**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

**TUESDAY, January 17, 2023**

**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.

***Approval of Executive Committee minutes from 10/31/22 and 11/28/22.***

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

***Oral Communication:***

***Discussion re: whether policy 3.1.11 should remain a senate policy.***

This was deferred to later in the meeting.

***From Chris Roberts: Strategic Planning Group Discussion Invite***

Senator Horst: Chris Roberts is coordinating the strategic planning. He was wondering if he could come to the Senate and/or Planning and Finance (which is actually the group that is charged with this type of work). He is already on the calendar for the Planning and Finance group. Both Rick Valentin and I are on the Strategic Planning Task Force. The question is would you also like to invite him to the Senate? He says they’d need about 30 minutes, or should we just give that task to the Planning and Finance, which is charged with long range planning?

Senator Mainieri: What is he wanting to share or get feedback on?

Senator Horst: “The Illinois State University Strategic Planning Task Force (technically the Steering Team since the Task Force is not official yet) is charged to develop the University’s next Strategic Plan in the coming year. As part of the planning process, we are seeking feedback from campus constituents and would like to invite the Academic Senate to participate. We are happy to attend a currently scheduled meeting sometime between January 3 and March 3 or schedule another time that works best for your group. We anticipate that we will need a minimum of 30 minutes to go through the discussion questions.”

Senator Cline: So, it’s like prompting for feedback. It’s not really a presentation, well, it’s a presentation for the purposes of seeking feedback. I think we should.

Senator Horst: We could start with the Planning and Finance group and then move to the full Senate?

Senator Cline: That’s a pretty tight window though.

Senator Horst: They are going to the Planning and Finance Committee, they’re on the schedule.

Senator Mainieri: Which meeting are they scheduled for?

Senator Horst: February 22.

Senator Mainieri: So, it would have to be March.

Senator Cline: The turn around time is for feedback. How much time do we have to give feedback after the meeting? I’d hate to have it on the last day and only have 24 hours for feedback.

Senator Horst: I think this is going to be a long process. Provost Tarhule, do you have more insight into this?

Provost Tarhule: They are coming into the dean’s council meeting tomorrow. My sense is they’re just going to talk about how. They are not asking for information at this point. They’re just talking about the general framework of how this strategic planning will unfold. So, its more letting people know. We’re a long way from… you’re part of that group, right?

Senator Horst: Yeah. We haven’t even had a meeting yet.

Provost Tarhule: Exactly. So, there’s nothing to share yet. The committee has been formed and here are some general thoughts about it. It’s more letting people know that we’re planning. That’s my sense.

Senator Cline: He said between January and March. If bringing them in in March isn’t a problem.

Senator Host: We could just present to the Planning and Finance Committee now, and then bring them to the full Senate in the fall. Or we can schedule them for both the Planning and Finance and Academic Senate. Whatever you guys want to do.

Senator Blum: Is the framework… is it like this is what we’re going to do, or is there possibility for feedback? If there’s not a possibility for feedback, it’s just framework being laid out to tell people, I think that’s less helpful.

Provost Tarhule: They’re not going to have any framework because they really haven’t met.

Senator Nikolaou: Then on February 22 within a month they will not have been able to do much to come to the Senate.

Senator Horst: They are going to Planning and Finance on the 22nd.

Senator Cline: Maybe have them go to Planning and Finance, and then let Rick tell us whether he thinks they should come to the Senate.

Senator Horst: Okay. And I’ll be there too. And I’ll have had a meeting. I think this is a long process.

Senator Mainieri: It’s a little unclear. 30 minutes is a long time. I don’t think they would be talking, just getting info at this stage for 30 minutes. So, I’m just curious how they are going to use that time. So, maybe we can let them do it.

Senator Cline: Yeah. Let them see the presentation and let Rick say if it’s time for them to come to the Senate or not.

***Former Senator Ama Oforiwaa Aduonum request to present a piece she composed to the Academic Senate.***

Senator Horst: Former Senator Aduonum wrote me a note. She has a spoken word piece. It’s about 15 minutes long. She would like to read it at Senate.

Senator Cline: I have a general comment, it’s nothing to do with the particular former senator faculty, but to be sensitive to people’s time. There are single parents, other parents, and other people with obligations at Senate. I think the longer we push Senate the harder it is on the membership to stay. I think if we start brining people’s creative and research lives into Senate, we will never leave Senate. If it’s about policy. If it’s a spoken word piece about policy, then maybe we can do it. This is not critical of her suggestion; I just don’t want to start this trend where people are bringing their research lives and creative productivity lives into Senate, because that’s not what Senate’s for.

Senator Horst: We’ll communicate with Professor Aduonum, thank you for the invitation, however, we’re cognizant of people’s times and we have to limit it to Senate business.

Senator Mainieri: And public comment is always available.

***Advisory:***

***ADVISORY\_ Email Re\_ Update on Policy 1.2 - Anti-Harassment and Non-Discrimination Policy***

***ADVISORY\_ Policy 1.2 Anti-Harassment and Non-Discrimination Policy\_ Crown Act changes***

Senator Horst: There was an update to policy 1.2. This is one of the policies that we have declared that is not a Senate policy. However, if it is ever updated, we want to know about it. So, Débora Piovezan Barbosa Avelino forwarded this to me, and she is available to come to the Senate to give us further information on the updates. Expanding the definition of race to include traits associated with race such as hair texture and protective hair styles, etc. are the main changes.

