**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

**MONDAY, October 25, 2021**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

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

***Oral Communication:***

***Honors Program Director position***

[***3.2.13 Administrator Selection***](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/employee/3-2-13.shtml)

Senator Horst: I am starting off with a lengthy communication regarding the Honors Director question. This came up through an email that I received on September 10 from a constituent with a request that the Executive Committee place the policy of the permanent Honors Director position on their next agenda to discuss with the Provost and President whether this position falls under the Panel of Ten searches as dictated by the Administrator Selection policy.

The email was copied to Dan Holland. The email sender thought a Panel of Ten search for this role may have occurred during his time as Senate chair. Dan Holland responded that he did not recall the process but thought that it should certainly have been an open search, possibly a Panel of Ten search.

Because there is no job ad or announcement for a permanent Honors Director search, an interim Honors Director has been named. Thus, because there wasn’t an Honors Director position announced, I did not view this question as “urgent.”

Between September 10-24, I interviewed two former Honors Directors regarding their searches. The first one said that the chair of their search committee was Chuck McGuire; you’ll remember he was part of the Provost staff. So, that’s not a Panel of Ten search.

The second said that the chair of their search was Anthony Crubaugh. I verified that this search did not occur during the period when Professor Crubaugh was on the Panel of Ten. It did not.

Both Honors directors, who had served in the position for a combined total of 10 years, said that they did not think the position should be a Panel of Ten search. Both called the position a “glorified admissions director.” Both did not view the position as having oversight of curriculum, nor were they direct reports to the Provost. They described their duties as recruitment, review of applications, ambassador for the program to faculty and chairs, and setting up enrichment activities.

September 24, I had a meeting with the Provost. We had 9 agenda items for this hour meeting, one of which was the block scheduling discussion. We discussed policy 3.2.13 and specifically the wording in part I at the end that talks about “**searches to fill other administrator vacancies, such as those positions that report directly to the Provost and involve curriculum, faculty, or staff evaluation or supervision for a number of colleges, may also require the participation of representatives from various constituencies.”**

This constituent is insisting that an item be placed on the Executive agenda immediately based on the Bylaws. But the Bylaws, Article V, do not give that power to people who file items with the Senate; nor should it. They don’t have the power to place something immediately on the Executive Committee agenda.

And furthermore, people weren’t even quite sure if the past searches for the Honors Director were actually done as a Panel of Ten search. So, I thought I would do some research before I brought that issue to the Executive Committee.

There is precedence by the previous Senate chair to screen and deny items for immediate inclusion on an Executive Committee agenda that have been submitted. On February 22nd of last year, I received an email from the Senate chair that an item that I had submitted on behalf of the Rules Committee was not making it to the Exec agenda because I needed to be clearer when I forward them as to why the Rules Committee did not address the Issues Pending reason for the item to be on the Rules Committee Issues Pending in the first place.

The item forwarded by the constituent was on my list for a meeting with the Provost on October 6th. However, if you recall, this was the day that the power went out at the Bone. At my meeting time at 3:00 pm, I was hearing from other VPs that it would be necessary to find an alternate place for the Senate meeting in 3 hours. So, I was around 20-30 minutes late to my meeting with the Provost and did not get to all of my agenda items.

On October 18, I had another meeting with the Provost. We discussed this concept of what qualified for a Panel of Ten search and what did not and why. The Provost and I discussed the two criteria in part I of policy 3.1.13: the direct reporting to the Provost, and the curriculum. I reported what I had learned from two previous Honors Directors.

October 20, I received this email, “If I do not receive by the end of the day a good explanation regarding why this matter and this email below both appear to have been hidden from the view of all Senators since September 10, and if the matter is not scheduled for discussion at the October 25 Exec, I will be opening this conversation up to a wider audience.”

On October 21, I asked Cera to put the item on Exec. I had a conversation with Senator Nikolaou, who correctly zeroed in on the two issues that were in question: 1) Does the Honors Director position “involve” curriculum? 2) Does the Honors Director position involve faculty or staff evaluation or supervision for a number of colleges?

According to what I learned from the two Honors Directors that I spoke to, the answer to #2 is clearly no. However, the curriculum issue is not as clear. Dimitrios asked whether getting approvals for an honors course is a sort of curricular process. Great point.

David Marx also said that he felt the Honors Director should be a Panel of Ten search because “it has very strong academic components.” The policy, however, uses the wording “involve curriculum…”

This weekend, I spoke, again, with two Honors Directors—and there’s only one other Honors Director, Rocio, but I don’t have a strong relationship with her that I could talk to her over the weekend—about whether or not their positions “involve” curriculum.

The first one said: The department owns the course. The department decides the content of the course without curricular oversight from the Honors Director. No curricular say. Only good will discussions between “faculty.” No direction on the curriculum because HONORS does not own the courses. This person’s own daughter took an English course for presidential scholars. They wrote a pamphlet. As Honors Director, he did not approve, but had no say on the course content. The orientation seminar that Honors gives on Intro to the program (HONORS 102) -- he called it basically, a glorified Honors advising course. This director tried to put content into this, and he had Rosenthal sign off on it, but he said it was a stretch to call this curriculum development. He views Honors as an advising and a recruiting unit.

