**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

**MONDAY, January 11, 2021**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

Academic Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order***.***

***Oral Communications:***

***Engineering Programs proposal (Provost Tarhule/President Dietz)***

Senator Kalter: Welcome back. Happy New Year! We’re going to start with an Oral Communication about the Engineering Programs proposal. So, let me just do a little bit of preface to that. So, you might remember that at the last Exec on November 30, we discussed how the consultants had either wrapped up or were sort of wrapping up their work with us. And the administration was getting ready to move forward with the next steps toward approval. And basically, that even though it’s sort of simultaneous in the Senate and the Board of Trustees, obviously the Senate has to approve first and then it will go to the Board of Trustees for approval. The processes in their information stage, right, have to be simultaneous but… So we’re going to be likely seeing this as an agenda item on the Boards agenda for the February 19th meeting in addition to one in May. And I don’t know, maybe the administration also plans to have some in between there, I’m not sure what the plans are. We’ll hear from Dr. Dietz and Dr. Tarhule in a minute. For the Senate stages, I recommended on Friday to both Dr. Dietz and Dr. Tarhule that we sort of “prime the pump” for the actual Information Item phases of the proposal at the first meeting, at the January 20 meeting.

And by the way, I do fully expect that we’re going to be witnessing the suppression of another insurrection because apparently there’s a Million MAGA or Million Militia March on Washington on that day. And so, you know, we may be dealing with that or the aftermath of that kind of thing.

But in any case, we’re not going to have an actual Information session because the distributed communications aren’t ready yet for that. But I think it’s important for the Senators to begin to hear about the fact that the Engineering Programs proposal is going to go through this spring. So, basically, either the Provost or the President or both are going to make oral comments about those plans. And then on February 3, I think, Dr. Tarhule and I talked about…we hope for a Distributed Communication and the beginning of the Information Item stages. And then hopefully having some mention of Engineering every evening during the spring until the Action Item votes are taken. And so that probably means that we’re not going to be able to cancel early meetings, you know, the meetings of the spring even when we don’t have other business because I’d like to make sure that this gets through early.

And so, you might remember also that I had recommended basically three types of approval. One of them was sort of the approval of the program concept and this kind of is going to entail, you know, why we can’t do an actual curriculum approval first, which would be the normal process for a new program. Why does that need to be written after Engineering faculty are hired? And then the second one would be the organizational change for the new college that’s going to be created. And then the third one is what would ordinarily go with a curriculum proposal, which is approval of the financial implications. And so, I had suggested that that should include some talk about a hiring plan for faculty and staff, a recruitment and enrollment plan for students—and that would include the discussion of differential tuition—and then also capital funding and logistics plans, so that, you know, all of this is basically so that campus is going to be reassured that not only are these programs and the investment of money in the programs not going to bring the University down financially, but it’s actually going to help sustain us financially and maybe even to help us replenish the reserves that we’re losing in Housing and Dining right now from the pandemic.

So, that’s my preface. Dr. Dietz, do you want to say anything to expand on any of that?

President Dietz: Not a lot. You did a great job kind of outlining the whole progress on this. Obviously, the Engineering topic is not new to the Senate but, you know, the pandemic has impacted everything a little bit, but I think it’s time that we get the momentum going again here, and the Cannon group has really been terrific to work with. The Provost and I have been talking about this, I think it’s a terrific idea that we have something outlined for each of these Academic Senate meetings to keep it top of mind with Senators. And I have a call this week scheduled with the chair of the Board of Trustees trying to make sure that she’s in sync with us having a longer meeting on the 19th at the Board meeting, possibly up to an hour to talk about, you know, a presentation there with the Board, you know, just informational, no decisions, etc.

I think it remains to be seen as to whether we’ll have special meetings in March and April, though historically we have somewhere between February and May meeting. So, this could be a topic of other conversations. But I think it’s important that we, you know, the program I think is on the right track. I think we had different ideas initially, and I think this is part of the evolution about what the program would be. I think the college is the right direction to head with all this. I think that we also need in our financial viability scenarios… When we first introduced this to the Board a couple of years ago at their retreat in Chicago, we talked about the financial scenario of having this, you know, totally financed by new enrollments and the tuition from those new enrollments. My hope at the time, and I’m still hopeful, that at some point maybe the state will smile on us to have another Engineering program which would be good for workforce development in the state, and has all kinds of positive reasons for that, but we can’t wait, because we’ve had a history of having to wait on the College of Fine Arts funding and it took 10 years to get there. So, I think, you know, at some point the state will help us, because it’s number one on our capital improvement list, but everybody knows the difficulty that the state’s in financially. So, I think we’ve got to have a different plan, and I think the tuition fed plan is probably the right one. But I think the college is the way to go. I do think that we will receive some private support. I’ve already been talking to a number of corporations and I think that may be more likely than the state support initially. But we’re going to continue to, you know, try and advocate for this program with the state.

But I think keeping it top of mind is a good idea, and I appreciate Dr. Kalter’s encouragement that we have something that we’re reporting on at every Academic Senate meeting, with the idea that we will have support of the Senate and hopefully of the Board before the end of the spring semester.

Senator Kalter: Dr. Tarhule, do you want to add anything to that?

