**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

**MONDAY, March 28, 2022**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

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

***Public Comment:*** None.

***Oral Communication:***

Senator Horst: I’d forwarded Eduard’s comments to Eric Hodges. I received a response that I can read later when we get to that item.

I want to remind everyone that we’ll be having a meeting about the Presidential Commentary, and we’ll be doing that in Executive Session on April 25. The material is in the Senate office. Cera is working from home now, so if you would like to come in the Senate office, you have to email me and make an appointment.

Legal has reviewed the new wording for 5.1.5 and they are okay with it. I just had them (remember I said on the floor that you’re taking out the language saying that we have some discretion when we’re drinking alcohol) include some language that basically says it is if you’re unsafe, and it was from the public civil service code. So, they’ll be forwarding that.

Wendy Smith is reviewing the audit finding and the policy 2.1.21 Academic Standing. She’s taking over for Alice Maginnis. The plan is that she’s going to finish that by April 7th so we can have it on exec on the 11th, and it can get on the agenda on April 20th. Old Senate will do an Information Item and then new Senate would do an Action Item, but that’s just the way it’s going to be. People could also do a move to Action on the 20th if they want.

***Distributed Communications:***

***From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: (Advisory Item 4/6/22)***

***03.24.22.01 Academic Calendar 2022-2031 AABC Approved***

[***1.11 Academic Calendar***](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/conduct/1-1-11.shtml)

Senator Horst: This is from the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee, the Academic Calendar. This is adding Juneteenth and the one Election Day holiday. It’s been vetted by HR and the Provost office. Per this policy, we now review it just as an Advisory Item.

***From Provost Tarhule: (Dist. to ?)  
02.28.22.03 PIE Grant draft and comments from Deans  
02.28.22.04 PIE Pilot Program Application Final Draft  
02.28.22.05 PIE Feedback from Deans***

Senator Horst: At a meeting a while ago, the Provost asked me to forward to the Executive Committee his PIE Grant—nice name, other than RERIP—Provost Innovation and Enhancement Grant. It is building on some of the principles that were in RERIP, but now it’s a grant process, if that’s fair to say. And you asked us, the key question is, do you see any concerns about this program that infringes on academic freedom, or adversely impacts curriculum decision making? Could you just introduce the topic for us?

Provost Tarhule: Yes. Just as context, the RERIP Grant that we had had three components. Last year when we tried to do it there were some concerns at the Academic Senate about a third component. People felt that part of it might infringe on academic freedom because it might entice faculty to do things a certain way. But most of the program was essentially backward looking. So, departments were getting rewarded for doing a number of things. Maybe I can even back up one step before that. There are many departments across the university that don’t have enough money to operate. Everybody knows that. But in the current system that we have to allocate money, which is just whatever you got last year is what you’ll get next year. So, it’s very hard to give money to those departments that need it. The previous Provost before my time created RERIP, with the help of the Vice President of Finance and Planning, as a means of providing supplementary budget to those departments that don’t have enough. That’s what RERIP is.

Last year we did a little bit of a modification and added another category of factors to the things that departments would be awarded for, including things like how quickly you graduate students and so on. So, there were some concerns amongst some faculty members that this might entice faculty to do things that sort of water down their curriculum. So, in discussions with Martha and Dimitrios, we took out that component. Nobody really complained about category one and two, so we kept those, and we took out the third component that people had concerns about. And I decided that instead of giving people money as an incentive for doing that, we will convert that into a grant program. We know that there are many departments where people also say, if only I had this much money, I could do something like this, but they don’t have that. So, in this case we will convert it into a grant so that if you want to—so, it’s not us telling you, but giving you credit for doing it—but if you decide that you want to, for example, convert your class from an online class to an in-person class or vice versa. If you say, my class is not doing well, if only I could change how I teach it, but I need a little bit of money to experiment or do things differently. Then you can apply to this grant program, and you’ll get funding to do what you want. So, in this case, the motivation is coming from the faculty, not somebody telling you to do it. If they already want to do it and are looking for money, this will give them an option.

So, as we started looking at those types of things that we might support, we found it’s very similar to what I already do with the Provost Enhancement Fund. So, we said instead of having people apply to the Provost Enhancement Fund and then apply to this other grant, let’s make it one grant. So, it becomes a Provost Innovation and Enhancement Grant. Anything that you want to do to improve your program, whether it’s curriculum, whether it’s department, whether it’s how you teach, you can apply to this grant and receive some funding. So, what you have before you is the way that we structured the program. We shared this with the deans and got their feedback. We shared it with other constituents. But because of the concern last year with RERIP, we thought it made sense to share it with this group to make sure that we cross all the Ts and dot all the Is. I had promised that when we redesigned this as a grant, we would come back to this body anyway. So, it was really fulfilling that promise and making sure that we are all comfortable. And if you have any concerns, I’d like to be able to address them ahead of time. So, that’s the idea.

Senator Horst: So, I would just emphasize that this body is the scheduling committee in a way. So, the real body is the Academic Senate.

Provost Tarhule: Sure. However, you want to do it is fine.

Senator Horst: So, the question is should this go in front of the Academic Senate, or should it go into an internal committee?

Senator Spranger: It does seem to be something that people have big feelings about. I don’t have all the background information. But it does seem like something that people would have thoughts about. I just don’t know to what extent you want all those feelings. You know.

Senator Cline: So, if this goes directly to Senate then this could be passed this year?

Senator Horst: Or it could just be an Advisory Item because it’s a budget program. We could conceive of it as the faculty should be aware of it, should have an opportunity to have a conversation with the administration, and because it’s curriculum, it would be appropriate. But because it’s in the budget house, it doesn’t necessarily mean that we should be writing the text, for instance.

