**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

**MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2019**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

Academic Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

***Oral Communications:***

***Solicitation Policy***

Senator Kalter: We’re going to start with Oral Communications. Welcome, everybody. As I said, the Provost will not be here, and one student will not be here because of a class conflict. So we’ll begin with Oral Communications. Solicitation policy, the reason that’s on there as an Oral Communication, so it had been actually routed to the Rules Committee a year or two ago, maybe three, but the Brent Paterson committee that was working on Facilities Use issues, stuff like that, had it as one of its many policies that it was looking at. So now, it’s technically also in Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee. So the proposal is for us to simply pull it out of Rules, how does that sound to everyone?

Senator Horst: Good.

Senator Kalter: To say, let’s not have both committees look at this and let it go. Okay so everybody’s agreeing with that. Good.

***Hazing Policy***

Senator Kalter: Hazing policy is a harder one. Obviously, we had a very robust discussion about that on the floor. I’m fine… I think where we left it was put it back to SGA, but it sounded like we also needed to put it first to the Student Code Review Committee. Is that what people heard there?

Senator Mainieri: There was also a question of what do we do in the interim. Like should we vote to at least bring the policy up so it matches the current Code, so there’s not any confusion or misinterpretation.

Senator Kalter: Yes. Thank you for reminding us of that.

Senator Mainieri: That seemed to make the most sense to me. Yes, route it to the appropriate committees, but it seems like we should do something in the interim so that they’re not conflicting.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, like one or the other thing has to happen. Either the policy needs to be taken down, which can’t really happen because it covers faculty and staff, or it needs to be conformed. Dr. Dietz, do you have an opinion about that, in terms of the Anti-Hazing policy?

President Dietz: Not really. I could go either way. I would say that it ought to be part of the larger review, but whether or not we bring it up right now really probably depends on how quickly we can get a review done. And those usually are time consuming.

Senator Kalter: Time consuming, and we’re waiting on the federal government for that other stuff.

President Dietz: That’s what I meant.

Senator Horst: Oh. Okay.

Senator Kalter: For the Title IX stuff.

Senator Horst: I see. So the Student Code potentially won’t come to the Senate this year?

Senator Kalter: What I heard from Lisa Huson was that they’re worried that it’s going to have to come in the middle of the year, and likely will have to come because the presidential administration in Washington D.C. will create the new rule, the new regs, because I think it’s new regs not new law, as I understand it. Because nobody’s getting laws through the Senate and the House right now. So they’ll have to put it in place with a compliance date of X, and I think I said a couple of nights ago that you might even have to sign off on the things, on the Code itself without us having first reviewed it, and then it’ll start going through our process. But in order to comply, it’s got to be in place.

President Dietz: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: And my guess is that the anti-hazing stuff won’t be able to get checked until after that new Code gets put into place anyway.

President Dietz: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: How do people feel about… We were trying to tempt fate last time with having the Code language and the policy language be different for however long. How many people want to tempt fate? How many people want to push it through…not push it through but like… Well, I guess it would be pushing it through, because we’re basically pushing it through in order to get them together even though we don’t like it. Which is worse?

Senator Ferrence: I think having them different, to me, is worse because it opens up… Otherwise we’re just hoping that a problem doesn’t arise in the short term and, if it does, you’ve got competing statements. Whereas if you change it, it’s not like it can’t be changed in the future. I mean we could change it a day later if we wanted to. So I don’t see that updating to match one another conceivably does any harm, but not bringing them to at least match has the potential for harm. If we knew that SGA was going to meet and update the Code within the next couple of weeks, maybe you’d wait, but it’s ready for Action and it’s not like we’re adding anything new, we’re just making the words in the policy read according to what the current practice actually is, which I think personally is a good thing.

Senator Kalter: Tracy, I think I heard you making that same argument, right? That you’re more in favor of changing it now, than waiting.

Senator Mainieri: Yes.

President Dietz: I think there’s more exposure if you have the inconsistency than not.

Senator Horst: The only down side I see is that there was a lot of input from the Senators that is basically going to be ignored.

Senator Kalter: Not ignored, but routed to committee.

Senator Horst: But basically saying, oh, we can’t do that because we have to have the same language. So if we could just make… When we go through and pass this language that is parallel, if we could clearly state that it’s going to go on this committee’s agenda, and we’re going to pick it up at another time when it’s appropriate, so people don’t feel like they talked and then everything was for naught.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. Because I thought there were some really good suggestions. Like Dr. Topdar with the comment about sexual violence, and the dress inconspicuousness, and stuff like that. Those are really important for us to pay attention to. Yeah. We can say this is not what we would like to do but I think the risk, it’s not just a reputational risk, right, it’s a larger legal risk to have that out there. It’s better to sew that up first, and then make sure that the other stuff is being worked on.

