

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

2-7-2018

Senate Meeting, February 7, 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 7, 2018" (2018). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 1230.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/1230>

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 Meeting Agenda
Wednesday, February 7, 2018
Approved

Call to Order

Senate Chairperson Senator Kalter called the meeting to order.

Roll Call

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

Senator Kalter: We're going to start tonight with the annual report on the Recruitment and Retention of Underrepresented Students. And we have the Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management, Jana Albrecht over to my right who is going to give us a run-through of that report.

Annual Report on the Recruitment and Retention of Underrepresented Students: AVP for Enrollment Management Jana Albrecht

Ms. Albrecht: Happy to be here. Excited about talking about recruitment and retention. The good news for all of you is that Senator Kalter has already explained to me that you have a lot to go through tonight, so I will try and keep it brief. This is an 18-page report, so feel free to ask questions throughout the report. If there's extra data that you need that you don't have, we'll be happy to get that afterwards. But I thought I would just quickly go through some of the stats that are currently in the report and then we would maybe highlight two of the programs that you'll see in the report. And then we'll talk about one new initiative and then I do have some good news about our numbers for fall term so we can move into that probably pretty quickly. So if you have the report either in front of you or if you have it electronically, if you flip to page 2 – so you'll see 2 on the bottom there – you'll see the Figure 1 and Figure 2 on page 2 will show you our new student population for the fall term. So those are new freshmen and new transfers to campus. And we were down 9% for FTIC. We were down 11% for our transfer students. And so we know that we have some room to make up there, but what I will tell you with this incoming class is that we graduated the year before a pretty small class. So on the next page we'll look at our total enrollment. So we're only down 1% in total enrollment, but that's because this class is still relatively big even though we've had three record breaking classes and this isn't one of them. It's still a rather large incoming class for us. So, you see a lot of red on that page so we're down in a lot of our racial categories. And while that is a concern to us and we know that we want to increase all of those categories, I will point out that we are 29% non-white for our fall 2017 new students and in 2016 we were 28% non-white. So we are making some progression in the number of underrepresented students on campus. Questions either about Figure 1 or Figure 2, maybe, for those new student populations? Okay.

So if we flip to page 3, that's just where I'll point out in Figure 4, you can see that total enrollment in a lot of our categories we are up. So we do have more black or African-American students on campus. We have more Hispanic or Latino students on campus from last year to this year. And we are also only down 1%, and we moved from 23% non-white to 24% non-white for our overall... for our total population on campus.

Senator Kalter: Could you say how these compared to the state averages? Do you know that off the top of your head?

Ms. Albrecht: You know, I don't. But I can get those for you. Do you want state averages at public universities? Public four-year?

Senator Kalter: No, just population. Total population.

Ms. Albrecht: Oh, sure. Okay, absolutely we can do that. And then if you'll flip to page 5 really quick, more charts (because I love them). Figure 6 you can see the trend lines based on the racial and ethnic designations, and that's just good information to have. It's a three-year trend line for us. Figure 7 is our retention numbers, and we do know that we have some work to do. You can see that our retention numbers are slipping, and if you

look at page 6, our graduation percentages are slipping as well. So we know we have quite a bit of work to do in those two areas. But I will tell you that for retention purposes we know for the majority that students leave us because one, they can't get into their major; two, a lot of them say that it's financially related; and three, they list personal reasons as a reason for leaving the university. So we work a lot on major and one of my cohorts in crime here is next to me, so if I say something incorrect or, you know, you want to add some, feel free to do that. But we work with departments. We work with chairs and associate deans all the time to try and see where we can get our internal transfers into the majors that they want, but we lose an awful lot of students because they don't have the GPA requirement to get into certain majors and we know that students will leave us. If they can't get into a major, then they won't stay. So we work on that regularly. Financial aid packaging – we work with Pat Vickerman all the time to get additional dollars for students that are in hardship situations. We do have a pool of funds each year that we can use to help students that, you know, something comes up. So if a parent changes jobs or there's a loss of job or there are high medical expenses or there are things like that are pulling the students away from the university, we try and supplement those particular students with those funds that we do have. We also look at financial aid packaging policies from a recruitment standpoint, and every year we look to see low socioeconomic categories. In which categories are we doing okay? In which categories do we need to do a little bit better? And we do have a limited amount of scholarship dollars, but we work really hard to try and find how we can make those work for as many students as we possibly can. Amelia, did you... Okay, you're good. That's good. So, questions about any of the charts or the figures that we just quickly went over? Okay because I can keep talking.

I have several more points that I'll talk about. Okay. So we'll highlight two of the programs that you saw in this report. One is our You Can Do ISU program. It is a recruitment program that we hold every year. We've been doing it for the last five years. It's a program that's gone from about 100 students that visit campus to over 500 that visit campus. It's specifically targeted to underrepresented students, and what we had found in the past is while that event had gotten more popular and maybe more successful with drawing underrepresented students to campus, we weren't getting the yield numbers that we wanted to. So, not as many of the students that attended that program were applying, and even fewer were actually coming to campus for that program. So we went back and we looked at the evaluations to see what students told us that they liked about the program and what was missing about the program, and what we found out is that we didn't invite parents to the program. So this year we went back and we had about 100 additional people that we invited to the day, and so far we've seen a significant increase for that program as far as the number of students that have applied that actually came to our You Can Do ISU program. And that's just an example of we try and look at the evaluations for all of the events that we host on campus and we try and make them better. So we look at the feedback from all of you, we look at the feedback from the students, and then we try and fix those to make sure that students are getting the information that they need when they come to those campus events. We are also trying something new for retention. It's a little bit of predictive analytics, and we haven't done this in the past, but it's trying to help us with an early intervention program for students that are having trouble in the classroom, and I love it. And maybe, Amelia, you can talk a little bit more about what we're doing with the predictive analytics.

