**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

**MONDAY, September 13, 2021**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

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

***Oral Communication:***

***Is IDEAS ready for Action item stage?***Senator Horst: Do we think the IDEAS proposal is ready for an Action Item stage?

Senator Cline: Yes.

Senator Spranger: Nobody’s saying anything. So, I don’t know if that’s because they’re not paying attention or if everybody’s ready. But personally, I think yeah.

Senator Cline: I think you can interpret the quite in a couple of ways. I haven’t been inundated with emails afterwards. I would have felt differently if it was quiet in the room but I was getting a lot of backchanneling, and I haven’t gotten any.

Senator Horst: And do you think your discussion about the implementation stage was complete?

Senator Cline: Yeah. If we do bring it up for Action Item, the one thing we can share is the timing right. So, Amy said this morning that if we get it approved in the near-ish time, we’d be talking about students entering in 2023.

Dr. Hurd: Correct.

Senator Cline: That would give you the end of fall, spring, all of next calendar year to prepare. So, that means course approvals, hirings, things like that. That’s enough time for that all to happen.

Senator Garrahy: Surprisingly, no one has asked that. I don’t know why.

Senator Cline: I did have one student that said, “does that mean I have to take it,” and I said, “no” and that was it.

Senator Horst: So, you can announce that before you make a motion.

Senator Cline: Okay. Because I think that gives people—it’s not tomorrow we’re talking about. And you can’t anticipate everything until you start working through it.

Senator Garrahy: One of the student Senators commented in the previous meeting, “was it a three-credit course, how many credits?” I think that was an excellent point that we just somethings forget to mention.

Senator Stewart: I do have one general question. Something that hasn’t come up yet for discussion is how this is going to interact with the IAI, and with transfer credits and other kinds of things, and how that’s going to be handled?

Dr. Hurd: We have it outlined that if they come in with an associates degree, they don’t have to fulfill it because it’s all done prior to them getting here. Now, if they transfer in, they have an option to either go IAI or they go through our gen ed and we determine which is their best path. If they haven’t completed IAI and they complete that here, they’re going to have to do that graduation requirement because they don’t have an associates degree.

Senator Stewart: Okay. Then it sounds like there’s no need to… Well, we might still need to do this for students who are not coming in having fully completed the IAI, but we might need to find out if there are other courses at other institutions that would satisfy this requirement.

Dr. Hurd: We know that because any course that transfers in from a community college that would meet that requirement would be designated as a “D.”

Senator Stewart: Okay.

Dr. Hurd: And that’s how we do AMALI.

Senator Otto: I have been hearing some questions from faculty about the panel of experts that’s going to be evaluating whether or not courses will be admitted into that designation, and really faculty just wanting to be a part of that. How do faculty become a part of that? What’s the credentials that we’re looking for? How that’s all laid out, I guess.

Senator Horst: There’s two components to that. There’s the process that is going on now with AMALI. We’re proposing to create a new committee and we could flush that all out when we have that proposal. The questions right now, do people think there are enough questions out there that we should have a “Information/Action Item,” or should we go straight to Action Item?

Senator Cline: To answer your questions, Stacy, if you have faculty really want to participate tell them to email Amy Hurd and get their name on the list. Because I think it’s going to be mostly people from the ad hoc committee, the people who helped devise that, but it doesn’t mean that that list is fixed. Right? You need all the helpers you can get, right?

Dr. Hurd: Um-hum.

Senator Otto: Thanks for that, Lea.

Senator Horst: Alright. So, we decided on Action, but we’ll be lenient if there are questions.

***Create a public comment time frame that is appropriate for the 50 minute meeting time for internal and external committees (Dist. to Rules)***

Senator Horst: This is coming from David Marx, and he was wondering if you needed to have a public comment timeframe. He was saying 10 minutes, and I’m thinking that’s actually the time we allot for the full Senate. My first question, and I’m going to meet with Legal on October 6th, is it required for every single internal committee that they have a public comment time? But the question is if it is required, what would be the appropriate amount of time? 10 minutes is what we do for the full Senate meetings. This is a question for Rules. Are there any comments about that?

Senator Cline: I don’t really have an issue with how much time, I mean, I feel it’ll be proportional and there might be some legal ramifications or whatever. But I have a question about internal and external committees. If we make one rule it would be one rule for all, which is a huge number of committees. So, we have to think about the impact on a real variety of situations. Not base it just on what our internal committees feel like.

Senator Horst: So, the first question is, is it actually required? If it is required, then it’s clear that we have to establish something. If it’s not required, then there can be some discussion as to if this is desired.

Senator Cline: Yeah.

