

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

Fall 10-26-2016

Senate Meeting, October 26, 2016

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, October 26, 2016" (2016). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 940.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/940>

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
October 26, 2016
(Approved)

Call to Order

Senator Kalter called the meeting to order.

Roll Call

Senator Gizzi called the roll and declared a quorum and announced that the Cubs were up one to nothing.

Senator Kalter: Excellent. That's good to hear, for many of us at least. We begin tonight with a presentation. It's two days before the Board of Trustees meeting, and at this time of year we always hear the capital and operating budget request presentation so we'll have Vice President Alt, Senior Associate Vice President Deb Smitley, and the Director of Budget Planning and Operations, Sandy Cavi begin our meeting tonight.

Presentation: FY18 Operating and Capital Funding Request to the State of Illinois (Vice President Greg Alt, Senior Associate Vice President Deb Smitley, and Director of Budget Planning and Operations Sandra Cavi)

Senator Alt: Thank you, Senator Kalter. I will start out by pointing out that either in your packet or was passed out to you tonight is a one-page handout, two-sided, that we'll just talk our way through. And I think that Senator Kalter did mention that accompanying me tonight are Deb Smitley, who serves as our Senior Associate Vice President for Planning, Finance and Facilities, who has a lot of the responsibility for the capital planning and capital projects on campus, and so she'll focus on that side of our operating requests. And then Sandy Cavi, who is our Director of Budget Planning and Operations, who primarily focuses on the operating budget of the university. So I'll just set some context and then turn it over to them. You might ask yourself, why are we going through this? And so I point out on the handout there's a timeline there. There's a normal budget process that when it works, and it used to work (it'll work again someday), to where beginning about now we begin the process for our funding from the state for FY18. And when I say from the state, we're funded from a lot of different sources, but part of our revenue, particularly revenue that helps support our instructional and administrative support of the university, we get from state appropriations, tax dollars, as well as money to do buildings for instructional and administrative purposes. And so we make a request to the state in the budget process that starts about now. And that process will begin with us this Friday taking this request to the Board of Trustees for their approval to send this to the Illinois Board of Higher Education, and the Illinois Board of Higher Education will consider the request as well as all of the other universities in the state's requests in consideration of the state's priorities, and from that, reformat the proposals and make a proposal to the governor's office for budget. And then, from there, that proceeds to the General Assembly, and then in a normal process there's some agreement on a budget and some funding is approved in that budget by the end of May, and then we're able to proceed with finalizing the rest of our budget after that. At this point, this amount of money only accounts for 17% of the money that the university takes in. Some decades ago, that amount was much different. The state provided about two-thirds of the cost of the budget of the university, and now it's only about 17% of the operating money, not counting fringe benefits. So things have changed over time, but we still do get a substantial amount of money from the state, and money that would be difficult to deal without, and we make that request to the state as well as the capital money that we need to pay for not only the maintenance and improvements on existing buildings but for new buildings that we might need for the academic and administrative services of the university. And so with that, I'll just point out that we have this budget timeline, that this is the beginning of it, and so we have discussed this as well as other operating and capital budget needs with the committees that are chaired, the Planning and Finance Committee as well as Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee, and this is our final step before we take it to the Board. And so with that, I'll turn it over to Sandy Cavi to talk about the operating requests and then Deb will discuss the capital request.

Director Sandy Cavi: Good evening. If you turn the page over, you'll see the FY2018 Operating Requests at the top. And it's customary that we would use our prior year appropriation as our baseline when we determine what

to request for, then, this coming budget year. Obviously, that was a predicament this time and last. In speaking with the other budget officers in the state, it is common practice that we are going to use the FY15 level as our starting point simply because it's the last full year budget that we have, the last full year appropriation that we have. So, in our case, using that as a starting point, then, we added two cost increases in our request – one for salary adjustments and one for deferred maintenance of buildings – bringing us to about a 10% request, which would take us up to the \$79 million mark there that you see for 2018.

Senator Alt: I might add a little more context to that, if I may. This past year, of that 72 million that we received in FY15, we only received 21 million (29% of what we received in '15). And so we didn't receive the full amount even though we're requesting that \$72 million level again this year. And so far this year, we've actually received 38 million of that amount, which is about 53% this year so far. We don't know what the next step will be. By this time, we should've known what our appropriation is for this year, so you can I think hopefully appreciate how difficult it is to try to manage, that we're well into FY17, we don't know what our appropriation is going to be. We've received part of it. And as last year's experience proved, we don't know how that'll end up because last year's amount was not even paid until April 22nd when they did a stopgap funding where we received the 21 million, and then nothing more was done until June 30th when they approved a second stopgap, but unfortunately that money was intended to be FY17 revenue even though we could use it for FY16 expenditures. So you can just see the difficulty that we're dealing with the state right now that we have money towards FY17, but it was given to us to help pay for FY16 expenditures. So at this point we're requesting '18 money. We're requesting not only the base level that we got in '15, but we're asking for a reasonable increase of 10% to help fund necessary deferred maintenance as well and some kind of modest personnel service increase. So, any questions on the operating before we go to the capital?

Senator Kalter: I have a couple of questions if nobody else does. Last year when we made our request for FY15-16, did we ask for a 10% increase or was it less or more?

Senator Alt: Just slightly more. It was about 10.6%.

Senator Kalter: Okay. So we're asking for actually a little bit less than even what we asked for last year.

Senator Alt: Yeah, and that's a good point to make is that we used to expect new revenue. So we used to not only request personnel services and deferred maintenance, we used to ask for some programming money. And so I think... Did we have a programming request in last year? If it wasn't, it would have been before that. But we used to ask for some additional academic programming money, and our request last year I think included some money for edTPA or something like that.

Director Cavi: Possibly a small amount, yeah.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. My second question is, do we have an estimate of what we have saved overall both by not filling staff positions, and I know that's about four million or so, maybe five at this point. Any other estimate of savings?

Senator Alt: Well, we've reduced our overall budgeted amount by 11 million, which is a combination of the position vacancies that you referred to, which are now currently up to 110. We've also deferred some major maintenance projects as well as some other equipment and operating for a total budget reduction of 11 million. But actually, campus has underspent more than that because departments have been conservative, trying to also prepare for the unknown. So I would say, Sandy, that the underspending is probably beyond 11 million and probably around the 14+ million.

Director Cavi: I would say that's correct.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. That's very helpful.

Senior Associate Vice President Debra Smitley: The fiscal 2018 capital request is summarized on page four of the handout. The state asks us to submit the capital request in two specific categories. One category is major capital projects. Sometimes you will see these referenced as regular capital. And they tend to be those projects that have a large scope and a fairly sizeable price tag associated with them. The request for 2018 includes five projects that in total amount to about 289.6 million. These projects are the same five that we have included in our requests for the last several years. They are the same projects and in the same priority order. The amount that's requested has been escalated to acknowledge, or recognize, inflationary growth each year. So the amounts are a tad bit different. These types of projects in the past, for example, have funded at the university the renovation of Stevenson and Turner several years ago and is the same category for which we have the appropriation for the renovation of the College of Fine Arts complex.