The second former director said he would beg, borrow, and plead with faculty for Honors courses. He had no purview in curricular review. No judgement in courses. No sign off authority. They did workshops. They did lecture series. There are no curricular processes at all. It’s enrichment exercises, going to concerts. These “Honors Exploration” topics.

I talked with a person this weekend who did these Honors Exploration topics. He said that his course is for people who are curious on the topic. There’s no credit. He said, “These experiences are not courses that I can see on Campus Solutions. I am provided a roster by Honors and it is a pass/fail experience.” The pass/fail is so that Honors can monitor whether there was completion of these activities; this is needed to maintain status in the Honors program.

I had a meeting with Amy Hurd this morning. She verified that she posted the recent interim director search with HR. She also verified that the only other permanent director in the past 10+ years was Rocio Rivadeneyra, but she couldn’t remember if it was a Panel of Ten or not. She said she doesn’t know if there’s going to be a permanent Honors Director search this year or not.

We talked about the Honors Mindset Seminar. She agreed that it was run by the advisors and it’s really more of an advising session. She says it’s also kind of a stretch to call that curriculum. We also discussed the Advanced Honors Seminars. She says Honors provides the shell but there’s no direction discussion as to what’s in the syllabus.

Completion of these are required to “maintain honors status.” However, unlike the Honors Explorations (the lecture series kinds of things), the HON 102 Mindset Seminar and HON 202 Advanced Seminars are in the catalog and students do receive units for them and they’re on the transcript. So, is this “curriculum” that warrants a Panel of Ten search?

She thought the case is weak, which matched the description of the previous Honors Director who created the Honors Mindset Seminar.

I went into so much detail on what I have done to investigate the question from the constituent so that it can be clear to everyone that I am not dragging my feet and hiding this topic, like I was being accused of. I did not think it was prudent to bring the topic to Exec when we didn’t even know if it was a Panel of Ten search, and the previous cases are not, and I find some of this Honors curriculum confusing, so I did some legwork on it.

The constitution states, “A faculty may submit a matter to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee may include such items on the agenda to the Academic Senate or may recommend consideration of the matter to the appropriate University board, committee or administrative officer.”

I’m just going to say that the crux of, in my opinion, whether or not the Honors Director should be a Panel of Ten search is whether or not there’s a curricular component. And I’m going to suggest that we submit that question to the Provost and he can have a discussion with Amy Hurd.

Senator Garrahy: I have a clarification question because I actually spent time looking at the Bylaws today—which is stunning reading in the afternoon—and I just need some clarification. In October 12 2005 the Panel of Ten membership was revised to say “…tenure track faculty only…” and “…members selected to chairs search committees for positions other than those listed below amended to Academic Affairs administrators that report directly to the Provost.” But the Honors Director doesn’t, correct?

Senator Horst: Right. But then, I think a year or two years ago, we revised 3.2.13 again to include this curricular language. So, that’s the part that’s down in I. that says…

Senator Nikolaou: They report directly to the Provost and involve curriculum…

Senator Horst: AND involve curriculum.

Senator Cline: And. Okay.

Senator Horst: It says, “…and involve curriculum, faculty or staff evaluations or supervision…”

President Kinzy: So, not “or.”

Senator Horst: Yes. It is “and.”

President Kinzy: So, therefore…

Senator Cline: Yeah, both of the items have not been met.

Senator Horst: Yes.

Senator Otto: I just wanted to ask a question because I’m in a department that doesn’t have an undergraduate program in it. Who has the curricular oversight for Honors, in terms of sort of the program, of structuring the program?

Senator Horst: That’s a really good question. And there’s the Honor’s thing that’s actually in the catalog: the advanced thing and then the Honors Seminar. The advanced honors program that was started a couple of years ago was just signed off on by Jonathan Rosenthal. I asked that very same question because there’s been some recent revisions to the advanced seminars. Amy Hurd said she just signed off on it. And I said is it part of the curricular process? And she said no, because Honors doesn’t really belong to any particular college. But it’s sort of this grey area, because they are actually offering units and there’s been a lot of discussion offline as to me not handling this issue. So, I’d rather still ask the question of the Provost, whether or not there’s a curricular component to the Honors.

President Kinzy: But that says “and.” You have to report to the Provost and have curricular. But this position doesn’t report to the Provost. So, by definition it doesn’t. Am I missing something?

Senator Horst: I’m going to push back. David Marx, who chaired the AABC committee, he thinks this should be a Panel of Ten search. He chaired the AABC that crafted the language. So, there are Senators who have a question as to whether or not there’s enough of a curricular component here to warrant not necessarily be a direct report to the Provost.

Motion by Senator Cline, seconded by Senator Miller, to send this to the Provost for consideration.

Provost Tarhule: What should the Provost do when he gets it?

Senator Horst: He can report back to us. So, the question is, is there meaningful oversight to the curricular component for the Honors Director position? It’s a real question. I really don’t know.

Senator Nikolaou: When I look at the Bylaws, for example, if I go to the Honors Council, the function says, “to recommend the addition and/or deletion of required courses.” Which is clearly curriculum.

Senator Cline: Which is the Honors Council.

Senator Nikolaou: But they are ex-officio.

