

Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes
Monday, March 15, 2010, 4:00 P.M.
(Approved)

Call to Order

Senate Chairperson Dan Holland called the meeting to order.

Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of February 22, 2010

Motion XXXXI-74: By Senator Stewart, seconded by Senator Fazel, to approve the Executive Committee Minutes of February 22, 2010. There were a few minor revisions that will be forwarded to the clerical secretary for the Senate. The minutes were approved unanimously, pending the incorporation of the revisions.

Distributed Communications:

02.23.10.01 *From Ed Stewart, Executive Committee Member: Sabbaticals and Pensions Concerns (Dist. Faculty Affairs Committee)*

Senator Stewart: This is something that I talked about briefly at a meeting not too long ago. A 63-year-old faculty member is going on sabbatical and then will probably teach another three years before he retires. They are going to use the last four years before his sabbatical to figure his retirement. He is wondering if there is something we can do.

Provost Everts: I talked to Chuck about this and it looks like this is a SURS requirement, so that was the issue. Evidently, it hasn't come up before because, generally, most people don't take the full year and/or that close to retirement. The only advice that they had was evidently what HR had mentioned to him as well: you need to come back for four years.

Senator Fazel: I didn't understand the 51%. How does that work?

Provost Everts: I wasn't certain of that either. This was the first I'd heard that that was even a possibility.

Senator Fazel: So it's considered more than half-time, so they buy into SURS?

Provost Everts: Is that what it sounds like for that individual?

Senator Stewart: Yes.

Provost Everts: We can certainly explore that option.

Senator Kalter: So instead of getting the matching, you put in your own money...the whole amount?

Senator Stewart: Yes, so that you can count that sabbatical year for the salary that you would have gotten.

Senator Fazel: They determine the salary on what you contribute to SURS, so it would be less money.

Senator Stewart: I think that if he buys in that year...if I wanted to retire with 20 years so that I could get my insurance, I would have to buy in three years so that I could retire at 65, because I will have only been here 17 years when I am 65. People can do that. They can buy in years. I think what he is talking about is to buy in that extra semester he's taking making that a full year so that he can count that as one of the four years.

Provost Everts: It sounds like that was what the SURS representative shared as a possibility. I can check into the 51% aspect if you would like me to pursue that.

Senator Stewart: Yes.

Ms. James: So this should not go to the Faculty Affairs Committee?

Senator Kalter: I think it should because he is asking on behalf of the faculty as a whole.

Senator Stewart: If Faculty Affairs looks into this, what effect could they have if it's a SURS rule?

Senator Wedwick: What is that you want Faculty Affairs to do?

Senator Fazel: I think if the 51% is an option, we may want to consider that.

Senator Stewart: Apparently, other universities are doing that. They are saying you can buy in to make it 51%.

Senator Kalter: Has the new HR director spoken to you about the options?

Senator Holland: Do we have a new HR director yet?

Provost Everts: I believe we do. I think that there will soon be an announcement. I think Dan's in negotiations currently.

Senator Fazel: So why don't we wait and see what happens with the 51%.

Senator Kalter: I think that they can go in two different directions. The individual case can be...

Provost Everts: Handed to someone in HR for review?

Senator Kalter: And then Faculty Affairs can take it up when they have a chance.

Senator Fazel: To do what with it, though? If it's a SURS issue, what would Faculty Affairs do about it? It is not a university decision, except for the 51%. So if it's a possibility to go that route, then I think it would be worthwhile for Faculty Affairs to look at it. I am not sure even at that point whether it would be something to look at or not. It's a SURS decision and if the university says, 'yes, we are willing to do the 51%', that takes care of the issue. If the university cannot do not do the 51%, what is the Faculty Affairs Committee going to do?

Senator Kalter: I am not really comfortable with that as a solution, though, because that means that any faculty member that has this happen is basically giving up more of his own money to fund their own retirement rather than getting matching. The real solution should be that it is the highest four of the last five years so that if a person goes on sabbatical in the middle of that, they don't get penalized or they take it out of the base salary of that year that they are on sabbatical rather than what they actually got.

