

Spring 2-4-2015

Senate Meeting, February 4, 2015

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>

 Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting, February 4, 2015" (2015). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 888.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/888>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISURed@ilstu.edu.

Academic Senate Minutes
Wednesday, February 4, 2015
(Approved)

Call to Order

Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

Roll Call

Senate Secretary Ed Stewart called the roll and declared a quorum.

Approval of Minutes of January 21, 2015

Motion XLV-129: By Senator Thornton, seconded by Senator Whittington, to approve the minutes. The motion was unanimously approved.

01.16.15.03 Request for Endorsement: Information Technology Strategic Plan 2015 – 2018: Innovative Technologies, Engaged Partners (Mark Walbert, Assoc. VP for Academic Technologies, Matt Helm, Asst. VP for Administrative Technologies)

Dr. Walbert: This is our third version of the IT Strategic Plan. We have a coordinating team that has been working now for about two years on this. They go around campus and see what people's views are. Angela Engel, who is in PURPA, has been leading that group.

This is a new plan, but it builds on the previous two. It gets shorter each time we write it. The plan was formed by talking to a lot of different people on campus and getting a lot of information. We did an environmental scan, both internally and externally. We had focus discussions with a number of groups. We did two online surveys and we did a SOAR looking at strengths, opportunities, aspirations and results planning exercise with the Data Stewardship and IT Council. We visited several groups at the beginning and end of the writing stages. Those groups were the IT Council, the Architectural Review Council on the IT side, the Deans Council. We talked with innovative faculty, the AP Council, Civil Service Council, student ambassadors and the Student Affairs Advisory Group and local IT leaders.

The vision for IT is to leverage information technology assets to enrich students, faculty and staff in learning, teaching, research, scholarship, creative expression and public service. IT's role is to support what we do here. The values we adopted are four. Number one is collaboration. Usability is another value. Third is agility. The information technology assets need to be scalable, flexible and adaptable. We need to be able to scale up the technology services that we are offering from a small level to a campus-wide level. Preservation is important. It is a value because the university needs to protect, maintain and capitalize on its information assets.

We have four goals. The first goal is about supporting student-centered educational experiences. We want you to have all of the assets you need to get your work done available. The second strategy is to fully develop and utilize the new student information system and other information systems. We talked to you last month about the LEAPForward project and all of the different pieces that were a part of that. We want to utilize analytics to improve student outcomes. We want to take large sets of data and figure out things about what you may not know to ask. You can leverage a large data set to be able to predict student success factors. It will help students choose the right major path. And finally, facilitate accessibility by all members of the university community.

Goal 2: Support rigorous innovative and high-impact academic programs and facilitate university research with state of the art information assets and technologies. One of the strategies that supports that goal is to develop and support collaborative learning environments beyond just the classroom. One of the things that mobility has allowed us to do is create spaces in which mobile devices can come together that, particularly, students can use to promote their learning.

Second, provide information assets and technology to support a sustainable mission of consistent growth in the research enterprise. This is one of the things the cloud environment helps us to do that we could not do years ago. We need to focus on how we can assist the research enterprise in whatever way possible to both grow research that we currently don't do now because we lack the computing or storage power and to sustain it after it has started.

Finally, evaluate the creation and deployment of new and innovative curriculum delivery. It's about whatever the universities goals are for curricular delivery, we are going to be able to support that. The next strategy is to ensure appropriate instructional technology available in all scheduled learning spaces. We are at the end of the third year of a project to put similar instructional technology in all scheduled learning spaces so that we will no longer get a call in the fall with someone saying I'm in a classroom with a chalkboard, because they will all have similar kinds of technology that will be very useful for faculty. They will be similar enough that you don't have to worry about going from room to room and not knowing how to make it work. Finally, support faculty development and growth in competency and expertise in technology. Those are the first two. My colleague Mathew Helm is going to take you to the other two goals.

Dr. Helm: As we talk about the second half of the goals, we are talking more about integration and collaboration among systems at the university. So goal three gets at the integration and collaboration regarding information assets and technology throughout the university. The first one, ensure a high-performance, reliable network, we have made great strides in that regarding our server connections and also in terms of our wi-fi on campus. The more we put out there, the more people use, the more strategies we have to put in place to make sure that we have enough bandwidth to move forward. At the same time, we have to have a good plan for how we are going to integrate systems on campus.

Also, we want to enhance our communications and our partnerships among the business units. This is not only about technology, but how we can collaborate with the business units and the academic units to understand what their needs are before we even start to talk about technological solutions. We also want to make sure that we are evaluating and supporting any emerging technologies. That means a research and development effort. We need to know how it affects the different units on campus and we need to put some emphasis on training to most effectively use those resources.

The next goal has to do with enhancing the institutional effectiveness through adoption of enterprise architectural principles. We are not talking about standardizing everything; it's about planning and coming up with a collaborative approach to discuss what should our architecture look like today and in five years. Over the last two to three years, we have put some architectural teams together across the campus to discuss various domains so that we can start coming up with some common standards that we do want to implement.

The first thing is leveraging our business intelligence to ensure that we are using that data for good decision making and that we are able to put some solid data behind any decision that we are making. Another emphasis is on managing risks to the institution. That risk could be security, preservation; it could be many different things. We do want to have systems in place that are flexible and can be changed over time. We don't want vendor lock-in because nothing else works with it. So we want to make sure we are purchasing standards-based technology so that we can talk to several different vendors and get the best price and architecture to make it expandable.

The last couple—we want to put in an architectural framework for the protection of our assets, but also to assist access to scholarship. This would include things like ISU RED to give access to data sets to the campus at large. There is a strong preservation piece as well. As sort of the last piece of this, we want to make sure that as we expand the information assets on campus, we want a methodology about how we go about making decisions. One way is to look at what we currently have today. We want to make sure that if someone has a need that we have an inventory of what everyone has on campus so that we can say someone already has a solution; will this

work for you. We are not saying the solution will work for everyone, but we want to make sure that before we do a big expenditure on a new system, that we are looking at what we have today and whether it works for people. We want to keep track of requests that come in. We might find that we have three units that have the same request. Can we get them to collaborate and see if there is a solution that will meet all three of those needs? The other piece of it is to look at third party products rather than doing expensive in-house development. Lastly, we will still have some needs for developing in-house solutions, but we want those to more oriented toward integrating systems together.

