**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

**MONDAY, October 31, 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.

***Approval of the Executive Committee minutes from October 3, 2022.***Motion by Senator Cline, seconded by Senator Mainieri, to approve the minutes. The motion was unanimously approved.

***Oral Communication:***

***Student Code of Conduct review (SGA or another ad hoc committee?)***Senator Horst: As I said at our last meeting, I’m hoping we can get some movement on the Code. There’s a little bit of complication because we’re doing a search for a new Dean of Students. 2014 or 2015 is the last time the full Senate looked at the Code. At that time, the Academic Affairs Committee reviewed the Code. Before that, I believe, it went through SGA. People were not happy about that procedure, so there was a movement to get an ad hoc committee. The Senate formed an ad hoc committee and it had 21 people on it. The last time that committee met was 2021. They’ve done some surveys and that kind of stuff. But every year, they would be reformed by the Senate. So, we could request to have the ad hoc committee reformed, or we could just wait for the new Dean of Students to be hired and then send them to SGA to do the work. I think they’ve done some preliminary work (I don’t know what they’ve done specifically). What would people like to do? Would you like to try to reform the ad hoc committee which had faculty, students, the Director of the Grad School, people from Athletics, Chief of Police, lots of people from Student Affairs? According to Cera, it was very hard to get them to meet because these people have very busy schedules.

Senator Garrahy: So, Martha, help me understand, if we wait until the Dean of Students is hired would that help or hinder? Would we have to reform the committee anyway once this person is hired?

Senator Horst: No, not necessarily.

Senator Garrahy: Okay.

Senator Horst: This committee worked for four years. I’m not sure if it was the most effective way. The last way was the Dean of Students just sort of presented the Code.

Senator Cline: Can I ask, that committee was working on the revisions, that’s why they were formed?

Senator Horst: Yes.

Senator Cline: And so, they have already done some work? Remember Davenport sent us an email this summer when we asked him and he said it may be in the spring, maybe next fall? But it sounded like it was underway.

Senator Horst: I didn’t see any documents.

Ms. Hazelrigg: There haven’t been any documents submitted. There are three years’ worth of phases that they went through in Teams, and we have all the recordings. They just didn’t finish anything.

Senator Cline: But they started to relook at it?

 Senator Horst: They did some surveys. But I didn’t see a draft. The complete draft that we passed was because of compliance issues, it wasn’t any sort of review.

Senators Garrahy: So, this typically would be under the purview of the Dean of Students?

Senator Horst: Last time, it’s my vague understanding, but last time I remember Art Munin basically presented a draft of the Student Code of Conduct. It went through Student Government Association, I believe, and Academic Affairs. But I think the general consensus was people didn’t think they had a lot of say in shaping it. So, that was the idea of getting the ad hoc committee going. Since then, in 2019, that’s when we had this extensive conversation about hate speech, and I think this ad hoc committee picked it up. I wasn’t on this ad hoc committee. But there was no draft or anything formed.

Senator Garrahy: So, basically, this ad hoc committee has had it for about five years? My suggestion would be perhaps let’s have the incoming Dean of Students look at whatever they’ve had and then perhaps revisit it them, versus trying to get twenty something people back together again.

Senator Horst: So, try to get the new Dean of Students and have them start directing it towards SGA?

Senator Mainieri: What’s the timeline of that?

Senator Walsh: I’m on that committee. The goal is to have the new Dean of Students by January. That’s the goal.

Senator Cline: Prioritize this as something that needs immediate attention.

Senator Mainieri: Seems like a tall order.

Senator Cline: I think the new Dean of Students… I think it would be weird now, essentially in November, to form a committee which probably wouldn’t get to meet until January anyway. Maybe it would be good to have it done for the new Dean of Students, so that it’s in place for the new Dean of Students, but I don’t think it should be in lieu of letting the Dean of Students office take over.

Senator Horst: I think it might slow down the process again.

Senator Mainieri: No, I don’t think a 21-member committee is the way to go.

Senator Garrahy: That’s basically what I agree with. It’ll be ten years before we have something.

Senator Nikolaou: Don’t we need to send it to SGA?

Senator Horst: Yes. But the question is do we want to try to do this ad hoc committee again?