Provost Tarhule: No, not much. Like the President said, I think, Susan, you did a great job of summarizing what needs to happen. Maybe the only other thing I will add, and this is tentative only, we need to make about, I think, six presentations over the next two months. So, in between the presentations to the Academic Senate, to the cabinet, and to the BoT, and some of those presentations have to be made by Cannon Design. Some we have to take the lead, but with people from Cannon Design present so they can answer questions. So, as you can imagine, trying to choreograph all of that and make sure that the right people are all present in those meetings has been a challenge. But we’re working towards it and fully expect to be able to get the final presentation schedule out maybe as early as the next two day. What that does is we may not be able to give you a whole lot of notice about some of these presentations but just be aware that it’s coming.

In particular, one thing that the President has agreed to, which I’m very happy about, is we would like to have a combined meeting of this group (the Academic Senate Executive leadership), along with the cabinet, and the deans in one group and we make one presentation to all of them. It’s not just a time savings thing. We think this would be very helpful to hear the comments, questions, and concerns that come from the different groups. If we were to do it separately, maybe you won’t hear, you know, the issues that the cabinet is thinking about, or you know, what the other people are thinking about, and they won’t hear what your concerns are. But if we have all of these groups together and we have one presentation to them, I think we get the best opportunity to listen to all of those concerns. And we’re planning at this moment that meeting for probably January 20 or the 27, and part of that depends on Cannon Design. I worked with the President’s people and I think it’s okay on his schedule, but I’m waiting on Cannon Design and they told me that we could probably hear back by tomorrow. So, that’s one thing that will be very different.

Once we do that, we’ll be ready and Cannon Design will be ready too, to give a full presentation to the Academic Senate on February 3 if you have the time. And then we’ll be ready for another full presentation on the 17th if you have space on the calendar. So, we’re working towards those presentations and our plan, like Susan says and the President says, if we have space on the BoT’s calendar to make a presentation to them on the 19th. That would be informational. We may have to make two presentations before they actually take a resolution. So, there will be timing there where we’re making presentations to the Academic Senate and to the BoT, but with no resolutions expected from either bodies. And the expectation is the Academic Senate will hopefully give an endorsement before the BoT has to make a resolution. And if we could put this to rest this semester, that would be super, super terrific.

Senator Kalter: We are making time on our calendar. This is a top priority, I think. So, we will shove other things aside in order to get to this. Let me just ask you one question. I think I heard you say that the cabinet/Exec presentation would be either the 20th or the 27th, did I get that accurate?

Provost Tarhule: Yes. I talked to Brent and Dave Bentlin (the President’s assistants) and both of those days work with them, but I need a confirmation from Cannon Design because we would like them to be present. In fact, they will lead that presentation. But they’ve told me that they will confirm by tomorrow. So, hopefully they will pick one of those days and that’s what we’ll go with. Before that, they need to make a presentation to the President before that one, so there’s a whole series of things that have to line up, but we’re getting there.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Wonderful. For those of you who are thinking about this—I have a feeling that some of you have it in mind—Dr. Tarhule and I talked about the Open Meetings Act and we’re checking with Lisa Huson. Actually he took it on to check with Lisa Huson about what is the distinction between a Senate meeting and a meeting where Senators show up. But if necessary, we will need to, you know, have that as a public meeting. So, we’re trying to find out, you know, what the strictures are on that. If it is a public meeting, we would have to announce it 48 hours in advance. But he’s checking with Ms. Huson about that. So, let’s see. Let’s open it up for any other comments.

Senator Horst: I was wondering if you had any idea for the 20th or the 27th meeting if it would be in the morning or afternoon or in the night?

Provost Tarhule: Morning. On either date it will be at 10:00 a.m.

Senator Horst: At 10:00 a.m.

Provost Tarhule: Yeah.

Senator Horst: Okay, because I’d have to cover a class, so thanks.

Provost Tarhule: Yeah, it will be at 10:00 a.m. in the morning.

Senator Kalter: Any other comments? (Pause) All right. Terrific. That’s it for that one. We’ll wrap it up. And as I said, on the 20th, either the President or the Provost or both will make some statements. We’ll talk about that when we get to the proposed agenda.

***Distributed Communications:***

***11.24.20.10 From Janice Bonneville: Bonneville email Sick Leave policy (Senate/Non-Senate?)***

***11.24.20.11 From Janice Bonneville: Policy 3.2.7\_Sick Leave current policy (Senate/Non-Senate?)***

***11.24.20.12 From Janice Bonneville: Policy 3.2.7 Sick Leave\_Mark Up (Senate/Non-Senate?)***

***11.24.20.13 From Janice Bonneville: Policy 3.2.7 Sick Leave\_Clean Copy (Senate/Non-Senate?)***

Senator Kalter: We’re starting our Distributed Communications with the Sick Leave policy. Let me just give a little bit of preface to this. So, sometime back before October 2015, it was brought to my attention that the Sick Leave policy and two other policies that would normally show up on our policy website had been removed from the website by somebody in Human Resources and that they had not been available on the website to faculty and staff and faculty associates for over a year.

So, at that time we were at the beginning of our endeavor to identify policies that were in the academic area broadly conceived, according to our policy on the Creation of Academic Policies which is 3.2.17. And so, trying to identify which of those policies needed Senate review under that policy and under the Memorandum of Understanding and the Constitution, right. So, you might remember that the policy review process that had been in place for many years basically broke down when former President Flanagan had his infamously short reign, because he was not following our policy on the creation of policy, and he was not routing academic area policies to the Senate. So, basically we realized that Exec needed to take the process into its own hands and we worked with Legal to kind of straighten things out, and figure out once and for all which policies do we review and which ones don’t we.

