**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

**MONDAY, April 11, 2022**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

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

***Oral Communication:***

***Academic Senate livestream going forward. $27 per meeting.***

Senator Horst: Despite my best efforts, Senator Otto will not be continuing next year. So, our Zoom sessions will no longer be occurring. One question is are we going to continue the livestream? If we continue the livestream, now it will be as an independent option that we chose to do, not something that’s required in any sense. It would cost us $27 per meeting. It is not going to occur on May 4th since Dimitri’s not going to be there. We would have to rent a laptop from the Bone. So, every meeting would be an additional $27. In addition to the financial cost, can you just talk about what you have to do to set up the livestream?

Senator Nikolaou: If we don’t have to do Zoom, the livestream is going to be much more straightforward. I just have to go in there, start a Zoom meeting, any Zoom meeting and select the livestream. The main thing is that we need to make sure that all the connections are working when they put the mic and speakers on. So, when you see the guys in the Bone coming towards me, it’s because some of these connections either are not working, or on the console they haven’t done something. So, I go around 5:00ish when they are still setting up the room so that they can check that a livestream or the Zoom is going to work. So, that at 7:00 p.m., hopefully, there aren’t going to be any issues. But you’ve seen that even if we check it ahead of time, there still can be cases, for some reason, Zoom decided not to cooperate.

Senator Horst: I think we would be doing just the livestream. I’m not sure if they would be handling it or not. When you join the livestream, are you counted in the count? Do you see one when you join the livestream, or do you not see a number?

Senator Nikolaou: I think usually I would see two because it would be Stacy and I. But I don’t know.

Senator Horst: Cera reports that the numbers have been two or three. Now, we could advertise it more.

Senator Cline: Right. So, if we don’t do livestream, we would record it and then post it afterwards or no?

Senator Horst: No. We have the minutes.

Senator Nikolaou: I don’t think so. Even the recordings for the livestream, after the meeting is over, they are not available on YouTube anymore.

Senator Horst: I’m not quite sure about that because of Open Meetings Act. We might maintain a recording, particularly with executive sessions. But the question is, should we continue to livestream?

Senator Cline: I think we should do whatever the law requires us to do.

Senator Horst: The law does not require us to livestream.

Senator Garrahy: Then if I may propose than if for no other reason than we are trying to return to a sense of normalcy. We did not have this prior to COVID?

Senator Horst: No.

Senator Garrahy: Then I would propose we go back to wherever we need to, as long as we are under not state mandate for providing technology.

Senator Horst: So, you’re not in favor of continuing the livestream. How about you?

Senator Small: Yeah. I think we could definitely be done with it, in terms of returning to normalcy.

Senator Miller: I like it. It makes us more transparent as a governing body. It also gives access to people that typically wouldn’t have access. So, I would like it. But also, I understand that formatting and having it all set up is hard.

Senator Horst: Well, and just the continued cost. We would probably have to figure out a way to advertise it. Because doing it for one person or two people, I’m not quite sure.

Senator Otto: Well, of course I appreciate it. I also want to go back to how it was when we were all on Zoom. An incredible number of people would be on those calls because they’re interested, and it was something they could do from home or from their office or whatever. I do think it’s an accessibility issue generally. And I think if more people knew about the livestream, they would potentially participate in the same ways that non-speaking privileged folk were on the Zoom. I do think it’s a transparency issue as well, I agree with that.

President Kinzy: But is it transparency? People know it exists. Our goal is to have people participate in shared governance, and it’s a very passive way that people aren’t participating. To be in the room. To see the dynamics of the dialogue. It’s very different than what we see on the screen. I think we’ve all… The body language of people speaking. The looks around the room. The shaking of the heads. All of that is part of understanding the transparency of the process. Now, you’ll see Martha do it, you’ll see a lot of people do it, they’re sort of looking to see what people’s responses are. We want shared governance to be a participation.

Senator Horst: It is an open meeting.

President Kinzy: Right.

Senator Stewart: I think that the minutes do serve the role as the record. I guess what I wondered is whether we might find a halfway house. Maybe the livestream can be by request in case a member of the public or somebody has an access or accommodation reason. It might be that we don’t end up livestreaming most of the time, but it’s an option. So, I think that that would be what I propose.

Senator Garrahy: And I would certainly support that for a student senator, a faculty senator, a civil service… absolutely. 110%. But I think to just have it. And again, while the cost may seem nominal the cost of Dimitrios’ time, or whomever fills that in, that’s not $27 an hour.

Senator Horst: Yeah. It does add a little bit more stress to that moment when we’re setting up. Especially, if you are a committee chair. We all get in there with five minutes to go. We particularly want everything set up to accommodate a Senator. But it does add stress to that initial moment, right before the Senate.

Senator Nikolaou: I would say that I’m good either way, because I can see the argument that Stacy mentioned. The livestreaming is not going to be as time consuming now. The only thing that I’m thinking is what would happen, for example, so, next year we’re going to have the secretary. So, whoever is going to be the secretary, let’s say that they cannot make it. What happens then? Because if we say that we’re going to have the livestreaming, the other thing that you need to keep in mind is that I have to use this specific computer for the livestreaming because of the two-step verification, the ISUsenate gmail account is linked with that specific computer and my cell phone. So, if, let’s say, next year I’m the secretary and I’m sick on a day, and we’re supposed to be having the livestream, we will not be able to do it if I’m not there.

Senator Horst: And that’s why we’re not doing it on May 4.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. So, for example, on May 4 when I’ll be at a conference, if we want to do the livestream, let’s say Lea was going to do it, then we would need to transfer the credentials to you so that you can start it from your computer and then return the credentials to me. That’s why if we do the livestreaming, I don’t know, the tech people in the Bone said they cannot do it.

Senator Horst: Yeah. I’m not quite sure about that. But still, we would have to log into our account.

