**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

**MONDAY, November 28, 2022**

**Approved**

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

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

None.

The committee did introductions to welcome new member Senator Myers.

***Approval of Executive Committee minutes from 10/17/22.***

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

***Oral Communication:***

***Senate mingling seating***

Senator Horst: There were some pictures of a meeting, and my husband (who used to be Senate chair) commented that we were all in a row with the President, the Provost and Chair of the Senate, SGA President. We used to not meet that way. I forgot that. The President, Provost, Deans Rep and Chairs rep used to be distributed. Not the Senate Chair, the SGA President, and secretary -- they were always in front. But the other members used to be distributed. If you remember, Cynthia used to come and put the name plaques around the table. I remember sitting next to President Bowman and the Provost. It did lead to some discussion between Senate members, and it also broke up the SGA and faculty a little bit. So, Cera’s willing to distribute in a random fashion the plaques.

Senator Cline: Forced integration.

Senator Horst: We can do an announcement that winter is coming, and people are going to get colds, and please be considerate of others. Starting in January?

President Kinzy: Starting in January is going to be the height of cold and flu season. I think the question is, do you want to just start by just having me tell the VPs and I to move around?

Senator Horst: That’s part of it.

President Kinzy: To see if that starts it. They’ll all move away from us (laughter). I have to say I was at a meeting off campus, and they said I was exposed to flu-a. So, there’s a very heightened sensitivity and there’s a sensitivity that people have less natural immunity because they weren’t exposed to as many things. This is a fair consideration.

Senator Horst: Okay. We’ll start with the VPs mingling.

President Kinzy: If everyone in this room moves around a little bit. So, small amounts and we’ll just see if that… aside from you three.

Senator Horst: Yeah. But we won’t have Cera come and do the random sort. We’ll take it slow.

President Kinzy: It might just happen.

***Advisory Item:***

***From Provost Tarhule:***

***CAST\_Dean\_Search\_AS***

***CAST\_Dean\_Search\_ColCouncil***

Senator Horst: Provost Tarhule sent a memo saying to the Senate that there will be a search for the Dean of CAST. He also announced this at the Senate. This is just the official notification. This is a Panel of Ten search.

***Distributed Communications:  
From Amy Hurd: (Information Item [Action Item?] 12/07/22)***

***11.03.22.20 Hurd Email\_ Policy 2.1.21***

***11.16.22.07 Policy 2.1.21 Undergraduate Academic Standing, Probation, and Reinstatement\_Current Copy***

***11.03.22.10 Policy Policy 2.1.21 Undergraduate Academic Standing, Probation, and Reinstatement\_Hurd Edits***

***11.03.22.01 Policy 2.1.21 Undergraduate Academic Standing, Probation, and Reinstatement Mark Up from Legal***

Senator Horst:This email came on November 1. It’s a bit confusing because there’s two versions of the policy. Right now, we’re working on policy 2.1.11 Satisfactory Academic Progress Required for Continued Financial Aid Eligibility. When we were talking about that policy, we discussed that in that policy we were changing the term Reinstatement Committee to University, Legal advised us to do that. Amy Hurd notes that in policy 2.1.21 Reinstatement Committee is also cited, and Amy Roser, chair of the Reinstatement Committee and she’s also an administrator (I don’t have her exact title), is concerned because she feels that, technically, the committee should be responsible for this but it’s always been practice that they only handle difficult cases. So, Amy Hurd’s initial request was that we do a small edit to 2.1.21 before all of the reinstatement issues happen at the end of the semester; they changed Reinstatement Committee to University, and then they changed the URL.

Subsequently, Legal sent another draft of this policy—which we spent, I don’t know, four or five meetings on and passed last year—in which they had more changes that they requested.

The issue is whether we think this is important enough to send directly to the floor, which we can do, so that it would be in place. The University is responsible for all this work before the end of the year. If we decide that we want to do that, which version should we send?

Senator Cline: I just wanted to say that the primary issue is that most reinstatements happen in a proforma sort of way, at a computer. Amy Roser just says a person has to raise their GPA to X, they’ve raised their GPA to X, they’ve been reinstated. The Reinstatement Committee is there in case there are complex cases. When she worked with us on 2.1.21, she didn’t notice that problem. Once we noticed the problem in 2.1.11, we decided to go back and fix 2.1.21. I would just point out that the Office of General Council (OGC) is a different lawyer who is looking at this version of 2.1.21. From my point of view, this is like anyone who’s ever worked on an edited anything, a new editor is going to find something. There’s nothing really super substantive that they have found that needs to be changed. So, my recommendation to Amy Hurd to try to just put the small changes in and move it straight through so it can be changed as is to avoid legal problems for Amy Roser and her position. My preference would be to go with the smaller of the edits because we just spent half a year revising 2.1.21.

Senator Mainieri: I agree.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. That was my question, are we trying to figure out which version? I agree that if we are sending it directly to the floor it should be Amy’s. But if we are considering the one by Legal, it would have to go through the committee because it has much more changes, and we cannot just deal with them on the floor.

Senator Horst: Another piece of the information is that members of the committee have been told if this change doesn’t occur, they would potentially have to meet actively after the new year for 40 hours to look at all the reinstatement cases. That’s a burden to put on faculty that have volunteered for an external committee. So, it is a change that’s in line with the changes that are in 2.1.11, that will be going up in the same night. Do you have any thoughts?

Senator Garrahy: I just have a question; so obviously it is a burden to the faculty and participants that would review this. What does it do to the students, in terms of delaying their start to the spring semester? You don’t know.

Senator Cline: No. It’s never happened before, because functionally it’s always been that the members and the position that Amy Roser is currently in does these proforma reinstatements. So, I think Amy Hurd has found a way around it for this next semester, but it would just be much better if the policy was clean.

Senator Horst: I don’t think they’d get quorum. I don’t think they could do anything.

President Kinzy: Is it possible to send forward the Amy Hurd version, and send the other version to the committee for a later consideration when available?

Senator Cline: Yes. We can do that, but we just reviewed it after a five-year review, and all these people were involved six months ago.

Senator Horst: We can certainly put it in the pile. So, is everyone okay with that? We’ll put it as an information/action item from the Executive Committee—which is something we can do. We can send something straight to the floor. We’ll put 2.1.21, document 11.03.22.1 from Amy Hurd , forward. We’ll send the other one to the Academic Affairs Committee. Sound good? Okay.

***From Rules Committee: (Information Item 12/07/22)***

***11.15.22.01 Executive Summary College of Education Bylaws***

***08.23.17.01 College of Education Bylaws\_Current Copy***

***11.10.22.21 College of Education Bylaws\_ Mark up***

***11.10.22.20 College of Education Bylaws\_ Clean Copy***

Senator Blum: We have the College of Education Bylaws. They made a lot of changes and they’ve been doing it for three years. I got some feedback, so there’s actually some more editorial changes that are coming.

Senator Horst: I sent a note to Senator Blum and Senator Nikolaou. I separated the comments that are more editorial in nature versus the ones that I think we want to ask on the floor. But the questions that he and I were raising, nothing was really a policy violation like we had with the CAS Bylaws. So, I think we’re good to go to the floor. I talked with Stacey Jones-Bock about this thing with superintendents and directors.