So, the Sick Leave policy would ordinarily have been in a group of policies that we do not consider in the academic area broadly conceived, right. There are a whole bunch of HR policies that we never look at. But it was reviewed by the Senate at that time because it was pretty egregious that employees of the University had been basically unable to access such an important policy. I mean, the Sick Leave policy is probably one of the most accessed, I would guess, and especially one that can have sort of legal and financial implications for people, right. And also, because we have representatives from Civil Service and AP Council on the Senate, it was a good way to get all of the groups involved in reviewing that, putting that back up, because they were in the middle of revisions on it. As I remember, it was Alan Lessoff who did the job as chair of Administrative Affairs and Budget to work with HR to get the policy revised and did a great job there. I actually think that that policy, if I remember correctly, was removed under Bowman rather than Flanagan, so those two things are sort of separate.

So, the big question for us basically is does the policy still need to be a Senate committee review when changes are made, right? Does it need Senate review, or can those changes basically be made silently by HR? Or do we want to go somewhere in between, right, like asking that the HR director always come to the Senate when substantive changes are made to this policy or other sort of significant employee policies, and so that the full Senate would maybe be able to vote to refer it to committee if it was necessary. So, I’m going to open that up for discussion before I give a recommendation.

Senator Mainieri: Susan, I was trying to remember in the fall, I think it was the fall, when the Parental Leave policy came up and Janice came and talked about that. Was that like an Advisory Item and we were able to give some input? Am I remembering that correctly?

Senator Kalter: That’s how I’m remembering it. Cera, are we right about that? Was it Advisory?

Ms. Hazelrigg: Yeah, I think it was just a new policy, and to publicize it, she brought it to Senate.

Senator Kalter: And I think, Tracy, it may have felt like a different type of thing because we did it more than once in order to get good feedback in exchange, if I remember correctly. There might have been two sessions on it, yeah.

Senator Mainieri: Because I could certainly see value in when substantive changes are made to policies like these that clearly impact the Senators and who they represent, having someone from HR talking us through them, right. But I do see that perhaps, in terms of our scope of policies, that this might be outside of our typical scope in terms of our regular process. So, I was trying to figure out if there was kind of a midway solution.

Senator Horst: I mean, in the past, we have requested that we can revise a policy. I’m remembering the Domestic Partner policy was taken down from the website as well. I just think the types of changes that are made are often motivated by legal issues that she knows about that we don’t know about, and I don’t want us to hold that up. So, I think in general it should not be under the purview of the Senate review, but we can always request to review it, and we can always request to have her come in and explain changes.

Senator Nikolaou: I agree with Martha and Tracy.

President Dietz: I agree with everyone. I think generally these kinds of changes are out of something that’s happened that the central system level and we’re implementing them. But I think communication is the critical piece and that clearly didn’t happen either when policies were removed. Janice, I have great confidence in her ability, and I think that she would know that if there’s something that is, you know, more broad based that she would probably be contacting all of you asking for some time to come and explain some things that have wider reaching ramifications.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. She’s very good about consulting with me about whether she needs to consult with the full Senate and just consulting with me about the changes as well. So, I’ll go on record as agreeing with everybody else also. Basically I was going to recommend that, you know, that we do the third option, which was to invite her to come in, go over the changes with us, maybe even ask for an executive summary of them just so that people are looking at kind of a summary rather than just the mark up. I think the mark up is important but… And maybe that we try to remember as a group to do that with these things, or you know, maybe if the President can get that in to sort of that, you know, Dan Stephens and the HR side of the process and we will remember it on our side so that when there are substantive changes made to these kinds of policies, they come to us as Advisory and we have a talk about them, but they’re not really reviewed unless the Executive Committee or the Senate as a whole votes to send them to committee or something like that.

President Dietz: Great.

Senator Kalter: So, that sounds good. Great. It looks like we can go to the next thing, and I’m going to hand that one over to Dimitrios. This is about the Textbooks policy from Academic Affairs.

***12.10.20.10 From Academic Affairs Committee: Policy 4.1.3 Textbooks CURRENT Copy (Information Item 11/20/21)***

***12.10.20.11 From Academic Affairs Committee: Policy 4.1.3 Textbooks MARK UP (Information Item 11/20/21)***

***12.10.20.12 From Academic Affairs Committee: Policy 4.1.3 Textbooks CLEAN Copy (Information Item 11/20/21)***

Senator Nikolaou: So, this is the policy. We saw it as an Information Item in the fall and then we moved it into Action Item. So, in the Information Item, we didn’t get pretty much any questions apart from L.J., who asked about the exclusivity language. So, then we tabled it because we were running out of time. So, the mark up that you have in front of you, it’s pretty much the same changes that we saw in the fall. The main difference is that under item 3, before we had that “Illinois State may not enter into an exclusive contract for textbook sales with any one store.” After the concerns that L.J. expressed, we had a meeting where it was L.J., Danielle Miller-Schuster, Alice Maginnis, Susan, and myself to see what were the concerns and what we could do. So, the language that you see under 3 combines the three main concerns that were expressed from the administration, the faculty, and the students when we discussed it in Academic Affairs last year. And that’s pretty much the changes that we have. And we voted on the Academic Affairs to bring it forth and adopt this new language, which does not include the exclusive word, which was one of the main concerns that L.J. expressed. It makes clear that faculty input is going to be taken into consideration, also for the bill of textbooks for the student side. So, we think that it addresses all concerns that all the different constituents had.

Senator Kalter: All right. And I know a number of you are on Academic Affairs but does anybody else have any questions, or do any of you have any questions? (Pause) All right.