Senator Horst: Any other input on that? Okay I have a meeting with Lisa Huson on October 6th and I’ll let you know what she says.

***From Lea Cline: Permission to appoint Dimitrios Nikolaou as the APC rep since no one from AAC volunteered.***

Senator Cline: So, I’ll just give the background. When Dimitrios was helping me onload about what my job is as AAC chair, one of the things he said is he really enjoyed his service on the APC and if it happened to be the case that nobody signed up that he would be happy to serve again. And it could have been that we just read the APC report which was 77 pages that might have discouraged some of the members from signing up. But I did give it time, and nobody even shifted in their seats. And so, I said we’ll ask if it’s possible for him to continue because it’s something he enjoys. But it is irregular because he’s not a member of AAC, which is typically that person. So, we need Exec’s approval for that. But who am I to crush a man’s dream, right?

(Laughter)

Senator Horst: I’m wondering, do we have to open this up to the Caucus?

Senator Nikolaou: Actually, I was thinking because on our agenda for today it was to approve the APC membership, I was thinking if we were going to make a change to allow me to be on the committee, maybe we would want to add it in the Faculty Caucus agenda as well. So, for the full Caucus to say, “yeah, that’s fine with us to make the change.”

Senator Horst: It think that’s actually more appropriate that the full Caucus considers the nomination and see if there’s anyone else who’s interested at Caucus.

Senator Nikolaou: Otherwise, we are going to force Lea to go.

Senator Cline: NO.

(Laughter)

Senator Horst: Okay. We’ll put that on the agenda.

***Distributed Communications:***

***From Lea Cline: The State has implemented a policy barring the use of ACT and SAT scores for admission to state institutions. I would like some guidance on how to proceed with that item on our IP list – do we need to propose an elimination of this policy to be compliant or leave it as is?
09.09.21.12 Fw\_ higher education fair admissions act***

***09.09.21.13 Higher Education Fair Admissions Act***

***Test\_Optional\_Request\_2021-03-30***

Senator Horst: Amy Hurd notified Lea that there was legislation passed, the Higher Education Fair Admissions Act, and it is not requiring ACT and SAT scores. I dug up the text of the Act and my heart skipped when I saw it says, “requires the adoption of a policy.” So, I’ve sent Legal a note today asking what the deadline for that policy is. Is the memo from the Provost enough to get approved? So, we have to have a policy on the policy site. I did look at some other schools and they just said, “it’s our policy to do this,” and there wasn’t a formal policy. I emailed Jana Albrecht, the AVP of Enrollment Management, and she’s happy to draft a policy. But we don’t really have anything yet. Do you have anything else to add about that Amy?

Dr. Hurd: No. I know Jana’s working on it with Legal to come up with some wording.

Senator Horst: Yeah. And some schools actually have formal admissions policies.

Senator Cline: Right. The law only applies to the State of Illinois students. Right? So, there might need to be an articulation of what we require for in-state students versus out-of-state students. Did I ready the Act correctly? It’s only State of Illinois residence students do not have to use an ACT or SAT for entrance into state institutions. So, it does articulate the possibility of adding a requirement for out-of-state students. I guess we need to clarify, do we, or don’t we?

Dr. Hurd: It’s my understanding that she was going to go across the board. And she was also going to add in that policy, the courses that are required for a student from high school. Because there are a set of classes, and it’s getting ready to change, so I think she wanted to put that in there as well.

Senator Horst: So, I’m hoping we get some sort of communication from Legal that says, “oh, you can take your time, two years,” and then we get a policy, and we can discuss it at length and see what we want to put in it. Anything else you want to add about this?

Senator Cline: Just that our charge, the Issues Pending list for AAC said consider it. It didn’t say to implement, so that’s why it’s come back to Exec, because we haven’t been instructed to do anything with it. So, it may come back to us, but not yet.

Senator Horst: Yeah. So, the discussion was because Susan Kalter was communicating that this might come. She wanted us to get on the front end of that conversation, but it happened. So, I think if we have a new policy, as I said to Lea, I think it should come through Exec and we’ll farm it out. And hopefully, we’ll have some time, and we won’t need to rush it through. But I’ll find out what Legal says later.

