**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

**Monday, October 2, 2023**

**Hovey 419, 4:00 P.M.**

**approved**

***Call to Order***

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

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

None.

***Approval of the minutes from 9/05***

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

***Oral Communications:***

***Strategic plan review***

Senator Horst: I just wanted to double check about how the strategic plan is going to go through the Senate. Rick Valentin, who's chair of the Planning and Finance Committee, did some research; last time in 2017-18, it went through with just a vote of endorsement. They didn't do a feedback session, and they did their original feedback session with the Planning and Finance Committee. They intend to go back to all of the groups that they went to the first time to get their input on the plan, now that it's been developed. The tentative plan is they'll go to the Planning and Finance and then they'll come to the Senate for an endorsement. Does that make sense to everybody? They won't necessarily go to the senate for feedback.

***Distributed Communications:***

***From Dimitrios Nikolaou: Academic Affairs Committee (Information Item:10/11/23)***

***09.28.23.01 Code of Student Conduct (Current Copy)***

***09.28.23.02 Code of Student Conduct (Mark Up)***

***09.28.23.03 Code of Student Conduct (Clean Copy)***

***09.28.23.12 Comment on attribution***

Senator Nikolaou: So we are focusing only on Page Six of the Code of Student Conduct. It was based on an item on our Issues Pending list --- to discuss how and if we want to incorporate AI. We got the feedback from the situation. Initially the report mentioned they didn't see the need to in specific language when we talked in the Academic Affairs Committee; we decided that it fits in parts A and part C, where pretty much it says that you might have faculty that allow the use of AI for specific purposes. But what if some students use it when it is not approved? This is going to be part of plagiarism. That's why it appears on both sides. So in part A it says that some faculty may allow it; for some faculty, it's going to be appropriate to use AI in the instruction. “Unless specifically authorized by the instructor.” Then C says that, well, if you have instructors who explicitly say you are not allowed to and you end up using it, it is plagiarism. That's why it appears in part C. And then the long comments on the side, I didn't have them there to go to the Senate. It was more if anyone was interested what other universities are doing in terms of AI.

Senator Horst: I apologize to the students; I forgot about their document, so that's why it didn't make the packet. I will turn it over to you guys so that you can just discuss your thinking on the document.

Senator Monk: We agree with the Academic Affairs Committee on our final recommendation. After hearing from Janice Blair, from code of Conduct, we don't want to put in too many extra factors with this, especially with the lack of reliable trackers with this. So if we put it in, we want to make sure that it is kind of in that balance of where it is still available as a resource when it is appropriate within classrooms. But, simultaneously, still making sure that the plagiarism policy upholds academic integrity in the classroom, which we believe it does.

Even including the addition of AI, since it's the unacknowledged use of AI, so since it's specifically the definition and not necessarily the enforcement policy of it. We finished up our conversation not agreeing with the Academic Affairs Committee with the slightly small additions of AI.

Senator Horst: you guys did?

Senator Monk: yes.

Senator Horst: okay.

Senator Cline: I just have a question on what Senator Nikolaou said. Unless a faculty member says that it's officially OK, it’s considered not OK.

Senator Nikolaou: yes.

Senator Cline: If I don’t say either way and a student does it.

Senator Nikolaou: So that we talked about that. So that falls under the Faculty Responsibilities to Students. The policy that we have. There is a part where it says all policy specific for the class, they should be clear on the syllabus.

Senator Cline: At this point, do we mandate that faculty put in their syllabus that students can't cheat? Do we have to put on our syllabus literally every single thing that they cannot do or does the student code of conduct cover all the things that they should not do?

Senator Nikolaou: In that sense, it is up to the students to know their code. But based on that one, they will know that by default, AI would be plagiarizing unless you said and do not worry about it.

Senator Cline:  If I don't say yes, you can. The student can assume no, you can't.

Senator Nikolaou: Based on how it appears, yes, because it's part of the plagiarism here.

Senator Blum: The plagiarism part was about credit. So, like you can quote somebody and use it as credit, right as a source, right? And it's not plagiarism. So credit is crucial; if I generated an entire paper off of AI, and even if I gave it credit, we have a different problem. It's like you're giving credit to somebody, right? But you're not producing any work. The previous paragraph is about assistance.