Senator Fazel: I understand, but this is not something that we can decide as the Senate or as the university. It's SURS that comes from the state, so it is outside our circle of influence.

Senator Holland: About all we could do is write a letter to SURS.

Senator Fazel: Or maybe a Sense of the Senate Resolution or something like that.

Senator Kalter: Can't the Faculty Affairs Committee talk to the new HR director, maybe even next year, about the concerns and just communicate with them about this?

Senator Holland: That would certainly be worthwhile to do.

Senator Stewart: The thing that confused me a little was that it has to be the last four continuous years, but while they are on sabbatical, they are still continuously employed by the university. They are not quitting their job and doing something else. Sabbatical is part of their job.

Senator Holland: Right, but you are only getting half salary, so you are averaging in half and would get a reduced retirement.

Provost Everts: It's not a great solution, but given the SURS requirement, that was what I was told to bring back to you—that it is outside of our purview, but that was prior to my hearing that there was perhaps another option.

Ms. James: So this will go to Faculty Affairs.

Senator Holland: Yes, for next year as something that Faculty Affairs can talk to the HR director about because the new HR director doesn't start until July.

Provost Everts: I am not certain of the start date yet.

02.25.10.01 *From Jon Rosenthal, EMAS: Equitable Treatment of Students Participating in University Sponsored Activities or Service as a Volunteer Emergency Worker Policy-Revised (Dist. Academic Affairs Committee)*

Senator Stewart: This is from Jonathan's office. He sits on the Academic Affairs Committee. He said that we can go one of two ways. We can highlight it better in the current policy (Equitable Treatment Policy) or we can take it out of the current policy and make it its own policy. The rationale for doing that is that it would make it easier for the agency that comes from outside that makes sure that we are abiding by the rules to see it. It will be easier to access if it is its own policy.

Senator Holland: I appears that you have actually rewritten it.

Senator Stewart: Jonathan has rewritten it and he actually sent two ways of going about it. The Academic Affairs Committee is going to look at both those and vote for which one that they want to do.

Senator Kalter: So this is being distributed to you, not from you to us.

Senator Stewart: Yes, Jonathan pre-introduced it to us, but it has to go to through Exec and be assigned to us.

Senator Kalter: And we only got one of the two options you are saying?

Senator Stewart: Yes.

Senator Holland: Do you know what is done for the National Guard and the like? Do they have a separate policy?

Senator Stewart: No, they would be emergency volunteers. They would be considered part of this, the National Guard, ambulance, fire.

Senator Holland: Even when they go away for a year at a time?

Senator Stewart: They wouldn't be currently enrolled. They would be taking leave.

Senator Holland: I had one student, who after his 10th or 11th week was deployed.

Senator Stewart: So when he came back, you would have to allow him to make up his work.

Senator Holland: Actually, by the time you finish 11 weeks, you base the grade on that.

Senator Kalter: According to?

Senator Holland: According to policy. I didn't look it up. It was about five years ago.

Senator Kalter: Do you know where that policy is?

Senator Holland: I do not; Jonathan would know. So you are going to redo this and bring it back to us?

Senator Stewart: Yes, and we are probably going to vote by email and get back to you in two weeks. I think we are going to go with a separate policy. Anything that makes it easier for an outside agency to come in and say, 'you're doing a good job', is the way I think we want to go.

Senator Holland: The other thing is are we going to open it up for the same discussion we had the last time?

Senator Stewart: This is a separate policy. We are just taking it out of the previous policy.

Senator Fazel: And leaving the other policy as it is.

Senator Stewart: Yes, so I don't think we have to vote on that policy. Cynthia, if we are just removing this part from the Equitable Treatment Policy...

Ms. James: If you don't remove the line about emergency volunteers that is already in the Equitable Treatment Policy. There is already a line in the current policy.

