**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

**MONDAY, August 30, 2021**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

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

Senator Horst: Before we start, I’ve been reading about Jelani Day and I’m really moved by that. It’s really an upsetting thing for our University. I’m hoping there’s a positive resolution and I imagine some people in this room are dealing with that. So, just want to express my dismay at that situation.

***Distributed Communications:***

***08.27.21.01 IDEAS - Approval Language***

Senator Horst: We’re going to start with the IDEAS graduation requirement. This is a document that Dimitrios put together. It’s more condensed. It doesn’t include things like the appendix language and the courses that might be considered for the requirement. So, it’s more straightforward what the Senate is approving, and it includes the three-credit hour language. Lea, is your plan to talk with your committee and show them this on Wednesday?

Senator Cline: We can. This isn’t anything new. We have a meeting later this week with Amy Hurd to try to figure out implementation processes. So, I’m not sure if this needs to come back to committee yet. Does it? Because this isn’t anything new from last year.

Senator Nikolaou: I guessed it might because we added the three-credit hour. Just quickly do it in the beginning. “Are you all okay with the three-credit hour?” You will be presenting it at next Wednesday’s meeting, because you are the chair.

Senator Cline: Oh, really?

(Laughter)

Senator Horst: Yes. You’ll do great.

Senator Cline: That’s fine. We can run it through, so long as we’re not holding up the process actually in Senate.

Senator Horst: No, I don’t think. It’s basically everything on the proposal is just more condensed.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. It’s exactly the same.

Senator Cline: Hopefully, we’ll be able to flesh out some questions about implementation processes.

Senator Horst: Yes. So, when we get to that on the agenda, we can talk about how to tackle it.

***08.18.21.02 REMOTE ATTENDANCE EXCERPTS-A.S. BYLAWS Mark Up***

Senator Horst: On Friday, I was reading the Bylaws—as I do for fun on Fridays—Cera and I did a lot of searches on the bylaws looking for quorum and that kind of stuff. But one thing we didn’t catch was in the Council for Teacher Education part. It is a large committee, like 40 members. They have their own Bylaws like the Athletics Council does. In their Bylaws is says, “decisions of the CTE shall be made by simple majority of the voting members present when a quorum is present.” I didn’t catch that. So, the language is specifying that the people who make the decisions are the voting members present. So, I emailed Jim Wolfinger and Monica Noraian. They were very interested in that and said maybe they can tackle it on Wednesday at their meeting. They asked, otherwise what would happen, and I said it would go through the Academic Senate process. They said, oh no.

The first question I have for you is, because it’s the CTE Bylaws I don’t want to change it at all unless they approve of the change; but if on Wednesday they approve of adding the language that we added, which would be, “Present voting members shall include those members physically present and those permitted to join the meeting via video or audio conference resulting from an official accommodation received from the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access (OEOA) as outlined in the Reasonable Accommodation Procedures for Employees or Applicants policy (see policy 1.3.1)” -- if they approve of that, would you agree to adding that to our list of changes to the Bylaws? Because it then matches. Everybody’s saying okay.

Senator Stewart: I support it. The one question I have is that all these other changes are marked for a three-year expiration. Would that also apply to this change?

Senator Horst: I’ll ask the committee. Because it would then be approved by CTE.

Senator Stewart: I’m fine with it being a more permanent change. I’m just pointing out that all of these are being marked as being a three-year change.

Senator Nikolaou: It should fall under the last part, “unless the Academic Senate votes otherwise.” So, it should be fine if the CTE votes to change it. And then we could also have a quick one saying, yeah, we approve the change in the CTE. That’s why we added at the top of the markup that we gave out, that’s why we added “Unless the Academic Senate…” because we’re thinking that within the three years, the Rules Committee might be done with revising all of the Bylaws. So, it would be the new Bylaws and not what we voted on today.

Senator Horst: So, just to be clear, are you saying to make a separate proposal? Or are you saying to include this in the same proposal and include the CTE change?

Senator Stewart: I think I’m satisfied with what Dimitrios said. That we could include it as part of this.