This is a very high-level plan, so we need to have tactical plans annually to say these are the components of the strategic plan that we are going to attack next. We want to prioritize things and do so through a governance structure to make sure we have the right priorities for the university. IT doesn't want to be the decision maker on those priorities. They need to come from the university and academic units.

The Data Stewardship and IT Services Council will continue to monitor the progress of those projects and the Senate will be reported to annually through that organization. We want to make sure that we are doing things in accordance to Educating Illinois, so we will be reporting to the group that is monitoring that also.

Senator Horst: Could you talk about how your organization addresses privacy and securing data?

Dr. Helm: Two years ago, we formed an information security office that has a critical response team that deals with breeches and things like that. We are starting an educational effort through that office for the campus at large to ensure that we broadcast that information and people are made aware of what the risks are. We are looking at contracts that come in to make sure they have acceptable security provisions in them. We have also been upgrading our appliances that secure our network and protect our data.

Senator Eckrich: Who is on the Data Stewardship and IT Council?

Dr. Helm: The composition has associate and assistant vice presidents. It also has representatives from two colleges and from the Academic Senate when Dan Holland was chair. We have 17 members.

Dr. Walbert: Each of the units of the university is represented. Two of the deans, internal auditing, legal counsel...

Senator Crowley: Is there a protocol to make sure that there is wide representation across campus? If we were to revisit this ten years from now, would we be able to convene a diverse group of people for this very critical part of our university?

Dr. Helm: We want to be as inclusive as possible in terms of representation and I think that they have been successful in the creation of that, particularly governance structures, to ensure that we have members from both the academic and administrative side and throughout all of the divisions. In the charter of the stewardship council, it does talk about the inclusiveness of the campus as a whole.

Senator Hoelscher: Is the campus wireless campus wide, including the quad?

Dr. Helm: No, the first wireless plan is complete but we are now on the second. We are swapping out the old system; it did not provide enough coverage or bandwidth. So we have recently negotiated a new agreement with a different vendor. We have now put in new hot spots in Milner, the Bone Student Center and Schroeder as our primary test beds to see what the loads are going to be on those systems. Eventually, we are going to be swapping out those for higher density wi-fi so that we can meet the needs. We are looking at the quad area to ensure that we can get adequate coverage out there.

Senator Ellerton: One of the rooms that was used, I think as a trial for a new version of projection and so on, in fact took some of the replaced white board space to be used as a projection space. So, with all good intentions, a lot of the key white board space has now been lost and the pull down screen isn't used at all because you can't because the projector isn't there. That may be an individual case. Is there opportunity to address deficiencies like that or problems as they arise?

Dr. Walbert: There is no such thing as a single classroom design. One of the things we found early on was that projecting onto a white board creates glare so a lot of people don't like to use it that way. They use the screen instead. When the classrooms were originally designed, there was a front of the room and the front of the room had some sort of a writing surface on it. So in our first round of installations, we would put the projection in that front of the room. As we go through classrooms and update them, if we want white board space, whether the white board space is in the middle of the room or the projector is shining into the middle of the room—when we evaluate the space, we try to find a balance between white boards and screens. One of the technologies that we are experimenting with is a white board paint. You can paint an entire wall with this and it is used like a white board.

Senator Ellerton: Originally, this one was not set up so that it projected onto the white board. It was changed so it did. That seems to be counter to what you are saying.

Dr. Walbert: Projecting onto a white board is not our standard plan. There are only 320 classrooms and they are not all exactly the same.

Senator Kalter: First, I would like to volunteer if you would like to have the Senate Chair continue to be on the council. I would be happy to do it. If you want somebody who knows more about IT, we could hold an election and have a volunteer from the Senate. It seems like a good idea to maintain that connection. Second, I think you have already answered this in the last bullet point of the strategic plan. Would you say it is an assumption or a rule that in-house solutions are always more expensive than the other two options?

Dr. Helm: If you are talking about total cost of ownership, it is almost always more expensive because you always have to train the next set of people to work on that. IT people tend to move around a lot today, so it becomes a very expensive proposition that everyone annotates the code in a way another person could pick it up.

Motion XLV-130: By Senator Gizzi, seconded by Senator Rich, to endorse the IT Strategic Plan for 2015-18. The motion was unanimously approved.

Chairperson's Remarks

Senator Kalter: Good evening!...

With the beginning of our discussion of the proposed revisions to the Student Code of Conduct tonight, we have a full agenda, so I will hold any comments until we get to our action and information items.

I would like to welcome Senator Nagorski and thank him for his service.

I also just wanted to express my condolences to the family and friends of Benjamin Allison and extend my concern to Joshua Dunn, his family and friends.

I'll leave my comments at that for now. I can take questions if anyone has questions.

Student Body President's Remarks

Senator Joyce: Hello everyone. The last time we met, I said that the Student Government Association was planning a couple of events. First, we will be hosting a Wellness Fair March 2nd from 2:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. This is the first time SGA is hosting something of this sort and it is spearheaded by the senator from the Mennonite College of Nursing. The event is being organized by SGA, but it will showcase different health organizations, Health and Wellness and the College of Nursing. The second event is the town hall meeting. This event will be held March 3rd from 5:30 to 7:30 in the Old Main Room. The town hall meeting will be an information session to connect both students and the administration while allowing open conversation. I have invited Senator Dietz and all five of the vice presidents to this event. Each will give a brief description of their role at the university. After each individual has had time to speak, we will then open the floor for questions. This will allow the students to match a face to a name and position of the administration.

Senator Paterson: I am trying to figure out who the fifth vice president is.

Senator Joyce: That would be Associate Vice President Baur. My goal is for students to get a better understanding of the departments within our university and feel freer to bring comments to the proper division. We are beginning a marketing campaign next week, so I expect a good turnout. Even though this event is being put on for students, I want to invite all of you to attend.

