

2-21-2018

## Senate Meeting, February 21, 2018

Academic Senate  
*Illinois State University*

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

---

### Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting, February 21, 2018" (2018). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 1238.  
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/1238>

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](mailto:ISURed@ilstu.edu).

**Academic Senate Meeting Agenda**  
**Wednesday, February 21, 2018**  
**Approved**

***Call to Order***

Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

***Roll Call***

Senate Secretary Martha Horst called the roll and declared a quorum.

***Chairperson's Remarks***

Senator Kalter: Hello everybody. Just a couple of chairperson's remarks. We are going to aim for a hard stop time at 8 pm tonight, rather than 8:15 pm. We'll see how we do; 8:15 pm is the absolute, absolute hard stop time. Also, because it's been three weeks since we've had committee reports, I'm actually going to try to start with those. I meant to email you all this morning to warn you, but hopefully you can be on your toes. Can we start with Senator Pancrazio? Are you ready to give a committee report?

Senator Pancrazio: Yes. How far back do you want me to go?

Senator Kalter: Three weeks' worth, apparently.

***Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Pancrazio***

Senator Pancrazio: Okay. That would take us to January 24, 2018. We had visits from Dr. Hurd to talk to us about the Accelerated Bachelor/Masters program. We had a visit from Dr. Rosenthal, Jess Ray, the registrar, and Sandy Colbs to talk about the Leave Of Absence Policy, and we had continuing discussion on the University graduation requirement.

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

Senator Hoelscher: I don't have my computer up. Is Senator Laudner here? Could you do that report for me, because I've been out anyway for three weeks.

Senator Laudner: The last couple of weeks we met to talk about the Presidential Commentary. We're looking at potentially revising the questions. We discussed the procedures for collecting the data and providing reports. And then tonight we met and we discussed potential revisions to the Administrator Selection and Search policies.

***Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Liechty***

Senator Liechty: Yeah, my computer is still coming up too, so I'm not exactly sure what we discussed two weeks ago, but it was exciting, I'm sure. Tonight we met and we discussed policy 1.8 Integrity in Research and Scholarly Activities and basically kind of got clear as to where we stopped from last year and where we'll pick up now, so we have an agenda for that.

***Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Marx***

Senator Marx: So our committee has begun its deliberations for the Institutional Priorities Report for this year, and that's coming along very well. In addition to that, tonight we were joined by Dr. Catanzaro to discuss faculty development issues beyond what is typically done by CTLT, and looking forward to maybe some more discussion in the future on these issues. That's all I have to report.

***Rules Committee: Senator Horst***

Senator Horst: Ah yes. Three meetings ago we finalized the bylaws and the Drug-Free Workplace policy, and we also considered the Mennonite School of Nursing bylaws, but those were rescinded. We have now since

then picked up the Consensual Relations policy; both the one that is pointed towards faculty, and then another one that is pointed towards University employees.

Senator Kalter: Excellent. We'll do questions all at once. Does anyone have any questions for any of the committee chairs? All right. We will leave out in the air what was so exciting about Senator Liechty's meeting. That's all of my chairperson's remarks. Does anybody have any questions for me? Excellent. Let's move on to Student Body President's Remarks.

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

Senator Grzanich: Hello. I'll try to make it quick for you tonight. So Senator Whitsitt, Senator Hale, and myself this past Tuesday met with the Board of Trustees of First United Methodist Church, which is the church right next to the Bowling and Billiards facility, in regards to our implementation of a food bank. I think the idea was very well received. We're waiting to hear back in that regard on whether or not that's going to be a potential facility that we could use.

On February 27, 2018, from 7-10 pm, and I'll go ahead and pass this away, is an event that we're hosting called Get Out The Vote, which we'll have speaking commentary from President Dietz and Governmental Relations Associate Richard Greenfield. It's going to be a phenomenal event in regards to trying to get more people involved within the voting process. Thank you to Senator Pryhuber and Senator Consuelos for orchestrating that event and putting a lot of time and effort into it.

This past Thursday, we released a mental health video in collaboration with Professor Lee Anne Hale's COM 110 class, which touches a lot on how mental health affects students and how the Student Counseling Services can help in regard to the different issues that you may face. That video has reached over 1500 people, which we're pretty excited about. On top of that, we also reached a video last week for Turbo Vote, which is a video promotion to try and get more people registered to vote within the Illinois State student body. It was a collaboration between the Center for Community Engagement and Service Learning, the American Democracy Project, and Student Affairs, and that video has reached over 7000 people thus far, which is also equally as exciting. Thank you to Senator Jacobs for all of his work in regard to both of those videos. They've been doing a phenomenal job.