Senator Stewart: We would have to take that out of the current policy because we are creating a new policy.

Ms. James: Then you would have to bring the revised Equitable Treatment Policy before the Senate again. You could leave that in there and still have a different policy.

Senator Stewart: That would actually make it easier if we can do that.

Senator Holland: It would make it easier now, but it will be confusing to somebody ten or twenty years from now.

03.03.10.01 *From Shane McCreery, Ethics Officer: Statements of Economic Interests Policy-Revised (Dist. Rules Committee)*

Senator Holland: The Statements of Economic Interests Policy is one that I think we are going to want to look at pretty carefully. There are a lot of people who will have a lot of interest in this. I don't know how much is state regulation.

Provost Everts: I believe it's all state regulation.

Senator Holland: Shane should definitely be involved in the discussion with Faculty Affairs on this one.

Senator Fazel: This is broader than for faculty.

Senator Kalter: "Anyone who is head of a department or administrator."

Senator Holland: All the way down to those who have the responsibility to procure goods and services, so anybody whose got a grant.

Senator Kalter: Does it include secretarial, because those are people who are often getting goods and services?

Senator Holland: I'm not sure who all is involved. There is a list that gets passed out to let you know that you are on it.

Senator Fazel: Would this go to the Rules Committee if it covers everybody?

Senator Holland: That's probably a good idea.

Ms. James: The policy seems to need a definition of what "economic interests" are.

Senator Kalter: Yes, when this first came up in the Senate, I thought, what are they talking about. It is really vague about what this is about.

Senator Holland: There are all kinds of things that economic interests might cover, like outside employment, if you are a consultant for somebody and the school ended up buying one of their computers.

Senator Kalter: It seems as if it should be economic conflicts instead of economic interests.

Senator Bonnell: Who is the Illinois State University Governmental Ethics Advisory Committee? I am not sure who these people are.

Senator Holland: Shane is the Ethics Officer. I think that is as far as it goes.

Provost Everts: Shane will have information and I think, given that we must be compliant, he has already sent out the letters telling us that we must pay attention to this.

Senator Holland: Who is actually going to supply the names to the Secretary of State that they need to file, because it says that they will be notified?

Provost Everts: What I have thus far has come from Shane.

03.05.10.01 *From Susan Kalter/Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Surveillance Equipment Policy-Revised (Information Item 3/24/10)*

Senator Kalter: We invited Lisa Huson, on Dan Layzell's advice, to talk to us about the Electronic Surveillance Equipment Policy, though it was so long ago, I can barely remember that conversation and this is what we came up with. You can see in that first paragraph that we strengthened the language. The second and third paragraphs are the most critical changes. This actually turned into a much bigger discussion than I thought it was going to be because I said the President has never actually informed the Executive Committee of where the equipment is each year, which is what the original policy says is supposed to happen. So we had a discussion about whether we should be enforcing the policy that is already in place or should we change the policy to conform to current practice. We ended up, as you can see, changing it to conform more to practice, but changing that a little bit.

Whereas before, it said that the President shall seek the advice and consent of the Executive Committee before he approves the equipment and has to tell us where it is and what it is being used for beforehand; now what we are asking is that the President has to consult with General Counsel and then notify the Chair of the Senate, not the whole Executive Committee, about where the equipment is going to be put. We also added a line, which said that ordinarily this isn't going to happen unless the police get involved and want the equipment there. We also added, and I can't believe this wasn't in the original policy, that it has to comply with all laws. Then the notification that we get every year that equipment is being used will be reported to us and, presumably, also then reported to the full Senate.

Then we added again a little bit stronger language that says when this equipment is no longer needed or justified, it must be removed, rather than "it will be removed". Finally, in cases where there is ongoing need for the use, we will be notifying the campus community where it is and what its purpose is, but we are leaving it up to the President to decide how. We had a back and forth again because I believe you have cameras in the residence halls in the elevators, or some of the residence halls do, so some people thought that having signs up all over the place saying that you are being watched would be frightening to parents, for example, and make them feel like this is an unsafe campus. Other people felt like it would make them feel safer as a parent. We went back and forth on that and decided we didn't need to write it into the policy and that the President and Steve Adams and others involved in this kind of decision would

decide if they should put it up on the housing website, tiny signs under each camera, or one sign as you enter each residence hall—that's up to them.