Administrators' Remarks

- **President Larry Dietz**

President Dietz: I was asked to comment on Executive Orders 8 and 9 from the governor. President Easter from the University of Illinois and I had a side conversation at the IBHE meeting yesterday about those. There is a lot of debate that is being worked out with the governor's legal office and general counsel of the various institutions around the term "state agency". We confirmed yesterday with the Chair of IBHE that universities are not state agencies and as a result of that, we don't think we are subject to some of the executive order language. We are going ahead and complying with the spirit of these two orders. For example, they asked to report on hirings between November 1, 2014 and January 20, 2015. A lot of that was around the political issue of trying to make sure that the former Governor Quinn didn't use some political maneuvering to put people in places based upon politics and not necessarily the needs of the institution. We don't do that, but we have complied with that request. We don't think some of the other language applies to us because all of our appropriation is spent on personnel. There is freeze language in there related to discretionary spending. That would be true if we were a state agency, but, essentially, it wants us to be good stewards of the dollars that we have, so we have been in compliance so I don't think there is much to worry about in regard to those executive orders.

The governor's State of the State Address happened today. There wasn't in there anything to be very excited about other than we all know that the State of Illinois is in a fiscal dilemma. The 18th of February is when he will make the address about the budget. He did say today that he wanted to increase the expenditure for education; higher education was not mentioned.

You may have seen a communication that came out last Friday. It was from the Illinois Council of Community College Presidents. This was an announcement that the presidents wished to join 21 other states in offering four-year degrees. We have concerns about it in terms of overlap and mission creep related to community colleges. The President of Heartland Community College met with me last week and gave me a heads up that this was probably going to happen. He pledged to me that before Heartland would do anything that we would have conversations about that. This was a discussion item yesterday at IBHE. The topic should be what are the needs of the State of Illinois related to the workforce versus do community colleges have the authority to offer four-year degrees. That is the tenor we are going to take here and we are trying to get the IBHE to take the same kind of tact.

Next week, we will have airport interviews for the VP of Academic Affairs and Provost. There will be a decision on the state relations position that will probably be released either the latter part of this week or the early part of next week. Lastly, thank you to the grounds crew for getting the sidewalks and streets in as good of a shape as they did after the big snow on Sunday. They were out there all night getting things ready for us on Monday.

- ***Provost Janet Krejci***

Provost Krejci: I would also like to offer my condolences to the family of the student we lost and I appreciate the work that Steven Hunt and that whole department did to provide support to the family and students.

Congrats are in order for a couple of areas. The Athletic Academic Scholars with Honors were honored last night and we had 108 student athletes who had a 4.0. Over 300 of our athletes have a GPA over 3.0. Joe Zolper, who is a History student, has been selected nationally from ROTC to attend the George Marshall Leadership Seminar. He was selected from thousands of applicants. Two other ROTC students, Steve Perez from Psych and Jacob Hansen from Business, were selected for the Cultural Understanding and Proficiency Program, again selected out of thousands of applicants. Steve will be going to Rwanda for a three-week emersion program and Jacob will be going to Viet Nam.

A taskforce on civic engagement has been formed; Jan Paterson is chairing that and they have been meeting already. We got a small grant last fall to help kick start this. We will be looking forward to their recommendations by the end of the semester. The Long-Range Financial Planning Taskforce, chaired by Deb Smitley and Troy Johnson, has also kicked off. Senator Rich will be on that as the Chair of Planning and Finance.

We continue to watch enrollment data carefully. Applications are down about 15% at this time and we believe some of that is related to the issues with the student information system. Fall deposits, however, are up by 15%. The application and deposit pool remain high in terms of ACT, diversity and the richness our students are bringing in. Spring enrollment is up by several percentage points. The College of Fine Arts Dean Search Committee will meet next to determine the potential for either the next group of telephone or airport interviews.

The International Seminar was held today. We had students from several different countries in the room, as well as faculty and staff. That group has been moving forward to look at connections with Panama, Mexico and continuing to create partnerships around the world. Next weekend, MBLGTACC, we have over 2,000 participants coming to a conference on this campus. It will be a tremendous event and they will be looking to see if we would be designated as a campus-friendly community. A Fine Arts cabaret will be kicking off on February 12. Aaron Schock will be holding a presentation here on February 17th for the campus community on human trafficking. I had a great conversation with the Chairs Council last week. We held the Provost Advisory Council meeting at the University Galleries this morning, which is a great place to hold meetings.

- ***Vice President of Student Affairs Brent Paterson***

Senator Paterson: First, thank you to President Dietz for his acknowledgement of the grounds crew. They did a lot of really hard work. MBLGTACC stands for Midwest Bisexual, Lesbian, Gay, Transgender Ally College Conference. It is pronounced mumble tech. We are still looking for moderators for some of the sessions. If anyone is interested in doing that, you can go to MBLGTACC2015.org and sign up for that.

The Accreditation Associations for Ambulatory Healthcare visited our Student Health Services in December. We received word that we were reaccredited for another three years. I mentioned in the fall some of our needs in terms of counseling and psychiatry. We were lucky to be able to hire a ten-month staff psychiatrist, so we will now have two psychiatrists on staff in Student Counseling Services. As part of our Higher Learning Commission visit, there is a student survey that will be going out again on February 9th.

There are many folks that supported Ben Allison's family during that very trying time. The students from WZND, who knew him very well, spent a lot of time at the hospital with his family. Students have planned a memorial service for Friday afternoon in this room.

- ***Vice President of Finance and Planning Greg Alt***

Senator Alt: We have not received anything substantive about a mid-year rescission or reduction for the FY16 appropriation. We will probably not hear anything until the governor gives his budget address on February 18th. The governor has recently appointed a new Chief Financial Officer by the name of Donna Arduin, who is an economist with a long history of working with states that face fiscal challenges. Her focus is primarily on changing the tax structure. However, she also does champion performance-based budgeting practices. I think we can expect some additional traction for that kind of movement in funding here. She also has championed some spending cuts to help balance the budget, but they are not necessarily harsh reductions for higher education. I think we should plan for some funding reductions for next year. We have had communications from the Office of Management and Budget about different scenarios to be prepared for. We have a plan in place for a current year reduction and we continue with our plans for cuts to next year's budget.