Actually, when I read the other definitions and then I read these, I actually thought it covered both of them, it covered two potential things. One is using AI as an assistance mechanism, and so, in that case and in that paragraph, it talks about when that might be appropriate, as stated by the instructor. The other one is actually more credit or not credit, which is plagiarism. So those are different things; both of them have elements. You can have assistance on open book, like a test for example. I give quizzes that the students know that they have permission to look at any materials they have. Also give tests that are in class. The students know very clearly that they have zero permission. So it depends on the context and what the purpose of the evaluation is, but then I actually thought that was clear.

Senator Cline: Right. But just to like, communicate plainly… if this passes, it could be communicated to students that unless otherwise specifically instructed by your professor, the use of AI as an assistance tool or as a generative tool is not allowed by ISU policy.

Senator Nikolaou: Yes

Interim President Tarhule: How clear are the boundaries between generative and non-generative AI?

Senator Fulton: Currently there is none. If I'm like writing an essay and I just use it in the ChatGPT and it just writes it for me. There's not a great system that can accurately tell you if it was created by ChatGPT. Some claim that they have, but there's no research to show it. Often times, it ends up actually marking students whose English may not be their first language. More often than not. So it's not a great way to catch it currently.

Interim President Tarhule: When I'm thinking about coding and if I write formulas in Excel, even something like Excel, it says “hey, there's something wrong with your formula. You want me to fix it?” And it will fix it, you know. So, I'm just wondering where is the boundary?

Senator Nikolaou: And partly that's why we added in part A the language for the AI; because in economics, for example, we tell our students, instead of going to Google, how can I generate a variable in data? Go to ChatGPT. because it's going to tell you exactly what is the code so it doesn't generate new knowledge. It is out in on the Internet, and then it just gives you the answer to that question. But then the generative one, it would be that no one has written the code for generating a variable in data, so it would generate new knowledge that then you claim it is yours.

Senator Horst: Student do want your document included?

Senator Monk: Yes.

***From Kate Sheridan: University Policy Committee (Information Item:10/11/23)***

***09.28.23.04 Policy 1.15 Whistleblower (Current Copy)***

***09.28.23.05 Policy 1.15 Whistleblower (Mark Up)***

***09.28.23.06 Policy 1.15 Whistleblower (Clean Copy)***

Senator Horst: We have policy 1.15 from the University Policy Committee

Senator Cline: What is the process this year for the review of the legal counsel? Because last year we were trying to fit them in a certain select time right after it comes to us.

Senator Horst: No one from legal called me today. They received the packet because they have access to TEAMS.

Senator Bonnell: The Committee did talk about the formatting that was weird, and it became really confusing because there is a section B. So, she was talking about it as an example that there was Section B that shouldn’t have been in there, but she didn’t refer to the fact that the whole section should not be in there.

Senator Horst: Who is she?

Senator Bonnell: Alice, sorry. My point in saying that there is a lot of confusion about the formatting of this document, and they spent a lot of time talking about that, if that makes sense.

Senator Horst: I’m still confused about this whole last page.

Senator Cline: I’m going to suggest to send it back.

Senator Horst: Do all senator feel that? Send it back.

Senator Mainieri: You know, I do wonder because I was reading the bottom part where it's talking about the other three policies and we talk a lot about when we're changing one policy. We don't always catch the implications on other policies, right, and where those changes might be made. So it's not appropriate to put in the policy document right? But can a committee? Like could this committee they were tasked with the Whistleblower policy, but they also know it triggers change threes, minor changes and other policies. Could they have those policy documents with those related changes and bring those forward as well?

Senator Horst: That is kind of what they did. They said “Senate, we think you should be changing these three policies.” and I thought we caught one of them.

So, we are sending it back to the committee? Okay. We have some issue with the format or the layout, the organization. There's a lot of terms that have different capitalization standards like” wrongful conduct.” Is it an official thing? and then the last page -- we're confused why that's there. So they need to consider deleting that. I have some issues with some of these definitions. I think they should look at some of the other policies and see how they're defined.

Senator Cline: I think our question is, is this even a Senate policy? It’s something that is so tied to legal strictures from a state level and we have very little to play with it?

Senator Mainieri: Is there a way to build in just legal doing what they did with that other document where they highlighted all the places that committee can't change?

Senator Horst: That was a special request, and that took Alice McGinnis some time and they only had so much time. In the meantime, we will send it back to the committee. Would you like us next time to discuss whether or not this is a Senate?