Senator Noel-Elkins: Sure. Enterprise Data & Analytics has taken the data on our first year – so this is just FTICs (first time in college students) – looked at the factors that contributed to their academic persistence, and they have created two models for us. One is a first semester to second semester model that weighs the factors that have an impact on their retention, and then they have divided our FTICs into five categories: Highest risk of not being retained, high risk of not being retained, medium, low, and lowest risk of not being retained. And what it's allowed us to do in University College is target our services better to students in terms of their particular needs. So instead of just doing a blanket type of service, an academic advisor has the ability to segment their population and provide different suggestions to students who may have different needs in the different categories. The next thing that they've done is they have created a model for us – EDA has created a model for us – that predicts spring semester enrollment to fall semester enrollment. So FTIC enrolled in the spring – what's the likelihood of them being enrolled in the fall? The factor that weighs most heavily, and it outweighs any other factor, is first semester GPA. And so we are looking at implementing some things for next fall and for during Preview that will help students recognize the importance of their first semester GPA on

campus because it is more important than any other factor we have in terms of their retention going into their second year. We also combine a lot of this information with our mid-term grades and do targeted outreach to those students who are in the high or highest risk category of not being retained. Massive phone calling efforts, e-mail campaigns to reach out to those students and get them the assistance they need either in the Visor Center or encouraging them to go in and see their faculty members in those classes.

Senator Pancrazio: Are there any possibilities of expanding some of the opportunities in courses like Success 101 and LinC and those other ones? Those are great programs.

Senator Noel-Elkins: Yes, actually we have expanded the opportunities. Thank you for setting me up for that. We used to offer both LinC and Success 101 only in the fall semester. This semester, through Instructional Capacity dollars, we were able to offer additional sections of Success 101 in the spring, which we had never done before, and we are also able to offer some additional sections of LinC in the spring. We have some plans for next fall, but I'd like to not get ahead of the University Curriculum Committee on that and so I will update you as to fall plans for expansion of those programs later.

Senator Pancrazio: Thank you. I'm glad to hear it.

Senator Kalter: Do you have another point?

Ms. Albrecht: Oh, yes. I promise I'll be quick. Super quickly I wanted to say that this is a small section of what the university does for recruitment and retention. We all do things all the time. And I was just talking to Senator Jones-Bock earlier. In her department she even does just so much for recruitment and for retention. So this is just a group of EMAS units that we're talking about in the report, but it's all over and we have a great campus community and a lot of support from faculty, which we really appreciate. But one thing that's exciting, we do have a new CRM, not that this matters specifically, but it's a Customer Relations Management system. We're in the process of... Actually we don't have it yet; we're in the process of getting it, but what it will allow us to do, right now so much of our marketing that comes out of the Admissions Office is pretty general, you know, and it's not super specific to students. But what this CRM will allow us to do is pull out the fact that they sent us a piece of information that says they're interested in English and Gamma Phi Circus. So it will allow us to quickly query those students and send marketing pieces or marketing information specifically for what the students want to know about the university. So this could be a real great tool for us to segment populations and give them the information that they really need for coming to the university. And one more thing – I promise, Senator Kalter – our numbers. I need to talk about the numbers for this coming fall term. We are up 6% in applications. We are up 12% in admits for students, so this is wonderful news. We are up 24% in our black and African-American admitted students. We are up 37% in our Asian students, and we are up 43% in our Hispanic/Latino students as far as admitted students to the university so we're really excited about that. We do know that we still have a really long road to go, so we have a lot of yield work that still needs to be done this semester, but at least for underrepresented numbers those look pretty good for the fall term.

Senator Kalter: All right. Thank you. Are there any questions?

Senator Grzanich: Two quick questions that kind of combine together. You touched on the six-year graduation rates. Do you have any idea what the numbers are for, like, four-year graduation rates?

Ms. Albrecht: We do, and it is a little over 50%, which has been actually growing a little bit. And we would love that to be even higher.

Senator Grzanich: Do you know how many students may or may not remove themselves post four years but before graduation?

Senator Kalter: What I think Senator Grzanich is asking is there are some students who need to take a break, and so they may or may not be academically successful but they are taking a break in the middle of their four years or six years or what have you.

Senator Grzanich: Specifically after the fourth year.

Ms. Albrecht: If they take a break or not? I don't know that we specifically track that, but Julie Huber in Enrollment Management can do wonders with the data we have, so we'll see.

Senator Noel-Elkins: I think Planning, Research, and Policy Analysis has that historic information. They do produce a chart that shows persistence and retention rates across all six years. So Planning, Research, and Policy Analysis does have that chart. I don't know the numbers off the top of my head.

Senator Grzanich: Right. I'm just asking for the sake of the University Scholars program in regards to the underrepresented groups – first generation, low income – who are awarded money but it ends after four years. I was just wondering what the retention is in regards to those post four years.

Ms. Albrecht: And so we do have a little bit of information about our scholars and their four-year graduation rate. It's really high.

Senator Grzanich: Oh, that's awesome.

Ms. Albrecht: But we'll check. We'll get some of that data for you and send it off.

Senator Grzanich: Cool. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Do you happen to know nationally what the four-year graduation rate is at a Research 2 institution?

Ms. Albrecht: We are higher is what I do know, but I will look that up. We have a bank of information where we can pull the information and get that to you.

