentional…

Senator Marx: Gotcha.

Senator Mainieri: In making certain ones that haven’t been as focused.

Senator Marx: As out in the forefront.

Senator Mainieri: Right.

Senator Ferrence: Tracy, correct me if my memory doesn’t serve, but it’s interesting where you’re coming from on that, because I think we were having some of the essence of the discussion of what would go in here before October, and when things heated up. So, we were already talking about these things, working on language. And so it looks… from what you said, makes it sounds like we’re being reactive to something that happened in October.

Senator Marx: Yeah. Yeah.

Senator Ferrence: When actually, our work here actually predates that. We were already having these discussions and it just coincidentally came up. But it wasn’t that we were reactive to what happen in October, and said we’re going to focus on this priority. We were saying, this is one of the core principles that we need to focus on, a bit more focusing, and we’ll work through other things. And it just so happens that we picked the one that we felt was really needing to get addressed, and lo and behold it looks like it was really needing to be addressed.

Senator Marx: That’s correct. When I was on the Planning and Finance Committee previously, these issues were discussed in terms of our priorities and so forth that we wanted to do more. So, I am aware of that.

Senator Mainieri: Um-hum. Yeah.

Senator Marx: That it was even way back then, long before this. Nevertheless, my point is that we don’t want to lose sight of all our core values, and just focusing on one very important one, certainly, but the others are important too.

Senator Mainieri: For sure.

Senator Marx: Yeah.

Senator Nikolaou: That was kind of my question too, on how it’s going to be presented. So, for example, are we going to have a similar statement for when you are done with the discussion for students getting into their desired majors?

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. So, just like we did last April, we put out a priority brief on increasing student financial aid after having explored that topic for several months. And then, we put out, I think it was a three page priority brief with what we found, and what we did, and then questions, and information, to get response from the administration.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah, and if that’s something that’s going to happen from now on it, would address the reactive part. Because if it was, let’s say, the only statement from the Planning and Finance for the whole year, it might seem that it is more that you are reacting to what happened. But if it’s that, okay, that’s what we are planning to do from now on, this was an important issue so this is our statement in, you know, I don’t know how many meetings; this is our statement for one of our main other priorities, and so on. Yeah I just… Yeah.

Senator Kalter: And so, unfortunately, both meetings where this has been discussed Dr. Dietz has not been able to be here. So, I happened to have my meeting with him on Friday, and asked him to read it through before we met so I could get his stuff. And the feedback he gave me on the first paragraph that I’m going to tell you about, is so similar to the kind of feedback that I get it’s not even funny. Right. Like, 100 times I’ve been given this feedback. He circled the word reactive. We heard from the students and faculty members on October 9th 2019 that they hoped that the campus community can take steps to be more proactive rather than reactive, and was sensitive to that because he felt that it was implying that they had been being reactive. When, as I said to him, you know, Larry has initiated an awful lot with regard to diversity and inclusion on this campus over the almost six years that he’s been here. So, I think he’s right that that could potentially be rephrased in a way that doesn’t make it look like that’s all he does is react.

Senator Mainieri: Um-hum.

Senator Kalter: When in fact, he and his administration in general, have been proactive. And then, the second thing was, down further, (counting) nine lines, where it says at the end of the ninth line, “in consideration of the above the members of the Planning and Finance Committee request that these considerations be given priority as future facility decisions are made.” He says they were considered. So, again, another sentence that he felt was sort of implying that they had not been considered, and that now they are going to be, or should be, but he was like, well, we did. And he did say, by the way, I think I forgot to say this, that he thought that this statement was much improved from the old version when it came to Exec. And I think part of that was taking out the Multicultural Center specifics, because I think that’s maybe where that response is coming from, right. Yes, we considered them then. We are considering them for other things, and all of that. And then in the next paragraph, he circles the word administration, (counting) five lines down. “As a result, we urge the administration to ensure that the values of diversity and inclusion are built into the Engineering programs during all aspects of the planning process,” etc. He said all of us, faculty, department heads, I think the next one was chairs, deans. In other words, it can’t just be the administration who’s doing this. It has to be everybody who’s in on the planning process for Engineering has to have this, not just the administration.