Senator Horst: And then it will all have the three-year sunset clause, and then the Rules Committee has to get to it. Right?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. And besides, if the CTE votes to approve the Bylaws and then we (as a Senate) can quickly say we approve the Bylaws of the CTE, then it falls under the second part of which says it has been officially changed from when we first voted. So, it doesn’t fall into the three-year term for the CTE.

Senator Horst: It’s all part of our Bylaws. So, the next question, they have quorum language that says, “…when not otherwise specified by the Senate, a quorum must be physically present to conduct CTE or committee business.” I think that one is taken care of because we are specifying by the Senate. Okay. So, I will find out if they are going to make that change. And if they don’t then they’ll have to go through the regular process of having their bylaws changed.

My other question is, I just noted in the language that we’re using when we talk about quorum, we’re talking about pursuant to the Open Meetings Act only those members physically present at the meeting location will be included in the count for quorum. And then members who are permitted to attend by means…” but then at the top we say a majority of the membership of the Academic Senate shall constitute a quorum. So, there’s this slight difference there. Are we talking about actual members, the “Pursuant to the Open Meetings Act…” is talking about actual members? But when we talk about the quorum we are talking about a majority of the membership. So, they’re two different things. Do you want to keep it that way and have Rules flush it out, or do you want to do a friendly amendment and have it a majority of the members? And it’s the same for committees. Do you want to have quorum based on the members, like the Open Meeting Act says, or do you want it on the membership?

Senator Cline: How are they different? For the OMA it’s majority plus one.

Senator Horst: The OMA defines a meeting as “a gathering of the majority of the members…” Members are actual people, as opposed to the abstract membership. So, there’s 29 potential faculty senators, that’s the membership. But then the members, are the actual people who are seated.

Senator Spranger: So, I think for example, SGA has open positions. So, it would be based on the 19 people that do come instead of the 20 seats that we’ve had. Correct?

Senator Cline: Right.

Senator Horst: So, you are members, but you have a membership.

Senator Spranger: It would make sense to have it based on the people, right?

Senator Cline: I would think that membership would be important so that a small number can’t override the majority.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah, I would say the membership too. Because in the Bylaws we talk about membership. So, it is up to us to fill the positions we need in the committees. Because then we run the risk of not having enough people, and then having a committee with only four, and then say, oh, you can pass a policy with only two.

Senator Horst: We have a committee that has open seats because they’re not filled, and we can’t make quorum.

Senator Nikolaou: And that’s the other problem.

Senator Horst: So, we could leave it as is and have the members and the membership and have contradictory ideas, we could kick it to Rules, or we could change it.

Senator Cline: What do unions do? I’m just trying to think of other public bodies where this might be an issue. Because it’s usually membership, right? If you’re going to make a major change, the majority of the membership has to be present and voting.

Senator Horst: I’ll just read you, the Open Meetings Act public meeting is, “…a gather of a quorum of the members of a public body held for the purpose of discussing public business.” So, that’s what a public meeting is according to the Open Meetings Act. I don’t know what the unions do.

Senator Otto: In the current guide from the state on the OMA it says, there must be a gathering, but it need not be an in-person gathering. It can be an electronic gathering. And then it says, “Second, a majority of the quorum of the board must be present.” It doesn’t have to be in-person.

Senator Horst: I’m going to talk about that with Lisa on Wednesday. That’s on my list of things to do.

Senator Cline: Ask her about the difference legally between members and membership. If there’s some sort of aspect that we’re not thinking about.

Senator Horst: I could talk with her, but it sounds like you guys… I can go either way. But what would you… because we are the one putting this forward?

Senator Spranger: Are there a lot of open spots, I guess? SGA, we’re trying to fill our last open senator spot on Wednesday. We have an appointment. So, that will be good.

Senator Horst: Cera?

Ms. Hazelrigg: If we look at the Faculty Caucus agenda, there’s six to eight committees that are missing two to three people. There are still committees missing several students but I’m working with Patrick [Walsh] to fill those. There are a lot of open seats.

Senator Spranger: Is that things SGA people are doing or is that the external ones?

Ms. Hazelrigg: They’re the external committees.

Senator Spranger. Okay. Now I’m caught up, I think.