Senator Kalter: Sure. Any other questions? All right. In that case, thank you very much. We'll see you again next year.

Chairperson's Remarks

Senator Kalter: And we will move on to Chairperson's Remarks, which are relatively brief. Just a reminder to everybody that tomorrow is the first on-campus interview for the first of our four Provost candidates. Please remember that in the morning at 9:45 there is a session up in Prairie Center North for the Senate, so the faculty, students, staff of the Senate can go to that session. There is also one, I think, right after us for AP and Civil Service Council. And I believe, if I'm not remembering incorrectly, that the open presentation is at 2 p.m. each of those days. So it's going to be tomorrow, Friday, then the following Tuesday, and then the next one is actually the following Monday. So not next Monday but the Monday after that. And that's all I wanted to announce. Are there any questions?

Student Body President's Remarks

Senator Grzanich: Good evening, everyone. A quick report from me tonight. Three short points. Student Government is excited to be a part of the process for the search for the new Provost this week as Chair Kalter just mentioned. Many of our members plan on attending the different interview days, and we're looking forward to seeing many of you there in the spirit of shared governance. Next week some of our members will be meeting with a representative from the town of Normal and a local church to discuss the feasibility of implementing a food bank close to campus. We are excited about this potential opportunity and look to learn

more regarding the feasibility soon. And finally, the constitutional changes that we have spent the past semester creating will be presented at our next meeting as an information item. We look forward to an intellectually challenging discussion for the betterment of the student body. And with that I yield for questions.

Administrators' Remarks

- ***President Larry Dietz***
- ***Interim Provost Jan Murphy***
- ***Vice President of Student Affairs Levester Johnson***
- ***Vice President of Finance and Planning Dan Stephens***

Senator Kalter: Are there questions for Senator Grzanich? That is one exciting thing. Congratulations. All right. You may have noticed that the room is administrator light tonight. That's mostly because we have Provost candidates who have come into town and so they are out to dinner with our Vice Presidents. Senator Murphy is at another event – I can't remember. I think she's at University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana. So we're going to move right into our information items and we're going to start with the AIF annual report coming out of the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee. I'm going to turn to Senator Laudner to present that. And I think I'm going to invite Senator Lacy also up to the table.

Information 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 Laudner: Yes, so this is the AABC's annual report on the Academic Impact Fund. And for those of you that don't know what those funds are, those are the funds used for tenure line faculty as tenured faculty leave and then we allocate for new positions. So these are the funds that are used for those positions as well as for one time use so when we need to fill a class with an instructor or a non-tenure track faculty member, we use these funds for that as well. So, very important resources for how we deliver our classes. To create this report, the AABC met back in October. We met with Dr. Lacy, who is here with us tonight. He is the Associate Vice President for Academic Fiscal Management. We discussed the funds for this year, so how they were used in FY17 as well as how they've been used thus far in FY18. So the report that we have for you here tonight reflects that meeting and an overview of those funds, and I think in general what we found is that the funds are being used very effectively and there's a strong plan for future use for those funds. So with that, I would be glad to deflect any questions to Dr. Lacy.

Senator Kalter: All right. And because we had this as information items last time and never got to them, you've had an entire four weeks to look at all of this stuff. Does anybody have any questions on either the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee report or the Provost report? I don't have any on the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee report, but I just have a couple of questions for Dr. Lacy. I'm calling you honorary Senator Lacy. I'm not sure I'm on the right pages, so I'm just going to try to tell you where I'm looking. Inside the report beyond the Statement of Priorities and Guiding Principles in the one that's for the annual stuff, I believe the FY17 Final Comprehensive Summary, I was wondering – and this is very small but it may be somewhat significant – I was wondering if there might be a typo in the wording there because it says something about, for example, a May '16 FY16 retirement is logged as a CY17 retirement. I'm wondering if that's accurate. Wouldn't it be that if you retire in May '16 that's a CY16 retirement? Do you see where I'm looking there? I think it's on page 6.

Dr. Lacy: Yes, I see. It's on page 5. If a person retires in May 2016, their salary does not hit AIF until the next year. So that's why it's logged in as a calendar year '17 retirement rather... For instance, anybody that announces they are going to retire or resign during this particular academic year, that money won't be in AIF until next year because they're going to get paid the rest of this year. And so that's the reason for that information, the way that's written there, Susan.

Senator Kalter: So the reason I pointed that out, Dr. Lacy, is just because the two tables are different in that respect. So FY17 has it as FY16, which is CY17. But FY18's table is showing FY17 to CY17. So there might need to be just for posterity, so to speak, a minor adjustment there to make sure that it's consistent year after year.

Dr. Lacy: It does appear to be a typo there. It should have been calendar year '18.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, exactly.

Dr. Lacy: Okay. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: The other thing that I wanted to mention, when it says, for example, that 37 searches were authorized, it seems like we might want to distinguish between the authorizations and the re-authorizations, and we do in the table but not in the verbiage. But that does seem to be important. And then I wondered on that same page, and this is still I think page 5, what a targeted hire was. It's the footnote about CAST and Mennonite at the very bottom. It says that they received targeted hires.

Dr. Lacy: Targeted hires are unusual, but they do occasionally occur. What happens there is that we authorize a search, and in the case of Mennonite we would authorize typically two positions in Mennonite. Once they have their pool of candidates, if they have perhaps a third candidate that is a really strong candidate, they can request permission to go ahead and hire another person. Or if it's a search where there is a deep pool and we know there's a retirement coming up in that area, a chair through their dean can request – can we go ahead and hire this person? We ask them, will that be a priority next year if we don't do this? Absolutely, it will be at the top. So that will count against your count next year, but rather than do a whole other search in the same area the following year, occasionally we will authorize another search mid-year and that's what's being referred to as a targeted search.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. And so that is open to any department, any college, but it's not necessarily going to be granted to any department or college from any one year to the next.