The second category is referred to as capital renewal, and those are smaller projects in scope. Those, traditionally, have funded... We've chosen on this campus to use them on smaller projects, but basically on at least one or two. These funds are allocated amongst the public universities and community colleges based on a formula, and the last time we got the money it was about three million dollars. It's a source of money that we used to renovate Capen Auditorium a couple of years ago, and it's a source of money that we will devote to finishing the work on the conversion of the heating system in Felmley that we were able to begin this year with university funds. Again, these two projects that are listed in terms of replacing exterior doors and windows at Metcalf, Fairchild, and Rachel Cooper Halls as well as replacing emergency generators in various locations around campus, are the same projects that we included in last year's recommendation, or request, to the state for funding. I'd be happy to answer any questions you have about these projects.

Senator Horst: I'm from the College of Fine Arts and so I don't remember when the \$54 million price tag was determined, but it was quite some time ago. Did you at all consider requesting some sort of compensation or inflationary subsidy for that item?

Associate Vice President Smitley: The College of Fine Arts complex were funds that were appropriated to the university for fiscal year 2010, so you're right, there has been some inflationary loss. We did not include, as part of this request, in part because in the past the state has come up with those funds in situations like this. So there is a general acknowledgement on the part of the Capital Development Board staff. We've been in conversations with them about this, that we've lost some inflationary money as the project sat with funds not released for a number of years.

Senator Winger: I had a question just out of my even more than normal ignorance. What's the base inflation rate, or how are we calculating inflation? Are we in an inflationary period at all? Or have we been?

Associate Vice President Smitley: The inflationary index we use is actually provided to us by the Capital Development Board, and it's specific to the construction industry. So it breaks it out by various areas of the state, and if I recall correctly, this year it was a little under, or around, 3%.

Senator Kalter: Senator Hoelscher, do you have a motion to make?

Senator Hoelscher: I would if I was paying attention. (Laughter)

Senator Kalter: Caught red-handed.

Senator Hoelscher: But I think I know the direction we're going.

Senator Kalter: We'll ask you the Cubs score later.

Senator Hoelscher: I know that!

Motion: By Senator Hoelscher on behalf of the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee to accept the operating and capital funding request to the State of Illinois for FY18.

Senator Kalter: Senator Hoelscher is making a motion on behalf of the committee, so it does not need a second. So, is there any debate about approving the operating and capital funding request to the State of Illinois?

The motion passed unanimously.

Senator Kalter: Excellent. And what are they? Two to nothing, I'm told. Thank you very much. Thank you, Sandy and Deb. It'll go next to the Board of Trustees. Just a reminder that last night, late at night, I sent out the list of 110 positions that have been vacated and not filled so that you can share that with your departments and other constituents so that we can have an understanding of what's going on and who's being affected by it. I think the staff are bearing an enormous burden, and one of the things that's not on that are GAs that have gone away and probably some non-tenure track faculty is my guess.

Senator Pancrazio: I had a question. Do we have a sense of how long those positions had actually been filled before they became vacant? And the reason I'm asking is that when we look at what happens in our own academic departments, we kind of make a distinction between temporary lines or new lines, or make a distinction between branches of the tree or the new growth and the actual trunk, which is the tenure-line faculty. And I can think of one, for example, in one of the categories. I'm assuming that would be the position that Dr. Bailey recently vacated is a relatively new position. So, my question is, at what point can we get some indication of a period of growth over this? I mean, is this part of the normal ebb and flow or are we actually cutting into the actual trunk of the tree? I don't know if we have those types of statistics, but is it possible to look into some of those?

Senator Alt: It would be difficult to dig into because it's a fluid thing. Some of these positions (the 110), some of those might get filled within the next year due to critical need and be replaced by another vacancy. So we gain a few, we lose a few. But overall, we are increasing the number of actual vacant positions, so back in the spring the count was, I think, 90 something. And before that, it was 72. So these are true positions. So I can give you some examples of Finance and Planning. We have retirements. And probably more times than not, we're not going to fill that position unless it's a critical need. So, for example, we have two cashiers that are leaving, retiring. We're going to fill one and keep the other. So I can't give you statistical analysis of it, but I would say the majority of those that have become vacant over the last few years, they're actually being held vacant for savings until something changes in the budget. Some of those might have been vacant from a prior time where the department hoped to fill it, and so we have a few of those. But I would say the majority of them, as we keep going along, are positions that we would be filling otherwise if it wasn't for the budget crisis.

Chairperson's Remarks

Senator Kalter: All right. We're going to move on to Chairperson's Remarks. There aren't going to be many of them. It's hard to predict exactly how long this meeting will go, so I'll refrain from comments right now. But I'll be happy to take any questions if anybody has any, and if not, move on to Student Body President Remarks.

Student Body President Remarks

Senator Walsh: So, last week we partnered with the Criminal Justice Association for their event, "Cookout with the Cops." This provided an excellent opportunity for our students to interact with their community law enforcement members in hopes of providing a good relationship between the students and the police. This past weekend, ISU hosted the Illinois Board of Higher Education Student Advisory Committee meeting chaired by one of our own, Senator Dan Heylin, who did an excellent job. The discussions were centered around higher education funding, MAP Grant funding, and then funding for public transportation as well. We decided that on November 16th, the student governments of Illinois colleges will be coordinating a "Call Your Legislator Day." This is going to take place during the brief veto session, so we wouldn't want to let that veto session go by

without something coming from the students. We're also looking at taking a trip to Springfield to lobby during the lame duck session for public transportation and for higher education funding.

Shared governance was another topic of discussion during IBHE-SAC, and many student representatives from other schools were actually very impressed by the strong framework of shared governance that ISU has, and they commended us on our practices. I'm also very pleased to say that many students fell in love with our beautiful campus and expressed a strong desire to transfer here. So that was nice.

Last week, we co-sponsored an event with College Democrats that consisted of a presentation from State Senator Daniel Biss on how to get Illinois back on the right track. He discussed a number of solutions in his own perspective that included the repeal of the part of our Constitution that requires that we have a flat tax, the lowering of property taxes, and the centralization of our pension systems in order to make them more efficient. Ultimately, though, the biggest part of the solution (which I agree with wholeheartedly) is that we need to elect competent leaders who are willing to compromise that we can actually hold accountable to address the problems of today and tomorrow and not just kick the can down the line.

And then, this Friday (in two days), Senator Heylin and myself will be giving a presentation at the breakfast before the Board of Trustees meeting. We'll be talking about student government structure, our functions and our role within shared governance as well as some of our past, present, and future initiatives. And so for those of you who will be in attendance, I promise there is nothing quite like waking up and the first thing you get to hear from is Dan Heylin and myself. So, I look forward to it.

Senator Kalter: I will just say also we'll be happy to host IBHE-SAC every time it meets so that we can recruit more students. Are there any questions for Senator Walsh? All right. Seeing none, we'll move on to Administrative Remarks beginning with Senator Dietz.