 ***From Janice Bonneville: (Currently in Faculty Affairs Committee)***

***09.13.18.10 Policy 3.1.11 Leave of Absence CURRENT***

***08.10.21.02 Policy 3.1.11 Leave of Absence Mark Up***

***08.10.21.03 Policy 3.1.11 Leave of Absence Clean Copy***

***06.14.21.16 Proposed New Policy 3.1.50 Military Service Leave of Absence MARK UP***

***06.14.21.11 Proposed New Policy 3.1.50 Military Service Leave of Absence Clean Copy***

Senator Horst: After Flanagan, the Executive Committee started the process of going through every single policy and determining if it was a Senate policy or not a Senate policy. This policy was deemed as Senate policy in 2016. I looked at the minutes and Dr. Dietz was commenting that there is a lot of stuff that’s mandated. We can talk about that later. On October 15, 2018, Exec assigned it to the Faculty Affairs Committee. There was a discussion about bereavement leave and comparing the amount of leave that faculty and staff get compared to students. This summer Janice Bonneville sent me an email. She is requesting that the part about Military Service, there’s two parts, be extracted and become its own policy. She wants that to be 3.1.50. She says, “Military service and temporary military duty are governed by state and federal law and are outside of the control of the University.”

Senator Garrahy: Martha, that’s for students and faculty, correct? Or are we just talking about faculty?

Senator Horst: I believe so, I’m not quite sure.

Senator Garrahy: Because I have some active students right now.

Senator Horst: And she says there’s at least 6-12 of these a year. She does not think a review of the Academic Senate is warranted. She then proposed (she didn’t quite understand how long it could take) to bring 3.1.11 minus the Military Leave to Senate for discussion. It contains edits that are results from the old statutory changes and the new statutory changes that she’s also proposing. So, there’s some changes to the Civil Air Patrol, that’s statutory change, it’s not new. The changes to the Bereavement, the Time Off for School Conferences, and Disastrous Service are all coming from statutory changes. So, my first question is, can the Military Leave part become a new non-Senate policy, or does the Senate want to wait until it reviews everything in 3.1.11 and separate it out them? Because Janice wanted to take it straight to the President.

Senator Cline: Because it’s statutory?

Senator Horst: Yes. She says, “it’s driven by state and federal law.”

Senator Garrahy: If it’s state policy and nothing’s really going to change from us looking at it, can we just move it forward to wherever it needs to be? Because we don’t need to review it if it’s statutory, do we?

Senator Horst: I’m just going to reflect on some experiences, for instance, the Religious Accommodation policy, which was more of a classroom thing. A lot of it was because of the law, but we had some input into it as to how it would happen in the classroom, what the timing was, etc. So, we could have some effect on the policy, but a lot of this is outside of our control. It was deemed a Senate policy in 2016.

Senator Garrahy: But it’s not. It’s not a Senate policy?

Senator Horst: We could discuss that. Stacy?

Senator Otto: We’re only talking about breaking off the Military Leave and putting that forward to the President? And keeping the part that are not statutes going through the Senate. Am I correct about that?

Senator Horst: That’s what she wanted us to do. But if we do that then we would have two policies. We would have the Military Leave policy and then we would have the full 3.1.11, which will have all of the old Military Leave policy. Unless we do this trick again where we send it straight to the Senate floor. Otherwise, if it starts going through the committee, it might take some time.

Senator Cline: So, I’m in favor of moving the Military Service Leave of Absence policy. I understand what you’re saying that they’re intertwined with the old, so we’ll have to get rid of those. As a military family member, I know that that changes frequently and to have that separate means that you can make adjustments to that without encumbering an entire process dealing with staff and faculty leave of absence. So, I think it would be cleaner in the end to do that. I do think that we should have the right to look at the Leave of Absence policy, however. I’m in favor of the separation of the two. I’m not sure it’s the right thing to do to make the Leave of Absence policy a non-Senate policy. I think the Military one probably shouldn’t be a Senate policy because there’s probably very few people in the Senate that have enough expertise to articulate some of the differences that have been outlined that I’ve read. Understanding which are civilian core and which are…, you know, these sorts of things. I think it’s probably not in the best interest of us long term to be involved in the military issues, because those are usually federal issues. But I do think we should have some say over the Leave of Absence policy.

Senator Nikolaou: Did Janice say by when? Does the separation need to be expedited? Because if it says by the academic year, it could be that this is the sixth policy that we sent to Planning and Finance, and if it is more of an expedited policy that we need to do, then we’ll tell them to put that on top of the list as priority. Because I looked at it and it didn’t seem that there were too many things to be changed above from making sure that the language for the Religious Observances is consistent with what we did for Religious Accommodations.

Senator Horst: That’s a good point. She was suggesting that she wanted to send it immediately to the President for signature, and I said I can’t do that. That’s what she wanted to do in the summer. And then she said we’d go down that path to add it to the Senate master list as not up for Senate review, and we will bring the balance of 3.1.11 to the Senate this fall with review and discussion.