Senator Cline: But how would that work in terms of a committee? So ,committees, if all seated is 10 people, that would mean that you would have to have at least 6 present and voting in order to act.

Senator Horst: So, if you’re missing three students, membership is 10, then one or two miss, you don’t make quorum.

Senator Cline: Right. How frequently is it that we maintain empty spots through the year?

Senator Horst: We did that all last year, right?

Ms. Hazelrigg: It’s a very frequent thing. With people going on sabbatical, not being able to find replacements, students schedules changing, there’s a lot of movement.

Senator Nikolaou: Maybe we do need to leave it for Rules, because if we don’t want to go from one to the other, it might be that we need to come up with language that says of the members, but it cannot exceed a certain level below the membership. So, you can’t have 50% of the membership missing and then you’re going to rely on the members. So, you can still allow for 10% of the membership to be empty, and then you’re going to do the quorum based on the members. But you can’t do the quorum on the members if you have 50% of the membership is missing. So, something that can protect from people not showing up.

Senator Cline: You can’t have two people meeting and just changing all the rules.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah.

Senator Horst: Okay. Everyone wants to kick it to Rules. And in the meantime, we’ll stick with the membership difference. Okay.

***08.26.21.01 Memo Internal Committees Priority Report 2021-2022***

***AABC IP 2021-2022***

***AAC IP 2021-2022***

***FAC IP list 2021-2022***

***PF IP 2021-2022***

***Rules IP 2021-2022***

Senator Horst: Okay. In the memos I included some language that Dimitrios and Todd Stewart forwarded to me. It asks internal committees to tell us whether or not you agree with this and send it to us by the Thursday, which is our traditional deadline. Other than that, there’s no changes. Did anybody have any other comments on the language? Academic Affairs stayed the same. AABC there’s this second paragraph that was added, I think this was yours, Todd. One of the changes discussed below is the removal of some items. This is one of the functions of the Executive Committee, the chairperson should email [acsenate@ilstu.edu](mailto:acsenate@ilstu.edu) and provide support of the committee of this decision. And then I also added some language that Dimitrios gave me, which is underlined. We talked about the idea that there are these policies that are being removed from their Issues Pending list and people expressed a concern that the committees might want to talk about that. So, we’re asking them to give us the thumbs up. So, I added that. Is there any other feedback on the language of these memos?

Senator Cline: So, these are suggestions? Just to reiterate our conversation from last time. These committees should investigate carefully as sort of we’re trying to prioritize it but if the committee chooses to investigate something else first this is perfectly acceptable.

Senator Horst: Absolutely.

Senator Cline: Okay. I’m fine with it.

Senator Horst: We’re trying to help the committees because they’re overwhelmed. The other main thing I’m trying to do is not have a situation like last year where committees don’t know when they’re supposed to submit things, because they don’t understand the timeline of the Senate, and then all the sudden the SGA turns around and then they don’t have a committee anymore. We had a committee chair that thought they met through the May meeting. Any specific feedback about these?

Senator Nikolaou: Are we talking specifically about the policies too?

Senator Horst: So, we have the language. Everybody’s happy with the language it seems. So, now, Dimitrios, do you have any suggestions on the specific policies?

Senator Nikolaou: So, I saw that Planning and Finance are going to get one of their regular policies based on the Excel file that Cera sent. So, I was wondering, do we want to give all the policies right from the beginning, or send some of them. Then if they are able to complete all of them, then in January we say, okay, if now you have more time, we would appreciate it if you could work on these extra two. I’m thinking, should we tell them to focus on the Faculty Affairs policies and when they’re done with the six policies assign the two extras from the AABC. Instead of just giving them eight policies from the beginning and also their usual work.

Senator Horst: You’re saying for Planning and Finance? Don’t give them all eight at once?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. It could be that we give them the AABC ones first, and then the Faculty Affairs. Or we give them the Faculty Affairs and then the AABC, so they are not overwhelmed, and say, on top of our work, we now have to do eight policies.

Senator Horst: I’m on that committee. Eight seems doable. So, would you suggest prioritizing the AABC policies first? Is that what you’re suggesting?