This next week will be our Diversity Week, and so I'll just touch on those events really fast. If you want information on any of them, feel free to reach out to me after. On Monday, we're having an event titled Debunking Religion in Schroeder 130 from 6-8 pm. Tuesday is going to be a social media day where we're going to use the hash tag diversity week to tell us what diversity means about you. Wednesday we're having a guest speaker, Erika Harold, who is a candidate for attorney general, and that will be in Schroeder 130 from 5-7 pm. On Thursday, we'll have a cultural art expo in Old Main from 7-9 pm. And then Friday will be a mini multicultural center in Stevenson 401 from 6-8 pm.

And then lastly, we had our informational meeting in regard to the constitutional changes. I think we had a lot of really great conversation and questions going, and we look forward to voting on that in our next meeting next week. With that I yield for questions.

### ***Administrators' Remarks***

- ***President Larry Dietz – not in attendance***
- ***Interim Provost Jan Murphy***

Provost Murphy: All right. Good evening. I'll make mine brief too. Applications and admissions for fall 2018 continue to look strong. Admissions are up by 11% compared to this date last year. Remember we are processing admissions a little more quickly, so that's a part of that. We are starting to track enrollments now, so think about it; applications, admissions, enrollments. Enrollments are what we're really shooting for. So right

now we're on track with last fall at about 1300. We have a number of big events, admission events on campus this month, and the enrollments in those are quite a bit bigger than last year, so we're hoping this leads to an increase and a pretty good uptick in enrollments for fall of 2018. Housing contracts are up significantly and that's also a good sign, we think.

We had a flooding issue in CVA 151. It rained quite a bit this week, so I want to start by thanking Facilities Management for their handling of the situation. They were right on top of it and worked diligently, I'm guessing all night, to try to monitor the situation. It could have been worse than it was, but we lost a day of classes and I hate that we had to cancel classes in that building again, so we continue to work with Dan Stephens and the folks in Facilities Management to monitor the building and try to prevent those issues. And then I know that on a bigger scale, the president is continuing to push the way he can with the legislators as he travels to and from Springfield to see if we can't, you know, it feels like it's getting to the point of kind of being ridiculous that we've got to get that building fixed. We've got to get the funding for that. The governor had the funding for that capital project in his budget proposal, so that gives us something to push on as we work with the legislators and try to encourage them to fund the renovation of all of our Fine Arts complex. It's needed badly.

This is Business Week, and it's a week of professional development opportunities for all of our business students. It's an extraordinary week of events and it is planned by students, so I think that's always a source of great pride for the College of Business that they pull together this fascinating week of events and it is planned by a student group.

The last thing I would tell you is, if I can remember, just a reminder that the Three-Minute Thesis competition occurs tomorrow night at 6 pm at the Normal Theater. It's a fun event. If you did not go last year, I would encourage you to go this year. It is fun. So it's 6 pm Normal Theater tomorrow night.

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

Senator Johnson: These things aren't working. Mine is working. Well, hello everyone. I feel like I'm going back to my day as an undergraduate with my broadcasting degree. LJ the DJ. All right. Here we go. We won't go there. I don't have a lot either. There are no major developments as it relates to the Bone Student Center Revitalization Project, but I do have a programmatic note just to make sure everyone is aware. In addition, again, to the major commencement ceremonies for the colleges that take place on May 11, 2018, and May 12, 2018, I want to just make sure everyone is aware of the cultural festivals or the cultural ceremonies that take place earlier in the week as well, including the Middle Eastern, Asian / Pacific Islander, and Southeast Asian or MAPS ceremony that will take place on May 6, 2018, Nuestros Logros which will take place on May 6, 2018, and then the Lavender graduation ceremony that will take place on May 9, 2018, and Umoja that will take place on May 10, 2018. If you would like any details on this, there will be advertisements sent out to the campus community as well as if you email me I will be more than happy to share that information with you all. That concludes my announcements.

- ***Vice President of Finance and Planning Dan Stephens***

Senator Stephens: Thank you, Dr. Kalter. A couple of quick things. We did price, we completed the pricing of the 2018 series, Bond Series, on February 6, 2018. We were very fortunate to go into the market on a very good day, and so we met and even exceeded our savings expectations. One of the biggest ways that we did it is we added some insurance to our...added an insurer to our credit. Not only did it improve our credit rating, by improving our credit rating, it lowered our interest cost substantially. On top of that, it actually allows our public debt, for Cardinal Court and the Rec Center, to be issued publicly and noted publicly at the insured rate, which is a Standard and Poor's AA. We are traditionally at an A-. So even though it is an insured rate, the marketplace looks at it as the combination of ISU and the insurer. So it definitely helps us not only with the public image, but also did help us quite a bit on the execution, so I go next week to Chicago to sign the closing

papers. That's just the formality, but the good news is that we over the next couple of months work with LJ and his team to integrate the financial pieces of the puzzle into the budgets over next year and the remaining year. It's going to be certainly a positive benefit, you know, for the students and for the University, so very happy to get that done.