Senator Otto: Isn’t this really just sort of changes to two different programs that we already have, and sort of bringing those together? In that case, it seems like it’s more Advisory.

Senator Garrahy: I would agree with Stacy on that. It does seem Advisory to me.

Senator Horst: I would like to advocate for you to just forward this document to the Senate and present it like you just did, and take any questions from the faculty and students as an Advisory Item.

Provost Tarhule: I’d be happy to do, if that’s what you advise.

Senator Cline: So, we don’t need to vote on it?

Senator Horst: We’ll vote on it when we get to the agenda.

Senator Cline: I’m saying, as an Advisory Item it doesn’t get a vote.

Senator Horst: Somebody could make a motion to endorse. It will be listed as an Advisory Item.

Senator Cline: But it doesn’t require passage?

Senator Horst: I don’t think so. It’s in the budget house.

Senator Cline: I agree with you. I just wanted to make sure I understood it.

Senator Horst: It’s crossed over so much in curriculum, I think it’s important that we’re consulted. Okay. So, it sounds like you have a future date with the Senate.

***From Rules Committee: (Information Item 04/06/22)***

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

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

***03.24.22.21 WKCFA Bylaws Mark Up***

***03.17.22.01 Fine Arts Bylaws Proposed Final***Senator Stewart: I’m never quite sure how much detail to go in walking through changes. I’ll try to focus on the most significant changes. There are some changes throughout, for example, updating the name from the College of Fine Arts to the Wonsook Kim College of Fine Arts. Things like that.

The major changes. Article II. They’re going to eliminate the College Recruitment Scholarship Committee. Turns out this is being done more locally inside each school/program. So, there’s not really anything for the college level committee to do. So, it makes sense to get rid of it. They’re also eliminating the election subcommittee. This seems like a really good change. It’s because now they do voting electronically. It used to be that they had a committee that had to calculate, prepare paper ballots and do lots of Xeroxing and collating. It’s a much more streamlined process. So, this committee can go away. They also make clear that the College Council validates elections, clarifying their own procedure. It never said that before.

Article III. One of the general changes throughout this document actually is that Creative Technologies has apparently grown quite a bit within the College of Fine Arts. They are then adding a Creative Technologies faculty member and then a student member, one each, to the College Council. We’ll also see that these members are being added to other committees later on. They removed some liaison and ex-officio non-voting members from the College Council. It seems that some of these liaisons never attended even though they were invited. In other cases, the information that the member might have provided was easily available in other ways. They clarify that the faculty members of the College Council must have at least 50% appointments in the College of Fine Arts. Terms from members of a single school are going to be staggered to enhance continuity. It used to be that the members would rotate off together. That seems like a perfectly good change. Also adds that NTT, A/P, Civil Service, and student members of the Council must have taught, worked, or studied within the college for at least a full semester.

Rules actually suggested stronger change, for example, an A/P member needed to have worked as an A/P within the college for a semester. But Wonsook Kim College of Fine Arts decided to reject those proposed changes. That is within their purview.

Student members for the Council will now be found through an all-call process and then selected by the director of their school or program. The thought is that this will allow students that have an interest in shared governance to self-identify.

Finally in article III, there the absence policy has been clarified to make sure that ex-officio and directors don’t count as vacating their position just because they missed two meetings. Those members are seen as so important, and really there’s no similar stakeholder. So, that seemed like a perfectly reasonable change.

Article IV. The voting procedures have been greatly streamlined because of the move to electronic voting. It also adds a policy that a special election will take place if a vacancy occurs before a term is finished, doing away with this old policy that had very complex runner up replacement rules, and having to keep track of who got second place in an election. Now they’re going to do a special election. That also seems entirely reasonable.

Article V adds associate and assistant deans to the College Council since it’s useful to have such persons involved in Council discussions.

Article VI. Policy for how various constituencies can request that an item be put on the agenda has been added. Actually, there’s a couple of different items about that. Also, there are conditions for calling a special meeting of the College Council by petition; in particular, they have something like six different groups that could call for a special meeting. They thought it was difficult for some groups to do because of how large they were, and it was too easy for other groups to do it. So, they rebalanced the groupings. They wanted to move students as one group, and faculty and staff as another. Rules thought that that way maybe going too far the other way, and suggested that it actually should be students/faculty and then staff in a third group -- partly because there’s so many staff in the College of Fine Arts. And that was a change that the College of Fine Arts accepted.

Article VII, they basically just eliminated all sorts of policies concerning referenda. That’s because they think that the special meetings policy creates a different mechanism by way of which such things can be resolved now.

Committees. Several committee descriptions were moved from earlier in the document into Appendix A. That just makes it easier to know where you can find everything. The College Research Committee. The charge of the CRC has been updated to bring it in line with current actual practice, and a Creative Technologies faculty seat has been added to reflect growth in CT. Martha Horst actually pointed out that there is a little bit of language about a faculty members related to the Creative Technologies that need to be clarified. The bylaws don’t make entirely clear whether that needs to be a tenure track member or whether it could be an NTT. I’ve emailed Wonsook Kim College of Fine Arts about that to see what they want us to do there. That similar problem also effects the College Curriculum Committee, so I’ve asked them the same question. Now as far as the College Curriculum Committee, they’re adding one faculty and one student seat, from Creative Technologies again. It actually sets term limits, or sets the terms of CCC members, which apparently used to be completely undefined. So, that’s an important addition. It also clarifies that student members must be graduate students, and makes clear that the dean’s representative is not a voting member.

A fourth change in Appendix A is the Budget Planning and Priority subcommittee is being dissolved entirely. These functions are now just done by the dean’s office in cooperation with various directors, etc. The dean does give an annual presentation to the College Council and in various other places, ensuring that there is transparency in the process. So, they thought this committee just wasn’t needed anymore.