Senator Nikolaou: That would depend how long they’ve been on there. And actually, for the AABC, I also had a follow-up question. If we want to reassign these two specific policies or actually looking at their Issues Pending, if it makes more sense to give them the Spring Break Flexibility and the Reasonable Accommodation Procedure? Because these seem that they are more long-term related, especially when talking about Spring Break, that’s definitely long range. And obviously there are Reasonable Accommodation Procedures, and it applies to faculty…

Senator Horst: Okay. You’re suggesting moving the Spring Break and the Reasonable Accommodations?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. Because they seem like they are more related to the functions.

Senator Horst: How about just the Spring Break because I already asked them to prioritize the Reasonable Accommodations.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay.

Senator Horst: So, you’re asking to move the Spring Break policy over to Planning and Finance. Is that your suggestion?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah, when I was thinking of alternatives that match better with their functions.

Senator Horst: Okay. What do people think of that?

Senator Stewart: That’s fine, but is that instead of these two or in addition to?

Senator Nikolaou: I was thinking of instead of.

Senator Horst: The idea with those is that they’ve been sitting there. And also, you have David Marx on the committee right now who sort of led the charge with these.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. And that was another reason I was thinking if we don’t do them instead of and we say, okay, we are going to have these… and the Evaluation ones, they are going to take time. So, if we have the Evaluation and the Spring Break, we might want to give this to them first, and then not send any of the Faculty Affairs. Or if we did it the other way around. If we sent the policies from Faculty Affairs to them for the fall semester, and if they get them done, then we can send them more from the AABC.

Senator Horst: How about that because Faculty Affairs is the one that’s really behind. Right? Because you seem to be concerned about some of the things going off of AABC, how about if we move the Faculty Affairs stuff. We start with that. And then we can wait on the AABC stuff. Does that sound good to you?

Senator Nikolaou: Yes.

Senator Horst: Okay. So, I’ll just have the Faculty Affairs. Everybody like that idea? And then when they get done, then we can give them more stuff. Okay. So, we’ll move these six Faculty Affairs Committee policies over to Planning and Finance. I’ll forget about all the AABC stuff, and we’ll keep AABC the way it is. Okay. Any other suggestions on this? Okay.

***05.06.21.01 Lucey Email Prior Notice of Administrator Remarks***Senator Horst: So, this comes from Tom Lucey and he sent this to me in May. We can discuss the Senate meeting last time and see if we want to fine tune it a little bit. So, first off, there is this standing tradition that, if Senators ask questions that are off topic from your Remarks, that they forward the question 48 hours ahead of time. So, if they were going to ask you about some Town of Normal initiative and you have no idea, you don’t want it sprung on you. I didn’t do too much last meeting, but it seemed as if all the COVID questions were fair game since you were talking about them. That’s called our 48-hour rule. So, Tom is wondering if we should get the Remarks ahead of time so that we could prepare questions? How do you feel the format of your Remarks and the Q&A is going?

President Kinzy: I’ll say one thing which is new this year. The first meeting we started coordinating to make sure there’s no redundancy in the comments to be more efficient for the meeting, so you could get more work done. But that takes time, and we definitely weren’t done 48 hours in advance. But our goal is not to tell any of the Vice Presidents what to say, but to make sure as we’re putting together our talking points that four of us don’t get up and say the exact same thing. That’s sort of FYI. That’s new this year, I think, in an effort to support you and be more efficient in getting more things through the Senate. That’s the only thing I would add, which is hopefully helpful because people get more information in a less period of time.

Provost Tarhule: I can go either way. I feel like a lot of the comments are more like updates rather than deep information. If we have a major information item, we share that in communications. So, these meetings are more like quick updates, things that are just coming up, things like that. So, I could go either way. Sometimes we change them at the last minute, especially with COVID, depending on how things are changing. So, it’s mostly updates that are coming up that we give. My strong preference with COVID last year, we were not able to do this, but I would really just prefer that if people have comments for clarification, lots of those comments we can actually have a one-on-one. I don’t feel like a meeting is a good place to discuss some of these issues. Right. I feel like if you are unclear about something and you want clarification, send me an email and I’ll be happy to talk about those. The meetings then just become a place where we give updates as opposed to an in-depth discussion. But I can go either way.