Senator Cline: So, you couldn’t do that because currently it’s a Senate policy?

Senator Horst: Yeah. I think they need to be together. I don’t think we can just separate it out and say, “okay, make that a policy,” because then we would have two competing policies, until we deal with 3.1.11. So, I think we need to do them both together. She didn’t give me any timing, but she says that she deals with these people every year, and I’m not an expert on what has changed. But I do think we need to expedite it, so I like your idea of sending it to Planning and Finance as opposed to Faculty Affairs, who have the ever growing list of policies. So, we could keep them together, expedite the separation and send it to Planning and Finance. Actually, we have a group of HR policies that we’re dealing with. So, we can meet with Janice Bonneville and I’ll ask her if it’s urgent. If it’s urgent, she can get it approved by the President and then we’ll deal with the Leave of Absence.

Senator Otto: I feel like there are some things that people are going to want to discuss about this. I worry about sending it… if we already are going by the federal law, because it’s the federal law, I think there are other things that people will want to discuss. For instance, that you can’t take bereavement leave if the relationship ends in divorce. That could be the father of your children dying. I think there are some things in here that people are going to want to talk about is all.

Senator Horst: Yes. So, we’re all in agreement that we’ll keep it a Senate policy—the leave of absence part. Once we see the two documents, then we can talk more about the Military Leave being a non-Senate policy. But we’ll keep it a Senate policy. We’ll send it to Planning and Finance, unless I get a note from Janice Bonneville that we need to do this right away. Everybody agree with that? (Pause) Okay.

***09.07.21.01 Proposed deletion of Policy 3.3.9 Proceedings in Faculty Academic Freedom, Dismissal, and Non-reappointment Cases Mark Up (Dist. to Faculty Caucus)***

Senator Horst: I had a meeting with Lisa Huson, Roberta Trites, Janice Bonneville, and myself to talk about this old policy 3.3.9, which was the basis for the articles of dismissal, sanction, and suspension that are now in the ASPT documents. After a long discussion, we decided to delete the whole thing. I’m now proposing that this go to the Faculty Caucus for discussion because it’s really directly related to the ASPT articles that we have now.

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

***Proposed* Academic Senate Meeting Agenda**

**Wednesday, September 22, 2021, 2021**

**7:00 P.M.**

**OLD MAIN ROOM, BONE STUDENT CENTER**

***Call to Order***

***Roll Call***

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

***Presentation: Improve the Teaching and Learning Experience: Learning Management System Initiative Proposal (Assistant Vice President for Academic Administration Yojanna Cuenca-Carlino, and Office of Advanced Technology Support for Faculty Executive Director Rosie Hauck)***

***Chairperson's Remarks***

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

***Administrators' Remarks***

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

***Action Item:***

***From Executive Committee/ Associate Vice President of Human Resources Janice Bonneville:***

***07.07.21.01 Presidential approval form***

***07.07.21.02 Policy 3.1.30 Criminal Background Investigation Previous Copy***

***07.07.21.03 Policy 3.1.30 Criminal Background Investigation Mark Up General Assembly Changes***

***07.07.21.04 Policy 3.1.30 Criminal Background Investigation Current Copy***

***09.10.21.01 Policy 3.1.30\_Criminal Background Investigation MARK UP***

***Information Items:***

***02.18.21.12 Academic Planning Committee Blue Book page Current Copy (Rules Committee)***
***09.09.21.07 Academic Planning Committee Blue Book page Mark Up (Rules Committee)***

***09.09.21.08 Academic Planning Committee Blue Book page Clean Copy (Rules Committee)***

***02.23.21.02 Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee Blue Book Charge Current Copy (Rules Committee)***

***02.23.21.03 Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee Blue Book Charge Mark Up (Rules Committee)***
***02.23.21.01 Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee Blue Book Charge CLEAN COPY (Rules Committee)***

***02.23.21.04 Planning and Finance Committee Blue Book Charge Current Copy (Executive Committee)***
***02.26.21.01 Executive committee minute excepts 08-22-17 AFAC report***
***02.26.21.02 Planning and Finance IP list AFAC report***

***Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Cline***

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

***Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Nikolaou***

***Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Vogel***

***Rules Committee: Senator Stewart***

***Communications***

***Adjournment or Hard Stop 8:45 p.m.***

The agenda was approved with friendly amendments noted in red and green text.