The last item. Jan spoke a little bit about it. The governor's budget was last week and a couple of just key points. Jan mentioned, Provost Murphy mentioned one, which was actually pretty exciting, is that the College of Fine Arts actually made it into the capital budget at the governor's level. Now that doesn't necessarily mean it will get funded, but the fact that it did get presented and it also got presented at an inflation-adjusted rate of around \$61 million when the original appropriation that was signed about seven or eight years ago that didn't get funded was at \$54 million. So we're crossing our fingers and hoping that there is a capital bill this year and it is as it gets presented, the IBHE. That was a recommendation by the IBHE, so at least we have that working for us. So if that will be the case, it will definitely be an exciting time relative to having that kind of funding, especially for that building because it's desperately needing some attention.

From an appropriation perspective, the IBHE recommended essentially the FY18 level with a small increase of roughly about 2%. So from an ISU perspective, our appropriation was around \$65 million in 2018. In 2019, they're recommending through the governor's office a little over \$66 million. So that's a positive sign. Probably the most interesting thing that was placed in there, which is something that we haven't seen for a number of years, is the IBHE, at the recommendation of all of the schools, was to request funding for mandated waivers that we provide to veterans and special education teachers as a state requirement. That's about \$8 million dollars a year that is required by the state, but they've never funded that. And so it's in the proposal, the governor's budget, to fund some of that. And so that could be another positive outcome if that actually continues to go through. There is a lot of talk going around about some of the most controversial pieces of the budget, which was pension shift cost shift, and health care cost shift. The governor's budget is quite aggressive. It's actually kind of unrealistic. It's like 25% of the normal cost every year. This is to everybody out there. Four years of basically shifting that in just four years, and that's just not even rational at all. So I really believe the legislature will debate that one quite intently. Now will there be some continued growth in that pension and health care discussion shift? Yes. Will it be as aggressive as the governor proposed? I can't imagine that passing, especially in this time. Anyway, our first Senate hearing is March 1, 2018. And then our House hearing is in late April. So next week the President and I and a number of others will be down in Springfield talking with the legislature for probably about an hour. So hopefully that will go well. Anyway, that's all I've got.

Senator Grzanich: When you're referring to military and special education waivers, is that tuition waivers? Right?

Senator Stephens: Yes.

Senator Grzanich: Okay. Just making sure.

Senator Stephens: Mandated tuition waivers. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Any other questions? Sure we got questions for Governor Rauner, but we're going to hold those.

Senator Stephens: Yes. Please.

***Action Items:***

***01.18.18.03 AABC AIF annual report FY 2018 CLEAN COPY (From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***01.09.18.04 and 01.09.18.05 AABC AIF Statement of Priorities and Guiding Principles Report FY18 11.28.17 (From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

Senator Hoelscher: I think we discussed this last week. My apologies for missing that, and thanks to everyone who covered for me. For those of you who don't know, I had a full knee replacement and I bet my doctor I would be back in two weeks. I lost that bet rather handily. But I'm back now, and thanks to Kevin Laudner and others who covered for me. I deeply appreciate it. I put before you the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee report on the Academic Impact Fund. I think you got to see it last week, or last meeting, so I'm not going to say much more about it. I'll open myself up for any questions prior to a vote.

Senator Kalter: All right, so you're formally moving that onto the floor for action on behalf of the committee.

Senator Hoelscher: On behalf of the committee. Correct.

Motion by Senator Hoelscher on behalf of the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee to approve the AIF annual report.

Senator Kalter: All right. Do we have any debate? Seeing none, it looks like you did a great job.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: Excellent. Thank you very much. We'll forward that to the President and Provost. The information items, if you will indulge me I'm going to go a little bit out of order. Ms. Huson is here, our University Counsel, to help us with the Compliance Program and the Drug and Alcohol Free Campus program, and so let's have her come to the table and start with the Compliance Program markup.

***11.29.17.01 Policy 1.18 Compliance Program Policy MARK UP (Rules Committee)***

Senator Horst: Yes. The Rules Committee passed this out of our committee, I believe, last year, and it came as an information item at that point. Senator Kalter raised some concerns about the wording, and then Legal took it to the Compliance group, and so I will let Lisa Huson...

