

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

2-6-2019

Senate Meeting, February 6, 2019

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

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

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting, February 6, 2019" (2019). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 1222.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/1222>

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 Minutes
Wednesday, February 6, 2019
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: We have a very brief chairperson's remarks. My only chairperson remark is congratulations to us, to Bloomington-Normal, to I think all of McLean County for getting through last week with no deaths or serious injuries. I think that's really remarkable and wonderful. And I wanted to say thank you also to Housing, Dining, Emergency Management (especially Eric Hodges and the Emergency Operations Team at the Emergency Operations Center), and the other essential personnel who came in when it was minus whatever, 50. Very well done. Wonderful. And I know that we're all jealous of the Provost for being in sunny Kenya, I believe, or Tanzania, during this, and I think the President was there as well. So we can rib them about that the next time we see them. The only other thing is we're going to try for a hard stop time tonight between 8:00 and 8:10 so that the Caucus can get to its business. And that's it for Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President Remarks, Michael Rubio

Senator Rubio: Good evening, everyone. Just a quick report from me tonight. This Friday from 2:00 to 4:00 in the Bowling and Billiard Center, SGA will be hosting an off campus conversations event. Off campus students are invited to express any concerns about living off campus and learn more about resources provided to them.

Next week I will be meeting with some student leaders and the Director of Governmental Relations, Dr. Lackland from the President's office, to plan an upcoming lobby day. We look forward to speaking with our elected officials on issues pertaining to students and higher education throughout Illinois.

And in the coming weeks, election information will be distributed and info sessions will begin for any student interested in running for a Student Government position for the 2019-2020 school year. I ask that all faculty share this information and encourage their students to learn more about SGA as it is such a great way to get involved and serve on campus.

And last, I thank everyone and echo Senator Kalter's remarks, especially Emergency Management and Grounds, in their efforts to keep our students and community safe during this polar vortex and dangerous conditions. Trustee Sarah Aguilar and I received hundreds of messages, and I can assure you that our students were extremely happy with the two days off staying warm and safe. So thank you, and I will yield for any question.

Senator Kalter: The faculty concur with that remark.

Senator Dawson: Would you somehow get that message out to the faculty through the listserv so that we can remind our students that now is the time to step up?

Senator Rubio: Yeah, I'll send out all information to faculty.

Senator Dawson: Wonderful, thank you.

Senator Rubio: Of course.

Vice President Remarks, Levester Johnson

Senator Johnson: I will echo all the accolades for all the essential personnel who came to campus in order to support our students who were living on as well as those who were visiting or with other students and things of that nature. They did a tremendous job in our residential environments bringing in snacks, developing programs, playing games, and our students were just outstanding, being patient, probably getting a little extra sleep in (at least that's one of the most popular things I heard that people actually did), but it was I think a good call on those two days to have those days off for everyone's safety. So definitely thanks to everyone who was involved in that.

I'm going into a little excitement right now because we are about a week and a couple of days away from one of the first phases of this wonderful facility being done. Okay? That's right. I think it does deserve some recognition. We will literally host our first event in the newly renovated Brown Ballroom on February 19th, so just a few days away, and that will be kicked off with the spring internship fair (how apropos) for our students to be hosted by the Career Center in the Brown Ballroom. And then that will be followed by literally our Founder's Day state showcase and the convocation, which will be on Thursday the 21st. So we're extremely excited about that, kicking off those events in that newly renovated space. Not to be outdone, come March 18th, as soon as we get back from spring break, we will have the opening of our new three-story addition on the east side of this facility. And the Starbucks will be open on the 18th that's located there. Qdoba will be open on the second level. The new Barnes and Noble will be open on the 18th as well. Milner Plaza entrance, the new second floor Milner Plaza entrance, will be open as well for campus community members and visitors to enter the facility through that side as well. So we're extremely excited about that as well as then later on and towards the end of the semester, Admissions will literally start their tours and their families' tours for our prospective folks around sometime in May. So we're extremely excited about that as well. Thank all of you for your feedback for all the information that was provided in order to get to all those little nuances in order to make sure people were safe, that people were aware of the different changes that were taking place. We've got two more phases to go, so we're not done yet, but we're excited about the first step that we've made in transforming this wonderful facility. So thank you all for your assistance in that sense. That being said, I will stop and yield for any questions.

Senator Marshall: What were those dates again?

Senator Johnson: One of the major dates would be February the 19th. That's where you're going to get the Brown Ballroom beginning to be utilized. That and the pre-function space and things of that nature. And that's with the Career Fair, okay? And then shortly after that when you all get back from spring break, that's when you're going to see most of the new addition over in the east side of the facility starting to open with Starbucks, Qdoba, Barnes and Noble and the like being open there. And then Admissions will start their operations here at the end of the semester in May. That's the short version of that.

Vice President of Finance and Planning, Dan Stephens

Senator Stephens: Thank you, Senator Kalter, and I do appreciate all the support for our facilities team. As you could imagine over these last few days, not only were they attempting to deal as essential employees during that very cold weather, but what I learned in this particular event is as that severe cold weather leaves the area, what happens is we end up getting some impacts as the cold air thaws and the pipes thaw. And so, interestingly enough, we had about 20-25 buildings that were impacted once that cold air left and the pipes and HVA systems were starting to re-engage again with people on campus. Fortunately, all those items were anything from water pipes getting burst to having to deal with fixing HVA systems that weren't operating properly because they had been somehow damaged by that severe cold. In talking with Chuck tonight, we did get everything fixed by now. We had to spend somewhere between \$20-25,000 in supplies and materials to fix close to 20 buildings. So the point I'm making there is I think this particular event is helpful for us to realize that as we try to protect

our staff and faculty from these cold temperatures, we have to be mindful once that air leaves us and it starts to warm up, to be watching for any kind of evidence that you might see in the buildings that you're in, either from a student perspective or from an academic facility. We've got a 24-hour team that is on call 24 hours a day to try to monitor our facilities, but they can't see everything we've got in each building. So if you do see anything that doesn't look right or doesn't feel right, the phone number is 85656. That is a 24-hour number, and feel free to share anything that you see and we'll make sure that we'll get out there to try to mitigate any damage that may have been caused by severe weather. Anyway, we appreciate all of the support and we are very, very thankful that we were able to keep everybody safe.