Senator Blum: I think we should clear that with Legal. And just so people know here, just like teachers, superintendents are certified by the State of Illinois. Another thing to know about the State of Illinois is that school districts are not just simply, kind of ones around here, multi-school districts or CPS or things like that. School districts can be one school. I did look it up and administrative code offers two exceptions where you cannot have a superintendent. One is if you have a school district that employees less than four teachers. The other one is basically CPS. There’s only one school district that meets the qualifications of covering multi, and over a million in population. That’s basically because large urban school districts are a CEO model. It’s not unusual. I’m perfectly happy to add superintendent and a director if Legal says it’s okay. I understand their problem. Their problem is that it’s a superintendent of two schools, and trying to find and fill positions it would add flexibility if they didn’t have to have a superintendent. I couldn’t figure out… they’re a public school like everyone else, they’re subject to the administrative code.

Senator Horst: Did they hire somebody as the director?

Senator Garrahy: They did, but I didn’t think he was a superintendent. I was just going to look it up. I thought they were going back to the director model.

President Kinzy: I thought that when I met him, he introduced himself as Director.

Senator Garrahy: I believe it’s director. He’s not a superintendent.

Senator Horst: So, they can sort it out because it’s their documents.

Senator Blum: So, if it’s perfectly legal, great.

Senator Horst: We can certainly ask them on the floor.

Senator Blum: Right. I’m not an attorney, I’m just a person reading the law, that the two exceptions that I told you were the only two exceptions. And it may be that Legal looks at it and there’s some other way of interpreting that code, or something like that, and it will be perfectly fine.

Senator Horst: It would be helpful if they were participating in this discussion. I sent a note to the dean, and I didn’t get anything back, so that’s why I called Stacey this afternoon.

Senator Blum: I understand the desire, right. For me it’s just simply a Legal question. Is it legal to do this or not? And if it is terrific.

Senator Horst: So, we have the list of probable questions you’re or they’re going to get on the floor?

Senator Blum: Yeah.

Senator Horst: And that can be one of them. Just move that up. Other than that, there’s just a lot of editorial suggestions. I said to Craig that I’m suggesting that we send this item as an information item, they receive the input from the Senate, and then they make the changes and pass it by their faculty, because this document has to be passed by their faculty. And then we pass it later in the spring, but they have to get it to us by a certain date. Does that make sense? Tracy?

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. I’m just, in my head, trying to go through the benefits of having them have this information now, before going as an information item. Because there’s just so many…

Senator Horst: We have all these questions.

Senator Mainieri: Yep.

Senator Horst: It’s questions about the content, but it’s not clear it has to be changed one way or the other. Like, for instance, they only put forward two names of faculty for a senate seat. They can do that (I actually looked it up in the Constitution), I just found it odd. Why don’t you have three people run for a senate seat? Sixteen was the case with me. So, it’s more just questions about why they’re doing things a certain way.

Senator Garrahy: Because they still have one seat that has not been filled in almost a year, isn’t that correct?

Senator Horst: Yeah, that is true. Okay. So, why don’t you reach out to the College Council chair and so they can start seeing the edits that we are proposing.

Senator Blum: Okay.

Senator Horst: And I’ll ask Cera, do you have the name of the College Council chair?

Senator Blum: Kristina Falbe.

Senator Mainieri: Made a list for Craig of editorial edits and more substantive suggestions, can that be included in the packet for senators?

Senator Horst: The mark up? Like we did with ASPT document?

Senator Mainieri: Because I just wonder, I want to save senators feeling like they’re combing through (because y’all did such a great job) and having to find all these little inconsistencies. If we just say Executive Committee has forwarded these things so far, right.

Senator Horst: Okay. Do people like that idea? Send this on like we did the ASPT document. That worked pretty well.

Senator Mainieri: I think any place where we can help senators focus in on where their input would be most meaningful and their limited time to review the materials, I think that would be really helpful.

Senator Horst: So, just point them towards the issues.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. Just say, hey, here are some of the issues that we saw, if you see new ones or have additional comments that would be great.

Senator Horst: That means we have to be a bit more formal since they are going to the full Senate. Okay.

***From Faculty Affairs Committee: (Information/Action 12/07/22)***

***11.16.22.05 Policy 3.3.3 Academic Ranks\_Current Copy***

Senator Horst: As of 2:18 p.m. I printed it out. There was only the suggestion to add “Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.”

Senator Mainieri: I did some later. I think my comment was just generally a comment that I brought up before where we just say “academic ranks” and I’m assuming that this policy is specifically talking about tenure line “academic ranks.”

Senator Horst: The people are only eligible for tenure if they have the title professor, associate professor, assistant professor. Right? That’s in the ASPT document.

Senator Mainieri: Right. But we’re just saying “academic ranks.” In the title of the policy, and saying “academic ranks”, which these are the academic ranks for tenure line faculty, correct?

Senator Cline: They are not non-tenure line teaching faculty.

Senator Horst: We’re not including them in the title.

Senator Mainieri: Right. So, I think as much as we cannot default to tenure line as a stand in for the default. And specify, this policy refers to tenure line academic ranks. I think by leaving it out we’re saying the default is tenure line.

Senator Horst: Okay. So, you have some proposed wording?

Senator Mainieri: Just tenure line. Before Academic Ranks we put Tenure Line.

Senator Horst: So, the Tenure Line Academic Ranks.

President Kinzy: Are you concerned that someday there could be assistant professors that aren’t on tenure track?

Senator Mainieri: There certainly could be.

President Kinzy: Is that why that wording is…

Senator Mainieri: I think also we need to in our policies make sure that we’re as specific as possible so that we’re not just assuming a particular class of people is the default. This comes up with marginalized groups that we leave off certain denotations just assuming that the default is the majority group. I think we have a history on this campus of sometimes marginalizing our non-tenure track folks and by, I think, just assuming everyone knows these are tenure line academic ranks.

President Kinzy: I’ve never seen it. There are many places where you will (I’ll use College of Business). You may want to hire Adam Grant (who’s a famous person) to come in, you’re going to give him the title of professor because it’s important, but you’re not going to put him on the tenure track or give them tenure. Where somebody, toward the end of their career, who moves to Bloomington/Normal, and they’d be an amazing instructor for a year or two—a bad example of that just happened at NYU, where a guy got fired for being too hard on pre-med students. So, I think if these are the titles, I’m not sure that the tenure track is the only way we do that.

Senator Horst: And it might be in the Constitution that way. So, “academic ranks” is a term that shows up in a bunch of different policies, and I don’t think I can scan the Constitution right now, but I think it’s defined somewhere in there.

Senator Mainieri: And I think that’s the case and this has come up already this semester and every time I see academic ranks not specified, I’m going to say the same thing, because there are different designations within the non-tenure track folks, aren’t there?

Senator Garrahy: That’s what I was just going to say. I’m just looking on our faculty page and our non-tenure track faculty have instructional assistant professor; some will have clinical assistant professor. I don’t know personally where those titles come from.

Senator Horst: Here it is from the Constitution: “all full-time appointments for faculty holding academic rank shall be one of two types, tenure appointments, probationary tenure track appointments. Non-tenure track appointments do not hold academic rank.”