Senator Cline: I think it should go back to the committee to deal with the last page at minimum, because this is stuff that shouldn't be on there. But I do think we might want to ask a question of the legal counsel's office. To what extent is this was legal mandate and to what extent is this a change in the interpretation of the law because we have a new chief legal counsel since the last time this has gone through? they sometimes have different opinions about how to interpret things, right. So maybe we can ask that question, and maybe even have Alice or someone come in and speak about to what extent is this legal mandate versus interpretation and reworking? I think it's more reworking, to tell you the truth.

Senator Mainieri: I think it's already on issues pending, have the committee finish this process then we can decide.

Senator Horst: but we are pulling it from the agenda.

***From Tom Lucey: Faculty Affairs Committee (Information Item:10/11/23)***

***09.28.23.07 Policy 3.2.12 Ombudsperson (Current Copy)***

***09.28.23.08 Policy 3.2.12 Ombudsperson (Mark Up)***

***09.28.23.09 Policy 3.3.8C Voluntary Conciliation (Current Copy)***

***09.28.23.10 Policy 3.3.8C Voluntary Conciliation (Mark Up)***

***09.28.23.11 Policy 3.3.8C Voluntary Conciliation (Clean Copy)***

Senator Horst: Now we're to the item from the Faculty Affairs Committee. They had a meeting with Council Jeannie Barrett; the administration took our lead and they investigated Ombudsperson Offices across the country. They concur that it would be a good idea to have a professional Ombudsperson person as opposed to a council. I talked with Jeannie today about the idea of whether or not we should delete the entire policy. I asked her if they saw policies for these other offices, and she said they did not see policies. The information we reviewed was presented on the respective ombuds websites, and I believe that would be the best way to provide information about those services moving forward. I double checked with U of I, and they didn't have the Ombudsperson policy, but they had an ombudsperson website detailing the services. So I saw that question on the markup, and that was the answer. The committee looked at this policy as being two parts: the first part is the selection of the members of the Council; and the second part is the Code of Ethics of the Ombudsperson Council. I remember when we created this policy 10 plus years ago, this was all coming from a national organization. So that part is not something we crafted, it was something borrowed.

Senator Nikolaou: Even two years ago, we were actually talking, “should we include the second-half the code of ethics for the Ombudsperson Council?” And we said, “well, it is not really part of the policy, but there is nowhere else where we can actually put it.” We cannot just put it on the website, and that's why we said it; the information is relevant, we should keep it there. But if we end up creating an Ombudsperson Office, then it makes sense that this part is going to be on the website.

Senator Horst: I contacted Kumi-Darfour and Amy Secretan. We have a

drafted letter to interim President Tarhule just basically saying “normally you would sign something passed by the Senate in a timely fashion. In the case of this policy, however, the Senate, AP, Council, and Civil Service Council request that you delay authorizing the requested changes passed on whatever date until a successful search for the permanent replacement has been completed.” So, I have a draft of a letter ready to go from these shared governance groups requesting you not to do anything until we actually have somebody hired.

Interim President Tarhule: So, we're still waiting on you about when to proceed on the Ombudsperson, is that right?

Senator Horst: Yes, we're waiting for the Senate to decide to delete this policy.

Senator Cline : Certain faculty will have real, specific questions about the authority that this individual will have, under whom they will be placed, you know, in terms of the structure. So you might want to put that in a letter?

Senator Mainieri: Didn’t we have a memo from the president’s office that exec reviewed about 2 or 4 weeks ago and we endorse that idea and said we are going to use that memo as part of the Senate process to get full Senate endorsement?

Interim President Tarhule: Correct, So from my perspective, we're just waiting for Senate to tell us you may proceed, then we'll start the process of trying to hire.

Senator Horst: I'm hoping we can have somebody in place by the beginning of the next fiscal year.

Interim President Tarhule: The only thing you might want to check is with the Kumi-Darfour. Then she says that the committee is not complete now.

Senator Horst: We actually just held a vote to complete the committee.

Senator Mainieri: Are we doing this as two separate items? Endorsing this creation of an Ombudsperson and deleting this policy? Are they going to be two separate vote or together?

Senator Horst: We don’t endorse creation of personnel positions.

Senator Mainieri: I feel like that how the wording came to us in exec.

Senator Cline: That's what you're effectively you're saying. If you delete this, you are endorsing the fact that we're going to create an office. Because we're not going to delete the policy unless we have this office.

Senator Horst: So what would you guys like to do?

Senator Blum: That's what's going happen though, right? I mean, it's an administrative decision. So, we don't have to endorse.

Senator Horst: So, we'll say we're presenting this deletion with the understanding that the President intends to hire somebody.