Senator Garrahy: And you’d always have to have a backup person, right, if something happens to you at the last minute somebody else has to be ready to go.

Senator Cline: So, right now, do we record the audio of the meeting for the purposes Cera doing the minutes?

Senator Horst: It’s been so long; I forget how we did it in the normal way. We must. Yes. (I’m sorry, I’m remembering) They do send us a recording from the board.

Senator Cline: Can we not take that audio, in whatever format Cera’s getting it to make the minutes, just post that?

Senator Horst: We can share it by request. That’s what we do now.

Senator Nikolaou: I think the concern with that is because Cera goes over the minutes. So, I have an accent, so sometimes what I say it’s not going to translate to what I said and it’s going to give a weird word.

Senator Cline: I just mean the audio.

Senator Horst: Also, the executive session stuff you would have to edit out.

Senator Cline: It was just an idea that if it’s already being recorded. I know that for instance, Doris Houston has listened to it online, and contacted me about something that I did in my committee report. Right. So, I know that some people have used it. But if we could take what product we already have and somehow translate that into a usable way that people can listen after the fact, then that could be good. Because obviously the livestreaming doesn’t allow the live streamer to participate, but just to listen. That would be the same, I think.

Senator Horst: I see what you’re saying. It’s just delayed a little bit.

Senator Cline: Yeah. And it wouldn’t require all the two -factor authentication and all that business if they’re already making the recording.

Senator Horst: So, we have the idea of just posting the audio, but it would have to be edited if we had an exec session. We have the idea of doing livestreaming by request, and we could end it. And I was just thinking we could just continue it for one more year and just try to advertise it and see the numbers. I thought we had a lot of important issues to discuss this year and we had really nobody who listened. For the amount of effort that we put into it, the return was low. We put it up on the website. It’s not that much of a cost though.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. I was expecting it to be much more expensive.

Senator Garrahy: And again, I agree. $27 in the grand scheme of things is not a lot. But I want to look at the secretary’s time, and I don’t know what Cera has to do with something like this.

Senator Horst: Nothing. Are people in favor of continuing live streaming as it is? One. How many people are in favor of continuing livestreaming by request?

Senator Cline: By request, meaning?

Senator Horst: If somebody request to have access to the livestream then we would set it up. Otherwise, we wouldn’t set it up.

Senator Nikolaou: So, it’s what Todd recommended, what Lea recommended or like a combo of the two?

Senator Stewart: Right. That’s…

Senator Horst: Well, if we post the audio, I have to check with Cera about our webpage.

Senator Nikolaou: But if we post it, it should be something that you can only play on the website, it’s not that you can just save it. Because you don’t want people to take excerpts out of context.

Senator Garrahy: That’s what I was just going to say.

Senator Horst: Yeah. Taking President Kinzy and Provost Tarhule and manipulating it, and all sort of things.

Senator Garrahy: And post it on social media.

Senator Horst: Yeah. I’m not in favor of that.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. That’s why it’s complicated.

Senator Cline: Well. Our government meetings locally, those are all livestreamed locally and kept permanent online. So, if someone manipulates them then that’s against the law. There are meetings from two years ago from the McLean County Government Hall.

Senator Horst: So, we had a couple votes for doing it by request, right?

President Kinzy: Yeah. But what if someone requests it but we don’t have anyone capable of doing it for that meeting?

Senator Horst: We just say we don’t have capability at this meeting. There’s no legal requirement that we live stream.

Senator Cline: So, for OMA, the only legal requirement is that we post the agenda and the minutes.

Senator Horst: Yes. And we have an open meeting, and we have public comment. So, I had a couple people in favor of doing it by request. No.

Senator Garrahy: Not by request no.

Senator Horst: You were in favor of doing it by request? So, that’s not a majority either. Okay. So, the last option was… So, we tried continuing the way it is now, by request. Stopping livestream.

Senator Cline: I argue for the retention of the audio.

Senator Horst: We always retain the audio.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. So, I will go with that one too. Pretty much what we had pre-COVID.

Senator Horst: Yes.

Senator Stewart: I could live with that, especially if the audio is retained.

Senator Horst: That’s four and I’ll vote five, so that’s stopping the program. Okay. There’s your recommendation.

Senator Nikolaou: But we’re still doing it if someone has an accommodation?

Senator Horst: Absolutely.

***Extending PIE discussion to next Senate meeting***Senator Horst: We discussed the PIE program. It was an Advisory Item, and at the end of the Advisory Item Senator Otto request that we put it on the agenda for next time. And so, we put that on as an Oral Communication because she said it during the meeting. So, the topic is… and we can fix the agenda when we get there. It’s unusual to have an Advisory Item go up twice. Do people feel that we should have the PIE discussion on the next agenda? Stacy, do you want to talk a little bit more about why you thought that?

Senator Otto: The reason that I ask is that we moved from RERIP toward this thing that looks very interesting and entrepreneurial. But there are a lot of bad feelings about the previous iteration of this, a lot of mistrust over the way that it was implemented, and the aspects of it that were very focused on surveillance. So, the reason that I asked for this is because people did have questions, and maybe no one will ask a question and we will just move through it, but I feel like in an act of good faith this is something of great consequence and it is something that people are a wee mite prickly about. So, I kind of think about it as a good faith thing.

Senator Horst: Okay. Thank you. I kind of think that the good faith thing was to put it on as an Advisory Item. Provost Tarhule, can you just talk about the enhancement fund and how long that’s been going on?