Senator Nikolaou: And actually, policy 3.3.4 which talks about NTTs, it says no non-tenure track faculty titles have rank assignment. So, the rank explicitly applies to tenure.

Senator Cline: The operative word in that title is rank.

President Kinzy: Because the non-tenure track ones aren’t qualified academic titles.

Senator Nikolaou: And what Deb mentioned.

President Kinzy: Instructional assistant professor and clinical assistant professor.

Senator Garrahy: They don’t move up. I’m not aware of a process where they can go from clinical assistant to clinical associate.

President Kinzy: At a medical school you would. You would want to if you had a really good faculty member, you would want to promote them. And they come from a different world.

Senator Garrahy: Right, I’ve just not seen that here. Doesn’t mean it doesn’t exist, but I’ve not seen it here.

Senator Horst: Tracy, do you think including this language will clarify it? It’s the way the system is set up.

Senator Mainieri: I totally understand. And I think at some point we need to start questions, okay, are there systematic changes that we want to think about. I think if we’re not there yet, then, yes, some reference to the fact that this relates to the Constitution would be helpful. Or say that academic ranks are reserved for tenure-line ranks.

Senator Horst: I understand what you’re saying. And it’s not incredibly clear that academic ranks is this term of art that’s coming from the Constitution. So, I think with that language I just read, it becomes clear why we’re talking about this set of people.

Senator Mainieri: I think the more transparency we can have in these policies about, okay, this is a term that we’re using just because, and then should we question it. Or this is a term from our Constitution, and this is why, and then if we also continue to question it then that’s a bigger question.

Senator Horst: Okay. I’ll suggest to Pete that they should include the Constitutional language. Any other suggestions for the Faculty Affairs Committee? Okay.

***From Faculty Affairs Committee: (Information/Action 12/07/22)***

***11.16.22.06 Policy 3.3.10 Termination Notification of Faculty\_Current Copy***

Senator Horst: The committee had no suggested revisions. I discussed this policy with President Kinzy before break. She and I, again, discussed what is “faculty”? what “faculty” are they talking about? She and I parsed out that they were talking about tenure-track and non-tenure track specifically. They are not talking about faculty associates, for instance. So, that was one suggestion. Again, Dimitrios and I were suggesting that they include some reference to the ASPT or policy 3.3.3. President Kinzy also suggested deleting that we just discussed this scenario where in the event there are insufficient appropriated funds to continue the appointment, notice must be given as soon as possible. We discussed how that would happen. She zeroed in on the term “appropriated.”

President Kinzy: “Appropriated” implies funds given to us by the state. That probably made sense 40 years ago, but now the percentage of our funding that comes from the state is 14%. So, would it be traumatic if we lost it again, like in the shutdown, yes. Is it the most likely cause of a loss of funding at the university, no. That would be a major drop in enrollment, things like that that would negatively impact. This policy implies that the only reason this would happen is if the state appropriation went down. So, either this is a byproduct of the budget shutdown (which doesn’t make sense because this university was strong and stable through that) or it’s just a term that the appropriation of funds to a unit, and then it’s unclear. You could just say “funds.” From an all-funds budgeting model, it doesn’t really matter. When your department gets money, you don’t actually know where it comes from. GR is just one large pot. So, I think it’s just an outdated term; they meant “allocated” as opposed to “appropriated.” In real life, we would always look at the sum of the money. We could say, you know what, we’ve decided that the Department of Underwater Basket Weaving, we’re going to give all of their funds from the state funding. So, if it was a drop in appropriations we’d be like, sorry, Underwater Basket Weaving, yours is an appropriation, but Kinesiology and Recreation is tuition funded, and so they’re safe. So, we just think it’s something that doesn’t serve the goal, which it of course to never be in that situation, but also of where our funding actually comes from now. Does that make sense?

Senator Nikolaou: I was just wondering if… and I agree with removing the “appropriated.” Because I was looking back to the presentation that VP Stephens gave. But if we remove appropriated, do we need to put what type of funds we are talking about? Because it’s not like we’re talking about facility funds.

Senator Cline: Just say funds, unqualified.

Senator Nikolaou: That’s why I didn’t know, because these are for personnel. If there is something that is specific for academic personnel. That’s why I put what type of funds, because I don’t know.

President Kinzy: All funds are green. This is what some of our colleagues run into. They have buildings that they don’t need, but they still cost them money. So, you would want to say that you can shut something down that you don’t need, but it doesn’t exactly work that way. We allocated the funds historically right now (we need to work on that, we all know that). But I think that there is no particular funding that determines whether or not you don’t have funding. It’s not as if… you could just as easily say, well we can do it if tuition goes down. I think it just means that if the university doesn’t have sufficient funds, that’s the point at which people do it, and as soon as we know that, we would tell people. If it were state funds, that could be any time between April and May that we would know about it for the next year. If it’s tuition, we wouldn’t know until the 10th day, so that would be in September. They are all different as to why the university might have insufficient funds. What they are saying is they want to give people as much notice as possible. So, you don’t want to find out in October that you have a 25% drop in tuition and you’re going to have to cut funds. And tell people when you’re contractually obligated to tell them. You want to tell them as soon as possible. That’s what I read as the main part of this, which is we have policies that say how much notice you have to give people, but we should be giving them as much as possible if there’s a loss of funding.

Senator Horst: Okay. Just going back to the conversation about what we’re submitting to the Senate. Would we want to submit this with the comments on the side? I guess it’s going to Pete’s committee first.

Senator Cline: I don’t think it should be on the agenda. I think it should go to the committee first.

President Kinzy: I think this is going to bring up more questions than you think. That’s what I think. I think the committee should thoroughly vet the questions about what does this mean, because this is about terminating people. And it’s about where does funding come from. I think it’s actually potentially more contentious than we think a single word is. We had quite a long conversation about it.

Senator Horst: We did. So, we can send it back to committee, certainly. We don’t think it’s ready. And we can ask them to consider revising this sentence. But ultimately, I think President Kinzy has the most knowledge about what the proper wording will be.

President Kinzy: And I won’t be there at the next meeting.

Senator Horst: Okay. It looks like 3.3.10 is probably not going to go forward, so we don’t have to worry about what we’re going to send forward. Okay.

***From Academic Affairs Committee: (Information Item 12/07/22)***

***11.16.22.15 Policy 4.1.18 Transfer of Credit from Other Institutions and Credit by Examination\_Current Copy***

***11.16.22.16 Proposed Policy 4.1.18 Credit Earned through Transfer\_Examination\_and Prior Learning\_Mark Up***

***11.16.22.04 Proposed Policy 4.1.18 Credit Earned through Transfer\_Examination\_and Prior Learning\_Clean Copy***

Senator Cline: In your packet you’ve got all the relevant documents. Just as a little bit of a background -- last year there was a new public act, public Act 1020174, which required that Early Childhood Education Programs in the State of Illinois begin to accept alternative forms of credit. This is trying to fight the lack of elementary education instructors in the state. This caused us to have to make a change to 4.1.18 in order to become current with the law. But at the same time, Amy Hurd and several other folks decided they probably should relook at the entire document; there have been other areas that have been asking questions over the years about what they could include and could not include as outside credit. The policy itself changed its entire name. It’s not the same name anymore, but you’ll see there have been some additions and some changes throughout. The most important is that escrow credit has now been allowed essentially across the campus. But I think the most important thing to say is that in all cases the programs or departments get to determine for themselves the extent to which they want to participate at any of the available opportunities. So, if Nursing (which Nursing has always had escrow credit) is doing it and it’s in the bylaws, it doesn’t mean that Art has to then take escrow credit. It’s just the available options for departments as the landscapes change for them. So, if there are any specific questions, I’m happy to answer them. I think I’ve resolved most of them that were asked on OneDrive. There was one question that Dimitrios had about CLEP, and we’ve resolved that. Just for the tape, I have corrected all the little ones and will send them to Cera.