Senator Mainieri: Which VP does this fall under?

Provost Tarhule: I think the President.

Senator Mainieri: I think this is a great update. I wonder if it could be folded into the President’s Remarks. I don’t think we need a separate presentation or anything. I think it’s important for the community to hear about.

Senator Nikolaou: Also, we can coordinate her, because she has the ADA procedure, 1.3.1. So, it is with her right now.

Senator Horst: Is that on the agenda?

Senator Nikolaou: No, because I haven’t heard back from her to say she approved the wording. So, we might want to coordinate that when she comes in for this policy then we also have the advisory item too. That way she doesn’t come two different times.

Senator Horst: Okay. Everyone agree with that? We’ll ask her to come whenever she comes for 1.3.1, so she doesn’t have to come twice.

***Distributed Communications:***

***From Jeannie Barrett: (Dist. to Rules Committee)***

***01.13.23.01 Barrett Email\_RE\_ Bikes Skateboards Scooters and other Recreation and Transportation Devices on Campus***

***01.12.23.03 Policy 5.1.8 Bikes, Skateboards, and other Recreation and Transportation Devices Current Copy***

***01.12.23.04 Policy 5.1.8 Bikes, Skateboards, and other Recreation and Transportation Devices Mark Up***

***12.21.22.02 Policy5.1.8 Bikes, Skateboards, and other Recreation and Transportation Devices Clean Copy***

Senator Horst: I’ve been communicating with both the Office of General Counsel and the President regarding the proposed revisions to policy 5.1.8. They both conveyed to me that they thought this was a very important update. Urgent. They wanted it to go to the floor as quickly as possible. I asked Jeannie to send a rationale as to why they thought it was important. There’s been this OSHA finding. I conveyed to them that it was important that it went through a committee, that’s why I tried to frontload some questions. We had a lot of good questions… just to try to jumpstart the conversation with the committee. Technically, last year, this policy was reviewed by the Rules Committee. I will note that the Planning and Finance Committee right now is talking about pedestrian safety. They also have strategic planning, and they also have to write their report on pedestrian safety. Likewise, the Rules Committee is also busy. So, what are your feelings about how to handle this policy?

Senator Cline: And it was your suggestion that it has to go through a committee?

Senator Horst: It could go to the floor, but you’ve already seen some of the questions we had. We could have it come from Exec.

Senator Mainieri: The number of questions we had times the floor is a little intimidating or might become a little unwieldy.

Senator Cline: Ms. Barrett hasn’t seen our questions or comments yet, is that correct?

Senator Horst: No. The deadline was 3:00 p.m. today.

Senator Nikolaou: Do you think it would be good from the Planning and Finance to look at the policy before writing the report?

Senator Horst: We’ve been having briefs from the Town of Normal and the police on this whole topic. Certainly, we’ve been hearing about the prospect of this policy, so one of the items I was going to suggest for the report is for the Senate to move on this policy. You’ve been asking for a presentation on this topic.

Senator Cline: Um-hum.

Senator Horst: It’s a nice coincidence that we do have a committee that is right now charged with this.

Senator Cline: I suppose my suggestion is we could frontload some of the work. We frontloaded the questions. But they haven’t gone back to Jeannie yet to respond to them. Some are typographical, some can be easy, I think. If we could be the committee, so to speak, and give it a little bit more work before we hand it off to Planning and Finance, so they aren’t fully burdened with a completely unedited policy.

Senator Horst: I think they are scheduling a presentation for February 8. David Marple from Risk Assessment. The President conveyed to me she’s trying to look for a timeline as fast as possible.

Senator Cline: My suggestion is possibly we could work faster than one of the committees.

Senator Horst: Planning and Finance have already had this presentation. We squeeze the policy work in 10 minutes before the presenters come in. And we’re supposed to write this report, and then we’re supposed to review the Strategic Plan. They could drop all that; it’s not in their charge, but it is related to what they are working on. We could all work on it, I could work on it with Jeannie, and then we could send it to the floor.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah, what Lea said. We can see what Jeannie says for some of these questions. She might be able to address most of them. Then, if there is a smaller number, it would be easier to send it on the floor. If we keep it the way it is, and for sure there are going to be other questions, which might be generally about the policy, we wouldn’t be able to complete anything in one meeting if it just goes the way that it is directly on the floor.

Senator Mainieri: I think regardless, it won’t make it in time for either agenda. Right? It wouldn’t make it for next week’s Senate agenda, it wouldn’t make it in time to pass on to Planning and Finance. So, taking the time to get this response and making a decision.

Senator Horst: Okay. So, we’re going to make a decision at next Exec. We’re going to look at it next Exec. Is that what I’m hearing?

Senator Nikolaou: Yes. Jeannie might look at it within the next week and then by the time we meet as Exec she will have an updated version, and then we say, yeah, we can deal with it on the floor.

Senator Cline: Yeah. We’ll know better then. If it turns into be much more of a mess than resolution, then we’ll have to figure out where it goes.

