**Rules Committee (RC) Meeting #1 20013-2014: 9/11/13**

**Committee members present:** Senators Peter Bushell (chair), Farzaneh Fazel, Jesse Shapiro, Mary Dyck, David Pequeno, Matt Riley, David Marx, Lucille Eckrich (secretary), and Neil Dale (note Neil always has class until 6:15pm this fall); Representative Sam Catanzaro

Absent: Adam Schumacher (wasn’t on email list yet, so didn’t know about it), Don LaCasse (theatre prof who is directing tonight)

1. Welcome and member introductions:

--Sen. Bushell: Graphic Design professor in the School of Art @ ISU since 1990.

-- Ex-officio rep. Catanzaro: Asst. VP for Academic Admin., Psychology professor @ ISU since 88.

-- Sen. Shapiro: Political Sci major & Peace & Conflict Resolution Studies minor @ ISU since 2010.

--Sen. Dyck: College of Nursing professor of Gerontology and Nursing Administration @ ISU since 2003; long career in gerontological nursing before coming to ISU.

-- Sen. Pequeno: Marketing major @ ISU since 2011 (?).

-- Sen. Riley: Athletic Training @ ISU since 2012 (?).

-- Sen. Fazel: Management and Quantitative Methods (MQM) professor in the College of Business.

-- Sen. Marx: Physics professor @ ISU since 2003.

-- Sen. Eckrich: Professor of Educational Administration and Foundations @ ISU since 2001.

-- Sen. Dale: Industrial and Computer Systems Technology major in CAST.

-- Introductions on this date of 9/11 led to a brief sharing of where we each were on that fateful day.

1. Functions of the Rules Committee (RC):

Sen. Bushell passed out a sheet from the Blue Book with the functions of the Rules Committee and summarized them, noting that the RC is primarily a set of eyes focused on the university’s by-laws, policies, rules, and constitution and their review and revision as need be, as directed to do so by the Executive Committee. There is also the special late spring task of assigning self-nominating faculty representatives to the external committees of AS. Sen. Bushell explained AS didn’t meet tonight because didn’t have any business yet.

1. Processes of the RC (and all AS committees):

Sen. Bushell asked if we were all OK with an informal meeting agenda and email notification thereof shortly before each meeting, rather than some formal and hard copy agenda-making and distribution process.

* 1. Sen. Fazel said that is fine except when documents are involved and more time to read them is needed. Then a few days prior notification will be necessary. She also indicated that after each meeting, minutes are written up and circulated to RC members, though nothing beyond that is done with them.
	2. Rep. Catanzaro asked whether that lack of easily accessible prior minutes has ever been a problem.
	3. Sen. Fazel said, yes, it has been, for example when a committee has no veterans on it. There is no one to share past practice with the newcomers.
	4. Sen. Bushell and Sen. Eckrich referenced discussions last year (i.e., revision of Code of Ethics) where it could have been helpful to be able to go back to minutes from the prior years when prior revisions had been done.
	5. Sen. Marx suggested—and we all discussed and agreed—that we propose to AS Exec Committee that a new rule be added to the functions of each AS committee, that minutes of each meeting not only be taken but be saved and at the end of the year be sent to AS Administrative Clerk James. She would then name each file and set in a consistent way across committees, and store them in a secure way for posterity. Future committees would be informed that minutes from prior years of their committee are accessible through James (or whoever is in her position). After she’s figured it out the first year, AS clerk James could also tell each committee secretary what the format for the committee’s minutes should be.
	6. Sen. Bushell and Sec. Eckrich will finalize the wording of this proposal and then Sen. Bushell will send it to AS clerk James and ask her to put it on the Exec Committee agenda.
1. Prioritization of tasks for the RC for 2013-2014:
	1. We reviewed the tasks left from last year and decided on the following order for doing them:
		1. College of Fine Arts (CFA) Bylaws. CFA finished its revisions last April or May and is now waiting for our review.
		2. Milner Bylaws. Also waiting for our review.
		3. Athletic Council Bylaws. Also waiting for our review.
		4. Additions and/or revisions to the Blue Book on the roles of AS Chairperson and Secretary. Sec. Fazel got a list from AS Sec. Kalter last year. Since AS clerk James does lots of what the Bylaws state are the Secretary’s tasks, there may be need for considerable review of the Secretary’s roles. Also still need to get some from AS Chairperson Holland.
	2. We need to follow up on whether some links will be put on the ISU Constitution page so Civil Service workers can find policy information since there is no longer a CS Handbook. We met with Tammy Carlson about this last year. She was supposed to talk with folks from Human Resources and Civil Service Council and get back to us about this, but Sen. Fazel said she had heard nothing and had asked Lois Soldner of HR who had also heard nothing. It was decided Sen. Bushell will follow up with Tammy about where this matter is now.
	3. Sen. Fazel said last year the Exec Committee discussed its role vis a vis Academic Senate (AS) committees without coming to an agreement. Some members thought Exec Committee should deliberate everything that comes to it and, with respect to each matter, decide either it is ready to send forward to the full AS or the committee needs to do further work on it with instruction from Exec Committee for doing so. The Bylaws don’t give guidance either way, but traditionally the Executive Committee has been deliberative.
		1. There was some discussion about this after which Sen. Fazel suggested we wait to see what the Exec committee this year does about this.
		2. Sen. Dyck asked for, and Rep. Catanzaro, Sen. Fazel, & others provided clarification on, the difference between the Blue Book, the Bylaws, and the Constitution:
			1. Constitution – for entire university
			2. Bylaws – lay out Senate rules
			3. Blue Book – for functions of specific committees of AS.
2. New Matters:
	1. Sen. Dale noted that students are concerned about new tailgating policies with respect to alcohol usage because violations are now under the jurisdiction of state law not university policy. Police are also stepping up enforcement. That’s OK except that if violations are subject to state law not campus policy, penalties are stiffer and stay on your record.
		1. Sen. Fazel said it’s similar to policies implemented for Cardinal Court. She said if Student Government has concerns about the policy, they need to bring their concerns to the Exec Committee, which may then send the matter to RC.
		2. Sen. Marx agreed.
		3. Rep. Catanzaro explained that for busy football games, the university hires city and even state police to be present. This will be even more so with the new stadium.
		4. Everyone agrees students should research what exactly the new tailgating policies are and if they have any concerns with the new policy vis a vis state law, they should bring their concerns to AS Executive Committee.
		5. Sen. Marx suggested they also need to inform the student body of the new policy.
	2. Sen. Fazel raised a question she received from a faculty member regarding volunteering service on two university committees. The discussion revealed bigger policy issues that we may want to return to in the future and the need to resolve the particular case now.
		1. The bigger issue is whose responsibility is it to deal with vacancies or changes that occur in external committee membership at times other than late spring when the RC is responsible for soliciting self-nominations and appointing volunteers to committees for a new term. It seems current practice is that each committee chairperson deals with vacancies as s/he needs to. Rep. Catanzaro expressed concern with this, saying it could lead to trouble. He noted that the RC guidelines don’t specify when RC may or may not meet its function of appointing committee members. Sen. Fazel pointed out that faculty volunteers can resign or quit anytime without our approval or knowledge. It was agreed we should address the particular case now and leave the general issue for the future.
		2. Sen. Fazel explained that Faculty member Diane Dean was assigned to the Student Grievance Committee (SGC) but would like to serve on the University Hearing Panel (UHP), either in addition or instead. It seems after the RC made assignments last spring some of those who had been assigned to the UHP were not told until this fall that they had been so assigned, and for a variety of reasons they cannot now serve. Thus, there is now a shortage on the UHP and Suzzette Walden, who heads both the UHP and the SGC, would welcome Diane on the UHP. After considerable discussion the RC decided that Diane could switch to UHP if she wanted to and there was a need for her there. However, because there may be cases that are heard by both UHP and SGC, the RC decided no one—including Diane—should serve at the same time on both committees. Sen. Bushell suggested serving on two other external committees might not be a problem except when the work of the two committees could be in conflict, as it might be with the UHP and SGC. We agreed there is no need for this switch to be voted on by the Faculty Caucus. Since Sen. Fazel was already involved in this email communication, she agreed to reply to Diane and Suzzette, with Sen. Bushell ‘cced, to say it is fine for Diane to swap committees but not to serve on both UHP and SGC.
3. Sen. Bushell moved to adjourn the meeting at about 7:25pm. Sen. Marx seconded and all agreed (two members had already had to leave before that point).