***From Academic Affairs Committee: (Remove from Issues Pending List)***

***11.14.22.01 AAC Memo to Chair Horst \_300\_400 Level Classes***

Senator Cline: One of the issues that was on our agenda is the item titled 300/400 level course questions. This originated with the document that you have in your folder from the CAS Curriculum Committee as it related to some issues having to do with some changes that were—I hesitate to say made—but some decisions that matriculated through the Graduate School having to do with dual credit courses. So, this issue came up in April 2021. In the background, while we were doing other necessary things, several things happened. This process kind of went through. So, at this point, it feels to our committee as if the changes that were being requested by the CAS Curriculum Committee have essentially been done. And overall, it feels like if there are underlining issues, they’re actually with the Graduate School, which is outside of our purview. So, I produced for you a little memo that explains some of these things, what we talked about, what has happened, and then what our suggestions to the Graduate School might be in order to help continue to resolve the issue which we deem to be primarily communication between those making the decisions and those implementing the decisions. And I did add just for good measure, because it wasn’t included in your posts, I added the UCC minutes where this was discussed, where there is kind of a year-by-year outline about what happened in the lead up to this 300/400 level change so that you know what I mean when we say they followed the current procedures as they had been. There wasn’t any procedural violation, it was just that the procedures were not as clear as they could have been. That’s very loaded, but there you go. There’s a lot of conditionals in that. Please let us put it to bed.

Senator Horst: Senator Blum, because you are working on the Grad School Bylaws, do you have any perspective on if they are addressing what sorts of grad curriculum items will go through the senate in there?

Senator Blum: The changes were kind of dividing things up. Is that what you’re asking?

Senator Horst: Are they talking about how the Grad Curriculum Committee will interface with the Academic Senate?

Senator Blum: Not the way you are talking about.

Senator Horst: Okay. Because I remember they were going to change their charge to do that. We can look at that later.

Senator Blum: It’s more like there was the UCC and now they’re pulling, sort of the de-tangling of those two. Now, they are going to take the graduate and then in the new one it lists all their new responsibilities.

Senator Horst: Okay. We can look at that.

Senator Blum: No one had any questions about that.

Senator Horst: Are there any comments about this? I did note that it talks about checking in with the Senate chair regarding what changes should go through the Senate. That’s why I was trying to figure out where they are with that. I think what I’m going to do is sit down with Noelle Selkow and Amy Hurd and try to make a document like the document about general education and how that works, just so we have a document with a clear understanding about what kinds of things the Senate should look at regarding the grad curriculum. Anybody want to help me with that that has expertise in curriculum?

Senator Nikolaou: We did it partly with Amy and Noelle in the fall of 2019.

Senator Horst: You have a document?

Senator Nikolaou: Well, we tried to develop some first steps.

Senator Horst: And where is that?

Senator Nikolaou: Oh, that was made for CAS because we were having many departments who were doing the separation between the 300 and 400.

Senator Cline: Thinking that it was a mandate.

Senator Horst: Okay. I’m talking about the Senate and the Grad Curriculum Committee, and because that’s kind of part of it, why didn’t this go through the Senate.

Senator Cline: Have we even decided whether the Grad Curriculum Committee reports to us? That was an open question last year that we sort of waited on the new director and what the new director wanted.

Senator Horst: And I asked her, and she never got back to me.

Senator Nikolaou: And it was weird because at that point we were saying that if you wanted to make a revision to an undergraduate program, let’s say I wanted to change the description to a 300-level course, I would need to split it into the 300/400 course, but then if I’m making a change in the Undergraduate Curriculum, it’s a Senate thing. But creating the course and splitting them it is not something necessarily under our purview, and that was something that was unclear what the situation is.

Senator Horst: So, this change, one of the questions that Senator Kalter asked is should this have gone through the Senate, and that’s why I’m hoping we can create some sort of document to understand what sorts of things regarding the grad curriculum should go through the Senate. That’s what I’m hoping I can work out.

Senator Cline: And that’s sort of outlined in the document I attached in the memo I sent you, which is this sort of model for how it’s done, and some undergraduate things that might serve as a model for the grad. That was attached to what I sent to you. But it has to be, I think, devised by the Graduate School about how they want to go about it. Which I don’t think is necessarily tied to this particular issue, but a bigger issue about the interaction with the GCC and the Senate.

Senator Blum: We don’t really have them yet, but in the proposed bylaws revisions of the Senate in the affiliated groups, they agreed that they wanted to be an affiliated group.

Senator Horst: They did?

Senator Blum: Yes.

Senator Horst: Okay. Good.

Senator Blum: There really isn’t an affiliated group at the particular moment, but that’s in the future bylaws, we’re structuring that.

Senator Horst: I didn’t know that. Great. So, that’s kind of the piece that I’m wondering about. I think we need some sort of document, some sort of understanding between the Grad School, like how we’re going to work together. Because I think the Senate was just sort of shocked that this didn’t go through the Senate. And that’s part of the question, what should go through the Senate, and I don’t think necessarily a committee can hammer that out.

Senator Cline: But it also came up last year when we were asked to change the University Curriculum Committee to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. So, there are several things outstanding waiting for this new formulation of the GCC and the Graduate School.

Senator Garrahy: So, Martha, I know I should know the answer to this, but I don’t, so I’m not embarrassed to ask it. I know we have a graduate student representative, or we’re supposed to. Do we have a graduate faculty representative?

Senator Horst: We do have a new senator.

Senator Walsh: We do, Jewel Woodard. She’s our new grad student senator.

Senator Horst: And she’s a PhD student so we might have her for a few years.

Senator Garrahy: Excellent. But I’m wondering, and maybe this has to do with the grad bylaws, do we have a faculty member that represents the grad school?

Senator Horst: We do not. Most faculty probably… we do not have anybody who represents the Grad School, and we can’t expand necessarily.

Senator Garrahy: Here’s my observation. Over the last three years, we have constituents who do a really good job about getting the information out to all of their constituents; and I just wonder how if/and when anything comes up with the Graduate School how does it get disseminated to Graduate School members? As a full professor, I’m a member of the Grad School, but I’m not involved in their day-to-day stuff.

Senator Horst: Lea talked about that with communication. I went to their website, because you talked about their website, and they did have grad school faculty support grad curriculum procedures and then in the procedures there was nothing. So, we can make that recommendation to put up some procedures.