Appendix B deletes a bunch of templates for committee reports. The minute are going to serve that role instead, as long as the minutes are detailed enough. The director search committee description has been moved out of Appendix C and into Appendix B. Again, just a bit of reorganization.

Appendix C is now really about the Creative Technologies bylaws and how they’re going to be treated. As Creative Technologies becomes more important, right, it needs to be handled more formally so the bylaws of Creative Technologies, as they connect to other schools, are going to be treated as addendums to those school’s bylaws.

Appendix D. This appendix now concerns the selection of associate and assistant deans and new policies for searches for associate and assistant deans than have been put into then Appendix D.

Finally, to raise two issues that were raised by Rules but ultimately rejected by the Wonsook Kim College of Fine Arts, first off Article 5 concerning officers as written actually implied that the Executive Committee of the College of Fine Arts might contain no faculty members at all, because it allows that A/P or Civil Service members could be elected to both officer positions. This struck Rules as being a little bit odd, so we said, “Hey, you may want to mandate that one of those officer positions must be faculty to make sure there are faculty on the Executive Committee.” But the College of Fine Arts did not accept that proposed change. The second revisions suggested by Rules that I think is important to mention, that was also rejected, was that both the College Research Committee and College Curriculum Committee language has been revised to say that faculty members will be appointed to the committees by the dean in consultation with directors. The old language had been that members had to be approved by the College Council. Rules at least suggested that we thought that the old language was better for shared governance, and we recommended returning to it, but the College of Fine Arts did not accept that and wants to proceed with the current language. That’s my summary. I hope I gave enough detail.

Senator Horst: Very good. Thank you. So, all the college bylaws go through the Academic Senate, as per instructions in the Constitution. So, this has taken Rules at least a year to work on this.

Senator Stewart: Yeah. Rules did a first pass edit, maybe last year. But certainly, it was our first item of business this fall. We spent several meetings on it. We sent a big packet of questions, comments, potential suggestions to the College of Fine Arts. They then responding accepting some of the changes and rejecting others that I just touched on, a couple of things they rejected.

Senator Garrahy: Those were some pretty significant changes, so kudos to you for getting through all of them.

Senator Nikolaou: I told him my mark up is <inaudible-laughing> I’ll sent him my mark up.

Senator Horst: Okay. So, you have some editorial changes.

Senator Nikolaou: Yes.

Senator Horst: Okay. Anything else about the College of Fine Arts Bylaws?

Senator Cline: Thank you for all that work.

Senator Horst: Yes. It’s a great achievement, and it is important that this college is sending the bylaws to the Senate. Not all of the colleges are doing that at this time.

***From Academic Affairs Committee: (Information Item 04/06/22)***

***03.24.22.02 Test Optional Admission Policy New Policy***Senator Cline: So, XXX. This is as close to fun as we’re going to get. We’ve got the drinking and the smoking and the skateboarding. The yet unnumbered Test Optional Admission policy was an item given to the Academic Affairs Committee on our Issues Pending list at the beginning of the year, given that state law had changed having to do with the use of ACT/SAT scores and admission for Illinois students to Illinois institutions. We had Jana Albrecht and Legal put together this language based on the Act. And we had a couple of massages to the actual language. A significant one was that they basically lifted from the new state law, but the state law, of course, stipulates that Illinois resident students should not have any of their score used at admissions. But we actually took that out and just say that students shouldn’t, whether they are out of state or in state. That comports with what we are doing now, but it seemed important to change that in a policy to make sure that we’re not setting up a chance that we could have a separate form of admission and requirement for an out of state students verse in state students. It’s only 3% of our populations but it seemed important. So, what you have here is the Legal language. This was reviewed by Legal before and after.

Provost Tarhule: Can I ask a question? Since you dived into this I don’t remember, did they forbid this use of this test for scholarship awards?

Senator Cline: It’s for admissions. My guess would be that students are going to stop taking them. So, using them for financial aid, merit-based scholarships would be problematic if most students are going to cease to take them.

Provost Tarhule: Right.

Senator Horst: It’s a good question.

Senator Cline: I don’t think the law stipulates that, but I think that we would just come up with the mechanical issue that students aren’t taking.

Provost Tarhule: I don’t know how many of you know, but our financial aid went up $8-$9 million this past year because of this law.

President Kinzy: Because of the inability to use test scores.

Provost Tarhule: Our total cost for financial aid went up $9 million because of this test option.

Senator Horst: Because we’re not using tests?

President Kinzy: We lost a piece a data in determining…

Provost Tarhule: In the past, if you’ve got a GPA of 4 and your ACT was low 20, you got a different band of scholarship. Or if your GPA was this and your ACT, you got a different kind of scholarship. Without this everybody at 4.0 GPA gets exactly the same. That shot up our cost by $9 million. And in fact, we have no mechanism now for figuring out how to further differentiate within those scholarship funding. It’s amazing how some of these things that you don’t think about are implications, but behind it it’s…

Senator Spranger: Is that something that would be worthwhile to talk to like the government about?

Senator Horst: What a great idea.

President Kinzy: I’ll tell you what they’ll say though. They’ll say that that’s the exact reason they got rid of it; is that there’s inherent bias in those tests and it was disadvantaging students. It’s an equity issue. So, they would probably come out with a law that says make sure you don’t use them for scholarships.

Provost Tarhule: Except that we didn’t anticipate a $9 million increase in one year due to a policy that seems to be totally innocuous and has nothing to do with financing. But our cost just went up.

Senator Spranger: I think more financial aid is a good thing on paper. I know where you are coming from but I’m thinking that if we say, “Hey, this is a policy that you passed, and it had a $9 million implication for us.” I don’t know. It could be worthwhile.