Minutes compiled by Sen. Eckrich, reviewed by Sen. Bushell, submitted to RC 9/16/2013, revised 9/25-10/3, resubmitted on 10/8/13, and approved by RC on 10/9/13.

**Rules Committee (RC) Meeting #2 20013-2014: 9/25/13**

**Committee members present:** Senators Peter Bushell, Farzaneh Fazel, Jesse Shapiro, Mary Dyck, David Marx, Lucille Eckrich, Don LaCasse, David Pequeno, Matt Riley, and Neil Dale, and Rep. Sam Catanzaro

1. The minutes from the 9/11/13 meeting were reviewed and corrections noted. Corrections will be made and the minutes will be put up for approval at the next RC meeting.
2. The entire meeting was spent reviewing the College of Fine Arts (CFA) revised Bylaws. Numerous corrections and questions were noted and recorded by Senators Fazel, Bushell, Marx, and others. The work was not completed so will continue at the next Rules Committee meeting.

Minutes compiled by Sen. Eckrich, reviewed by Sen. Bushell, submitted to full RC 10/8/2013, and approved by RC on 10/9/13.

**Rules Committee (RC) Meeting #3 20013-2014: 10/9/13**

**Committee members present:** Senators David Marx, David Pequeno, Jesse Shapiro, Matt Riley, Don LaCasse, Neil Dale, Farzaneh Fazel, and Lucille Eckrich

Absent: Sen. Peter Bushell, Sen. Mary Dyck, Rep. Sam Catanzaro

1. Approval of minutes:
	1. Unanimous approval of revised minutes from 9/11/13.
	2. Unanimous approval of minutes from 9/25/13.
2. Discussion of RC’s idea to recommend that Committee minutes be sent to AS Clerk for posterity:
	1. Sen. Fazel read section 2.6.R of Article II of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate of Illinois State University (<http://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/downloads/documents/BYLAWS-2004-Feb-Final.pdf>) , which pertains to the issue of the nature and distribution of minutes from the meetings of AS committees and reads as follows:

ALL COMMITTEES – DISPOSITION OF COMMITTEE MINUTES.

Until committee minutes have been approved, they shall not be sent to anyone except committee members. Minutes shall be kept for all regular meetings where a quorum is present. Without necessarily discussing details, minutes should indicate persons present, items and areas discussed, action taken, and discussion topics anticipated for the next meeting. Also, minutes should indicate the office or agency to which the committee’s recommendations were sent. The approved minutes should be sent to committee members, the Secretary of the Academic Senate, the appropriate Vice President, the President, the Student Body Vice President for the attention of the Student Government Association, and to other appropriate persons as determined by the committee.

* 1. We discussed how the 3rd sentence relates to, though differs from, the suggestion we had:
		1. It says minutes need not discuss any items in detail, whereas we were suggesting they contain enough detail to be helpful to future committee members working on the same issues.
		2. It says approved minutes should be sent to multiple parties, whereas we had just been suggesting they be sent to and held for posterity by the AS Clerk, Cynthia James.
	2. At first it was suggested (by Sens. Marx, Eckrich, LaCasse, and Shapiro) that we recommend that “Without necessarily discussing details” be replaced with “Keeping a reasonable amount of detail to reflect the committee’s deliberation.”
	3. Sen. Fazel suggested that changing the By-laws can be a more arduous process than is warranted in this case.
	4. We agreed that a better approach would be to bring this item of the by-laws—which AS committees are not currently living out—to the attention of the full Senate as a reminder of what we should be doing and, in the process, to recommend that enough detail should be included to reflect the deliberative process the committee went through, especially on matters that future committee members might be interested in.
	5. We discussed what part of an AS meeting would be the best time to raise this matter for discussion—during a RC report or as an information and then action item. We concluded that we will suggest—first as an information-item and then as an action-item—something like the following as new item #2 to the Blue Book instructions for each AS Committee: “Keep and distribute reasonably detailed minutes of each committee meeting in accordance with section 2.6.R of Article II of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate of Illinois State University, available at <http://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/downloads/documents/BYLAWS-2004-Feb-Final.pdf>.”
	6. Sen. Marx was going to write this up and email it to Sen. Fazel who will take it to Exec.
1. Continuation of discussion of revised CFA By-laws, starting @ ARTICLE VII. REFERENDA (p. 6, line 263):
	1. Sen. LaCasse pointed out that section 2 (line 279) should read “any pending referenda” instead of “matter, decision or action.”
	2. Sen. LaCasse also reported that the CFA has 68 tenured faculty, 27 tenure-track (but not yet tenured) faculty, and 30 NTT faculty, for a total of 125 faculty. He also reported there are about 1000 students, graduate and undergraduate. These numbers are relevant for concerns raised in the prior meeting about items in the by-laws that call for a certain percentage of members in the school voting.
	3. Sen. Fazel questioned whether Article VIII, section 2 should read “and” or “or” (in line 300 or 304?).
	4. With respect to the Appendices, Sen. Fazel raised concern about the majority of committee members being chosen or appointed by the Dean because this violates our principles of shared governance. A discussion ensued on this point:
		1. Sen LaCasse noted that this is the culture of the College. It is hard to get people to volunteer for these roles, and the Dean or Dept Chairs/School Directors play an important role in dispersing the responsibilities, getting older faculty to serve and freeing younger ones from such service, etc. He agreed that in practice Chairs and Directors do this more than the Dean does, and so the By-laws should reflect this. While he is OK with the RC recommending to the CFA that they consider filling these committees through elections rather than appointments, he does not think the RC should tell the CFA they must make this change. He thinks a diversity of approaches to shared governance should be allowed across the university and how the CFA currently does it is working for them and comes out of past practice.
		2. Sen. Fazel stressed that, although she has not seen it in writing anywhere, she has heard from key predecessors in AS and she has practiced herself over the past years that, as it is in AS, faculty should have the majority of votes in any university committee involving faculty. She would like to see the RC come to an agreement about recommending this to Colleges across the university.
		3. Sen. Dale asked why this tradition or belief about shared governance should carry more weight for the CFA than its own traditions and beliefs about it.
		4. Sen. Eckrich suggested that we try to look up what there is in writing about ISU’s shared governance processes and bring this to our next meeting.
		5. It was agreed to continue the discussion on the CFA by-laws next time and then ask Janet Tulley to meet with us. Sen. Eckrich and Sen. Dale suggested we mark all our suggestions, edits, and questions on the current draft of the by-laws and send that to her so she can read it before we meet with her. Sen. Fazel responded she does not want to record them all into the file as she doesn’t want the RC to dictate to the CFA what revisions it must make to its revisions. Rather she’d like to communicate the general philosophical differences to them, if the RC can agree on them. The main issues are:
			1. Whether, for shared governance to exist, a majority of the committee members should be elected not appointed.
			2. Whether faculty should always hold the majority in any shared governance committee or voting situation.
			3. What the % should be for a passing vote.
		6. Sen. Marx pointed out the status of Appendix C section 1.c. might be a problem since last year it was said in AS that students should not serve on search committees. We discussed whether this was at all, or just as voting members, and whether it pertained to Chair searches or only faculty searches. Find this out prior to next RC mtg.
2. Moved to adjourn 7pm. All in favor.