Senator Cline: Procedures and also, I think, there was a situation this year, a new graduate coordinator was hired in Politics and Government that had heard from somebody that they had to go through systematically and separate the 300 and 400. So, this sort of rumor persisted, and they did all this work. So, there’s nowhere for these kinds of headlines or updates or bulletins to be persistent on a website that could have assisted in saying that actually it’s not required, that only when the change is happening to the class does there need to be… so all the sudden of course CAS got through a plethora of…

Senator Mainieri: I do know that they actively use Teams to communicate amongst grad coordinators. That’s where they push everything really, so there could be an interface there.

Senator Cline: Yeah. It’s just a suggestion.

Senator Horst: Okay. Does everyone agree with that proposal, that I will talk with them about making some sort of agreement between the Senate and the Grad Curriculum Committee, just hammer out what’s going to go through the Senate, what sort of things we’re interested in. I’m going to suggest that they devote some procedures along the lines of the ones that you attached, just in the interest of communication. Other than that, I read the minutes, they were pretty thorough. I thought the discussion was good, and it seems like this was an issue from a couple years ago. Is everyone happy with taking this off the issues pending list and putting it on my issues pending list? Okay.
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***Proposed* Academic Senate Meeting Agenda**

**Wednesday, December 7, 2022**

**7:00 P.M.  
Old Main, 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.***

***Approval of the Academic Senate minutes of 10/12/22 and 10/26/22.***

***Chairperson's Remarks***

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

***Administrators' Remarks:***

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

***Action Items:***

***10.13.22.04 Policy 2.1.11 Satisfactory Academic Progress Required for Continued Financial Aid Eligibility\_ Current Copy***

***11.03.22.06 Policy 2.1.11 Satisfactory Academic Progress Required for Continued Financial Aid Eligibility\_ Mark Up***

***11.03.22.05 Policy 2.1.11 Satisfactory Academic Progress Required for Continued Financial Aid Eligibility\_ Clean Copy***

***Information/Action Item:***

***From Executive Committee:***

***11.03.22.20 Hurd Email\_ Policy 2.1.21***

***11.16.22.07 Policy 2.1.21 Undergraduate Academic Standing, Probation, and Reinstatement\_ Current Copy***

***11.03.22.10 Policy 2.1.21 Undergraduate Academic Standing, Probation, and Reinstatement\_ Hurd Edits***

***Information Items:***

***From Rules Committee:***

***11.15.22.01 Executive Summary College of Education Bylaws***

***08.23.17.01 College of Education Bylaws\_ Current Copy***

***11.10.22.21 College of Education Bylaws\_ Mark up***

***11.10.22.20 College of Education Bylaws\_ Clean Copy***

***From Academic Affairs Committee:***

***11.16.22.15 Policy 4.1.18 Transfer of Credit from Other Institutions and Credit by Examination\_ Current Copy***

***11.16.22.16 Proposed Policy 4.1.18 Credit Earned through Transfer\_ Examination\_ and Prior Learning\_ Mark Up***

***11.16.22.04 Proposed Policy 4.1.18 Credit Earned through Transfer\_ Examination\_ and Prior Learning\_ Clean Copy***

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

***Internal Committee Reports:***

* ***Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Cline***
* ***Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Senator Nikolaou***
* ***Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Smudde***
* ***Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Valentin***
* ***Rules Committee: Senator Blum***

***Communications***

***Adjournment or Hard Stop 8:45 p.m.***

Motion by Senator Mainieri, seconded by Senator Smith, to approve the agenda. The motion was unanimously approved as amended.

***Follow up on Senator Hollywood comment regarding scheduling issues with Student Counseling and Tutoring Center.***

***11.10.22.25 Hurd Email\_Visor Center Tutoring  
11.16.22.17 Fw\_ Counseling Services Wait Time***

Senator Horst: Okay, Senator Hollywood brought up two issues on the floor, one about tutoring and one about the Counseling Services wait time. I ask Provost Tarhule and VP Johnson to follow up and these are the memos you see. Is there any interest in forwarding these issues further? (Pause) Are you satisfied with the response?

Senator Mainieri: Will the Senate in general get them?

Senator Horst: I can forward them both to the Senate. Last year, we had a presentation on counseling as well. We had a lengthy conversation about the process and triage appointments and all that.

President Kinzy: We had a coffee hour about Mental Health Services.

Senator Walsh: Yeah. Before the Board of Trustees meeting, we had that.

Senator Horst: Right. We had that too.

Senator Duffy: I did have a question to make sure I have the definition right. Triage is pertaining to people who are coming in and not feeling well or…?

Senator Walsh: So, triage is like, to my understanding when I talked with Carrie, it’s like your first appointment where they’ll do an assessment test and they’ll see where they should best send you based on that test, or what resources you should best be provided based on that test.

Senator Horst: So, they’ll do triage and figure out what’s wrong with you.

President Kinzy: And the severity.

Senator Walsh: Yeah.

Senator Horst: Okay. We can forward these to the Senate. Any further action on those items? Seeing none.

***From Council on General Education: (Dist. to Rules Committee)***

***11.16.22.08 Bylaws\_Council on General Education charge\_Current Copy***

***11.16.22.09 Bylaws\_Council on General Education charge\_Mark Up***

***11.03.22.03 Bylaws\_Council on General Education charge\_Clean Copy***

Senator Horst: From Amy Hurd is the Council on General Education Bylaws. I worked on this for like a year, and they have some more edits. The big edit, I think is “8. Makes recommendations on new and existing university wide graduation requirements including but not limited to AMALI, IDEAS, and BS-SMT.” That’s a significant change. She is also working with me to come up with potentially separate curriculum committees for AMALI and IDEAS, but that’s still in formation. This is pretty clear that this should go to Rules, because Rules is in charge of the Senate Bylaws.

Senator Nikolaou: I did have a question for Rules to take into consideration. When they talk about the officers, where it says the chairperson are reelected by members of the committee. If they have talked about if there are going to be representation, so can the chairperson be a student? Or should it say from the elected non-ex-officio members? Because the issue that I see is because the AVP for Undergraduate Education is listed as a member, but the committee says that it is advisory to the Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Education. So, in theory the AVP for Undergraduate Education could be the chair of the committee, that is advising to themselves.

Senator Horst: Do you recall our discussion two years ago, or has COVID wiped it away? This is the exact issue I brought up when I was chair of Rules. Everyone disagreed with me. I was the one dissenting vote.

Senator Nikolaou: I think they said for this one that usually it’s the Associate Dean of CAS that’s usually the chair.

Senator Horst: But they continue to have five ex-officio voting members. The Senate agreed with them. The Rules Committee can talk about it again. But two years ago, we spent a year on these bylaws. And Amy said she would never be chair.

Senator Nikolaou: I’m assuming the Amy person, it’s unlikely that they will want to be the chair; but it would be weird if at some point there was someone who is the chair, and they are advising themselves.

Senator Horst: Yes. That’s exactly what we brought up, what was it, three years ago. These issues just keep coming back.

Senator Blum: Okay. I guess you and I can talk about agenda issues for Rules.

Senator Horst: Yes. We can talk about this. But the important change is just the AMALI and IDEAS. You can certainly talk about all this again.

Senator Mainieri: So, are we forwarding it to Rules just to review the proposed changes or are we going to wait for other additions for the next review cycle.