Senator Horst: Okay. Let me just flesh out these questions. The street comment I understand. Will there be exceptions to the rule? What about events on the Quad, when motorized support might be needed to carry equipment? It says something about university vehicles that will be permitted.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. But what is the university vehicles? Is it for university business and what do they mean with university business?

Senator Horst: “The policy does not prohibit the use of mobility assistance devices and other approved accommodation under the ADA, policy bicycles, EMS, and authorized university vehicles are excepted from this policy.” I think they are exempting all the planting work that they do. Authorized university vehicles.

Senator Nikolaou: But when they go and set up, like the radio stations, and they set up all their equipment.

Senator Mainieri: When we have Festival ISU.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. How would they move all their equipment and the stage?

Senator Horst: That’s an authorized university vehicle. The question would be something like band. The ISU Band has a vehicle. Are they an authorized university vehicle if they have to take the percussion equipment from Cook Hall to CPA?

Senator Cline: If they’re choosing to use sidewalks rather than go on the streets?

Senator Horst: Right. The question is what is an authorized vehicle? I had a question about how are we going to know about these? Is the President going to designate them? Are they going to be announced to the community? Are we going to get a note like we do for the surveillance? How are they gong to make a statement about it? Are they going to have a website? And how are we going to know what the dismount zones are? There’s going to be signage but just sort of how it’s going to be communicated.

Senator Cline: Transportation website you mean? Sort of like a little map color coded about where dismount zones versus non-dismount zones.

Senator Horst: Yeah. And if there is an update, will they tell us? Would this apply to riders of motorized bikes? In other words, are we expanding the sorts of devices that are allowed in outdoor areas on campus now? For the purpose of this policy, riding in a controlled manner means being able to easily stop and easily avoid people and structures. So, does that now imply the motor bikes? Now we are prohibiting everybody but there’s this language about how you ride outside of the dismount zones and my question is does that apply to motor bikes now?

Senator Cline: What do you mean by motor bike? Motorcycles are not allowed on the sidewalks anywhere.

Senator Horst: Where does it say that?

Senator Cline: That’s a state law. You’re not allowed to drive motorcycles, you know, vehicles that have license plates are not allowed. E bikes are the reason we are here. E bikes are bicycles that have electric propulsion, but they don’t have license plates.

Senator Horst: Okay. That’s the difference, E bikes. What are the conditions of the density and that’s regarding…

Senator Cline: My question was "density of pedestrians, terrain, and conditions." What conditions? Do they mean weather conditions? It just sort of seemed weird. Maybe I’m the only one who found that read strangely.

Senator Nikolaou: Also, the terrain.

Senator Horst: “Someone can be riding safely next to another person, but the pedestrian just swings into their path. If that's the case, who is at fault? What about bicycle designated lines?”

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. So, pretty much, I’m walking right now, and Lea is walking next to me not paying attention, and we clash on each other. Well, it was not my fault. The same can happen with a bike. Are we going to say that bike riders are always at fault? So, what is that riding carefully to avoid it?

Senator Cline: Speed, I guess.

Senator Nikolaou: But what is the speed? Like two miles per hour?

Senator Horst: Okay. I found it odd that problems with faculty would go to HR. We usually don’t say that because technically someone who violated a policy would go to the DFSC/SFSC. Correct?

Provost Tarhule: Um-hum.

Senator Horst: “If we are to refer to violation of University policies, then it should be explicit here what are these policies (given that non-campus people are also included in this policy).” Okay. So that’s just adding references.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah, that’s just what are the policies. Especially if it is for the ones that are not in the university.

Senator Horst: Okay. This is a question for you. “University students are referred to Student Conduct and Community Responsibilities (SCCR) and subject to all applicable University discipline policies and the Code of Student Conduct for violation of this policy.” Are they already in the Code? It has not been revised for a long time. Does this mean until it is updated there’s no disciplinary action for students? Do you know if there is anything in the Code about violating university policy?

Senator Duffy: Are you talking more broadly speaking, just violating?

Senator Horst: Yeah. If you violate a university policy is that…

Senator Duffy: I think it’s deferred to the Dean of Students.

Senator Horst: So, there’s some language in the Code that states that?

Senator Duffy: I believe so. At least from the last time I read it which was about a year ago. But I believe they do get deferred to the Dean of Students.

Senator Horst: If you could look that up.

Senator Duffy: Yeah, absolutely.

Provost Tarhule: Martha, did you have a question in Violations, second to the last line, on the line that says, “staff and faculty are referred to human resources,” did you make a question about that or are you saying it’s odd that that happens?

Senator Horst: If a faculty member violates a policy would you have that go through the DFSC?

Provost Tarhule: It’s not academic.

Senator Horst: But that’s the sanctions part of ASPT. If I violate the smoking policy, that’s our disciplinary process for violating policies.

Senator Blum: ASPT specifically says violations of university policies.

Senator Horst: I had a question about grad students. Okay. You had a question; Non-affiliated individuals will be referred to the police and maybe issued a no trespass order for violations. I also had a question; would it be an infinite no trespass order? How are they going to know about this? Well, there will be signage. But let’s say you have some teenagers who continuing to do skateboarding.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah, because even if there is appropriate signage and let’s say it is around the Quad. Well, if you have the ones who come for the first time to the university, they don’t necessarily look for signage for what isn’t allowed. So, will this have any implication for the prospective students? If that’s the case, why don’t we go to the other extreme and say pretty much the campus is a no-ride zone. And that’s one of my other questions -- how are we going to determine what is a dismount zone, and why are we… Let’s say the Quad is a dismount zone and then in between Hovey and Stevenson you are allowed to ride. Well, why?