Provost Tarhule: That’s not creation. Those courses exist in departments and it’s about which ones picking and deleting. Is that considered curriculum?

Senator Nikolaou: And I think that’s why in the policy it says involve curriculum. That’s what Martha was saying is that it’s a grey area. So, what do we mean with “involve?”

Senator Horst: And what is curriculum? You can throw that one in there too.

Senator Nikolaou: Yes. And also, if you see on the CGE, the Director of the Honors Council, it is included as one of the ex-officio members. So, if the Director of Honors doesn’t have anything to do curriculum, why is that person listed as an ex-officio in the Council of General Education? So, it seems that they are involved in the curriculum somehow, but what is the extent of the involvement. And that’s why it is a question mark.

Senator Horst: Again, I’m just going to say, I talked to these people who’ve had the position for 10 years and there’s a lot of talk about curriculum but what they do really isn’t curriculum based in terms of oversight.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. And I’m not arguing in favor of one or the other. It’s just that when this involves curriculum, these two charges show that it involves curriculum, but then it depends, does it go to the level where it’s actually really in-depth curriculum involvement?

The motion was unanimously approved.

Provost Tarhule: What’s the deadline for this?

Senator Cline: Probably before you announce a new search.

Senator Horst: Which we don’t even know if it’s going to happen this year or next year.

Senator Cline: Yeah. Because I think some of this can be solved in the writing of the job description.

Senator Horst: Just report back to us in a timely manner.

Provost Tarhule: Okay.

***New Policy on Educational Leave for Civil Service Employee (Senate or Non-Senate)***

Senator Horst: The new policy on Educational Leave for Civil Service Employees. There’s a couple of policies, 3.4.8 is the Educational Leave for Administrative/Professional Personnel is right now with Faculty Affairs. Dimitrios is trying to align the language in there with the Sabbatical policy. There’s also language regarding Educational Leave in 3.1.11 Leave of Absence policy. That’s currently going through Planning and Finance. As we were reviewing this Janice Bonneville mentioned that they want to create a Civil Service Educational Leave policy that would pertain to civil service. She asked me whether or not it should go through the Senate. I had a brief conversation with Stuart Palmer, who is the chair of the Civil Service Council. He supported the idea that HR and Legal could work directly with the Civil Service body, because it would be language directly related to civil service. Since we talked about this, Dimitrios and I are trying to untie exactly what educational leave means, in terms of this Sabbatical policy. But Janice was wondering if it would be okay if she worked just with the civil service and not at all with the Senate on that? Does anyone have any objection to that not being a Senate policy? Okay. Everybody likes that idea. Okay. Very good.

***Distributed Communications:***

***RERIP discussion (Dan Elkins, Dan Stephens, and Provost Tarhule) (Presentation 11/03/21)***

***10.21.21.10 RERIP metrics FY 22\_draft 10-21-21***

Senator Horst: All right. RERIP has been around for a while. This was all started by my husband. There were a lot of conversations about it last year. And this year, Dimitrios, myself, Dan Elkins, and the Provost, and VP Stephens had a discussion about how to get this in front of the Senate because we thought that it was important to have the Academic Senate included in this conversation. They agreed and they also did some revisions to the third point in the RERIP metrics which a lot of people pointed to last year in our committee discussions on this. So, this is an item that is in all of the internal committees Issues Pending folders. The Planning and Finance Committee actually looked at it and David Marx made a motion to get rid of it. I said it’s hopefully going to go in front of the Senate. He liked that idea. Are there any questions about this before we consider it for the agenda?

Senator Cline: So, it’s been added to all of our committee folders. So, if we send it to Senate it’s not going to be in any particular committee, it’s just providing documents to the Senators? Is that why it’s in there?

Senator Horst: Well, it was last year, the Senate chair assigned it to every single internal committee, I think. I’m hoping we can have a conversation at the Senate level. We can have a presentation which was the original thrust of my husband’s wishes that the Senate be involved in it; then we can give our comments, maybe endorse it, and then we can move on.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. Also, the third part of what you see in front of you, the Provost office reworked it and now it addresses most of the concerns that I had heard throughout the last year, which was more about the way it was previously was written. It seemed that it interfered with the curriculum and you are forced to do this and this and this, which was not the goal of the program. So, it’s much more clear now.

 ***From Human Resources: (Mention in VP Stephens Administrator Remarks?)***

***10.21.21.08 Policy 3.1.48 Emergency Paid Sick Leave - Expired 9/30/21***

***10.21.21.09 Important Notice\_ End of federal Emergency Paid Sick Leave benefit***

Senator Horst: Legal emailed me about the Emergency Paid Sick Leave benefit. It was a federal program and it expired. The memo went out to the campus notifying everyone of the policy expiring. Is there anything else people would like to do with this, because it’s a deletion of a policy? Do we want to consider having Janice Bonneville come in to have further discussion at Senate, or are we satisfied with the memo that she sent out?

Senator Garrahy: I’m satisfied with the memo she sent out.

President Kinzy: I haven’t heard any complaints about it. It was in place just for COVID. It was a federal regulation, and that regulation is gone.