Senator Horst: No. Those will come separately. This is about makes recommendations on new and existing University wide graduation requirements, not reviewing the courses that satisfy the requirements.

Senator Mainieri: Right. I’m asking if I had a question regarding what I see as their current charge is and something that I feel is missing, do I speak that now or wait until it comes up next time?

Senator Horst: Go ahead.

Senator Mainieri: Okay. So, I have two things. One, is it now the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee? I don’t know why I don’t know this.

Senator Horst: It’s the University Curriculum Committee.

Senator Mainieri: Okay. So, it’s still that. The other things 1. Under functions says, “ensures the spirit of mission goals of general education is maintained by the program.” I’m curious that none of the Functions specifically mention diversity, particularly equity in the curriculum. I wonder if that is part of the curriculum committees’ function is to ensure the courses that are coming through the review process are set up with equitable learning in mind.

Senator Horst: Okay.

Senator Walsh: I had one thing. Where it says—this is just kind of nitpicky but—it says nominated and elected by the Student Government Association, regarding the student votes, in the SGA Constitution it slightly contradicts where it gives the Vice President sole nomination or sole power to decide who’s in those.

Senator Horst: Okay. What is the wording you suggest?

Senator Walsh: I would say appointed by the Student Government Association Vice President.

Senator Horst: How about just appointed by the Student Government Association.

Senator Walsh: Perfect.

***From Amy Hurd: (Dist. to Academic Affairs Committee)***

***11.16.22.12 Hurd memo\_ Policy 2.1.9 Baccalaureate Degree Program***

***11.16.22.13 Policy 2.1.9 Baccalaureate Degree Programs\_Current Copy***

***11.16.22.14 Policy 2.1.9 Baccalaureate Degree Programs\_Mark Up***

***11.16.22.01 Policy 2.1.9 Baccalaureate Degree Programs Clean Copy***

<https://curriculum.illinoisstate.edu/procedures/operating-procedures/>  
***11.16.22.10 Changes to the General Education Program\_ Current Copy  
11.16.22.11 Changes to Graduation Requirements\_ Current Copy***

Senator Horst: Policy 2.1.9 is this policy that actually lists the graduation requirements. I was surprised when I saw this policy on our policies to review, particularly because we just did IDEAS, and we didn’t change this policy at all. Now they are out of whack. Amy Hurd has gone through and proposed a lot of changes. I requested that she did a memo because there were so many of them. Also, just so you know, there is this law that she is referencing. I might have Cera forward this. This state lists that we should have 120 units and that change was made a couple of years ago, but we didn’t make that change. That’s why they are changing from 124 to 120. Besides the fact that this will probably go to Academic Affairs Committee, I’d like to suggest that whenever general education changes and graduation requirement changes are considered by the Senate, they be accompanied by a revised 2.1.9. We should put that in these documents so that people understand that there is this policy. It’s awkward now that we have this graduation requirement that’s not in this policy. Any comments or observations? There’s no rush.

Senator Mainieri: Do you have a sense if the content in 2.1.9, is it all in other policies already? Like is there anything you need from this policy that is only in this policy?

Senator Horst: The proposal for certificates, I think, is a new idea. That’s one. I think a lot of it is duplicated in the catalog. So, you were sort of perceiving that we were changing the catalog when we did the IDEAS.

President Kinzy: So, is the answer to take things out of this policy, rather than adding them? Procedures should not be in policies because then you have to go through this process every time. Is it a policy or is it a procedure? If it’s in the student catalog…

Senator Horst: That’s a question the committee can ask Senator Hurd, but this is what she’s proposing.

Senator Mainieri: I think it’s an important question. Again, this is another instance where I feel like we are chasing out tails sometimes. Right. And are there places where we can eliminate or trim down policy to only what’s unique in the policy? If most of what’s in 2.1.9 is duplicated elsewhere, or procedure, then can we eliminate all of that, and only leave whatever.

Senator Horst: But do we control the catalog? Does the Senate control the text of the catalog?

Senator Mainieri: I think that’s the question, right. Where else is this information appearing?

Senator Horst: The catalog, I believe. But the text of the catalog doesn’t go through the Senate.

Senator Mainieri: But is this more, again, this is a question for the committee. What is procedural and what is actual policy.

Senator Cline: I’ll admit that I haven’t spent a whole lot of time with this yet. But there are a lot of things that seem very policy-ish. How many hours, what are the requirements, and not… There may be a lot of procedure in here I just don’t see it, but there do seem to be a lot of listing of the requirements in order to get a Bachelor of Arts. What are the baseline requirements? So, those feel policy-ish.

Senator Mainieri: Is there a way on the policy website, and I think we did this with some, that there is something on the bottom that says refer to these cooperating policies, or something like that? So, is there a way for us to… like if we keep this 2.1.9 as is, intact, is there a way then to flag these ones that we know, if these other ones change then we have to come back to them, like more formally. So that anytime we go to the website for one of these as we are doing a five-year review we know, oh, if we change this, here are the things that we also need to check.

Senator Horst: I had this vision that we could do an edit and then it could translate into all the policies. But that’s the power of putting those references so that the Senate does know to go look at them. Be it as it may, right now, this policy—we should have looked at this policy when we did the IDEAS requirement, although there were other additions that had to be made at the same time. But every time we do a graduation requirement, we should also revise this policy on graduation requirements. Sounds obvious. This has gone through the curriculum committee, so the next logical step is the Academic Affairs Committee. They can consider even truncating it a little further to see what kind of text they can delete. But on the other hand, we don’t approve the text of the catalog. Except for that moment when we do the gen ed reform, we’re essentially approving policy language and catalog language at the same time.

Senator Cline: Sure. Even though, I guess we don’t technically get to approve the catalog language, we approve the policy that mirrors the catalog language.

Senator Horst: The policy drives that catalog language. The catalog can point to this, it could go the other way, the catalog could point to this.

President Kinzy: If I’m a student, do I want to read a policy or a catalog? Which one am I going to go to?

Senator Walsh: Catalog.

Senator Horst: You can click on a link.

President Kinzy: That’s the other challenge, right. making sure that critically important information is where people can find it. That’s our number one goal, right. These policies are there to have people have clarity.

Senator Garrahy: Then the catalog is what we hold our students to, in terms of graduation requirements, correct? I mean if Patrick came in under the 2017 catalog, we don’t care that we are on a different catalog, I think it’s done every two years (I don’t remember). So, what’s in that catalog is your guarantee as to what you’re suppose to have to graduate.

Senator Horst: The policy could say graduation requirements are specified in the catalog which must go through the Academic Senate.

President Kinzy: It doesn’t move fast enough for us to make requirements that have to be done for accreditation or purposes like that.

Senator Horst: Well, whenever there is a major change in the catalog it goes through the Senate.

President Kinzy: The catalog has more than just this in it though.

Senator Horst: Yeah. I’m just saying it could say all graduate requirements are listed in the catalog, such graduation requirements must go through the Academic Senate if revised.

President Kinzy: Maybe we should look at what best practices are out there, because I don’t think that most catalogs go through that process.

Senator Horst: Okay. Anyway, whenever we do gen ed reform.

Senator Cline: We’re working on it, okay.

President Kinzy: This idea that policies have links to related policies at the bottom is a fairly standard thing.