Senator Horst: That’s why, I’m assuming the President will decide and it needs to be communicated to the community what the dismount zones are, so we all know. Right.

Senator Nikolaou: But I’m thinking how are we going to justify why some areas on the campus are dismount zones? Are we saying that, well, we don’t care about the students and faculty that are in that area? That’s why we don’t have them as dismount zones.

Senator Cline: So, I guess we would need more clarification about the reasoning for the choice of the areas, as opposed to simply blanket. Because it does get a little bit weird if you say it from this line forward, from this line over here you can ride, but you have to dismount at this point versus just saying a blanket across campus, we’re not going have any vehicles.

Senator Horst: But that’s just how the President communicates her decisions. Right. That’s not a policy.

Senator Cline: Well, but what made them make this choice as opposed to a blanket, the entire being a dismount zone versus…

Senator Horst: So, the President will communicate annually her decisions about what’s a dismount zone. Something like that?

Senator Cline: At this point we’re just asking the question, why. Why in this iteration is that the choice?

Senator Horst: Okay.

Senator Mainieri: I would be surprised that once we see the map it is probably going to be all of campus.

Senator Cline: I just think it would be hard for our university officers to manage. They might say from some of the residence halls over if the students riding their bicycle, there might be some areas by the stadium that aren’t such a problem or something like that. I don’t know.

Senator Duffy: I just found, for Student Conduct violations they get forwarded to the Office of Vice President of Student Affairs.

Senator Horst: If they violate a university policy?

Senator Duffy: Yes.

Senator Mainieri: And there’s a link to the policy website in the Conduct Code.

Senator Horst: Okay. But also, we have this question about how they are going to deal with non-university people. So, I’ll try to flush that out with her.

Senator Blum: I was just reading this sentence again about the discipline policies, I know you had questions about that in general, but it seems… It should say something like “could be subject to university discipline,” “possibly subject to,” something along those lines. I don’t think it’s a foregone conclusion that a discipline action would be necessary. I think it would depend.

Senator Cline: Someone accidentally violated it once and was told.

Senator Blum: Right. Even if you read through the disciplinary policies there’s these who set of pre-sanction, proactive steps. I wouldn’t say it would automatically… It feels the way it’s written that disciplinary policy is the action. That’s all I’m really saying is soften the words. It definitely could be an outcome but it’s not a forgone conclusion that it’s the outcome.

Senator Horst: Okay. So, I think I have enough to go on and we’ll see how it goes. And we’ll bring that back to Exec.

***From Janice Bonneville: (Information/Action Item 01/25/23)***

***11.29.22.02 Policy 3.1.11\_Summary of changes for Senate***

 ***01.12.23.01 Policy 3.1.11 Leave of Absence\_Current Copy***

***11.29.22.01 Policy 3.1.11 Leave of Absence\_Mark Up***

***01.12.23.02 Policy 3.1.11 Leave of Absence\_Clean copy***

Senator Horst: Janice Bonneville is requesting that this go straight to the floor. It’s a result of Public Act 102-1050, which is the amendment of the Child Bereavement Leave Act. This act may be cited as the Family Bereavement Leave Act. I think that’s the term you were asking about. It’s broader in its coverage. It went into effect January 2023. For that reason, she is hoping we can send it straight to the floor so that our employees can benefit from the expansion from this policy.

I did look into some of the language and some of the question that people raised. Tracy, I don’t have an answer about the three days versus the five days. I can ask Janice about this but I’m assuming it’s coming from state law.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. I guess to follow up, my question here, and it comes back to considering whether or not this should be a Senate policy, is at what point does the university make the decision to comply with an Act versus going above the minimum requirements of an Act or legislation to take into account what we know about the humans on our campus. Does that make sense?

Senator Cline: It’s hard to know without having read the actual Act myself, what is an interpretation of the law or what is verbiage taken directly from the law. Like this term son and daughter, if it’s written that way there’s probably not much we can do about it. But it’s a little hard to know what is verbatim from the law versus what is an interpretation of that.

Senator Horst: I do recall Janice Bonneville asking that exact same question when this came up. But I can ask her about that. I don’t have an answer about “or any other relative within the first degree living in the same household.” I don’t have an answer for that. The son or daughter is coming from the Act. These definitions, “why do we have to define who in folks’ lives may be significant enough to need bereavement leave?” I think Janice would say this is according to this Act; it is what’s guaranteed by law. Does the leave need to be continuous days, or can it be non-continuous? The 60 days bereavement leave under subsection a of this section must be completed within 60 days after the date on which the employee receives notice of death of the covered family member. So, that 60 days’ notice is coming straight from the Act. “Does the leave need to be continuous?” I didn’t find an answer to that. “The Family Bereavement Leave Act,” that’s the term they’re using for the Act now. “Is this limitation the university imposes, or a limitation based on the Act?” The FMLA business, I believe is in here. I found a passage and I’m pretty sure it’s from the Act. So that was my stab at trying to read the law in the 10 minutes before this. We can take this straight to the floor, certainly, and bring in Janice Bonneville. We can send it to a committee. This was done by the Planning and Finance last year. However, if we send it to a committee, then these benefits will not be offered to our employees through this policy—although it will be state law.