Senator Cline: An unfunded mandate from the government is not an unknown phenomenon, right.

Senator Spranger: I know.

Senator Cline: I would just say that this is really restricted to just admissions, so it doesn’t affect any other rules that you might make.

Provost Tarhule: But Martha’s point is a good one, because people will stop taking it if they don’t need it for admissions. So, we still can’t use it for financial aid.

Senator Cline: Unless you say that that’s required for financial aid consideration. So that’s different.

Senator Horst: If we can focus here. We have an agenda with 15 items on it. So, the question is, is this ready to go on the agenda? And the Provost can consider some other way of differentiating the financial aid applications in a different way. Everybody satisfied by this? It’s dictated by the Higher Education Fair Admissions Act.

Senator Cline: Yes.

Provost Tarhule: Sorry about that.

Senator Horst: It’s a good conversation we can have on the floor.

***From Planning and Finance Committee: (Information Item 04/06/22)***

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

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

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

Senator Horst: The Planning and Finance committee looked at policy 4.1.5 Organizational Change. They did not recommend any changes. They just changed the date.

***From Planning and Finance Committee: (Information Item 04/06/22)***

***03.24.22.04 Email from Vogel\_ Policies for Exec***

***03.24.22.25 Policy 3.4.7 Employment for Teaching Purposes of Administrative\_Professional Personnel Current Copy***

***03.24.22.27 Policy 3.4.7 Employment for Teaching Purposes of Administrative\_Professional and Civil Service Mark UP***

***03.24.22.06 Policy 3.4.7 Employment for Teaching Purposes of Administrative Professional and Civil Service Personnel CLEAN COPY***

***NEW POLICY: 03.24.22.05 Policy 3.6.27 Employment for Teaching Purposes of Administrative Professional and Civil Service Personnel CLEAN COPY***Senator Horst: From the Planning and Finance Committee. This policy 3.4.7 was up for policy review. It went to the Planning and Finance Committee. There was a request from Associate Vice President Janice Bonneville to include Civil Service in the policy and make it clear that it’s an A/P policy and a Civil Service policy. She also proposed that we have the exact same language under two places in the policy manual. 3.4 which is the A/P. And then 3.6 which is Civil Service. So, whatever we pass as the language will be duplicated in the other policy website. It’s been through the A/P Council and the Civil Service Council, and pass the Planning and Finance Committee.

Senator Nikolaou: My first question is, “Why are Civil Service in this policy and not keep it A/P specific, and then add the new policy that is CS specific?” Because now, I can see why they say to put it under 3.4 and 3.6. But if it is under 3.6, it should talk only about Civil Service, not about A/Ps because that is the classification.

Senator Horst: Yeah. I had a similar concern that when this policy comes up for policy review, how will people know to look at both policies simultaneously? So, I was thinking it should say related policy on the one and related policy on the other one. And if you have both of the names on there, it suggests to go look at the other policy. But maybe it almost needs a line saying, this policy should match policy blank. So, we know to look at both policies simultaneously, if you see what I’m saying. You don’t want one to get out of date with the other.

Senator Nikolaou: Or it could be the one that we usually say for Civil Service, please refer to policy that. Because right now we say that they are going to be the same. It doesn’t mean that in the further A/Ps and CS are going to be exactly the same. So, it might be that they actually need to have two different policies but now if we put them together, we don’t have that flexibility if something happens in the future.

Senator Horst: Okay. So, the first suggestion is to delete “and Civil Service” and delete “A/P” over in the 3.6.27.

Senator Garrahy: Martha, I have a question. So, was the addition of Administrative/Professional and Civil Service added? Because over the last couple of years many A/P positions have transitioned to Civil Service. So, I’m wondering if that’s why it’s been added. That these Civil Service positions in question where Administrative/Professional and it’s been a change. And that was, if I remember correctly, HR had to do that because of something at the state level.

Senator Horst: Sure. Janice is better to answer that, but there are Civil Service personnel who are assuming these duties.

Senator Garrahy: Right.

Senator Horst: So, she also just wanted it to be clear that you’re not a Civil Service person working under an A/P policy. But that very well could be the motivation. But I don’t know. So, I could get back to them. So, the first suggestion is to have different names. What about adding some language referring… like see policy blank and see policy blank, referring back and forth to the different policies?

Senator Stewart: I like that idea.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. Another question, because they start and they say that you cannot teach during your regular scheduled times and days, but at the same time, if your supervisor agrees then you can. So, I was not clear. If you say that if the unit supervisor agrees, pretty much the exception is going to become the rule. Because in paragraph two and three it says pretty much that you cannot teach between 8-4:30 p.m. because that’s your regularly schedule time. But then in the last paragraph on the first page they say, the teaching assignment could fall outside of the employers if x, y, z happens.

Senator Horst: Right. So, it gives you a mechanism.

Senator Nikolaou: Well then, what they just said at the beginning it does not apply. So, it didn’t seem that there was a link over there.

Senator Horst: So, just to get back on track. This is a question for Janice because there are Civil Service laws. I don’t really know all the things that govern Civil Service.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. And all these are questions for her. Yeah. Or are there any limitations, when they talk about summer, that first we need to make an offer to a tenure track faculty to teach, and then we need to move to the NTTs, and then move to the A/P and CS? Or there is no such limitation? So, would someone decide and say, well, during the summer I’m going to give all the courses to A/Ps and CS and to none of the faculty?

Senator Horst: And why are you thinking summer is different? It says it should follow the same procedure but will be categorized.

Senator Nikolaou: Or even during the regular semester.

Senator Horst: it says A/P and Civil Service employees should not be utilized in teaching to displace members of the departmental faculty.

Senator Nikolaou: But if it is during the summer, departmental faculty are not under contract.