Administrative Remarks

• *President Larry Dietz*

President Dietz: Thank you very much. I also want to commend the students on hosting that conference, and thanks for your leadership with that. Earlier this week, we had the Illinois Board of Higher Education here in a series of meetings that took the better part of a half day, and they were talking about the FY18 budget which you've just reviewed. But they are interested in that as well and it's a regular meeting that they have at various campuses throughout, but we were sharing our plans with them as well. In addition, tomorrow, Senator Powers and I, along with other trustees (Dobski, Louderback, and Donahue) will attend the first ever Board of Trustees training session. It'll be in Chicago, and I've been asked to serve on a panel there relating to advocacy role for boards and making the value proposition. So I think it's a good thing that all the trustees are getting together. They are bringing in folks also from Association of Governing Boards to make some of the presentations. So Senator Powers and I will be departing from here very, very early in the morning, so I appreciate his going up with us. In addition, on Friday we will have a Board of Trustees meeting here. I will be giving two reports and seven resolutions as a part of that meeting. We invite you to attend that.

Also want to say congratulations to a couple of different groups. The Black Student Union had a very successful and informative and peaceful event on the campus recently. And also the Culturally Responsive Campus Community Conference was also held recently and I had an opportunity to play a small part in that, but that conference was well received and well attended including by a number of high school students from some other communities, so congratulations to all of those that were involved with that.

Finally, after the Board of Trustees meeting on Friday we are going to be having a retreat next week, which is our usual time of the year to have a retreat, and talking about future issues. And that, again, will be in Chicago. So that ends my report. If any questions you have, I'll do my best to answer them.

- ***Provost Janet Krejci***

Provost Krejci: Thank you. I'll just echo Dr. Dietz's kudos for the CRCC we held Monday and Tuesday. A shout-out to the initial group who kicked that off: Dr. Stacey Hardin, Dr. April Mustian, Mayuko Nakamura, Dr. Stacy Jones-Bock, Dr. Ameer Adkins, and Dr. Doris Houston. There were faculty, student, and community members and it was really a wonderful two days.

Update on enrollment: Just as an FYI, as you know, Troy Johnson is leaving us. He begins at UT Arlington on November 1st. Please feel free to stop by from 4 to 5:30 on the first floor of the Atrium on Hovey tomorrow if you'd like to bid him farewell. We'll have a few treats for you. But, in terms of our enrollment numbers, first time in college for fall 2017 admission applications are down 7%. If you remember, two weeks ago I reported they were down 11%. So although they're still down, we're gaining ground and we believe that's because the view book went out just a little bit later this year and we're starting to see some gains there. And that's evenly distributed across the colleges. Admissions are only down 1% from a year ago. Overall applications (grad, transfer, first time in college, and continuing) are down 8%, but transfer and graduate applications are up slightly for 2017. We, again, think this is very true across the state, but data from other universities are a little hard to get right now in terms of really having some trust in the validity of them, but we are beginning to hear from high school counselors that some of the issue may be that students are feeling the state budget and are looking elsewhere and a little bit more reticent to apply here. But we are doing very well according to others. It's early. We're going to continue to monitor that. International recruitment is ramping up, and we are doing a variety of efforts there for international student recruitment.

CAST search: Just an update. The finalists were in last week and the search committee met earlier this week and forwarded their comments to me. I will be consulting with the president and the incoming interim provost, Dr. Jan Murphy, and we hope to have a decision on that soon. Just as an FYI, all finalists commented on the strength of this university, the excitement they had to be here, the feeling of community they found with everyone, and all four finalists as they left said they would really love to have an opportunity to be here, and I think that is really good news for us as external, these are out of state as well as in state. I'll pause for questions.

- ***Vice President of Student Affairs Levester Johnson***

Senator Johnson: Hi. Good evening. Any update on that score? (Laughter) I really only have one major area to cover, but before I do that I want to echo Senator Dietz, President Dietz's comments about the event a week or so ago sponsored by the Black Student Union and in particular I want to thank the faculty, staff, and students who came out in support as well. Again, a wonderful event that demonstrated the civility and the proper discourse that should take place when expressing ourselves. In particular, I want to shout out and kudos to the Dean of Student Life Office that did come out in force in order to make sure that there were no incidents in that sense.

The one item I did want to touch upon does cross over into the enrollment report that you just heard of. Our second big initiative that Student Affairs wishes to get into (besides, again, launching next month the Greek Life Task Force), we want to address issues of housing on campus. In partnership with Senator Alt and the Facilities and Planning area, Student Affairs is about to partake in a housing master planning type of process for the campus community. It will involve probably about anywhere from 10-12 months of surveys, focus groups, market analysis, assessment of existing facilities and things of that nature to really figure out what's the TLC needed for our existing facilities and then what's the base that we need in order to provide decent and sufficient housing for our students, especially if we are going to be increasing or having even stable enrollments from our students as far as the pipeline that's coming in as well as addressing student needs as far as international students who may be coming in and things of that nature. So we're very excited about that process. It will involve the entire campus community, though, and looking forward to that. I will open things up for any questions that you may have.

Senator Cox: Some time ago, sir, I touched base with your office and a few other offices around campus about an ongoing concern about lack of transportation for students in the evening to and from Shelbourne, and I just

wondered what the update is. I still am chauffeuring a few students in the evening after seminar, and they (as well as some of their neighbors in Shelbourne) are concerned, particularly as it becomes colder.

Senator Johnson: We did have meetings with, is it Connect Transit (I believe is what they're called) as well as representatives from our parking division and representatives from Student Affairs, and an actual graduate faculty member I think attended that as well. We shared some ideas as it relates to maybe things to consider in order to restore possible service to that area. We are waiting, I think, at this point for some feedback from them as it relates to what some possibilities are and pretty much decide on whether or not they're going to be able to accommodate. If that's not the case, we'll have to consider other options then in that sense.

Senator Cox: As a follow-up, would one of those options be temporarily running a university shuttle bus back and forth particularly in the evenings? There are a number of students who are still walking.

Senator Johnson: Yeah. It's my understanding that that's one of the items that has been looked into as far as possibly a bus type of shuttle. I think Athletics does the same type of thing, and I believe Senator Alt's area and representatives from his area actually looked into that.

Senator Dawson: I want to double check and make sure that the Office of Parking and Transportation is included, and Senator Alt, I would assume that you are making sure of that. But they do have the contracts with Connect and when we had some problems with the new Cardinal Court, they were able to resolve those as well. Because three buses had passed by crowded full, and there were students waiting to get on and they were late for class, on and on. But I would hope that they're consulted and included on this issue of transportation.

Senator Johnson: Actually they are taking the lead. I think Senator Alt can speak to what leadership is involved with that.

Senator Dawson: Okay great. Thank you.