Provost Tarhule: Two comments. RERIP is not going away. RERIP had three components. People were happy and comfortable with two of those components. There was one component that gave people concern that it might have an implication on curriculum. That’s the part we removed. So, we took out any question that had any implication on curriculum. The other two parts remain. So, RERIP remains. Those two parts of it, we’re going to give out grants again using only metrics from those two areas that nobody had any complaints about. The part that people had any complaints about we said, we’re not going to use this as part of RERIP. So, the complaints as I heard was that if you give out money for things like DFW it might encourage faculty to maybe be softer or change their grading practices, which is what was the concern. So, what we’ve done is we take that out and we’re not going to give you money to do this. However, we’ve got the Provost Enhancement Grant. And from this, I know that departments have been asking for money to do a variety of things, because they do that every year. Some people say, we want to do recruitment, we want money from the Provost Enhancement Grant. Some people say we want to change our curriculum, and they ask for the Provost Enhancement Grant. So, we have converted some of the parts of RERIP, like if you want to change your curriculum and integrate it with the Provost Enhancement Grant. And we’re calling it the Provost Innovation and Enhancement Fund. So, now it’s no longer something we give to you because you did something. It’s something that if you want to do, if you have an interest in improving or changing something in your program in some way, you can ask us for money, show how you want to do it, and we’ll give it to you.

Quite frankly, when we presented this as an Advisory Item, my hope was that people would look at the new program and say, do you still have a concern that this will impact on curriculum. That’s really what I was looking for, because that was the original issue, that it might induce people. So, the concern now is no longer how this operate, it’s do you still have a concern that this has an impact on the curriculum.

President Kinzy: A negative impact. You want it to have a positive impact.

Provost Tarhule: Exactly. We want it to have a positive impact. With respect to some of the questions like the ones your constituents asked me, people can always send suggestions to me about how we operate a program, and if they want to see changes, but that’s not part of Senate process. Right. That’s part of general feedback. So, it’s only that one. Do you see what we are operating now, do you still have that concern that there is a potential to impact or influence curriculum using what we’re doing?

Senator Horst: But the Provost Enhancement Fund program is a standing program.

Provost Tarhule: Yeah. That’s a standing program that’s been around for more than 10 years and that continues. So, it’s really, as you said, a good faith effort is because I took some money from the RERIP—I can give you the numbers. We used to give RERIP fund about $800,000. So, when we took out one of the components, we valued that at $200,000. So, I’m basically incorporating that $200,000 to the Provost Enhancement Fund that I’ve always given anyway. And I could have said we’d just fold it in, but as you said, because people were excited and interested in this, I thought it made sense to come back to you and to say here is what I have done. And do you still have any concerns about the curriculum aspect. Does that help?

Senator Cline: I was just going to say, if the concern is to get people aware, because the new PIE program as you laid it out, sort of incentivizes us, or gives us the thoughts of what could we do in our curriculum to meet these different goals that they’ve had. Maybe the thing to do is to go through the colleges, not Senate, to advertise it and discuss. I know you’ve talked to the deans, but I mean to have meetings, because we have annual meetings in the colleges. Maybe that’s a good point to sort of mention it and discuss it, or whatever.

Provost Tarhule: Yeah.

Senator Cline: I think you would actually meet more people and get more interest not at Senate.

Senator Horst: The thing is Senate stepped in because it has a strong curricular component, and we have the right to have a voice and a say in the process.

Senator Cline: Sure.

Senator Horst: So, that’s why it was an Advisory Item, because he’s coming to the Senate to engage with us on something that clearly is in our purview. The question is, did we do enough or do people think it should go on another agenda?

Senator Garrahy: I have a question, and if I’m overstepping I’m fine with saying I apologize. So, it will be that programs, colleges, departments say what they would like to use the Provost Enhancement Fund for? Kind of like with sabbaticals, do they have to show how they actually followed through on that?

Provost Tarhule: Like give a report? Absolutely.

Senator Garrahy: Thank you.

Provost Tarhule: Yeah. So, they will apply. At the end of it they will give a report. The logistics of the implementation, again, is not the point here. The point is as we constituted, do you see that this infringes on faculty curriculum decision making in any way? And if it doesn’t then we would…

Senator Horst: But we do have the right to be consulted, which you did. I just would say that nobody raised any of those concerns as they were asking questions, at least that I heard.

Provost Tarhule: Right.

Senator Horst: Senator Small, any opinions?

Senator Small: I don’t really know. I don’t feel like I have formed an opinion totally.

Senator Nikolaou: I would say that since it was an Advisory Item it was presented with every opportunity to ask questions. I don’t recall another item that was Advisory and came back again as an Advisory Item. So, the only thing, what the Provost mentioned earlier, that we might just want to mention in the meeting as a reminder that if you have any questions about the program that they can directly email the Provost.

President Kinzy: So, we’re just begging people for feedback after we gave them the opportunity before?

Senator Nikolaou: No. no.

President Kinzy: I’m just saying… My point is you guys are working really hard to bring things forward, to have the Senate have these opportunities and if people aren’t taking advantage of them, I sort of feel shame on them. Right. That’s like saying I didn’t vote, and I get to complain about who’s the President. Right. Well, you didn’t vote. You complain all you want; you don’t have a voice. You can say, well, I’m just one person. I’m telling you any person that took the time to come to that Academic Senate, we would listen to them, because they took the time to come. And anybody that comes we take very seriously. Right.

Senator Horst: We had five questions from Senators.

Senator Otto: But no one can speak at Senate who’s not a senator.

Senator Horst: But they can talk to their senators. This was a lot. We had five senators who asked questions, but the typical process for an Advisory Item is what we just did, Stacy.

President Kinzy: But they also could have talked before the meeting. They knew it was on the agenda. If they had past concerns about it, they could have spoke right there.

Senator Horst: Some people did that. Todd had a constituent that did that. So, that process worked.

Senator Cline: I feel like we’ve met our burden. And if it’s about getting the word out, that’s another vehicle.

Provost Tarhule: If I had gotten any questions that were remotely close to curriculum, I would be happy to continue the discussion. But the questions I got were logistic, how would you do this, how would… like any grant program. So, as you said, Lea, if this goes forward the next step, and we actually discussed today about extending the deadline so that we can actually go to every college and explained how this works, what the process is so that people have an opportunity to ask those.