***10.20.21.01 National Immigrants Day Installation***

[***6.1.13 Sound Amplification***](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/facilities/6-1-13.shtml)

Senator Horst: The Provost informed me at our meeting on October 18 that he denied the sound amplification request for National Immigrants Day. He expressed a desire for clear criteria to be written in the Sound Amplification policy that would allow for the evaluation of academic programs that want to have sound amplification on the Quad, and it would have to be in a content neutral fashion. If you look at the last part of the Sound Amplification policy in exceptions, it says “Exceptions may be granted to the place and/or time restrictions of this policy in certain cases. Typical exceptions to this sound amplification policy have included Springfest, Festival ISU, Passages and other "welcoming" activities, and Homecoming activities.” So, it doesn’t mention anything about academic programs, it’s all Student Affairs sponsored. I don’t want to speak for the Provost, but he was in a bind and he turned to the policy and there’s no clear criteria. So, he asked me to explore creating clear criteria. I have a meeting with Legal on November 3 to start that process because it is very technical, and it has to do with free speech. Last time there was a whole task force that worked on a lot of policies that had to do with campus space. So, I’m just wondering would you like me to work with Legal to try to get a draft to the Executive Committee? Would you like to do an ad hoc committee? Would you like to do anything more formal?

Senator Cline: We just passed this, right? Last year.

Senator Garrahy: AABC looked at this ad nauseum. We thought we had it.

Senator Horst: But the Provost has a desire for more clarity.

Provost Tarhule: So, I’m going to be speaking at it this event. I support it. But that’s not how a decision is made. They want to have amplification and they applied to the committee that approves these requests and they were denied. So, they appealed to me to overturn that decision. I consulted with Legal and Legal thinks this is not a good thing to approve because of the content neutral requirement. If you approve this, then you can also have groups that maybe we don’t want to support what to come to the Quad, give a talk and amplify it, and we won’t be in a position to say no because we approved this one. So, Legal was very strongly opposed to approving it for those reasons. I went to the Vice Presidents, because they, too, will have to approve a similar request, maybe appealed to them; they looked at it and considered all the issues and they were all very concerned about the ability to approve this. I talked to the group about whether there could be a back-up option. We suggested possibly using a different location while we try to figure this out. They were opposed to that. They didn’t want to use a different location. We thought about whether you could put a limit to the amount of amplification that they would do. We had Chief Woodruff and people from Emergency Services go out and tried some of the microphones that we had. They mapped it to have a nice report of showing how far the sound carried and they came back and said no. The sound carried too far, beyond the limit considered amplification, so we shouldn’t approve it. That’s what I did on the back end in reaching that decision.

But it does raise a number of questions. Under what conditions can we approve people holding an event on the Quad? It says exceptions may be given. What are those conditions? If it’s a pure academic event, maybe that’s one thing. In this case, part of the concern was there are external groups, groups not affiliated with the University, who are also going to be taking part in the event. They will be coming on campus, which makes it much harder to argue that it’s completely academic. It also raises the issue of other groups that may then be affiliated with groups off campus that maybe we might have concerns about. So, I felt put in a tough situation where I couldn’t make any decision that would satisfy anybody. So, I thought that this group should think more thoroughly about the conditions under which we would allow this amplification. Maybe we don’t need to refer back and redo the policy. We might have something like an implementation ad hoc committee. So, that committee may look at how do we implement this policy. It doesn’t work like that?

Senator Horst: I think we have to craft new language for the exceptions.

Provost Tarhule: Yeah. Whatever it is. But we pulled out certain things up front and said this may be exempt. If we could figure out the type of academic type events that could be exempted, I think that will give us a template from which to work. Right now, I wasn’t sure, so I took a conservative position. We can set a precedent that we can’t be able to pull back from.

President Kinzy: I will say, four days ago there was a preacher with amplification out on the Quad. So, that’s where we… people show up with amplification and we have to tell them no or they will disrupt.

Senator Garrahy: And I do recall from our discussion of that policy, I recall us looking at academic programs. You know, we were talking about our colleagues in Music and how they practice outside sometimes and how that comes into play, but it wasn’t a big issue. So, I recall it being kind of in-house type situations, if you will.

Senator Otto: I just wanted to say that I think it’s a mistake not to allow this. I think that this policy is just chilling in terms of free speech, but I think it also goes against the aims and mission of our institution. We are trying to educate student in civic engagement. We all went to multiple schools. We all had people on the Quad. Maybe it wasn’t always something educational or that you wanted to listen to, but it’s part of the experience of being in college. And I just think it’s really troubling that we’re not allowing this. Also, for the folks that are doing collective bargaining, to do teach-ins. I think that’s a problem too, that we’re not allowing that.

Senator Horst: The question is the amplification. So, my question to the group is, it’s not the decision that the Provost made, my question to the group is this. Hhe reached out to me and said, wow, this exceptions language is really poor and sort of tied my hands, and I can’t come up with a way to justify an educational event. So, I have a meeting with Legal set up. Would you like me to just work with Legal to come up with new language and then forward it to the Executive Committee? Would you like to form an ad hoc committee?

Senator Spranger: This is a little bit different but sponsored and not sponsored RSOs have different guidelines. So, you can do different things, you get different funding. So, like this is something that’s being sponsored by a college, right? Like an academic thing? Because a preacher wouldn’t be sponsored by an academic group. So, accounting can sponsor RSOs and they kind of are responsible for them. So, if there’s a group from the University that’s sponsoring an event, I feel like they could have different guidance than not affiliated people.