Senator Mainieri: Can we also say, like, just to reassure everyone that the minutes of that discussion will be passed along with the policy just so that the people will understand that that’s what happens.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. Because Cera does that all the time, but maybe only the committee chairs know that. So yeah, we can definitely do that. Does that sound good to everybody? Great. So we will then add that when we get to that time. Let’s see. That’s the other question. Well, we’re almost there. I’ll just say something about the approval of the proposed agenda. We were trying to keep some stuff off of the proposed agenda so we could have enough time to talk about the operating and capital fund, but since this was already an Information Item and it’s going to Action, does that seem like it’s too much? What we’re going… and I wanted to make sure that our student members understood what we’re doing so that you can kind of spread the word about this, we’re going to have the Operating and Capital Funding Request to the State at the Senate meeting, but afterwards we’re going to have a focus on the Engineering programs and the engineering building at the Caucus. So that the Caucus can have sort of a faculty driven discussion about that but if students would like to stay and listen to that, that’s fine. And then at the following meeting, we’ll have the larger discussion, sort of Engineering programs and all of that. That was the other reason we were trying to make the agenda relatively short. So you’ll notice that the Transfer Credit policy isn’t on there yet even though it’s ready to go. We were just sort of trying to make sure that we had enough time for the Caucus meeting, so having a relatively short Senate meeting. Of course somebody could jaywalk, and then it turns into a 45 minute, be ready for that. There was this one comment once about jaywalking and the Student Body President took 45 minutes of flak from somebody. It was pretty interesting.

Senator Phillips: Like the President jaywalked?

Senator Kalter: No. They had been ticketing students for jaywalking, and Ryan Powers made a comment that one of the faculty members didn’t take very well, so he got challenged and then it was jaywalking for 45 minutes. But in any case, we’re ok with putting the Anti-Hazing policy on as an Action Item, like, probably that won’t take much time? Okay. All right.

Senator Horst: Hopefully.

Senator Kalter: Hopefully. I’ll try to limit that if it starts going off. And then the only other thing we have on there is the Distributed Communication about a new search for the Assistant Vice President for Academic Planning. Those of you here may know our very beloved Bruce Stoffel is leaving. I can’t believe it. It’s like, can’t you clone yourself? And I know there’s like no, there is no nature versus nurture, it is nature and nurture, so I don’t know what combined to create Bruce Stoffel, but he is just great. So he is leaving. We don’t have yet the job description for that, but what I’m told is that it’s his duties plus a little bit more, which elevated it from Coordinator of Academic Programs and something, to an AVP level. And so that position will report to the Associate Provost as one of the several things in her portfolio, so that’s just a Distributed Communication. So we move on, unless there are comments about that. We just put out the faculty call for volunteers, and the non-tenure line call for volunteers, and I imagine, I believe, that SGA has students on that search as well, I think, pretty sure, so we’ve got that going.

***\*\*Approval of Proposed Senate Agenda for 9/25/19 – See pages below\*\****

***Proposed* Academic Senate Meeting Agenda**

**Wednesday, September 25, 2018**

**7:00 P.M.**

**OLD MAIN ROOM, BONE STUDENT CENTER**

***Call to Order***

***Roll Call***

***Presentation: Operating and Capital funding request to the State of Illinois by Vice President for Finance and Planning Dan Stephens, Assistant Vice President for Budgeting and Planning Sandi Cavi, Director of University Budget Office Amanda Hendrix, and Associate Vice President of Facilities Management, Planning and Operations Chuck Scott.***

***Chairperson's Remarks***

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

***Administrators' Remarks***

* ***President Larry Dietz***
* ***Provost Jan Murphy***
* ***Vice President of Student Affairs Levester Johnson***
* ***Vice President of Finance and Planning Dan Stephens***

***Advisory Items: None***

***Assistant Vice President for Academic Planning Search Committee***

***Action Items: None***

***Information Items: None***

***Consent Agenda Items: None***

***Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Nikolaou***

***Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Senator Marx***

***Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Crowley***

***Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Mainieri***

***Rules Committee: Senator Seeman***

***Communications***

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Mainieri, seconded by Senator Horst, to approve the proposed Senate agenda.

Senator Kalter: Man, this is going fast. We could actually beat our record from last time that’s how short this meeting is.

Senator Nikolaou: For the agenda, we want to remove the “none” though.

Senator Kalter: Yes, we do.

Senator Nikolaou: Next to Advisory and Action.