Senator Bonnell: I wonder if there is a process for that already. If you notice when you come in Milner's front door, there are stickers on the doors that say that there is surveillance equipment. I don't know if this is the same thing.

Senator Stewart: Didn't President Bowman say at one time, we are not going to tell everybody where it is because we are trying to catch somebody that is doing damage. So in certain cases, you might say that surveillance equipment is being used, but don't want to disclose the exact location.

Senator Holland: I think that is what the main policy is about. It's is the ongoing surveillance that we need to notify the campus about.

Senator Kalter: This last line is just an exception for anything that is essentially permanent where the need is continuing and sort of constantly justifiable. In general, we were sort of tightening the circle of how many people would know exactly where it was, but we wanted more than just the President and the Chief of Police to know.

03.05.10.02 *From Susan Kalter/Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Academic Calendar Policy-Revised (Information Item 3/24/10)*

Senator Kalter: This was almost entirely revised by Jonathan Rosenthal. This is, again, another policy being changed as the practice has changed. What used to happen, apparently, is that the Administrative Affairs Committee would first approve the Academic Calendar five-years out and then it would go to all of these other people on campus. I think that is a very silly way to do it because if any of those people changes the calendar, it has to come back to the Senate. So what he did was to rewrite it so that the draft goes to all of these administrative people and SGA and a bunch of other people to make sure it's working. Then it comes to the Senate.

I made a couple of changes because we had this other thing going through. We are changing the Blue Book so it won't go to the (Administrative Affairs and Budget) committee automatically. It will only come if enough people on the Senate raise questions about the calendar that it gets referred to the committee. The two changes that I made were it has to get to the Senate by March 15 so that would leave us enough time before the end of the year for any referral to happen. We have a ton of time since it's always five years out, so it's not that big a deal. We changed something in the bold in the bottom. "This matter is not subject to a general vote." So the Senate won't vote on this thing as whole. It just comes to the Senate and then if there are questions, it gets referred. "Significant issues that arise shall be referred to the Executive Committee, which shall determine if they will be referred to the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee. Should such a referral to committee occur, a draft calendar will be approved by a majority vote of the committee..." We should probably put in the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee so that it is not confusing. "...which should then include the recommended calendar as a report to the Senate." So, in other words, if people on the Senate are dissatisfied with the calendar, it gets referred to us and then we decide if it gets referred to the AABC and then they decide if there are any changes and then tell us about it.

Senator Fazel: I wasn't on the Senate at that time, but I heard that senators had heated conversations about the Thanksgiving holiday.

Senator Holland: It was not overly heated.

Senator Fazel: But at one time I remember that one of our senators actually supported the Thanksgiving holiday to be one week and that was before it was finally approved. After the University of Illinois had it, then we approved it.

Senator Holland: I was on the Senate the year we did it and I was surprised about the lack of debate about it. The students wanted it.

Senator Fazel: This happened before it was it approved and I heard that administrators actually did not like the idea and were asking senators, 'why did you vote for this?' The question I have is is that part of developing the calendar.

Senator Kalter: The Thanksgiving holiday? Absolutely.

Senator Fazel: If that is the case, then I think it should go through the Senate.

Senator Kalter: It does go to the Senate.

Senator Fazel: But basically, it is a matter of information. The Senate doesn't vote on it. In other words, the Provost's Office will develop a draft. It will go to the whole university, in terms of deans and so on. Then it will come to the Senate. We will have a conversation about it. There will be no vote. In general, I think that would be perfectly fine if we are not going to make a major change. But if, and I have heard this from many faculty, we should not have a week off one week before the semester ends, who should be discussing that? I think the Senate should be involved in discussing that rather than having, for example, the staff in the Provost's Office coming up with a suggestion to not have that week and we don't even vote.