Senator Kalter: Wonderful. Thank you again. Do we build those kinds of things into our budget? Do we have an emergency fund at the ready? How does that work?

Senator Stephens: Yeah, every year there is I guess you call it an emergency contingency sitting in the facilities team because you never really know where it's going to come from. It can come from warm weather. You know, a situation within our buildings. But it very much is during the winter months when we've got excessive snow or excessive ice, or in this case, excessive cold, you have to start spending a lot more supplies in order to get the pathways cleared, and in this particular case we had a lot more damage to water systems. So hopefully we won't have any of that, or any more of that, over the rest of the winter, but just be mindful of that because we do need your eyes and ears to help us make sure we can correct something quickly so it doesn't get worse.

Action Items

Action Items:

11.15.18.01 Policy 2.2.1 Student Employment-Current (Academic Affairs Committee)

11.15.18.02 Policy 2.2.1 Student Employment-Mark Up (Academic Affairs Committee)

11.29.18.03 Policy 2.2.1 Student Employment-Clean (Academic Affairs Committee)

Senator Pancrazio: We looked at this policy in our last Senate meeting, and there were questions that came from the floor about the role of international students and about the ability to pay students through grants, and we've answered those questions. So at this point we'd like to go ahead and put this... I also have a question. Let me see. The clean copy that we have here, there were also some recommendations from the floor to add the word "or" in the bullet point. For example, fall, spring semester, six graduate credit hours or five graduate... I believe I included those in the mark-up but they're not here. So were there some additional changes?

Senator Kalter: Can you say again where those are? This is in the clean copy, which is 11.29.18.03.

Senator Pancrazio: That is correct. That is correct, and the two bullet points, it says fall, spring semester, six undergraduate credit hours. And often what happens with the copies, if the person receiving the document doesn't have it on all mark-up, it doesn't always appear, so I don't know if that made it in.

Senator Kalter: That's possible.

Senator Pancrazio: But if we want that to be in there, we need to make that clear now.

Senator Kalter: So inserting the word "or" between six undergraduate credit hours and five graduate credit hours in that first bullet and then between three and three in the other one.

Senator Pancrazio: Correct. I believe I also included a reference to international students, that they were included in that as well, but I don't believe that that's necessary. But Senator Ferrence's question was answered in the first paragraph after those bullet points. So at this point if there are no other further questions or comments, I think this is ready for our decision.

Senator Kalter: Before we move it to action formally, the one that you just said about the international students, did you say that that was also supposed to have been embedded in the copy but didn't get there?

Senator Pancrazio: I believe that... Yeah, because they are Illinois State students, so the same rule applied to them.

Senator Kalter: But I mean, is there a correction to the clean copy that we need to have, or is it already...

Senator Pancrazio: I inserted it to indicate to the Senators that had answered the question, but I don't... It's not here.

Senator Kalter: You're not seeing it? I think that this was partly a victim of the two-day shutdown because we had to get this out in a very short period of time. So I think that's what's going on there. Do you remember where that other insertion about international students would have been? What it said?

Senator Pancrazio: No, and I was looking for it here but it's on my home computer. But being Illinois State students, they fall under the same rule as... Now, there was some discussion back and forth about visa requirements because many of us that work with international students, we also are aware that some students may have to be full-time to maintain their visas, but that visa issue is kind of a separate and special issue. Would the Senate like me to double check all that and re-present this?

Senator Kalter: Well, I want to ask the Senators that actually... Do you feel uncomfortable? Essentially what we're talking about are friendly amendments that simply clarify the status of international students. We can do this right now with the contingency that those will be included in the approved policy. We can defer it. If anybody has any objection, I think we should move forward. I'm sorry, unless anybody has an objection, I think we should move forward. Does anybody have any objection to moving forward and including that intended friendly amendment in the clean copy once we find that copy?

Senator Horst: I'm just a little confused what the amendment would be. So, I'm all for approving with a friendly amendment, but I'm not even sure what it is.

Senator Pancrazio: Specifically, I think the wording was something akin to the following: That because there are different types of visas, there are different sets of requirements. So a student on an F1 visa would have to be full-time. However, that's not necessarily a requirement for employment. Okay? And when we discussed this, we didn't want to mix the two, but at the same time we want to make it clear that the same rules for employment apply. However, foreign students, because they have different types of visas, may have additional sets of rules that are not contemplated by the Employment Policy which we're looking at here.

Senator Kalter: Does that clarify it all, Senator Horst?

Senator Horst: Yes.

Senator Kalter: Okay. So if there are no objections to us moving forward, what we're going to do is ask Senator Pancrazio to put it on the floor, we'll vote on it, and if Exec sees any issue that would raise it to something other than a friendly amendment, we will bring it back before having the President sign it. So, Senator Pancrazio, do you want to just formally put it on the floor on behalf of the committee?

Senator Pancrazio: Yes, it's on the floor.

Senator Kalter: Awesome. We love Robert's Rules of Order. All right, so Senator Pancrazio has formally moved that we approve the changes to the Student Employment Policy with the friendly amendments mentioned.

