**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

**MONDAY, November 8, 2021**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

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

***Oral Communication:***

Senator Horst: I had meetings with Legal and I wanted to tell you about them. There was a lot of discussion about the SGA and its current status as an internal committee. I’ve met with Jon Davenport on that. Legal would also like to have a meeting with him, Senator Villalobos, Lisa Huson, myself, and others to continue to explore what it means to have SGA as an external committee in terms of the Open Meetings Act. Basically, the legal department is really taking a serious look at our documents in light of the Open Meetings Act and giving us their opinion, which I welcome.

We had a meeting with Rodrigo, Lisa Huson, and Wendy Smith regarding the Amplification policy, so we’re working on that. We should have a draft in a month or two; sometimes after the break, I think.

I met with Lisa Huson and Teri Hammer where they discussed our Consent Agenda. The Consent Agenda has been in place, in terms of approving the curricular items, for 20 years. But in a recent Bylaws change we expanded the Consent Agenda to include the minutes and include items deemed editorial and approved to be on the Consent Agenda by the Executive Committee. They didn’t agree with the way we were handling the Consent Agenda, and they said it’s nowhere in the Open Meetings Act. I did find a Consent Agenda discussion in the Open Meetings Act and I have documents for the Rules Committee to look at. The Consent Agenda is used by entities like the City of Bloomington and the Illinois State Board of Education; they have consent agendas, but they still go up for a vote. So, the way I understand it after researching it today, it’s more of a docket of things that the body deems not in need debate or discussion, like the minutes.

Senator Cline: The body meaning?

Senator Horst: The Academic Senate. So, they sign off on their desire to debate the minutes or curricular items. But they still have to go up in front of the body. Today I looked at different town councils and the City of Bloomington, and I crafted some potential language for the Bylaws. The way I understand it, and the way Legal understands it, is that we can have a Consent Agenda where things are deemed routine and we can basically approve them as a slate—that’s the enact by one motion—and we can say they’re non-debatable, but we can’t say we’re never going to vote on this in a public meeting. That’s the part that we can’t do. And that’s the part that Legal, in their opinion, said it’s not allowed under the Open Meetings Act.

I’ve had a meeting with Amy Hurd, and I explained about the curricular items and my concerns about the deadlines. I asked her to develop a list of deadlines in which we would have to have the curricular items approved by this point, and what would be some items we would have to do right away, versus ones we could lump together in one big vote. She said program changes have to go through various IBHE stages. So, I’ve asked her to make me a document detailing that. Basically, the Open Meetings Act trumps our Bylaws. But in our Bylaws, we talk about items on the Consent Agenda such as minutes and curricular items and changes that are editorial. We can still have all that, we just have to vote in a public meeting, and there’s no debate. Does that make sense to everyone?

Senator Stewart: Would you like the specific thing fast tracked or should this be rolled into the broader set of Bylaws revisions that we’re engaged in?

Senator Horst: We are just going to start doing this. The only thing that’s tricky is that it says we can do the minutes by Consent Agenda, but then it has this 10-day approval window. Cera and I talked about this, and she doesn’t think she can get the minutes done, and then have them go on a Consent Agenda, and then have them go on an agenda and satisfy the Open Meetings Act one month deadline. So, we can just do the minutes the old fashion way, and the first thing on the agenda will be the approval of the minutes. I think once we get through this batch of things that’s been approved on the Consent Agenda, we’ll just start doing the minutes the old fashion way until we can start lumping them in with the curricular items. And I put in this language about 48 hours; see what you guys think about that regarding the minutes. Because just the timing of the minutes, it’s hard to do it and still have it satisfy the one-month requirement of the Open Meetings Act.

To get to your question, I think we can still do the curricular items as a Consent Agenda and any little policies that we deem editorial, I just have to read them out loud at the meeting. At some point we will change the Bylaws to make it exactly correct, because we’re not technically approving things, we’re just waiving our right to debate them. We have to approve them as a slate. Does that make sense?

Senator Nikolaou: In terms of process, if we say these policies are in the Consent Agenda…. Let’s say there’s a Senator who wants to remove an item. Are we going to do it on the spot?

Senator Horst: No. If they want to remove an item, they have to notify us according to the language in the Bylaws. As soon as it passes that stage then they’ve waived their right to remove it.

Senator Nikolaou: So, let’s say we have three policies for the next meeting on the Consent Agenda. Let’s say I’m fine with two of them, but I have a question about the third one, that I don’t think it should be on the Consent Agenda.

Senator Horst: Then you have to flag it like we always have. You would have to send Cera a note and say pull it from the Consent Agenda, and you’re still going to do that.

Ms. Hazelrigg: I’m still going to send out the emails, post curricular items and policies on the webpage so people have time to review them.

Senator Horst: Currently, if you don’t flag it, it gets approved. In the new system, if you don’t flag, it’s non-debatable. And you can vote against the Consent Agenda, but you’re voting against the entire slate.