*Minutes compiled and submitted via email by Sen. Eckrich 10/9/13. Revised based on feedback emailed from a member and resubmitted via email 10/22/2013.*

**Rules Committee (RC) Meeting #4 20013-2014: 10/23/13**

**Committee members present:** Senators David Pequeno, Jesse Shapiro, Matt Riley, Neil Dale, Peter Bushell, Don LaCasse, Farzaneh Fazel, and Lucille Eckrich, and Representative Sam Catanzaro.

**Absent:** David Marx, Mary Dyck

Meeting convened @ 6:02pm

1. Sen. Shapiro moved to approve the minutes from the 10/9/13 meeting. Sen. Dale seconded. All approved.
2. Continue work on/discussion of College of Fine Arts By-laws revision:
	1. Sen. Bushel thanked the committee for keeping the work on the CFA By-laws going in his absence at the last meeting. He also noted the email Sen. Fazel sent summarizing the issues the committee discussed regarding these by-laws. These notes were as follows:

Comments related to the CFA Bylaws (they’ll probably apply to all college by-laws)

* + 1. In the spirit of shared governance, it is preferred that in shared governance committees/teams:
			1. Faculty have the majority
			2. The majority of a committee/team members are elected by their constituents (instead of being appointed)
			3. The chairs of committees/ teams will be faculty
		2. Confusion about approval of referenda:
			1. Do faculty, students, AP and SC vote on every issue?
			2. Do the votes carry equal weight? E.g., 10% of students may be a larger number than 90% of faculty; so could 10% of students vote against and defeat an issue supported by 90% of the faculty?
	1. Sen. LaCasse asked about inviting CFA’s Janet Tully to come to explain the CFA’s reasoning behind their revisions on these issues.
		1. Sen. Bushel replied perhaps after today we’ll be ready or, if we have succinct recommendations, we could do it in writing instead.
		2. Sen. Fazel noted she did come meet with us last year and we asked about the %s. She said they were in the by-laws that way for a long time. Sen. Fazel noted that in the COB they have the opposite problem, that students aren’t involved in governance. It’s great CFA is so inclusive, but there students could overrule faculty, even on faculty matters. That seems undesirable and not in accord with how shared governance originated at universities—which was through the AAUP on behalf of faculty and faculty’s rights and responsibilities to self-govern as a profession.
	2. Rep. Catanzaro said he came up with two other models for fair voting within a college:
		1. Use the model of ASPT revisions at the college level. Each department gets one vote at the college level, but all the members of each department determine (by majority) what that one vote will be.
		2. Non-binding referendum of all members the result of which comes to the duly elected College Council, which votes on the matter, taking the referendum vote into consideration as it does so.
	3. Sen. Bushell said, yes, Janet Tully has reiterated in some informal conversations that CFA students get to vote, and the CFA wants to keep it that way, but we/they still need to tease out what degree of power their and everyone’s vote should have item-by-item.
	4. Sen. LaCasse volunteered to go with Sen. Bushell to meet with Janet Tully. It was agreed they would, and we went through the revised CFA by-laws again, to reiterate the questions and suggestions the RC has on particular items that they should take to her. The details of this were recorded by Sen. Bushell (and others). In this discussion, one issue numerous members voiced thoughts on is what the position/power of the Chair/Director of a Department/School is and whether s/he is viewed as a faculty member or an administrator.
1. We began work on the Milner Library by-laws but didn’t get very far. In the process it was discovered all but Sen. Fazel had a copy that was missing two items at the bottom of the first page. We agreed to get the correct version sent to all for next meeting.
2. Sen. LaCasse moved to adjourn. Sen. Riley seconded. All agreed and meeting adjourned at 7pm.

**Rules Committee (RC) Meeting Minutes #5 20013-2014: 11/6/13**

**Committee members present:** Senators David Pequeno, Jesse Shapiro, Matt Riley, Neil Dale, Peter Bushell, Don LaCasse, Farzaneh Fazel, Mary Dyck, Lucille Eckrich, and Representative Sam Catanzaro.