Ms. Huson: I think most of them are, they really aren't very substantive, so...

Senator Horst: So the policy you see in front of you reflects the wording changes that the group agreed to.

Senator Kalter: All right. So are there any questions about the slight wording changes? The committee had a nice discussion. I was present for it. I think there's not much to see there. That's good.

***12.07.17.01- Policy 5.1.5 Drug and Alcohol Free Campus MARK (Rules Committee)***

***12.07.17.02- Policy 5.1.5 Drug and Alcohol Free Campus CLEAN COPY (Rules Committee)***

***01.23.18.01- Policy 5.1.20 Alcohol Policy (Rules Committee)***

Senator Horst: All right. I'm just going to give a little bit of overview. The Alcohol Policy, 5.1.20. At one point I believe there were some state law changes, and so Legal had to do some quick changes to this a few years ago. Some of those changes are finally going in front of the Senate. One of the things that Legal decided to do was to make this more of, you know nuts and bolts policy, and we moved some of the language discussing that Illinois State is committed to sustaining an academic environment that doesn't include drugs and alcohol. We moved some of that language over to 5.1.5. So that is why the Rules Committee asked that both of these policies go up together so that you can see how the language has shifted over to that policy. We did include

some of that language that used to be in the tailgating section, we put that up at the top of 5.1.20. Other than that, the changes that are made to this Alcohol Policy, 5.1.20, reflect changes that happened in State law. So I will turn to Lisa Huson.

Ms.Huson: That was actually a very good summary of it. So, yeah, it's probably been four years ago maybe that the State law changed relative to where we could serve alcohol on campus and what were the requirements for when we did so, and it was a very short turnaround time from the time the law was implemented and it happened in the summer before the Senate was back in session. So we just made some changes and, like Martha said, we changed it into more sort of a nuts and bolts things in terms of where it can be served and the requirements that went with it. At the same time back then, we created a website where people could go to get the alcohol approvals done, which is actually kind of neat, because it has behind-the-scenes, it gets sent to Risk Management to make sure insurance requirements are met, and it's a pretty nice little slick website that allows things to be done in a fast fashion. And when we did that, Martha was right, we did take out some of those things that went more towards sort of general principal-type statements about alcohol, and we put them over in the drug-free workplace policy. Now the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act, Drug-Free Workplace Act policy is a federal requirement that we have to do, so there are things that you're going to see in there that are just required that we just have to do. So we took some of the stuff from the alcohol policy and put it over there, and I mean I think it's actually, I think the Rules Committee did a great job, you know, getting it all, getting it all right. So I don't know if you have any specific questions about it.

Senator Horst: Another full disclosure, we did add the Planetarium to the list of places that can have events.

Senator Kalter: Former Senator Chairperson Holland will be happy that you were able to slip that in right under the wire. Very good. Do we have questions, concerns, anything... Senator Smith.

Senator Tyler Smith: I just have a small friendly amendment. Under the section titled students, where it talks about how...

Senator Kalter: Which policy are you in?

Senator Tyler Smith: The Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act.

Senator Kalter: Great. Thank you.

Senator Tyler Smith: Under the second page, under students, I propose that you would add the word confidential right before professional advice just so that students are aware that if they go to seek help, they're not going to be getting in trouble for that.

Ms. Huson: It's okay with me if it's okay with them.

Senator Kalter: So this is in the second paragraph under students, the second line down.

Senator Horst: Seek professional confidential...

Senator Kalter: Seek confidential professional advice.

Senator Horst: Is that correct?

Senator Kalter: Yes.

Senator Horst: Thank you.

Senator Grzanich: Yeah. In 5.1.20, is there a legal reason to leave Shelbourne Apartments in the explanations on residence halls and apartment living.

Senator Horst: We actually, we sent out, there was a later version of this policy, and Cera sent it out on Friday after I saw that the wrong version was sent out, so it now says University-owned apartments on Fell and School Street.

Senator Kalter: So the policy that Cera sent out is 02.06.18.01, for all of you who are looking, and I believe, Senator Horst, that was the only change that was made, the only difference between that one and 01.23.18.01. Is that right?

Senator Horst: Yes. That was made up after the executive session, just we sent out the wrong... Yeah. Yeah.

Senator Judson: Is the College of Business conference center, the conference room, 412?

Ms. Huson: Alcohol venue approved, is that what you're asking?

Senator Judson: The only reason I wonder is because I don't know if you want to use... I believe the AFNI Room, it's sponsored.