Motion by Senator Pancrazio, on behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee, to approve the Student Employment Policy with friendly amendments. The motion was unanimously approved.

01.20.16.05 7.8.1 Operating Budget Policy Current Copy (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)

01.24.19.01 7.8.1 Operating Budget Mark Up (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)

01.24.19.02 7.8.1 Operating Budget Policy final copy (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)

Senator Kalter: We will move on to the next action item, which is our Operating Budget Policy. Now, this one we're going to do a soft start on also because you might remember that we had a handout last time with these changes, and so some people may not have had a chance at the last meeting during the information item to read through all of the changes that were made. So let's start in information, and I'm going to go to Senator Marx for Administrative Affairs and Budget.

Senator Marx: Okay, as described last time, the committee had worked with Vice President Dan Stephens' office, particularly Sandy Cavi, to revise the Operating Budget Policy to make it more in line with the operations that do go on with regard to university funds and budgeting. The change that was made from the first time this was presented was to break out what the particular funds are that go into this university operations – General Revenue Funds, Restricted Funds – and then define what those are and where they come from. So it's pretty well laid out now, and then the rest is the procedures that happen within that division each year.

Senator Kalter: All right, if we're in information that means this is the time for questions and comments. Does anybody have any observations, questions, comments? I have two; they're very minor. One of them is simply a formatting thing, which is that as the policy reads right now, we have General Funds with some bullet points, Restricted Funds with some bullet points, and then we go back to general funds and then we go back to Restricted Funds. And I'm just wondering if it would make sense to bring that paragraph that begins, "General funds are budgeted centrally and allocated," et cetera, up above the Restricted Funds line and bullets so that we have everything in the General Funds in one place and everything in the Restricted Funds in one place.

Senator Marx: Absolutely. That makes sense. Thank you very much.

Senator Kalter: To just do that sort of friendly formatting. The only other thing that I had a question about is I think for Senator Stephens. We have right now in the write-up that financial aid funds, both federal and state, are included under grants and contracts. My sense is that that might be confusing a little bit because a grant and contract, you know, like a principle investigator gets as a faculty member is quite different from financial aid that a student gets. I wonder if we could understand sort of why those might be in the same category or if they should be put out in two different bullet points.

Senator Stephens: Well, if the grant itself provides for the opportunity for financial aid to be paid within the proceeds, you know, the expenditures, just like compensation for faculty or a grad assistant, that it has to stay within that restricted area. Our institutional aid, the ISU scholarship aid we provide that is funded by the General Revenue Funds, those have to stay in the GR column, but if we receive funds from anyone else other than ourselves, we can't place it in the same column as if it belongs to us. So it really is who provided the funding ultimately results in us placing it whether it is restricted or unrestricted. Grants and contracts are Restricted Funds; General Revenue is not.

Senator Kalter: Okay, so I guess one thing that I'm wondering, then, is up under General Revenue we have two types – State Appropriated and University Income Fund – and you're saying that it would not be appropriate to

say that most financial aid goes into that General Revenue category even though some of those General Revenue Funds come from outside the university. In other words, having a line that has federal grants to students or federal loans to students or something. Because actually that doesn't come into the university except for the student anyway, right? A loan, for example, would come into the University Income Fund by the student paying tuition.

Senator Stephens: And it goes right back out.

Senator Kalter: Right.

Senator Stephens: It's an in and out. Again, not having this information in front of me, if you're looking for some greater clarity, we can work again with Sandy if there's still some element of confusion. But we do have accounting requirements, accounting and reporting requirements that force us into where items are placed. And at the end of the day, if it's funds we provide, the institution provides, either by the form of tuition or state appropriations (they come in together), that's institutional aid. If an outside agency outside of the state (a grantor), then it can't be in that same column.

Senator Kalter: I am wondering under grants and contracts whether, now that you have explained what that refers to, at least in various ways, if what was intended was also included are any federal and state financial aid funds granted to the university to be distributed to the students under a grant or contract obtained by a faculty or staff member, if it's that specific. Does that make sense? So I'm wondering if it's specifically those kinds of financial aid versus all other types of financial aid, and I don't know if Senator Baur knows. It looks like you were reaching for a microphone.

Senator Baur: I think it includes some things besides grants that are awarded to faculty because, like Pell Grants, for example, are considered Restricted Funds by the federal government and so they're made as a grant to the university. I don't know the details of how they're distributed, but they follow all the federal regulations. And anything from the state that's federal flow-through, even if it's student financial aid, has to follow the same requirements. So they are Restricted Funds similar to grants.

Senator Kalter: Okay, I just wanted to make sure that when we are talking about grants and contracts that we're not mixing really different types of money in that same category.

Senator Baur: They are different in how they're used.

Senator Stephens: But that is the category itself. Like you said, a Pell Grant is still a grant. What you, again, are referring to is not a faculty grant, but from the nomenclature of how it's used in policy, it's going to still be referred to as a grant.

Senator Kalter: And so when we report it, like in the Factbook or in other places, we are in fact right now putting that under grants and contracts.

Senator Stephens: That's exactly right.

Senator Kalter: Okay. That's kind of the point of the question. All right, so those were my questions, Senator Marx. Back to you.

Senator Marx: Okay, with that, we would put this on the floor for a vote.

Motion by Senator Marx, on behalf of Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee, to approve the Operating Budget Policy. The motion was unanimously approved.

Information Items:

02.01.18.10 Policy 4.1.4 Dress Codes CURRENT (From Academic Affairs Committee)

01.29.19.01 Policy 4.1.4 Dress Codes Mark up (From Academic Affairs Committee)

01.24.19.13 Policy 4.1.4 Dress Codes Clean Copy (From Academic Affairs Committee)

Senator Kalter: Information items. We begin with the Dress Code, and I know that there is a copy of this that has some comments along the side. So we are in Information. We're not going to be voting on this tonight. I'll pitch it back to Senator Pancrazio.