Senator Horst: They could be.

Senator Nikolaou: That’s what I’m asking, because there is no provision over here. Because it means that someone might decide to offer the summer courses.

Senator Horst: But then it says it follows the same procedure. The summer and winter teaching assignments should follow the same procedure.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. But it wouldn’t displace because in essence you are not under contract.

Senator Horst: I see. So, you’re not displacing because you don’t have a place.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. And that’s why I’m asking. Is there like an intention where it says you need to offer it first to faculty, tenure track or non-tenure track, or if it is an A/P or a CS needs to be like a specialist in that area and they should teach over faculty.

Senator Horst: Okay.

Senator Nikolaou: and, Martha, it might be that it’s already the case.

Senator Horst: Okay. So, any other items to follow up on this one?

Senator Stewart: Very minor. So, this is the third paragraph. It says the request must also be approved by the employee’s primary position supervisor staff administrator/department head, and I wasn’t sure if department here meant academic department or if it meant something else.

Senator Horst: I think it means something else.

Senator Garrahy: It does. It has in the past. Because I was a director I had to sign off on these. I was not a chair of a department. So, yeah.

Senator Stewart: Good.

Senator Garrahy: It did at the time.

Senator Stewart: Okay. Yeah.

Senator Horst: It doesn’t mean school department.

Senator Garrahy: No.

Senator Stewart: That’s what the issue was if we needed school in there but apparently not. Good. Thank you.

Senator Horst: And then the other thing is this was an interesting one, the appropriate college dean or appropriate administrator, that was thrown in because of the Honor’s college. If there’s teaching in the Honors College, the Honors director would sign off on it and not necessarily a college dean. Okay. So, I have the title, the policies- just clarify one is one and one is the other, I have added a reference to the policy and the other policy so that people in the Senate in the future know that these policies are linked and they want to look at those other policies. I have the question about summer teaching and whether or not there’s going to be first offering to faculty and NTT first because they’re not on contract. So, they’re not being displaced.

Senator Nikolaou: I’m thinking mainly in terms of NTTs that have status.

Senator Horst: Okay. Right. I will forward those questions to Senate Vogel, who is the chair of the committee. We can talk about whether it should be on the agenda later.

Senator Cline: Can I role back the tape a little bit, back to our policy that I just did a little bit ago? I got an email from Teri Hammer that raised a question for me. Test Optional Admissions. She’s suggesting that the policy be number 2.1.3. What raises my question is that she says that she would like to make the current 2.1.3, which is medical entrance requirements into 2.1.3a. So, do we need to companion a numerical change to the current 2.1.3 to this one? Put them together.

Senator Horst: Because it would be a change to the naming policy. So, 2.1.3 would be a Medical Admissions Requirement, the tuberculosis part, that would be a, and this would just be 2.1.3.

Senator Cline: Yeah. Correct.

Senator Horst: And we could put those together, if people are comfortable with that, when we get to the agenda.

President Kinzy: Why does she want to change them? Because that means you’ve got to change them everywhere they’re posted on the website.

Senator Cline: I can say she says, since they both relate to admissions of students.

Senator Nikolaou: But are we talking about 2.1.3, you said?

Senator Cline: She suggests 2.1.3. the current 2.1.3 is Medical Entrance Requirements.

Senator Nikolaou: But then the first sentence says, Pursuant to state law blah blah blah required to provide proof of immunity according to law… who are enrolled in an on-campus class. It doesn’t say for admission to the university. It says if they are enrolled in classes. It’s not the same as the admissions requirement. So, I don’t see why that’s a subcategory of Test Optional Admission.

Senator Cline: So, are we rejecting her suggestion? Just tell her to come up with another number. I guess she’s trying to couple them together.

Senator Small: I think if that one doesn’t have anything about admissions, if it’s about just being enrolled, it’s not necessarily related.

Senator Horst: So, we’re rejecting the legal number?

Senator Cline: I will share my concerns. For now, we won’t use a number.

Senator Horst: We’ll call it XXX still.

Senator Nikolaou: And the biggest thing is what the President mentioned that we’d need to change it everywhere.

Senator Horst: They should all be linked, and update automatically, but that’s another thing.

***From Rules Committee: (Information Item 04/06/22)***

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

***03.24.22.18 Policy 1.10 Security and Confidentiality of Data and Information - Mark Up***

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

Senator Stewart: This has been on the Issues Pending list for seven years. It came up in the fall and we tried to do an editorial change, and this committee rightly pointed out, no. you have to do more than that. So, I actually did hear back from Teri Hammer today approving the final little edits that Rules had proposed, Martha, I think you were cc’d on that email. This revision was really done by the Office of General Counsel together with Charley Edamala’s group, AT. This policy needed to be very significantly rewritten. It’s no longer a Code of Responsibility as much as it is now a Security and Confidentiality of Data and Information policy. So, sort of bringing into the twenty-first century. You can see there’s lot of deletions, basically cleaning out a bunch of artifacts, getting rid of the directory information stuff. Several of the cross-linked policies got updated. Martha actually pointed out that a couple of the titles on that list were wrong. Instead of the Freedom of Information Act it should be the Freedom of Information Act Implementation Rules. Under Appropriate Use policy it should actually be Policy on Appropriate Use, so Rules will make those editorial changes. There’s period missing somewhere.

On the advice of the Executive Committee (I forgot who it was, it might have been you, Lea, but it might have been Deb) one of you had suggested that there was this huge paragraph that had a bunch of stuff buried in it about various contact information. Rules did propose turning that into a bullet point list. That was one of the editorial changes that Rules made, that Legal finally accepted. We caught that there was an area code missing, so we added the area code in. I think that’s about what I have to say. Rules didn’t feel comfortable trying to rewrite this aggressively because it just came out of Legal and AT and it’s really their thing. So, we kind of just focused on catching periods and making sure names were right. I fixed a link that was broken inside of it somewhere. Stuff like that.