Senator Kalter: So you're talking in the list where it says College of Business Conference Center, it's called the AFNI room?

Senator Judson: I believe. Right.

Senator Kalter: A-f-n-e?

Senator Judson: I.

Senator Kalter: Oh, I'm sorry. A-f-n-i. Sorry.

Ms. Huson: Why don't we just double check the right name.

Senator Judson: You might want to double check the right name.

Ms. Huson: Okay. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. Other questions, comments, observations? All right. Looks good. So we will likely bring both of these back, or all of these back, the Compliance Program Policy, the Drug and Alcohol-Free Campus Policy, and the Alcohol Policy back in a couple of weeks to go to action. Thank you very much, and thank you.

Ms. Huson: Thanks for letting me move in.

Senator Kalter: You're welcome. You're very welcome.

Senator Horst: Don't leave.



Senator Kalter: So we have also... We were, we were trying to let Ms. Huson leave, and she is told not to leave. We're going to go back to the top of the information items, go to Changes in the Structure of General Education and Graduation Requirements from Academic Affairs Committee.

***12.07.17.03 Changes to the Structure of General Education and Graduation Requirements CURRENT COPY (From Academic Affairs Committee)***

***12.07.17.04 Changes to the Structure of General Education and Graduation Requirements MARK UP (From Academic Affairs Committee)***

***12.07.17.05 Changes to the Structure of General Education and Graduation Requirements CLEAN COPY (From Academic Affairs Committee)***

Senator Pancrazio: This is part of our regular policy review cycle. The two policies that we're looking at here are Changes to the Structure of General Education and Changes to Graduation Requirements. The Academic Affairs Committee discussed and made minor recommendations. We sought input from Assistant Provost Rosenthal, from the UCC chair Jean Standard and from Provost Murphy. The only change that we're asking, that we're recommending was a general University-wide announcement that a process was underway, something over the listserv so that everyone would know. Otherwise, I think the other additions in there came from the chair of the UCC Standard, and they are in the comments explaining what they are. They are minor.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. The Executive Committee talked about this a couple of weeks ago and, as you'll notice, J3 is marked as all these strikeouts were in the original documents sent by the Executive Committee. This year's Executive Committee couldn't figure out exactly why some of these things were struck out, so we're recommending that in those places where it said "if necessary the Academic Senate, the Executive Committee or the Academic Affairs Committee may also send a proposal of those changes back," that we simply make that more concise and say that the Academic Senate or its internal committees may send proposed changes back to the UCC, because that's just essentially describing a normal process, a normal power of all of those committees.

Senator Pancrazio: I think I recall what you're talking about. Those were comments, I think, that were in the previous review cycle.

Senator Kalter: Yes.

Senator Pancrazio: Yeah. If that's a friendly amendment, that certainly should be included.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. So we didn't want to have this have, take away powers that the Senate generally can exercise just in general for any committee, so I thought that that would be advisable. Does anybody else have any questions, observations, comments? All right. If not, this one will also come back soon, probably in two weeks, to the floor. We're going to, because Ms. Huson has been asked to stay, we're going to actually skip around again and go to the Academic Senate Bylaws.

***02.08.18.05 New Academic Senate By-Laws Articles 5-7 (Rules Committee)***

***01.30.18.02 Senate Bylaws ARTICLE I CURRENT (Rules Committee)***

***01.29.18.02 Senate Bylaws ARTICLE V (old I) MARK UP (Rules Committee)***

***01.30.18.03 Senate Bylaws Proposed ARTICLE V CLEAN Copy (Rules Committee)***

Senator Horst: Yes. And so, as I said last time, this is an article, it used to be Article I in the old bylaws, and now it will be our new Article V. It goes to the procedures of the Academic Senate, and this one has been edited quite a lot. Before I go through all of the language through how the procedure language is discussed in the bylaws, I'd like to fast forward to the last page 5, which is, let's see, Section 4 meetings. There is new language about the opportunity for public comment, and this is why I'm asking Lisa to stay. There have been some changes in the Open Meetings Act and, based on those changes, we have now included language that

reflects the Board of Trustees procedures. And so we will now have a procedure for having public comment at our meetings. Are there any questions about that section in particular?

Senator Kalter: Senator Horst, why don't you describe what the open comment consists of. It's a little bit different from what the Board of Trustees will be.