Senator Horst: That’s a good point. This was actually sponsored by some colleges.

Provost Tarhule: Not quite. The decision isn’t based on sponsoring. The legal decision rests on content neutral. It’s not the sponsoring as was explained to me. It’s not who sponsors it. It’s that it should be content neutral. The decision has to be content neutral. You’re not making the decision based on the content that is to be presented. There’s no question that this event is deserving, and we are supportive, and we would like to see it go ahead. By the way, it’s going ahead. It’s the amplification. The decision was not denied. The event will hold. But should it be amplified. As I’ve said, I, myself, am speaking at the event. So, it’s not about this event. It’s about the kind of precedent that it may set for other events, other people who use this decision that we may not be as supportive of. Think Charlottesville. That’s exactly how that happened, right. I don’t know if you guys remember Charlottesville. That’s exactly how that happens. We approve this because we think it’s a good event. We’re sponsoring it. We’re supporting it. And then another group that we’re not quite supportive of comes and says, “iIf you approve that you have to approve this.” And then legally we won’t be able to disapprove that event. That is the situation we are in. This event is fine. We would all like to see it go forward. We would all like to see it happen. We just want to make sure that it doesn’t create an opportunity—at least Legal’s position—it doesn’t create an opportunity where those other groups that we don’t want, or we wouldn’t want to support can take advantage of it.

So, for me, how do I allow events like this to go forward…

President Kinzy: With amplification.

Provost Tarhule: With amplification. That’s the key thing, and not open the door to those other events that lets in hate groups that may want to come and speak on our campus with amplification. It’s not just for me, it’s for all of us. So, we need to think through, we want this to happen, we want events like this to happen, how can we capture that in our policy in a way that doesn’t prevent us from doing this and yet doesn’t open us to that kind of vulnerability.

Senator Horst: Rodrigo, would you like to be involved in the discussion with legal?

Senator Villalobos: Yeah, I can be there.

Senator Cline: I think it would be smart to have the Student Body President, Senate Chair, and Legal, because Legal can look at precedent of other campus’ and how they’re handling it. We all face the same issue, right. Wanting to support certain events loudly and also not wanting hate speech screamed into our classrooms from outside. So, how are they handling it at other campuses, and I think Legal would be the best person to interpret how those are going forward.

Senator Horst: Would that do it for everyone? Rodrigo and I would work with Legal to try to craft some exceptions language.

Senators (several at once): Yes.

Senator Otto: But what is the point of having this if people can’t hear the speakers? My understanding is they are trying to have it outside for safety reasons.

President Kinzy: No. No, it’s not for safety reasons. I have to say the event was approved by the University. It did not request amplification. That’s a part of every approval on the Quad, always has been. That was changed. But now the point is that it can’t disrupt other classes. So, academic mission can be in conflict. If the marching band is a class, and the marching band decided the only place it could practice was on the Quad, would we want them practicing on the quad for all of their practices, even though it’s an academic event?

Senator Otto: The marching band practices outside my window in DeGarmo when I’m teaching for six hours. That’s just part of it. I mean, that isn’t upsetting to me or my students.

Senator Horst: The communication with the Provost can certainly happen with an email to him or a conversation on the floor asking for further information about his decision, but I’m just trying to steer what I’m going to do with Legal. I think it would be great if Rodrigo and I would work on it, just to try to get further clarification on that exceptions. Because I agree with his assessment that that part of the policy is completely unworked. There’s not much detail in there at all. And it has no language regarding how to assess the academic presentation, it just talks about welcome week. So, that’s what I wanted to ask the group.

Senator Cline: Anything you come up with will come back to us?

Senator Horst: Absolutely.

Senator Cline: Okay. So, this is not the end of the conversation.

Senator Horst: Last time it was this huge task force that was run by Brent Paterson. Okay.

***From Academic Affairs Committee:***

***Reinstatement Committee Memo 20-21***

***Reinstatement Committee Annual Report 2020-21***

Senator Cline: We reviewed this report and didn’t have any questions or concerns.

***From Academic Affairs Committee: (Information Item 11/03/21)***

***10.21.21.02 Policy 2.1.14 Withdrawal Policy Current Copy***

***10.21.21.03 Policy 2.1.14 Withdrawal Policy Mark Up***

***10.21.21.01 Policy 2.1.14 Withdrawal policy Clean Copy 2021***

Senator Cline: The Academic Affairs Committee spent the first several weeks of our meetings working on the Withdrawal policy. It’s the kind of policy I think of as kind of an octopus policy; it has a million feet everywhere and there was a lot of follow up on it. Essentially, before the pandemic started, Jess Ray and Amy Hurd had asked to have this conversation about the Withdrawal policy. The reason they wanted to have the conversation is because it seems to be the case in all academic institutions across Illinois that they’re unifying policies: the policy for the withdrawal date, the last date to withdrawal from courses, and the last day to withdrawal from the University. We were very bad in this instance in that our withdrawal date for our classes is very early (at 8 weeks) and we were on two separate systems. So, he was going to ask to unify these things and to think about it. Then the pandemic hit, and the Senate made some action to suspend the normal rules and to suspend those rules in semesters that begin with a declaration of a health emergency from the Governor, to make the withdrawal the last day of the 14th week. So, an extension to give people as much leeway as possible. Now as we are staring down the removal of that emergency order, the question again was, do we want to unify the policies to have the same date and what should that date be? In the end, after many conversations with Jess Ray and feedback from many of the process partners on campus, the committee decided to, yes, stream line them into one deadline, and to make that deadline the end of the 12th week of class. It’s a little bit moved forward from the 14th week, but we are in concert now with many of our peer institutions around the state. So, what you have in front of you is a new policy that combines those deadlines and then sets the deadline at the end of 12 weeks.