Senator Mainieri: Yep.

Senator Kalter: And that was it.

Senator Mainieri: Okay. Great.

Senator Kalter: And I had no comments. Except that I thought it was improved as well. I liked it. All right.
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Senator Kalter: Moving to the approval of the proposed Senate agenda.

Motion by Senator Horst, seconded by Senator Nikolaou, to approve the proposed Senate agenda.

Senator Kalter: So, looking at the proposed Senate agenda. Would we like to take the Withdrawal policy off because you have heard from whom?

Senator Nikolaou: The Dean of Students about the Student Conflict and Resolution, and then the Academic Integrity, or the misconduct part.

Senator Kalter: Okay.

Senator Nikolaou: So, I don’t know if we are going to have heard on time, that’s why.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Let’s take that off then.

Senator Nikolaou: And then we removed the Religious Observances.

Senator Kalter: Are you looking at the right thing?

Senator Horst: I think I may be looking at the wrong one. Sorry.

Senator Kalter: Proposed Senate Agenda.

Senator Ferrence: Not Caucus.

Senator Kalter: Okay. And we are taking off the Religious Observances policy for the moment and it will probably go on the February 19th. So what we have is an Action Item for University Curriculum Committee turning into Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. Hopefully that will be ready. Have you heard from Scott?

Ms. Hazelrigg: I have not heard from him.

Senator Kalter: Okay. And if we don’t have… The main thing was my comment, I think, if I remember correctly. Was I the only that commented about that one? We’re adding the word undergraduate to specify things in the charge. If we don’t have that, we should take that off. So, that’s sort of a friendly here. If Cera doesn’t hear anything back or if he’s not ready, we’ll just pull it off. So, we have that as an Action Item, Program Priorities, Facilities Naming, and then Committee Reports. Do we need to add or subtract anything else?

The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: We could if we want to discuss the Parental Leave policy, if we want to. It is 5 what?

Ms. Hazelrigg: 5:20 p.m.

Senator Kalter: 5:20 p.m. The incentive to do this is that the faster we move on this one, the faster it actually gets passed, and then we can enforce the policy. Let me tell you, I also met with Janice Bonneville right after meeting with the President on Friday, talked through with her some of my technical writing issues with the way that the policy has been written up. And so she went back and is looking at that. Like, for example, don’t bury the lead, everybody keeps burying the lead. Like, if the policy is about this say that. So, moving the definition first, and then putting the other stuff second, and all of that. If you have stuff like that that you noted, send it to her, but our main thing, there are two things here. Should we distribute this to committee, implying that this is a Senate policy that should always be reviewed by the Senate, or do we want to say that this is a non-Senate policy? And what I suggested also to her, was that I view it personally as a non-Senate policy but 1) it would be good to have it as an Advisory Item for Senate, so that it would get scheduled for the meeting, in fact we just approved the agenda without doing that, we might have to amend the agenda. I can’t remember where I left that with her in terms of timing. But anyway, so that she could get a whole bunch of feedback of that same sort. Like over the weekend I realized, I woke up one morning and I was like foster children. We might want to include foster children in this, and she wrote me back this morning, and said, yes, we feel like that’s a friendly thing, right. So, getting feedback from faculty, students, and staff about it before they put it into their polices. This is an ISU only policy. It is not government backed. It’s not State of Illinois backed.

Senator Mainieri: So, if we do it as an Advisory Item now, and then they decide to make an overhaul of the policy, do they have to bring it back as an Advisory Item, or can they make changes since it’s non-Senate? Like how does that work if we decide on it now?

Senator Kalter: If we do non-Senate, they can make changes anytime, just in the administrative process, but any individual on campus can make an argument to Exec that we need to see this again. And then Exec would have to decide at that point, should we bring it back, and should we put it into the regular Senate rotation, or should we just have a one off because of whatever the issue might be.

Senator Horst: Domestic Partners.

Senator Kalter: Yeah.