Committee Reports:

Academic Affairs Committee:

Senator Crowley: We kicked our meeting off tonight on the happenings of edTPA on campus and we had a guest, Dr. Ameer Adkins; we engaged in an interesting conversation with her. Then we moved on to discuss student help worksites and we are continuing that discussion and how it connects with the Code of Student Conduct and maybe some creative ways to protect our students from ever getting into any dilemmas with such. We are going to recommend the Satisfactory Academic Progress changes. We will be bringing that to the Senate at the next meeting. The Sale and Solicitation of Assignments will be referred to the Senate as well. We discussed the Sale of Instructional Materials and we will be forwarding that to the Senate as well. The Pass/Fail, we want to check the minutes to see when that was last updated. The final one was Non-Traditional Constituents. We are needing to rework that one. We might be sending it to the Provost's Office. We are going to keep our eyes on it because it really needs a lot of work.

Senator Huxford: I am told that the Academic Affairs Committee is the one dealing with the Monday, Wednesday, Friday scheduling question. I have been waiting for news on this with bated breath.

Senator Crowley: I am going to put that one on the top of agenda next time.

Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee:

Senator Lessoff: We mainly talked about procedural matters for business that we had underway, the three projects going simultaneously—the Academic Impact Fund Report, the commentary on the president and the review that we are undertaking of review forms for evaluations of deans, chairs and directors. We mainly figured out how we are going to approach these things because we have pretty much decided all of the substantive matters.

Faculty Affairs Committee:

Senator Horst: We had the pleasure of having Provost Krejci come to our committee. We discussed the Distinguished Professor Policy and the University Professor Policy.

Planning and Finance Committee:

Senator Rich: We continue to review the documents from our vice presidents. Our homework over the next two weeks is to review our own document and work through proposals for revision.

Rules Committee:

Senator Bushell: We invited Lisa Huson and Wendy Smith from the General Counsel's Office to help us review the Protection of Minors Policy. We will clean up details and edits that we have discussed and bring that back to Exec to bring to the Senate.

Information Item:

01.16.15.04 *Code of Student Conduct – Review Sections 1 -7 (Draft Approved by SGA)*

Code of Student Conduct 2012 – Current Version (Comparison Document Only)

01.27.15.01 *Reference Document for Code of Student Conduct – Current and Revised (Susan Kalter, Senate Chairperson)*

Senator Kalter: Since the Code is a 42-page document, the Executive thought it best to start reviewing the first seven sections tonight and then next time we will review most of the last seven sections. There is a significant item that must go to the Rules Committee because there is a proposal to rearrange some of Senate External Committees in the Blue Book. We are going to start by looking at sections one and two of the new Code. This is the preamble and a section called Authority and Review.

I just have one suggestion. In the Authority and Review section; there is an awful lot that seems to be attempting to capture various items from other policies, like the proposed policy 10, the Memorandum of Understanding, etc., and I would suggest that that section either be removed or greatly reduced because some of the things don't really follow what we do or they may be changed by whatever we decide policy 10 would be. A general principle that we have is to not try to put other policies inside of policies, because when those policies change, then you have to remember that you have to change the other policy, too.

Senator Horst: This is a very large document and traditionally the Senate likes to focus in on what is being changed. I am hoping that we can get a marked-up copy for next time.

Dr. Munin: As far as speaking to the process, while there are parts in the old Code that are now in the new Code, they really saw this as a redraft process. So there isn't a redline version that is available.

Senator Horst: Perhaps you could give us a list of the new additions to this.

Dr. Munin: Sure, the most substantive changes will come up during our conversation at our next meeting when we are going through the second aspect where we have shifted the process in the way that we phrase it as a much more front-loaded process. In the old system, an allegation would come forward. A conduct officer would review that allegation, assign whether or not charges were potentially violated, send the student a charge letter, have them come in and go through the conduct process. With this new process, it is much more conversational. Instead of starting with an accusation letter, we invite a student to come in to have a conversation about this is what was alleged to have come forth; we would like to have a conversation with you about it. The hopeful outcome of that process is that the student and the conduct officer reach a shared understanding of what happened and if there was a violation of policy, come up with what the most appropriate sanction is.

Senator Kalter: One of the things I had already added to one of the things we received in our packets was that the Authority and Review section, number 2, does not have a correspondence in the old Code. Can you address Senator Horst's question about the preamble. Were there significant changes in the preamble?

Dr. Munin: There is nothing I would specifically call a major difference.

Senator Schneider: If this has been revised as extensively as you are saying, maybe it would be better that we have a presentation by Student Government to talk about the purposes of the changes and what they have deleted. It might be more clear for the discussion if it goes up on the screen.

Senator Kalter: We generally have not done that with anything coming from an Internal Committee.

Senator Schneider: Do we normally have a 42-page document?

Senator Kalter: What we are trying to do is give you small sections of it so that people have enough time to read the proposed Code against the current Code and with a rubric that allows us to not waste our time trying to find the stuff in the old Code. That is what I did all day on Martin Luther King Day to try to give people a guide to that. I think in the interest in moving the discussion forward on the Code... To do what you are suggesting, we would have to delay this discussion and hold this discussion next time. It's a little bit difficult today for Dr. Munin to shift modes and give a presentation instead of answering questions. I don't know if this is going to make it through our processes by the end of the year, but it our goal to do so.

Senator Schneider: I would just rather see it in its entirety with an explanation and the rationale for the change and not rush it. One of the things I would ask right now is do we have staff that would bring students in for a discussion before the complaint would go through.

Senator Kalter: I am going to rule that particular question out of order for this discussion.

Senator Schneider: That's just an example. It feels like it is just put down in front of us and we haven't had time to discuss the purpose, the rationale and the impact of the major changes.

Senator Kalter: That is what we are here for tonight and we don't have to rush it. If we decide that we haven't had enough discussion on sections 1 through 7, we can certainly discuss them again.

Senator Schneider: What was wrong with the current Code of Student Conduct that it needed to be overhauled so extensively?