***05.05.21.01 From Mary Elaine Califf: UCC name change request memo (Dist. to Rules Committee)
08.26.21.02 University Curriculum Committee charge discussions (Dist. to Rules Committee)***

Senator Horst: This came to me in the summer from Mary Elaine Califf, who is the chair of the UCC. She recognized that there was a discussion regarding name change and she didn’t agree with the outcome. She’d like us to reconsider it because the majority of their work is undergraduate related. However, the Rules Committee noted that in their charge there’s functions that are not specifically undergrad. Furthermore, this is the only external curriculum committee that we have. Our three choices are: we could say “no, we’ve already addressed this, we’re not going to address it again,” we could send it back to Rules, or do you want to send it to the Academic Affairs Committee because they’re having a broader conversation about the interaction of all curriculum committees.

Senator Nikolaou: Isn’t it back in the Rules Committee? Because I think if I remember correctly, last year when we were talking about it we said that there are some items that we cannot just immediately change from University to undergraduate and then we said that Rules is going to look into it, and then it’s going to come back. I think I remember something along those lines from when we talked about it at Senate. So, for example, I went back and looked at it and #11 it says, “the procedures should be followed from all,” which suggests it’s going to be from undergraduate and graduate. Or when #8 states that, “all areas of the curriculum,” which includes undergraduate and graduate. Then I was thinking if we change it immediately from undergraduate to university does it mean that we will not be getting on the consent agenda any of the graduate proposals at all? Because in essence, we aren’t having any connections with the graduate proposals. And also, does anyone know the history of the graduate curriculum is not at all related with the Senate? It says the Senate reviews all Academic related areas of the University; it was weird that the graduate curriculum is not.

Dr. Hurd: I don’t know why it is not part of the Senate, but neither is the Graduate Council. So, it operates separately. The process of getting on the Graduate Curriculum Committee is very different than the UCC. The UCC doesn’t do anything with grads. So, anything that goes on in GCC never comes to UCC. They operate as two completely separate groups.

Senator Horst: But are there general curriculum matters that go to the UCC?

Dr. Hurd: To the Graduate Council?

Senator Horst: That’s in the functions: To study trends in curriculum nationally and on specific college campuses.

Dr. Hurd: Well, neither committee does that. I mean it’s in there, but they don’t do it.

Senator Horst: “To provide advice and consultation on any budget decision which would affect funds for curriculum development.”

Dr. Hurd: They don’t do that either.

Senator Horst: “To communicate to the university community curriculum developments on and off campus.” There’s a lot of these general things. So, we can send it back to Rules.

Senator Garrahy: So, you have committees, and the committees are made up of colleagues who’ve been elected across their constituents and they make a recommendation based on their expertise—I’m talking about the UCC, this is just an example, but just in general the format of how we do this with shared governance—so, the committee works on their proposal and recommendation and gives a rationale. I’m trying to figure out how we come back with, “no, you can’t do that.” That’s what I need clarification on.

Senator Horst: Yeah. Sure. For everything, the final approval is at the Senate stage. So, the University Review Committee has the ASPT documents, and our job is to talk with them about their proposed changes, but we actually approve it. We approve all the curricular items on the consent agenda. We are the final stop in the approval process. They are all reporting to us. Right.

Senator Garrahy: So, is the University Curriculum Council primarily an undergraduate review committee for undergraduate curriculum?

Dr. Hurd: Yes.

Senator Horst: But the charge isn’t matching that.

Senator Cline: Is it possible when you’re reading off those elements of the charge if we inserted the word undergraduate, whether or not they do it, but review trends of undergraduate education. Right. If we inserted that into the charge would that make it okay. I guess I’m concerned, sort of like Deb, this has now come twice from the same body with the different leadership each time and they are seeking it again. I think we need to take it seriously that they have now twice through shared governance brought it up again. I just wonder if we could make an adjustment to the charge by including the word undergraduate.

Senator Horst: And take out all the global language. It makes it sound like the University Curriculum Committee and then basically anything of that level is going to go to the Academic Affairs Committee, because that would be the committee to address it.

Senator Cline: Right.

Senator Nikolaou: But then all the graduate programs and courses, they are not going to be coming to us anymore.

Dr. Hurd: They don’t come now.

Senator Cline: They don’t come currently. I mean, that’s a separate issue to discuss.

Senator Garrahy: And that might be another conversation, is do we have a Graduate Curriculum Committee?

Senator Cline: Right. But they don’t report now. Those things don’t come to Senate now.

Senator Nikolaou: Are we sure? Because they do appear in the consent agenda, some of the graduate programs. Maybe not the courses, but the programs do appear.

Dr. Hurd: Senate has to sign off on them but there’s no other review.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. And that was my main question. Because right now, the UCC says in the description that “all areas of the curriculum,” which means undergraduate and graduate. If that changes and says undergraduate areas of the curriculum it means that these new graduate programs are not going to come to Senate for approval.