**Absent:** David Marx

Meeting convened @ 6:02pm

1. Sen. Bushel moved to approve the minutes. Sen. Shapiro seconded. Approved unanimously with additional notation of Sen. Dyck’s absence.
2. Sen. Bushel reported that he and Sen. LaCasse had a productive meeting with several CFA staff members, including Janet Tulley, Assistant Dean, about RC’s feedback on their revised By-Laws. The CFA staff agreed with some of our suggestions and will take other ones under consideration. They’ll send a final revised version back to RC when it is ready.
	1. Sen. Bushell reported they discussed our question of whether College Committees must be chaired by faculty or could be chaired by staff. CFA may view the latter as appropriate sometimes.
	2. Sen. Fazel explained that, because faculty are and need to remain independent and because the whole notion, principle, and practice of shared governance originated with faculty leadership, university-wide shared governance should be rooted in faculty leadership. This is why she thinks faculty should chair College Committees.
	3. Sen. LaCasse asked if what Sen. Fazel stated is written anywhere in our university policies. No one knew it to be and Sen. Eckrich pointed out that, at least based on what she could find online, ISU’s stated shared governance policy is very brief with no link to any other documents (find it at <http://policy.illinoisstate.edu/employee/faculty-staff/3-2-19.shtml>).
	4. Sen. Bushell suggested that College Councils should be chaired by faculty but that there may be some College subcommittees for which it might sometimes make sense to have non-faculty (i.e., staff or student) chairpersons. Colleges should be free to make those determinations themselves.
	5. Sen. Fazel pointed out that still, the chair of committees take on a bit more responsibility and risk than other committee members do and this is why their independence matters and is valuable for all involved. The sentiment was expressed that this is consistent with the history and the spirit of Academe in the USA as expressed through our professional association, the American Association of University Professors (<http://www.aaup.org/our-work/promoting-shared-governance>) as far back as 1920.
	6. Sen. Eckrich asked the student Senators if they could offer their insight and perspective on the matter. Sen. Shapiro said that he thinks, from a student’s perspective, that students should not chair College committees because they do not have sufficient institutional knowledge or memory to do so. Students are still learning the scene they are part of and should be involved in the institutional life of the College, including sitting on Committees, but that they should not chair them.
	7. Rep. Catanzaro suggested that the vast majority of College committees should be, and most probably will be, chaired by faculty but that College Councils and Committees should not give up their flexibility to have staff chair committees if and when they think that makes sense. He pointed out “We have a ‘shared governance’ system not a ‘faculty governance’ system.” A ‘shared governance’ system rests on the democratic principle or value that decisions should be made at the most local level as they can be made. Shared governance is a decision-making process that is as broad/inclusive and as local as possible. So each College Committee should be able to decide if there is a good reason for someone other than faculty to chair it. In short, we could acknowledge a general practice of faculty chairpersons while maintaining the option for others when appropriate. Many if not all RC members concurred.
	8. Sen. Dyck noted that in the Mennonite College of Nursing all faculty members are on their Council and all are nurses by professional background except for one statistician. He is chairing their Research Committee, and that is a good fit/role for him to play. But it would not be good for him to Chair other Committees.
	9. Sen. Bushell noted this was a helpful discussion as participants in the meeting with CFA staff wondered if faculty Chairing is a general assumption or written policy.
	10. Sen. Fazel added that it should be noted that there are only two representatives of AP and Civil Service staff on the Academic Senate, with the understanding that those senators represent and report about AS matters to their members. Also noteworthy is that the Chair and elected Secretary of the AS are faculty, with the Assistant or Co-Chair being the elected SGA President. She concluded that core College Committees are best chaired by faculty unless they can explain why it should be otherwise in a given instance.
3. Review of Milner By-Laws Revisions: The RC began walking through the revised By-laws and came up with the following suggestions for Milner:
	1. CONSIDER eliminating the word “Faculty” from the name of the Council since there are folks other than faculty on the Council. Call it simply Library Council or Milner Council. This might also help make a better distinction later in the document between the library faculty and the Library (or Milner) Council. Apply this change everywhere Library Faculty Council is mentioned in the rest of the by-laws (i.e., replace it with Library Council).
	2. EDIT Article II:
		1. Reinstate: All Library Council decisions and recommendations are advisory to the Dean of Milner Library, This is because this is true for all Councils and shared governance bodies across the university: They and their decisions are all advisory.
		2. Continue from there: …who will report his/her acceptance or non-acceptance of these recommendations. Under conditions of non-acceptance, the Dean shall provide rationale to the Library Council for the decision.
		3. Can you explain why you changed your text from “University Libraries” to “Milner Library” in the last sentence (although we suggest the alternative wording suggested in item 3.b.ii. above.
	3. Article III, Third bullet:
		1. EDIT: If suggestion 3.b. above stands, then the third bullet could also stay instead of being deleted: To serve as a sounding board for the Dean of Milner Library
		2. Regarding the 11th bullet (2nd on p. 2), isn’t there a normal practice for faculty on search committees to make recommendations to the Dean? If so, is this bullet point needed at all?
		3. Regarding the 12th bullet, what do you mean by “to support the Provost”? Consider other language, such as “To provide input to the Provost in the periodic….” Our concern is that there are already structures and processes out of the Provost office for gathering evaluative feedback on Deans, rather than them coming out of the initiative of the Colleges or Units.
		4. *Regarding 15th bullet, should it be to “report at the monthly Council meeting”?*
		5. EDIT bullets 16 – 19 to also begin with “To” for consistency sake.
	4. Article IV:
		1. Regarding the first sentence: We propose that the Dean be a non-voting member. If so, then consider whether that will somehow mean you need nine faculty members on Council instead of eight so there are no ties in voting.
		2. Define and simplify the second sentence to eliminate redundancies and/or clarify better the members eligible for election.
	5. *The RC discussed that there is a broader national trend among university libraries to have fewer positions be faculty lines, which raises concerns of academic freedom in libraries and, through them, for the university at large. Even at ISU lines have dropped. This concerns us. We recognize that it’s complicated and your language in these By-Laws is reflecting that.*
	6. Article V, Second paragraph: Clarify the phrase “...and administer the results of the election.” Administer the election? Share the results of the election? Report the results of the election?
	7. Article VI:
		1. Chairperson, Second bullet: We suggest that 24 hours are not sufficient for dissemination of agendas for Library Council meetings. We suggest two or three days before the date of the meeting.
		2. Documentarian, Third bullet Reinstate: Ensures that Library Faculty meeting files are updated and maintained.
	8. Article VIII, Second paragraph: We thought votes and final actions COULD be taken in closed meetings. Why would you state they cannot be? The whole wording there seems to contain contradictions.
	9. Article IX, Second paragraph:
		1. Clarify how many members on the Election Committee. Any beyond the vice chair, secretary and documentarian?
		2. Are there two-year terms for standing committees also?
		3. *What is the “procedures document” referred to? Should that be included in the by-laws?*
	10. Article XI, Second sentence:
		1. Clarify who can propose changes for a referendum vote. There are various constituencies at library such as faculty, AP, civil service, students? Who all among them can propose referenda?
		2. Clarify who is eligible to vote on such referenda. Only members of the Library Council or all members of other constituencies?
		3. *Note that we think the Dean should be an ex-officio non-voting member of the Council and that there should be an odd # of members on it.*
4. Sen. Bushell offered to do up a summary of the above revisions, send them out, and ask Senators to review them for our next meeting. All of those have been incorporated above in these minutes (additional items added are in italics).
5. Sen Bushell said assuming we finish our work on Milner By-Laws quickly next meeting, we will move on to the Athletics Council By-Laws.
6. Sen. Shapiro moved to adjourn. Sen. Pequeno seconded. All agreed to adjourn at 7:01pm.

Minutes compiled by Sen. Eckrich and Sen. Bushell and submitted for approval on 11/20/13

**Rules Committee (RC) Meeting Minutes** #6 20013-2014: **11/20/13**

 **Committee members present:** Senators David Pequeno, Jesse Shapiro, Matt Riley, Neil Dale, Peter Bushell, Farzaneh Fazel, David Marx, Lucille Eckrich, Delane Mclurkin, and Rep. Sam Catanzaro.