***12.10.20.13 From Rules Committee: Horst Email Reinstatement Committee Charge (Information Item 11/20/21)***

***04.06.18.01 From Rules Committee: Email\_Student Representation on Reinstatement and LOA committees (Information Item 11/20/21)***

***01.04.20.01 From Rules Committee: Reinstatement Committee charge Current (Information Item 11/20/21)***

***01.04.20.02 From Rules Committee: Reinstatement Committee charge mark up (Information Item 11/20/21)***

***12.10.20.16 From Rules Committee: REINSTATEMENT COMMITTEE CLEAN Copy (Information Item 11/20/21)***

Senator Horst: Okay. We were forwarded some suggestions, I believe by Provost Murphy, and we’re in general cleaning up the Blue Book part of the bylaws for the Academic Senate. And so in this particular committee charge, there was a suggestion to not have students on it and the committee had quite a lot of discussion and we sought input by the Provost staff, and we voted on it, and we did not endorse that suggestion. And so, we are sticking by the changes that we have here, which still includes the students.

Senator Kalter: All right. Do we have discussion about that before we talk about it as a proposed agenda item?

Senator Nikolaou: I had a quick… in the mark up, for the faculty voting seven, that probably we want to say College of Applied Science and Technology.

Senator Horst: Ah. Thank you very much.

Senator Nikolaou: And then I had more of a question. So, I agree with what Martha said, that the students should remain in the committee. Is there a reason why the students only come from the Student Government Association, they cannot come from the graduate students? Because I was thinking in terms of what the memo said, that they were concerned about peer involvement, and then I was thinking, well, if that’s the concern, couldn’t it be that if they’re reviewing undergrads, grads are involved, graduate students are involved in the process? But I don’t really agree with retaining the students because, you know, the argument that it meets during the winter and the summer breaks, well, faculty also are not supposed to be working during the summer breaks. So, in that sense we shouldn’t be in the committee.

Senator Horst: I mean, we didn’t discuss that. It’s an interesting proposal. I would also say if we did that kind of thing, we start thinking about representation of the grad students, we would probably think of that for several committees.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. I was just wondering.

Senator Horst: It’s something that we can talk about on the floor, certainly. But we didn’t… we focused just on the issue of students; we didn’t think… we just got the students on there. We didn’t think of expanding the students, we just preserved the three seats. But it’s an interesting point and it would be interesting to hear some other perspectives when we have more students in the virtual room.

Senator Kalter: Great. In some ways, this needs no response, but I think this has been kind of a, what Dimitrios is bringing up, has been kind of topic over the years on and off, and maybe SGA can have a conversation, especially with like the Graduate Student Association if it’s still around or the Graduate Council to see that we can kind of regularize patterns for seating both grads and undergrads on all committees because, when it says student, it shouldn’t mean just undergraduate student or just graduate student, it ought to mean both, so that would be helpful.

I had one thing that I’m not sure really needs to be talked about with this change, but you guys might remember a year or two ago, we invited a number of the external committees to give sort of the annual reports in person on the Senate floor, and just because of what this year has been like, I’m kind of wondering if it’s a good idea to have sort of a rundown from somebody like Amy Hurd or maybe the chair of this particular committee at some point about what are the standards that we use to determine whether a student should be dismissed. And I’m assuming that those standards are objective standards. And then what are the both objective and subjective standards that the committee uses to see, you know, about whether a student can be reinstated because I don’t know if many of us know that. And it’s been kind of a long time since the Senate as a whole was sort of made aware of what do we think the minimum standard should be for access to an education at ISU, you know, once a student has been accepted and has enrolled for at least a semester when they’re not doing well, you know, what is that standard and how does that work?

And I would imagine that some of the students on SGA and just in general might want us to sort of scrutinize, you know, are those fair standards, is everybody who deserves a second chance getting one, and are we giving too many second chances to some people, right? That kind of thing. So, like I said, I’m not sure if that should be done in tandem with this, especially since we’ve got the Engineering stuff and a bunch of other stuff. But I just kind of wanted to throw that out there as a possibility because it seems like we at some point ought to take the opportunity to have that kind of a discussion. Just wondering if people have thoughts about that?

Senator Horst: They issue a report. Dimitrios, do you know when the report usually gets to your committee?

Senator Nikolaou: So, we should be going over them, probably in our next meeting. All our committee reports. And probably we are going to go over last year’s because we didn’t bring it on the Senate because of COVID. So, probably we are going to be getting like two groups from this year, from 2020 and 2019.

Senator Kalter: Great. Let’s actually bring it up after you folks have looked at the one for the Reinstatement Committee for this year and last year. And then maybe it could be as brief as a committee report from you, either just alone or with an assist from Amy. Does that sound good to people?

Senator Horst: And so, Susan, are you suggesting (I think that would be a good plan), are you suggesting to pause this charge a little bit and then have that report come in, and then bring this up just so the Senate has a little bit more knowledge about the committee?

Senator Kalter: No. Actually, I’m kind of feeling this spring that we want to do our business as our business comes in. So, I think it’s, I mean, it’s not going to be that big of a lag between when we see this charge on the 20th and then potentially approve it on the 3rd, and when Dimitrios might be able to make that report, or Amy might be able to make that report. So, when we talk about it, if it gets brought up, because I’m not going to bring it up on Wednesday, but if somebody else brings it up, I will just say, well, we’re going to talk about that, you know, in the spring. We’ve already talked about that in Exec and we’re going to talk about that later in the spring. But that the charge is just the charge of who’s on the committee and what the committee does and that kind of thing.

Senator Nahm: I think that depending on the committee’s rationale that I’m guessing that, Martha, you will go over when the item is brought up. It might not, I mean, I would love to know, right, how the Reinstatement Committee operates, but I don’t know if I need that information to make a decision on whether students should be represented or not.