Senator Horst: and Charles Edamala has reviewed this and signed off on it?

Senator Stewart: Well, the version that came to Rules, yes. Now the email that we got from Teri Hammer today said that Legal is fine with it. I haven’t heard back from Charles specifically, but he was cc’d on that email, saying hey, Rules has some final editorial changes.

Senator Otto: Just a typo thing. In the actual policy itself the a, the first and, and the first of, should be lower case. In the title.

Senator Stewart: Oh. Okay.

Senator Horst: Yeah. They are crossed out but then the “and information” is lower case. Any other comments?

Senator Nikolaou: A question is why we are deleting the director of information? Does that mean now that they can be served, or they cannot be served? So, that’s one of the questions that I had. And then when they list abcdefg why some of them are musts and some of them are mays? And then under e, when they added with university and/or department policies. But then I’m wondering, is it really department policy? Isn’t it just university policy?

Senator Horst: It could be the Registrar’s policy, but you’re saying everything would ultimately be university policy?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. So, that’s why I’m going to ask you if they had something specific in mind.

President Kinzy: Which department? Is it the IT department? Because there are department policies and then there are university policies. Not every IT policy would have to be a university policy.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. And they can tell us what they had in mind.

President Kinzy: Right. The policy that you have to change your email every 60 days is not a university policy, right. It’s an IT policy but it’s not in the policy library right. I’m thinking that’s what it means.

Senator Horst: Getting back to the directory information. I know that’s classified, contains sensitive information, so I remember a conversation with Jess Ray about that. There was concern about the directory information being on the list.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. I remember that conversation. But then if it is deleted, what does it mean? It can or it cannot be served? Because now it is not addressed at all.

Senator Stewart: It’s kind of in limbo.

Senator Horst: It’ll probably be best to have Legal answer that.

Senator Nikolaou: And then for the violations at the very end, do we need to add something for the students as well? Because now, we say could result in disciplinary action, up to and including termination of employment, and/or disciplinary action under the Student Code of Conduct up to and including expulsion from the university. So, then it is like mirroring each other.

Senator Horst: I think the Code sets the disciplinary action. And I’m not sure if it goes up to and including termination from the University. We can follow up on that one.

Senator Stewart: Okay.

Senator Horst: And most of the language says Code of Conduct, it doesn’t say up to and including termination. But the faculty one does.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. And that one for the admission it explicitly says including termination of employment.

Senator Horst: Okay. So, we have the fix of the title, that one’s easy. If you could follow up on the directory information with Legal, whether or not that can be shared. The must and the may sounds like a formal question for Legal.

Senator Nikolaou: The department, I can always ask that on the floor.

Senator Horst: Yeah. Yeah.

Senator Nikolaou: Even the last one I can just ask it on the floor if someone is there.

Senator Horst: Okay. Very good.

***03.25.22.03 NextLMS Update from Rosie Hauck and Yojanna Cuenca-Carlino***

Senator Horst: Okay. I had a request from Rosie Hauck to come to the Senate. I explained to her that we were quite tight on time, and I proposed to her that she could write a memo explaining where they are in the process and the Senate could read the memo, and then they could take questions. She has supplied the memo. I thought they could just frontload a bunch of information for the Senate and then take some questions, as opposed to last time they did a big presentation for about 20 minutes.

Senator Cline: you want this read at Senate?

Senator Horst: I’m proposing that the senators all read the memo ahead of time, and then they can come in…

Senator Cline: I thought you were saying we would read it aloud.

Senator Horst: No. the senators would read the memo ahead of time and then they could come and answer questions. So, that’s what that memo was about.

***IBHE Faculty Advisory Council March report (Advisory Item 04/06/22)***

Senator Horst: The IBHE FAC report by Dr. Lane Crothers. There’s this one item about the IBHE staff person assigned to FAC subsequently reported that the Board would soon be requiring institutions to embed the IBHEs strategic plan goals of diversity, equity, and inclusion in their program review processes. I forwarded that to Cooper Cutting. Other than that, I do note that we get this annual list of bills that are going through, and a couple of other contexts I’ve seen Jonathan Lackland present on this. I understand that at various points he’s also presented to the Senate, so it might be something the Senate could consider for the fall. Jonathan Lackland is our Director of Government Affairs.

President Kinzy: Martha, how about I ask him when is the most active time for him to update and come back to you? Like he may say the very best time when I’ll be able to tell you everything that’s happening is this date or this date based on when they are in session. Would that be helpful?

Senator Smalls: But that would be next spring?

Senator Horst: Yeah. Or maybe January. Yes. That might be better. I’m trying to avoid a presentation in the next two sessions because we have a lot to do. I do think it would be helpful for us to start hearing from him; he had lunch with me recently and it was very informative. And certainly Dr. Crothers is giving all of that information as well. But other than that, is everyone comfortable with just forwarding this to the Senate? Okay.