Senator Nikolaou: Right. But I’m thinking what if a Senator actually wants to remove an item on the spot?

Senator Horst: You guys can think about the Bylaws, but the way we have it is you have that 20-day window for policies and the 10-day window for curricular items. Items right now, if they’re on the Consent Agenda, they have to sit on there for 10 days and if you do nothing they’re approved. Right. And then if a policy sits on there for 20 days and nothing happens, it’s approved. Now it’s going to sit on there, and if you do nothing then it gets approved on the floor.

Senator Nikolaou: Well at some point we might need to clarify that in the full Senate. Because Senators may be thinking, oh, we’re going to talk about this item in that meeting, so I don’t think it should be on the Consent Agenda. I’m going to ask for it to be removed when we talk about it in the actual Senate meeting.

Senator Horst: But it’s not that way now.

Senator Nikolaou: But we don’t have it on the agenda. So, that’s the difference. Consent Agenda items don’t appear on the Academic Senate agenda. But now if I see all these items, and now I have a comment about this item I’m going to bring it up. So, we need to make it much more clear, because they are different processes.

Senator Cline: Parliamentary procedure allows you to pull something from the Consent Agenda. So, if we’re talking about OMA versus policy, I mean, in all governmental bodies if a Consent Agenda is brought to the floor anyone can pull any part of that off of the agenda to be discussed separately or to be voted on separately. That’s the rules according to the state statute. I think we’re kind of finding the policy blend. Right. I understand you concern. That’s how people expect it to function. If we’re going to put it on the agenda, we might need to just clarify.

Senator Horst: If you guys want to change it to where you can pull it at some point right at the meeting, we could do it that way. Just look at some examples. I’m just going by what we have established right now.

Senator Cline: I’m thinking, the only thing that I might raise, is if there’s a conflict of interest or something like that. So, in my position, sometimes I have to pull something because I have a conflict of interest with the University. I pull it from the Consent Agenda so I’m not voting on it. Right. So, if someone says there’s something on the Consent Agenda, and someone says, well, I can’t vote on that because I have a conflict of interest, for some reason, I’m not sure how that would appear, but there has to be a mechanism for that.

Senator Horst: And there is. The Bylaws.

Senator Cline: Yeah. As long as it’s clear. And I understand your concern, because it’s sort of combining two processes.

Senator Horst: Right. There’s a process that’s going to exist outside of the agenda. Maybe I’ll just send a note to the Senate explaining what we’re doing going forward with the Consent Agenda.

***Distributed Communications:***

***11.03.21.01 Senate Bylaws Article V.F Consent Agenda Current Copy (Dist. to Rules Committee)***

***Approval of Executive Committee minutes:***

* [***August 16, 2021***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/committee-sites/executive/agendas-minutes/Executive%20Committee%20Minutes2021-08-16.docx)
* [***August 30, 2021***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/committee-sites/executive/agendas-minutes/Executive%20Committee%20minutes%202021-08-30.docx)
* [***September 13, 2021***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/committee-sites/executive/agendas-minutes/Executive%20Committee%20minutes2021-09-13.docx)
* [***September 27, 2021***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/committee-sites/executive/agendas-minutes/Executive%20Committee%20Minutes2021-09-27.docx)

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

***From Planning and Finance: (Information Item 11/17/21)***

***11.04.21.02 Policy 3.1.13 Illinois State University Domestic Partner Benefit Program Current Copy***

***11.04.21.03 Policy 3.1.13 Illinois State University Domestic Partner Benefit Program Mark Up***

***11.03.21.07 Policy 3.1.13 Illinois State University Domestic Partner Benefit Clean Copy***

Senator Horst: Policy 3.1.13 is from the Planning and Finance Committee. They are also deleting the procedures, which Janice Bonneville called outdated. Any question about that?

Senator Stewart: It’s very minor but in most places, it’s being very careful about natural and adopted. But under the wellness policy it just says open to domestic partners and their children. I don’t know if we need a restriction there, but just in light of how careful this document is, that was just a place that stuck out to me.

Senator Horst: Yeah. I had a question about natural versus biological. I sent a note to Laura Vogel asking her that, but she hasn’t gotten back to me.

President Kinzy: Biological could be by your genetic material but not of your body. Natural would be by your body.

Senator Horst: So, natural is the preferred term?

President Kinzy: So, they’re different. Yeah.

Senator Nikolaou: So, we don’t know if it’s been changed by Legal or Human Resources?

Senator Horst: I know they consulted the Queer Coalition regarding the wording and the language.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. I had the same question. I tried to Google it to see what’s the difference, and I saw some cases where they said natural actually means that they’re out of wedlock. So, that’s why I’m thinking, do we also have unnatural children?

Senator Horst: I don’t know either and it might be what President Kinzy is saying. Janice will be there, and it sounds like something they can clear up on the floor.