Senator Horst: Yeah. It’s this tradition that it’s the chance for faculty and students to directly communicate with the administration without any filter. I understand you’re point that things could change up to the moment of the meeting.

Senator Villalobos: That’s what I was just going to add. I see what you’re saying too, and I would agree in that I don’t think we should remove any opportunity for clarification at the meeting. But as he was saying, you could have an update or something that day of the meeting. There could be something that occurs six hours beforehand and then you wouldn’t have the opportunity to distribute that in prior Remarks. I do feel like if there’s anything of huge importance we already do kind of know about it.

Provost Tarhule: We use communication for that. It’s rarely what we would present at Senate.

Senator Cline: At least brought up for the first time in an administrator update.

Provost Tarhule: Yeah. Either way, I’m happy with whatever you guys decide. I just wanted you to know how I approach the comments that we put together.

Senator Horst: If somebody wants you to address something that’s sort of what the 48 hour rule is about. Right. They say I have a question about this so please prepare some comments.

Senator Cline: Right. And it’s further compounding in so far as if someone was to put in notes 48 hours ahead of time asking the administrators to make a remark on it, then how would you then update within an appropriate time back? If someone says please address X, the administrators learn about that only within 48 hours of that moment, they don’t have enough time to prepare and then reshare. It becomes too tight of a loop to be able to turn around, it seems like to me. I think it’s very fair, a 48-hour window to present questions so that they have a chance to prepare them. I’m not sure it’s fair to go back the other direction because they’re in the process of answering the questions that have already come in.

Senator Horst: Right. So, you’re saying somebody that was in the meeting that didn’t know about that issue wouldn’t have gotten…

Senator Cline: Or if someone sends a private email within the 48-hour rule to the office, they give it to Provost Tarhule. He’s preparing that remark. It’s not in his list of Remarks and therefore the notification is no longer valid. I understand the question and I understand the desire, I’m just not sure it’s feasible.

Senator Horst: Right. And I think it takes away from the flexibility of the administrators to give up to the minute remarks.

Provost Tarhule: You may also be able to address the problem with the first part of his suggestion. Right. So, rather than saying tell us what you’re going to speak on, it can actually be a request. We’d like you to speak on this. Right. So, that kind of focuses what the remarks are. Does that make sense to you?

Senator Horst: Yeah.

Provost Tarhule: If there’s something that people want to hear, then that’s something that they can send as part of the 48-hour notice. We’d like to hear more about this, and then you prepare a remark.

Senator Horst: As opposed to waiting for it to be the question.

Provost Tarhule: Exactly.

Senator Horst: Right. So, you would accomplish that by, could you please comment on this in your remarks.

President Kinzy: What if you get 15 things that they want me to comment on? How are you going to filter them? Because a student might want to talk about more benches on the Quad. But a faculty wants to talk about the learning modules. I mean, it’s great. Dialogue is great. I just…

Senator Horst: Yeah. I let a lot of the questions go because it was your first time and everything. But at some point, I said if you have more questions send it to [acsenate@ilstu.edu](mailto:acsenate@ilstu.edu) because people got very excited about talking with you, which is great. Any further comments on this? It seems like we’re going to just stick with the 48-hour rule because we could get into a feedback loop, as Lea described.

Senator Nikolaou: And also, there is nothing preventing a Senator from asking a question that they had not sent within the 48 hours. Because if I remember from all the previous meetings, we say good question, but it was not said within the 48 hours and then we say that the President, the Provost, (whoever the question is referring to) is going to address it in the next meeting or they are going to send a response within 48 hours.

I’m thinking in terms of, something happened today, and we really want to know about that, and the meeting is tomorrow. I don’t have the 48 hours to send that email. Most likely the administration is going to have included it in their remarks if it is a big item that is occurring. But it is possible that someone might be asking questions. It could also go into Communications if we have questions like, next time I would like, for example, the Provost to talk about that thing that happened yesterday. So, we have different parts during the meeting where a question might be posed. Because if it is a quick answer it might be answered immediately. But if it is something that needs more research, we can always say we need more time to do the research and we will come back to you. So, I agree that we shouldn’t make the President, or the Provost send us a list of topics because that takes away from their flexibility.