Senator Alt: To add to Senator Johnson's comments, yes, Parking and Transportation has been also consulting with Connect Transit, and I think some context on the issue is this is a city-wide issue. Connect Transit is suffering some of the same things we are in state funding. So if you've noticed, they've had to change routes city wide. It happens to impact this one route with very low ridership, actually, even though it inconveniences those students that are involved with it, and the situation the university has is that we don't contract with Connect for bus service. We simply subsidize and pre-pay the ridership costs for our students and faculty. And so rather than you going to the bus and you have to pull out the fare and pay it, the university pays that on your behalf and that way it's a discounted rate and it's also prepaid, but it also is funded, subsidized, by the state who manages funds for some kind of state funding mechanism that provides transportation funds to Connect Transit. And so it is something that's very difficult even for Connect because there's many areas of the town that have suffered from some scheduling and re-routing. And you've probably read in the paper even a couple weeks ago, they're not even certain they're going to be able to operate past January if the state doesn't come through with some funds. So we continue to talk with them hoping that they can work out some kind of solution to that as well as they have for other areas where we've needed additional buses for high ridership. But it's one of those areas that we don't have a solution to yet.

Senator Cox: I want to follow up just for a moment. While there may be a relatively low number of students involved at Shelbourne, and you probably have a better count than I do (some of the students have said it's been as much as two dozen at various times), we're looking at students now who are considering scheduling their classes and we're talking about evening classes for graduate students in order to accommodate the lack of accommodation for transportation, and some of those students are international students disconnected from other resources in the community.

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

Senator Alt: I just have two items to mention. First, an information item regarding ReggieNet. Several days ago, students who live in residence halls may have experienced periodic difficulty gaining access into ReggieNet. Actually, ReggieNet was functioning normally but someone had figured out how to spoof the system by setting up a fake ReggieNet access point which caused students trying to enter through that fake access point to be unsuccessful. So, AT has since put controls into place to protect against that type of activity, but I do encourage students if they experience that kind of thing to make the Helpdesk aware because it did take a while to resolve that not knowing that's what the problem was. But someone had figured out how to put a fake access point and students were thinking they were entering the normal ReggieNet site, but they were not. And the incident is still being investigated by the AT security officer, but we are fairly confident that the spoof was not originated by any Russian hackers, so we know that much at least. (Laughter)

As a follow-up to a communication by Senator McHale a few weeks ago, there was a question raised by members of the School of Communication regarding emergency procedures for securing classrooms during an emergency incident. So that information was passed along to Eric Hodges, who serves as the university's emergency manager, and Eric, along with Police Chief Woodruff, met with staff in the School of Communication and provided a 60-minute type of informational training about how to deal with an emergency incident. So I don't believe that Senator McHale is here tonight. I hope that he would concur that I believe that that did resolve their concerns, but I also mention it because if other departments want additional information related to the same concerns in responding to an emergency incident, that that informational training is available to your department. All you need to do is contact Eric Hodges, our emergency manager, and he'll be happy to arrange a time for him and Chief Woodruff to come meet with your department to provide some additional information about dealing with that kind of incident. And that concludes my comments.

Senator Kalter: Are there questions for Senator Alt?

Senator Kinross: I'm just curious if proper precautions have been taken to prevent that ReggieNet incident from happening again.

Senator Alt: Yeah. They've been able to put a control in place to prevent that because it did expose that that was accessible to be able to set that up. So they've got that somehow that that can no longer happen.

Senator Kalter: Further questions? I regret to inform you, Senator Alt, that your joke is not original. I just heard it on both sides of me from the Student Body President and the Senate Secretary, and then you said it, which is why I laughed so hard. Thank you very much.

Action Item:

09.16.16.05 Faculty Affairs and Planning and Finance Committee Blue Book Pages – Membership Revisions (Rules Committee)

Senator Kalter: We'll move on now to our first and only action item. This is the Faculty Affairs and Planning and Finance Committee Blue Book pages. So, you'll remember this from a couple of weeks ago. We kind of put it off because it wasn't urgent. What we have is we're proposing to move one... Actually, I'm sorry, I should give this to Rules Committee. What am I doing? Senator Horst, go ahead, introduce.

Senator Horst: Why, thank you, Susan. Yes, the Bluebook is the document which details how our committees are structured, and we are proposing that we move one member from the Planning and Finance Committee over to the Faculty Affairs Committee and I'd like to make a motion that the Senate approve this action item.

Senator Kalter: Senator Marx, would you like to add anything to that on behalf of your committee. Such as crossing out the third line of the Planning and Finance Committee charge?

Senator Marx: Yes. That's included in this as well. It presently says that the committee will appoint a member to be on that other committee, and historically it's been the Senate Chair that has been the member. So, therefore, we no longer think that that is a necessary item.

Motion: By Senator Horst on behalf of Rules Committee and by Senator Marx on behalf of Planning and Finance Committee to approve the proposed changes to the Faculty Affairs Committee and Planning and Finance Committee Blue Book pages

Senator Kalter: Terrific. I don't know if we've ever done sort of a double motion before or what the rules are, but I'm not sure we should care. So we have a motion from the Rules Committee to move one member from one committee to another and a motion from the Planning and Finance Committee to eliminate part of the charge for the Planning and Finance Committee as no longer necessary. Is there any debate?

Senator Winger: Should there be any debate? Is there any history here that I don't know about that I should think about?

Senator Kalter: It seems uncontroversial to me. With regard to the Planning and Finance Committee one, we discussed in Exec how it's actually quite important for the Senate Chair to be the one who sits on the Academic Planning Committee and it seems like everybody is agreed about that. That person, because of their institutional memory, can really serve as a stop for unhappy events such as attempts to rid the university of a German program that was, you know, very healthy, for example. So, because Dan Holland many years ago was sitting on both committees, he was able to pull out procedures and policies and say this is something that should go through APC whereas that would be a little bit less possible with the Senate Chair not being on it. With regard to the other switch, we've known for years that the Faculty Affairs Committee often does not make a good quorum or does not have enough tenure-track/tenured faculty members in a meeting at the same time just because people are sometimes absent or whatever, and the Planning and Finance Committee has traditionally been our biggest committee, so we're sort of raiding from the rich to give to the poor in that sense. Something I'm sure that some of you would like to do in a larger sense. But we're done talking about the budget for now. So is there any debate? Anything anyone would like to say? All right. All in favor of these two changes (we're going to do it as a double vote), please signify by saying "aye-aye."

All: Aye-aye.

Senator Kalter: Excellent! That was great.

The motion to approve the proposed changes to the Faculty Affairs Committee and Planning and Finance Committee Blue Book pages passed unanimously.

Information Items:

09.03.16.02 From Lisa Huson, Legal Counsel: 1.2.1 Anti-Harassment & Non-Discrimination Policy Complaint Procedures

Senator Kalter: Let's move on to our information items. The first one is from Lisa Huson, the legal counsel on Policy 1.2.1, the Anti-Harassment and Non-Discrimination Policy. It's actually the procedures part of this policy. I'll just give a little bit of introduction to this as Lisa's coming to the table. Basically, in the middle of the summer as you can kind of see by your copy on this, there was a compliance issue that needed to be met so the president informed me, I think at the August chair and president's meeting, that this would be coming to the Senate retro-actively because they needed to make a policy change right away. And Wendy Smith has also come to the table. Welcome. Anything else that you want to say, either of you, to let us know what was changed?