Senator Nikolaou: I’m thinking do we need to send it back for a little more cleaning up? My main question is, because now we say withdrawal from a course or courses, and it has been changed to say “…when a student drops one, several, or all courses…” By default, “all courses” means withdrawing from the University as defined in the second section. And then the second section, paragraph one, two, and three are exactly the same as in the previous section. The ones on the next page are exactly the same. Then there are two paragraphs that pretty much talk about the same thing in the same section. So, regardless of the circumstance of withdrawal and the added students living in campus housing, they talk about the same thing. So, that’s repetitive. And I don’t know why the separate section is needed, because it seems that it has been taken care of by adding all courses in the first part.

Senator Cline: So, there are some others of the committee here who can comment, but essentially, Jess Ray suggested that we have two outlines: those who are dropping a course/courses and then students who define withdrawal from the University as a separate action. So, this is really about student perception about what that action is. One of our big concerns is that students have not been properly communicated to about what that process looks like; there is no withdrawal from the University procedure. It’s dropping all your classes, right. So, he had it always set up as these two things for students to read. We can take it back and look at it, but it was suggested by Jess that we should have them as separate parts of the policy because they are seen differently by the students.

Senator Otto: They have different consequences.

Senator Cline: Yeah. They have different consequences for the students. Yeah.

Senator Nikolaou: But that’s not communicated in the policy, because the consequences are exactly the same. So, the policy doesn’t specify the consequences.

Senator Cline: What consequences are the same? A student dropping a single class and a student dropping two classes could go from just dropping a class to falling below half time or part time.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. But the first part says “or all courses”, which means if I drop all courses. What would be the difference between dropping all courses for the withdrawal for a course or courses and the second part where it says withdrawal from the University?

Senator Horst: Could you clarify that with Jess Ray before?

Senator Cline: Yeah. I have half the committee here with me, I think we can make that when a student drops one or more courses in which they are enrolled.

Senator Horst: But not all.

Provost Tarhule: Could a student drop all courses without withdrawing from the University?

Senator Cline: So, there is no procedure to withdrawal from the University; I think part of Jess’ concern is that if someone is at 14 ½ weeks, they can appeal to the University to say that they were in the hospital or somehow incapacitated and unable to meet the 12-week deadline, and that would allow them to withdrawal, but they wouldn’t have to move out of their dorms, so to say. Right. So, they would still be active as students but withdrawn at the same time. The problem with the withdrawal policy is that there are so many octopus’ hands, right. There’s housing. There’s finance. There’s student aid. There are all of these things. So, one of the concerns about that is, if a student is still able to appeal because of being incapacitated or somehow unable -- maybe say military leave and unable to get to a computer in time -- that they could technically withdrawal after the withdrawal date and just continue into the next semester without being fully disenrolled from the campus. Because there is no withdrawal from the University, technically. But the students refer to it in those terms.

Senator Horst: Okay. Could you clarify with Jess some language about what Dimitrios is saying?

Senator Cline: Yeah. I think what we can do is just do “…if a student drops one or more courses in which they are enrolled…” We can probably easily do that, but I can take that back.

Senator Horst: Is that fine, Dimitrios?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. I’m fine if we have the separate section because now it has the “all courses” and then the second part specifies that if you drop all courses this is known as withdrawing from the University, and that’s how it’s defined in the first paragraph under Withdrawal from the University. You know, if I read it, I’m saying, “Well, am I under that? Am I under the other part?”

Senator Horst: Maybe add some language in the Withdrawal policy about if a student drops all their courses, then the Withdrawal from the University part may apply.

Senator Cline: Can I ask a question? I have four of us in the room from the committee, and I know that there’s a time sensitive concern for Academic Affairs because they need this to be approved in time for the machinations of the spring semester to be fully going.

Senator Horst: Right. So, you could work on it with your committee, and it can still go to the Senate as an Information Item. You can develop some language with Dimitrios and Jess Ray before your committee meeting, get it approved or not, and then at the information session, you can bring up this concern. I think the policy still looks pretty good.

Senator Cline: Right. We changed that first sentence to like, “the following policy applies when a student drops one or more courses but not all of the courses in which they are enrolled,” or something like that?

Provost Tarhule: What if you just say, “if a student wishes to leave the University…” because I think a student can drop all courses and not disenroll from the University. They can drop all courses if they have a medical issue, or they just want to come back later. So, they aren’t leaving the University.