**Absent:** Senators Don LaCasse and Mary Dyck

Meeting convened @ 6:07pm

1. Approval of minutes postponed until next meeting to give time to read them.
2. Review of Sen. Bushell’s summary of RC’s recommendations on Milner’s revisions of its Bylaws:
	1. Sen. Fazel said on Article II, last sentence should say “shall” instead of “can” (“The Library Council shall discuss their decisions and recommendations with the library faculty”).
	2. Sen. Fazel clarified our question with 11th bullet of Article III is whether there are search committees for new positions and, if so, where the procedures for them are laid out.
	3. Sen. Eckrich said minutes from the last meeting indicated we had asked for the wording of the 15th bullet of Article III to be made clearer, say “to report at the monthly faculty meeting.”
	4. Sen. Eckrich said minutes from last meeting indicated that, as we worked with Bylaws revision, we pondered distinctions between and among job classifications unique to Milner. Suggested we should communicate this in our feedback to them, both in that we recognize the complexity of their unique unit and encourage them to be as clear as possible in terminology.
	5. Sen. Eckrich said minutes from last meeting indicated that we wondered what the “procedures document” referred to in Article IX is and suggested it could be included as an appendix to the by-laws.
3. That completed our work on the Library Council By-laws. Sen. Bushell said he would set up a meeting to communicate our feedback to the appropriate Milner staff.
4. Sen. Bushell reported that the CFA Council is in the process of reviewing the RC feedback on their bylaws. They reportedly spent 45 minutes discussing just one of our points and appreciate our feedback and are still working with it.
5. Athletics Council By-laws revisions:
	1. Sen. Fazel asked who did these revisions and submitted them to us, because the document we have includes side-bar comments that suggest their revision work was not yet completed. Sen. Bushell suggested we just take the file as given and provide feedback with which they can go back and work further on it.
	2. Sen. Bushell suggested we ask them to state exactly how many “Associate/Assistant Athletics Directors there are. Others agreed, though Sen. Marx pointed out they are non-voting members so it doesn’t really matter how many they are.
	3. Under “D. Students” (p. 2), Sen. Bushell suggested the 2nd ¶ remove “non-athlete” from the parentheses and say instead: “Non-athlete students shall be….”
	4. We discussed how the formatting of items I, J, and K seems odd given that all the prior items A-H in this first section (“I. Operating Procedures”) have a heading. At the time, we did not come up with an alternative, but agreed we should think on it for next time. Here’s an option:
		1. Rename section I “COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP:” followed by “The Athletics Council membership shall consist of:” after which the membership is enumerated as is.
		2. Then make “FACULTY” sub-item A, “NCAA FACULTY ATHLETICS REPRESENTATIVE” sub-item B and so on C through E, with E being “EX OFFICIO NON-VOTING MEMBERS.”
		3. Then start a new section “II. OPERATING PROCEDURES” with the following 3 sub-items:
			1. “A. COUNCIL CHAIRPERSON AND SECRETARY” containing the contents under the current items G and H.
			2. “B. VACANCIES” containing the contents currently in items I and J.
			3. “C. ANNUAL DATES OF SERVICE” containing the contents under the current item K.
		4. If the above option is taken, “COMMITTEE STRUCTURE” will become section III, and “FUNCTIONS OF THE COUNCIL AS A WHOLE” will become section IV.
	5. Sen. Marx said under current section III.A.1, they do not need both “if needed” and “when necessary.” Remove one of these phrases.
	6. We came back to the concern first expressed by Sen. Fazel, about this seeming like an unfinished draft, and agreed that we should ask the Athletics Council staff to incorporate or somehow deal with their tracked comments in the file and to create a new revised version for us to review. If some of these are legal changes, well do them. If they are not, then decide what you want to do with them.
	7. Sen. Fazel drew RC members’ attention to the note from Cynthia James to the RC at the top of p. 1 of this file. It says that any mention in the By-laws of reporting to a committee should include also reporting to the Faculty Affairs Committee, as the latter “has oversight of the Athletics Committee” (but did CJ mean “Athletics Council” in her note?).
		1. Sen. Fazel asked whether this means that all the reports mentioned on p. 7 must be specified to go also to Faculty Affairs.
			1. If so, the last ¶ under III.A. should name Faculty Affairs Committee instead of “Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee,” and items 7 and 8 under B should also mention Academic Affairs Committee as recipients of the items mentioned.
			2. Also, the sentence on “Reporting” at the top of p. 8 should be revised to include “and reports formally to the Faculty Affairs Committee of Academic Senate.”
			3. Sen. Fazel also asked them to clarify whether they report to SGA or to SGA Academic Senate Senators.
6. Time was up and Sen. Fazel moved to adjourn. Sen. Marx seconded it. All agreed.
7. New SGA senator Delane Mclurkin joined Rules Committee for the first time tonight and was introduced during the meeting. He is an Accounting major. For the remainder of fall semester he will come a bit late, as soon as his Wednesday night class gets out at 6:15pm.

Meeting adjourned 6:57pm. Minutes compiled by Sen. Eckrich and submitted to RC on 12/2/13.

**Rules Committee (RC) Meeting Minutes** #7 20013-2014: 12/11/2013

**Committee members present:** Senators David Pequeno, Jesse Shapiro, Matt Riley, Delane Mclurkin, Peter Bushell, Don LaCasse, Mary Dyck, David Marx, and Lucille Eckrich, and Rep. Sam Catanzaro.

**Absent:** Senator Farzaneh Fazel

Meeting convened @ 6:00 pm

1. Minutes from 11/6/13 and 11/20/13 approved unanimously.
2. Senator Bushell reported he submitted the RC’s recommendations on the Milner By-Laws to them. They will work on them this spring. It’s likely to be fall again before we review them again. Sen. Bushell also reported that all Milner faculty members are members of the Milner Council.
3. The bulk of the meeting was spent completing our revision of the Athletic Council By-Laws. [See notated version done up by Sen. Bushell for details.]
4. Sen. Bushell said he would write up our revisions and send to all, including Sen. Fazel for her OK and/or additions. After one more approval round we will send them to the Athletics Council.
5. Discussion of agenda items next on the horizon:
	1. Civil Service Handbook. Since the hard-copy handbook no longer exists, but has been all put online with cross-referenced sections, the reference to it in the constitution needs to be amended, and we need to make sure all the reference links work and are sufficient for people to find what they need.
	2. We agreed Tammy Carlson may need to be invited again.
6. Sen. Pequeno moved to adjourn. Sen. Marx seconded.

Meeting adjourned @ 6:53 pm. Minutes compiled and distributed by Sen. Eckrich 1/20/2013

**Rules Committee (RC) Meeting Minutes #8 2013-2014: 1/22/14**

**Committee members present:** Senators Matt Riley, Jesse Shapiro, Peter Bushell, Don LaCasse, Mary Dyck, Farzaneh Fazel, and Lucille Eckrich, and Rep. Sam Catanzaro.