Senator Horst: And we’re doing more and more of that. What I’m suggesting is that we revise this document simultaneously, to just basically say look at this policy if you’re revising graduation requirements or look at this policy and propose a change to this policy if you are doing gen ed requirements. Would you like to send both of these to Academic Affairs?

Senator Mainieri: I think if we are going to want them together, then we should send them together.

Senator Horst: Okay.

***Possible Bylaws Question for Rules:  Should we extend the prohibition of senators serving on external committees of the senate to include any members of SGA?  Could it apply only to the University Appeals Board and the University Hearing Panel? SGA bluebook page.***Senator Horst: I had the pleasure of attending an SGA meeting. It was very informative, very interesting, and ran much more efficiently than our meetings, and they follow Roberts Rules more specifically that we do. One issue that was raised at that SGA meeting was this issue of a conflict of interest -- whether or not members of SGA who are participating in a debate and potentially endorsing a resolution, whether or not they are creating a conflict of interest if they are simultaneously sitting on the University Hearing Panel of Appeals Board, specifically. Do you guys want to talk a little bit more about that?

Senator Walsh: Of course. With recent events, there was a piece of legislation that went up that was basically encouraging getting SGA’s opinion on events that happened with the Kappa Sigma fraternity; a question that arose was if this passes could this then be, say for instance, the fraternity is removed, could the fraternity then use that as an appeal mechanism to then argue a conflict of interest because SGA is the voice of the students, right under the Dean of Students office, so on and so on. We wanted to know if there was a conflict of interest, and then SGA members then participating on these University Hearing Panel or University Appeals Boards, could it then create a further conflict of interest? That’s what we are asking.

Senator Horst: And then the other confusing piece is what is SGA. So, can you guys talk about your structure in terms of the senators?

Senator Walsh: Yeah. SGA is comprised of an executive branch, and then there is a legislative branch, and then we have our ex-officios. So, first of all ,the executive branch is comprised of myself (president), vice president, chief of staff, and then our cabinet—which consists of our secretaries that all oversee different niches, I guess you could say, within the University. So, there’s sustainability, IT, so on and so on. Additionally, we have our legislative branch, which is comprised of 20 senators. Those are broken up into four different categories. So, we have our on-campus senators, our off-campus, our more academic (not academic in terms of academic senate but more represent the different colleges) and there are six of those. Four on-campus, six off-campus, six academic college related ones, and then four student life. Student life oversee athletics, help promotion and wellness, and then all the RSO’s as well. Then ex-officios, they typically represent underrepresented groups here on campus. But then additionally, they also represent… we have ex-officios for the different GREEK councils and so on. Any organization is allowed to apply for ex-officio status. But typically, underrepresented groups are automatically granted that pass. Also, the legislative branch we have our POA (president of the assembly), our vice president of the assembly, and then our secretary of the assembly as well. That’s the compromise of SGA and the quick Patrick Walsh one minute run through.

Senator Horst: Am I correct, it was about five years ago is when you expanded with these ex-officios. Is that right?

Senator Walsh: To be honest I’m not sure the history on that. When they first came about.

Senator Horst: I think the structure changed significantly about five or six years ago. They expanded it to include these ex-officios, and that’s why I’m wondering if the Senate should think about this. Because what happened was one of the non-senators but a member of the SGA who is Biancalana…

Senator Walsh: Oh, AJ. So, he’s a secretary. He’s a non-voting member.

Senator Horst: He’s not a Senator, but he is on the Appeals Board.

Senator Smith: We have several secretaries that serve on the Appeals Board, and that’s why for this particular issue it became a problem. Because when we put out a resolution, that’s a statement of the opinion of the entire association, so they do get lumped into that opinion.

Senator Cline: So, they have just expressed an official opinion of unhappiness with a particular action of a particular fraternity, and they are on the Appeals Board charged with handling that appeal, they have already publicly expressed dissatisfaction with the situation, so they have a conflict of interest.

Senator Smith: Right. And especially with this resolution, we were calling specifically for their removal from the University. So, that’s kind of where things got murky with us being a sponsored RSO and…

Senator Cline: If a senator has that conflict of interest—I’m thinking of my own political life—I have conflict of interest I have to recuse myself. Would that then leave the Appeals Board without student senators?

Senator Horst: Senators are not supposed to be on external committees. That’s the first thing.

Senator Smith: Senators are not.

Senator Horst: But SGA members are, and that’s kind of where I’m wondering if Rules should look at this.

Senator Blum: This is kind of a loophole, right. These SGA members are not covered by the senator clause.

Senator Horst: Right. So, my first question, and maybe we can talk about this tomorrow, is do you guys want to remain an internal committee of the Senate? And we’ve been talking about that. That’s one question, that they are formally an internal committee. My second question is that SGA is defined as the 20 senators, plus the president of the assembly and the trustee and the membership is different. Why is it defined that way in this document? Are they part of the internal committee? If not, why not? My third question is should they be excluded… is anyone that is part of SGA, the big SGA, should they be excluded from being seated on an external committee of the senate? We have this clause about senators, but they are all kind of part of an internal committee of the senate. It’s this unique situation where they are not senators, but they are actually tied in just like other senators are.

Senator Walsh: Yeah.

Senator Mainieri: I’m curious about the recusal process and how that’s applied.

Senator Cline: Okay. You have to recuse yourself. If you’re in a hearing panel and your roommate is up, you are going to have to recuse yourself. But if all the student government associated members have to recuse, that would leave a constituency unrepresented in the panel, and I understand that.

Senator Horst: It’s a pool, so they could just choose to not be in the pool. But if you are putting a bunch of people who are ex-officio SGA members on the University Hearing Panel, it could compromise the University Hearing Panel and also sort of compromises your body; you are in this awkward situation. It seems that you couldn’t pass a resolution, necessarily, because you didn’t want to compromise the other process. So, that’s also what concerned me. Because of this connection, you are compromising your ability to speak.

Senator Mainieri: Are all student representatives on these two SGA?

Senator Walsh: No.

Senator Mainieri: So, I’d be interested in what the percentages are, right. So, if there’s enough non-SGA student members of these committees to be pulled in, then why couldn’t the recusal process just naturally happen.

Senator Walsh: I’d have to look at the specific committee. When I was vice president last year, all the external committees I had then like the back of my hand. I’m a little rough with them now, in terms of what the specific make up of each. I know some can typically be like we need X amount of SGA members, X amount of non-SGA. If I remember correctly, I don’t believe these two specify. The current make up, and typically how it is, last year and then even this year, there is rarely if any SGA members, and when there are, it’s very few. But that’s not guaranteed. So, some could, if a vice president wanted to, he could fill them all with SGA. But that’s not typical.

Senator Smith: I do know that Senator Chassy was advised by our GA advisor or one of our co-advisors for SGA that if he was having a hard time filling those spots that he could fill with SGA members. So, I don’t know if it was slim pickin’s this year with outside students.

Senator Walsh: It’s usually tough.

Senator Cline: Then maybe one of the solutions is to make sure the University Hearing Panel and the Appeals Board have rules in their bylaws that there needs to be not just SGA members, so in these circumstances if all SGA members need to recuse themselves, there’s still enough students to keep quorum.