Senator Nikolaou: We could send it to SGA right now based on the information that we have.

Senator Horst: We could ask the Dean of Students to just go straight to SGA.

Senator Nikolaou: Once the Dean of Student comes, it’s not that they will immediately come up with something.

Senator Horst: We have nothing. We have no draft.

Senator Horst: The new Dean of Students is going to form the draft.

Senator Blum: There isn’t anything. Then to constitute the larger committee would take at least as long, right. It’s not going to expedite anything; plus it sounds like historically there’s meeting problems. This is not an efficient way to get to an end, which seems like there absolutely (given comments in the last meeting) are specific issues that needs to be specifically addressed in the Student Code of Conduct that have been sitting on the back burner. So, I think efficiency is the best course of action in this particular situation.

Senator Horst: I think it was a good idea. We’ll just have to make sure that there is dialogue this time with SGA and then Academic Affairs, and then when we get to the full Senate. We’ll have to make sure that they understand how to present something to the Senate. If you recall, we got this 90 page document, so for a whole meeting we just discussed how they were presenting it. Okay. So, no ad hoc committee. We tried that; it really wasn’t efficient. I’m sure they did a lot of great work, but now we are just going to proceed with going through the SGA.

Senator Walsh: So, I guess my question with that is (because I wasn’t here in 2015) does SGA write the draft? Or does the Dean of Students write the draft, then we approve it, and then it goes to Academic Senate?

Senator Horst: I assume the Dean of Students will write the draft and you guys will work on it with the Dean of Students. And it includes the plagiarism piece that we talked about.

Senator Walsh: Okay. That makes sense.

Senator Mainieri: The hate speech issue is something that’s come up on the Senate floor several times. I wonder if there is a way for, whether it’s Academic Affairs or somebody of the Senate, to offer some suggestions to the new Dean of Students in terms of the hate speech issue. Right.

Senator Horst: We don’t want to get the cart before the horse, right.

Senator Mainieri: But at the very least sending a paragraph saying, hey, this has come up, here’s the selection of the minutes. If we don’t want to get involved in the drafting, that’s fine, but I would…

Senator Horst: Memo.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. I feel like when the Code comes back to us, and it hadn’t been addressed, we would have waisted some time.

Senator Horst: Okay. As soon as we’ve hired someone, I’ll send my remarks.

Senator Blum: Yeah. Your remarks were a good summary actually.

Senator Horst: So, as soon as we hire someone, I’ll say, hi, my name is Martha Horst, here are my remarks from this meeting. Okay? Everyone is happy with that?

[***1.17A. Code of Ethics: Professional Relationships***](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/conduct/1-1-17A.shtml)

Senators Horst: The other thing I commented on is we haven’t looked at the Code of Ethics since 2013. It’s actually in Rules for a five-year review. It was placed there in 2018. I might have been chair then. My general comment is it could use a general revision with an EDI perspective. It sounds like a good thing that the University Policy Committee could work on when it’s formed. But we really should be looking at these documents more than every ten years.

Senators Mainieri: Could we put a note for Rules for next memo that you give next year that it’s considered a priority item?

Senator Horst: I think so. But we’ll see if we actually have a new committee to forward it to. We can make that decision next year. Thank you, Tracy. We’ll put that note that it’s a priority for next year.

***Distributed Communications:***

***From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: (Advisory Item 11/09/22)***

***Deans and Chairs Directors Cumulative Evaluations FY23-FY27***

Senator Nikolaou: This will be pretty quick. We just updated the periods when interims, permanent chairs/directors and deans have their annual and their five-year evaluations.

Senator Horst: Okay. This item does not have to go to the Senate if we choose not to forward it.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. And Craig Gatto has seen it.

Senators Horst: Do people think this needs to go to the Senate? No. Okay.