Senator Pancrazio: Senator Kalter, I found the original copy on my phone, and I sent a copy of the Student Employment Policy. There is a missing paragraph and it specifically addresses the issue that was brought up by Senator Qaddour and I wanted to make sure that everybody had that copy. I did follow up on that. Hopefully that clarifies and you should have that in your hands.

Senator Kalter: Oh, wonderful. Does anybody have that where they can read it to us? It would be nice to have it on the record.

Senator DeGrauwe: One second. Let me find out the change in it. "The above-mentioned rules also apply for international students. At the same time, international students, depending on the type of visa they hold, may be required to hold full-time status during the fall and spring semesters. As such, they should consult with their advisors regarding their visa requirements of employment on campus."

Senator Kalter: Would anybody like to change their vote? Would you like to change your vote?

Senator Midha: Yes, I was just checking on the under USCIS requirements, and this is correct.

Senator Kalter: Okay, great. So you're...

Senator Pancrazio: Out of respect, I made sure that was there.

Senator Kalter: So you'd like to change from a no to a yes?

Senator Midha: Yes.

Senator Kalter: Okay, wonderful. So we have Student Employment Policy going to the President for signature. Let's go back, then, also to Senator Pancrazio for the Dress Code Policy.

Senator Pancrazio: Many of us will remember that this came up before as an informational item; however, due to some questions that came up in the Executive Committee, I pulled it because I wanted to make sure that the policies at the unit level were actually doing what they should. The question that came up in Exec was, how do these unit-level policies address, for example, religious clothing? And that information is not contained in this policy. I wanted to look at how this was being carried out at the unit level – policies that we are not looking at – and it is addressed in, for example, the one in the Marketing department's Dress Code Policy so that it was being... And it gave us an additional opportunity to have more discussion about this.

First of all, we had some discussion about what this policy was. Were we endorsing dress code policies or were we creating a policy that would deal with how these policies were going to be administered? And we opted for the latter of those two. So we see this as a policy about how those other policies are going to be administered.

Suffice to say that the members of the committee were strongly in favor of self-expression and the freedom of expression and the freedom to wear the clothes and to groom the way one wants to. At the same time, faculty members saw that different departments had different values as far as teaching – notions of professionalism – especially you see this in the College of Education and others. So it was a difficult policy for us to debate.

First of all, we recommend a title change. That this is not a Dress Code Policy but a policy Regarding Dress Codes. We've also looked again and we saw that we want to add some language about professionalism because some of these departments are talking about professionalism as part of their teaching. So we want that addressed. We've also asked that this policy should be able to direct those other policies to review themselves on occasion. A lot has changed over the past years. For example, there is a unit-level policy that basically describes tattoos as kind of a taboo. Well, I'm sorry, times have changed. My daughter has an entire sleeve, and we've survived as a family, so I think really it's time to maybe update some of those policies. Likewise, the University has had a number of different initiatives. We're looking at INTO, we're looking at recruiting internationally, we're talking about diversity, and we're talking about costs to students. Books are very expensive, but what about dry cleaning? If we have to add \$3 for every shirt three days a week, we'd come up with an extra \$150, however, and so we want that to be something that these units, recognizing their autonomy and their ability to administer their things, but we'd like them to really think about these. Are they up to speed?

Likewise, the other major change – and we have a number of different other editorial changes – but the major change is we want them to be very clear and articulate about what the appeal policy is and how that appeal is carried out. Some of the unit-level policy is not always very clear. But that, in a nutshell, is what we're recommending. Title change, some additional changes, and a policy that will better administer and also give a clearer degree to students that when there is a problem they really have a right to make an appeal. Any questions, I'd be happy to... And likewise, the members of the committee, they're free to weigh in and also our students, who gave plenty of feedback.

Senator Kalter: So this is our second Information Item session on this policy. Do we have comments, questions, concerns?

Senator Marx: Yes, in the policy you asked that the policies be reviewed periodically. Did you think about putting in a particular time – maybe three years, five years, ten years? Periodically is not very specific.

Senator Pancrazio: We were thinking of better than not being reviewed at all, but if the Senator would like to make a friendly amendment, I'm certain we'd be willing to hear that.

Senator Marx: I might suggest five years as a reasonable period for this.

Senator Pancrazio: Accepted.

Senator Kalter: So the phrase rather than "periodically," "at least once every five years."

Senator Nikolaou: Is it every five years or at least five years?

Senator Kalter: The way I just phrased it was "at least once every five years." So obviously you could review it every year if you wanted to, but at least once every five years. Does that seem friendly?

Senator Pancrazio: I think that's better than not reviewing it at all.

Senator Horst: Yes, did you at all consider tying Dress Codes to specific course objectives?

Senator Pancrazio: I thought to some degree there is some mention to it. "Dress code must be specifically tailored to an individual course, labs, clinical experience, or performances." I don't think we went beyond that, but if there's something we're not seeing, please... You know, it's a time to, if we can make this better, make this more functional. We're certainly open to that.

Senator Horst: This idea actually comes from Senator Blum, who now wants to speak. I don't mean to acknowledge him.