Senator Cline: Yeah. I mean, state law your causing trouble with HR if our policy is out of step with state law. We know that. She’ll be there for questions, right?

Senator Horst: If we bring it straight to the floor, of course she will.

Senator Cline: Then she can respond to, like, this is verbatim from the law, this is what is required, and answer people’s questions. But I do think people will have questions.

Senator Horst: To mix in whether or not it should be a Senate policy, we declared this to be a Senate policy in 2016. It wasn’t a Senate policy before that. We can keep it the way it is, that it’s reviewed by us whenever there is a change, and it goes through committee every five years. We can put it on this list of policies that we want to know when it’s changed, and we want it to be an advisory item. We can at any point declare it a Senate policy. We can have it be on our advisory list and if we don’t like the direction it’s going, we can say the Senate wants to take this over again.

Senator Cline: I don’t see the utility of putting it on a five-year cycle if the committee doesn’t have the ability to change, because this is in accordance with state law. So, the committee can’t really change it unless the state law changes. So, I guess I would like to see it on “we get advised when it’s being changed” list. But I don’t see the utility of putting it into a normal cycle because I’m not sure what a committee could do with it.

Senator Horst: Except for Tracy’s point. Why are we only complying with exactly what the law says? Could the employer be more generous?

Senator Mainieri: As y’all know, I’m in full agreement with pulling things off of our Senate list, right, that are just copying over the Act, this is what we have to do. But this does offer the senators the opportunity to advocate if they feel we should be considering going beyond what the minimum requirement is.

Senator Cline: This is just an innocent question. So, if the committee says I think we should be giving people 10 paid days of bereavement for a first line family member and so the committee makes that decision, and the Senate passes it. Is the university bound to do it? This is an HR policy. That’s a dollar and cents.

Senator Horst: If the President signs it.

Senator Cline: So, the President would have to be put in a position where she would have to make that decision.

Senator Blum: The President, I would think, would weigh the financial cost of that.

Senator Mainieri: And I would hope that’s a discussion that happened earlier.

Senator Cline: I just didn’t know if we pass it, are they going to be bound to hold it because that’s HR? We’re the academic mission broadly conceived.

Senator Blum: It seems like there are some numbers, like the 60-day number, that are immutable; you can’t change them.

Senator Horst: You could.

Senator Cline: You could. You could be more generous.

Senator Blum: Could you do it more than 60 days or not?

Senator Cline: It says the minimum. The employment laws set the minimum, right. You must at least do this. So, the university could do more than that as long as they don’t get more stringent than the state law, then that’s the financial burden that the university has to take.

Senator Blum: I guess what I want to know is what exactly are the minimums, and it sort of says that but. So, you could exceed the minimum?

Senator Cline: If your organization decides to pay for it.

Senator Blum: So, you had to do it in 60 days, so it could be 70 days?

Senator Cline: Conceivably, you could pass a policy that says that you can have 120 days of unpaid bereavement leave, or you have 120 days from notification to take those days. So long as you don’t go under 60 days, you’d still be in compliance with state law.

Senator Blum: Right.

Senator Nikolaou: Is one of the reasons it’s with us because the educational leave section? If it was not there, then yeah, all the other sections include specific laws. But educational leave is specific to the university.

Senator Horst: “Employees may be granted an educational leave with or without pay for advance study upon approval by the President of the University.”

Senator Nikolaou: I think that’s one of the parts when we were doing the sabbatical leave that was talking about the education leave. We removed it from the sabbatical because we were saying it would be included in the other leaves of absences.

Senator Cline: I’m not sure we are in our boundaries. Senate is supposed to be academic mission broadly defined.

Senator Horst: With a caveat of student life. So, for instance, the dismount zones I think is clearly something that’s going to impact student life.

Senator Cline: I’m not sure, Tracy, that the letter of understanding between us and the President’s office wouldn’t be strained if we started to rewrite HR policies that are not in the academic mission broadly defined.

Provost Tarhule: Could an encouragement suffice? Like, this is the law, but Senate is encouraging the administration where appropriate to consider, you know, more generous. So, rather than specifying something specific we’re advocating if it is appropriate, and we can do it, would you consider more.

Senator Horst: But it’s literally under a different VP. It’s not under the Provost because it’s not under academic house.

Provost Tarhule: Right.

Senator Cline: Right. That was the nature of my question. If we, on the academic side, say we want this, does that side of the campus have to listen to what we are saying?

Senator Mainieri: I think, like you just said, academic mission broadly conceived with the exception of student life. And we’ve always said that. Right.

Senator Horst: The Constitution says that.

Senator Mainieri: This might be a broader question. But where does faculty life come in, or staff life? Right. This is a direct impact on the wellbeing of our employees. Which then in turn can impact students and academic welfare. So, at what point…

Senator Horst: I don’t think we are the experts in this area.

Senator Mainieri: We are not the experts, but we are the experts in what we need as humans to make recommendations.