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

***Proposed* Academic Senate Meeting Agenda**

**Wednesday, April 6, 2022**

**7:00 P.M.**

**OLD MAIN ROOM, BONE STUDENT CENTER**

***Call to Order***

***Roll Call***

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

***Approval of the Academic Senate minutes of March 2, 2022***

***Chairperson's Remarks***

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

***Administrators' Remarks***

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

***Advisory Item:***

***Q &A only regarding memo on Next LMS - please read memo ahead of meeting***

***03.25.22.03 NextLMS Update from Rosie Hauck and Yojanna Cuenca-Carlino***

***From Provost Tarhule:  
02.28.22.03 PIE Grant draft and comments from Deans  
02.28.22.04 PIE Pilot Program Application Final Draft  
02.28.22.05 PIE Feedback from Deans***

***From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee:***

***03.24.22.01 Academic Calendar 2022-2031 AABC Approved***

[***1.11 Academic Calendar***](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/conduct/1-1-11.shtml)

***Action Items:***

***From Office of General Counsel and the Executive Committee:***

***01.26.22.02 Policy 5.1.5 Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act Drug-Free Workplace Act Policy Current Copy  
02.18.22.04 Policy 5.1.5 Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act/Drug-Free Workplace Act\_Mark Up***

***02.18.22.03 Policy 5.1.5 Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act\_ Drug-Free Workplace Act\_Clean Copy***

***From Academic Affairs Committee:***

***01.20.22.19 Policy 2.1.12 Pass/No Pass – Credit/No Credit Current Copy***

***02.24.22.02 Policy 2.1.12 Pass/No Pass – Credit/No Credit Mark Up  
02.23.22.01 Policy 2.1.12 Pass/No Pass – Credit/No Credit Clean Copy***

***From Rules Committee:***

***02.23.22.02 Policy 10.2.1 Academic Policy Review and Implementation Procedures   
10.19.21.10 Email from Legal\_ Policy on Policies***

***From Planning and Finance:***

***03.03.22.03 9.6 Policy on Student Computer Ownership Current Copy***

***03.17.22.02 Proposed 9.6 Student Access to Personal Computers Mark Up***

***03.17.22.01 Proposed 9.6 Student Access to Personal Computers Clean Copy***

***From Planning and Finance:***

***03.03.22.05 Policy 1.14 Sustainability Policy Current Copy***

***03.03.22.06 Policy 1.14 Sustainability Policy Mark Up***

***03.03.22.02 Policy 1.14 Sustainability Policy Clean Copy***

***Information Items:***

***From Rules Committee:***

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

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

***03.24.22.21 WKCFA Bylaws Mark Up***

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

***From Academic Affairs Committee:***

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

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

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

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

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

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

***03.24.22.04 Email from Vogel\_ Policies for Exec***

***03.24.22.25 Policy 3.4.7 Employment for Teaching Purposes of Administrative\_Professional Personnel Current Copy***

***03.24.22.27 Policy 3.4.7 Employment for Teaching Purposes of Administrative\_Professional and Civil Service Mark UP***

***03.24.22.06 Policy 3.4.7 Employment for Teaching Purposes of Administrative Professional and Civil Service Personnel CLEAN COPY***

***NEW POLICY: 03.24.22.05 Policy 3.6.27 Employment for Teaching Purposes of Administrative Professional and Civil Service Personnel CLEAN COPY***

***From Rules Committee:***

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

***03.24.22.18 Policy 1.10 Security and Confidentiality of Data and Information - Mark Up***

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

***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 at 8:45***

Motion by Senator Spranger, seconded by Senator Villalobos, to approve the agenda, as amended. The motion was unanimously approved.

***From: Judicial Committee of the Student Government Association (Dist. to Academic Affairs)***

***03.25.22.01 Emergency Alert System Improvement Proposal***

***03.25.22.02 Policy Proposal for Syllabus Attachment***

Senator Horst: Eric Hodges got back to me. He said, “ISU Emergency Alerts are sent out when there’s a credible, imminent threat to the campus community. Initial alerts are issued by the ISU Police Department and then the University’s Incident Management Team convenes to assess the situation and posts follow-up alerts. For certain incident types, an All-Clear message are issued to indicate there is no longer an immediate threat to the campus community. In other situations, like the recent armed robbery, the suspect was not immediately located so the final message took the form of law enforcement continuing to investigate. This is unfortunately the reality of some incidents when a suspect is not immediately located and brought into custody. The reality is that not all incidents are brought to a rapid conclusion and in those circumstances, we are unable to issue a closing alert indicating that a suspect was apprehended and in custody.” And then he goes a little bit further, but he tries to address the unique situation that was happening as to why they couldn’t issue an all clear because they couldn’t, it wasn’t an all clear.

Senator Nikolaou: I had a general question about both of the comments. Did this go through SGA?

Senator Villalobos: No. Not like officially.

Senator Small: It’s an external committee of SGA.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. So, I was thinking, why do we even have it on our agenda? Because it should have gone through SGA.

Senator Horst: Because they were public comments. He issued it as public comment.

Senator Villalobos: Yeah. It’s an external committee of which he is a member. Not a paid member of student government but he’s a member strong committee initiatives and public comment.

Senator Nikolaou: But it should go through the SGA, I’m assuming, first. And then if SGA, not only for this one but for the next one too: and then if the SGA supports it, then we decide does it go to Academic Affairs or a different committee.

Senator Horst: Any member of the public can bring something to the Senate. We can move to bounce it to SGA for instance.

Senator Cline: Or we could just move to not forward it to committee, right?

Senator Horst: Yeah. But right now, it was a formal public comment with a memo. And it was made at Senate.

Senator Villalobos: Yeah. I think the extent of it is what you’ve already done. You sent it to Eric, and he responded. I don’t know if we need to publicize the response. I mean, do you make those responses aware to…

Senator Horst: Yeah. We could forward this to the Senate.

Senator Villalobos: Yeah. I think that’s sufficient.

Senator Cline: And send it to the commenter.

Senator Horst: Yeah. Okay. I was also confused because it says Judicial Committee of the SGA. So, I was confused about that. What would you like to do about the second one regarding asking professors to attach syllabi to their course description? Would you like to bounce this back to SGA?

Senator Villalobos: Syllabi in terms of… what did he say again?

Senator Horst: Professors that have taught a certain class before should be required by Illinois State University to attach the most recent syllabus to their course description. This is essential to allow students enough time to consider the classes that best fit their career goals.