Senator Paterson: The basis for the changes relate to the model Code of Student Conduct that has been written by some experts and attorneys in higher education. The previous Code was based on a version of the model code. There was an update that came about two years ago. In the writing of this Code, we looked at the new model. If we try to go through and redline, I think this would be at least a hundred-page document. Things are significant in specific wording. In terms of intent, they are not that significant. Things are reordered. Some areas have been pulled out.

Senator Gizzi: One of the things that would have been helpful for me is not redlined, but a series of charts that showed in section 1, this was basically here. It doesn't have to be word for word, but I think it would be helpful to see what the major changes are. If some of it is just reorganization, then you could just say reorganization.

Senator Kalter: I would like to make use of this meeting and Dr. Munin's time tonight and have Dr. Munin and Dr. Paterson to go back and consider this and give that to us for the next time.

Senator Hoelscher: Am I correct? We need to get this out by the end of this semester?

Senator Paterson: We wouldn't be able to impose a new Code in the middle of an academic year, so it is something we have to do at the beginning of the year. So if it goes beyond May, then it will be another year before we can put this in place. It may force us to do some processes that don't fit with the current Code. Some of that is legally; some of that is process oriented.

Senator Gizzi: In the last paragraph before section 2, 'A student should be aware that student conduct processes are fundamentally different from criminal and civil court processes...' I am very leery of some of the language

in the paragraph. I don't know how you are going to define "fairness for all" and I think that the notion of due process raises concerns for me. I would like to see a more specific definition of due process.

Senator Kalter: We may get to that later on in the document. There is a distinction between legal due process and academic due process, but you are right—it is never defined. Are there any additional comments on sections 1 and 2? Moving on to section 3 on definitions. Are there any comments about that section?

Let's move on to Jurisdiction. I have one comment about that and that is the last time we reviewed the Code, lines 35, 36 and 37 say that students who host guests on campus and/or at university events may be held responsible for the actions of their guests. Does that mean if your parents are misbehaving that you are responsible for them? That came up last time the Code was reviewed and I would like Dr. Munin to give that answer.

Dr. Munin: The short answer is yes, parents are accountable. The longer answer for that is when there is a situation when a parent does something, you may or may not want to have the student to be held accountable for that. It is extremely rare, but we would need to take measures to protect the community.

Senator Croker: In the third paragraph, the Code refers to behaviors that take place on campus and various events and off campus when the off-campus behavior impacts university interests. Interest is defined very loosely here. It seems to me that the university can take it upon itself to hold any behavior as in its interest and, therefore, something students are held accountable for. It seems to me that that is rather a stretch. Off campus could be in their hometown during the summer months. Yes, we should be concerned if our students are engaged in criminal activities, but I am not really sure that that is our business.

Dr. Munin: As far as holding them accountable for off-campus behavior, sadly we can think of those awful cases where we would not only want to but have to intervene because of the egregiousness of the offense. I think that one way to answer your questions is the checks and balances of this process that in making a decision in the conduct process, if I am the hearing officer, I am making an individual decision and if the student feels that the outcome of that is unjust, they do have the right to appeal that to a second level.

Senator Croker: Say somebody is accused of some sort of criminal activity of whatever nature. We get to hear about this and we can get involved. So there are two parallel things going on. One is whatever the court systems are up to and what we are up to and I am not sure if that is appropriate.

Dr. Munin: You are not sure it's appropriate in what way?

Senator Croker: If someone is being accused of a crime and they are being dealt with through the police and the court system—obviously we can find that someone who has been found guilty of a crime should not be allowed on campus—but it sounds like that there are two parallel processes. Are we making our own adjudication of guilt or innocence independently of what a court decides or are those processes always going to be integrated?

Dr. Munin: The processes will not be integrated; they are separate processes. This is not a legal process; it is an educational one in nature that seeks to provide that educational opportunity for the student but also holds in balance making sure that our community is protected in certain circumstances. So they do not interweave through how it's adjudicated—student conduct and conflict resolution.

Senator Gizzi: One of my concerns is when an arrest occurs that the action that can occur from the student conduct is nothing more than the police report, which isn't necessarily an unbiased document. Then the adjudication process can be completed by the university in a very quick time without anything other than a police report. That is concerning to me.

Senator Paterson: A police report may be the basis for a charge and then the hearing. Decisions are not made without a hearing unless it is an interim action.

Senator Gizzi: But an initial decision can be made before a hearing.

Senator Paterson: There can be an interim action pending a hearing. Interim actions are taken rarely, when there is concern that that behavior is so extreme that there is a danger to students or the campus community.

Senator Winger: Wouldn't there also be a problem for the university on the other end. If you penalize the student, would you be subject to a lawsuit on the other side? Creating a parallel judicial system seems perilous to me.

Dr. Munin: These decisions are very difficult and absolutely litigation could be brought on either side. In some of these cases, we have to keep in mind that the alleged or real victim is a member of our community and failure to act in that way could also bring litigation. These are difficult conversations that are done with extensive training and the checks and balances of the right to appeal.

Senator Dallas: Going back to lines 34 and 35 on page 5. I know it says students, but what if a group were to bring in a guest and they were to do something that needed the university to step in; would that group or student still be responsible?

Dr. Munin: Answering hypotheticals is so very difficult because there is a question of intent. Philosophically, none of us got into this work to see how many cases we could push through at any given time. We got into this work because we genuinely believe in student learning and genuinely want to protect the community and that is the decision-making paradigm that I would put through that.

Senator Kalter: Anything further on section 4? Let's move to sections 5 and 6 together. This would be Interim Actions and Violations of Law.

Senator Schneider: Senator Kalter, I am not sure the senator's question was answered.

Senator Kalter: Senator Dallas, was your question addressed?

Senator Dallas: I understood what you were saying. I feel like the risk is still there for the group being penalized even if they are not involved.

Dr. Munin: Hypothetically, the Code is structured where we are responsible for the guests that we bring on campus. Stated black and white like that, then yes, there could be a conduct case. In the actual living of this document every day, that is not what we seek to do. We seek to have those educational conversations to protect the community. Outside of more specifics of what happened at the actual event, how potentially egregious the event was and whether there was intentionality in it, it is difficult to answer what the actual step would be.

Senator Kalter: Any questions about sections 5 and 6.