Senator Nikolaou: They should also add the respective policy for tuition waiver, because for all the others they do refer to the specific policy. So, they need to refer to 3.1.17 Employee Tuition Waiver Benefits. And on the third paragraph, they’ll want to talk about the Benefit policy instead of the benefit program, since they change the title of the policy.

Senator Horst: Okay. I’ll tell her about that as well.

***From Academic Affairs Committee: (Information Item 11/17/21)***

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

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

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

Senator Cline: We were asked to look at 7.7.2. These were corrections that were found in an audit, and then this prevailing question being is this really a Senate policy. So, we made those changes. And, yes, Dimitrios, I know there are two parentheses that are in the wrong spot, I’ll fix those. The changes are something that we didn’t have difficulty with, although we did go back and forth with them a bit about verbiage. For instance, evidently in Financial Aid they use this term “free money” a lot, which we felt to be a little bit jarring and strange, so we’ve had them change that to “no cost/no interest” and things like that. So, we did work with them on vocabulary. And so, essentially you have their changes, and we just cleaned it up.

Senator Nikolaou: I have a clarifying question. When it says “and/or received” in the first sentence, why is it “and/or?” For example, if it is “or received,” it means that it doesn’t have to be reviewed or approved?

Senator Cline: So, “once completed, reviewed, approved, and/or received…” So, sometimes aid goes directly not to you, so you never receive it. It goes to another office on campus, and if there is money left it will find its way to you. So, disbursed would probably be the better word than received, but that was their terminology.

Senator Garrahy: That happens a lot when students receive, like, scholarships from donors that have to be applied to their student package first.

Senator Cline: To cover housing costs, or something like that. So, nothing trickles down to their bank account so to speak.

Senator Nikolaou: I’m assuming someone’s going to be on the floor to talk about that.

Senator Cline: We can ask if you want.

Senator Nikolaou: I only had for the loans, where it says, “based on established rules…” What are these established rules?

Senator Cline: So, a lot of this is statutory. The established rules are rules associated with particular loans, as I understand it. Because there’s another document coming that you’ll see that loans are delineated, so each loan has a different formal rule.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. Yeah. I just didn’t know because it said established rules and then it was nowhere else in there. So, it might be that they have it on the Financial Aid website.

Senator Cline: Yeah. I think it has to do with that there are so many types, that there are established rules for the type of loan, so to say. And also, just to the question of if it’s a Senate policy, I think generally speaking we agreed that it probably isn’t a Senate policy, but there’s concern about construction, grammar, and language. I can tell you in 7.7.8, for instance, there were 40 errors just in that one policy. So, we’re just sort of concerned about that in terms of legibility so that students and people can understand. It’s statutory, but the way that it’s constructed is not the most amenable.

Senator Horst: But Legal is going to be reviewing all of the policies and they can be the editors-in-chief.

Senator Cline: Right. I’m just putting if forward that even though we don’t think that statutorily we think this is something we should be in charge of, that there is need of a review for language.

Senator Horst: Yeah. And there’s this other group, the compliance group, where I’m just going to talk about how we’re going about reviewing University policies in general.

Senator Garrahy: With something like this that is focused on getting financial resources to our students, I always worry that, and not just at Senate, but if there’s anything that can delay getting that aid to our students, I’m a little concerned with that. So, I agree that grammatically things should be fixed, but if the lawyers can do it, and we’re not going to muck up delay to our students, I say give the policy to the policy people.

Senator Cline: Yeah. So, everything that we did here was based on Bridget Curl’s interpretation, we just fixed grammar and other things.

Does everyone agree with that assessment, that after we pass this, it should become a non-Senate policy? Everyone’s nodding. Okay.

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

***Proposed* Academic Senate Meeting Agenda**

**Wednesday, November 17, 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.***

***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:***

***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***

***10.28.21.02 Policy 2.1.14 Withdrawal Policy Mark Up***

***10.28.21.01 Policy 2.1.14 Withdrawal policy Clean Copy***

***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 Items:***

***(All items under the Consent Agenda are considered to be routine in nature and will be enacted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion of these items.)***

***Approval of the Academic Senate meeting minutes:***

* [***August 25, 2021***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/agenda-minutes/academic-senate/Senate%20Minutes2021-08-25.docx)
* [***September 8, 2021***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/agenda-minutes/academic-senate/Senate%20Minutes2021-09-08-mch.docx)
* [***September 22, 2021***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/agenda-minutes/academic-senate/Academic%20Senate%20Minutes2021-09-22.docx)
* [***October 6, 2021***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/agenda-minutes/academic-senate/Academic%20Senate%20Minutes2021-10-06.docx)

**From School of Information Technology:**

* **[Delete Program\_ Enterprise Computing Systems Graduate Certificate](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/Delete%20Program_%20Enterprise%20Computing%20Systems%20Graduate%20Certificate.pdf)**