Senator Cline: And there might be questions that develop, but untested it’s a little hard to abstract to know what the problems might be.

Provost Tarhule: Correct. The problem here is really getting people comfortable that there isn’t anything that is going to induce people to change something related to curriculum, as was the concern before.

President Kinzy: In a negative way. We want people to change curriculum. We don’t want them to change it in a negative way.

Senator Cline: If someone perceives impacts on curriculum, they can write a letter to us, and we can bring it back.

Senator Horst: Ask us to look into it further.

Senator Cline: Right.

Senator Horst: Okay. I’m going to move on because we have a huge agenda.

***Distributed Communications:***

***04.07.22.22 Provost thoughts on choosing summer session instructors\_ Policy 3.4.7 & 3.6.27  
04.07.22.24 Hollywood Email\_3.4.7 Employment for Teaching Purposes of Administrative\_Professional and Civil Service Personnel***

Senator Horst: We had a question regarding policy 3.4.7 and 3.6.27, which are the same policy, essentially. And it was difficult to figure out the answer. So, I asked the Provost to make a statement because it wasn’t clear that he was going to be here. Senator Hollywood said she recalled something from the contract. She looked that up and you have that email as well. There is no more standing committee. So, I’m just wondering how people would like to move forward with this. We could send this policy back to committee, or Senator Nikolaou could craft an amendment from the floor; something like, “in most cases, faculty will be offered summer teaching opportunities before civil service and A/P employees.” But the committee cannot consider this item further. So, how would people like to proceed with this one before we get to the agenda? And, Provost Tarhule, do you want to speak further since you’re here?

Provost Tarhule: My thoughts, I think in the email, there may have been a lack of clarity about when should faculty be prioritized. And to my mind, for the duration that faculty are on contract, that’s not a question. The faculty are always prioritized when they’re on contract. But when they are not on contract, should we still prioritize them over the summer when we’re looking for classes to teach? That’s where I equivocated a bit, because sometimes I remember from my days as chair, sometimes some departments really want to give their PhD students an opportunity to teach. So, you put them in summer classes to teach. That’s a good introductory step for students. Sometimes you have a summer class where A/P folks have very special skills. If I want to bring someone in student affairs to teach in my class related to… or some kind of unique practical and say we have Engineering or I want to bring in someone from Industry to teach Cyber Security, any of those. In those case, I will still prioritize a faculty member if the faculty member has the better experience. But if they don’t, then in the interest of the student’s learning success, I would prioritize the best person who can give the students what we need. So, I think giving that kind of flexibility for the summer, to me, makes the most sense.

Senator Nikolaou: So, based on Mary’s email though, NTTs with status will always have priority. So, then that makes me think, well, if we say that whenever we are hiring, we have tenure/tenure track, NTTs with status, and then we have NTTs, A/Ps or CS just because what the contract says for the NTTs. I don’t know how I could justify…

Senator Horst: Isn’t this within the NTTs though?

Senator Cline: The status NTTs get it before any other NTTs.

Provost Tarhule: Yes.

Senator Horst: Yes. And the retiring NTTs get the first crack based on this.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. But based on that one…

President Kinzy: But it doesn’t say they get preference over anybody else. It’s just the preference within NTTs.

Senator Cline: So, faculty first, then this is the pecking order within the NTT’s.

Senator Horst: Yeah. The pecking order within the NTTs.

Provost Tarhule: Yeah.

Senator Nikolaou: Have we asked Legal or whoever is responsible for the NTT contracts?

Senator Cline: Ahead of other NTT faculty members is what it says.

Senator Nikolaou: Well, but then the second part says, if additional summer assignments or overloads are still available after those NTT faculty members who meet the intent, etc. Then individuals with status will be given. So, I just want to make sure that it is indeed that if we decide to offer a class to the NTTs, then what the email says happens and it is not that if we have a class it has to be offered to an NTT.

Senator Cline: That’s not what it says.

Senator Horst: Yeah. I don’t think that’s what this says. But just to your point, do you think a committee should look into this further? Or could we treat it just as a question to Legal? And then an amendment from the floor, if you are so moved.

Provost Tarhule: Dimitrios, if it helps, let me state how I saw this in my mind. So, in my mind, the first question is actually not even status. The first question is, I’m a department chair trying to assign. I’ll be looking for who’s the most qualified person? Who has the expertise? And if I had a tenure track faculty member and an NTT faculty, two people, I would go to my tenure track faculty member. If I don’t have a tenure track faculty member, I would go to an NTT. If I don’t have an NTT, I would go to… But my first priority is who has the expertise to teach this class the best and then a classification. The faculty is actually a secondary. I would not take a tenure track faculty member who doesn’t have an expertise in a class just because they’re tenure track.

Senator Horst: So, there could be some class that A/Ps are traditionally teaching for whatever reason, and it would be counterintuitive to say, oh, faculty now get priority.

Provost Tarhule: Right.

Senator Horst: Because if it’s some class that the A/Ps are always teaching.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. And I totally understand the point that you made about whoever is the best for the success for the students. I’m just thinking of like the worst-case scenario of, let’s say, is it possible that we are going to have a chair who is going to be making automatically the offers to CS or A/P, even if a faculty would be the best option?

Provost Tarhule: Yeah.

Senator Cline: Because they’re cheaper.

Senator Horst: Because they’re cheaper.

Senator Cline: A full professor is going to make more for that class than an assistant professor, for instance. So, there are certainly rumors within areas that that is the decision that was made. I think we would need to be clear, but I think that we all agree that the students deserve the best that we can give them. But I think by making it soft like that, you’re leaving open the opportunity.

Provost Tarhule: Yeah. There’s a difference between our administration and policy. So, when I was chair, we prioritized junior faculty for summer teaching. Because we say senior faculty already make more money and most of them have research. So, in my role, we would prioritize junior faculty. So, I think what we’re trying to solve here is add administration. I don’t know if you can really solve it through policy, you can make it better if you can.