Senator Blum: I just want to add support to the discussion here about this that it seems to me that it would be really easy for a department to interpret this in a very broad way, which I don't think is what the committee is intending here and the policy's intention. And one way that I suggested that this was a possibility of narrowing that, it should be relevant to the content of a given course. I mean, there are some things that are, I think in this policy, like bullet three about clinical or performance that are rather obvious. Right? So, I work in teacher education. You're in a school, there's standards of dress that are part of the norms of a particular school. Or you're performing. Those are certain kind of norms for dress that are essential. But there's also a possibility that someone could just say, "I think everybody should wear ties because I think that's what people in my discipline do" (whether they do or don't) and that everybody has to wear ties and it doesn't have anything to do with the underlying content. I mean, students would learn the content just as well whether they were dressing in ties or dressing in blue jeans or casual shirts. So, that was kind of my thinking around this. And I do see that there is language about program-specific academic performance, and then it does say you should clearly state the purpose, but it seems to me there's a lot of wiggle room between those two things.

Senator Pancrazio: If we're looking at the second bullet point where it says, "Dress codes must be specifically tailored to the individual course," how would the Senator feel about we add "objectives?"

Senator Kalter: So, Senator Pancrazio, in the comment attached to that one, Exec suggests, KS2, although I don't remember if I made that one or not. Exec suggested rephrasing this to something like, "Dress codes must be specifically tailored to the individual course, labs, clinical experiences, or performances to which they apply and (and this is the new part) to their approved learning objectives..." In other words, it can't just be made up. It has to actually have been approved, gone through the curricular process and been approved as a learning objective. So not just seen by one faculty member but multiple ones. "... and must be reflective of national standards common to the discipline" so that we have some... I think what Senator Blum is bringing up is the potential for arbitrariness on the part of individual faculty members. And then below that also saying, while we understood why "and may not be of general applicability" was crossed out because it may have seemed redundant, that perhaps that redundancy is actually a good thing in this case. Because I will make a comment that the Marketing department, under this policy, really cannot have a dress code policy. Their courses can have policies. But this policy says that it can't be a departmental level policy or a college level policy. It has to be specific to the courses. That's what this says.

Senator Pancrazio: Well, there is a copy, and the department chair did provide that copy, and that was specific to I believe the Marketing courses that are 200 and above. So, yes and no. All right? And I do believe at some point in time that I circulated that copy to the Executive Committee as well.

Senator Kalter: But my point is that if our policy on dress codes is saying that a dress code has to be tailored to individual courses, that means it has to be an individual course dress code, not a dress code that applies to multiple courses.

Senator Pancrazio: Are you saying that each one of these has to be completely different?

Senator Kalter: No.

Senator Pancrazio: Because the department has decided that... And this is where I'm kind of getting to be a little... Are we telling the department what they have to do? Because we're not looking at that policy because the policy was forwarded to me by the Marketing department, and at this point the only one that we have in front of us is this one. So we're kind of... It's almost like we're setting up a situation of telling another department what to do, and I'm kind of saying, hey, look, if we have a university policy that says review it periodically, and change it. It's a policy on policies, but it sounds to me like... Are we trying to combine something that would have to go through the UCC as well? Is that where this is going?

Senator Horst: Let me clarify a little bit what my position was and I believe what Senator Blum's position was. For instance, Music has a lot of dress codes. We have tux dress codes, but they apply for specific reasons because specific courses have course objectives, like a concert. My Music Theory course where we talk about how music is constructed does not have a dress code because I don't have any element in my class, any element in the course objectives that requires a dress code. So we were looking at your language here, "Dress codes must be specifically tailored to the individual course, labs, clinical experience, or performances," and we were extending that to the logic and they should be tied to specific course objectives such as you will go out as a Music Therapy student into a clinical setting, and that's a requirement of the course.

Senator Pancrazio: No, it's not the objectives. And I think I was suggesting that that word would have been adequate, but it sounds to me like if we have a group of faculty that are in one unit and that come to an agreement about what they want for a series of classes, I don't see the difference.

Senator Horst: Because there would be something in the courses, there would be some sort of objective of the course, hopefully.

Senator Pancrazio: They have decided that that is their way of teaching professionalism. So, I mean, regardless of whether I do it or not, I think we're kind of arguing six of one and half a dozen of the other. I don't really...

Senator Ferrence: So, I understand where Senator Horst is coming from, I think, on a Theatre side. Coming from the science side, part of the issue... And some of it has, when I look at these bullets, if these bullets are being treated as they're "ors" and pick a bullet of choice, then fine. But if the bullets are treated as an "and," that all of these should be in play, one of the problems I would have is that we expect, we require, everybody to wear safety glasses in a laboratory setting because it is the law. We do not make it a learning objective in our laboratory classes to teach students how to put on safety glasses. It's just that the law says you have to have them. There's nothing curricular per se. It's that it would be essentially illegal to not have them on in that kind of setting. So to say it has to be tied to a course objective, and even a specific course, I get concerned because we might forget when we create a new course... You know, Biology 220-19 (something that wouldn't exist) as a lab, to actually specify in the learning objectives of the course that we need to have safety glasses, would that mean that that particular group of students couldn't be held to the legal standard of safety glasses in the laboratory? So it's not really a learning objective beyond the fact that we are in a lab. That's just what you do.

Senator Horst: Right, but part of the course objective is to perform labs, right?

Senator Ferrence: Yeah, but lots of people don't necessarily wear safety glasses in the labs, not necessarily at ISU, because they don't care about the law. And we're saying we're not making this an objective of the learning. We're saying we would like to be compliant with the law. If we don't care about compliance with the law, I can guarantee you (I won't name names) I can point to faculty that would happily say, "We don't need our students to wear safety glasses in the lab. It's silly," and nothing would ever happen. We don't do it because of a learning objective. Some people are philosophically opposed to it as a learning objective. We do it because it's the law.