***From Academic Affairs Committee: (Information Item 11/09/22)***

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

***10.27.22.06 Policy 2.1.11 Satisfactory Academic Progress Required for Continued Financial Aid Eligibility\_Mark Up***

***10.27.22.03 Policy 2.1.11 Satisfactory Academic Progress Required for Continued Financial Aid Eligibility\_Clean Copy***

Senator Cline: We’re finally, I hope, are getting policy 2.1.11 Satisfactory Academic Progress Required for Continued Financial Aid Eligibility to the floor. Last year, the Academic Affairs Committee reviewed 2.1.21, which is sort of a companion policy to this one. So, this year, we’re taking up the changes for academic progress for financial aid eligibility. There were some legally required adjustments that were made in a short quick change, and now this was kind of a deep dive into the policy. So, I can see that there are a couple little things on the OneDrive version of it, but essentially (and, Tracy, feel free to interrupt if you think I’m telling a lie, it’s been a long time we’ve been working on this) one issue that Academic Affairs wants to do across the board is remove procedure from policy. A policy should be policy. Procedure should be separate; procedure changes a lot, and being forced to go back in and change policy just because the pecking order or certain forms change is not a responsible use of Academic Senate’s time. So, that’s one thing that our committee’s been thinking about doing for years. This particular policy rides, in a sense, next to eligibility for academic probation and academic good standing. When we first got this policy, this particular policy contained both academic probation and financial aid probation intermixed. So, one of our first jobs was to disaggregate those two things, to sort of pull them apart, and to remove things that were really about academic progress and not about financial aid progress, because this is about financial aid eligibility not about academic probation; that is its own separate policy. We did that. We had it reviewed by Noel, who did some changes on behalf of the Graduate School. We had Amy Hurd involved. We had Bridget Curl from Financial Aid. Then, when it went to General Counsel after we had very systematically disaggregated these two things, they said well… The issue is that the law states that the academic probationary or academic good standing policy at an institution cannot be less stringent than the financial aid policy. So, for instance, a student can lose their financial aid eligibility before they lose their position as a student. But they can’t lose their position as a student and not be able to regain their financial aid. They can come back in as a student but not be able to regain their financial aid. So, Legal Counsel said we don’t have to give specifics about academic probationary status here, we just had to… that sentence that was added at that first section, under where there used to be the word policy, is there to say these standards are aligned with the university’s policies and procedures related to academic probation and dismissals as outlined in 2.1.21. That’s why that’s there. Basically, we’ve just aggregated them, and there are just a couple of places where we have to say this is when the academic policy overtakes, right, at this moment. Anyway, lots of changes in every single paragraph. I don’t know what happen to that link, Martha; we will try to get that fixed. But I’m happy to take questions. We fixed all of your “terms” to “semesters.” I see that extra “and” we’ll take that out.

Senator Nikolaou: I just had a quick question. In the Notification of Appeals, did they say if they want any type of timelines? Because right now it doesn’t say, well, we think five days. There is nothing referenced in terms of time periods.

Senator Cline: I think that would be considered procedure and not policy. It would be tied to the procedure, which is outlined separately on the website, University College and the Grad School’s websites, because they are separate. You’ll see that we have taken out Reinstatement Committee and put in University because the Reinstatement Committee doesn’t actually look at all of them. There’s a staff member who looks at most of them, and the Reinstatement Committee only gets involved if there’s a complex or arrant case that needs evaluation.

Senator Horst: So, is there going to be a link to the procedures or is it mentioned in here?

Senator Cline: They will tell you, if someone is in this point of where they have been put on probation, they get letters and they get emails. So, they have a link to the person that can give them the procedures. I’m not sure that they are fully available; I think they’re partially available. But all of the details, including addresses and names and who to call, that is a separate document that’s both physically mailed and email to the person who is on probation.

Provost Tarhule: On page three, I want to make sure… this probably came from Jana, right. it says, “federal regulation prevents financial aid after 150% of the time.”

Senator Cline: For graduate degrees.

Provost Tarhule: So after, let’s say, a PhD is 4 years, so in their sixth year they won’t get anymore. They won’t be eligible for it.

Senator Cline: That’s my understanding. But I guess anything can be appealed. And I think it’s federal financial aid, which would be different than other kinds.

Provost Tarhule: Coming from the universities, so we can still hire such a person for teaching assistantship.

Senator cline: I think so. I believe that’s the case. But this is for federal financial aid eligibility. So, maybe they wouldn’t be eligible for federal financial aid, but they could be for teaching assistants or grants or things like that.

Senator Mainieri: We did ask Noel about the impact on TAs, and she said it’s a completely separate issue.