Dr. Lacy: That's correct.

Senator Kalter: Okay. The only other question that I had had to do with a term called "Enhancements as IC," and I believe that was on the next set of tables. Let's see. It's I think probably page 7 in everybody else's copy, page 8 on mine. It's underneath the AIF FY17 Final Year-End Summary, the cash flow chart, and then it's under Temporary Expenditures, the very last one, Enhancements as Instructional Capacity. I wasn't sure what that meant. It may refer to the use of Strategic Budgeted Carryover, but I'm not sure.

Dr. Lacy: Sometimes we will use temporary money when we get... We will send out the Instructional Capacity in two parts. We will ask in the spring for departments to request it and will send out what we call the base Instructional Capacity. We know a lot of things happen in May and June with retirements and resignations and such, people moving into administration, and so we do a supplemental Instructional Capacity request in July when most of the dust has settled, so we'll give a second allocation out to the colleges to distribute to the departments and the units. So in these reports, when you see the amount in the case of the table that Senator Kalter is referring to, it shows \$5,278,982. That's what we gave out in the base in the supplemental, but then during the school year sometimes things happen. A faculty member could be ill and go on FMLA. A person could move up into an administrative position in the middle of the year. A person resigns in the middle of the year. There are different things that occur, and so sometimes we get requests from the colleges for additional instructional capacity for these things. We'll also have as well, we try to predict how many gen ed sections we need in high volume departments. Sometimes we'll have a need for more sections. And so that falls in there. We also fund DART and CTLT through that because that is for people to learn how to teach online for faculty,

and it's related to faculty and instruction. So there's a variety of things that can be involved there, and that number can vary significantly from year to year.

Senator Kalter: Gotcha. Thank you. Maybe just in a future year we could put a note next to that one so that it's clearer what "Enhancements as IC" meant. That would not necessitate a question about it. That would be great. Does anybody else have any questions? All right. So this is an information item. It'll come back to us probably in a couple weeks. We'll move on now to, I believe we're at the Senate bylaws.

01.25.18.01- Executive Summary of Revisions Made to the Academic Senate Bylaws (Rules Committee)

10.14.13.01 –SENATEBYLAWS- Current Copy (Rules Committee)

01.29.18.01- ARTICLE III MARK UP (Rules Committee)

02.01.18.01- NEW ACADEMIC SENATE BY-LAWS (Rules Committee)

Senator Horst: Thank you. The Rules Committee has been working on the bylaws for this academic year. I made an executive summary of the process we went through. The Senate bylaws – just a little bit of background about the different governing documents that the Senate has – we have the bylaws, which discuss how the meetings are run. We also have a document called the Blue Book, which has general information about the structure of the Senate, and then it has a description of every single committee and the charge to that committee. We also have a Powers and Responsibilities of Committees document that was authored by Chairperson Crothers in 2004, I believe. And we also have the Memorandum of Understanding. As you can hear, we have a lot of different documents, and at this point they're not really tied together. So last year we put out a general call to the entire Senate to ask for input/changes that they'd like to see to the bylaws. And then there was a task force of Senator Kalter and Marx and myself who got together. And one of the points that we made early on was we thought that somehow these documents shouldn't all be separate. That there's no reason that we should have the Blue Book that discusses things and then the bylaws discuss similar things but then different things. So we'd like to reintegrate them. So that's one major thing that we have done in these bylaws. We also spent a lot of time changing the language so it more reflects the way the Senate actually discusses its procedures, for instance. So I will be going through that at another time. But the main thing for tonight that I'd like to talk about, when we talk about the first couple articles, is how we created Articles I through IV by essentially taking the Blue Book and putting it back into the bylaws. So a lot of the language is not new; it's straight from the Blue Book. I'll go through a couple of the specific changes later, but are there any questions about the different documents and how we're merging them? Okay.

All right. So another thing that you have to appreciate is that these bylaws haven't been changed in quite some time and so, for instance, all of the formatting seems to be coming from 1970-something where, I don't know if you remember this, but people used to return at the end of a line and you'd have all these hard returns. So one afternoon I took out all of the hard returns in the bylaws and that kind of thing. The formatting just didn't look modern and so I put it in Garamond font and that kind of thing, used bold and different italics and all these kinds of things that modern documents do. And so when Cera created the comparison document, Microsoft is picking up just on some of those formatting issues. So a lot of the things it's underlining or they're now bold instead of not being bold before. All right?

Okay, so another major thing that we decided to do because when we were merging these documents of the Blue Book and the old bylaws, the old bylaws started with procedures, I believe, and we thought it was important to follow the format of a traditional bylaws which would create the body, talking about its function and responsibilities, and then move on to who is in the body and then go into an article about officers. There's actually no verbiage about officers in our current bylaws, so we created that. So we wanted to create a bylaws that looked like every other bylaws on campus that have this logical progression of establishing the body, establishing the officer, establishing the committees, and then talk about the procedures. So the articles are now complete... The numbers are different. All right, so Article I: Purpose, Function, Responsibilities, Section 1: The Definition of the Academic Senate. This is coming from the Blue Book page 5. Section 2: Function and Responsibilities. This is a description of the history of the Senate, and this is all coming from, again, the Blue Book on page 5. So none of this is new. The new thing is that it's being added to the bylaws. And then all of

the duties of the Senate – we recommend policy and different kinds of how we participate in shared governance with the Board of Trustees. This is all, again, directly copied from the Blue Book, pages 3 and 4.