Senator Kalter: So to keep this as an Information Item rather than a debate, we are moving into debate and we are not in an Action Item phase. So what I would say about this is that the Executive Committee has suggested changed language. If Academic Affairs Committee does not accept that as a friendly amendment, we can have a debate about it on the floor the next time this comes through, whether to add that separate language or not. But let's use this time to get out all of the things that we're observing. So we've now put that on the floor, whether or not that language should be added about learning objectives and national standards and whether or not the phrase "and may not be of general applicability" should be crossed out or kept in. Right? So that's the comment there. Do we have other comments?

Senator Haugo: Mine is a question I think to you, Senator Kalter, about a point that you had raised that may have gotten lost in the discussion. For the second bullet point, "Dress codes must be specifically tailored to the individual course, labs, clinical experience, or performances to which they apply," there was a concern raised that this bullet point then makes it impossible for a program to institute a dress policy that isn't attached to a specific course objective or lab or clinical experience that would say all majors must dress in a particular way.

Senator Kalter: I think that the existing policy already does that is what I was pointing out and that for those programs like Chemistry or Theatre or what have you, and Marketing, it shouldn't be that hard to say we can say this as a course dress code rather than a program dress code, right? If it's legitimate, it's legitimate. It's just the difference between having a department-wide dress code and a course-specific dress code, right? And so now it may be that there are some departments where they can justify that the learning objectives of the course or of the field, the discipline, or what have you, justify having the same dress code across every course that it teaches, but there has to be some connection to the academic performance of the student, right? And that's why one of the other things that Exec is reminding us of is that during the last Information Item we had suggested that the Grading Practice Policy be mentioned because that's an incredibly significant policy and that the Equal Opportunity and Nondiscrimination statement also be mentioned, especially if we're concerned about religious discrimination, right? So that's all I was saying was that it shouldn't be thought of as a Theatre dress code or a Marketing department dress code or a Chemistry department dress code. It's a dress code for the courses where that dress code needs to apply, right?

Senator Haugo: Okay, thank you.

Senator Judson: Yes, and as a point of information, I just want to point out that the Department of Marketing's dress code is a departmental requirement. So the second bullet would require a change, but I agree with Senator Kalter that that would not be so difficult to institute.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. Other comments, observations, questions?

Senator Horst: I just appreciate Senator Ferrence's comments, and I'm thinking that some sort of language regarding what he was saying could be included. If there's a legal requirement for a particular kind of dress, such as goggles, that's a rationale for a dress code and it doesn't have to necessarily be part of a course objective if it's a safety legal requirement.

Senator Ferrence: And that was kind of my comment about whether these are "ands" or "ors" is the language in the bullet immediately following the one that you're talking out, "Dress codes may be applied in specific circumstances," that pretty much, in my mind, captures that. Mentioning OSHA that basically is saying the legal is captured. What my concern was, if then also the bullet before that must be enforced, then you might have two bullets which are at opposition with one another because the one bullet is specifically saying for legal reasons and the other is saying... Now, if you can choose your bullet... And I assume the intent here is that we should broadly follow all of these principles, not just pick which bullet we want to follow for our code, but it

doesn't explicitly say that. But I think that's implied by the bullet. So I was just worried about that possibility that... You know, I think it's great to tie it to a learning objective if you can, but I can imagine circumstances where the reason might not be due to a learning objective but still a very valid reason, and I wouldn't want to eliminate the ability to enforce something for another very good reason that just happened not to be a learning objective. So that was my objection.

Senator Jenkins: The final bullet point, "any recommendation for corrective action for non-compliance..." Non-compliance in this final bullet point, you're talking about a student who didn't comply with the dress code and they have an appeals process. Is that right?

Senator Pancrazio: They should have an appeal process of some kind. Or if that dress code were implemented arbitrarily – one student received some type of demerit and another didn't.

Senator Jenkins: So, we have a lab in Nursing where the students are required to wear their scrubs, which are expensive. They come into the lab, they take off those scrubs, and they put on a patient gown so they can practice examining each other. They put the scrubs back on as they walk out the door. I've been tilting at this particular windmill for a while. Do I, as a faculty member, have a right to appeal or do students who maybe didn't break the dress code but they're asking does this really make sense for this course? Does this give us the right to an appeals process too?

Senator Pancrazio: That never, ever occurred to us. However, we did get the information from Mennonite College of Nursing. We asked and we said, "Do you have some type of dress?" and they said, "Yes, for the labs, and that's all." We didn't ask any additional things.

Senator Kalter: I just want to do a time check here because we're about five minutes to eight and I think it would be a good idea for us, since we have a visitor with the CAST bylaws, for us to get to that one. So if we can try not to be redundant with what we've been talking about. Not debate. Do we have any new comments?

Senator Blum: I'll try to be brief. I just want to say that I agree with Senator Ferrence. I think the bullet that's there captures the lab kind of situation, and so any adding of, you know, course objectives or anything like that, those things need to be coupled. And so, if those things above don't apply, that... I mean, I think all of those... Bullet number three is a very sound reasoning in and of itself. But if you don't have one of those, and you don't have course objectives or national standards, if you don't have that either... Right? So to me, the language around that would have to be in that way, and that way would avoid the problem that, well, we didn't state the course objective is to have a certain... like goggles on.

Senator Midha: I took it as the third bullet point is more important in the sense that if it's a legal requirement, as Senator Ferrence said, then if a faculty chooses that these are bullet points and I can pick and choose one or the other, and let's say the faculty picks the second one and says okay it is to be tailored to an individual course and I do not want my students to wear glasses so I'm using this as the excuse, that trumps the third bullet point, which is the legal requirement. That would be a challenge. So this should be written in a way that if it is a legal requirement or something, that should trump your personal preference.