Senator Kalter: Yes. So next to Advisory let’s remove the “none.” And then next to Action, let’s remove the “none” and put the Anti-Hazing policy. Even though it’s on our agenda right now as the Hazing policy, it’s the Anti-Hazing policy. Let’s make sure, also, that they get those wording changes.

Senator Ferrence: It was the Hazing policy as written.

Senator Kalter: Yes, it was. And it was like you’re going to get in trouble if you prevent people from getting hazed. So let’s make sure that doesn’t go through. That would be really bad. So we’ll put that on. And then does anybody have anything else they see about the agenda, as thick and wonderful and marvelous as it is?

The motion was unanimously approved.

***Policy Review:***

***3.4.14 Administrative/ Professional Attendance and Punctuality (Non-Senate)***

***3.4.15 Administrative/ Professional Non-Exempt Hourly Work Time (Non-Senate)***

***5.1.12 Proper Operation of University In Case of Disruptive Activity (Non-Senate)***

Senator Kalter: All right. And we’ve got a tiny little policy review cycle. So the first two are easy, I think. For the most part, unless they somehow have to do with faculty duties, we have the Administrative/ Professional policies seen as non-Senate, and this one is attendance/punctuality, and hourly work time. So that seems uncontroversial. I did ask Brent Paterson this morning, isn’t the Proper Operation of University In Case of Disruptive Activity one of those ones that his committee for facilities was looking at, and indeed it is. So one thing that we can do is to agree that it’s non-Senate, and say okay it goes to the President, and he gets to do with it what he wants to. If we decide that it is a Senate one, it should kind of be put on hold, or so to speak, or what have you, because as I understand it the proposed new policy that’s going through Administrative Affairs and Budget does not incorporate it into it, it simply refers to it, but it’s not a replacement. Right now, it’s on here as a non-Senate policy, one that doesn’t need to be revised by the Senate. So, do people have opinions about that? Is that the right designation for it?

Senator Marx: I didn’t get a change to look at it. Does somebody have a copy they’re not looking at?

Senator Horst: Yes. I think that’s accurate. I would point out that the governing policy of the Board of Trustees, I think it’s the Board of Trustees governing documents. There’s a different title for that, but other than that it seems like it should potentially be rolled into that University Facilities Use and Space policy, or considered along with that.

Senator Kalter: They’re not considering rolling this in. They’re considering sort of quoting from it or what have you, so this would still remain policy 5.1.12, but that one would then refer out to the language in it.

Senator Horst: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: So you’re in favor then of non-Senate?

Senator Horst: Yes. But except it’s not called the Governing Policy of the Board of Trustees.

Senator Kalter: And David you’re nodding your head.

Senator Marx: Yeah. It’s a non-Senate policy.

Senator Kalter: What about, Sami, what do you think?

Senator Solebo: Non-Senate policy.

Senator Kalter: Non-Senate, okay. And, Alex, same?

Senator Campbell: Um-hum.

Senator Kalter: Taylor, do you have any dissent?

Senator Phillips: Not today.

Senator Horst: Susan, can I ask how many more policies we have to review?

Senator Kalter: I think this is it.

Ms. Hazelrigg: Zero.

Senator Kalter: Isn’t that glorious?

Ms. Hazelrigg: We have one that Exec decided last year to hold until the faculty, AP/Civil Service status comes around.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. So we’ve got some that are a year or two or three out, but we’ve got through our cycle. And you helped us, Rules like batted them seriously out.

Senator Ferrence: So, what in your mind sort of constitutes the threshold for where you would tip the balance in terms of should be a policy that the Senate reviews versus one that wouldn’t. Because I assume it’s a slip… There’s a complete continuum of policies, and where you draw that fine line between Senate doesn’t want to review it seems like a potential slippery slope.

Senator Kalter: So there is one very determining policy called the Creation of Academic Policies policy, and it says that Senate looks at policies in the academic area broadly conceived. And so then you sort of think about well what does that mean, and according to American Association of University Professors that means if it’s a budget, for example, that it has to do with stuff that’s going to impact the academic area, that would count. If it’s a faculty personnel issue, that would count. If it’s a student life issue, because that’s in our--whatever you call it--bylaws, constitution, that would count. If it’s a comptroller office policy, probably not. But if it’s like a grants and contracts policy that has to do with what the comptroller’s office does, probably, because it’s about how the research endeavor at the university goes smoothly or doesn’t go smoothly.

Senator Ferrence: But, for example, attendance and punctuality whether a faculty member is actually showing up to class does have an impact…

Senator Kalter: Yes.