Senator Powers: If a student is taken out of the campus as an interim action and then found not guilty during the hearing process, what are the steps to get them back into the schoolwork and missing homework and not failing out?

Dr. Munin: First, we find students 'not responsible' instead of 'not guilty' to use our language. Everything possible from working with professors to trying to provide whatever kind of academic materials there are,

working with fellow students to make up for notes. It would be very individualistic to the classes, but anything possible we could do to set the students up for success.

Senator Powers: Is that language in the document?

Dr. Munin: I don't believe that that is reflected in the document.

Senator Powers: Is there any way we could put that in the document?

Dr. Munin: So you would like language that in the case of an interim action where a student is allowed to return following the outcome of the process, it would either be the Student Conduct Conflict Resolution or the Dean of Students Office, would work to ensure that they are set up for academic success?

Senator Powers: Yes.

Dr. Munin: I could write that in. It would be inherently nonspecific. It would be more philosophical than policy.

Senator Powers: I still think it would be better to officially have it in there.

Senator Kalter: I wrote down language regarding how to restore the student to academic wholeness. I don't know whether that would be sufficient or if you would like something that is more detailed.

Senator Powers: More detailed would be better.

Dr. Munin: Would some of the examples I listed before, some of that extrapolated out, to provide the detail?

Senator Powers: Yes, that would be good.

Senator Rich: On off-campus behavior, the document describes university interests in off-campus behaviors in the preamble, jurisdiction and in violations that has been stated fairly broadly. But when we get to this section 5, Interim Actions, the language is substantially more restrictive. It refers to university property, operations of the university. The off-campus references fade into the mist. Is that intentional and what are the practical implications?

Dr. Munin: As far as the interim actions, it comes down to the extent of our authority. We can limit you from campus; we can limit you from activities related to the university. Limiting you at venues and at places where we don't have direct oversight or authority would be an overreach.

Senator Paterson: If I heard your question correctly, why is language in the preamble more general and more specific elsewhere. That was intentional.

Senator Cassata: In the preamble, it talks about due process. Under section 6, line 21 says accordingly formal rules of due process procedure and/or technical rules of evidence that are applied in criminal or civil courts do not apply to the student conduct process. So would due process still be applied or it does not apply to the conduct process at all?

Dr. Munin: I think your question gets to delineating in some way legal due process and institutional or university due process where that gets confused. There are ways we can clean up that language in order to make the two separate.

Senator McHale: One question is about recompensatory accommodation when the issue is someone is falsely charged, then there are interim actions made. The word accommodation might be valuable there. On the second, I have a question back to the basis of the entire Code of Conduct. What was the organization that we got this template from that we are adopting?

Senator Paterson: The model code was developed by the Association of Student Conduct Administrators and the National Center of Higher Education Risk Management.

Senator Kalter: I have a grammatical comment. 5.A.c. is worded so that we are opposing a threat to the disruption rather than the actual disruption. It says alleviate a threat that the student poses to the disruption... I think we might want to say they are posing a threat.

Senator Lin: I have a question about number 8, the hazing section. It says failing to prevent or failing to discourage or failing to report anyone who enacts hazing, etc., would that entail...

Senator Kalter: What page are you on.

Senator Lin: Page 14.

Senator Kalter: I think you just jumped ahead to the next section.

Senator Heylin: If a student is suspended, is there any type of appeals process.

Dr. Munin: Do you mean the interim suspension?

Senator Heylin: Yes.

Dr. Munin: There is not an appeals process for that. The conduct process would decide whether that suspension stays as a sanction.

Senator Kalter: Any other questions on sections 5 and 6. Ok, section 7, the longest section that we have tonight. This is the section on university regulations.

Senator Lin: Page 14, line 10. If an organization were to be found to be hazing, would each member of that organization be facing consequences?

Dr. Munin: In the case of hazing in an RSO, it is possible individual members could be sent through the Code of Student Conduct in addition to the organization.

Senator Lin: But not all of them?

Dr. Munin: No, not all of them. There would have to be some understanding of involvement.

Senator Gizzi: Were there significant changes to the definitions of academic dishonesty? Is this our only academic dishonesty policy?

Dr. Munin: Yes.

Senator Kalter: I believe that the academic dishonesty policy is quoted in the catalog. Is that correct and is it substantially the same and which one takes precedence?

Jonathan Rosenthal, Associate Provost: I would have to do some checking.

Dr. Munin: There is nothing that comes to mind as a substantive change with the academic dishonesty. There was one piece of information that came up in the conversation with Senator Kalter that I can highlight, but it was just relating to line 19 on page 7, ‘group assignments’, and the recommendation was to add unless otherwise indicated by instructor, all parties assigned to the assignment are responsible for the submission.

Senator Kalter: There were small wording changes that improved the academic dishonesty section. I think I noticed something substantive, but it wasn’t big enough to mark out as a question.

Senator Winger: I am confused by the question raised by Senator Lin. Why doesn’t the text reflect what you said? It seems to imply if a student knows about hazing, the student is subject to penalty.

Dr. Munin: If you have knowledge of it, there is an element of involvement.

Senator Winger: We use the participle “known”; we don’t have a noun. I assume it applies to the person knowing is any student in that organization.

Dr. Munin: When I was answering the question, I was answering it through a completely different lens of a completely ignorant member of the organization who did not know what was going on, was not present and then conduct charges come down, that person would not be involved in that conduct case.

Senator Winger: But it wasn’t about intent.

Dr. Munin: I mentioned intent as an example.

Senator Winger: But it is not about intent and involvement in this language, it’s about knowing. So to Senator Lin’s point, if you know your fraternity is hazing, but if you are not involved and you have no intent, you are still liable.

Dr. Munin: For me, the definition of knowing, there is an element of involvement.

Senator Winger: Can you change that language?

Senator Paterson: That language actually comes from the state law on hazing. It talks about having knowledge and the expectation is if you have knowledge, you are to report that. There is knowledge you have heard from someone as opposed to active knowledge where you are more knowledgeable in the planning process versus I learned later that something happened, so I am now knowledgeable.