Senator Horst: Okay, so the Academic Senate will now allow up to 10 minutes in total for public comments and questions during a public meeting. This is a public meeting. An individual speaker will be permitted 2 minutes for his or her presentation. When a large number of persons wish to speak on a single item, it is recommended that they choose one or more persons to speak for them. The Academic Senate will accept copies of the speakers' presentations, questions, and other relevant written materials. When appropriate, we may provide a response to the speakers' questions within a reasonable amount of time. If they wish to make a presentation during a public meeting, they should sign in on the sign-in sheet held by the secretary prior to the start of the public meeting so that the chair may be made aware of the request. In the event of a number of requests to address the Academic Senate at a public meeting exceeds the time available, the request will be approved based on the order of requests listed on the sign-in sheet. Okay?

Senator Kalter: Any questions on that particular section? I think that there was no change to the Open Meetings Act. It was just more best practices around it. Right?

Ms. Huson: Yeah. It became sort of notable in the last couple of years, and I think there was a PAC, public access counselor, opinion on that.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Great. Thank you. All right. Now we will allow...

Ms. Huson: Now I may go...

Senator Kalter: ...Ms. Huson to go back home. Thank you, Lisa.

Senator Horst: Okay. So we have a new Article V. Part of the problem with the old article is the language did not match our current process, so it's talked about the promulgation stages and the decision stages, and we talk about information items and action items. Nobody was quite sure about that term promulgation, so we did away with that, and we matched up the language that we use in the Senate with the language of this article. The path of how something goes through the Senate wasn't so clearly spelled out. It didn't really mention the Executive Committee and how items go through the Executive Committee. It didn't really mention the path through the internal committee, so we really tried to spell that out more clearly so the members will be aware of the process of how something is passed. I talked about the Open Meetings Act. Another thing that we are currently doing that's not in our bylaws is this concept of a consent agenda. It's not in our bylaws, so we added specific language about a consent agenda, and we actually opened it up to potentially policies that have little or no wording change that it could go to the Executive Committee and the request would be to put it on a consent agenda. So a policy has a phone number change. The committee then could request that it be placed on the consent agenda, the Executive Committee would agree to that. We can look at the specifics later. More to the point, we are doing this consent agenda concept, and it's not in our bylaws. Senate resolutions were added. We changed the term to Senate clerk for our assistant, Cera, and also the fact that the Caucus isn't in the article that we now used. So basically the attempt is to align our bylaws with our current practice.

Senator Kalter: Is that it for Article V?

Senator Horst: I mean I could go through specific items.

Senator Kalter: No. That's okay. Why don't we just ask if people have questions about specific items?

Senator Horst: I actually have an amendment I'd like to make.

Senator Tyler Smith: So as far as consent agendas go, it says that a Senator may request an item to be removed from the consent agenda and that the Executive Committee can then decide to put it right back on the consent agenda basically ignoring the request of the Senator. So like, do we have any kind of guarantee that if ten of us all request something not be on the consent agenda, the Executive Committee can't just ignore that?

Senator Horst: The one time that I've seen, for instance, that happened with a curricular item, it was placed back on the consent agenda, because the item, the question that they had was addressed, so that's why the Executive Committee put it back on the consent agenda. So if a Senator raised a question about an item and that question was answered, then it could go back on the consent agenda, so the one time I've seen that happen, Susan, that was the scenario and that's why it was placed back on the consent agenda.

Senator Kalter: That's the only time that I've seen it happen as well. Let me also just clarify, we are actually not currently practicing #3 in F.3. That is the novelty here. So the curriculum proposals being approved by the UCC being able to be on a consent agenda happened at a Senate meeting a couple of decades ago. So we have minutes that show that the Senate approved that as consent agenda. Number two, we have been doing that for the last couple of years just because of changes in the transcription and how long it takes and that kind of thing, and so, you know, to take pressure off of that system, and because you would spend a couple of minutes doing minutes at the meeting and basically everybody said yes to them, right. But the novelty here, the new item that we have never done before and that could be controversial is that #3, and I think that your question is a very good question. Under what kinds of circumstances could the Executive Committee, it could be taken as ignoring, you know, the Senator or under what circumstances would it be appropriate for them to place it back on the consent agenda.

Senator Tyler Smith: Yes. It makes me a little concerned that it would give the Executive Committee almost dictatorial powers to just pass something through without the consent of the Senators.

Senator Horst: I mean, I think the scenario would probably be that the Executive Committee would exercise caution and not place something on the consent agenda, even though the committee asked it to be placed on the consent agenda.

Senator Tyler Smith: I'm just concerned that there's not a guarantee that a hypothetical situation might happen where the Executive Committee might be in a particular administration a little bit, I guess, power greedy.

Senator Horst: So the power greedy part would be that we would place something on the consent agenda against the will of the Senator.