Provost Tarhule: I don’t know if in the past people have been unnecessarily unwilling to help bereaved families. If that’s not the case, then I would say if we push this too much, we could put the president in a very difficult situation by saying we recommend something specific and she says no, even if it’s for a financially sound reason, it looks like she’s not sensitive or she doesn’t care. But in fact, I am seeing a little bit of how some well-intended policies can actually hurt us in the long run. I think I mentioned to Martha, we have a policy (I forget the number) that says when people go from administration back to faculty you can’t cut their salary by more than 15%. So, there are serious financial implications on our AIF that undercut our ability to hire tenure-track because we are paying some tenure-track faculty high salaries; to people we decide maybe were not doing such a good job. So, I think, bereavement, most people are very sensitive. I don’t think we necessarily need a policy to make people be generous, unless we have a history that this has been a problem in the past. So, I would almost advocate for encouraging each other to be thoughtful and sensitive during bereavement. And if we see that maybe that’s not happening enough then we’ll move to… The more policy you have sometimes the more it indicates a lack of trust in the system. It can be hard for me to think that during bereavement that people have been mean to each other and not giving people enough time to recover and do what they have to do. I certainly would. I would expect that other people are doing that as well.

Senator Mainieri: So, your information is helpful, to know where this language is coming from. I’m okay if this comes off the Senate review list. Thinking about the avenues, if it comes off the Senate review list, what are avenues that we can use our collective voice to make a recommendation for HR to consider. I would be interested in exploring that further, because I feel like—and I’ve had constituents come to me—I feel like this is not sufficient.

Senator Nikolaou: It might be easier to make the decision of if it stays or if it goes after we hear from Janice on the floor, where she’s going to say specifically which part are because of the Act, and if there are any parts that are specific to the University. If she says pretty much all these changes come from the Act…

Senator Horst: I’m pretty sure they do. But certainly, your question about why are we always complying with minimums, that’s an important question. Right. And can we as a collective voice advocate for something more, like what the students have. So, it sounds like we’re going to send this straight to the floor and make the decision later as to whether this is a Senate policy?

Senator Cline: Based on her comments, yeah.

Senator Duffy: I would think that, yep.

Senator Cline: This is for staff also? Not just faculty.

Senator Horst: Yes.

Senator Cline: I see some union things in here too.

Senator Horst: Some Civil Service code that I don’t understand. But also, just structurally the Senate is not representing the entire university. We have a specialization in the academic area with faculty and students. We don’t have a broad Civil Service Council representative. We’re not that kind of body. So, there is that. We are going in the direction of an Information/Action item?

Senator Mainieri: Yes. And for the purposes of the senators preparing, should be tell them to focus solely on these track changes? Because that’s what we’re bringing to them.

Senator Cline: Instead of all the other things.

Senator Horst: Yes. Okay. So, we will send the Janice Bonneville track changes, without our comments.

Senator Nikolaou: We can send to Janice our comments, but not to the floor so that we don’t direct them one or the other way.

Senator Horst: Cera will forward our comments to Janice Bonneville and maybe also the Act. I found this Act pretty easy to find.

***From Planning and Finance Committee: (Information Item 01/25/23)***

***03.24.22.25 Policy 3.4.7 Employment for Teaching Purposes of Administrative\_Professional Personnel Current Copy***

***12.09.22.02 Propose Policy 3.2.21 Employment for Teaching Purposes of Administrative Professional and Civil Service Personnel\_Mark Up***

***12.09.22.01 Propose Policy 3.2.21 Employment for Teaching Purposes of Administrative Professional and Civil Service Personnel\_Clean Copy***

Senator Horst: Okay. We have policy 3.4.7 or is it policy 3.2.21? I know that at one point it was going to be cross referenced, and I think they went a different direction with that. So, they’re changing their mind about the policy numbers. They can decide what policy numbers are what. We’re not going to get in that business. There was a lot of helpful comments, particularly about the overload. That sounds like a good question for the floor. Is there any further discussion about this policy in terms of whether or not it’s ready to go to the floor? I emailed Rick. We had an issue with this last year, and here’s Janice’s response, “A/P and civil service exempt employees who are hired on an overload are hired as NTTs for that overload. So, there’s no inconsistency or conflict between the contract language and the policy.” Right. We had an issue with where’s the NTT contract in this. Okay. So, there’s the answer to that.

***From Faculty Affairs Committee: (Information Item 01/25/23)***

***12.09.22.04 Policy 3.3.11 Endowed Chairs and Professorships\_Current Copy***

***12.09.22.05 Policy 3.3.11 Endowed Chairs and Professorships\_Mark Up***

***12.09.22.03 Policy 3.3.11 EndowedChairs-Professorships\_Clean Copy***

Senator Horst: We have quite an edited policy on Endowed Chairs and Professorships. This is coming from Faculty Affairs. I had a question, the named appointment. I had an email from Tom Lucey -- remember we designated certain people to work on certain policies in the Office of General Council, and Jeannie is the point for this. I’m wondering if the edits we’re seeing are a reflection of Jeannie’s perspective? Are there any concerns about this going to the floor? I do note that the tone of the policy really changed, but we can ask them about that on the floor.