Senator Gizzi: When we get to the sections about sanctions, one of the things that would be very valuable would be a brief report in aggregate—give us a sense of the numbers of the cases that we are dealing with, types of sanctions—aggregate data. Also, I don’t know why the section on academic dishonesty would not be sent to the Academic Affairs Committee to take a very close look at.

Senator Kalter: There has been a concern about the Code of Student Conduct for a very long time. If we decide as a Senate that we want to send a section or the entire Code to a committee, we do have the power to do that.

Senator Schneider: I would be interested in how many cases go to appeal. One of my faculty is head of the appeals board and I wanted to know if there has been an upsurge and why.

President Dietz: I would like to express my deep sympathy to Dr. Munin in his first year to tackle this, but also my sincere appreciation for having done so. Thanks to VP Paterson for his work with this. It's tough work. Everybody is well intentioned and I really appreciate the engagement of the faculty and students around the table. I think everybody wants a good and workable document.

Senator Kalter: Are there any comments about process and going forward next time.

Senator Horst: Just to reiterate my plea. I am thinking about trying to communicate what is going on with this document to my faculty and potentially the students in the School of Music. It would help if I could send them a two-page document so that I can communicate effectively what is going on. So I believe if we can get some sort of executive summary for next time.

Senator Kalter: Dr. Munin, do you think it is possible to get an executive summary for next time in two weeks.

Dr. Munin: This is an executive summary you want to be very tangible, not philosophical? Because the big moves in this document are more philosophical. If you want something more tangible, we could make every effort to get that to you in two weeks.

Senator Horst: Or the philosophical stated clearly.

Dr. Munin: Sure, we have an executive summary that did accompany this to Student Government to encapsulate that. Perhaps I could send that and that would be of assistance.

Dr. Kalter: That would be fantastic; thank you. The plan is to bring sections 8 through 14, minus section 13, for the next session. Does anyone think we should go more slowly? Alright, we will go forward with our plan; we can pause at any time.

Action Items:

Election of Replacement Faculty Member for Senate Executive Committee

(1 Faculty Vacancy; Self-Nominations are Welcomed)

Senator Kalter: We have a faculty vacancy on the Executive Committee. Senator Lessoff sort of accidentally got scheduled to teach during his regular 4:00 p.m. slot. Do we have any volunteers or nominations?

Senator Horst: I would like to nominate Nerida Ellerton.

Senator Kalter: Senator Ellerton, do you accept?

Senator Ellerton: Yes, I do.

There were no further nominations. The Senate unanimously acclaimed Senator Ellerton to serve on the Executive Committee for the remainder of the spring 2015 semester.

01.26.15.01 Success Week/Final Exams Policy – Additional Revisions Following 1/21/15 Senate Meeting and 1/26/15 Executive Committee Meeting (Academic Affairs Committee/Executive Committee)

Senator Crowley: The policy is designed to protect students from assignments that have been unannounced on the syllabus that are worth more than 10% of their grade due the week before final exams. The plan is that any assignment that might be due the week before exams would be written into the syllabus assignments at the beginning of the semester and that students would be assured that know what is expected of them all semester long. We had great deliberation on our committee regarding this because we are aware of professors' academic

freedom, yet we are very much aware also of students' right to know what is expected of them within a reasonable set of parameters.

Senator Joyce: This is a document that has been in the process for the last two years. It is something that Student Government has found is an issue on our campus and something that will help out students. I think we had a great information session last Senate and most of the corrections that were asked to be made have been made—a couple of grammatical things and minor tweaks—but beyond that, Student Government has full support of this document and I hope it gets passed.

Motion XLV-130: By Senator Crowley to approve the revised Success Week/Final Exams Policy.

Senator Horst: As I read this document, the second bullet point which talks about the responsibilities of the faculty to deliver a clear syllabus that outlines what is expected of the students makes a lot of sense to me. But the first bullet point, tests that are more than 10% of the course grade may not be given or due. It seems arbitrary between tests and assignments and take-home tests and papers. I really think it should be up to the faculty how they want to plan out their tests. I would like to make a motion to delete the first bullet point and then add to the second bullet point, 'tests and assignments worth more than 10% of your grade'.

Motion XLV-131: By Senator Horst, seconded by Senator Hoelscher, to delete the first bullet point and add 'tests and assignments worth more than 10% of your grade' to the second bullet point.

Senator Joyce: In essence, by taking out that bullet point, you are taking out the entire purpose of Success Week. Success Week is built around the test factor. If you add the tests of over 10% that have to be outlined in the syllabus, then you are rendering Success Week useless. It would just create a syllabus where a professor could outline their tests and it would not change anything. The purpose of nothing over 10% for tests is to create that week to allow students time to study for their final exams. If you know that you have a test that was outlined in the syllabus doesn't change the fact that you have to study for that test and then a week later, have a final exam. I understand that it will change course structures, but that is what the purpose of this is to do—to allow that week where students will have a full week where there are no substantial tests, quizzes, papers, projects that are dropped on them in the middle of the course.

Senator Hoelscher: I would argue in favor of the motion because it has to do with the freedom of the faculty. That is very important and I would argue further that it does a lot to protect the student if we require that it be in the syllabus because the syllabus is a contract. I would argue that academic freedom almost necessitates that we change that language.

Senator Lessoff: We as faculty impose restrictions not necessarily on the content of our curriculum, but on the procedures all the time. As I understand what generated this proposal was that students were concerned that faculty members were planning and assigning large amounts of work in the last week of classes and, in those same classes, during finals week. There is really no justification for doing that; it is a legitimate concern that the student government is raising and I think that we can adjust to the kinds of things that the Student Government is asking for.

Senator Thurman: I am going to speak on behalf of the Mennonite College of Nursing. It is a very rigorous curriculum. I had an exam a week before my final exam. I had to remember one-third of my curriculum before that day and then I had to regurgitate what I was taught three months before that exam as well. I think that 40% of my grade should not be decided in the last two weeks of school.

Senator Kalter: I have a question for Senator Horst. There is language further on, second to the last paragraph before "Grading". 'Instructors may petition their director or chair or dean of the College of Nursing if they

believe the policy jeopardizes or interferes with their professional judgment regarding appropriate pedagogy.’ Is your argument that that language does not cover the academic freedom issues?’