Senator Tyler Smith: Yes.

Senator Kalter: It does seem, in my view, generally speaking, to go against the point of a consent agenda. So, for example, if we put something on the floor for information, we do that even if only one person is interested in talking about it. Right? It is interesting that we have this one case in point, you know. It was probably a couple of years ago, within the last 5-10 years or something like that, when it was not necessary to bring it forward because the person had their question answered, and so in that case maybe one of the safeties that you're looking for is with the consent of the person asking to take it off the consent agenda, it could be put back on. Would that solve the issue?

Senator Tyler Smith: I almost feel like specifically in regards to #3, because that's the novelty of this section, as you said, but I almost feel like it would not be appropriate to put something back on the consent agenda when a Senator, even just one Senator, has raised an issue with it.

Senator Kalter: So pull it off and bring it to the floor no matter if that person wants it off.

Senator Tyler Smith: Yes.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Thank you. Other questions or comments about... Let's stay on the consent agenda because I know that this has been talked about in the past. Do people have any concerns about having a consent agenda that is more open?

Senator Horst: Just to refresh everybody's memory from a year ago, this was a proposal from Senator Gizzi, and we tabled it at the time it was put forward as an information item, and the concept from Senator Gizzi is this would make the Senate more efficient, because sometimes on the Senate, Senate items, in his opinion, the topic of the item is trivial. The changes are trivial in a policy. The question is what is trivial, but that was the idea behind the consent agenda. But could I just get back to the wording that I'm going to propose with my committee? If one Senator objects, the item may not go on the consent agenda.

Senator Kalter: May not go back on...

Senator Horst: May not go back.

Senator Kalter: Yes. Senator Blum, I remember you being one of the people who brought up a concern about what is trivial.

Senator Blum: I remember those comments myself.

Senator Horst: We've reminded him of it.

Senator Blum: Yes. When we discussed this in Rules, all right, because I brought up kind of a similar concern. Right? I mean at that time it was like what's the definition of trivial. Right? But when we sort of hashed out and sort of looked at this that, I mean, my position evolved. All right? When that sense that I felt like moving it towards Exec, putting it through a process, and that process, which is a vote, right, that sort of strengthened it a little bit, all right, in the sense that there was somebody looking at it, somebody talking about it, somebody making a democratic decision about it. On the other hand, I mean, you know, if we get into modifying this, it sort of defeats the purpose a little bit.

Senator Horst: One point that we brought up was that an internal committee has looked at it and the Executive Committee has looked at it, and both of those bodies have decided that the changes warrant it being placed on the consent agenda. So this is the concept that Rules is putting forward.

Senator Kalter: I'll just say one of the lingering concerns I have, because I go back and forth on this one, administratively, in terms, in other words, in terms of Cera's job, I think it makes her job harder, because she then has to route things in two or three different directions, instead of just one. But one thing that might help with that is to place items on the consent agenda on our agenda, mail them out as items to read for the meeting, and sort of like... I think the Peoria City Council does it this way where they ask, you know, does anybody want to pull something off the consent agenda, and they say that at the meeting, and you do it at the meeting, so that it's a little bit halfway between the kind of email consent agenda that we use for curriculum proposals and for minutes, and more of a traditional information item, so might serve the purpose of not wasting as much time on

the Senate floor with very, very trivial changes, and yet it would be incorporated still into everybody's prep for the meeting, and so, you know, I don't know whether that would be a good sort of kind of a compromise, but it might be something that would be workable so that we don't feel like, okay, we are now giving up our... You know, because there have been many times in many meetings across campus, not just this one, where I've seen something that seemed trivial all of a sudden bring up a really major question, because somebody with different eyes looked at it and noticed something that none of the committee members, none of the executive members, or in the case of a department that nobody on their, you know, meetings noticed. And Senator Smith is nodding, so I must be on the right track somehow. Senator Grzanich, did you have your hand up?

Senator Grzanich: Yeah. So I would say with the example that you gave previously about someone within the last 5-10 years having a question about something like on the consent agenda, polling it, and then bringing it back, that procedure that you just outlined would in effect be very effective for not only addressing that question, but potentially if anyone else in the Senator groups had this similar question, it could be addressed in front of everyone rather than an email chain. So it might put a little bit of visibility in regards to how those conversations happen as well. So I would be in favor of that process.

Senator Horst: I'm not sure that would have to be in the bylaws. The consent agenda could just be published along with the agenda. And so people would receive the Senate agenda and the consent agenda as a combined document. I'm not sure we have to put that in the bylaws, but that seems like then we would all... I mean, one concern I also have is that, you know, with all of these different things that we have to review outside the meeting, there is a lot of pressure on your time to do that, and now we would have another level of review that would happen outside the Senate meeting.