Senator Kalter: My understanding is that currently the Senate never votes on it. Is that right, Cynthia?

Ms. James: It's an Advisory Item.

Senator Kalter: Yes, it's an Advisory Item. So the only people right now who currently vote is the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee and we almost never take a formal vote. It's just kind of talked about.

Senator Holland: It was just a policy change that the entire Senate voted on.

Senator Fazel: For Thanksgiving?

Senator Holland: Yes.

Senator Fazel: If we want to remove that, the Senate would have to vote. Where would that be in this process?

Senator Holland: I am not sure it necessarily would be. You could put it under significant concerns. It could still be covered if we did want to go back to a three-day Thanksgiving break.

Provost Everts: The way you have written that allows that with the last comment, "significant issues that arise will be referred to the Executive Committee." So if that becomes a significant issue, you have that in place as a possibility.

Senator Fazel: But it still doesn't allow for a vote of the Senate. It just goes to one committee, so could we add something to that?

Senator Kalter: This policy doesn't change the way it is in terms of what you are talking about at all. It just rearranges the order. So what you are asking is that the current language, which says, this matter is not subject to a general vote be stricken?

Senator Fazel: For major issues, such as changing the length of the Thanksgiving holiday. Definitely, in my opinion, it should come to the full Senate for a vote, not just for a conversation and then have a group make a decision about it.

Senator Kalter: Then I think we as a committee would need to decide if this has to get sent back to my committee to discuss whether we also want to strike that or if we can send this revision forward and discuss that at a different time or if we want that at all.

Senator Holland: That is the only thing I can really envision right is whether we want to move back to a three-day Thanksgiving break.

Senator Spialek: I think students like the week.

Senator Holland: Before we made the change, students typically took a week anyway. What happens now is that people start disappearing on the Thursday the week before.

Senator Wedwick: So, Susan, that line already existed in the original policy; you just added the word “general”?

Senator Kalter: I think we did add the word “general”. We didn’t actually talk about this in committee. I think Cynthia and I added the word “general” just to make it clear that it wasn’t the same as the committee vote. The committee never talked about this aspect of it. So if we want to change it, it would have to back to my committee or go to my committee as a separate item.

Senator Fazel: But if Dan says that the Senate voted on the Thanksgiving, then based on what policy did they do that?

Senator Holland: I don’t remember if it was an official policy or just saying this is what we would like to do and then we forwarded it off to the Provost’s Office saying we want to get rid of fall break day and have a week for Thanksgiving.

Senator Fazel: My suggestion is removing that ‘not subject to a vote’ and the Executive Committee could decide whether to send it back to the full Senate or not for a vote. Leave that option open.

Senator Kalter: If we want to make changes to that, we would have to send it back to my committee to talk about that. Do we want to do that or do we want to send it forward as is and then have your questions come to my committee? Do we want to hold up this change to talk about that?

Senator Fazel: Is there anything urgent about this?

Senator Holland: I don’t believe there is.

Senator Wedwick: I am not sure it’s necessary for the full Senate to vote on that. It sounded to me from Jonathan that they really can’t change anything and if it’s something like the Thanksgiving break, it would come up in the way anything else comes up. People send an email saying can the Executive Committee discuss such and such. It sounds like they are separate issues to me.

Senator Fazel: But I think the Executive Committee should be able to send to the Senate for a full vote of the Senate. That option should be available.

Senator Wedwick: What they would be sending is not a vote on the calendar, but a vote on do we want to change the way we do things. It’s not really a vote on the calendar for this year. It’s a vote on some kind of structure or something.

Senator Fazel: That’s why I was asking if they had a vote last time. Then that was against this policy.

Senator Holland: We were really not talking about the calendar per se, as to when things actually start and stop. We were just talking about do we want three days or five days off.