Senator Horst: What I want Rules to think about, too, is should members of an internal committee be eligible for an external committee?

Senator Blum: Under the current…

Senator Horst: Because right now, everybody who is a member of an internal committee of the senate is not eligible for an external committee because they are senators. But there’s this group of people in the SGA who are members of an internal committee of the Senate, called the SGA, that are also eligible for external committees.

Senator Blum: Right.

Senator Horst: Right. So, should they be eligible for both?

Senator Blum: My gut says no.

Senator Nikolaou: Unless we change the title. Instead of calling it SGA the internal committee. We have like the student caucus. And it is just the 20, plus the president, plus the vice president, and then that will resolve it. The student caucus is going to be only the senators, and then the SGA is the RSO. That will resolve the issue.

Senator Walsh: Would there be a way to guarantee that that student caucus would be made of the 20 senators would be guaranteed from SGA?

Senator Nikolaou: Yes. So, we could change what we call right now in the bylaws the Student Government Association it would be the Student Caucus, but everything else pretty much will remain the same.

Senator Walsh: Okay great.

Senator Horst: But then it says that the student caucus is in charge of the Code, for instance. SGA is in charge of the Code. So, it all is sort of tied in with what you guys want to be structurally.

Senator Smith: Is there a difference between our assembly and our association? Because I know that your cabinet is in our constitution, they’re not counted as our assembly.

Senator Walsh: I’ve always interpreted assembly as voting members. But that’s always been up for debate as well. Assembly is never specifically defined. Some have defined it as every single member who is in SGA including my cabinet. I don’t believe that. I always see assembly as voting members.

President Kinzy: Seems like that should be defined.

Senator Walsh: Yeah.

President Kinzy: We had this discussion about the student trustee, right. About their ex-officio but they shouldn’t vote because they could end up recusing themselves from a vote at the Board of Trustees, when their whole job is to represents the students at the Board of Trustees. So, they are there to learn just like they are there at Academic Senate, and they are ex-officio. Ex-officio is a really important role because you are taking the knowledge and you’re using it. You are there to gain knowledge and use it. So, I can sit in a Senate meeting, and if members of executive team of the cabinet hear something and we think we can solve it faster than you we can try and do that. That’s why we sit there. We don’t vote.

Senator Horst: So, ex-officio non-voting for the trustee, that’s your suggestion?

President Kinzy: That’s what we decided, because the trustee would then compromise themselves. Student Trustee has never voted at the senate. Again, the point being is what is your purpose. I always go back to this. What is the why? The why is to make sure that we do everything as equitably as possible, and that sometimes means not voting—which seems counterintuitive but it’s actually very true.

Senator Horst: Perhaps I can ask the SGA executive team to think about this bluebook charge in tandem with the bigger question of do you guys want to be an internal committee? Maybe you guys should think about how you want this bluebook charge to read. And then the question is, too, whether or not they’re eligible to be on external committees. I would like to forward that to Rules.

Senator Duffy: The question I have about that is what would be the alternative if we were not an internal committee?

President Kinzy: Can I ask? A/P and Civil Service Council are not internal committees of the senate, correct?

Senator Horst: Correct.

President Kinzy: Yet they have voting members on the Senate. So, we have a precedent of two organizations that represent members of the university community, that have representation on the senate and vote, but are not a sub-committee. Is that where your mind was going?

Senator Duffy: Yeah. I was wondering what the caucus would be. So, it would be labeled as the student caucus is my understanding.

Senator Horst: So, Legal is requesting that SGA really consider not being an internal committee because if you are an internal committee you have to abide by the Open Meeting Act, and you can get in trouble for not following it. I’ve forwarded some things to you. So, for instance, I couldn’t find your agenda on Wednesday. That needs to be posted 48 hours ahead of time. If you are a formal internal committee of the Senate, you are subject to the Open Meetings Act. If you are not, the Board of Trustees documents list SGA as one of the shared governance bodies (or something like that) so you have structural strength in the official university documents. The question that we kick around, and this is the exact same argument that I gave to Legal, is it’s a structural thing that shows that the Faculty Caucus and the Student Government Association are equally participating. It’s sort of a symbolic thing that SGA is an internal committee. I’m not sure that SGA as the internal committee is actually the SGA anymore. I think it expanded five or six years ago. So, that’s another thing that’s awkward. But it is a symbolic thing. The Senate is faculty, students, with some additional members, and we have these two internal committees. So, that’s the symbolic thing that you and I have talked about. So, I will talk about this with you tomorrow at our meeting. I would like the SGA to just think about revising this. Like for instance, the student trustee, are they ex-officio non-voting? Is SGA an internal committee of the Senate? If it’s just the senators, are they the ones that are in charge of the Student Code of Conduct? Is it the entire SGA? And we include the entire SGA in this thing, then they shouldn’t be eligible for external committee, I would say.

Senator Walsh: Yeah. And to your question about who is in control of the Student Code of Conduct, wouldn’t that technically be a committee in the assembly under policies and procedures?

Senator Smith: It’s coming to all of us through the Dean of Students next semester.

Senator Horst: “Conduct a regular review of the Code of Student Conduct and review and approve all bylaws created to carry out the Code of Student Conduct.”

Senator Smith: The only ones to be able to vote on that, the actual changes being made, would be the senators and the ex-officios.

Senator Walsh: Yeah.

President Kinzy: Ex-officio with vote, is that actually a thing?

Senator Duffy: Yeah. In Roberts Rules.

President Kinzy: Is it, I’ve never seen it.

Senator Duffy: Yeah. And in Latin I believe it means designee basically.

Senator Blum: So, by office. So, a senator is elected but they’re by office.

Senator Cline: So, they are there because of their external role.

Senator Horst: It’s 5:30 p.m. I’m going to try to move along. So, you guys can think about it, and a further question for Rules.

***Policies up for policy review:***[***3.2.18 Oral English Proficiency***](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/employee/faculty-staff/2.1.18%20Oral%20English%20Proficiency.shtml) ***(Dist. to Academic Affairs Committee)***

There was not discussion. This was assigned to the Academic Affairs Committee.

[***4.1.12 Sale of Instructional Materials***](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/academic/4-1-12.shtml) ***(Dist. to Academic Affairs Committee)***

There was not discussion. This was assigned to the Academic Affairs Committee.

[***4.1.15 Sale/Solicitation of Academic Assignments***](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/academic/4-1-15.shtml) ***(Dist. to Academic Affairs Committee)***

Senator Horst: The citation is wrong. You guys should work with Laura Gossett. And I believe the law is called something else.

This was assigned to the Academic Affairs Committee.

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Mainieri, seconded by Senator Smith, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.

Attendance:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Lea Cline***- WKCFA Faculty | Present |
| ***Deb Garrahy***- CAST Faculty | Present |
| ***Tracy Mainieri***- CAST Faculty | Present |
| ***Alex Duffy***- President of the SGA Assembly | Present |
| ***Zoe Smith-***Secretary of the SGA Assembly | Present |
| ***Braxton Myers***- Vice President of the SGA Assembly | Present |
| ***President Terri Goss Kinzy***- Ex-officio non-voting | Present |
| ***Provost Aondover Tarhule***- Ex-officio non-voting | Excused |