Senator Kalter: That's definitely a concern of mine that when we turn things to email they get less attention, because people are really, really busy, and it's easy to say, well I'll get to that later, and then it never happens.

Senator Tyler Smith: It's more of a comment than a question, but I think that when we're making policies we should strive for efficiency while not sacrificing transparency. I think that a lot of the things on the consent agenda can be pushed through in a less transparent manner, and I think that it renders us useless in a lot of ways.

Senator Horst: I see your point. The scenario we discussed in our committee is something like the following. AFEGC changes its name to AFEGCL, and I don't know what the L would be, but that would affect 50 policies, OEOEA, whatever it is now, often changes its name. So that kind of change, that's what we're envisioning going on the consent agenda. Again, this would be reviewed by the Executive Committee and by the internal committee. The internal committee would put it forward as something to be considered for the consent agenda, then the Executive Committee would agree with that assessment. Anything that's substantive would not be put on the consent agenda.

Senator Tyler Smith: I understand the reasoning behind that, and I like the logic of it, but I think that you run into an issue where you have to decide what is substantive. Like, for example, when I had the issue with whether we were going to use freshmen versus FTIC, that was probably a trivial matter, but it ended up being an entire meeting's worth of debate. So, you know, we run into issues with that.

Senator Kalter: All right. I'm remembering also that this is still the information stage, so anybody else have anything about that? We'll ask Rules to consider this feedback as they look at changes. Anyone else on that? We're almost at our proposed hard stop time of 8 pm, and I have a number of sort of trivial, potentially, items for Article V, but I'm going to propose that because we have to bring the articles back anyway for another round, and we probably won't have time even if we were to go to 8:15 pm for all of them, that maybe I bring those things up either to you for presentation next time or just wait until next time. Does anyone have anything else immediate that they would like to say about Article V before they forget?

Senator Horst: I would just like to also say that there was an omission that was made on this Article V, Section I.D in the action stage. I noticed that we deleted the motion to rescind, so Rules Committee voted tonight to add the sentence under section I.D, the action stage, a motion to rescind or to amend a previous action of the Academic Senate, which has not been enacted, requires two-thirds vote for passage. And that's a change that we made this evening.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. Any comments on that particular change, that new addition?

Senator Horst: Might I propose that when we do potentially bring this to the action item, the Rules Committee will discuss this, but one avenue might be to vote specifically on the item, such as the consent agenda.

Senator Kalter: That's an excellent idea so that we have, essentially we do those as though they are amendments or have an amendment, a specific amendment stage for them. Terrific. Sounds good. I'm going to try to fit in the Indirect Cost piece because it's been sitting on our agenda for a month or so. Senator Liechty, it looks like there are trivial changes here.

***12.08.17.05 Policy 7.6.3 Indirect Cost MARK UP (Faculty Affairs Committee)***

Senator Liechty: Very trivial. This is an item that's just part of our regular review sequence, so we updated some language, as indicated, and that was based mainly on UResC recommendations. We doublechecked to make sure that the policy complies with federal rules. We made sure the figures involved are what's currently practiced, and I have a note here, punt to John Baur for any details.

Senator Kalter: Excellent. And, by the way, the URC that he's referring to is the University Research Council, not the University Review Committee. John, did Senator Liechty forget anything? Senator Baur.

Senator Baur: Yeah, I think he covered it.

Senator Kalter: All right. Anybody have any questions or observations on this one? Does everybody know what an indirect cost is now? Exciting stuff.

Senator Pancrazio: Is it what the University takes from grants, from external grants?

Senator Kalter: Yes. Exactly. Exactly. Thank you, Senator Pancrazio. I don't remember when I...

Senator Pancrazio: Commission.

Senator Kalter: What's that?

Senator Pancrazio: Commission.

Senator Kalter: I don't remember when I learned that, but I don't think I was an undergraduate anymore. I think I learned it after I graduated. All right. So if there are no comments, observations, questions, or concerns about that one, do we have... Senator Liechty, have you remembered anything about your previous meetings?

Senator Liechty: No, I haven't.

Senator Kalter: Sorry. Were you going to say something else?

Senator Liechty: No, that's fine.

***Communications***

Senator Kalter: No. Okay. All right. Sounds good. Do we have any communications for the Senate before we adjourn? All right. Remember to go to the Get Out The Vote item, which was in its way a communication for the Senate

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Dawson, seconded by Senator Hoelscher to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.