Senator Cline: Who sends those graduate programs to the Senate for approval?

Dr. Hurd: The GCC.

Senator Cline: So, the GCC is sending them. So, if we change the charge of the UCC that’s not going to affect that flow of graduate courses coming to the Senate for review.

Senator Nikolaou: It will because now there is not going to be a link between Senate and the graduate.

Dr. Hurd: The Senate still has to sign off on all of them. So, GCC and UCC are operating in parallel. They’re going through the same process and everything, it’s just that UCC is a committee of the Senate and GCC is not.

Senator Horst: We need an understanding with the Graduate Curriculum Committee about what needs to go through the Senate, so we have a clear hook on to anything that we think deserves our review. You don’t want to pull away this language because you’re afraid that that will sever that connection. So, we need to establish clear connection with the graduate curriculum process.

Senator Nikolaou: Right. So, for example, the Graduate Curriculum Committee says they are going to add something in their functions saying it’s going to be coming to the consent agenda, that would be an option.

Senator Horst: We reviewed their bylaws.

Dr. Hurd: Yeah. That’s all in their bylaws.

Senator Nikolaou: But is it explicitly in there? Because I don’t remember seeing it in there.

Senator Horst: That’s why I’m wondering if this should go to the Academic Affairs Committee maybe at the same time? Because it seems like how we reviewed grad curriculum is decided before we X-out this language.

Senator Nikolaou: I’m perfectly fine with the UCC becoming the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. It’s just I’m worried if it changes without creating a new link between the GCC and the approval process from the Senate. They do say right now they follow pretty much the same process for the curriculum proposal. So, if you go to the website, they’re pretty much doing the same process. But if we change the language from the “procedures should be followed from all” to “procedures should be followed from undergraduate programs then it means that the Graduate School might say, “okay, we’re going to come with a totally different process,” and it might not make any sense.

Senator Cline: So, we review their Bylaws, but we don’t write their Bylaws?

Senator Horst: No, but we review them and approve them.

Senator Cline: Right. So, they couldn’t sneak up behind us, so to say. But you’re suggesting that maybe we need to impress upon them to change their bylaws to include some explicit language that they won’t be exempt from review by the Senate for these program changes.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. To make it clear that we are fine with changing them to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, but the previous purview was about the courses and the procedures, it should now be in your own Bylaws.

Senator Horst: How about we do this, we send it to Rules, but we tell them to pause until we actually work on this grad part. And I can communicate with her so she can understand that we’re actually willing to change the name, we just want to make sure we’ve established relationship with the graduate curriculum process.

Senator Nikolaou: And it might be as easy as taking the language from the UCC and putting it into the GCC. And instead of undergraduate they say graduate. It’s just that they need to go through the Graduate Council to approve it.

Senator Horst: Yeah. Amy and I did it last time. It was not that simple. Alright. I’ll communicate with Mary. It’ll go to Rules, but we’ll pause until we get this grad part worked out.

Senator Stewart: I’m just going to admit that I still have reservations about the restriction of the UCC to undergraduate only, but I think there’s a value to having some committee somewhere that looks at the curriculum as a whole. Especially when we’re going to have more accelerated master’s degrees that are going to have an undergraduate component and a graduate component. And the way this is pushing, it’s going to be college level committees that are the highest level, looking at an integrated proposal.

Dr. Hurd: Well, UCC does, because accelerated degree programs are undergraduate in nature. They are just editorial changes at the graduate level. So, the UCC does deal with them.

 ***05.06.21.02 From Susan Kalter: Email Proposed Changes to Structure of Senate Membership (Dist. to Rules Committee)***

***03.19.21.03 From Susan Kalter: Senate chair on Planning and Finance no more proposal (Dist. to Rules Committee)***

***09.07.21.02 From Civil Service and A/P Council: Email Civil Service and A\_P Council rep on Exec (Dist. to Rules Committee)
09.07.21.04 From Civil Service and A/P Council: Staff Senate Representation Letter (Dist. to Rules Committee)***

***08.19.19.10 University Governance Structures 2019 (Currently in Rules)***

***09.08.21.01 Illinois State University Constitution Article V***

Senator Horst: We have Bylaws proposals. We have proposed Changes to the Structure of the Senate Membership. Proposal that Planning and Finance doesn’t include the Senate chair. An extensive proposal, and they wish that this is the updated proposal, and we should ignore the letter, Todd, from three years ago. This is now their new proposal from Civil Service and A/P Council. We also gave some background material which includes some research that Cera did on different governance structures at different universities, and also what is currently in the Constitution. Lots of people have lots of opinions on the Bylaws and it falls under the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee. Send it to the Rules Committee? Alright.