Senator Horst: What we really need to do is think about the agenda. Would we like the internal committee to investigate this further? Would the Provost like more time to think about the policy and then come back with specific language?

Provost Tarhule: No. If you want it to go to committee, that’s fine with me.

Senator Horst: Okay. They could work with your new academic administrator. Do we want to pull this from the agenda, or do we want to give Dimitrios a chance to do a floor amendment?

Senator Cline: I think it’s better to go back to the committee.

Senator Horst: Back to the committee so they can investigate this further.

Senator Otto: I agree.

Senator Horst: Agree? Okay.

***From Bridget Curl: (Dist. to Academic Affairs Committee)***

***02.18.22.14 Email from Bridget Curl RE\_ policy 2.1.11 SAP review***

***02.18.22.06 Policy 2.1.11 Satisfactory Academic Progress Required for Continued Financial Aid Eligibility Current Copy***

***04.08.22.03 Policy 2.1.11 Satisfactory Academic Progress Required for Continued Financial Aid Eligibility Mark Up***

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

***From Academic Affairs Committee: (Information 04/20/22)***

***03.09.22.01 Policy 2.1.21 Undergraduate Academic Standing, Probation, and Reinstatement Current Copy***

***03.09.22.02 Policy 2.1.21 Undergraduate Academic Standing, Probation, and Reinstatement Mark Up***

***03.03.22.09 Policy 2.1.21 Undergraduate Academic Standing, Probation, and Reinstatement Clean Copy***

Senator Horst: Now I’m going to reshuffle and I’m going to now talk about policies 2.1.11 and 2.1.21. These are linked because they were part of the same ISAC audit. And that audit brought up inconsistencies. One of the inconsistencies was that it didn’t match federal regulations. What happened with this is that Lea’s committee was working on 2.1.21 and Bridget Curl and Amy Roser were working with Legal on 2.1.11. All of the work was as a result of this audit. I mixed them up a little bit. And Alice Maginnis, who was also working on this had to take a leave for a bit, so Wendy Smith was sort of thrown into that. And that made this process a little bit delayed. So, the upshot of it is one of these policies has been through an internal committee and one has not. However, they are both as a result of audit findings, and Legal is requesting that we take 2.1.21 as an Information Item on April 20, from your committee, at the same time concurrently bring 2.1.11 from Exec to the floor.

They say that all the changes basically are related to federal and state regulations, and they say that they can make an annotated version of 2.1.11 that would show how all of this is related to regulations. So, my question to you is do you agree with that? That 2.1.11—even thought it was not through Lea’s committee—could that go simultaneously with this other policy? And they are concerned about compliance to the extent to which they could just have it signed by the President and we could look at it later.

Senator Stewart: My concern is there’s still other stuff that needs to be done in here. There’s still gender language.

Senator Horst: Yeah. I sent them a note about capitalization. I sent them a note about gender language. Stuff like that. So, I could gather everybody’s edits. We could work on a google doc.

Senator Cline: I have maybe a compromised solution. I agree that there are some legal issues that, basically a lot of Academic Affairs this year has been dealing with the fallout from this audit. But in each and every case, we have fixed the audit issue and improved the policy tremendously overall. So, what I would think is if we could let them do the legal changes that keeps us into compliance, and then put this on the Academic Affairs Committees Issues Pending list for next year.

Senator Horst: So, take it to Senate and then have it go through committee again?

Senator Cline: Take it to Senate with just the legally required changes that they’re going to give.

Senator Horst: Which is what they sent.

Senator Cline: Right. But then send it back and put it on the IP list for Academic Affairs so we can deal with things like the gender language, and to do all that work on the normal schedule next year. It hasn’t been revised since 2015.

Senator Horst: Yeah. I already sent them a list. We can continue to send them observations about the gender language. There was these capitalized terms, financial warning something.

Senator Cline: Right. If you see in 2.1.21, we changed a lot of that. So, I feel like the committee could get a crack at it in the full sense of the term.

Senator Horst: Okay. Do people agree with that plan? That we would send it to the floor on April 20 as is from Legal with some edits, possibly of people’s observations from this committee. And the President will sign it, hopefully. Then it will immediately go on the Issues Pending list for your guys to do a deep dive.

Senator Nikolaou: So, I’m assuming no one has seen it, right? Because for instance, the grad school hasn’t seen it?

Senator Horst: Amy Roser has seen it. Bridget Curl has seen it. Legal has seen it. Past that, I don’t know.

Senator Cline: That’s what I mean, all of that has to happen.

Senator Nikolaou: There are some things that are not consistent with what the graduate school does in terms of 3.0.

Senator Horst: Okay.

Senator Cline: That’s what I mean. When I looked through it, it’s one of these octopus policies that we’re going to need time to go through all of it.

Senator Horst: Okay.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. For instance, just the legal stuff, so we’re not in trouble with Legal, and then Academic Affairs will do it next year.

Senator Horst: Okay.

***From Planning and Finance: (Information Item 08-2022)***

***04.07.22.12 Policy 3.2.10 Emeriti Academic Employees Defined\_Current Copy***

***04.07.22.13 Policy 3.2.10 Emeritus Academic Employee Defined\_Mark UP***

***04.07.22.01 Policy 3.2.10 Emeritus Academic Employees Defined Clean Copy***

Senator Horst: 3.2.10 is coming from Planning and Finance. As I was looking at this today, I noticed that there is language regarding Emeriti faculty in 3.3.4. They define Emeriti faculty and even talk about the privileges and how the process works. So, that needs to be addressed before this goes to the floor. Cera put Information Item in August because we are now in the situation where April 20 is the old Senate and May 4 is the new Senate. But are there any other observations from this group about 3.2.10?

Senator Nikolaou: First of all, do we have emeritus dean, emeritus chair, emeritus president?