**From School of Theatre and Dance:**

* [**Musical Theatre Sequence - Revision 6**](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/2021%20Musical%20Theatre%20Sequence.pdf)
* [**Minor in Stage Combat - Revision:6**](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/2021%20Minor%20in%20Stage%20Combat.pdf)

**From Interdisciplinary Studies:**

* **[Deletion of International Studies Minor](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/2021%204%20International%20Studies%20Minor.pdf)**

**From Masters of Business Administration:**

* [**Masters of Business Traditional Program**](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/2021%201%20Masters%20of%20Business%20Traditional%20Program.pdf)
* [**MBA Panama Program**](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/2021%202%20MBA%20Panama%20Program.pdf)
* [**Masters of Business Corporate Program**](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/2021%203%20Masters%20of%20Business%20Corporate%20Program.pdf)

**From Health Sciences:**

* [**Integrative health and wellness**](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/2021-09%20Integrative%20health%20and%20wellness.pdf)

**From Creative Technologies:**

* [**Audio and Music Production Sequence**](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/2021-11%20Audio%20and%20Music%20Production%20Sequence.pdf)

***Information Items:***

***From Planning and Finance:***

***11.04.21.02 Policy 3.1.13 Illinois State University Domestic Partner Benefit Program Current Copy***

***11.04.21.03 Policy 3.1.13 Illinois State University Domestic Partner Benefit Program Mark Up***

***11.03.21.07 Policy 3.1.13 Illinois State University Domestic Partner Benefit Clean Copy***

***From Academic Affairs Committee:***

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

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

***11.04.21.05 Policy 7.7.2 Financial Aid Distribution 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.***

The agenda was unanimously approved, as amended above.

***From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: (Dist. to Rules Committee)***

***10.07.21.23 AIF review & AABC***

***02.23.21.01 Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee Blue Book Charge CLEAN COPY***

Senator Horst: We have an item from the AABC. There was discussion about whether or not in October they meet with the Provost office regarding all aspects of the fund. They were wondering if that’s the best timing. I was wondering, could we just strike the specific month and just say meet with the Provost’s office? But they request that Rules Committee think about that.

Senator Nikolaou: Do we know why it was in October in the first place? Is there a certain reason? For example, that the Provost allocates certain positions and then in August or September there are more positions announced and that’s why they want to hear about the information, instead of waiting until the end of the year? I don’t know if there was a specific reason why October was there in the first place.

Senator Horst: It might be that it used to be okay in October, but now it’s not. Part of what David Marx said is there’s specific things that the committee needs to do. They need to do the Presidential Commentary and the AIF; there’s really not a lot of space for them to work on it, so they do need to get it at a specific time. Dan Elkins is wondering if it can be pushed to February, and I don’t think that’s possible given they have to do the Presidential Commentary.

Senator Garrahy: You know, last year was just kind of hit and miss with all the different pieces that we were doing. It seems to me this year we have more on our plate. So, I know that in February of last year we did focus on the survey for the President. So, I don’t have a good judge of how long the AIF will really take.

Senator Horst: Right. And it might be that October used to work but now there’s some new rounds that the Provost office does, and he’s even thinking there could be more rounds of assessment of new positions. But it sounds like a discussion with Dan Elkins is needed. I’m just suggesting not pinning the committee down with specific timing.

Senator Garrahy: That would be great.

Senator Horst: Right. Because at the end of the day they have to get the AIF report done, and they can work with the Provost’s office to figure out the best timing.

Senator Garrahy: Yeah. And Pete Smudde is really great at laying all that out for us in a timeline, so I don’t think it will be an issue.

***10.08.21.17 From Roberta Trites: Email\_Policy 3.3.12A.5 revision (Dist. to Rules Committee)***

[***3.3.12 A. Appendix to Code of Ethics - Faculty Responsibilities to Students***](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/employee/3-3-12a.shtml)

Senator Horst: Okay. Roberta Trites had an observation about policy 3.3.12A.5. I think the language she’s pointing out should include specific course information, office hours, objectives of the course, tentative assignment, and examination schedule. I was reading that as tentative. I’m not sure I see an issue. Does anyone else see an issue?

Senator Nikolaou: I didn’t see an issue because it says tentative. For example, we need to say that mid-term exam is going to be that day, second mid-term is going to be that day, and then finals, well, we know when finals week is. We don’t know the specific day and time, which is why it says tentative. I also didn’t see any problem with the language.

Senator Horst: I always say it’s going to happen in this week, and I’ll tell you later when. That’s tentative. I don’t give a specific time. Do other people interpret tentative as a specific day or range of dates?

Senator Nikolaou: And I didn’t know, was Roberta suggesting removing reference to the examination schedule or what? Because if we remove it all together, then we go to the other case where I could just tell my students, on Wednesday we have an exam.

Senator Horst: Exam schedules are no longer available at the start of the semester.

Senator Garrahy: I guess I’m confused what the problem is because it’s been like this for a while. We know that the Registrar will notify the entire campus when the rooms and dates have been scheduled for final exams. Correct?