**Absent:** Senators David Pequeno and David Marx.

Meeting convened @ 6:00 pm

1. Minutes from 12/11/13 approved unanimously.
2. Completed our review of the Athletics Council By-laws with a few questions from Sen. Fazel who had reviewed our finalized edits from the last meeting, which she had missed. No additional changes were made, and Sen. Bushell will now take the results to the Athletics Council representatives.
3. Review of Academic Senate’s policy and practice of reviewing all standing policies and procedures every five years.
	1. Sen. Bushell reported that AS Executive Committee has raised a concern that if, as is current lore, it is the case that ISU policy stipulates that all standing policies and procedures of shared governance units be reviewed at least every five years, we need to tighten up the accountability for doing so because many policy reviews are not being sent to the Senate on this time frame. However, Dan Holland looked for but couldn’t find such a 5-year review policy. Thus, our task, assuming we accept the assignment, is two-fold:
		1. Determine whether and, if so, why we want/need such a 5-year review policy, what it should be, and where it should be added into existing policy.
		2. Figure out how to implement it as seamlessly and efficiently as possible.
	2. Rep. Catanzaro reported his office just got a new list/table of all the Policies & Procedures that can come-up for review and the date of their last review. It’s not exactly clear from it whose responsibility it was/is to initiate that review.
	3. Sen. Fazel noted that if it is not brought up by someone, it doesn’t get reviewed, but if it comes up automatically, it would probably be way too many reviews to do.
		1. Rep. Catanzaro said there are at least 100, and Sen. Fazel said that means, on average, 20 per year, which is more than RC could handle. Some would have to go to another committee.
		2. Later Rep. Catanzaro found the file and saw it contains, in fact, 380 policies total.
	4. Rep. Catanzaro suggested we make a coversheet that would include review options to check off, such as “Reviewed and no changes requested at this time” and “Reviewed and changes requested; see attached.” The second option could have three sub-items to choose from, such as “Technical changes only” or “Substantive changes only” or “Technical and substantive changes.” Then, any time changes are made, technical support could do a massive find & delete/replace, to make sure that everywhere that policy is referenced, the updated version is referenced.
	5. Someone noted that “substantive changes” often come to be because external compliance requirements change (such as for the Athletics Council from NCAA).
	6. Sen. Fazel suggested the initiating body for that cover letter going out every 5 years would be AS Executive Committee. Any policy that was reviewed and required no changes, would go directly back to Exec and the only change that would be made is the new date of when last reviewed. Any policy that had changes would go to Rules Committee. [If this proved to be too many, perhaps only those that had substantive changes would go to RC, and those with only technical changes could be handled by Exec.]
	7. Sen Fazel suggested a computer program like Facebook uses be created to automatically trigger that a message be sent when it is time for the next review. Sen. Eckrich suggested it could be a task assigned to AS’s administrative secretary (Cynthia). Rep. Catanzaro said the President’s office currently has jurisdiction over policy revisions, so the task of sending out reminders that it is time for the next review could come from a staff person in that office. Sen. Fazel concluded it should be easy enough for someone to keep track of what’s up for review and to inform the pertinent parties.
	8. Sen. Bushell asked how many different originating bodies are there for our policies—probably far fewer than the number of policies themselves. Rep. Catanzaro answered yes, probably just 5-10. But he pointed out that even that information needs some review and updating or correcting, because some policies list Academic Senate as the originating body that he knows for a fact is not the case.
	9. Sen. Bushell asked whether changing it to a 10-year review cycle would be too long.
		1. Sen. Fazel said there’s nothing stopping a body from reviewing it sooner, so we could make the mandatory review cycle longer. However, members of some bodies change often enough that it can be good to require a review more often.
		2. Rep. Catanzaro pointed out one policy that indicates it was last reviewed in 1970s.
	10. Sen. Bushell asked again, so who initiates the review or can anyone—the body itself, Academic Senate (through its administrative secretary), and/or President’s office?
		1. Sen. Dyck said it should not be left to the body itself because they won’t do it if they don’t remember or don’t want to.
		2. Sen. Fazel suggested President’s office staff member because AS admin. Sec. already has too much work on her plate and it looks more official/weighty coming from President’s office. Then the review itself should be sent to the AS Exec Committee, which would either handle them itself (if no changes requested) or pass on to RC (when changes are requested that need full review). She agreed that developing a cover letter like Rep. Catanzaro suggested is a good idea and would expedite this process.
		3. Sen. Eckrich concluded that it would then be the RC’s task to develop this cover letter.
	11. Sen. Bushell concluded he would share this feedback with AS Chairperson Holland and then, pending his input, we could turn all this into a Policy Review Procedure.
	12. Someone (Rep. Catanzaro?) pointed out that, in fact, the university already has a 1999 “University Policy on the Policies, Procedures, and Guidelines,” and there is already some kind of form there for policy review. So we may just need to adapt that form and add it to the policy manual, which is now, Rep. Catanzaro explained, the university policies website itself.
4. Alcohol Policy 5.1.23
	1. Sen. LaCasse explained this policy initiative comes out of the President’s office and what we (RC?, AS?) did last year on it is now obsolete.
	2. Sen. Fazel asked Sen. Riley the origin of the President’s initiative, and Sen. Riley explained that Student Council asked why students can’t have alcohol if they are over 21 and it’s in their private housing. Sen. Fazel noted that, in fact, on p. 4 it indicates it’s OK in university apartments, so the question is, why it isn’t OK in Cardinal Courts.
	3. Rep. Catanzaro explained university has more supervision of Cardinal Court because it has more mixed ages now. Sen. Fazel said yes, it used to be for married and international housing, but now it includes sophomores, whereas the Fell and School Street apartments are only upper-class and graduate students. But Cardinal Courts (it was said later on) is a glorified dorm and included under age students. That’s why it requires more controls from the university.
	4. A question came up about the policy for “Alumni Relations” on p. 4. Sen. Riley said RSOs can now BYOB, why couldn’t Alumni? Someone noted that it may be simply money related. University catering wants to earn whatever can be earned from having alcohol at an event. Sen. Bushell said this is one question we should ask the originators of this policy in the President’s office.
	5. Sen. Fazel stated no university funds can be used for alcohol, but Rep. Catanzaro said that policy is under review now for alignment with newer state law that affects it. Sen. Fazel shared how this affected the CoB’s Christmas party this year, which in the past they have always served alcohol at but this year could not. Others were surprised to hear that the CoB has been serving alcohol as they thought that could not be done unless one was using ISU Foundation monies. Something was said about the Cash Disbursement Policy and legal limits on general reserve funds, which include department funds. Sen. Bushell suggested this is a second question we need to ask the originators of this policy in the President’s office.
	6. Sen. Bushell asked about the statement at the bottom of p. 4 that specifies no university funds may be used for alcohol. He asked is the issue only a matter of no university funds being used or that alcohol simply can’t be served no matter who pays?
		1. Rep. Catanzaro said we should ask whether these policies are consistent with the changes in the law that we understand have occurred.
		2. Sen. Fazel said we need to ask whether the university is banning all alcohol from all events on campus and, if so, why. Is it state law? Waste of money? Religious reasons? What is rationale if it is happening?
5. Policy 5.1.23 on “University Property Where Alcoholic Beverages Are Permitted” needs still to go through our full review.

Meeting adjourned 7:05pm.

**Rules Committee (RC) Meeting Minutes #9 2013-2014: 2/19/2014**

**Committee members present:** Senators Jesse Shapiro, David Pequeno, Ryan Powers, Kenny Lin, Peter Bushell, Don LaCasse, Mary Dyck, Farzaneh Fazel, David Marx, Lucille Eckrich, and Rep. Sam Catanzaro.