Then, we added the Memorandum of Understanding. This is the document that was negotiated with Chairperson Borg, I believe, and the Board of Trustees when there was a re-establishment of the structure of... Illinois State University used to be part of this other type of university structure. When it became its own structure, the Constitution had to be rewritten and at that time there was a need to establish the relationship between the Academic Senate and the President, and this is the document, the Memorandum of Understanding. And so this is the text of the Memorandum of Understanding and also the first paragraph is from the Senate website, which describes what it is.

Senator Kalter: I'm just going to interrupt just for a moment and just let everybody know also that we are going to be doing information items on the bylaws a little bit at a time, so Senator Horst is going to go through Article I, Article II, Article III, Article IV, and then we're going to stop for tonight and then next time we will bring back more because they are 70-some pages long and we don't want to go through them all tonight. So I just wanted to say that. Also, just to crack a joke, just for those of you who are wondering whether Garamond Light is truly the most modern, you know, way to do things on 8 1/2 x 11 paper, we also have recently posted our current bylaws online in a hypertext rather than just in the document that downloads, and when the Senate approves new bylaws, we will put those bylaws online as well. So, in other words we'll just change that, and that's also thanks to Senator Horst doing some research about what other Senates around the country have done.

Senator Horst: And just along those lines, I had intentions of having all of these hyperlinks within the documents, so if it says "in Appendix 2," you should have a hyperlink that should take you to Appendix 2 the way modern documents do. Unfortunately, I had a family tragedy at the beginning of this semester, so I wasn't able to do that work. So I'm hoping the Senate will just trust that these hyperlinks... If you could just approve the hyperlinks that will be created another time, I would appreciate that. And we could do those with Cera at another time.

Senator Kalter: So does anybody have any comments about Article I?

Senator Horst: Again, this is all coming from this document that used to be called the Blue Book, and the Blue Book is the document that used to describe the Senate, its responsibilities, and we are now just putting that general definition of the Senate into an official part of the bylaws, and we're basically doing away with the Blue Book. The Blue Book is now being absorbed into the bylaws. Thank you, Senator Marx, for that brilliant idea.

Moving onto Article II. Article II talks about the membership of the Academic Senate. This is again from the Blue Book page 5. You see on the side, Senator Kalter did make some small edits to titles and that kind of thing, and it's tenured, right? Not tenure. Sometimes it's tenure and sometimes it's tenured, and she'll explain to me why at another point. But basically, besides these small edits that you see, this is coming from the Blue Book on page 5.

Senator Kalter: Any questions about Article II?

Senator Grzanich: In regards to the Constitutionally-Specified Standing Internal Committees, is the Campus Communication Committee still consisting solely of senators?

Senator Kalter: So you are way ahead of us.

Senator Grzanich: Am I on the wrong Article II? My bad.

Senator Kalter: Yes. We are on Article II: Membership. So let me make sure that everybody's on the right pages. We are in document number 02.01.18.01. Does everybody see that? We always number our documents

in the top left hand corner. So I think, Senator Grzanich, you were looking at the old bylaws or maybe the new bylaws but somewhere much further on. Any other questions about Article II?

Senator Horst: But just to answer, the description of the Campus Communications Committee, the membership, is detailed in the old Blue Book, which is now Appendix 2.

Senator Kalter: And if I'm not mistaken, it may also be in the Constitution.

Senator Horst: It is.

Senator Grzanich: Okay.

Senator Horst: Okay. All right. So now we're on to Article III, which is Elections, which magically also lines up with the old Article III, I believe, which was Elections. So that was good. And now I'm going to actually go to... Cera created a document that shows the changes because this is going to have some changes to the wording. Again, a lot of it is... We made a decision that we didn't like the way it was laid out, and sometimes it was illogical. Sometimes it would say A, B, C and sometimes it would say 1, 2, 3. So there's some reformatting of that. But if you look at this document of the mark-up, you can see a lot of the changes are really just formatting issues. So, Section 1: Election of Faculty Representatives to the Academic Senate, and then Election of Tenured and Probationary Faculty Members. This is lining up with the old Senate bylaws Article III, Section 3.1. There are some slight changes in titles. And then going on, Election of Non-Tenure Track Faculty Members. This is again, I believe, lining up with the old bylaws. This is Section B, so we're in the same section. There's no substantive changes.

Senator Kalter: Let me just come in. For those of you who are trying to follow in two documents, the mark-up is 01.29.18.01, which corresponds to Article III within the other one that I announced.

Senator Horst: And then in Section C: Election of Faculty Associate Member, there was a change in a title from director to superintendent that was done. But this is again essentially the text from the old bylaws. Section 2 is again corresponding with the old bylaws, 3.2, and there was no change to that except for... Hold on. Adjunct membership in the college council for the sole purpose of consideration of college election bylaws. That's just capitalizing it. All right. In Section 3 we actually get a significant change. This is regarding the elections. So again, this is the Election article, and Section 3 we have the election of student representatives to the Academic Senate. It now reads, "Undergraduate and graduate representatives shall be elected according to the rules prescribed by the Student Government Association." That's what it said before. We have added the clause "in consultation..." With Amy Hurd, who is the Director of the Graduate School, we have added the clause "in consultation with the Graduate Student Association or, in its absence, the graduate students serving on the Graduate Council." There was discussion with our committee that at times it's appropriate to consult with the Graduate Student Association and there can be differences in the way they handle elections and when their representatives... when is the best time of the year to elect graduate representatives. And it's appropriate for one shared governance body to consult with the other shared governance body. There was specifically a discussion of an election that if it was held in the fall they would have had a lot more participation. So this clause was added after we talked with Amy Hurd.