General Counsel Lisa Huson: No. I mean, I think it's all in there. As you said, it was a compliance issue so they went in and changed and while we were doing that we changed things like the name of the office, since

that changed in the middle of the summer. Many of the changes were related to the Preventing Sexual Violence in Higher Education Act that became effective August 1st and so we had to make changes to that and concurrent changes to the Code to make sure that we were in compliance with that.

Senator Kalter: This is the information stage, so are there any questions about these changes? I e-mailed an apology to Ms. Huson before the meeting that it had taken until last night for me to read again through this, and I do have a couple of editorial comments that I'll just give you probably in an e-mail. Things like just clarifying the titles of a couple of things or putting in a clarification about who is stalking whom. In other words, in that first one, "students can report instances of sexual assault," etc., and it probably should say "by students," for example, so that it's clear again both in the title there. So there are a couple of things like that in terms of formatting and that kind of thing for clarity, but my main question had to do with the burden of proof under the OEOA complaints against employees or against students that are not Title IX type of issues. In this section under Burden of Proof, which is my page 3, there is a preponderance of the evidence standard, and I wondered if you could talk a little bit about that because the American Association of University Professors has actually strongly criticized the Title IX guidelines out of the Office of Civil Rights regarding "preponderance of evidence" versus "clear and convincing" as the standard. So I'm kind of wondering why we have that as the standard for the non-Title IX stuff. And actually, one thing just to point out is that I don't think it's mentioned for the Title IX, although it may be that that "General Procedures and Rights for OEOA Cases" is supposed to cover both. No. Okay.

Associate University Counsel Wendy Smith: Preponderance of evidence for the student cases is in the Code.

Senator Kalter: No, I'm talking about this particular policy, I'm sorry.

Ms. Smith: Right. For students, the procedure, if you look at the top of page 2, complaint procedures can be found...

Senator Kalter: Oh, I see. I'm sorry.

Ms. Smith: So that's where it covers that.

Senator Kalter: Terrific. So, in terms of the burden of proof for the other kinds of cases, can you talk a little bit about why we would want preponderance of evidence versus clear and convincing? One of the concerns that they have is that there's no real due process. You know? It's not civil or criminal court, so there's none of the due process that you get in a court of law. And so they suggest that a slightly higher standard of proof is better, that preponderance of evidence is too low of a standard; clear and convincing is better. So I wondered if you could talk a little bit about whether, first of all, is it legally mandated that we have it like this, and if it's not, why wouldn't we want to have the clear and convincing evidence standard?

Ms. Huson: It's legally required under Title IX, which I think you said, but I just want to be clear. So if we went to a different standard we'd be having different standards for different people in different circumstances. That would be one issue. The other issue is that preponderance of the evidence means it's more likely than not that it's true, and it's been that way (and I hate that answer when you say, "oh, it's been that way for a million years"), but it is true that that is how it has been and it's how it is at most universities. It's also the standard for civil trials and it's also what the outside agencies look for when they investigate us. So if we held ourselves to a different standard, it would be extremely complicated when we were looking at cases on the outside, whether it was civil litigation or whether it was an administrative proceeding. We would have some weird standard over here that then we're doing a different standard out there. So, for my purposes... And I'm here in two roles sort of, you know, as the OEOA director, and that's actually what I would be here for with this, but as legal counsel it would be very complicated for us to do it in a different way, which is not the driving reason. It also happens to be that, you know, is it more likely than not has been the standard.

Ms. Smith: And that was not changed in this version.

Senator Kalter: Oh, that's interesting. So I guess I didn't catch that because I didn't go carefully through the cross-out.

Ms. Smith: No, this hasn't changed. This has been that way. This was not a change. In fact, when the OCR guidance came out that you must use preponderance of the evidence in Title IX cases, we were already using that. So we didn't have to change that at all. In addition, when the state law came out, the state law also required us to use preponderance. So it's required for us by the federal guidance and by the state law, but it was always that way at the university, in the Code and in this policy, so it didn't change.

Ms. Huson: Yeah. We didn't change that.

Senator Kalter: So I have another question but does anybody else have questions before I go with my second one?

Senator Grzanich: Is there a difference, in your opinion, between the preponderance of information and the preponderance of evidence?

Ms. Smith: There's a slight difference in that we don't use rules of evidence, and so any information can come in whereas in a court or where evidence is used by rules, only certain evidence can come in. So if you're looking at all the information that can come in, you have to balance all of it versus evidence which has a more legal term that we don't use, so there's not a big difference, but you can use more information if you use preponderance of the information. So if you bring in information either as a respondent or a complainant in a hearing, all of it can be used versus whatever is just considered evidence.

Ms. Huson: Because in a court of law, even if you've just watched television, you know that there are objections to certain types of evidence coming in. And so that doesn't exist in these processes nor, frankly, would I think we would want that to be the standard. You know, we don't want people to have to get attorneys to be involved in our processes. We want them to be able to just tell us the information that they need to tell us and we can either use it or not.

Ms. Smith: There is a relevancy requirement for the information in the Code as well as in the employee process.

Ms. Huson: Well, it's not a standard.

Ms. Smith: In the Code it says it.

Ms. Huson: Right, in the Code it may be, but in the other one it would be the person weighing the information.

Ms. Smith: In the Code, it has to be information that is relevant to the charges.

Senator Kalter: Lisa, in other words, you're saying that in 1.2.1 it's a single person who makes the determination and then that goes essentially I think directly to the president, right, for an appeal? Is that right?

Ms. Huson: Are you talking about in one of the ones that goes to OEOA instead of under the code? Are you talking about employees?

Senator Kalter: You were saying just now to Wendy that it's true in the code but not in the other case.

Ms. Huson: Right. I don't know which policy – you're much better at the policy numbers than I am – but yeah.

Senator Kalter: I'm sorry, so the one that we're looking at with the burden of proof where it says preponderance of evidence, you just were saying it's not really a procedure or what have you.

Ms. Huson: Well, you're not limiting it by the relevance. You're not going to stop somebody from saying something to you and saying, "That's irrelevant." You're going to listen to it and you're going to decide whether it was relevant to it or not.

Senator Kalter: Oh, I see what you mean. Okay. So, in the Code process you go to the University Hearing Panel, which is more than one person, whereas in a staff or employee kind of situation you have a single person who's the OEOA director or one of the people in that office, and they listen to both sides of the case and then decide.

Ms. Huson: Right. A finding is what they make.

Senator Walsh: Does the relevancy of the information imply that the information has to be factual? Because I don't believe that the term "information" alone implies that something is factual. Information could just be non-factual information.