Provost Tarhule: That can still get used?

Senator Cline: Yeah.

Provost Tarhule: Okay. Cause the master’s program, that would be three years. Okay.

Senator Nikolaou: For the Maximum Timeframe, because for example, under Undergraduate Students, on page three, where it says, “Credit hours attempted include completed credits, audits, incompletes, withdrawals,” do you want to add, because here you added “not passing.” My question is do we need to add not passing? Or there is a reason why there is not? On page two, under Undergraduate Students there was an addition of “not passing.” So, I’m asking on page three, the first paragraph under Maximum Timeframe, if it should also add the “not passing?”

Senator Horst: But they couldn’t take grad classes Pass/No Pass.

Senator Nikolaou: But that ‘s not under the grad students.

Senator Cline: It’s under undergraduates. This includes transfer credits and all attempted credit hours at Illinois State.

Senator Nikolaou: So, I’m wondering, because you added the “not passing” in the other one, if it needs to be included here as well.

Senator Horst: But I thought grad students couldn’t take No Pass?

Senator Cline: it’s above undergraduate, so it’s kind of a general statement.

Senator Horst: Oh, I see.

Senator Cline: It says failed classes.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. That’s just my question. Here it also says or “failed classes,” but we added “not passing.” That’s why I didn’t know if it should mirror each other.

Senator Cline: Okay. I can ask. That would be an Amy question, I think.

Provost Tarhule: Why is there “not passing?” What does that denote? So, you have incomplete, withdrawals, not passing. That seems like something continuous. Failed classes. Everything else is after the fact, except that not passing.

Senator Cline: I don’t know, I’m going to have to ask. You’ll have to forgive me. There were like a thousand changes. So, you’re asking in the original place, is that right Provost Tarhule?

Provost Tarhule: This is something added under undergraduate students. “Incomplete, withdrawals, not passing, repeated,” it’s almost like if the student is not passing…

Senator Horst: I think it’s like you get the grade Pass or No Pass. And No Pass can be a D. Right?

Senator Cline: I think so.

Senator Horst: It’s not the same as a fail.

Senator Cline: Right. Because courses with a grade D or higher as well as credit or Pass count as completed. “Credit hours attempted include completed credits, audits, incompletes, withdrawals,” NPs, right, would be not passing, and repeated or failed courses.

Senator Mainieri: So, maybe you should put in no pass or whatever the correct term is.

Senator Cline: Or maybe put in parentheses NP or something like that.

Provost Tarhule: No pass would make it more grammatic and cover it.

Senator Cline: Okay.

Senator Horst: And you’re going to clarify those little things?

Senator Cline: Yes, I will. Thank you.

***From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: (Information Item 11/09/22)***

***10.27.22.04 Policy 1.3.1 Reasonable Accommodation Procedures for Employees or Applicants\_Current Copy***

***10.27.22.05 Policy 1.3.1 Reasonable Accommodation Procedures for Employees or Applicants\_Mark Up***

***10.27.22.02 Policy 1.3.1 Reasonable Accommodation Procedures for Employees or Applicants\_ Clean Copy***

Senator Nikolaou: These are the changes that came from OEOA back in January from Jeff Lange and then we also had the new interim Director, Debora, come and talk us through all these changes, which were pretty much based on law. Where they were clarifying the process for employees, civil service, job applicant accommodations. So, pretty much all the changes that we had from Jeff, these are the ones that are reflected here. The committee didn’t do, apart from small editorial kind of stuff, and we ran it through OEOA. We’ve ran it through Legal. And then you saw the email from HR where they wanted to make clear that it’s not only Janice, but it could be a designee to deal with the appeals. So, we might want to have Debora come, because she will be able to answer any specific questions.

Senator Cline: I had some notes for you in the One Drive document. I don’t think I’m the only one with notes in there. But the first thing I wanted to ask, and I’m asking it even though I think I know the answer, at no point do we actually define the term reasonable, which I understand. I did some research the best I could to understand what that term means in the context of these kinds of laws, and it still is kind of a loose area, but I don’t think it would be terrible…

Senator Horst: These are just the procedures though. Remember there is another policy.

Senator Cline: Okay. So, these are just the procedures. There is a separate policy that defines all of this?