Senator Kalter: Just to clarify one thing, currently the Graduate Student Association is an RSO. It would be nice if it were a shared governance body at some point. I think, you know, that might take some more development on the graduate school level to get there, but that would be consistent with other universities that usually have a graduate student senate, etc.

Senator Horst: All right. Moving on, Section 4 is essentially the old bylaws, 3.4. The title was changed, I believe, but no significant changes there. Section 5 is again lining up with the old bylaws 3.5. Section 6: The Voting Procedures of the Academic Senate is lining up with 3.6A, the old bylaws. Okay, and then moving on to

Section 7, there are some changes here. We deleted language regarding adding nominees no later than one week prior because we typically don't do that. You know, if there was an election and somebody had somebody they wanted to nominate, we even have taken nominees from the floor. So we thought that better matched the practice of this Senate. Also there was language regarding using mail. "The Senate office will mail any such additions to all members." And we don't really do that anymore. "The administrative appointments to committees regarding Senate ratifications should be referred to the Rules Committee prior to being presented to the Academic Senate." There was a feeling that this language might reflect a time when administrative appointments might somehow... These would be ex officio nominees to committees, and we couldn't see why these necessarily had to be referred to Rules for ratification. We don't currently do that practice, so we deleted that text. Finally, the title SCERB was changed to University Hearing Panel. And there actually is some new language in Section D here. "Except for the Faculty Review Committee and the University Review Committee, faculty members of the AFEGC – the Academic Freedom, Ethics and Grievance Committee – may hold another external committee membership on any external committee of the Senate." This is a rather big pool of faculty that don't go all the time to the meeting. They're basically a jury pool, and it's a significant number of faculty and there can be difficulty seating faculty on external committees. And if we have a rule that you can't serve on two external committees and you have this big pool of people that are only called upon maybe once, if at all, it really depletes the number of volunteers we had. And so we thought it was parallel to the University Hearing Panel that they have an exemption that they can serve on two external committees. So we're hoping that this will increase the number of people we have to seat on external committees. So that's why we added this change.

Senator Kalter: So, any questions that anyone sees for Article III? Comments? I just noticed a small typo type of thing. There probably should be commas between Academic Freedom, Ethics, and "and." So, AFEGC does three things. It looks at academic freedom issues. That's one; then there's a comma. Then there's ethics. That's another thing that it looks at. And then there's grievances. So it used to be two different committees. One dealt only with academic freedom, one dealt with ethics and grievance. They got combined several years ago, but just so that people understand what that committee is, because everybody always says AGFCA, etc. But this is across the country. Academic freedom committees are very important as are ethic committees. So, a small one. All right. No questions on Article III? Comments? Anything? All right.

Senator Horst: Again, Article III is essentially, except for the points that I noted, it's essentially the old Article III. As we go forward, there will be new and exciting language that we can talk about – like Article IV. As I mentioned, there was no discussion about, in the old bylaws, about the officers at all. The first sentence comes from the Blue Book page 5 where the officers are mentioned. But other than that, there was nothing in the bylaws about the officers. We thought that was kind of odd because that's a standard thing when you're setting up an organization, to describe the officer structure. So we added an article on officers. This list of what the chairperson's responsibilities are – Senator Kalter, could you describe the process of creating that list?

Senator Kalter: Sure. I think it was the first year that I was chair. We actually had been requested in previous years to create this list. Senator Holland never got to it when he was chairperson, so I actually drafted the Secretary of the Senate one because I was secretary at that time but then during my first year as chair drafted the chairperson description and then sent it to the four previous chairs. That would be Senator Borg, Senator White, Senator Crothers, and Senator Holland. Senator Borg and Senator White were already retired by that time, so they did not respond to the request for input. Both Senators Crothers and Holland did respond and said, "Yep, that's just about what we do." And some of this was also created by documents that Senator Crothers had left in the Senate office for Senator Holland when he took over, and then Senator Holland left them for me when I took the chair. So that's basically the process for that one. Senator Grzanich had a point about the very first line of the article.

Senator Grzanich: The line specifically reads "chairperson/Student Body President." I think "vice chairperson/Student Body President" is more appropriate language.

Senator Horst: Vice Chairperson.

Senator Grzanich: Right. Right now it reads essentially that the Student Body President is also the chairperson.

Senator Horst: Okay. Thank you.

Senator Grzanich: Which I don't want to do.

Senator Kalter: You might get a course release for it.

Senator Grzanich: In that case, maybe.

Senator Horst: Okay. And now we have another list about the vice chairperson shall be the President of the Student Body. And Beau, do you want to talk about your list?

Senator Grzanich: Sure. So I essentially just stripped any power mildly related to what the Academic Senate is in charge of from our Constitution and our bylaws. Left out a couple things. Some of them are a little bit less relevant, but nonetheless I think it's a pretty extensive list of different obligations for my particular role.

Senator Horst: Okay. And then the final one is the Secretary of the Senate, and luckily Susan Kalter had drafted something so that was already in place, and then she edited her drafted list.

Senator Kalter: I edited it a couple of days ago just to conform the language to the new other language because they were saying the same things in different words, and that seemed unwise. So it also, I hope, made it more concise.

Senator Horst: All right. So that is the end of Article IV and that's the end of the discussion of the bylaws. Again, the next bylaw article is the Procedures of the Senate, and that one will be completely new. So I look forward to that discussion next time.