President Kinzy: If we don’t have an answer, we’re going to say that. We’re never going to make stuff up. I do think people understand that if you say something extremely specific, I’m going to the subject matter expert. Trust me, we’re getting ready for something in front of the state on Wednesday. We’re going to have one person talk but we’re going to have six people in the room in case a question comes up. We can’t do that for every meeting every time. So, I think people understand that. They’re very reasonable about that.

Senator Horst: Yeah.

Senator Spranger: Yeah. There was one meeting where everyone was really upset about COVID stuff and President Dietz didn’t feel prepared to talk about it then. I still have the email saved, he responded to all of our questions from the transcripts, and I think that that’s perfectly appropriate.

Senator Horst: Okay. Sounds like we’re going to just stick with the format we have.

***From Sam Catanzaro: (Faculty Caucus)***

***06.30.21.01 Policy 3.3.9 Proceedings in Faculty Academic Freedom, Dismissal, and Non-reappointment Cases Current Copy***

***06.30.21.02 Policy 3.3.9- Proceedings in Faculty Academic Freedom, Dismissal, and Non-reappointment Cases Mark UP***

***06.30.21.03 Policy 3.3.9- Proceedings in Faculty Academic Freedom, Dismissal, and Non-reappointment Cases CLEAN COPY***

Senator Horst: I’m going to move to policy 3.3.9. I worked on this policy when I was Faculty Affairs chair, maybe in 2014. This is the policy that started the discussion that led to the ASPT articles on Dismissals and Suspension. It still stands. Last time we talked about it there’s this question of what to do with it. Last time we talked about it in Faculty Caucus, but at one point it did belong to the Faculty Affairs Committee. It reflects what turned into the ASPT policy. So, I think that was the logic for sending it to Faculty Caucus.

In Faculty Caucus in 2019, we talked about what to do with this and how it doesn’t address union and non-union faculty. Sam said he would work on it, and he got us the draft in August 2021. It still doesn’t talk about the union and non-union faculty, so I’m going to talk about this with Lisa Huson on Wednesday. My question is once this draft that came from Sam Catanzaro is set, do you want to send it straight to the Faculty Caucus or do you want to send it to Faculty Affairs Committee?

Senator Nikolaou: Unless there are changes that need to be made when you talk to Lisa, I think what is down here is pretty straight forward. It can go directly to Faculty Caucus. But if Lisa says, no, we need to make changes for that and that and that, then it might need to come to the committee.

Senator Horst: To the Faculty Affairs Committee?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah.

Senator Horst: So, all of these changes were done by Sam and it’s purely about dismissal and non-reappointment, which is all ASPT.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. And that’s why I’m saying if we need to add stuff that isn’t already here, we will need to do background work, which means it will be hard to do it in the big Faculty Caucus.

Senator Horst: That is true.

Senator Nikolaou: So, it would need to go to Faculty Affairs. But if Lisa says, oh we may need to make a small change here and there, then it makes perfect sense to go directly to Faculty Caucus.

Senator Horst: So, if I can get Legal to write the language then we can send it straight to Faculty Caucus? Otherwise, we’re going to send it to the Faculty Affairs Committee and then the Senate.

Senator Cline: Just to ask a question about the unions. We’re essentially talking about the non-tenure track faculty. Because the faculty are not unionized. So, which constituency would be impacted by any changes that Lisa might make?

Senator Horst: So, there’s the unionized NTT and the non-unionized NTT. So, in a meeting in April we talked about having language that said the unionized NTT, everything would be handled in their union contract. And what we talked about in 2019, the question is what to do with the non-tenure track faculty with regard to suspension and dismissal. That’s what we asked Sam to figure out because they don’t have anything. They don’t have a union contract and they don’t have the ASPT.

Senator Cline: Right.

Senator Horst: So, that’s not in here. I don’t see it.

Senator Cline: Then perhaps it’s not ready for us yet.

Senator Horst: We could ask Roberta.