Ms. Smith: Yeah. There's a separate section in the Code that covers relevance. Even in this policy, it collects and analyzes relevant information. Mostly the type of information that may be excluded is general character references may not be heard as witnesses, but they may provide statements. Because a lot of times a character reference doesn't necessarily go to whether or not a specific violation occurred, so they may handle those in a different way. Or, for instance, in sexual assault cases, they will not hear evidence related to previous sexual history, previous sexual activity, and that's required by the law as well. So, relevant covers a number of things. They're not going to consider what your previous sexual history is in deciding if there was a sexual assault in a current case.

Senator Heylin: I just had a question about this one word, and the reason I'm asking now is because I've seen it again. In Section 3 with the "Cooperation with an Investigation," in these policies, it seems like the university uses the word "expected" a lot. How much legal bearing does the word "expected" have for a person to cooperate with any process that the university has?

Ms. Smith: Are you talking about for the student or an employee?

Senator Heylin: Both, I would ask.

Ms. Smith: In the Code, there's a charge for non-compliance. And it can affect whether you can remain a student if you don't cooperate. I think, as an employment matter, it depends on what your employment status is or if you are an employee. So if an employee brings a complaint against a non-employee or a past employee, obviously you have a different ability for cooperation. Did that answer your question?

Senator Heylin: Yes, thank you.

Senator Kalter: All right. I'll just mention my other substantive one, which is that on, let's see, it looks like it's at step 6, Sanctions, fairly far into the policy, right before the large cross out section. It indicates under Sanctions, "Should the OEOA conclude that the respondent's behavior violated the Anti-Harassment and Non-Discrimination Policy, the OEOA will notify Human Resources..." For faculty, that would seem to be either the provost or the DFSC and I just wondered about whether that needs to be added there.

Ms. Huson: It could be. I mean, for practical purposes you're right. What would happen is, if it went that way, Human Resources would tell the provost's office.

Senator Kalter: Would notify the provost's office. Okay.

Ms. Huson: Or maybe not even the provost. They might notify just the dean or the department head or whoever, you know, up the chain. You could add it there.

Senator Kalter: Got it. But we could put it in as sort of a friendly amendment.

Ms. Huson: Yeah. We could put something in there about Human Resources and/or...

Ms. Smith: There's language in another policy that covers that. I'll look that up and send it to you.

Senator Kalter: Oh, terrific. That would be great.

Ms. Smith: I can't think of what it is right now, but there's other language that covers it.

Ms. Huson: Because you're right. I mean, for practical purposes they would tell them anyway, but, you know.

Senator Kalter: I think the thing that concerned me about that one was not notifying Human Resources but that the sentence continues to say "... who may impose disciplinary action up to and including termination of employment," and technically speaking that can't happen for faculty from Human Resources. It has to go through the academic process. So, terrific. Does anybody else have any other questions or comments about this particular policy? All right. We'll move on then to the next information item, so we'll see this come back again probably in two weeks.

07.28.16.01 Proposed ISU Constitution Article IV, Section 3B (Rules Committee)

09.29.16.02 Current ISU Constitution Article IV

Senator Kalter: The next one is the proposed changes to the ISU's Constitution Article IV, Section 3.B., and I'll pitch that back over more rapidly to Senator Horst from Rules Committee.

Senator Horst: This is a proposed revision to the Constitution, so I am assuming we're going to have an information item and then we're going to have a request to endorse. Is that what we're going to do? Because we don't necessarily approve the revisions to the Constitution.

Senator Kalter: Personally, I would say that we approve our suggested revision. Of course, because the Board of Trustees ultimately has jurisdiction over the Constitution, it wouldn't be our decision, but we are approving our proposed revision to move on to the president and the Board of Trustees.

Senator Horst: Okay. And so this is a request for us to change the Constitution. There is a Constitution that the Board of Trustees governs, and in that there is language which describes the civil service staff. And at one point a former chair of Rules, Farzaneh Fazel, noticed a Civil Service Handbook referenced in this section and she inquired as to what that was and through this process we started looking at this text specifically and how the civil service staff is described. So I'd like to turn it over to Amanda Smith, who has been waiting patiently, and she is the Civil Service Council chairperson. She is going to say a little bit about what her organization does and how they came up with this proposed language.

Amanda Smith: Hello. Again, I'm Amanda Smith. For those in the room that don't know me, I am a graphic designer out of Web and Interactive Communications. I'm currently the Civil Service Council chair, and I was asked to just speak a little bit about civil service staff on campus. Technically, everybody on campus that is non-academic is civil service. The administrative professional designation, and Nikki Brauer can confirm or deny this, is specific to Illinois State University and some other universities, you said as well, but within the civil service system you're either exempt or non-exempt staff. So administrative professional would be exempt staff. It's an HR designation. The Constitution change had been started before I became chair, so as soon as I

got thrust into chairmanship, Susan and the director of HR e-mailed me and said, hey, can you confirm this information that was clearly started before you came in? So I only had a couple very small edits and submitted it back for your approval.

Senator Horst: So basically it's broadening the description of the civil service staff.

Amanda Smith: Yeah. I think it was very limited. It was only like one or two sentences in the current Constitution and we added a little more description and brought in information about the State University Civil Service System, which actually, it's that system with the Merit Board that provides a lot of the governing rules for civil service employees at all universities in the state.

Senator Horst: And then the final thing it's doing this clarifying that the resources providing guidance specific to the rights and responsibilities are found on the university policy website, so that's addressing the original inquiry regarding the Civil Service Handbook.

Amanda Smith: Yeah. We don't officially have a handbook anymore. It's just part of the policies. It was all worked in. It's the same information. It's just on a separate document.

Senator Kalter: When Senator Fazel originally noticed this, we wanted to make sure that that had gone through a shared governance process, essentially. That changing the handbook from a print thing to something other, it had actually been checked through the Council. We found out that that was, indeed, the case. Does anybody have any questions? I just have two little grammatical things. Right in the bottom, getting rid of the apostrophe after Human Resources and turning university "policy's" (apostrophe "s" as though it's possessive) to "policies" plural. These are also late night, 9:00 at night, reading it for the 25th time kinds of things.

Senator Horst: And if you could send me the first one.

Senator Kalter: Absolutely. Any other questions? All right. Seeing none on that one, we'll move on, then.

09.26.16.02 Policy 3.5.2 Laboratory School Continued Service – Faculty Associate (second 2016 revision) (Faculty Affairs Committee)

09.19.16.06 Policy 3.5.2 Laboratory School Continued Service – Faculty Associate (first 2016 revision) & May 19, 2016 memo from Jeff Hill to Perry Schoon & Janet Krejci

Senator Kalter: To the policy from the Laboratory Schools, and I see that Jeff Hill has joined us, so if you'd like to come to the table. And I think I also saw Cassandra Mattoon. But I'll turn it over, first, to Senator Dyck, who is the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Senator Dyck: Yes. We received the policy after it had been revised and approved, and so we were looking at this and we were very thankful that Senator Mattoon was on the committee and could explain the details to us. I'll give a brief overview and then either you or Dr. Hill can add additions if you like. The Lab Schools are requesting a change in this policy regarding the contractual continued service for faculty associates. And if you're not familiar with that term, it basically indicates whether or not they get tenure in terms of a university sense, so it took me a little bit to understand that. There was a new state law enacted that was effective August 1, 2016 and that would have affected this policy in terms of evaluation for the Lab School's faculty associates, and so they did talk with the Illinois State Board of Education in terms of whether Metcalf and U High are considered a school district. They are not, so they're not required to comply. The part that I thought was really good is that there was discussion with the faculty associates and a process where they could identify whether they wanted to go with the new school code or wanted to continue with their own evaluation, and it looked like they very much wanted to continue with their same process. Hence, the revision of this policy. Any other details you'd like to add?