Senator Kalter: All right. One final chance for observations, questions, comments. All right. Next time we meet we will see at least Article V, if not Articles V, VI, etc. and we'll do an information session on them.

10.27.16.05 Policy 3.2.13 Administrator Selection and Search Policies (From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)

01.09.18.07 Possible Administrator Selection wording (From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)

01.18.18.04 Academic Affairs Administrator MARK UP (From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)

Senator Laudner: Okay, the AABC has been reviewing these policies. We started reviewing these last year with very minor revisions with the one exception of the area of the Director of the Graduate School, which currently does not exist. So this is Amy Hurd's position, but there was no guidelines for how we determine who's on the committee that searches that position. So, some criteria was created and it got caught up in limbo. We went back and forth. I think one of the main concerns was the student representatives on this committee and how many student representatives there should be and exactly what classifications those students should have. So the way it currently has been revised, or – yeah, revised, I guess – is that there would be two students, at least one of whom must be at the graduate level. So that could be a master's student or a doctoral student.

Senator Horst: Or an undergrad?

Senator Laudner: Yeah. Well, one of the students could be an undergrad, but at least one has to be at the graduate level, and that would be either a doctorate or a master's level.

Senator Kalter: So, I had a suggestion on that one that we expand the student representation to three students so that one could be a doctoral student, one could be a master's student, and one could be an at large student who could be an undergrad so that we make sure that we have good representation for the grad students who are most impacted by the policy. And I wondered if Senator Baur wanted to comment on that and maybe say a little bit about how we created this as an ad hoc kind of committee before suggesting incorporation into the Administrative Selection Policy.

Senator Baur: Sure. First of all, I think it's a good idea to include both doctoral and master's students because they both have different issues that are relevant to the grad director position. It's been about four years since we did this search, so I don't remember the details, but we did put together an ad hoc search committee. I think it pretty closely followed this. I believe we had a doctoral student and a graduate, and a master's, student on the search committee and then we tried to get college representation. Very similar to what we have here. I don't believe we used a Panel of Ten member at the time. So anyway, that composition seemed to work pretty well for the search committee.

Senator Ferrence: So I'm going to ask Kevin maybe to correct my memory, but I vaguely remember when we were discussing this in committee that one of the concerns that rose of formalizing that you had to have a master's and a doctorate, because there aren't a huge number of doctoral students on campus, could put us in an awkward position of saying, if there are no volunteers, what department is going to force a doctoral student to serve. So I think we left it open so that we weren't forcing the hand of saying we have to have a doctoral and we have to have a master's, but we also wanted to have the ability to have at least one undergraduate. So I think that was part of the impetus for keeping it at two and leaving it open.

Senator Kalter: It seems like we could potentially find wording that would allow for that so that if for some reason a doctoral student couldn't be found, there could be two master's students and an undergraduate. So whatever wording might work there, that seems like an important concern. I doubt that we would have trouble finding a doctoral student, frankly, because we have pretty activist doctoral students, but it is a very good point and we might also have trouble, on the other hand, finding a master's student. So it could work, but to maybe try to leave those slots open so that the first preference would be to fill them with a doctoral and master's and then the at large, and then if for some reason that's not working just open those two that are reserved for graduate students to any graduate student.

Senator Baur: I was just going to mention the Graduate Council requires a doctoral student and a master's student on the Graduate Council. So another option would be to have them be the default members of the search committee if we can't find the volunteers. Just an option.

Senator Kalter: Anything else on that one?

Senator Noel-Elkins: In the document, I noticed that the Office of Diversity and Affirmative Action is referred to. I recommend we replace that with the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. Where is that?

Senator Noel-Elkins: The first one I saw was on page 2, but it's referenced a couple other locations. Second paragraph of page 2 towards the bottom, but I think there's a few more. I saw one other one in there.

Senator Kalter: We do try to clean that stuff up whenever we can. Thank you. We will look for that. There's two of them on that page at least. Thank you.

Senator Dawson: I'm looking at the composition of membership of the committee, and I see no reference to non-tenure track. And is that by design or just an omission, do you think? I'm sure it's just an omission.

Senator Kalter: You're referring to the Director of Graduate School search?

Senator Dawson: The search committee composition, yeah. And that is specifically, then, for... Is this not all search committees for administrators?

Senator Kalter: So, let me again make sure everybody's looking at the correct...

Senator Dawson: 3.2.13?

Senator Kalter: So, we're 3.2.13, but its document number 10.27.16.05.

Senator Dawson: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: So let me give an overview of this policy. This policy refers to a number of different types of administrative searches, and so you'll see starting I think on the fifth page, because different vice presidents are in different areas, we have different types of searches. And so what Senator Laudner is talking about is adding to the policy a Director of the Graduate School search. And Senator Baur, are there non-tenure tracks who are on the graduate faculty?

Senator Baur: I was afraid you were going to ask that. I believe the answer is we no longer admit them to graduate faculty status. There might be some that were admitted perhaps in contrary to the bylaws of the graduate school, but my understanding... I can check with Dr. Hurd and see if that's true or not. That's my recollection.

Senator Laudner: That's correct. There were some that were grandfathered in, but they're no longer eligible.

Senator Kalter: I'm just going to reiterate publicly my disappointment in that decision. I don't like it that non-tenure tracks cannot be on the graduate faculty, but that's for a different policy and a different day. And it's actually not a Senate policy, but I'll put on record once again that I don't think that that's a just policy to prohibit our non-tenure tracks, many of whom do a lot of research and are very good at graduate mentorship. So does that answer your question, Senator Dawson?