Senator Cline: That’s a constituency that does need to be handled. We don’t need to put through something that’s incomplete.

Senator Horst: Right. And I don’t think we have the expertise on the Faculty Affairs Committee to work on this. So, I’ll talk to Legal and then I’ll ask Roberta to draft something, because I feel this is incomplete.

Provost Tarhule: Are you talking about dismissal during the semester?

Senator Horst: Yes. In 2019, Sam talked about how it would be a rare thing, and most of the time you just wouldn’t renew the contract.

Provost Tarhule: That’s what I was thinking. Most of these are one year contract. And so, when something comes up, I think in most departments, what would happen is they wouldn’t get… Are we worrying about dismissal during the semester before the new contract kicks in? That’s very rare. It doesn’t need to be…

Senator Cline: But can people challenge their non-renewal if there aren’t set procedures that were followed, per se? I mean this would give chairs some insulation in so far as they follow the policy then challenges would be reduced.

Senator Horst: I think it would be dismissal for cause.

Provost Tarhule: It’s not a dismissal. That’s a non-reappointment.

Senator Horst: It’s not non-reappointment, it’s dismissal for cause. Like if someone doesn’t follow the COVID procedure mid-semester. They’re not getting their tests, and they’re not doing anything. It’s grounds for dismissal, right?

Provost Tarhule: Well, wouldn’t that be covered in the HR policies?

Senator Horst: Would it?

Provost Tarhule: I don’t know.

Senator Garrahy: I mean they are employees. I mean you can check with Lisa.

Provost Tarhule: I’m trying to see the situation. I’m not saying it doesn’t exist but it’s a very rare situation.

Senator Cline: You have to talk to Lisa anyway about the policy, maybe ask her, are those loopholes concerning to her?

Senator Horst: Yeah. We talked about the three areas. We talked about the ASPT faculty. They’re taken care of now. The unionized faculty, they’re taken care of with their union contract. So, there’s this group that we were going to address in this policy. Non-unionized NTTs.

Senator Cline: Right. See what she says. I would say if she doesn’t have substantive changes, I would say send it to Faculty Caucus, but if she’s got substantive changes it needs to come back to be reviewed.

Senator Horst: I think it needs to go back to Roberta and Legal, and we’ll try again with this policy from 2014.

Provost Tarhule: Was there something that brought it up or were you just thinking that you’ve covered the other constituents and not this one?

Senator Horst: There was a question whether to keep this after we drafted the massive ASPT policies. The reason to keep it was to just say if you were going to dismiss somebody there would be three areas. The union people will go to their contract. The ASPT people will go to this. And Roberta was even wondering if all of this would apply to the non-unionized NTTs. I’m not sure.

Provost Tarhule: This is one of those things that I think is so rare, I don’t know how much time it’s worth investing in, but it’s hard for me to think of a situation where this is not already covered.

Senator Horst: But the problem is this policy still stands. The old policy still stands.

Provost Tarhule: But what does the old policy say?

Senator Horst: “Individual rights and institutional integrity require that a procedure be established for handling faculty sanction, suspension, dismissal. These procedures follow general principles set forth in the constitution, the governing documents, and the AAUP RIRs.” Which is basically what we did with ASPT. We based it on the RIR, but we did our own little thing. Right? So, it sounds like I’m going to talk to Lisa, Janice, and Roberta about this and try again. Okay.
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**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.***

***Presentation: Color of Money (Vice President of Finance and Planning Dan Stephens, Assistant Vice President for Budgeting and Planning Sandi Cavi, and University Budget Officer Amanda Hendrix)***

***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:***

***08.18.21.01 Excerpt from email on June 24 OMA and electronic meeting attendance (Executive Committee)***

***Academic Senate Bylaws Current Copy*** [***https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/about/bylaws/***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/about/bylaws/)

***08.18.21.02 REMOTE ATTENDANCE EXCERPTS-A.S. BYLAWS Mark Up (Executive Committee)***

***Information Items:***

***08.27.21.01 IDEAS - Approval Language***

***03.25.21 IDEAS Graduation Requirement Proposal Recommendation from AAC (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***05.01.19.03 UCC\_IDEAS\_Executive Summary (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***05.01.19.04 ProvostCharge\_AdHoc\_Report-Jan2018 (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***05.01.19.05 UCC\_Subcommittee\_Report- Nov2018 (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***05.01.19.06 45 PAGES- Summary\_UCC\_Campus-wide\_Survey\_2018(Academic Affairs Committee)***