Dr. Hill: Thanks, Cassandra. Yes, in essence what we had to do, if we were going to... Because our old policy was tied to the Illinois school code, we would need to conform, then, to what the new Illinois school code would say in regards to faculty evaluation. That was onerous for our faculty associates, and we spent the better part of a year discussing that. We had a faculty committee that presented information to both U High and Metcalf and had fairly broad participation in regards to making that decision. So one of the things that the current Illinois school code did not take into account is the role of the faculty associate, and that role is not only to teach but to be involved with research and work with clinical students, and so our evaluation model needs to include those components, and certainly the state model would not do that.

Senator Kalter: I'm just writing that down because I'm not sure many people know that faculty associates have research as part of their portfolio, so it's an important thing for us to know. Cassandra, did you have anything else?

Senator Mattoon: No. I would just like to reiterate as one of the faculty associates that we did spend a great part of our time last year going through the process, talking about the process. There were ample opportunities for us to ask questions, give our opinions, any concerns, those types of things. So it went through quite a process. And, like I said, there was multiple opportunities to talk and work through this policy before a decision was made.

Senator Kalter: Terrific. Does anybody have any questions?

Senator Winger: Just really briefly, could you explain the difference between the code that you rejected and the code you like, that you currently have? I'm a little lost.

Senator Mattoon: I'll let you talk specifically about the code.

Dr. Hill: The Illinois school code adopted the Performance Evaluation Reform Act, and that process is driven by a teacher evaluation that has at least 30% of their evaluation driven by standardized test scores. And so that, along with some other items, helped us take a long, hard look at that school code and make determinations on whether or not that was a best fit for the Laboratory Schools and the faculty associates. But that's a pretty key component that we've seen. That's a big difference. We look at student growth a little bit more broadly in the Lab Schools and not just considering standardized test scores and certainly the Illinois school code model does consider other factors, but we like the flexibility to be able to consider student growth in a broad range of things.

Senator Winger: Overwhelmingly, the faculty associates (AKA the teachers) are in agreement?

Senator Mattoon: Correct.

Senator Winger: Got it.

Senator Mattoon: Yes. I mean, we do value (at least I can speak for myself and from some of my colleagues) being able to have a little bit more of that freedom to decide and really think about, from our perspectives, what is best for students and for those evaluations. And, yes, that piece is one that not everybody's in full agreement that, you know, test scores and those kinds of things should be fully tied into the evaluations. And we felt that what we currently do and some changes that we are working on with our evaluation process were best practice and that we wanted to stay with that.

Senator Winger: Thank you very much for that, and I apologize for not keeping up better. And, could you briefly speak to any differences between the tenure we experience as faculty on this side of University Avenue and the tenure you all have?

Senator Mattoon: Yes. So, our tenure process is a four-year process. And so within those first four years, we are evaluated twice a year by our administrators and there's full evaluation forms and criteria and all those things. And then at the end of four years, then being contracted again, then we would receive tenure. So we don't do a portfolio necessarily like you do on that side of the university, but there is an evaluation process that happens twice a year through those four years.

Senator Winger: And then are the rights and responsibilities of a tenured faculty member relatively parallel after that point?

Senator Mattoon: As far as...

Senator Winger: Like when you can be fired, basically?

Senator Mattoon: Yes. After that point, I mean, yes, there needs to be a reason and you would be in contact with the administration. You would know about those things.

Dr. Hill: I might add a little bit to that. The evaluation process changes pretty significantly once faculty reach tenure, so our process is then focused on faculty growth and we give them a lot of freedom to help design their own growth plans that is based on both what's best for their students, what's best for their clinical students, and how they can help us fulfill our mission. So that really, once they move from non-tenure to tenure, that opens up really basically a whole different focus for them as faculty associate. We do have a third strand, which is an assistant strand, which if we happen to have a tenured faculty associate who is struggling, then we will provide for them a more directed plan based on classroom observations and things that we've seen that we're concerned about.

Senator Kalter: I'll just add to that also that certain parts of this are determined by the code that's put across by ISBE, so there's more state control rather than local control, as I understand it. So there's a process, for example, if you were to dismiss somebody or what have you. Any other questions?

Senator Blum: I was just kind of curious more than anything. Are there any elements maybe that you already had that I think are similar... You mentioned that you rejected kind of the standardized test as a principle reasoning that you wanted to look at a more broader picture on how to evaluate the outcomes, but I was kind of wondering are there any commonalities of kind of like the process that goes on with sort of a teacher in an average public school?

Dr. Hill: Yeah. One of the things that we've done as we've gone through this process is revise our core expectations, and that language has changed and there are some similarities now with some of the language that other public schools will use in evaluating faculty, so that's pretty common. The student growth issue, we're not saying we're not going to be using test scores as part of that whole student growth concept, but what we're saying is we're not going to place that high a percentage on it when there's other ways to look at student growth besides standardized test scores. So there are similarities in regards to a lot of the concepts that we have that are evident in our plan, but the particulars are a little bit different.

Senator Blum: I just want to say, I didn't object to that. I was just... Or being critical or judgmental, I was just kind of curious like what other commonalities and I thought, you know...

Dr. Hill: It's a good question. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Further questions? All right. One of the things I'm going to point out here is this is why we have the Senate. While this was going through the Senate process, we noticed a pretty significant need for a subsequent change which was that when over the summer the connections to the school code, ILCS stuff, were crossed out, it left two paragraphs, one of which said that you could get tenure after two years and one of which

said that you could get tenure after four years. And because the dates had been removed, both of those were in there. So we caught that at the Senate level and subsequently crossed out the first paragraph because no employees at the Lab Schools right now were hired prior to January 1, 1989. And so now if you are looking on... It's actually already been changed on the website because it seemed unwise to leave up something that suggested that you could get tenure after two years and get it after four years, so that has been changed, but we're still here to approve any further changes. Anything else? All right. Seeing none, we will move on. What is the score? Five to nothing. We'll move on to our final information item of the night.