Senator Garrahy: President emeritus.

President Kinzy: That’s at the discretion of the Board of Trustees.

Provost Tarhule: President, but not dean or chairs.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. So, the one thing was when they added in academic faculty rank, like the end of the first paragraph, well, are there non-academic faculty ranks?

Senator Horst: NTTs.

Senator Nikolaou: But they are still academic faculty.

Senator Horst: No. Academic faculty rank is defined in this other policy 3.3.3 Academic Ranks.

Senator Nikolaou: So, then we might want to add…

Senator Horst: Faculty of academic rank.

Senator Nikolaou: If we are using the academic faculty rank from the Academic Faculty Rank policy then we should cite the policy.

Senator Horst: Okay. Faculty of Academic Rank, per 3.3.3.

Senator Nikolaou: Then, did anyone else have a weird… I mean were you okay with the phrasing of the first sentence? Where it says, “…faculty rank on continuing appointment who retire while still employed after having served the University…” What does it mean “still employed after having served the University?”

Senator Horst: So, they’re about to retire.

Senator Nikolaou: But obviously if you are about to retire it means that you have served the University, otherwise you cannot retire. So, they say “after having served the University,” do they mean that there is a second period after which we can get this emeritus? So, for example, if I come here and stay for two years, and then I retire. Am I eligible or do I need to have been at the University for a second period?

President Kinzy: Okay. I will weigh in on this one because we looked at the Emeritus President policy as this was happening at other universities and such. There is often a residency requirement. And for presidents a lot of the average is 10 years at the university. So, you can’t hop in for two years… like Vic Boschini, right. He was a good guy. He wasn’t here too long. He’s been at TCU for what 20 years or some crazy amount of time.

Senator Garrahy: About 15, yeah.

President Kinzy: Great guy. Nice super guy. Sent me a note. Right. But would we want to go back and make him an emeritus president?

Senator Horst: But that’s never been the case with this policy.

President Kinzy: Yeah. I know. He asked what the practice was, and I was giving him context.

Senator Nikolaou: I was wondering if after having served the University, is there a time limit that’s missing there?

Senator Cline: Yeah. Is there something missing there?

Senator Nikolaou: There is something missing. That’s why I said the phrasing was weird.

Senator Cline: A minimum of.

Senator Horst: Okay. So, after having served, is there further time limit? Okay.

Senator Otto: It seems like we should say usually if there’s not a hard time limit in this other policy. I can imagine someone retiring who hasn’t been here very long who was ill, and you know, we might want to allow them emeritus status. So, I think not having it be such a hard and fast rule if it is indeed there’s a residency as President Kinzy said.

Senator Horst: And all of this sounds like floor questions. Is there something that you observed that you would like to send it to the committee now because of the wording?

Senator Nikolaou: The other one is in the middle of the new paragraph where it says, “or potential legal liability.”

Senator Horst: Uh-huh. This is all coming from Legal.

Senator Nikolaou: So, I can understand everything else, but “potential legal liability.” It’s not even legal liability, it is the potential for legal liability. Because then I was thinking, well, would we deny someone promotion because of the potential of legal liability?

Senator Horst: Okay. I’ll ask for more clarification on that.

Senator Nikolaou: And then I just have some editorial things.

Provost Tarhule: So, I know that this rule operates differently than many places, but this almost seems like everybody has it and then maybe you can decide who doesn’t have it. But in other places that I’m familiar with, the process starts in the department. So, a department actually recommends somebody for emeritus status, and then at that point whatever the appropriate body is considers it and says, okay, we approve it. But somebody has to nominate them. But then in that case, the assumption is not everybody has it, it’s a department says this person served with credit and did good things for us. We want them to have emeritus status. And if somebody doesn’t have that standing in your department, they don’t get it at all. So, I’m not necessarily advocating, I’m just saying there is another way that it’s been upgraded.

Senator Horst: You know, the committee thought about that, and they did not go down that path. I can say that.

Senator Garrahy: So, Aondover, what you’re saying is there’s a formal documentation process to do this?

Provost Tarhule: Right.

Senator Garrahy: That’s what I thought.

Provost Tarhule: In the way it’s written now, you begin with everybody who retires is emeriti. And then if you had some negatives then we take it back from you. But if you wanted to be something deserving, something that shows class distinction then somebody’s got to say this person served with credit, they did well, and we want them to be emeriti. So, you end up with a much smaller group of people and it’s seen as a status of distinction for service, not something that everybody gets.

Senator Horst: So, that could be a direction the policy could go. But that’s something the body would have to… you could raise that on the floor and then people could agree with you, and we could send it back to committee.

Provost Tarhule: Am I allowed to raise issues on the floor?

Senator Horst: Absolutely. You just can’t vote.

Senator Otto: I was just going to say that I agree with Provost Tarhule. The last time I looked into this, I couldn’t find any process for this in our materials. And I’m used to places where you actually do, as Provost Tarhule says, you go through this process, and you’re recognized as emeritus. And at a lot of institutions, you actually have to keep producing research in order to retain your emeritus status. So, those are all things to think about.

Senator Horst: And then the question is would that go through ASPT if we did it that way? If it was an evaluation.

Senator Otto: I would think so.

Senator Horst: Yeah.

President Kinzy: It’s easy enough to benchmark what other universities do.