Senator Horst: Yeah. I mean, we basically said that the University Appeals Board has students on it, and they deal with confidential information. And this committee deals with confidential information, but we thought the student representation and student viewpoint is very important. And it just didn’t make sense for us to have one committee with sensitive information get a different treatment than another one, and that’s the very important part of being a committee member on these committees. So, unless we want to have no student representation on these kinds of committees, we decided it made more sense to have students on this committee.

Senator Nahm: Right. And I can, you know, like personally agree with that without knowing the full details of how the committee operates.

Senator Horst: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: And I would imagine, and if it’s not the case, I hope it would be put into place, that in the background, there might be a procedure that says, you know, just like we have with faculty and staff, if you have some sort of personal relationship with the student in question you can’t serve on that case. And I know of at least one time in the distant past, I guess, where that did happen, where somebody knew somebody, and they were serving on a case in an inappropriate way. Hopefully that got sort of imbedded into the process after that, so. Good. Okay. So, it looks like that one’s probably going to go on our agenda.

***01.08.21.01From Senator Kalter: Sense of the Senate Resolution***

Senator Kalter: The next one is just a Sense of the Senate Resolution. Obviously, I have this on here because I think that as intellectuals and students we have a strong role to play in our democracy through the rights and responsibilities of academic freedom and, you know, promoting the freedom of thought and idea, and that we should take a stand about the insurrection, and the acts of incitement of insurrection that we saw last week. I hope I’m wrong that it’s going to happen again, but I’m not optimistic about that. I do consider the resolution fully non-partisan. I happen to have a large member of family members in my extended family who did vote for Trump and who were supporters of his but who are appalled by what has happened, which gives me hope that they are appalled. And I kind of wrote it in a way that I thought that Adam Kinzinger could get behind it, and I’m very proud of him for speaking out in the way that he has. Yay, Illinois for having one of our reps say the right thing on this. So, anybody have any suggested revisions? You can say them now, or you can give them to me before Thursday at noon, before Cera sends the whole thing out. And if you’d like to sign on as co-sponsor, you’re welcome to do it. I feel like Nancy Pelosi when I say something like that, or Ted Lieu.

Senator Horst: You know, there are quite a number of people that you could cite in addition to Donald Trump and all of the people. So, I mean, I would suggest maybe you want to just stop with Donald Trump or then you might think of other people.

Senator Kalter: So, what I tried to do, and of course I don’t remember when I wrote this exactly but since then I’ve gotten a little bit more information about the rally about who was there. So, I was trying to name the people at the rally but not the people inside the Capitol building. Because, although I disagree wholeheartedly with Cruz and Hawley, what they were doing was legal. I think the fist raised by Hawley as he was walking in was questionable, but I don’t have enough context for that. But, Martha, if you remember or want to send me the other people who were at the rally who spoke in ways that incited violence, I’d be happy to add them.

Senator Horst: Yeah, I was particularly thinking about Hawley, but I’ll look into it and see what I can come up with.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. I know I heard on either the radio or the television two other names, and at least one of them was a representative, but I don’t remember who exactly it was that was at the rally.

Senator Horst: And there’s this representative who went to charge the building, right. A West Virginia representative, so.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. (sigh) I will say I stayed up all night watching democracy in action and I’m proud of my country for…you know…and thank God for CSPAN, frankly. Right. Because you can get it straight from the horse’s mouth, so to speak. But in any case.

Senator Spranger: I’m glad you said that, thank God for CSPAN.

Senator Toth: I was going to say that was the only night that CSPAN was super exciting to watch all night long.

Senator Kalter: Actually, that’s not true. I watched the Kavanaugh hearings on CSPAN…

Senator Toth: Absolutely.

Senator Kalter: And I watched the Mueller Investigation on CSPAN.

Senator Toth: Yes, add it to the short list of exciting CSPAN nights.

(Laughter)

Senator Kalter: They’re few and far between.

Senator Toth: Right.

Senator Kalter: And yeah, you’re right, that’s the first time I’ve ever said that out loud or even ever thought it.

Senator Nahm: And hopefully CSPAN can become boring again after this month. A very, very minor thing. The file name says Senate of the Senate instead of Sense of the Senate.

Senator Kalter: Oh. Thank you. Thanks for catching that, Kee-Yoon. All right.

***01.08.21.02 Policy 2.1.30 Excused Student Absences Due to Communicable Disease CURRENT (Dist. to Academic Affairs Committee)***

***01.08.21.03 Policy 2.1.30 Excused Student Absences Due to Communicable Disease MARK UP (Dist. to Academic Affairs Committee)***

***01.08.21.04 Policy 2.1.30 Excused Student Absences Due to Communicable Disease CLEAN (Dist. to Academic Affairs Committee)***

Senator Kalter: Before we go to the approval of the agenda, let’s go to the submission from Ani Yazedjian, because I think we want to make sure that this is in the right place, right. So, currently we have it slated for distribution to Academic Affairs Committee. I’m just wondering, first of all, if these are changes that are going to need to be retroactive to today, and whether it needs to move more quickly than going through a committee, whether this is a committee of a whole kind of thing. So, I’m curious about that. I wonder, Dr. Tarhule or Dr. Dietz, do you have advice for us about how quickly this one needs to move?