**Guest:** Senator and AS Chairperson Dan Holland

Meeting convened @ 6:00 pm

1. Issue of 5-year review of all University policies
	1. Sen. Holland explained that it came to the attention of the AS’s Exec. Committee that not all university policies were being reviewed on a regular basis every 5 years as they thought university policy mandated. For instance, one policy they happened upon had not been reviewed since 1971. They asked the provost’s office to generate a list of all university policies, including who originated each and when it was last reviewed. That list was indeed generated and found to contain 380 policies. Exec. Committee also looked for but could not find any 5-year review policy. However, they did find a “policy” on the “creation of policy” (Sen. Fazel later sent <http://policy.illinoisstate.edu/employee/3-2-17.shtml>, but see also <http://policy.illinoisstate.edu/update/> on policy updating). They suggest that something be added to that policy to stipulate how often and according to what procedures policies should be reviewed and they are asking the RC to decide and draft all this.
	2. There was open discussion about the various considerations involved including some of the ideas we came up with for the review process in our last meeting (see 1/22/14 minutes). Issues to decide include:
		1. How often a review be mandated (i.e., every 5, 8, or 10 years)? The more frequent, the more work it will be and the more committees that may need to be involved in doing it. RC is leaning toward every 10 years; Sen Holland seemed fine with that. Policies could be reviewed and changed before then, but each would at least come up for review that often.
		2. Who keeps the list and initiates each review process? The Provost office generated the list, which Academic Senate now has. Rep Catanzaro said President’s office maintains the policy pages on the ISU website. A staff person in one of these bodies could be responsible to initiate each review cycle and see that the results get recorded on the website (on the policy page and wherever else that policy is referenced).
		3. A cover sheet should be developed or revised (access link to the current one at the bottom of <http://policy.illinoisstate.edu/update/> and directly at <http://policy.illinoisstate.edu/downloads/newpolicies.pdf>).
		4. Do “procedures” and “guidelines” need to be separated out from “policies” for this mandated review cycle and only “policies” reviewed, or are all to be reviewed?
		5. Substantive revisions to policies could be sent (as they are now) to the RC for full review and, if necessary, ongoing work with those who made the revisions, and then when ready, RC would send them on to Exec for approval. Exec could handle directly all cases of no-changes or technical changes only (see 1/22/14 minutes).
2. Alcohol Policy 5.1.20
	1. Sen. Holland explained that RC is looking at Alcohol Policy 5.1.20 because it was changed last summer (to supersede 5.1.23?), and Academic Senate has not reviewed it yet. So we are to do so to see if we agree or not or have questions or suggestions. It needed to be changed last summer because of new stadium and selling alcohol there and a different place now for tailgating before games. In addition to reviewing the policy, Sen. Holland said RC should look into certain related matters:
		1. Asst. Chief of Police reviewed it and noticed there’s nothing there that says faculty can’t come to class drunk. They just can’t have open containers.
			1. Rep. Catanzaro suggested the drug free policy (5.1.5) should prevent this, though a technically it doesn’t say being under the influence of alcohol is a violation of policy.
			2. Sen. Eckrich suggested it might be a violation of Code of Ethics (<http://policy.illinoisstate.edu/conduct/1-17.shtml>).
		2. How the new alcohol policy intersects with/needs to be referenced in students’ code of conduct and HR policies for employees.
	2. Sen. Fazel asked why on p. 4 alumni are prohibited from supplying own alcohol at events when student organizations can do that.
		1. Sen. Holland explained legal counsel wrote this new policy, and the ISU foundation changed its policy regarding alcohol purchase.
		2. Rep. Catanzaro said ISU foundation decided their prior policy had been interpreting the law wrong, so that they changed their policy to be in compliance. He said the policies and procedures are currently in flux/being worked out. There will still be ways of permissibly having alcohol at events, just fewer ways, and the details are being worked on by Assoc. VP Wilson in conversation with Deans and Chairs.
3. Academic Freedom and Ethics Grievance Committee (AFEGC) policy:
	1. Sen. Holland explained that Exec. Committee would like one aspect of AFEGC policy changed, though he pointed out AFEGC is less needed ever since the creation of a university Ombudsman office, as more issues are getting resolved before needing to go to AFEGC.
	2. However, when a case is handled by AFEGC, at the end it comes to Exec. Committee which, according to current policy, only has two options. It may:
		1. Send the outcome to the Provost without comment.
		2. Send the outcome to Faculty Caucus where it can be discussed and comments made.
	3. Exec. Committee would like to have a third option: Namely to send with comment to Provost.
4. Sen. Holland departed and RC returned to the discussion items to see where we are on each.
	1. Decided unanimously to table the Alcohol Policy discussion as the revised policy seems still to be in flux. We will wait for a revised version of it to come to us before making a full review and taking action.
	2. Agreed to review the AFEGC policy for next meeting:
		1. Take up specific concern that Exec. Committee has.
		2. Sen. Fazel said he thought entire policy needs cleaning up: There are typos, sentences that aren’t clear, and procedures are mixed up with policy. University Council says to try to separate them. Membership might need reviewing.
		3. Sen. Fazel asked how/where grievance between an AP (i.e., a Dean) and a faculty or staff member are handled. Rep. Catanzaro and Sen. Eckrich said Dean/faculty conflict can go before AFEGC, at least if not resolved through Ombudsman help.
	3. On 5-year review, Sen. Bushell asked for volunteer(s) to take a first stab at drafting a new cover page and policy and procedures for regular review of existing policies.
		1. Sen. Marx volunteered to draft a new cover page (and review procedures?) and bring it (them) back as sacrificial draft.
		2. Sen. Marx asked why we would recommend policy review only every 10 years. If only a subset end up at RC needing a full review it may not be as onerous as seems.
5. Toward the end of the meeting we paused for introductions as there were two new Senators present:
	1. Ryan Powers, sophomore, accounting major, Senator for Cardinal Court.
	2. Kenny Lin, junior (?), accounting major, economics minor, Senator for off-campus housing.
6. Approved the minutes for 1/22/14 with a few corrections:
	1. Sen. Shapiro was present. Dulane is no longer a Senator so shouldn’t be listed as absent.
	2. Correction on 4e to add Sen. Fazel’s name and correct abbreviation of College of Business.

Meeting adjourned 6:50pm. Minutes submitted by Sen. Eckrich 3/4/14, corrected and approved 3/5/14

**Rules Committee (RC) Meeting Minutes #10 2013-2014: 3/5/2014**

**Committee members present:** Senators Jesse Shapiro, Ryan Powers, Danny Thompson, Peter Bushell, Don LaCasse, Mary Dyck, Farzaneh Fazel, David Marx, Lucille Eckrich, and Rep. Sam Catanzaro.

**Absent:** Senators David Pequeno and Kenny Lin

Meeting convened @ 6:00 pm

1. Minutes from 2/19/14 corrected and approved.
2. We spent the entire meeting reviewing, discussing, and revising a draft Policy on Policies worked up by Sen. Marx and Sen. Fazel called “Policy on Creation and Revision of Policies.” It was proposed to “replace [policy] 3.2.17 [<http://policy.illinoisstate.edu/employee/3-2-17.shtml>] and the content that is currently under the “Updating” tab on the Policies & Procedures website” [<http://policy.illinoisstate.edu/update/>], both subpages of <http://policy.illinoisstate.edu/>. Thus, the proposal not only addresses the review of existing policy, what RC was charged to review, but also the creation of new policy. Discussion fluctuated across both topics somewhat indiscriminately. A few of the more major points were as follows:
	1. Sen. Fazel pointed out after Units receive notification to review, they must reply within 3 months to indicate what course they are taking with the work.
	2. Numerous senators weighed in at various points on the issue of whether Academic Senate (AS) should review all 380 policies or only those related to academics, shared governance, and the constitution, as the draft proposes (most agreed with the latter), and, assuming the latter, how to achieve the initial determination of which policies do and do not fit into one or more of these three types. The main suggestion was that all policies go through AS Exec Com the first time around, when Exec would also determine if each belonged in the purview of AS review for future reviews. This info would be added in a new column to the database info kept on each policy. Review of any policy that AS Exec determines is not within its purview would be handled by the President’s office or its delegate.
	3. Sen. Catanzaro suggested the following language be added at the end of the first paragraph under “10.1.3. Policy Review”: “The Chairperson of the Academic Senate will be ‘cced on all policy review requests and submissions related to academics, shared governance, and constitutional matters, broadly understood, as determined by the President’s office in consultation with the Academic Senate.”
	4. Sen. Bushell suggested we replace “Manual” with “Website” in the *Illinois State University Policies, Procedures, and Guidelines Manual.”* Others agreed. Sen. Marx pointed out the ISU website will need to be searched to find each reference to the “Manual” and changed it to “Website.” Policy Manual coordinator would be changed to policy Website coordinator. It was agreed the text we write should avoid as much as possible specifying procedures for that coordinator. Rep. Catanzaro pointed out that “all policies have procedures that follow from them, but not all procedures have policies; they just must be consistent with policy.”
	5. At one point Rep. Catanzaro asked “Is there a problem we’re trying to solve?”
	6. Somehow this Policy on Policy must specify and define “in a timely manner” for the policy-review process because the problem now is that it isn’t being done.
3. At the end of the discussion it was agreed that Sen. Marx would revise the draft for the next meeting based on this input, and that Sen. Eckrich would send him her notes to inform that revision.
4. Since some new student Senators were there for the first time, we did a round of introductions.
	1. Danny Thompson: Senior Accounting & Finance major, Off-Campus Senator.
	2. Ryan Powers: Sophomore Accounting major, Cardinal Court Senator
5. On next agenda item of review of AFEGC policy, Sen. Fazel suggested Sen. Bushell check in with the current (Kim McCord) and past (Klaus Schmidt) chairs of AFEGC to get input on what especially needs revising in AFEGC policy. Sen. Bushell said he would contact them. If we can get guidance this year, RC can begin that work in earnest next fall.