Senator Horst: Then it also said it had to be publically posted. My argument is I don’t really understand the difference between having a major paper due versus having a take-home test due versus having a test due. I understand the pressures on the students during the week before finals and a Reading Week would have nothing due, but if the point of the second bullet point is that we can’t spring things on students, fine. I completely agree with that, but just to single out tests as one thing that could potentially be limited seems arbitrary to me if you are going to allow all of this other stuff. That’s why I am suggesting that that bullet point be taken out and I did not consider, if the motion passes, how that would impact that later paragraph.

Senator Gizzi: I don’t think we even need this policy if we are going to make this change. I think Senator Joyce is correct that we are defeating the entire purpose of it. I am not 100% sold on it, but if we approve this amendment, we might as well just start all over.

Senator Huxford: That is not true. There are two big issues; one is not springing sudden assignments in that last week versus the 10%. They two separate issues and they are very important. I don’t think it is a particularly good idea to spring a big test in that final week, but I don’t think we should stop the faculty having that choice because of academic freedom.

Senator McHale: I really respect the work by the student body in coming up with the policy. I agree with Dr. Gizzi that if we get rid of this, we get rid of the essence of the policy. I am reluctant about the academic freedom word being thrown around. Usually, I think of that as the protection of ideas and repression of our ideas, rather than I can choose not to teach the last seven weeks of my class and that’s my freedom. Academic freedom is being thrown around a little bit more than what the original intent was, which was to protect from political repression those ideas that are unfriendly. The second thing is far be it for anybody in the faculty to make decisions about when to put a test based on their personal preference rather than what is good for a student. To differentiate, as a teacher of mass media writing, there is a large project that they work on all semester that is due the week before finals week. I think it is going to be up to individual faculty members to use some discretion and try to reserve and respect the wishes of the student body and what they think might make them have a healthier final exam experience.

Senator Croker: I want to try and clarify something that relates to things Senator Horst and Senator Huxford said. The difference between an examination and a large project like Senator McHale just mentioned is really time cost of the activity. So that large project, if that is due the week before finals, if they come to us and say, ‘This is too much work.’, we say you have had three months to do the project. An exam, almost by definition, is something you can’t do the preparation for three months before it’s due and then you are ready. So I think that there is a key distinction between these types of projects. This leads to the difference between the two points. That distinction only works if the student has the lead up time to work on the projects, hence, the not springing it on them at the last moment. The intent was not to have big back-to-back exams. In an earlier version of this, students were keen to not have anything during that week. I want those large projects due; I think that is appropriate because there is enough time. So that is why the distinction is made between tests and the other assignments. I would also like to agree with Senator McHale about academic freedom. Nowhere in our definition of academic freedom is the scheduling of assessments; it is about the content—what we say, not the timing of when we assess it.

Senator Huxford: That is a very good point. I think you are making an important division there.

Senator Stewart: If you have got a certain amount of material that you want to test the student on, you can put that material in the week before the final week of school or include it in your final exam. Why do have to give

them another big test the week before exams when they really need to be studying for exams, so I am kind of in favor of the students' proposal.

Senator Hoelscher: I am concerned that students will try to classify a final project as an exam and they always beg me for the last possible minute. If this goes through, then I am probably not going to allow them that. I am going to require everything to be due before finals week no matter what you call it—project, exam—because sometimes those things are not clear. I did enjoy the definition between the two and that might change my mind a little bit.

Senator Powers: In my personal opinion, I don't think any student would think a project was an exam or even bring that up to a teacher.

Senator Nagorski: I have cumulative finals. I might argue that an exam in that final week will allow the student to be up to date and ready for a large section of my cumulative final. Therefore, I am helping my student prepare for the final.

Senator Joyce: The purpose of this document and the foundation that it comes from is that this week will be for studying. Even if you may take away that chance when that test may help studying for the exam, this week will allow for that studying that would have occurred to study for that exam, except the exam will have already passed and they can focus fully on all of the material rather than just that last section.

Senator Whittington: With most syllabi, if you term it a project, I believe it is a project. Many of my classes have projects that you work on the entire semester, but you do have exams and they are clearly labeled on the syllabus.

The question was called. The motion to amend the document did not pass.

Senator Kalter: The motion has failed, so we go back to the original motion on floor, which is the Success Week/Final Exams Policy in front of you. Do we have further debate on the motion as a whole?

Senator Joyce: In debating the motion to amend, we pretty much debated the entire document. This is a strong document. This is something that students have found is an issue on our campus. It is something that the Student Government has been working on for two years and it will improve our campus.

Senator Stewart: A large bulk of what is in this document is in the existing exam policy, which says don't give your (final) exams the week before exam week, but give them during exam week.

Senator Crowley: I admire our students for participating in shared governance because they have worked very hard.

Senator Astroth: Under alternate arrangements for exams, in the last sentence of the first paragraph, could you add "or the Dean of the College of Nursing" to that one as well?

Senator Kalter: That seems to me like a friendly amendment. Does the Academic Affairs Committee agree?

Senator Crowley: Yes.

Senator Kalter: Going back to Senator Horst, going back to that second paragraph before 'Grading' that says instructors may petition their department or school director... We may not want to call that academic freedom, but I think there is an ethic on all campuses that faculty should be making decisions in the classroom and about the classroom. That is where the faculty, if they feel very strongly that they need to have sectional exams and

the last one has to happen in the 15th week and it has to be more than 10%, they can petition their chair, director, etc. I do think that the policy does allow for that.

Senator Hoelscher, seconded by Senator Gizzi, called the question. The motion to close debate was unanimously approved.

The Senate unanimously approved the revised Success Week/Final Exams Policy.

Second Information Session:

~~12.17.14.01—Creation and Revision of Policies Policy (Rules Committee/Executive Committee)~~

The Senate declined discussing the above policy due to the late hour. There have been some suggestions from the AP and Civil Service Councils, so placing the policy on a future agenda will give the committees time to consider those recommendations.

Adjournment

Motion XLV-132: By Senator Hoelscher, seconded by Senator Thornton, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.