Senator Ferrence: So the other thing I was going to say, which was not directly related to this, is that last bullet, at first I thought it's fine, but then as we discussed, one thing that I think we should just consider is when I read any recommendation for corrective action and it says there should be a chance for appeal, I want to make sure that it's not suggesting that corrective action can't be taken until there's been an opportunity for appeal. Because, for example, in the specific case of safety, in the event of someone violating a safety, like not wearing safety glasses – and we do have this happen where a student says no, I simply refuse to put them on – the corrective action is immediate ejection from the laboratory. If the refusal continues, we even have a secret code

that we're to call that will bring campus police to have them ejected. And so there is no opportunity for appeal at that case because you're putting other students at risk. And the corrective action is simply ejection from the lab. So in principle I like the statement there, but I'm just pointing out that there might be a scenario where it's not really an appealable offense.

Senator Kalter: I think we have enough questions on this because there are still questions that are on the side of the copy such as where should the final appeal be and things like that and the question of the Student Bill of Rights. It seems to me that this is not quite ready to come back for action. It may need to go back to the committee. But do we have any final comments other than the ones that are already on the copy right here on 01.29.19.01 that have not been articulated or that have not been articulated on the floor?

Senator Pancrazio: I'm going to resist this notion to send it back to committee, and I'll explain why.

Senator Kalter: I'm so surprised.

Senator Pancrazio: I'll explain why. This was a topic that just really could not... Even after we approved it, we still kept debating it.

Senator Kalter: So let me stop you just for a minute because I really want to get to our guest. I don't necessarily mean go back to the committee to be talked about ad nauseam for three more meetings. Right? I know that you've been there, and every committee that will ever get this policy will be there. What sometimes going back to committee means is circulating the draft over email and saying, did we catch everything that got mentioned on the floor the first time? Did we get everything that got mentioned on the floor the second time? Do we have it tied up in a nice little bow ready for debate? And did it get through Legal and all of that kind of stuff.

Senator Pancrazio: Let me ask those people who have some strong... some observations. Could you please email me? You have my email. I sent one out. I would appreciate your comments directly so that we can try to wrap this up because this is one of those issues that is going to provoke a lot of different thoughts. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Great, thank you. All right, moving to the final Information Item.

01.24.19.07 CAST Bylaws Dec 2015 (From Rules Committee)

01.24.19.09 CAST Bylaws Mark Up (From Rules Committee)

01.24.19.10 CAST Bylaws Clean Copy (From Rules Committee)

02.04.19.01 CAST Bylaw Proposed Changes Summary (From Rules Committee)

Senator Horst: Thank you. The CAST bylaws comes to the Rules Committee from the CAST College Council. They came up with a set of revisions and then they submitted it to the Senate and it went to the Rules Committee. This document needs to be approved by the entire CAST College. Because of that, I am requesting that we have an Information Item tonight. If you have any questions or comments about the document, you say them tonight. After tonight, we'll take the comments that you have, we'll do any final revisions to the document, and then it's going to be approved by the college, go up for a vote by the college. Then it will come back to the Senate for final ratification. We are hoping that there will be no changes at that point. So because there is this college approval process, we're hoping that we can take any comments tonight and then incorporate them into the document, then get the college approval, and then come back as an Action Item.

I gave you a document that lists the changes, and we have Michelle Kibler here, who was the chair of the committee that did the changes. Student members of the CAST College Council now will serve as voting members of the council. We're very happy about that change. We asked them to clarify the terms faculty and staff, and they did that in Section 8. There's some policy numbers that were referred to. The associate dean who serves on the College Research Committee, I believe it became ex officio non-voting. A significant

change that they made was regarding their department searches. The University Policy 3.2.13 allows for department school chairs to be appointed from within the department. However, CAST chose that they did not want to have a limit to a search to just internal candidates, so they wanted to go a different direction. We also updated some dates in one of the appendixes, and we removed Appendix 6 because that was technically part of the ASPT approval process, not the College Council bylaws process.

Senator Dawson: I'm looking at Appendix 5 in part III, Organization of the Search Committee, and it says, "The search committee that shall consist of at least five faculty- the majority of which would be tenured/tenure-track, one AP and civil service..." Is that AP and civil service or one or the other?

Senator Kalter: Senator Dawson, can you tell us which exact page number you're on?

Senator Dawson: Page 20. It's Appendix 5, the first page under item III.A. So is AP and civil service combined there for that purpose?

Dr. Kibler: Yes, so that would be one or the other.

Senator Dawson: All right. Further on in part C on the next page, it has that each department/school shall establish procedures for determining the faculty membership of the search committees and it goes on in part 1 to define full-time faculty, etc. And then in part D I'm a little confused because then it brings in NTT search committee representatives. I don't see anywhere that there is a provision for at least one NTT within that five faculty, and the way I'm reading this is that they could actually exclude NTTs from the search committee. Am I right, with the way it's written?

Dr. Kibler: No, so the majority of faculty, and we defined faculty as tenure-track and non-tenure-track earlier in the document.

Senator Dawson: Where is that?

Dr. Kibler: Section 8 at the beginning.

Senator Horst: CAST, it's a little confusing. We had to clear this up ourselves. I think it's Military Science is the people who are faculty but adjuncts, and so we asked them to include a definition of faculty that clarified that, and it's... Michelle, can you help me with that?

Dr. Kibler: So, in Section 8 in the beginning, we do have adjunct faculty that are true adjunct faculty. There were some questions about whether the Military Science faculty members are truly adjunct, and they are because they're appointed by the U.S. military and not ISU. And then we defined faculty throughout the document as tenure-track and non-tenure-track, so we used that blanket term for both of those.