***From Planning and Finance Committee: (Information Item 01/25/23)***

***12.09.22.06 Policy 4.1.14 Laboratory Schools\_Current Copy***

***12.09.22.07 Policy 4.1.14 Laboratory Schools\_Mark Up***

***12.09.22.08 Policy 4.1.14 Laboratory Schools\_Clean Copy***

There was no discussion.

***From IBHE-FAC Rep Lane Crothers: (Advisory Item 01/25/22)***

***FAC November 2022***

***FAC November 2022 McMahon-Delaney FAC Power Point FINAL***

Senator Horst: Next, we have an older memo from Professor Lane Crothers, his IBHE-FAC report. It does touch on some of the themes that President Kinzy is scheduled to talk about in terms of the IBHE Funding model that she’s been working on. Are there any further questions? Would you like to forward this to the Senate just so they can read it and I can gather questions? Then people will be a bit more prepared for what President Kinzy has to say about this committee that she’s on and funding.

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

***Proposed* Academic Senate Meeting Agenda**

**Wednesday, January 25, 2023**

**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.***

***Presentation:***

* ***Winter Clean Up (Vice President for Finance and Planning Dan Stephens, Nick Stoff, and Mike Gebeke)***
* ***Illinois Board of Higher Education Funding (President Kinzy)***
	+ ***FAC November 2022***
	+ ***FAC November 2022 McMahon-Delaney FAC Power Point FINAL***

***Approval of the Academic Senate minutes of 11/09/22 and 12/07/22.***

***Chairperson's Remarks***

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

***Administrators' Remarks:***

* ***President Terri Goss Kinzy***
* ***Associate Provost Ani Yazedjian (Provost Aondover Tarhule-Excused)***
* ***Call for Higher Learning Commission Planning Taskforce (Accreditation process) (1 Faculty Senator seat)***
* ***Vice President for Student Affairs Levester Johnson***
* ***Vice President for Finance and Planning Dan Stephens***

***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.)***

* ***Mathematics:*** [***Mathematics Actuarial Science Online Masters Sequence***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/2022-11%20Mathematics%20Actuarial%20Science%20Online%20Masters%20Sequence.pdf)
* ***School of Information Technology:*** [***General Computer Science Accelerated***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/2022-11%20General%20Computer%20Science%20Accelerated.pdf)
* ***Special Education:*** [***LBS I Endorsement Certificate***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/2022-11%20Special%20Ed%20LBS%20I%20Endorsement%20Certificate.pdf)
* ***Marketing:***  [***Advanced Marketing Analytics Accelerated Sequence***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/2022-12%20Advanced%20Marketing%20Analytics%20Accelerated%20Sequence.pdf)
* ***Health Science:*** [***Executive Summary: Healthcare Leadership Sequence***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/2022-12%20Healthcare%20Leadership%20Sequence.pdf)

***Action Item:***

***From Academic Affairs Committee:***

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

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

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

***Information/Action Item:***

***From Janice Bonneville:***

***11.29.22.02 Policy 3.1.11\_Summary of changes for Senate***

 ***01.12.23.01 Policy 3.1.11 Leave of Absence\_Current Copy***

***11.29.22.01 Policy 3.1.11 Leave of Absence\_Mark Up***

***01.12.23.02 Policy 3.1.11 Leave of Absence\_Clean Copy***

***Information items:***

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

***03.24.22.25 Policy 3.4.7 Employment for Teaching Purposes of Administrative\_Professional Personnel Current Copy***

***12.09.22.02 Propose Policy 3.2.21 Employment for Teaching Purposes of Administrative Professional and Civil Service Personnel\_Mark Up***

***12.09.22.01 Propose Policy 3.2.21 Employment for Teaching Purposes of Administrative Professional and Civil Service Personnel\_Clean Copy***

***From Faculty Affairs Committee:***

***12.09.22.04 Policy 3.3.11 Endowed Chairs and Professorships\_Current Copy***

***12.09.22.05 Policy 3.3.11 Endowed Chairs and Professorships\_Mark Up***

***12.09.22.03 Policy 3.3.11 EndowedChairs-Professorships\_Clean Copy***

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

***12.09.22.06 Policy 4.1.14 Laboratory Schools\_Current Copy***

***12.09.22.07 Policy 4.1.14 Laboratory Schools\_Mark Up***

***12.09.22.08 Policy 4.1.14 Laboratory Schools\_Clean Copy***

***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 Cline, to approve the proposed agenda. The motion was approved as amended.

***From Martha Horst: (Dist. to Academic Affairs Committee)***

***01.12.23.06 Horst Email\_ A.I. plagiarism when AAC reviews Student Code***

***01.12.23.08 Horst Email\_two AI articles
01.12.23.09 AI article nytimes***

***01.12.23.10 AR article 2***

Senator Horst: You sent out a note about this issue. Could you talk about the kind of comments you’ve been receiving from faculty?

Provost Tarhule: Not really. I haven’t received any comments. I got a request from WGLT, they want to do a program about it, and it’s been scheduled. But I haven’t received any comments.

Provost Tarhule: There’s some guidelines in that that we provided about how to deal with this issue. But I met with the chair of the Chairs and Directors Council today and they felt like they aren’t hearing a lot of big complaints about this. They don’t feel like it’s a big enough issue to really worry about yet. Although, I do know that some people are concerned about it. I think the article you sent from the New York Times, that was very informative. Basically, this is still evolving. We really don’t know what it can do. It’s just in a test phase now. People are going out there and testing it. Could it be used, yes. But we really don’t know its capabilities yet, enough to make an informed… Have people think about how they said questions and how they answer their questions, what they expect from students.