Senator Cline: Sure. This is something that Jess and I talked about. Again, this principle is written for students who are living in campus housing, and other things. This is for campus housing to use as a policy. So, a student can drop all of their courses and then just re-enroll the next semester, right. They have like a year of their enrollment approvals. But if they’re living on campus, or they have financial aid, there are certain guidelines that those offices need in order to implement their policies. So, yes, there is no official withdrawal from the University. You can drop all your classes and not break with the University forever; but those offices need some sort of policy in terms of carrying out if a student is in housing and needs to be removed from housing or has financial aid that needs to be managed.

Senator Otto: They have to move out of housing immediately if they drop all their courses, is what Jess told us.

Senator Garrahy: And I have that situation at a graduate level, so this doesn’t apply, but they have to return any equipment loaned to them from the University. There’s a whole list for undergraduates and I’d assume graduates.

Senator Cline: In the policy, the graduate students are listed and that they need to get clearance from the graduate school before they… The issue with graduate students is dropping courses that take you below half time, and then fully withdrawing from both of your courses. But again, there is no technical cessation of relationship with the institution. And so, that’s why I’m saying withdrawal is sort of otherwise known as withdrawal because there isn’t really a technical process on this campus.

Senator Horst: yeah. I think just clarify what Dimitrios is saying. Okay.

Senator Nikolaou: I have a couple more too. So, there are two paragraphs that are the same. So, we need to decide which one needs to be kept.

Senator Stewart: Actually, they’re almost the same but one of them talks at the very end about fee reductions. The other one talks about something else. So, there’s actually a very minor difference.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. But they can be combined.

Senator Stewart: No, I agree.

Senator Nikolaou: The one that you added above accommodation -- “students living in campus housing” -- that one is pretty much the same as the one that starts, “Regardless of the circumstances of withdrawal….” Because it still talks about you must contact University Housing to get clearance about room and board, Financial Aid.

Senator Cline: Right. Again, I understand that they are repeated, and they are repeated with intension. There are two different policies contained within this.

Senator Nikolaou: They are under the Withdrawal from the University. They are both in the same section. So, they are totally repetitive.

Senator Cline: Okay.

Senator Horst: Okay. So, your first comment was about if a student drops everything from the University isn’t that withdrawing from the University. You need to clean up the definition of withdrawal from courses. Your second comment is about the repetitiveness of the “regardless of the circumstances of withdrawal,” and “student living in campus housing.”

Senator Nikolaou: Yes.

Senator Horst: Okay.

Senator Nikolaou: And then the related comment was, if we say that we want to have two separate policies, don’t we need one of these paragraphs to be under the first section? Because if I drop courses and I drop under full time, I still need to contact Financial Aid to determine the impact of the withdrawal and the future financial aid. And I think we still need to keep the initiating and the contact parts at the end of the policy.

Senator Cline: So, “In the event that withdrawing from a course or courses causes a student to fall below full time…” you’re staying that that needs to also have something having to do with…

Senator Nikolaou: Well, I don’t know if the intention was to have, let’s say, the paragraph that starts with “Regardless” if the intention was to actually be under the first subsection, the one that calls Withdrawal from the Course or Courses, and then they knew you added where you say “students living in campus housing” that it should be under the second subsection.

Senator Horst: Don’t you think we can address some of this in the information stage if she doesn’t get the text done? I mean, I think the policy is basically there, the stuff that you’re saying is the way the language is spelled out, it’s not necessarily the content. Right? Or do people think it’s not ready for an information item review?

Senator Nikolaou: I’m just bringing them up now so I’m not bringing it up in the Senate and we’re taking time from the full Senate.

Senator Horst: Right. But you see what I’m saying, right. The decision is whether or not to put it on the agenda.

Senator Cline: That wording about “Regardless of circumstances of withdrawal” is under both. “A student should consult the Office of the University Registrar Service Center for questions regarding adjustment in charges for specific withdrawal dates during any instructional term. Regardless of the circumstances of withdrawal, the student is responsible for returning and laboratory equipment or library materials issues to them and paying any outstanding parking fines.” That’s under the Withdrawal from a Course or Courses.

Senator Nikolaou: Right. But it doesn’t say, for example, the Financial Aid part. So, if that’s the big component, that’s why we explicitly spell out Financial Aid. We can talk about that one.

***From Planning and Finance Committee: (Information Item 11/03/21)***

***10.21.21.04 Policy 3.1.29 Right of Access to Personnel Files Current Copy***

***10.21.21.05 Policy 3.1.29 Right of Access to Personnel Files MARKUP***

***10.21.21.06 Policy 3.1.29 Right of Access to Personnel Files CLEAN COPY***

Senator Horst: Planning and Finance did a review of the Right of Access to Personnel Files. This was motivated by a draft from the URC from 2015 where they tried to merge some of the language, which is in the ASPT. After discussions with Janice Bonneville, she clarified that this policy needs to refer to an official personnel file and the ASPT file can be referenced; but that’s not what this policy is talking about. So, I think when this goes up, it needs to go up with the URC changes. I notified Chad Buckley that the committee wasn’t recommending his changes, and he said, okay, he wasn’t there in 2015.

Senator Nikolaou: The only small thing that I had was maybe that there is one point where they need to specify that it is business days. In the first sentence under Access to Personnel Files, “within seven working days” so probably should be business days. And then at the end of the sentence is says, “an additional seven days,” so I’m assuming it’s seven business days.