Senator Garrahy: Do you have a timeframe? Just a guestimate? Because in all honesty, this has been an A/P and Civil Service conversation for a while. I know it’s called the Academic Senate and that the history, my understanding, is that our students became members of the Academic Senate under President Bowman, I believe. Is that correct?

Senator Horst: No. This actually—I was just reading it today—this current makeup is from like 2001.

Senator Garrahy: Okay. So, that wasn’t Bowman?

Senator Horst: No.

Senator Garrahy: Okay. Well, what I’m saying is, having been on both sides of that, a faculty representative and having been an A/P service member I get what they’re saying. That, yes, we might need a longer table. So, I just wonder what the timeframe might be? Do you think that is something we would get to this year?

Senator Horst: You know, it would be a major Constitutional rewrite. It would be a major Bylaws rewrite. It would be a big lift, and anything like that…so Todd has formed this little sub-committee just to look at the Bylaws. Because just for history, the Bylaws were typed in all hard returns on a manual typewriter and that’s what existed until five years ago when David Marx, Susan Kalter, and I did a heavy lift and we wrote the Bylaws to match what we did in the Senate. But it’s just difficult to address the Bylaws and address the Constitution. It would take a major effort and Rules Committee just starts addressing other things. It’s just hard to get to.

Senator Garrahy: I absolutely get that. But I do think we’re talking about 2,500… I forgot what the statistic was that Stuart sent us, you know that there are 2,000 people that comprise A/P and civil service and they’re asking us to have equal representation.

Senator Horst: Yeah. And they also have a A/P Council and Civil Service Council.

Senator Garrahy: With one person representing each body. Right. So, we’re at two people who represent them.

Senator Horst: Yeah. So, it would take a Constitutional rewrite, which can be done. It was done when they wrote the Constitution back 20+ years ago.

***09.09.21.06 From Faculty Affairs Committee: Faculty Affairs Committee items***

***SpousalHiringExecMinutesExcerpt2014-03-17***

***09.26.14.04 - SpousalHiringPolicyEmail2014-09-25***

***06.07.17.01 Email from Senate Chair- Title IX incident at Boston College***

***08.08.16.01 UsesAndAbusesTitleIX(corrected)Email2016-08-08***

***05.21.18.01- Faculty Insurance Statute email***

***04.11.13.02 - FinancialExigency-BlueBook First Revision***

***07.27.15.01 - FinancialExigency-BOT-Reviewed2015-07-27***

***07.27.15.02 - FinancialExigency-AAUPSum2015-07-27***

***07.27.15.03 - FinancialExigency-Timeline2015-07-27***

***08.29.19.01 Financial Exigency Committee BB Mark up Alt Revision***

***08.29.19.03 - Policy 3.3.10 TerminationNotificationPolicy-RevisedBySK2015-10-26***

***08.29.19.02 Policy 4.1.9 Disestablishmnet of AcadUnitRevised 2015-11-20***

Senator Nikolaou: So, we went over the proposed items to be removed. We talked about the Spousal Hiring policy. The first thing is because this is a longer-term policy and because of the comments that were made in 2014, the recommendation was that if we developed a Spousal Hiring policy this might mean that they need to be created as specific stock position within the Provost office. That it is a more longer-term change. And at the same time, the recommendation over here talks about spousal hiring. It doesn’t refer explicitly to faculty-faculty hiring. It might be that I’m hired and my spouse wants to work at the University but is not faculty. So, it might be faculty-staff. Or it might be staff-staff. Or A/P-faculty, which ever combination.

Senator Horst: Provost Everetts mentioned that she used to work to place people at local universities. That was another idea that could be proposed at some point.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. And because this is more of a long-term policy, and because it’s not faculty specific, we propose to remove it from our Issues Pending. Then we said this would be a good idea to send to the Planning and Finance, if it is something that down the road they want to investigate more. If they want to create a spousal hire policy. But that was just a recommendation that we had. Then we had Title IX. We are always waiting for changes in Title IX, to change it we just need to abide by what they say.

President Kinzy: Title IX just changed.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. And I think that item is also in Academic Affairs.

Senator Horst: This is an article from 2016.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. So, this is obviously an outdated article. We have the Faculty Insurance Statute that was mainly by a state mandate. The recommendation was if the Faculty Affairs Committee wants to write a Sense of the Senate resolution, but we also don’t know who the person is who proposed that. So, we didn’t feel comfortable as a committee to investigate writing a Sense of the Senate when we don’t know who and why they wanted it.