Provost Tarhule: If you can, I would say quickly, partly because we’re worrying about the post-holiday surge, and what that might mean for students and stuff like that. So, if we were able to move it quicker, I don’t know when we would need it, but the quicker we have it in place the better I think it would be.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. When you say it like that, I’m actually wondering if this is one of those very rare instances where Dr. Dietz wants to sign it before the Senate talks about it, and if we then want to do it as a committee of the whole? Since we’re thinking about the surge.

President Dietz: I would agree with Dr. Tarhule about timing being important on this. And, you know, kind of reserve the right to do what you just said in a lot of instances, but I generally don’t, but I think this might be one of those exceptions. And then if people want to wordsmith that afterwards that’s fine. But I think we need to have something in place fairly quickly, and I’d be happy to sign off on this and then we see if the Senate as a whole wants to have additional wording. So, I could come up with something as a cover letter to approve this in the meantime.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. I don’t want to confuse students on the one hand, right, by having something come out in a press release that’s one thing and then have it changed by Thursday or Friday of next week. But on the other hand, waiting until Thursday or Friday or even Monday of the following week seems really inadvisable if this is about absences and, you know, COVID related absences.

President Dietz: Right.

Senator Kalter: What do people think? Is that objectionable to anybody to have Dr. Dietz go ahead and move this into policy, and then have us review it as a committee of the whole on Wednesday?

Senator Horst: It makes sense. The only thing I would request is when it goes in front of the Senate, she laid out the old language and the new language, if she could do a traditional mark up just because we’re so used to seeing that.

Senator Kalter: I think she did, Martha. I’m pretty sure I asked for that old/new because we only got the mark up.

Senator Horst: All right. Then maybe I didn’t go through everything. I apologize.

Senator Kalter: Sometimes, I know that some computers sort of hide the mark up sometimes as well, so.

Senator Horst: Yeah. I just saw the old/new. The mark up to me is clearer.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Great.

Senator Nikolaou: So, the question at this point that I have is, because it says “documentation from a public health official or healthcare provider.” So, what does that mean? So, is it like a healthcare provider needs to tell me that you need to self-quarantine? The reason I’m asking is because I’m thinking of international students who are just flying in and they cannot go anywhere. They need to self-quarantine for two weeks. So, how are they going to get that documentation from a public health official? Are we saying that, for example, what CDC says that you need to self-quarantine for 14 days counts as documentation, or documentation is actually I need to have something signed for that specific students? Because if it remains like that, “documentation from a public health official,” what happens with international students? So, that was the main one and the other one can wait, you know, it’s not… Specifically because some of them, they had visa delays and they are going to be coming towards the end of this week or maybe next week. They are going to be affected by the change in the policy.

Senator Kalter: And they’re going to need excused absences because they’re required to quarantine for two weeks, even if they’re not a COVID risk. So, that’s really, thank you for bringing that up.

Provost Tarhule: It’s a good point, Dimitrios. Though I think it’s one that we can cover in practice because as you said international students are returning, they are required. So, it’s like saying there’s a requirement that covers them, that maybe is not explicitly stated in this policy. That could be something we amend and add to the policy subsequently when we discuss it. But it won’t prevent anything in the time being because, as you said, the CDC already requires students coming in to self-quarantine and that will be enforced.

President Dietz: In my approval of this, perhaps I could address that. That international students will be asked to follow CDC guidelines and recommendations.

Senator Kalter: Perfect. That’s kind of what I was thinking, just a quick sentence that tells them how they’re covered. That’d be great.

President Dietz: Yep.

Senator Mainieri: The only other thing I saw, just because I experienced this in the fall with the students who did the official Dean of Students notification was I saw in the mark up the addition of students may provide documentation when they’re no longer required to be isolated or quarantined or when their excused period is up. And that just became really confusing as a faculty member, and then me trying to communicate with the students exactly what they needed to do. Because I’m always worried, the way that I always phrase it with my students is I want to make sure that you’re getting the same support across campus, right. And that’s one of the reasons why the Dean of Student processes are so helpful because it provides same amount of support regardless of the instructor, and it, you know, I had students who I got notification the first week of class that they were to be isolated and excused, and I never received any follow up. And they didn’t really know what to do to have that end officially, and so I wasn’t sure. I saw that there was the addition of “may” to that particular sentence like it was optional, and I wasn’t sure how Dean of Students office is handling that. If it just automatically expires, and maybe we can get like an automatic notification, I don’t know. I just wasn’t sure if we needed to have a bit more specificity on how to end that period in the mark up of the policy.

President Dietz: It might be wise to have our Dean of Students at the meeting. So, I can contact him if that would be helpful. I don’t think we need to have it right now, before I approve this, but your point’s well taken, Tracy, that, you know, that’s an issue that I think John Davenport is already wrestling with. But I think he’s probably in a better place to give us some suggestions about this.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, I thought that was a good point too. Cera, you can just invite both Ani and Dr. Davenport, and that way we won’t have to bother Dr. Dietz to remember to do it. I’m sure you’ve got other stuff on your mind.

President Dietz: Thank you.

Senator Kalter: I was just going to say to, Tracy, or about what Tracy said, that one of the things that I was doing was, you know, if I had to, I would go back into Reggienet and retroactively give them an excused absence once I got the notification. So, that kind of process, if everybody is doing it in a standard way, would be helpful for students to have that. Lauren, what were you going to say?

Senator Harris: I was just going to say, I think, because I had to quarantine earlier, whatever medical notice you get, for me, they went based off the date that was on there, and 14 days from there was kind of like you’re back to normal is how it was for me.

Provost Tarhule: I know they track when students come off of quarantine, what I don’t know is how much they then disseminate that information to faculty so that everybody knows. But it would be good to have John at the meeting to clarify.