Senator Stewart: It was a policy on the vacation time, not the actual calendar.

Senator Fazel: Do you have any policy on that?

Senator Holland: I think it’s just information that gets fed into the calendar.

Senator Fazel: So somebody recommends to the Executive Committee and the Executive Committee forwards it to the whole Senate for discussion and a vote? Then we will communicate that to the Provost’s Office for when they are putting the calendar together?

Provost Everts: I suspect that would be the case. I am guessing that's how this happened, but I don't want to speak, because I wasn't here.

Senator Holland: I am trying to remember who was chair, either Lane Crothers or Curt White. It was a while ago.

Senator Kalter: I can say that in the three years that I have chaired this committee, we have had a conversation with either Jonathan or Amy Roser. Every single time, we always talk about Thanksgiving for about half of the session and we always get split. Half of the people or two thirds of the people want a week-long Thanksgiving; half or two thirds don't want it. So then it goes no where.

Senator Holland: If somebody wants to change it, write something up and send it the Executive Committee and we will have a debate.

Senator Kalter: I still need to know if my committee needs to talk about this. In that last line, we could say, 'should a referral to the committee occur, a draft calendar will be approved by a majority of the committee' and then instead of having it as a report to the Senate, it could be a vote of the Senate. We could change that.

Senator Fazel: If it is a significant issue?

Senator Kalter: If it is a significant issue that the Executive Committee sends to the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee and they change something and vote on it, then it would go back to the Senate. I feel uncomfortable changing that and forwarding the policy to the full Senate without taking it back to my committee.

Senator Wedwick: I still think it's a separate issue from that line you are talking about: 'the draft calendar will be approved by a majority.' Maybe it's a line that's added, 'should an issue arise that would impact a future calendar' ... Starting it that way would be a better way. Should an issue, that is referred to Exec Committee, potentially impact a future calendar, then that issue would be taken to the full Senate or something like that.

Senator Fazel: Don't you think when significant issues that arise and then it comes to Exec and then it goes to Administrative Affairs...if it gets to that point, it's a good idea to have the Senate vote on it? Because we are not talking about every year. Every year, it comes to the Senate. There is no issue. It is an Information Item, but if there are serious concerns about it, I think it's much more democratic to have the committee work on it and then bring it back to the Senate again, rather than it having the final say.

Senator Kalter: I am just concerned that we'll reopen the can of worms that this is.

Senator Holland: There is one question that needs to be answered. What is the official policy and who makes the official statement that Thanksgiving is indeed a week? We have a week in the fall, a week in the spring, Labor Day and Martin Luther King Day.

Senator Stewart: What about the break between semesters?

Senator Everts: You have set your calendar pretty much forever because you made those decisions by vote.

Senator Holland: We voted on that, but I am not sure where that information is now and who it is that can actually change it. I think we can change it. It would be the Senate that would change it.

Senator Fazel: What other significant issues are there relative to the calendar?

Senator Kalter: The two weeks that Paul Borg brought up last year about how bad it is to have only week after Thanksgiving.

Senator Fazel: That was Thanksgiving. Anything aside from that?

Senator Kalter: That's not the same as Thanksgiving.

Senator Stewart: Whether we have two days off or a week off, it doesn't change the fact that when you come back from Thanksgiving, you only have a week left unless we can move Thanksgiving.

Senator Kalter: What he was saying wasn't to move Thanksgiving, but he was arguing that the people who run grades and all of that don't really need as much time as they say they do. That is why we had Jonathan write up that nice piece that I think is attached to the other Blue Book issue because it makes it clear why they need that much time. So these are separate issues, but those are the big ones we've talked about. I think we almost never talk about spring.

Senator Stewart: You are not bumping up against coming back and then going. That's the problem.

Provost Everts: That's why you want to move Thanksgiving?

Senator Stewart: That's right, because whether it's a week or two days, you are not going to get rid of that there's only a week left when you come back in some years. So, it's where Thanksgiving falls, not how many days off you are going to get.