Senator Horst: I think what she’s saying is you can’t even give a tentative date.

Senator Cline: But you know it’s going to be during exam week.

Senator Horst: So, to me that’s tentative. It’s tentatively in this range of dates. That’s what I usually say. I don’t have a problem.

Senator Cline: I mean, is the question whether tentative assignment… is it a grammatical question? Tentative assignment and examination schedule? Are we asking is it that tentative applies to both examination and assignment schedule?

Senator Horst: I think she’s saying the examination schedule is unknown so you can’t even say it’s tentative?

Senator Cline: That’s just the final examination schedule. There’s a whole lot of other exams that you do. That’s only the final exam one that remains undetermined at the beginning of the term.

Senator Horst: I don’t see a problem. Does anyone else?

Senator Garrahy: I don’t.

Senator Cline: No. I mean do y’all just have faculty that just pop exams on you?

Student Senators all at once: No.

Senator Horst: So, I do respect that we should give a tentative schedule, but I think tentatively the finals going to be between these dates as tentative.

Senator Miller: And I’m feeling most professors normally have in their syllabus somewhere that says this is subject to change and you’ll be notified if it’s changed.

Senator Garrahy: She’s not talking about some rogue professors who give their final during what we used to call dead week?

Senator Horst: She says, “since exam schedules are no longer available at the start of the semester.”

Senator Cline: When have they ever been available at the start of the semester?

Several senators at once: Not since I’ve been here.

(Laughing)

Provost Tarhule: If we had block schedules…. The reason we don’t have it is because we don’t schedule in blocks. If we scheduled in blocks from day one you would know.

Senator Cline: Right. But I’m fully in compliance.

Senator Horst: Maybe when I first got here, we had standard times.

Provost Tarhule: You would know exactly when your exam is.

Senator Horst: So, we’re going to say that we think this wording is fine and we’re not going to forward it to anyone.

***Policy Review:*** [***3.3.12 C. Appendix to Code of Ethics - Involvement in Political Activities***](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/employee/3-3-12c.shtml) ***(Dist. to Rules Committee)***

Senator Horst: Policy 3.3.12 C Code of Ethics is on policy review and goes to the rules committee.

Ms. Hazelrigg: Can I give you a bit of a reminder? We put 3.3.12 A with 3.3.12 C because neither one of them have been updated since 2006.

Senator Horst: Oh. I see. So, you’re saying both policies should be on policy review.

Ms. Hazelrigg: Yes. That’s why we grouped them together.

Senator Horst: Okay. Going back, we won’t worry about the tentative, but we’ll send these both to Rules.

***From Legal: (Dist. to Rules Committee)***

***10.19.21.10 Email from Legal\_ Policy on Policies***

***10.19.21.11 NEW POLICY 10.1 Policy on Implementation, Deletion and\_or Revision of Official University Policies***

***10.19.21.12 NEW POLICY 10.3 Policy Review and Implementation Procedures\_Non Senate***

***10.19.21.13 NEW POLICY 10.3.1- Policy Review and Implementation Procedures\_Senate Review***

***10.21.21.18 Policy 3.2.17 Creation of Academic Policy Current Copy***

***10.19.21.14 POLICY RENUMBER\_Policy 10.2 revised from 3.2.17 Creation of Academic Policy- Mark UP***

***10.21.21.19 POLICY RENUMBER\_Policy 10.2 Creation of Academic Policy CLEAN COPY***

***10.21.21.20 Policy Implementation Procedure Current Copy***

***10.21.21.21 Policy 10.2.1 Academic Policy Review and Implementation Procedure MARK UP***

***10.19.21.15 Policy 10.2.1 Academic Policy Review and Implementation Procedures CLEAN COPY***

Senator Horst: Right now, there’s an old ISU policy on policies, procedures, and guidelines. Legal is creating a new category 10. They’re making the old policies, procedures, and guidelines 10.1. 10.3 is going to be the non-senate approved policy review policy. And 10.3.1 is going to be the procedures. I met with them about this, and I said, you know, we already have a policy on policies regarding academic policies-- 3.2.17. Then I was trying to work with this thing that was joined, and we came up with the solution that we will separate it. We’ll have the policy on policies and the procedure on policies academic, and the policy on policies and the procedure on policies non-academic. So, that was the solution, to separate them. The 3.2.17, the one sentence that basically says all academic policies go to the Senate, that’s the policy, they would like to move this over to a new category and they would like to call that 10.2. They did include a wording change, “when creating, revising, or deleting policy…” but that’s pretty minor. Would people agree with that to the point where it’s editorial? I actually reviewed the Consent Agenda, and the Executive Committee can send things straight to the Consent Agenda. “The Executive Committee may also consider an item for placement on the Consent Agenda independent of a request to do so from another internal committee.” So, given that Legal has already set up this “10” area and given that they’re populating it with their own policies and procedures, would this committee like to forward the old 3.2.17 now called 10.2 with the three words inserted as a Consent Agenda item?