Senator Ferrence: So that would seem to fall more on the…

Senator Kalter: But this is the Administrative Professionals.

Senator Ferrence: Just the Administrative Professionals?

Senator Kalter: And when the APs are in their faculty role, like if they teach, they would be under the faculty policies, like non-tenure line policies. Yeah. Or tenure-line, I suppose, some of them are tenure-line faculty who are in AP roles, for example.

Senator Horst: But there is (because we were just looking at the Constitution) there is this list in the Constitution of what kinds of policies we’re supposed to look at. So that’s another direction that we can look to, see this list.

Senator Kalter: And people… what we said at the beginning of doing this kind of cycle… so it used to be before we had a nine-month president…was it a…

President Dietz: Seven.

Senator Kalter: Seven-month president. Before we had this one strange seven-month presidency, the president’s office use to send us policies. Right? I assumed that what happened was that people wanted to change a policy so they would let Legal know, or let somebody know, and then they would get routed to us, etcetera. That kind of broke down during seven months, especially with regard to the Alcohol policy, that was one significant one. So we talked a lot about that, and eventually what happened was that we decided to bring it in house, so to speak, and say that the Executive Committee is going to decide once and for all which of these are our policies that are in the academic area, which ones are not. And anybody can always, if we’ve put it in the not policy, you can make an argument to Exec at any time, like in 20 years somebody can argue that this policy about disruption really has an academic area thing and here’s why, and that Exec can decide, is that true or not. But otherwise we’ve got, frankly I think the five year cycle is too much; for some policies it’s not often enough, but for a lot of policies it’s like it’s way too often to do it every five years.

Senator Ferrence: Although if you get into the habit of actually doing them and just sort of being, a lot of what we do with American Chemical Society is that a lot of ours are on a three year cycle, but at three years it’s the option to sunset, accept as is or minorly amend, or major amend. And many of the things are just like, it’s not quite pro forma but it’s just looked at as yeah. So the point is it’s looked at every three years to make sure. Because what was happening in that organization was things had been sitting around for 20 years and wasn’t looked at.

Senator Kalter: That’s what happened in our organization.

Senator Ferrence: So it created… But then we’ve developed the culture of, no, really it’s quite all right to just pick it up and go yep it’s fine. We’re just making sure at least once every, in the case of our organization, three years, and in the case of ISU, five years, yeah it’s okay. But onboarding people to feel the, particularly academics that…

Senator Kalter: I was just going to say that.

Senator Ferrence: We feel to say it’s okay without but can’t we wordsmith a little.

Senator Kalter: You should just get a whole bunch of chemists on…

Senator Ferrence: No, no, no. Industrial people. It’s the industrial people that…

Senator Marx: In AABC we’re working on the Television policy; it was last revised in 1974 and it desperately need to be updated.

Senator Ferrence: Do we allow more than six stations on campus?

Senator Marx: It doesn’t say anything about that, but the content is what’s limited in that policy.

Senator Kalter: I think that is now our oldest policy. It used to be another one, but I think it’s now that one.

Senator Marx: I’m waiting to hear back from Steve Hunt. He said they would work on it in the spring. And I wrote to him last week, and he said I thought we answered you.

Senator Kalter: Very nice.

Senator Ferrence: Communications break down from…

Senator Marx: It was a breakdown of communications from the School of Communications.

Senator Mainieri: I did have one comment as this goes to whoever is then going to review it. For the non-exempt hourly work time, just because I’ve become hyper aware of this recently, there is a policy for nursing mothers in the workplace that I think could be linked in with the rest and breaks, just to make sure that people are aware of it as they’re reading this policy. I’ve just become super aware of those things recently.

Senator Marx: An accommodation for breastfeeding mothers.

Senator Mainieri: So just a suggestion.

Senator Kalter: That’s a great idea. I’m trying to remember if we have a policy on that.

Senator Mainieri: It’s 3.1.47.

Senator Kalter: 3.1.47.

Senator Mainieri: Yes.

Senator Kalter: And it specifically…

Senator Mainieri: Nursing Mothers in the Workplace.

Senator Kalter: Gotcha. Great. So in other words having a reference in the rest and break, then out to that policy.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. Just because that could make some people nervous trying to do everything that we need to do.

Senator Kalter: Great. Anything else before we send these three out to the President? It’ll be like a shuffleboard. We can slide them all down to the end of the table.

Senator Marx: He’s ready for them.

Senator Kalter: He’s ready I can tell.

President Dietz: I’m ready.

Senator Kalter: Excellent. All right. Our meeting is over. Does anybody want to have a motion to adjourn?

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Campbell, seconded by Senator Solebo, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.