Meeting adjourned 7pm. Minutes submitted by Sen. Eckrich 3/24/14. Sen. Eckrich tracked notes on the proposed Policy on Policy itself & sent file on 3/6 to Sen. Marx w/ Fazel, Bushell, & Catanzaro cc’d.

**Rules Committee (RC) Meeting Minutes #11 2013-2014: 3/26/2014**

**Committee members present:** Senators Jesse Shapiro, Ryan Powers, Danny Thompson, David Pequeno, Don LaCasse, Mary Dyck, Farzaneh Fazel, David Marx, Lucille Eckrich, and Rep. Sam Catanzaro.

**Absent:** Senator Peter Bushell

Meeting convened @ 6:00 pm. Sen. Fazel chairing in Sen. Bushell’s place.

1. Proposed Policy on Creation and Revision of Policies:
	1. The committee reviewed and discussed the 4th draft of the policy, developed by Sen. Marx based on input from our last meeting and subsequent email exchange among Senators Eckrich, Bushell, Fazel and Marx.
	2. After discussion and making a few final edits, the policy was unanimously approved.
	3. Sen. Fazel will incorporate the final edits in the electronic file and send it to the Exec. Committee for their meeting next Monday (3/31).
2. Minutes from 3/5 reviewed and approved unanimously without changes.
3. Sen. Fazel explained that our next meeting (4/9) is our last RC meeting for this year because committees do not meet before the final two Academic Senate meetings of the year. She reviewed what work we have left to do and how much of it we are likely to fit in yet this year or save for next. Depending on how far we get tonight with external committee assignments, we may need to save all our work on reviewing AFEGC policies and procedures for next year.
4. External Committee assignments for 2014-2015:
	1. We reviewed the list of assignments that we had been emailed before the meeting. It was based on the list of volunteers that Cynthia sent the committee, which Sen. Bushell made a first pass at assigning. Sen. Fazel reviewed that and made some additional changes and that was the file we reviewed.
	2. We made a few further revisions (Elizabeth Lugg was removed from Student Grievance Committee and placed on University Hearing Panel; Michael Sublet was removed from Student Grievance).
	3. Sen. Fazel noted RC does not assign Ombudsperson Council members as that is done by the Provost.
	4. We approved the resulting list of committee assignments unanimously.
5. With time left, we decided that we would try to invite the prior (Klaus Schmidt) and current (Kim McCord) chairpersons of the AFEGC to our next and final RC meeting for the year (4/9), asking them to lay out for us what are the main issues in the AFEGC policies and procedures they see in need of revision. If they (especially Klaus) are not able to come, we would ask for a written list of issues. If they do neither, we will cancel our 4/9 meeting since we will not have any business to do.

Meeting adjourned early at 6:50pm. Minutes compiled and submitted by Sen. Eckrich on 4/8/14. Approved with one correction 4/9/14.

**Rules Committee (RC) Meeting Minutes #12 2013-2014: 4/9/2014**

**Committee members present:** Senators Jesse Shapiro, Ryan Powers, Danny Thompson, David Pequeno, Peter Bushell, Don LaCasse, Mary Dyck, Farzaneh Fazel, and Lucille Eckrich,

**Absent:** Senator David Marx and Rep. Sam Catanzaro

Meeting convened @ 6:00 pm

1. RC minutes from 3/26 reviewed and approved unanimously with one correction.
2. We reviewed the External Committee assignments we are recommending for next year, which were distributed to faculty Senators for our next Faculty Caucus meeting.
	1. Sen. Bushel said Catherine Ellison (English, CAS) is new assignment who can be added for Council on General Education. He will check with Cynthia before the Senate meeting about adding her.
	2. Cynthia will go back to the Colleges to solicit volunteers for the remaining openings.
3. Athletic Council By-Laws
	1. Senator Bushel raised the issue of whether there should be any limit on how many terms alumni and student members may serve on the Athletics Council (as there is for faculty, namely two consecutive terms), and how many terms a member may serve as Council Chairperson or Secretary. The consensus was that there shouldn’t be and the document should be left as is.
	2. Sen. Fazel asked why the sections on some Athletics Council committees (i.e., C, E) stated the committee’s Chair person must be a faculty member while others gave no specification. After some discussion, we decided that all the committee chairpersons should be elected faculty members and that we could streamline this guideline by stating it in the Committee Structure section, just once there, for all the committees.
	3. The RC agreed that this was a minor change that Sen. Bushel could take to the Athletics Council for wording adjustment and then send to Exec. Committee.
	4. Sen. Fazel moved to approve the Athletic Council By-laws with the correction; Sen LaCasse seconded it. It passed unanimously.
4. AFEGC
	1. Sen. Bushell explained that he met with former AFEGC Chairperson Klaus Schmidt about what changes are needed in the policy or procedures. He reported that Schmidt indicated the policy and procedures are effective enough as they are. Sen. Bushell feels they look OK too.
	2. Sen. Eckrich and Sen. Fazel expressed a need for the AFEGC policies and procedures to be thoroughly reviewed and updated, as there are typos and confusions throughout.
	3. Sen. Bushell indicated questions had been raised by others about the AFEGC membership, especially the high number of NTTs on it. After we discussed the matter, it became clear that the high numbers are needed in case there are multiple Appeals Committees at the same time. It’s not really a problem to have so many committee members as there isn’t any work to do unless one is assigned to a Hearing Committee or an Appeal Committee.
	4. We agreed to table the AFEGC revisions for now, to pick it up again in the fall.

Sen. Bushell moved to adjourn. Sen. Dyck seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned 6:55pm.

Minutes compiled and submitted by Sen. Eckrich on 4/22. Revised and resubmitted on 4/24 based on email feedback from Sens. Bushell, Fazel, and Marx.

Note: RC email communication between 4/9 and 4/16 resolved an issue with the membership of the Athletics Council for 2014-2015. The result was Hulda Back (COB) was reappointed for a second term, and all other current AC members [Phyllis McClusky-Titus (COE), Cyndee Brown (CFA), Brent Beggs (CAST), Mike Torry (CAST), Chris Hansen (COE), Kerry Tudor (CAST), Doug Hatch (COE)] are continuing as they are in the middle of their current terms.