Senator Nikolaou: Do we know if it is mentioned anywhere else? 3.2.17. In any other policies?

Senator Horst: It is in the Memorandum of Understanding.

Senator Nikolaou: We would need to change the Memorandum of Understanding. Right?

Senator Horst: No. We won’t do that.

Senator Nikolaou: But then if we change the number of the policy and then the Memorandum of Understand says look at policy 3.2.17…

Senator Horst: The Memorandum of Understanding is a formal agreement that was made between the Senate and interim President Strand. That is a document, it’s not a policy. This one sentence basically makes it a policy and the Memorandum is much longer. But this is the policy on academic policies.

Senator Nikolaou: I was just thinking if there are any other policies that say, “see policy 3.2.17.” If we do, and we put this on the Consent Agenda, and it changes, then we need to go and change the number of the policy in all the other policies. But other than that, I’m fine with putting it on the Consent Agenda.

Senator Cline: But that can also just be an editorial change.

Senator Horst: We can research it, but I don’t think it’s referenced at all. But as far as adding these three words, is everyone okay with this going on the Consent Agenda? Nodding. Nodding. Okay.

Okay. Now the procedures 10.2.1; that’s basically the second half of the old policy implementation procedures. So, if you looked at the markup, it might have been confusing because it used to have the academic and the non-academic policies all put together. Dimitrios and I worked on the procedures document. That’s what we’re submitting to Rules for their review. Is there any discussion regarding that? Okay.

Senator Nikolaou: 10.3.1, I have small grammatical…who do you want me to forward them to?

Senator Horst: Me and I’ll forward it on to them. Sure. And the procedures documents, Dimitrios and I put at the top, this is not at all the Bylaws. It’s just procedures to help people understand how a document goes through the Senate. Okay.

***From Planning and Finance Committee: (Remove from Issues Pending list)***

***10.21.21.07 From PF\_Executive Committee consideration***

***10.21.21.08 PF IP Administrative Cost item***

Senator Horst: We have a request to drop an issue off their Issues Pending list and it’s something that we recommended that they drop. Is everyone comfortable with that?

Senator Garrahy: Absolutely.

***10.29.21.01 Trites Email\_ Policy 4.1.2***

[***4.1.2 Course Proposals for Undergraduate and Graduate Courses***](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/academic/4-1-2.shtml)

Senator Horst: Policy 4.1.2, this comes from Roberta Trites. She found this policy and she realizes it’s supposed to have language regarding proposals for grad courses and then there’s nothing. It relates to a lot of conversations we had in the past; if you remember, we talked about working with the grad school to put something in their bylaws. I had a meeting with Noelle Selkow and Craig McLauchlan, and they agreed to do that. I talked with Mary Elaine Califf and told her we are willing to do the change, having it be Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, but we need to do this part first. She was willing to do that. And then I just find it very interesting that there’s this policy here that actually doesn’t even mention how grad school courses are proposed. And then it says this language, “…and in some instances by the Academic Senate.” And I’m wondering if that’s accurate. But it seems like this should go to the Academic Affairs Committee.

Senator Nikolaou: So, what is bolded that she’s talking about? Is it the undergraduate courses at the top? Because “I just noticed what is an anomaly in policy 4.1.2. I have bolded what I think is the anomaly.” So, is it just the title where it says undergraduate courses? Because I didn’t see any other bold part.

Senator Cline: Yeah. I think she means that it just should read proposals for undergraduate courses, because there is no descriptive of what to do with graduate courses.

Senator Horst: And there should be.

Senator Nikolaou: For this one, it might be because of the dual listed courses, for courses that are undergraduate but are for graduate credit. And that’s why the policy might say for undergraduate and graduate courses. So, the ones that are still 300 but you can take them and receive graduate credit. Because we have not approved a policy where it says you need to split them into 300 and 400. So, you can still have these dualistic courses. Which I’m assuming is why we have this policy here.

Senator Cline: If it comes to Academic Affairs that’s fine, but it does feel very wrapped up with a much bigger conversation about the directorship, like how the graduate school is going to fall under Senate and all those things. So, I’m not sure how to bite this very small piece of it accurately.

Senator Horst: Right. And that’s why I put down Rules as well. But I am hoping that Noelle Selkow and Craig McLauchlan lead the changes. So, they could develop language regarding graduate courses. Because don’t you think it should include language regarding how course proposals are approved, Dimitrios?

Senator Nikolaou: If they wanted to make it much more clear, yes. And that would address the concern that we said… the UCC title that we’re talking about.

Senator Garrahy: Yeah. I think it needs to parallel, otherwise where is that information that somebody finds it? It’s kind of like a crap shoot, isn’t it.