Senator Villalobos: That is not what we did.

Senator Spranger: No. No. I don’t think anyone said that.

Senator Cline: This is a sticky wicket.

Senator Garrahy: Yeah.

Senator Horst: See. I didn’t understand this.

Senator Villalobos: At first, I thought it had to do with… because we worked on some stuff in terms of syllabi, that was in terms of having mental health in that bereavement policy. This is something different.

Senator Small: This is like basically he wants to be able to see what the week by week is going to look like of a class. I talked to him about this.

Senator Cline: You’re not going to be able to do that.

Senator Small: No. But he wants to see, okay, in fall of 2021 this is what the class looked like. Just to like get an idea of it, I think.

Senator Cline: But a student can do that already by asking the department.

Senator Garrahy: Because the department have their syllabi for the courses that outline and has been approved by their department curriculum committee. And then, at least in my department, my additional information is called an addendum to the syllabus. So, that information is already there. They just have to know who to ask.

Senator Otto: I just wanted to say that this is a big can of worms, y’all. A big ol one. The ways in which public syllabi are used for political reasons, particularly by those of us who difficult and dangerous knowledges as a big part of our curriculum. We will careen down that path, I guarantee you, by putting syllabi out and making every step of every course public.

Senator Garrahy: I could not agree with Dr. Otto, 100%. As one of the people who teaches course like that.

Senator Horst: So, because this came from a student who’s in an external committee to yours, what would you recommend for this proposal?

Senator Spranger: You could recommend just bouncing him back to SGA. Because I have never met this person.

Senator Cline: He took one of my classes. I think he liked it. He’s an international student who has gotten very involved.

Senator Small: Yeah. We interned together at the States Attorney’s office.

Senator Spranger: I think if someone just explained that that’s just not going to work.

Senator Horst: But make it a formal SGA proposal or non-proposal, as opposed to your external committee.

Senator Spranger: Yeah. I don’t know if they approved that in their committee, that he could use that title.

Senator Small: That was his own passion project. I don’t think that that was a part of the committee at all.

Senator Spranger: I was going to say. I don’t think he had permission to attach the committee’s name to his work.

Senator Small: I don’t think so either.

Senator Cline: It might be an opportunity for education for SGA to know that you can ask department office and attach to every course description is a basic syllabus which discusses the basic structure. It doesn’t address the particular faculty member’s scheduling or things like that. So, maybe it’s just an educational point that that basically exists, to the point that it can be made public in advance, it does already exist.

Senator Horst: And just like a click and you find it, that’s asking a lot.

Motion by Senator Spranger, seconded by Senator Cline, to send the Proposal for Syllabus item to SGA. The motion was unanimously approved.

***From Amy Hurd: (Dist. to Academic Affairs)***

***03.08.21.01 EMAIL\_Policy 4.1.18 Transfer of Credit from Other Institutions and Credit by Examination***

***03.08.22.03 Policy 4.1.18 Transfer of Credit from Other Institutions and Credit by Examination Current Copy***

***03.08.22.04 Proposed Policy 4.1.18 Credit Earned through Transfer, Experience, and Prior Learning Mark Up***

***03.08.22.02 Proposed Policy 4.1.18 Credit Earned through Transfer, Experience, and Prior Learning Clean Copy***

Senator Horst: Any Hurd has worked with various people to review and revise policy 4.1.18 that focuses on credit for prior learning. This policy change was sparked by a public act, Early Childhood Access Consortium for Equity Act. The Act says we have to accept credit for prior learning. I spoke with her earlier, and it’s not just any experiential learning, it’s actually ones where there’s some sort of testing mechanism, like current license or certification or credential review. But the question we have right now is who to forward it to?

Senator Otto: I just wanted to ask a question about this. How did we move from a public act that gives this credit to early childhood education majors only, to offering this to everyone in the University, undergraduate and graduate? I’m asking because we discussed this as our faculty, and most of you probably know that we graduate 50% of the doctoral students at the University every year in our department. So, this is a big thing to us on the graduate side. And we really were not interested in this at all, for a lot of curricular reasons, and getting people ready to write dissertations. So, I’m just wondering how this got interpreted from this one Act to a policy for the whole institution and all programs.

Senator Horst: The way I understand it is that Amy Hurd has been working with a group of administrators from across the state to figure out how to implement the language in this Act. And this is her suggestion -- that it has to be done through a policy change. Beyond that I just don’t have the expertise. But I understand that this, I’m just going to say it, it’s making her uncomfortable, but she thinks it’s legally required because of the language in the Act. So, I’ve had a conversation where she’s like we just have to do it because of the Act. I know she’s working with her colleagues in different institutions to try to figure out how to implement the Act. Do you have any further comments?

Senator Otto: But the Act is just for this very particular major. Is that correct?

Senator Horst: Yes. But I would just assume that she doesn’t think you can have something for a particular major. But this is a great question for the committee that works on this policy. I also will note that it didn’t go through Legal yet. Are people comfortable forwarding it to Academic Affairs, after it goes through Legal?s

Senator Spranger: That makes more sense to me.

Senator Cline: Yeah. We won’t get to it this year.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. And they may be able to address Stacy’s question, if it is specific to only one major, does it need to be applied to everything else?

***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 | Excused |  |  |  |
| Nikolaou, Dimitrios | Present |  |  |  |
| Otto, Stacy | Virtual |  |  |  |
| Small, Maddy | Present |  |  |  |
| Spranger, Avery | Present |  |  |  |
| Stewart, Todd | Present |  |  |  |
| Tarhule, Aondover\* | Present | NV | NV | NV |
| Villalobos, Rodrigo | Present |  |  |  |