Senator Horst: They did that, and they decided to go with this. So, I think the best place to have this discussion is on the floor. I’ll send your comments, I’ll follow-up on that wording. We can certainly change the direction of the policy, but the committee did not choose to do it. I’m going to just move forward because I’m running out of time.
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***Proposed* Academic Senate Meeting Agenda**

**Wednesday, April 20, 2022**

**7:00 P.M.**

**OLD MAIN ROOM, BONE STUDENT CENTER**

***Call to Order***

***Roll Call***

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

***Approval of the Academic Senate minutes of 3/23/22***

***Presentation: Illinois State University’s Five-Year Campus Climate Evaluation (Interim Assistant to the President for Diversity and Inclusion Doris Houston)***

***Chairperson's Remarks***

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

***Administrators' Remarks***

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

***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.)***

* ***College of Business:*** [***New Program: MBA Sequence--STEM***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/consent/2022-04%20MBA%20Sequence--STEM.pdf)

***Action Items:***

***From Rules Committee:***

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

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

***03.24.22.21 WKCFA Bylaws Mark Up***

***03.17.22.01 Fine Arts Bylaws Proposed Final***

***From Academic Affairs Committee:***

***03.24.22.02 2.1.31 Test Optional Admission Policy New Policy***

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

***03.24.22.22 Policy 4.1.7 Organizational Change Current Copy***

***03.24.22.24 Policy 4.1.7 Organizational Change Mark Up***

***03.24.22.03 Policy 4.1.7 Organizational Change CLEAN COPY***

***From Rules Committee:***

***03.24.22.16 Policy 1.10 Code of Responsibility for Security and Confidentiality of Data Current Copy***

***03.31.22.06 Policy 1.10 Code of Responsibility for Security and Confidentiality of Data - Mark Up***

***03.28.22.17 Policy 1.10 Code of Responsibility for Security and Confidentiality of Data - Clean Copy***

***Information Item:***

***From Executive Committee:***

***02.18.22.14 Email from Bridget Curl RE\_ policy 2.1.11 SAP review***

***02.18.22.06 Policy 2.1.11 Satisfactory Academic Progress Required for Continued Financial Aid Eligibility Current Copy***

***04.08.22.03 Policy 2.1.11 Satisfactory Academic Progress Required for Continued Financial Aid Eligibility Mark Up***

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

***From Academic Affairs Committee:***

***03.09.22.01 Policy 2.1.21 Undergraduate Academic Standing, Probation, and Reinstatement Current Copy***

***03.09.22.02 Policy 2.1.21 Undergraduate Academic Standing, Probation, and Reinstatement Mark Up***

***03.03.22.09 Policy 2.1.21 Undergraduate Academic Standing, Probation, and Reinstatement Clean Copy***

***Communications***

***Adjournment or Hard Stop at 8:45***

Motion by Senator Small, seconded by Senator Miller, to approve the agenda as ammended. The motion was approved.

***From Academic Affairs Committee: (Information Item 08-22)***

***04.07.22.17 Policy 4.1.2 Course Proposals For Undergraduate and Graduate Courses\_Current Copy***

***04.07.22.18 Policy 4.1.2 Course Proposals for Undergraduate and Graduate Courses Mark Up***

***04.07.22.02 Policy 4.1.2 Course Proposals for Undergraduate and Graduate Courses\_Clean Copy***

Senator Cline: We were sent this earlier this year. Dr. Trites noticed as she was just looking up policy that the title of the policy said undergraduate and graduate course proposals and then there was just a subheading that said undergraduate proposals, but the text was written to encompass both, and there was no subheading for graduates. So, she just asked that we make some editorial shifts just to bring us current. Since we don’t have an editorial process, we took it into the committee. We did talk about it this past meeting. Dr. Kalter, the UCC’s liaison, gave basically a rewrite of the policy and that’s what you see now. So, essentially, she wanted to delineate more and to sort of focus on that first sentence, that “all proposals for creation, revision, and deletion of curriculum” and to make sure that the policy treated all three of those. So, what you have here is a little bit longer. As we say, it’s not an easy greeting card kind of policy but it’s got a lot of meat in there for dealing with those three things: creation, revision, or deletion.

Senator Horst: And “ordinarily” could help something like the College of Engineering.

Senator Cline: Yeah. “Ordinarily,” and also the Graduate School wanted that word ordinarily there as well because that allows for some exceptions in unusual circumstances.

Senator Horst: And I did look at policy 4.1.9 Disestablishment, and one of the last phases is phasing out or reassigning courses, facilities, or properties of the academic unit. So, that would all be in negotiation with a bunch of people. So, that makes sense.

Senator Cline: Right.

***From Faculty Affairs Committee: (Information Item 08-22)***

***04.07.22.14 Policy 3.2.12 Ombudsperson Current Copy  
04.08.22.01 Policy 3.2.12 Ombudsperson Mark Up***

***04.08.22.02 Policy 3.2.12 Ombudsperson Clean Copy***

Senator Nikolaou: Pretty much this is responses to questions that we received. There was some rearrangement, moving at the top what is the Ombudsperson Council and what is the Ombudsperson. We clarified that the faculty members need to be full time tenured and that the staff member is a full-time staff as well. We added categories who are not eligible to serve. So, if you are in the AFEGC, if you are a current member of the Academic Senate. And then in that same paragraph we also added which positions may be more administrative, they should not be eligible for the Ombudsperson, because later on in the policy it actually explicit states that no one who has supervisory responsibility that makes decision about the University should be part of the Ombudsperson Council.

Then at the next paragraph, we clarified about what happens with the pool of candidates. It’s more about the process. We added mirror language only for faculty, and then when we talk about the staff, if we talk about the A/P or the CS Council.

The other item that we added, because right now the policy says that there is a course release for the faculty members. I know that that was a question that we got. We were planning on adding a similar time release for the staff member, or compensation, but we did talk with Human Resources and pretty much they told us no, because staff are in a different… so they are in full time appointments and there are no provisions for receiving release time for service. Pretty much they said, everyone who serves in a committee, and is a staff member, they do arrangements with their supervisors during the work schedule when they are going to have to do work for that specific committee. And actually, what you see over here, it has gone through AVP Trites, Human Resources, Legal, A/P and CS. So, everyone has seen the policy. And that’s why if and when we talk with the chair of the A/P and when he brought it to the A/P Council, he also agreed that we cannot talk about release time for A/Ps because, based on how they’re classified in HR, there is not always a positive time release or a negative time release. That’s why we added the part where we say staff members of the Council shall consult with the unit supervisors for appropriate modifications to perform duties under the Ombudsperson Council. So that it is explicitly stated in the policy that their supervisors do need to work with the members of the Council in order to do their duties.