Senator Horst: In 2018.

Senator Nikolaou: And, again, because it is a state mandate according to Janice’s response. There is nothing we can do about that part. That’s why we are proposing to remove this one. The Financial Exigency, based on our Issues Pending it says it was held with Susan and Larry Dietz because they were talking…

Senator Horst: Yeah. I brought it up in like 2013 and then it stalled.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. So, we actually said it’s perfectly fine because the main concern was that if we talk about the Financial Exigency Committee and we change the definition it would require a change in the governing document of the Board of Trustees. And when I was reading the minutes, I remembered that Larry Dietz was saying that we should have Senate approval before we send it to the Board of Trustees for a change in the document. But then we were talking we were saying, well, it does make sense for us to propose to the Board of Trustees to change their governing documents.

Senator Horst: So, it’s an issue that didn’t get much traction. I think this body actually recommended that this be removed, and you agreed with all of it?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. But our question for Financial Exigency, because when we were sent the different items there were two policies (3.3.10 and 4.1.9) that were included as part of the Financial Exigency discussion, but these two policies are from 2013 so they are in their review cycle. So, if we remove the Financial Exigency, we should still review these two policies.

Senator Horst: You want to keep them on your list?

Senator Nikolaou: Yes. They should have been reviewed and that’s why we request to remove the Financial Exigency but maintain the other two policies because they need to be reviewed.

Senator Horst: And just because I was the one that brought all this up, one conversation I had with Joerg Tiede back in 2013 was the definition of unit. He’s the AAUP guy who reviewed these policies, and he was a bit concerned that you don’t want to… you know, are you talking about a department or are you talking about a sub-department. There have been universities that actually try to say, like, “you three people are the French unit. We can do away with you.” So, he though we needed a little bit tighter language regarding departments, sub-departments, and units. Unit was a little bit too general. So, these will be removed from the Issues pending list for Faculty Affairs except for 3.3.10 and 4.1.9. Okay.

***Information only- for upcoming meetings starting September 27:***

***09.03.21.03 From Martha Horst: Email Policies on policy review list (Non-Senate)***

***09.03.21.04 From Director and Title IX Coordinator Jeff Lange: Fw Senate Policy Review (Non-Senate)***

***09.09.21.01 From Associate Vice President and Chief Human Resource Officer Janice Bonneville: Senate Policy Review (Non-Senate)***

Senator Horst: So, the final thing is that I’ve been discussing our policy review list that was created. The way it used to be was that the President’s office would send policies to the Senate for review, the way I understand it. And then that somehow broke down through the Flannagan era. As a result of that the Senate took upon itself to create its own list that are under Senate review. That process took us several years, and we went through every single policy, like three Execs maybe. We would look at every single policy and say, “this is Senate, or this is not Senate.” So, based on that that’s how we have the table. I think in general it’s good that we are the ones in charge of feeding ourselves policies to review because I’ve been looking at it and prioritizing policies I think are timely. But as a result of that process, I’m wondering, and so is Lisa Huson and Janice Bonneville, if we caught up too many policies in that net. We just basically finished the creation of this policy review document two or three years ago. One thing that I’m concerned about is the amount of workflow that we’ve created for ourselves. So, in the next couple of meetings I have some correspondences with a list of policies that they’d like us to reconsider whether or not they’re Senate or non-Senate. We can always declare something to be in the academic area broadly understood even if it’s not on our list. But if something’s on policy review it means we’re committing to reviewing it ever five years. These three correspondences are just lists of policies that we’re going to go through and make a determination whether or not we definitely want to keep them on the list. I just gave that to you as information. I didn’t want you to start reading all the policies for this meeting. So, Cera and I will pick two or three for each meeting to go through.

***Adjournment***

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

**Attendance**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SENATE****REPRESENTATIVES** | **Attendance** | **MOTION:** | **MOTION:** | **MOTION:** |
| Name |  |  |  |  |
| Cline, Lea | Present |  |  |  |
| Garrahy, Deb | Present |  |  |  |
| Horst, Martha | Present |  |  |  |
| Kinzy, Terri\* | Present | NV | NV | NV |
| Miller, Chloe | Present |  |  |  |
| Nikolaou, Dimitrios | Present |  |  |  |
| Otto, Stacy | Virtual |  |  |  |
| Small, Maddy | Present |  |  |  |
| Spranger, Avery | Present |  |  |  |
| Stewart, Todd | Present |  |  |  |
| Dr. Amy Hurd (sub Tarhule, Aondover) \* | Present | NV | NV | NV |
| Villalobos, Rodrigo | Present |  |  |  |