Senator Dawson: Yeah, the wrong question that I asked. But then moving up above the Director of the Graduate School, looking at the department and school chairperson, director, there is no even guidance here that would tell departments of colleges that – to suggest to them strongly – that a non-tenure track person is a constituency that needs to be on the search committee for a department. If there's any one person that has direct major influence over non-tenure track, it's the department chair. And as such in our college, we have been precluded from that and we've had quite a few search committees going on over the last 15 years for department chairs.

Senator Laudner: So we're talking about the department and the school chairperson director?

Senator Dawson: Yeah. I know in the past the Rules Committee has reviewed bylaws on their regular schedule, and many of them that I've seen include most specifically a non-tenure track faculty representative on the chair searches for the departments. And this offers no "thou shalt include a non-tenure track faculty member." And in many cases some colleges exclude us intentionally. That's wrong.

Senator Laudner: Is that determined at the college level or at the department level?

Senator Dawson: That's what this says, and that is at the college level with the college bylaws.

Senator Kalter: So you'll notice, Senator Laudner, that the second paragraph gives guidance about other constituencies. Search committees should, whenever possible, have representation from constituencies including probationary and tenured faculty students, administrative professionals, staff members, and civil service employees. And so I think that what Senator Dawson is suggesting is that the committee discuss whether or not non-tenure track faculty should be added to that sentence.

Senator Laudner: Absolutely.

Senator Dawson: Is there a way to say that somehow, even stronger, that not just wherever possible have representation but something to compel each of the colleges to include us for sure along with AP and civil service, etc.? Everybody else is mentioned.

Senator Kalter: The Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee can debate that as well, whether or not it would be appropriate to make this sentence stronger.

Senator Horst: I was just going to suggest you might look... I have a binder of all the bylaws of the colleges. That might be a place to start as well to compare how different colleges handle it. My one thought is that the composition of the faculty and the types of employees can differ from department to department. So, you know, a general statement that you should include stakeholders can maybe work better given all the diversity, the types of organizations that we have.

Senator Laudner: Yeah, and I agree with your comments. The one thing that you can run into problems with when you say that you have to is NTTs are not required to serve, to provide any service. So sometimes you may run into an issue where you cannot find one that's willing. So you may want to be careful about using strong words like "have to have" one. But we could certainly strengthen the language to encourage use of NTTs, but we may want to refrain from handcuffing a committee in that capacity because technically it's not required of an NTT to serve in that capacity.

Senator Dawson: I understand that. Myself, I can't begin to imagine the NTTs of a department, someone, not stepping up for that. I know that when it comes to the college bylaws, each of the colleges gets pretty specific. And leaving a little opening to where they don't have to, it happens for real.

Senator Kalter: So we're running out of time. I forgot to say that we're going to try to observe our hard stop time. We're about to run over it, but I want to finish this policy. One thing that you may notice is that your packet also included numbered communications 01.09.18.07 and 01.18.18.04. These came out of – one of them came out of an Executive Committee when Dr. Krejci was the Provost. She had been constituting college dean committees, so looking at the college deans part of the policy, and noticed that the year... We believe it was a Nursing dean search that was happening, and the students who were put up from SGA were not Nursing students, or at least not all of them were. She was hoping, and I think many of us thought it was appropriate, that if you're searching for a college dean that the students on that search be from that college, or in the case of Milner, perhaps be working in the library or what have you. So we are suggesting changing a small part of that to read, instead of two students from a list of ten provided by the SGA for a college dean search, two students from a list of up to ten provided jointly by the appropriate college council, the SGA, and the Graduate Council so that we make sure that we're getting a pool of people from that college. So that's one suggested, hopefully friendly, amendment.

And then the other one has to do with a very weird type of clause where it says we might have other kinds of administrators, but we don't know who they are yet. Often this refers to people within the Provost's office but who were not in place when the policy was created. And so there's currently a provision for that that has four tenure-track faculty members, one civil service, one AP, one student, an administrator who is not always but often a faculty who is also an administrator, and then a chairperson chosen from the Panel of Ten. The suggested revisions there have to do with saying President or his/her designee (or we can find gender neutral

language for that) because it's not necessarily always the case that an Academic Affairs administrator would only be searched by the Provost. And then adding a couple of things. It could be four to six tenure-track faculty members, one or more students, and then some provisions for making a new structure should for some reason the structure listed not seem to be appropriate given that you don't know exactly who you're searching for. So those are two other suggestions. Does anybody have any comments about either one of those? Not when it's three minutes past the hard stop time. All right. Unfortunately we are going to skip everything else including committee reports again tonight. Sorry about that. Does anybody have any communications for the Senate?

Senator Baur: I'd like to have everybody put on their calendar February 22nd. Three Minute Thesis is occurring at 6 p.m. at the Normal Theater. No admission. And it's a really exciting event.

Senator Kalter: It is. It is fantastic. It is fun. It is rapid fire, and you get to see the best of your fellow students come out. Anybody else have any communications?

Senator Mainieri: I'm not going to be here for the next meeting, so I wanted to say February 28th in the Student Fitness Center is Adaptapalooza where our therapeutic recreation students put on a celebration to celebrate adaptive sport. You get to try all sorts of different adaptive sports like seated volleyball and things like that. So I encourage everyone to come out and support this great event.

Senator Kalter: Awesome. Any other communications?

Senator Dawson: The College of Business, we will celebrate Business Week from February 19-23. First Lady of the university is on tap for the professional dinner on Monday night as well as several other keynote speakers, one of which is Tricia Griffith, who is the CEO and President of Progressive Insurance.

Senator Kalter: Any further communications? All right. Senator Hoelscher is not here, so who wants to have the honors of moving to adjourn?

Adjournment

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