Senator Dawson: All right, then I'll ask the question again where it says that the majority of which should be tenured/tenure-track, all could be tenured/tenure-track and actually exclude NTT. Am I right? By design or desire.

Senator Horst: We're going back to Appendix 5.

Senator Kalter: Before you move on to that, could you just tell us what exact page Section 8 is on?

Senator Horst: Page 4. It's Article 1, Section 8.

Senator Kalter: Thank you.

Senator Horst: "Throughout this document, the term faculty refers to all tenured/tenure-track and full-time non-tenure-track faculty." And that's to clarify the Military Science faculty.

Senator Dawson: All right. But still, in the appendix it is worded such that there is no requirement and not even encouragement to include a non-tenure-track faculty on a search committee for a department chair or a school director.

Senator Horst: Michelle, when you say at least five faculty, that's including all the faculty.

Dr. Kibler: Right, but I think what she's saying is that with the language saying the majority of them being tenured/tenure-track, the majority could be all five I think was her question.

Senator Horst: Yes.

Dr. Kibler: So we could clear that up.

Senator Horst: What would you suggest?

Senator Dawson: At least one of which must be a non-tenure-track faculty.

Senator Horst: Is that okay?

Dr. Kibler: Yes.

Senator Kalter: Is that going to be possible in all of your departments, or would that mean that in some departments it would always be the same person serving?

Dr. Kibler: I couldn't speak for all departments. I can speak for my own that we would not have the same person, and we have quite a few non-tenure-track faculty in CAST. But I can check on that. But I don't think that would be the case, but I can certainly check on that.

Senator Kalter: Great, thank you. I believe that that was raised the last time we saw the CAST bylaws, and that's why I asked that question because I think the argument was made that there are some departments that have maybe one non-tenure-track. Is that the case?

Senator Qaddour: Yeah, that's the case. For this reason we put the language majority to be there. But I think sometimes you don't have...

Senator Dawson: Yeah, but if we don't add the language about NTT, they can intentionally exclude them.

Senator Kalter: Or even unintentionally exclude them, actually. I mean, it could simply happen.

Senator Zeck: Having been a long-time non-tenure-track faculty member, I certainly applaud the desire to include non-tenure-track faculty persons in important decision-making matters. However, the contract for the bargaining unit does not necessarily allow for non-tenure-track faculty persons to do service work without additional compensation...

Senator Dawson: No, that's not relevant on (inaudible) the contract. There's no compensation for anybody serving on a search committee.

Senator Kalter: I think what Senator Zeck is saying is that for many non-tenure-tracks, the essential job duties are teaching whereas for tenure-line faculty they're teaching, research, and service. And so even though we don't get extra compensation, it's because it's seen as part of our job.

Senator Zeck: So NTTs cannot be compelled to serve on...

Senator Dawson: They can decline.

Senator Zeck: That is correct.

Senator Dawson: That doesn't mean that they should be excluded. They should be given an opportunity, at a minimum.

Senator Zeck: But if you make the language that a non-tenure-track person must be on the committee, and there are potentially no NTTs who wish to do that service, then you've made a difficult problem.

Senator Dawson: In that case, I could see where it could be compelled. But the problem that we have, and it's been a problem a long time on campus (and as former NTT chair for the union), we are facing a situation where NTTs are being excluded from the very search committee that has the most impact on them as an employee, as an educator, etc. And if they are not given an opportunity to be a part of that search committee, as they are specifically for VPs and Provost and any number of other things... I believe they are even prescribed for most colleges on the dean's search, but when you include department chairs in some of the colleges – and I know, Martha, you could probably answer this because you've got some of them at the tip of your fingers, I'm sure – but to where the language is such that they could be excluded is not fair.

Senator Horst: I was going to suggest instead of what we said, "at least one must be NTT," we could add a clause that said, "an effort should be made to include non-tenure-track faculty in this majority."

Senator Kalter: Another option would also be to have a seat set aside for a non-tenure-track and then have language that says if the seat remains vacant because there are no non-tenure-tracks willing to serve, then the seat remains vacant, right? And then you have a seat reserved but it may or may not be filled in any particular department's search. That would be another potential option.

Senator Dawson: That's an interesting way to look at it.

Senator Kalter: Because we do that on all of our other committees where we have tenure-line seats that are not always filled for one reason or another. You know, a college doesn't have enough faculty to fill that seat or what have you.

Senator Blum: I was just going to offer similar language to what you're saying, Senator Kalter. Having a seat and having that always available and then if there's no one willing to fill it, well, then there's no one to refill it.

Senator Horst: So we could say at least one of these faculty seats must be made available to a non-tenure-track faculty, but we don't use the language "must be" because then we could potentially not constitute search committees if we can't find an NTT.

Senator Qaddour: So that would be extra to the five.

Senator Kalter: Right. What I am suggesting is that there is a separate seat. Like you have a separate student seat, you have seats for different people, that these are different seats.

Senator Whitters: I agree with what you said because I was going to say that maybe instead of adding demanding language you can add the word "possibly" so it gives them a choice to accept the job or not. That's all I was going to say.

Senator Kalter: Awesome. And I just want to concur with what Senator Dawson said. I think non-tenure-tracks are impacted much more by their department chair than almost any other member of the department except for the direct staff, the support staff, who report to that person. Any other comments about this one? Any observations? We've blown past our hard stop time by a couple minutes, but it was worth it. So much for a hard stop. It's sort of like a soft hard stop. All right, we're also going to blow past the committee... Thank you very much, Professor Kibler, and we're going to blow past the committee reports if you can just send those in by email and we'll send those around.

Communications

Senator Dawson: Just real quick, College of Business Week is next week, and you can go to the College of Business website to find out more about it. Thank you.

Adjournment

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