We also talked about removing the three-credit hour course release for faculty members. The issue is that Ombudspersons work during summer, and we are not under contract during the summer. So, if we are not offering a course release, it means that two out of the three members of the Council are going to be out for the summer, so no conflict that may happen during the summer will be able to be resolved because we cannot have only the staff member working on the Ombudsperson Council. Also, the reason why we kept it in there is because… we were not really in favor of keeping it or removing it, and the idea was that if the Senate thinks that we should remove it from the policy we are fine. But there is this caveat about the summer.

And the other changes are under the independence. This described the process about if an Ombudsperson Council becomes ineligible, because, let’s say, I’m a faculty and they moved in an administrative position that’s not currently allowed to serve, what would be the process? If I do something and I need to be removed from the Ombudsperson Council because I’ve done some “neglectful of duty or misconduct,” what would be the process where we say that it can be initiated by the Provost or the majority of the Ombudsperson Council. But then they would need to have the support of the Faculty Caucus, if we talk about a faculty member. The A/P Council, if we talk about a staff member who’s from A/P. Or the CS, if we talk about the CS.

The last part, Wendy Smith recommended adding something about a temporary suspension from the duties while an egregious issue is reviewed until a final decision is made.

Provost Tarhule: I much rather pay the faculty working over the summer a stipend to do so than this course release. My preference would be pay faculty over the summer a stipend to work over the summer than to give this course release because I look at the workload that they’ve done over the past several years and there isn’t a good justification at all. There’s so many more committees where there’s a lot more work involved.

Senator Horst: Yeah. I wrote down the URC chair who easily worked 50 hours this year. The AFEGC chair who is on call over the summer. They looked at cases over the summer. The Academic Planning Committee members I totaled up at least 50 hours for that. Right. The Faulty Exec members easily work over 35 hours. So, if you start looking at the load compared to others, it’s really not justified.

Provost Tarhule: It’s not justified.

Senator Horst: And then you’re hiring somebody to do the course that they did, so it’s sort of a double thing.

Provost Tarhule: Right. Right.

Senator Nikolaou: I talked with Dan, because when we’re talking about offering to pay for the staff member, and Dan said based on our budget, we would be able to cover if we were going in that direction. So, we’re not going to have the funds to pay if we do it…

Provost Tarhule: Yeah. But a preference, because we can go down the route where all of this service, people asking for money, and they have much stronger cases to make than this one. So, I much prefer to remove, if we can, this course release.

Senator Horst: But his committee has completed its work. So, it needs to go to the floor. I mean you can talk on the floor again.

Provost Tarhule: How do I get an opportunity to weigh in on those discussions before they get to the floor?

Senator Horst: He worked with AVP Trites, correct? So, AVP Trites was the conduit with your office.

Provost Tarhule: I didn’t get to hear about it. I hate raising issues on the floor because it can look like I’m opposing the work that people have spent a lot of time on. I much prefer to be able to weigh in before we get to that point.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. And for this one, we actually wanted it to go on the floor with having the course release in there. Because we wanted the Senate to talk about if we should remove it or not, and not appear that a committee of nine people removed a benefit that the Ombudsperson has.

Senator Horst: So, when this goes forward could you make a little table of the history of the hours that they’ve worked? That might be helpful just to see the amount of hours.

Senator Cline: Two things. It might be smart to funnel through AVP Trites wording for the stipend to give people an option.

Senator Nikolaou: Oh, you mean when it’s being presented on the floor, have prepared language.

Senator Cline: Right. Have some prepared language, that way we’re not spending an hour trying to get… What I wanted to bring up is this issue on page three that has to do with staff members. I know you’ve talked to God and everybody else about it, but “staff members of the Council shall consult with their unit supervisors.” All that says is that they have to talk to their unit supervisor. It doesn’t mean that the supervisor is in any way obligated to adjust. And for some staff, their primary workload isn’t going to change. Right. So, I think there may be slightly stronger language that could be in the benefit of the staff. Not that they shall consult, but that the supervisors shall make appropriate accommodations, or something like that. This puts the burden on the staff rather than their supervisor. And their supervisor could say no. Right. That, no, the time allotment is not allowable or something. But I feel like you “shall consult,” that doesn’t mean anything, because there’s no shall be appropriate adjustments, it’s just you “shall consult.”

Senator Horst: Yeah. Again, that’s a good conversation for the floor.

Senator Cline: Right. I’m going to bring that up on the floor, but I’m giving you a warning that that’s a concern that several people have.

Senator Otto: I think that there might be a typo in A on the first page. I think neutral should not have an “s” at the end. And I also wondered if we want to, I just noticed in other policies we put web links to these other bodies that are involved, like the Student Conduct and Community Responsibilities office. Do we want to have a phone number, link, or an email in parentheses for those AFEGC that are sort of sprinkled throughout this? I’m just sort of throwing that out there.

Senator Horst: Right. So, the Student Conduct and Community Rights office, and then you said AFEGC.

Senator Otto: And there may be some others, but I just noticed those, and I thought I’d just raise the question generally.

Senator Nikolaou: Oh, for what Lea mentioned, what I was going to say was that they have all seen the language and no one made recommendations.

Senator Cline: Staff has approached me about it and don’t agree. I get it. This is a warning to you that it’s going to come up on the floor.

Senator Nikolaou: I know. But it came from the A/P Council and the CS Council.

Senator Cline: I get it.

Senator Nikolaou: So, the actual Council’s they said they are fine. So, if it is one specific person and we have the Council itself….

Senator Horst: You’ve been warned.

(Laughter)

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Stewart, seconded by Senator Miller, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.
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