Senator Horst: Okay. And I’ll clarify that because this is all governed by an act.

***From Planning and Finance Committee: (Consent Agenda 11/03/21)***

***10.21.21.14 Policy 3.7.1 Graduate Assistant Appointment Procedure Current Copy***

***10.21.21.15 Policy 3.7.1 Graduate Assistant Appointment Procedure Mark Up***

***10.21.21.16 Policy 3.7.1-Graduate Assistant Appointment Procedure CLEAN COPY***

Senator Horst: This was reviewed by the Planning and Finance Committee. You see the changes. They’re asking for it to be considered for the Consent Agenda.

Senator Nikolaou: One small thing. In the contact it should say Director of Graduate Studies because we don’t know what director they’re talking about. And then at the end of the first paragraph it says, “A Graduate Assistant receives a tuition waiver plus a monthly stipend.” Do we need to specify that it is a full tuition waiver? Is there a GA that doesn’t get full tuition waiver?

Provost Tarhule: I would leave it as is because what if we need to pro-rate the tuition.

***From Faculty Affairs Committee: (Consent Agenda 11/03/21)***

***10.21.21.11 Policy 3.2.3 Academic Notice of Appointments - Current Copy***

***10.21.21.12 Policy 3.2.3 Academic Notice of Appointments - Mark Up***

***10.21.21.13 Policy 3.2.3 Academic Notice of Appointments - Clean Copy***

Senator Horst: They changed the title of the Provost, and other trivial things.

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

***Proposed* Academic Senate Meeting Agenda**

**Wednesday, November 3, 2021**

**7:00 P.M.**

**OLD MAIN ROOM, BONE STUDENT CENTER**

***Call to Order***

***Roll Call***

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

***RERIP discussion (Associate Vice President for Academic Fiscal Management Dan Elkins)
10.21.21.10 RERIP metrics FY 22\_draft 10-21-21***

***Chairperson's Remarks***

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

***Administrators' Remarks***

* ***President Terri Goss Kinzy***
* ***Provost Aondover Tarhule***
* ***Vice President of Student Affairs Levester Johnson***
* ***Vice President of Finance and Planning Dan Stephens***

***Action Item:***

***Faculty Affairs Committee:***

***10.07.21.06 Policy 1.8 Integrity policy - Current Copy***

***10.12.21.03 Policy 1.8 Integrity policy - Mark Up***

***10.12.21.04 Policy 1.8 Integrity policy - Clean Copy***

***Information Items:***

***From Rules Committee:***

***01.21.21.11 COUNCIL ON GENERAL EDUCATION-current***

***10.13.21.01 COUNCIL ON GENERAL EDUCATION charge Mark Up***

***10.12.21.08 COUNCIL ON GENERAL EDUCATION Charge-CLEAN Copy***

***From Faculty Affairs Committee:***

***10.07.21.01 Policy 7.4.7 Filling Grant Positions - Current Copy***

***10.07.21.02 PROPOSE DELETION of Policy 7.4.7 Filling Grant Positions - Mark Up***

***From Faculty Affairs Committee:***

***10.07.21.03 Policy 3.2.1 Academic Personnel - Current Copy***

***10.12.21.01 Policy 3.2.1 Academic Personnel - Mark Up***

***10.12.21.02 Policy 3.2.1 Academic Personnel - Clean Copy***

***From Academic Affairs Committee:***

***10.21.21.02 Policy 2.1.14 Withdrawal Policy Current Copy***

***10.21.21.03 Policy 2.1.14 Withdrawal Policy Mark Up***

***10.21.21.01 Policy 2.1.14 Withdrawal policy Clean Copy 2021***

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

***10.21.21.04 Policy 3.1.29 Right of Access to Personnel Files Current Copy***

***10.21.21.05 Policy 3.1.29 Right of Access to Personnel Files MARKUP***

***10.21.21.06 Policy 3.1.29 Right of Access to Personnel Files CLEAN COPY
08.19.15.01 - URC recommendations 2015\_ not accepted by PF2021\_3.1.29 RightAccessPersonnelFiles***

***Consent Agenda:***

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

***10.21.21.14 Policy 3.7.1 Graduate Assistant Appointment Procedure Current Copy***

***10.21.21.15 Policy 3.7.1 Graduate Assistant Appointment Procedure Mark Up***

***10.21.21.16 Policy 3.7.1-Graduate Assistant Appointment Procedure CLEAN COPY***

***From Faculty Affairs Committee:***

***10.21.21.11 Policy 3.2.3 Academic Notice of Appointments - Current Copy***

***10.21.21.12 Policy 3.2.3 Academic Notice of Appointments - Mark Up***

***10.21.21.13 Policy 3.2.3 Academic Notice of Appointments - Clean Copy***

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

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

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

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

***Rules Committee: Senator Stewart***

***Communications***

***Adjournment or Hard stop at 8:45 p.m.***

Motion by Senator Nikolaou, seconded by Senator Garrahy, to approve the proposed Senate agenda. The motion was approved, with friendly amendments shown above.

***Adjournment***Motion by Senator Miller, seconded by Senator Small, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.

**Attendance**

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