Senator Holland: What was the net result there? You're going to look at it again.

Senator Kalter: If I had my druthers, we wouldn't look at it again, but that is for you guys to decide.

Senator Stewart: I like the balance of having a week off in each semester.

Senator Fazel: That's not the discussion. The discussion is if something happens in the future, who should have the final say on it. Should it be a committee or should it be the full Senate if something comes up? If nothing comes up, then it just goes through the Senate without any issues and it doesn't come back to us and it doesn't go to a committee. But if it is something significant, then I think it should go to the full Senate.

Senator Holland: I tend to agree that it probably should have a full vote. I would recommend that you talk to the committee.

Senator Kalter: It is very unlikely that that will happen before the fall.

Senator Wedwick: What about if you just said, 'significant issues will be referred to Exec Committee, which shall determine whether they should be forwarded to the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee and/or the full Senate for further discussion'? Would that suffice?

Senator Fazel: For me, that's fine.

Senator Wedwick: Then the Exec Committee can decide. I just have faith in the Exec Committee that if something like Thanksgiving came up again, that they would want it to go to...

Senator Fazel: I think I would like to have the option. If it is something really significant, then we take it back to the Senate.

Senator Holland: You would bypass the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee entirely then. We would discuss it in Exec and have the Executive Committee bring it forward, though I don't like to do that. In that case, your committee could vote one way or another to allow that change.

Senator Kalter: And this was the change that Linda just suggested?

Senator Fazel: So instead of the committee, it would be the Senate.

Senator Wedwick: “and/or”

Senator Kalter: What should I do with the second sentence? Just leave that as is, because there is still nothing about the vote of the Senate in there? It still says, “this matter is not subject to a general vote.” I think this is going to be on the table for some time.

Senator Wedwick: I was only good for one suggestion.

Senator Holland: Ok, I think it will be on the table.

Executive Session:

From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Presidential Commentary Report (Distributed 2/22/10)

Motion XXXXI-75: Senator Stewart, seconded by Senator Hochauser, to move into executive session. The motion was unanimously approved.

The committee completed its work in executive session and returned to open session.

Proposed Agenda for Academic Senate on March 24, 2010:

Academic Senate Meeting Agenda

Date: Wednesday, March 24, 2010

Time: 7:00 P.M.

Location: Old Main Room, Bone Student Center

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of March 3, 2010

Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

- *President Al Bowman*
- *Provost Sheri Everts*
- *Vice President of Student Affairs Steve Adams*
- *Vice President of Finance and Planning Daniel Layzell*

Committee Reports:

Academic Affairs Committee: Chairperson Stewart

Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Chairperson Kalter

Faculty Affairs Committee: Chairperson Liechty

Planning and Finance Committee: Chairperson Fazel

Rules Committee: Chairperson Solberg

Action Items:

12.17.09.01/02 Academic Impact Fund Recommendations (Distributed in 3/3/10 Packets) (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)

02.17.10.01 Academic Impact Fund Authorizations (Distributed in 3/3/10 Packets) (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)

02.17.10.02 *Academic Impact Fund Data Dashboard (Distributed in 3/3/10 Packets) (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)*

02.22.10.01 *Academic Calendar Approval – Blue Book Revision (Distributed in 3/3/10 Packets) (Rules Committee)*

02.22.10.02 *Faculty Code of Ethics-Revised (Distributed in 3/3/10 Packets) (Rules Committee)*

Information Items:

03.05.10.01 *Surveillance Equipment Policy-Revised (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)*

~~**03.05.10.02** *Academic Calendar Policy-Revised (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)*~~

Communications

Adjournment

Senator Holland: I was contemplating inviting Phil Adams to come to give us a report about what is really going on in Springfield. I will check to see if he is available.

The Senate Agenda for March 24, 2010 was unanimously approved.

Adjournment

Motion XXXXI-77: By Senator Stewart, seconded by Senator Fazel, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.