Senator Mainieri: Well, and even the date of quarantine sometimes can be tricky because they may still be sick, right, and still need that protection.

Provost Tarhule: Right. Yeah.

Senator Mainieri: And so, just some clarification there I think so that the students really are getting the grace that they really need during this time.

Provost Tarhule: Understood. It’s a good point.

President Dietz: Just out of protocol, would it be alright then if, when I approve this, that I send an email to Susan and Aondover to say what I’ve done, and then I’ll add this piece in about the international students, kind of pending further discussion by the Senate?

Senator Kalter: Yes. You can even say that the chair of the Senate suggested that the President approve this before the Senate spoke about it, right, because I usually do not do that. And it’s usually inadvisable, but this seems like an extraordinary circumstance that we’re in.

President Dietz: Yeah. Right.

Senator Nikolaou: One question on that. Do we know, are we going to get this weekly email about the Coronavirus update on Friday? Because I was thinking in the previous email that we got it was saying that you should contact the Student Health Services, that’s going to direct you for quarantine protocol, etc., etc. But if the President is going to sign this version where it says the Dean of Students, we should make sure that, you know, we don’t have in the email saying Student Health Services and then what the President’s going to sign says, you know, students, because then the students are going to say, well, should I contact both, one, what should I do.

Senator Kalter: Is that a Katy Killian questions, or a Dr. Tarhule questions, or somebody else’s question?

President Dietz: You know, it might be a Katy question. Those, I think those come out on Thursday, those updates.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay.

President Dietz: I might be able to put something in there this Thursday, and actually put the language of this under one of the heading for communication on Thursday. So, to make sure that I’m going the right one here, it’s obviously 2.1.30 and it came from Ani and there’s some blue mark ups I’m showing. Is that the one I should be doing, or there’s a cleaner copy behind that, and I would imagine that’s the one I should be approving.

Senator Kalter: So, those are essentially identical, Larry. What Cera does is, she takes the clean copy, she takes the current copy and she melds them into a mark up so that we can see the changes.

President Dietz: Right.

Senator Kalter: So, the mark up and the clean copy should be identical, except that the mark up shows what the changes are.

President Dietz: All right. I can talk to Katy about this to see if this is something we could put in that Thursday update. That would give us a little heads up until we get to the actual topic on the 20th.

Senator Kalter: Awesome.

President Dietz: Good. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Great. Anything else about that before we move to the proposed Senate agenda? (Pause)

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

***Proposed* Academic Senate Meeting Agenda**

**Wednesday, January 20, 2021**

**7:00 P.M.**

**VIRTUAL MEETING per state law and Governor Pritzker’s Executive Order**

**Zoom Link:**

*Request to make public comment at the meeting should be sent via email to* [*acsenate@ilstu.edu*](about:blank) *no later than 6:55 p.m. on the day of the meeting.*

***Call to Order***

***Roll Call***

***Chairperson's Remarks***

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

***Administrators' Remarks***

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

***Discussion:***

***Engineering Programs proposal (Provost Tarhule/President Dietz)***

***Action Items: None***

***Information Items:***

***12.10.20.10 Policy 4.1.3 Textbooks CURRENT Copy (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***12.10.20.11 Policy 4.1.3 Textbooks MARK UP (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***12.10.20.12 Policy 4.1.3 Textbooks CLEAN Copy (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***12.10.2013 Horst Email Reinstatement Committee Charge (Rules Committee)***

***04.06.18.01 Email\_Student Representation on Reinstatement and LOA committees (Information Item 11/20/21)***

***01.04.20.01 Reinstatement Committee charge Current (Rules Committee)***

***01.04.20.02 Reinstatement Committee charge mark up (Rules Committee)***

***12.10.20.16 REINSTATEMENT COMMITTEE CLEAN Copy (Rules Committee)***

***Consent Agenda Item: None***

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

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

***Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Hollywood***

***Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Avogo***

***Rules Committee: Senator Horst***

***Presentation: Campus snow and ice removal procedures for Spring (Kristie Toohill, Mike Gebeke, and Nick Stoff)***

***Communications:***

***Sense of the Senate Resolution (Susan Kalter)***

***Adjournment***

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

Senator Kalter: All right. So, I wanted to call your attention to one thing that you probably already noticed. Venus is not here today, and the reason is that she has resigned from the University effective on December 15, 2020, as far as I could tell. So, we need to fill her seat on the Executive Committee. I’m wondering if we should attempt to have the election to fill this seat just after my remarks as chairperson, and have the Caucus do that, and then move immediately to the Senate confirmation of the Caucus’ nominees, so that we can have somebody seated on Exec for the next time.

Otherwise, if it takes… usually, in other words, let me sort of give a preface to that. Normally in the spring when we do voting for Exec, all of the Exec members are nominated by the Caucus and then two weeks later in the May meeting they are elected by the Senate. And so, we’re going to follow that process, but it seems like an acceleration of that would be in order. And since we have no other business for the Faculty Caucus except for this, it seems like again a good opportunity to sort of meld the Senate and Caucus meetings together a little bit and do it that way. Does that sound good to everybody? Is there any problems with that?

Senator Horst: We have one volunteer, is that correct?

Senator Kalter: Yes.

Senator Horst: But, you know, if we have more volunteers from the floor, you know, traditionally the faculty would vote first and then it would go to the Senate.