Senator Cline: If we don’t have to endorse it, then he can go on.

Interim President Tarhule: I think the complication here is that, there is an Ombusd council that does this and the policy that guides the action. So if I go hiring someone, it’s like two different system in place. That where we need to clarify, if senate clearly express their interest and eliminate that council, then I will hire someone.

Senator Horst: So we will present it in a better way. We will have the memo from the president and the memo from the committee.

How about policy 3.3.8C? just deleting the word council and including ombudsperson.

Senator Nikolaou: should we wait until the ombudsperson policy to be deleted first?

Senator Mainieri: yes, I don’t think they should be on the same agenda.

Senator Horst: okay we will do it later.

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

Motion by Senator Beddow, seconded by Senator Fulton, to approve the agenda. The agenda was unanimously approved as amended. See below.

***09.29.23.01 Email from Jeannie Barrett Policy 2.1.17 Residency Status***

[*2.1.17 Residency Status*](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/students/2-1-17/)

Senator Horst: We asked more information about this from Jeannie and send something. Do we want to keep this as a senate policy?

Senators: We’ll keep it.

Senator Horst: This is on SGA Issues Pending list

Senator Monk: Yes.

***From Amy Hurd Policy 4.1.18 change (Dist. To Academic Affairs Committee)***

***09.29.23.02 Email***

***09.29.23.03 policy 4.1.18 changes***

Senator Horst: We have 4.1.18 from Amy Hurd. They would some changes to this policy, and it would go to Academic Affairs.

***Policy review***

Policy 3.2.9 [*Leave without pay*](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/employee/faculty-staff/3-2-9/) **( Dist. To Faculty Affairs Committee)**

Senator Mainieri: This seems to me for all employees and not just faculty, so I’m not sure if its appropriate for Faculty Affairs.

Senator Horst: right.

Senator Mainieri: so it should go to University Policy?

Senators: Right.

Policy 3.3.2 [*Faculty hiring procedure*](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/employee/faculty/3-3-2/) **( Dist. To Faculty Affairs Committee)**

Senator Horst: how about this policy? Faculty Affairs?

Senators: Yes.

Senator Horst: any comment?

Senator Mainieri: I have a minor request the list of faculty appointment type. Can we make sure that they are listed in alphabetical order please.

Senator Horst: Okay.

***Adjournment***

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

***Proposed* Academic Senate Meeting Agenda**

**Wednesday, October 11, 2023**

**7:00 P.M.**

**OLD MAIN ROOM, BONE STUDENT CENTER**

**Hard Stop 8:30pm**

***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 8/30***

***Chairperson's Remarks***

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

***Administrators' Remarks***

* ***Interim President Aondover Tarhule***
* ***Acting Provost Ani Yazedjian***
* ***Vice President for Student Affairs Levester Johnson***
* ***Vice President for Finance and Planning Dan Stephens***

***Information Items:***

***From Academic Affairs Committee:***

***09.28.23.01 Code of Student Conduct Plagiarism Definition (Current Copy)***

***09.28.23.02 Code of Student Conduct Plagiarism Definition (Mark Up)***

***09.28.23.03 Code of Student Conduct Plagiarism Definition (Clean Copy)***

Added report from SGA

***~~From University Policy Committee:~~***

***~~09.28.23.04 Policy 1.15 Whistleblower (Current Copy)~~***

***~~09.28.23.05 Policy 1.15 Whistleblower (Mark Up)~~***

***~~09.28.23.06 Policy 1.15 Whistleblower (Clean Copy)~~***

***From Faculty Affairs Committee:***

***09.28.23.07 Policy 3.2.12 Ombudsperson (Current Copy)***

***09.28.23.08 Policy 3.2.12 Ombudsperson (Mark Up)***

*Added President MEMO*

*Added summary from Faculty Affairs*

***~~09.28.23.09 Policy 3.3.8C Voluntary Conciliation (Current Copy)~~***

***~~09.28.23.10 Policy 3.3.8C Voluntary Conciliation (Mark Up)~~***

***~~09.28.23.11 Policy 3.3.8C Voluntary Conciliation (Clean Copy)~~***

***Internal Committee Reports:***

* ***Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Nikolaou***
* ***Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Senator Mainieri***
* ***Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Lucey***
* ***Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Valentin***
* ***Rules Committee: Senator Blum***
* ***University Policy Committee: Senator Sheridan***

***Communications***

***Adjournment***