Senator Horst: You sent me an email about academic integrity. Do we have that at all in a policy for students?

Senator Duffy: Yes.

Provost Tarhule: Yes. It has to be in every syllabus.

Senator Cline: I don’t know. I’ve read all these and others, and I certainly don’t mind it being sent to Academic Affairs. But I feel like this is a little bit of a sky is falling, overreaction, in the same way people flipped out that all academic integrity was going to go out the window as soon as Wikipedia existed. It’s a methodology. I know the tech faculty in my school have showed it to me. We practiced it. We were writing essays during graduation on his phone. But I think the methodology would be to have CIPD create some notes for faculty because plagiarism is not using your own effort. Copying or not using your own effort. So, that’s pretty clear to most faculty about where AI generated text goes in the world. But knowing how to write questions and prepare yourself, I mean, you should also know that there are whole websites dedicated to cheating on campus.

Senator Blum: It’s not the only technology driven that supports plagiarism. I think it’s difficult and what will ultimately become unique about this is that it’s more difficult to detect than previous. So, you could use plagiarism detectors and things like that. So, particularly large classes where there’s writing and things like that.

Senator Cline: Right. But some young person has launched an app that helps faculty to check. They understand how the generation works.

Senator Blum: even the people who developed this actually have a way of detecting it.

Senator Cline: If you want to send it to the committee to talk about it, it can certainly be there. I just don’t feel the need, there are more pressing issues. And we don’t even know, it’s not out fully, and we’re going to need a coupe of semesters with students messing around with it to really understand how to respond. But I also think it’s a little bit of an over response.

Senator Horst: So, how about when you guys look at the Code.

Senator Cline: The Student Code of conduct. Sure, add that on.

Senator Horst: Add that on to your discussion of plagiarism and examine it with an eye towards if it correctly addresses original content.

Senator Blum: I was actually a little concerned that some students might not understand that it’s plagiarism. Right. Because it’s being generated by this computer and there are young learners who are not always naïve, and they don’t always think the same about how we think about copying and this kind of stuff. Even using stuff that’s off the internet. I mean to me that’s a developmental process. That’s something we teach students. So, this will be a different…

Senator Cline: I think putting it with CIPD.

Provost Tarhule: Right. At some point, some discussion about technology and education. They say students know how to write but they are using Grammarly to write essays now. There’s no way we can check that. But Grammarly or things like that are helping people don’t have to know grammar anymore.

Senator Cline: Academics are using Grammarly.

Provost Tarhule: Yeah. It corrects it for you. When I was going to school the big sky was falling at that time was calculators. Calculators would stop everyone from learning and calculators would make everyone dumb. We’ve incorporated it, and here we are. And then as you say Wikipedia, online learning. This is just going to be one more technology that we’re going to find a way to deal with. The current version, I’m not sure there’s anything to be done yet. The training material for this version stops at 2020. It can’t even answer any questions beyond 2020. It’s not like Google that actually goes out and looks for information, it uses prepopulated information. And that starts in 2020. At some point they are going to improve it, but right now there is plenty of mechanisms by which we can bypass this by focusing on how we ask questions. Questions that require more thought. Will students use some of it? probably. But I don’t think it’s going to be to the level that we are afraid of. And right now, the reality is we just don’t know how. A big part of the question also is asking the right questions. It’s almost like those operators. People who are really good at asking the right questions will get much better responses out of it. If you ask it the wrong question, you will get the wrong responses out of it.

Senator Cline: That’s why I thought the CIPD would be a good mechanism through the faculty to teach what are some ways, it’s never going to be fail proof, what are some ways you can require student responses that will minimize the effectiveness of those sorts of devices. And that’s why our tech faculty are really good because our technology faculty…

Senator Mainieri: CIPD put together a great strategy guide.

Provost Tarhule: Having a group of faculty to think through what does this mean, including people in Computers Science who do AI, and come up with some really thoughtful ways by which faculty could address this. I think that’s a lot more meaningful.

Senator Horst: There’s also the AI art generator. Okay. So, we will defer that to you for when the Student Code come up.

***Adjournment***

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

***Attendance:***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Martha Horst***- Chairperson- WKCFA Faculty | Present |
| ***Patrick Walsh-*** Vice Chair and Student Body President | Excused |
| ***Dimitrios Nikolaou-*** Secretary-CAS Faculty | Present |
| ***Craig Blum-*** COE Faculty | Present |
| ***Lea Cline***- WKCFA Faculty | Present |
| ***Deb Garrahy***- CAST Faculty | Excused |
| ***Tracy Mainieri***- CAST Faculty | Present |
| ***Alex Duffy***- President of the SGA Assembly | Present |
| ***Zoe Smith-***Secretary of the SGA Assembly | Excused |
| ***Braxton Myers***- Vice President of the SGA Assembly | Excused |
| ***President Terri Goss Kinzy***- Ex-officio non-voting | Present |
| ***Provost Aondover Tarhule***- Ex-officio non-voting  | Present |