Senator Kalter: If we had that happen I could imagine calling a recess of the Senate so that the Caucus could basically put people in the waiting room and the Caucus could do the vote as a Caucus so that we don’t have sort of an uncomfortable, you know, we do not electioneer for these seats, right. We don’t, like, make statements about why we want to serve or whatever, we just vote. And I can imagine that that could feel uncomfortable for people to have students, staff, administration watching that faculty process. I think that’s kind of what you’re pointing out, Martha. So, yeah. I’m not sure about the, I’m trying to think through the Open Meetings Act implications of doing that because of course usually we say that the Caucus will follow the Senate meeting. We’d have to have a separate Caucus agenda.

Senator Horst: Could we have a Caucus meeting from 7:00-7:10 p.m.?

Senator Kalter: I think we could.

Senator Horst: And then we’ll just, you know, and probably there will be one candidate but if there are two then we could do a vote, and then everybody can wait in the waiting room like you said, and then we could start the Senate meeting around 7:15 p.m. or something like that.

Senator Kalter: Yep. And I’m thinking… I don’t think that’s a problem with, even though we’ve approved the calendar for the Senate meeting to start at 7:00 p.m. on the 20th, I think as long as we announce, you know, there’s going to be a delay with the beginning of the meeting, that that’s fine.

I just saw the Board of Trustees do that a couple weeks ago where they went into Executive Session for two or three hours and all of you were having a lot of fun watching them go in and out of Executive Session not knowing that they were. So, I think that would work, especially if we announce it on the agenda, right. If we put up the Senate agenda and say, please expect a delay in the start of the Senate meeting due to a need for a Caucus meeting immediately before, or something like that.

Senator Horst: And then we’ll just let in the faculty members?

Senator Kalter: Right. yeah. So, letting everybody know that we’re going to be late opening the doors. The other way we could do it is have everybody… except I don’t think we can do this now that I think about it because Cera can only be a host of one meeting at a time. It would be better to have everybody go into the Senate meeting and everybody who’s on the Caucus go into the Caucus meeting, right, so that they don’t feel like they’re being shut out of the doors of the Senate meeting. But I don’t think we can do that because you can’t host two meetings at the same time. So, we’ll just have to leave people in the waiting room and let them know.

Senator Harris: I was just going to suggest maybe you can make a breakout room for Caucus.

Senator Kalter: Oh.

Senator Harris: Yeah. Just make one big breakout room all in the same Zoom.

Senator Kalter: You’re so brilliant. Thank you, Lauren. That’s the better idea. Let’s do it that way.

President Dietz: Gladly we learn and teach.

Senator Kalter: I love it that one of us came up with that after…

Senator Horst: I’m not sure you can record breakout room though. I don’t think you can. And I think it technically has to be recorded, right?

Senator Mainieri: You can record breakout rooms.

Senator Kalter: Supposedly, you can record breakout rooms, but I have never seen it done successfully. Like, we were supposed to do that at the National Council of Faculty Senates…

Senator Horst: Yeah, that’s right.

Senator Kalter: And nobody could figure out how to do it.

Senator Horst: Oh.

Senator Kalter: Okay. So, we’re back… even though it was a brilliant idea, we’re back to the other idea. So, we’ll do the waiting room idea. Tracy, what were you going to say?

Senator Mainieri: I did it all fall semester just there has to be a co-host in the breakout room.

Senator Kalter: Oh.

Senator Mainieri: So, as long as one of the co-hosts in the breakout room, and co-hosts have recording abilities they should be able to record. I had to do it for one of my classes, so that’s the only reason I know. But if we’re nervous about it, I totally understand, but I just wanted to say it is possible.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, I knew it was possible. I’m kind of wondering if we want to take the chance of having it not work? You know what I mean. Like I would like to experiment, but I’m not sure I want to experiment on Inauguration night, on the night that we’re doing Engineering, like, yeah. So, yeah, let’s go with plan A and then try to do a little mini… I don’t know if we’ll ever be in this situation again, but a mini test on it some other time, because we’re sort of… yeah.

Senator Harris: The only thing I would say is maybe send out like a notice to everyone. Because I know the student will see it and they’ll just leave because they don’t know what’s happening, so.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. I agree. And maybe, Cera, do that blast a couple of times, right. Like when we send the agendas out, maybe the early afternoon of the meeting, and then during the beginning of the meeting just so that everybody, you know, can’t ignore it so to speak. All right. Let’s see. Okay so we’re going to do it that way. Let’s see.

The only other thing that I saw on the agenda was that the Textbook policy I think was in Action instead of Information stage, so we should probably make that Action and the Reinstatement is Information. And if we could maybe add the word “short” before the word “presentation” for the snow and ice removal that would be helpful. Anybody see anything else for the agenda?

Senator Mainieri: And then we’re adding in the communicable diseases policy, right?

Senator Kalter: Oh, yes. Thank you, Tracy. Let’s see. Where should we put that? I’m thinking first, right? The first Action Item?

Senator Horst and Nikolaou: Shouldn’t it be Information/Action Item?

Senator Kalter: Did you both say the same thing, Info/Action? Okay. Yes. Good deal. Let’s make that Information/Action, and then we’ll have Textbooks be Action. Do we want the discussion of Engineering Programs before that or do we want that after? Tracy is nodding yes before that.

Senator Mainieri: I think it’s good just to start off the spring with, I mean, engineering is going to be a priority, right, and I feel like we can still get the communicable diseases thing done.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. Especially since we don’t have a caucus. And it’s also to a certain extent this time an extension of Administrator Remarks, so that’s helpful. Good deal. Okay. Anything else before we approve the agenda? (Pause)

The motion was unanimously approved.

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Phillips, seconded by Senator Harris, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.