Senator Horst: Yes. We let go of policy 1.3.

Senator Cline: Okay. Good. I just thought this is very spare.

Senator Nikolaou: We did ask about that part too, and Debora said pretty much we cannot give a definition because it will be a different definition for you based on your circumstances, and it’s going to be a different definition what is reasonable for me depending on the accommodations that I need in that they may change even from when you apply for a job, after you have been employed. Ours gives better flexibility to serve the university.

Senator Cline: Okay. So, maybe you’ve just answered it, but this says to implement procedure 1.3.1 (this is in the first paragraph under Background, second mini paragraph) “The University has designated the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access (OEOA) to implement Procedure 1.3.1,” should it be policy?

Senator Nikolaou: It is policy 1.3 and it is procedure 1.3.1.

Senator Cline: Okay. And you’re missing an oxford comma.

Senator Horst: I included comments about a scenario where you have a faculty member who, for instance, wants to serve on the Academic Senate and needs accommodations. We did a formal contract with OEOA, and then we received financial compensation for that. That’s why we had a contract. But this is all going through the department level. So, when we worked on this with Jeff Lange, I suggested that he include language about university entities, and put that in the draft. Further questions?

Senator Mainieri: I have a question regarding that policy/procedure thing that almost broke my brain. I’m just flipping through our policies list. Section 1 is the only place we have policies and then procedures underneath it. Why do we have procedures here, as opposed to on the various office’s websites?

Senator Horst: Can I ask Legal that and get back to you?

Senator Mainieri: Yes.

Senator Cline: I had no idea we had procedures.

Senator Mainieri: I didn’t either and I get a little, I don’t know.

Senator Horst: And just for the history of this, last year we let go of policy 1.3 but members of the Executive Committee thought it important to maintain Senate review of this procedure. So, this part is still under Senate control. The policy, which is driven by the Disabilities Act, is not. We let go of that last year.

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

***Proposed* Academic Senate Meeting Agenda**

**Wednesday, November 9, 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.***

***Presentations:***

***Updated Policy [7.4.3 Pooled Fringe Rate](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/fiscal/7-4-3.shtml) Proposal (Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies Craig McLauchlan, Senior Director of Research and Sponsored Programs Jason Wagoner, Assistant Comptroller Jeffrey Jacob, and Director of Benefits Services Kelly Walker)***

***Approval of the Academic Senate minutes of October 03, 2022.***

***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***

***Consent Agenda Items:***

[Special Education: Major in Special Education, Specialist in LBS Online](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/2022-10%20Major%20in%20Special%20Education%20Specialist%20in%20LBS%20Online.pdf)

[History: Deletion of European Studies Major](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/2022-10%20Delete%20Program%20European%20Studies%20Major%20Executive%20Summary.pdf)

***Action Items:***

***From Planning and Finance Committee:
10.13.22.09 Policy 3.2.10 Emeriti Academic Employees Defined\_Current Copy
10.13.22.10 Policy 3.2.10 Emeriti Academic Employees Defined\_Mark Up***

***10.13.22.08 Policy 3.2.10 Emeritus Academic Employees Defined\_Clean Copy***

***From Academic Affairs Committee:***

***10.13.22.06 Policy 8.5.1 University Library\_Current Copy***

***10.13.22.07 Policy 8.5.1 University Library\_Mark Up***

***10.13.22.03 Policy 8.5.1 University Library\_Clean Copy***

***Information Items:***

***From Academic Affairs Committee:***

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

***10.27.22.06 Policy 2.1.11 Satisfactory Academic Progress Required for Continued Financial Aid Eligibility\_Mark Up***

***10.27.22.03 Policy 2.1.11 Satisfactory Academic Progress Required for Continued Financial Aid Eligibility\_Clean Copy***

***From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee:***

***10.27.22.04 1.3.1 Reasonable Accommodation Procedures for Employees or Applicants\_Current Copy***

***10.27.22.05 1.3.1 Reasonable Accommodation Procedures for Employees or Applicants\_Mark Up***

***10.27.22.02 1.3.1 Reasonable Accommodation Procedures for Employees or Applicants\_ 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 Blum, seconded by Senator Duffy, to approve the Senate agenda. The agenda was approved as amended.