Senator Horst: We did that. I would be in favor of this not being a recurring Senate policy, but it makes sense to have it be an Advisory.

Senator Kalter: As it’s coming online.

Senator Mainieri: Okay. So, here’s my thing. I understand that this isn’t technically like academic broadly defined…

Senator Kalter: Academic area broadly conceived.

Senator Mainieri: Yes, there we go, thank you. I forgot that phrase. However, this has significant impact on the constituents that we serve. This really important policy that I’m happy to see is being considered, and in progress that we, even in the last ten years, we’ve seen opinions change on what should be considered right, in terms of parental leave, and I worry that if it is not recurring that it could sit forever and not get reviewed, given new thoughts about parental leave, and parenting. And I find it amazing that ISU hasn’t had a parental leave policy until now, except for FMLA. And so I would be worried that if it wasn’t under regular scrutiny that it could become stagnant, and not have the opportunity to be improved.

Senator Horst: I think it’s a very technical policy that has a lot of legal language. You have to have a lot of legal knowledge of HR laws, and I think we could contribute a lot, but like the domestic partner policy, you know, at one point we stepped in, and said we’d like you to reconsider this, but in terms of just that continuing review, I think you have to have a lot of knowledge about what’s going on with FMLA, and that kind of things. And I’m not sure that we have that expertise. I’m all for the policy. But you know, just thinking of what committee it would go to.

Senator Kalter: It would, most certainly if it were a Senate policy, go to Faculty Affairs Committee, I would think, because, I mean even though it touches all employees (AP and civil service included), I don’t think Administrative Affairs and Budget is used to dealing with this type of a policy. Faculty Affairs tends to do the personnel policies.

Provost Murphy: My question would be which employee… I mean, think of all the employee policies. So, if you open up, why this one and not other FMLA, or why this one and not, you know, fill in the blank, would be my worry.

Senator Mainieri: And I just wanted to put out, I just think it’s incredibly important.

Provost Murphy: Yeah. I agree.

Senator Mainieri: So, I would want to really make sure that there is ample time for input and that the input is considered very carefully.

Senator Kalter: I think this has happened several times. You just mentioned one, Sick Leave policy was another. That happened because it got taken off the policy website, and they didn’t catch it until the Senate started going though its policies, that it’d been off. So, I think there is precedent for when there are changes made that are problematic, or even the existing policy with no changes is problematic, for people to bring it here, and for us to go over it, and then, you know, then make a decision again at that point whether it now has to go on the regular cycle or only come back intermittently. One problem I think also with putting it, other than what Senator Murphy just said, was that, if we do that, it’s going to delay its implementation for probably months if not more than a year. Because both committees, whether it would go to Administrative Affairs and Budget or Faculty Affairs, are bogged down right now, so they’d either have to push aside their other work, or they’d have to, you know, delay this one.

Senator Mainieri: I hear that.

Senator Kalter: Okay. So, let’s do a motion to amend the agenda if I had agreed that Janice would come in a week. And if she wanted more time, then we’ll just not put that on.

Motion by Senator Marx, seconded by Senator Mainieri, to amend the agenda if Janice Bonneville can attend the next Senate meeting. The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Horst: Did we clarify though all of the issues?

Senator Kalter: I think.

Senator Marx: Um-hum.

Senator Horst: Because if it’s Advisory that would define that it’s not a Senate.

Senator Marx: It is Advisory.

Senator Kalter: Right. I think what I’m hearing from the majority of members, sorry, is that it is a non-Senate policy.

Senator Marx: Um-hum.

Senator Kalter: And that actually, you just kind of agreed yourself.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. I listened and yeah. I’m fine with that.

Senator Marx: Right.

Senator Kalter: Okay. So, yes. Thank you. So, the decision is that, at least for the moment, it’s a non-Senate policy, but it’s going to be an Advisory Item for Senate so that they can give feedback and then polish it before putting it on the books.

Senator Marx: Yep. Perfect.

Senator Kalter: All right.

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Marx, seconded by Senate Campbell, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.