Senator Horst: Right. And that’s one of the questions. What happens to grad curriculum? How is it handled? And it doesn’t even necessarily go through the Senate, and they have this mechanism for approving courses that really, we don’t have any control of. So, I would suggest that you work with them and have them craft some language. But there is this parallel conversation regarding what the Graduate School Bylaws are going to say. And that eventually will go through Rules. But I think those are the people you should contact, and I think it should start off in Academic Affairs.

Senator Cline: Yeah. I’ll talk to Noelle. It feels like it’s wrapped up in this much bigger thing, and once the bigger question gets answered, this will fall out pretty easily. I suppose I’ll contact them and see what they want. If they want to put a pause on it for right now while they work out some other issues, that’s fine.

Senator Horst: Yeah. They were under the impression that they were going to do the Grad School Bylaws and have the language regarding how the curriculum committee works in relation to the Senate. But I think it would also be great if they could also include language in there that’s very clear about how graduate courses go through the Senate. And maybe even think about the 300/400 stuff.

***Policy Review from Janice Bonneville: (Non-Senate?)***

***09.09.21.01 Senate Policy Review***

***University Policy*** [***3.1.29 Right of Access to Personnel Files***](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/employee/3-1-29.shtml)

Senator Horst: Now we’re at policy review. We have requests from HR to take some items off the Senate list. Policy 3.1.11 we decided to keep. We are now currently working on 3.1.29. What is your opinion on that policy, now that we’re about to approve it as an action item? Should it stay on policies to review?

Senator Nikolaou: One of the items does refer to tenure and promotion, in the policy when they are listing items, things that you cannot access.

Senator Horst: It also has those files that the chairs and directors keep.

Senator Nikolaou: So, that raises a question, even if it is just for us to at least see that it’s not going to be removed, meaning that anyone could access these files.

Senator Horst: The thing is that it’s all controlled by this act. When we were working on it with her, it was controlled by this records act. So, I’m not sure how much say we can have on the actual policy. We would think of it as an advisory item. We are developing this list of items that if they are changed, we want to know about them. But I don’t think we can have much say about the language in the policy because it’s all controlled by this records act. I’ll go either way, but when we worked on it there wasn’t much we could do.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. And I don’t know if it’s going to be linked with the ASPT that we are reviewing now. Because, let’s say that we decide to approve the external letters and we say that this is going to be confidential. I’m assuming it’s going to fall under the Right of Access to Personnel Files too. So, I don’t know what’s the link between the two, because it’s going to be on the ASPT saying that well, letters of recommendation, or letters for tenure and promotion, you cannot just give them to anyone; they are going to be under the restricted access. I don’t know if there is a link.

Senator Horst: See. That’s where she said there’s an official HR personnel file, and then you refer to the file that your chair keeps. So, the ASPT process is almost this separate thing.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. I’m fine either way. I just didn’t know, because it mentioned it in the policy.

Senator Garrahy: I think the personnel file is the HR file. I don’t see them as the same as the SFSC files we’re reviewing now in my department. I see them as separate.

Senator Horst: Yeah. They’re separate. And that’s where we got confused. We thought they were the same thing. And that’s why initially this all went to the University Review Committee, and they made it the same as the ASPT language, and the Planning and Finance committee rejected it. But that’s the way I understand it. This is referring to the official HR files and it’s all controlled by this act, the Records Retention Act, and we didn’t have much say in it at all.

Senator Garrahy: I see this as an HR driven, state requirement type of documentation that’s limited to whomever can see that in HR. I don’t see it as stuff that I’m looking at now.

Senator Horst: Yeah. And it applies to everybody, all the employees.

Senator Stewart: I agree with what Deb just said. This seems like it’s HR.

Senator Cline: Because it specifically excludes external peer review documents and letters of reference. It seems to deliberately exclude all of these things that we’re concerned about in this list.

Senator Spranger: The wheels are spinning, but I don’t really have anything to add.

Senator Horst: I mean, I really didn’t understand this either until we started working with Janice Bonneville, and she started talking about the HR file and then referring to the other faculty file, and that they are separate. She was like no, no, there is an official HR record.

Senator Garrahy: Having dealt with HR as an administrator with civil service and A/P type of situations, I can tell you that these type of files are when you’re taking an employee through a disciplinary process that’s mandated by civil service contracts and things; those are the personnel files that I see and things like that. It’s not “Garrahy was late for her class five times” or whatever.

Senator Horst: Right. We could, whenever it’s changed, ask for an update. We have this list now that are items that are advisory. So, people feel comfortable with that? Nodding. More nodding. Okay.

***University Policy*** [***3.1.37 Employee Assistance Program***](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/employee/3-1-37.shtml)

Senator Horst: Okay. Continuing. Employee Assistance Program. All these great things that you can get. Would you like to keep this as a Senate policy, or does it seem like one of these HR policies?

Senator Cline: It’s definitely not academic in nature.

Senator Garrahy: Agreed.

Senator Horst: Everybody agree? Okay.