***Policy Review:***

***Dist. to Academic Affairs Committee:***

***10.25.22.03 Policy 3.1.1 Categories of University Staff\_Current Copy***

***10.25.22.04 Policy 3.1.1 Categories of University Staff\_Mark Up***

***10.25.22.02 Policy 3.1.1 Categories of University Staff\_Clean Copy***

***10.25.22.01 PROPOSED DELETION\_ Policy 3.2.1 Academic Personnel***

[***https://illinoisstate.edu/trustees/governing-documents/table-of-contents/#c2***](https://illinoisstate.edu/trustees/governing-documents/table-of-contents/#c2)

Senator Horst: The next item is coming from HR. This might look familiar because we just worked on 3.2.1 last year. But Janice Bonneville reviewed the Board of Trustees Governing Documents, and in that they define faculty and AP as basically, “faculty and AP employees include all faculty of Illinois State University and those Administrative or Professional personnel who are not civil service employees” is sort of the circular definition. And then the civil service employees are very specifically defined in a statute. But it specifically lists graduate students as student employees. So, they realized that in the standing policy 3.2.1 that we passed last year, it listed graduate assistants as academic personnel. And then they just started wondering why we had two policies. So, they decided to merge them because this is about categories of university staff; Janice Bonneville said she didn’t think it was necessary to include the definitions you see in 3.2.1 or the information about continuous or non-continuous. So, that’s how she merged them.

Last time, this went to the Planning and Finance Committee, which was doing policy work. I also got indications from Janice Bonneville that she though it was important to review this policy in a timely fashion because it categorizes graduate students in an incorrect way, according to the BOT Governing Documents.

Senator Cline: So, what’s happened to 3.2.1?

Senator Horst: She’s proposing to delete it.

Senator Cline: Okay.

Senator Horst: First off, are there any observations? Second off, where would you like to send it?

Senator Nikolaou: I can understand the point about the graduate assistants. But then, 3.2.1 actually includes a clearer definition of what is faculty, what is A/Ps. So, if we delete it from the policy, do we have a different place where we define where it says “(Any ranked or unranked appointment for the purpose of instruction, organized research, or public service in one of the academic [credit hour producing] departments and related areas).” So, if we delete it from the policy, in ten years can we say, oh, this definition applies to A/Ps? It’s not as simple as just deleting it. It defines what are these categories. And it’s not that we changed the definition last year. These definitions were there. So, I don’t know why the whole thing is being deleted instead of just deleting the graduate assistants; or if we are merging them, why don’t we include the more detailed definition in 3.1.1? And then, I’m assuming we’ll need to change the title of the policy because we’re not talking about university staff, we’re talking about university employees. Faculty are not staff. In 3.1.1, And even within the policy, it says the following categories are university staff. They are university employees; they are not staff.

Senator Horst: One thing we could do is definition and categories of university employee and staff. We could get the definition in that way. Or we could have 3.2.1 standing. Somebody has to look at this ,and it seems somewhat controversial; we can’t send it straight to the floor, after what you just said.

Senator Nikolaou: Also, we may not want to because under other employees it says in accordance with institutional policy. I don’t know what institutional policy is. If there is a specific policy, we should explicitly say. If it is the Board of Trustees… just before Other Employees, at the very end.

Senator Cline: If there is an expedient need? I’m not sure Academic Affairs can meet that charge.

The committee assigned this policy to Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee.

Senator Horst: The person to work with is Janice Bonneville. And you want to make sure it’s aligning with the Board of Trustees Governing Documents, which has that circular definition of faculty.

***Adjournment***

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

***Attendance:***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Martha Horst***- Chairperson- WKCFA Faculty | Present |
| ***Patrick Walsh-*** Vice Chair and Student Body President | Present |
| ***Dimitrios Nikolaou-*** Secretary-CAS Faculty | Present |
| ***Craig Blum-*** COE Faculty | Present |
| ***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 |
| ***Morgan Taylor***- Vice President of the SGA Assembly | Absent |
| ***President Terri Goss Kinzy***- Ex-officio non-voting | Excused |
| ***Provost Aondover Tarhule***- Ex-officio non-voting  | Present |