***From Janice Bonneville:***

***07.07.21.01 Presidential approval form***

***07.07.21.02 Policy 3.1.30 Criminal Background Investigation Previous Copy***

***07.07.21.03 Policy 3.1.30 Criminal Background Investigation Mark Up General Assembly Changes***

***07.07.21.04 Policy 3.1.30 Criminal Background Investigation Current Copy  
08.10.21.01 Policy 3.1.30\_Criminal Background Investigation MARK UP***

***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 Villalobos, seconded by Senator Nikolaou, to approve the proposed agenda. The motion was approved unanimously.

***Wonsook Kim College of Fine Arts Bylaws: (Dist. Rules)***

***06.11.21.03 Fine Arts Bylaws Summary 2021***

***06.11.21.01 Fine Arts Bylaws 2014 Current Copy***

***06.11.21.04 WKCFA Bylaws Mark up***

***06.11.21.02 Fine Arts Bylaws 2021 Clean Copy***

Senator Horst: How about we do one more. The College of Fine Arts Bylaws. This goes to Rules.

Senator Cline: It’s mostly verbiage, no? And a name change.

Senator Horst: Yeah. And the name change. Also adding the Creative Technologies. But the immaculate document prepared by Janet Tulley seems very clear. If anybody has any comments on the language, they could send it to our new Rules chair Todd Stewart.

***From Sam Catanzaro: To replace the obsolete Policy 4.1.16 Non-Traditional Constituents***

***03.28.19.06 Policy 4.1.16 Non-Traditional Constituents- Current Copy***

***06.22.21.02 9.9.xx Non-primary Constituents Proposed New Policy***

***06.22.21.03 9.9.xx Current Non-Primary Constituent Groups Proposed NEW Procedure***

***06.22.21.04 Non-Primary Constituent Group Addition Request Standard Proposed NEW Policy***

Senator Horst: How about getting one more done. It came to Exec in 2015. It went to the Academic Affairs Committee. In 2017 it came to Exec. They recommended deletion. President Dietz suggested that the VPs look at it, so it went to the cabinet. It came back again to Exec in 2019. Academic Affairs again asked for it to be deleted. Again, there was dialogue, and President Dietz again asked for a second cabinet review. Sam Catanzaro worked on it with Charles Edamala and Sam gave us revised documents before he left the university, and this is one of them. They are recommending a new policy number 9 because it’s dealing with data and not academic activities. It’s essentially how to store data. So, would people like to send this back to Academic Affairs?

Senator Cline: If it’s data, is Academic Affairs the best place for it to go? I mean, we’ll take it.

President Kinzy: What about that facilities committee? Because you know, IT falls under Finance and Planning. Because wasn’t that the committee you were looking to send things to?

Senator Horst: Yes.

President Kinzy: I’m trying to synthesize things. It’s where you’re trying to send things and that part of our organization, where Charley is, falls under that. Right. And I hear you saying don’t send things where it doesn’t belong, and I think that might be where it belongs.

Senator Cline: Yeah. Since it’s clear it’s data oriented and it’s not really in our purview.

Senator Horst: Right. Now they have this process for how they bring in groups, and then they have this panel. It’s more just about storing this data. Do people agree with that? Sending it to Planning and Finance, give them a crack at it? Okay.

Senator Cline: And you can tell them that Jim Pancrazio has all of the collected knowledge of this. So, if they need help contextualizing, he will come in as the walking historical monument to tell them everything.

***Adjournment***

The meeting was adjourned.

**Attendance**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SENATE**  **REPRESENTATIVES** | **Attendance** | **MOTION:** | **MOTION:** | **MOTION:** |
| Name |  |  |  |  |
| Cline, Lea | Present |  |  |  |
| Garrahy, Deb | Excused |  |  |  |
| 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 |  |  |  |