Senator Horst: Okay 3.1.50 we have already decided that once we do the final review that will be a non-Senate policy.

***University Policy*** [***3.4.13 Use of External Search Firms Policy***](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/employee/ap/3-4-13.shtml)

Senator Horst: How about policy 3.4.13? “In accordance with 110 ILCS 675/20-180,” it seems like this is all stuff that’s statutory.

Senator Cline: Comptroller sort of stuff. Right.

Senator Horst: I don’t think we have any say over this.

Senator Garrahy: I don’t have the skill set.

Senator Horst: The one thing is that the President or designee is the one that shall communicate a decision in writing, and they will review the request for the external search firm.

Senator Cline: But that’s in accordance with the law. That’s nothing that we have a choice about.

Senator Nikolaou: The only problem I had is because it is mentioned in 3.2.2 and 3.2.13. Again, because it’s mentioned in the other policies those are in our purview, I don’t know about that one, because it is linked.

Senator Horst: Yes, but we don’t have to control policies just because they’re mentioned in other policies. Right?

Senator Cline: 3.2.2 and 3.2.13 are not legal and statutory in nature. So, 3.2.2 and 3.2.13 are not driven by state law.

Senator Horst: But this one is.

Senator Cline: Right. That’s what I’m saying. But you’re [Dimitrios] saying is it a concern that they’re linked? Those two are not determined by state law, this one is. I don’t see a conflict with them being linked.

Senator Nikolaou: In 3.2.2 where it says for example, you cannot use an external search committee for that and that and that case.

Senator Horst: I have a feeling that 3.4.13 is basically the statute as a policy, and so the other policies should conform with this.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. And again, I’m fine with removing it, I just want to make sure that if we remove it, we are not creating issues with the other two referenced policies.

Senator Horst: Yeah. We’ll just have to make sure that they’re conforming to 3.4.13. Right.

Senator Cline: Yeah. I think 3.2.13 is also talking about what are Panel of Ten and which aren’t, and the composition of the committees. So, it’s a long policy. So, you might want to give it a good look through to make sure there’s nothing that mentions external search firms.

Senator Horst: Yeah. And if there’s anything that’s not conforming with this policy, that’s a problem. That has to be changed.

Senator Cline: I don’t see anything that talks about external search firms. Because external search firms are the President and then anything the President so deems.

Senator Nikolaou: Again, I’m okay with removing it, I’m just being cautious.

Senator Horst: Okay. Thumbs up. Okay.

***10.26.21.01 Schimmel Email\_ Fall break & mental health***

Senator Horst: My colleague sent an email requesting fall break. My understanding is there used to be a Friday off and there was a deal made 20 years ago to eliminate that Friday off, the fall break day, and to make Thanksgiving an entire week. I know people have conflicting opinions about it. I will just say that I was fortunate to go visit my mother right before she died because she lives in Canada, and I could do that because I had a week off. That’s my statement about it.

Senator Garrahy: I was here when they had the couple of days instead of the entire week. What happens is students just take the days off anyway, and it becomes very disrupting in terms of having to reteach some stuff when you’re missing the majority of students. So, I personally like the full week.

Senator Horst: But we don’t have to debate it right now.

Senator Spranger: I just want to make sure that you’re talking to all the people… Dr. Davenport is already working on stuff like this. Like, maybe working with a short syllabus week and then a fall break, stuff like that. There’s a lot of options. I think the fall break would be really, really important and good. But I’m not sure how it should work logistically.

Senator Horst: Right. Well, it’s the calendar. And the calendar belongs to AABC. So, it’s all one big calendar discussion. The last item that we forwarded to AABC, I’m just going to also mention this at the same time is ISU Spring Break conflicting with Unit 5 and District 87 Spring Break. So, not only can you not do something with your family, but then you have to cover all this childcare for a week. So, families are out a couple hundred bucks because you have to hire a sitter or put them in day camps. We asked AABC to look at that, and they put a student senator on that, they made some calls to District 87. I’m not sure how much they listened to that student senator. So, I would hope that more of the committee actually engaged in these topics, including the Spring Break issue and the Fall Break issue, because I think they are important, but they are complicated. And no matter what people will say, other people will say conflicting opinions. But we’ll send that to AABC, who’s in charge of the calendar.

***11.01.21.05 From Susan Kalter: Fw\_ Violations of Academic Freedom at the University of Florida***

Senator Horst: Then we have Susan Kalter’s item. I just want to follow-up that the University of Florida on Friday actually announced that they were reversing course on the three professors, however the Conflict of Interest policy still is standing. So, I’m not sure if the lawsuit is still going on or not. And I made some comments about this. Is there any opinion as to whether or not we should forward this to an internal committee? Shaking heads, no. It’s a timely issue. I’m not sure what the Senate could do about it. People are certainly free to make Sense of the Senate resolutions or statements about it as I did. Any other discussion on this item?

Senators (several at once): No. No ma’am.

***Adjournment***

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