10.13.16.01 From Administrative Affairs and Budget: Inspection, Examination, Use and Control of University Financial Records Policy

Senator Hoelscher: I'm actually ready. So, this policy came from Senator Alt's area, Vice President for Finance and Planning. And some fairly extensive suggested revisions, mostly removing verbiage and bringing us in line with the Illinois Freedom of Information Act. The only concern that was raised in our group and earlier had to do with the removal of a paragraph that basically said "the above policy shall not be applicable to..." and one of the things it wasn't applicable to were medical files. And so we brought that question up and had a conversation about it, and basically our concerns were alleviated when it was pointed out that it never had anything to do with medical files. We're not quite sure how it got in there. Medical files are handled in a completely different manner in a completely different way under a completely different law. And so that became amenable to the committee and we passed it out actually two weeks ago.

Senator Kalter: Excellent. Do we have any questions or comments on this policy at the information stage?

Senator Horst: This is an external person asking for some information from Illinois State. This isn't applying to, like for instance, if the Senate wants information, correct?

Senator Hoelscher: I would defer to Senator Alt.

Senator Alt: I haven't thought through that. Generally, I think it's thought about external looking for it, but most information is public anyhow. So whether it's from the Senate or from somebody externally, it's available. But, yeah, the Senate might have opportunities to see information that someone external to the university would not.

Senator Horst: So I wouldn't have to file a FOIA form, right?

Senator Alt: I can't just answer it out of hand, though, because it might depend on the information. It might be something that would have to go through that process. But in many cases the Senate asks for information and you don't have to file through FOIA where somebody from outside the university for standard information would have to file a FOIA. But there might be information that you might be requesting as a senator that might be required to go through a FOIA. I couldn't address that.

Senator Horst: Okay.

Senator Kalter: Would an example be if you asked, for example, the specific paychecks for specific individuals on specific dates that that would be a FOIA type of thing as opposed to the sort of broader financial information that might be needed for determining whether a program is costing too much or something like that?

Senator Alt: Yeah. Good example because we'd want it to go through FOIA to make sure that it was not protected and that it's available.

Senator Horst: Okay.

Senator Kalter: Further questions? All right. Seeing none on that one, all of these will probably come back to us in about two weeks. We'll move on to committee reports and start with Senator Pancrazio for the Academic Affairs Committee.

Committee Reports:

Academic Affairs Committee:

Senator Pancrazio: Thank you. We are still in the process of working through the policy review cycle, and we've forwarded a number of those, of the policies that we've already reviewed, back to the Executive Committee. I think we still have a number of requests out for some clarifications, and I appreciate this is a tedious process and appreciate the people who give the attention to those so that we can get through this. Thank you.

Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee:

Senator Hoelscher: Thank you. The Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee did meet on the 12th and again on the 26th and basically tonight our guests were Diane Dean and Thomas Crumpler, the Chair and Vice Chair of the College Council for the College of Education, and the discussion was over the College of Education dean's evaluation instrument. That discussion is ongoing and will come back to our committee, actually, probably several more times before we pass that through. We also did a final review of 3.2.13, the Administrator Selection and Search Policies. We made some changes in that and we will be sending that to Academic Exec, I think the rule is by noon tomorrow. So expect to see in an information item soon. We did our first review of 6.1.16, Display of Flags on Campus, and we'll be actually working on that probably for a while. We will be actually referring it to L.J. (I'll come see you about that) and seeking a little bit of help from L.J. and his department to help us with that. That's it. That's what we got done.

Senator Kalter: Excellent. Do we have any questions for Senator Hoelscher? All right. You almost gave Senator Horst a heart attack because I think her husband was the one who invented that policy.

Senator Horst: Worked on it for six years.

Senator Kalter: For six years! We'll move on to Senator Dyck for Faculty Affairs Committee.

Faculty Affairs Committee:

Senator Dyck: We met last week and two weeks ago and today also. We're talking about the Distinguished Professor and University Professor policies. Today we had gathered some input from other universities in terms of what their different policies are in terms of both selection and eligibility and the total processes. So that's where we're at.

Senator Kalter: Any questions for Senator Dyck? All right. And soon that committee will be five, in fact, almost now it is five rather than four tenure-track faculty members.

Planning and Finance Committee:

Senator Marx: Yes. Two weeks ago our guest was Senator Krejci and we talked about Academic Affairs and what's going on there and had a lot of interesting discussion about things that can happen in the future of the University. That's sort of become our path this year is to try to figure out how the committee can be more involved in the long-range planning and finance issues. Tonight we discussed the fundraising policy, which is 7.1.10, and we have completed our review and suggested changes. We'll be sending that to Exec tomorrow.

Rules Committee:

Senator Horst: Two weeks ago we met with Amy Hurd, who is the Director of the Graduate School, and we suggested some revisions to the Graduate School Bylaws and those revisions are complete and so Exec will be receiving that item shortly. We also will be forwarding to Exec some revisions to the Blue Book language on the faculty liaison to the SGA. And the Athletic Council bylaws have a revision. We met with Leanna Bordner

tonight and we will be forwarding that item to Exec. So those are the three items going to Exec. And we are now continuing work on the College of Ed bylaws.

Communications:

Senator Hoelscher: Just one more time, Startup Showcase is Friday, November 11th, and we have a very nice prize package this time. We have to call that financial compensation. We can pay for things and we can reimburse things. We can't give them actual cash. A \$5,000 first prize this year, \$3,000 second, \$2,000 third, and \$1,000 fourth. I got lost there for a second. We are a little bit down on applicants this year, and that just means the odds are much better so if you have a student or a team of students who have a great idea, it might be a really good year to apply and have a great time in the competing.

Senator Dawson: I probably deserve this particular seat this time. Regarding the MAP grant cards, our card campaign to send notice to our state representatives and senators that work for us in Springfield, to make them aware that we're watching them. And hopefully... ISU has been so fortunate on being able to cover some of the MAP grant monies, but that doesn't mean they'll be able to continue doing it, so we have to kind of put our legislators on notice. This is a state-wide project. If you have any from when they were passed out through Senate or if the SGA has some that have been collected, I'm looking for an end date of next Monday or Tuesday, and that's department code 5520. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Further communications? I have one, and that is to congratulate Senator Jeff Clark. I do not remember the name of the award, but Senator Clark received a prestigious award recently, I believe. What is it called?

Senator Clark: It's the William A. Howell Award provided by the American School Health Association.

Senator Kalter: Congratulations. I don't know your field, but it looked like an enormous honor. (Applause) Any further communications before I read the Executive Session information? All right. We're about to go into Executive Session. The Illinois Open Meetings Act Section V, ILCS 120/2, Section C1 allows for closed meetings to consider the appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of specific employees of the public body or legal counsel for the public body, and we are proposing to go into Executive Session for the honorary degree selection.

Motion: By Senator Winger, seconded by Senator Dawson, to move into Executive Session. The motion passed unanimously.

Senator Kalter: And I'll ask anybody who is not a senator to get up for a couple minutes and leave the room. Thank you.

Executive Session

The Senate completed its work in Executive Session and then returned to regular session in order to adjourn.

Senator Kalter: All right. And we've got the ballots and everything duly hidden so we can ask our guests back in. All we need now is a motion to adjourn.

Adjournment

Motion by Senator Heylin, seconded by Senator Broderick. The motion was unanimously approved.