Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

3-27-2019

Senate Meeting, March 27, 2019

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

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

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting, March 27, 2019" (2019). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 1254.
https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/1254

Academic Senate Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, March 27, 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.

Senator Kalter: We're going to start with a presentation, the Recruitment and Retention of Underrepresented Students Report, which we get annually. Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management, Jana Albrecht, is here, and if she'll come to the table and give us a couple comments on it and then we can ask questions.

Recruitment and Retention of Underrepresented Students (Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management Jana Albrecht)

Ms. Albrecht: Thanks so much for having me. I love talking about recruitment and retention, and I noticed that Senator Kalter said some brief remarks probably because you have a long agenda tonight. So it is a long document, and one of the things that I will point out initially is that we did add an entire section on Student Affairs this year, and we did that because we have a lot of collaboration that's going on at the University, and not just with Student Affairs, but Student Affairs helps us significantly in recruitment and retention so we wanted to include them this year. It did make it a little bit longer, but I think there's some really good information in there. We are making good progress on increasing diversity on campus. The students of color for our freshman class for this fall term, we were at about 34%, and that compares to last fall term, which was about 29%. So that was an increase of about 272 students. Total enrollment of students of color in our class went up from 24% to 25% this year as well. So we also had a big increase in our international students, about a 32% increase (that's 126 students overall), and we think some of that is because of the work that we're doing with INTO. So, happy about international increases in numbers. We did have increases in Pell eligible students, or our lower income student group. Also saw increases for first generation students. So in general, this report talks a lot about students of color, but when we say underrepresented students, we're likely talking about veterans, first generation, low income, students of color, so there are a number of categories that make up information for this particular report. So if you want to see trend lines, those are on page 5. You can see trend lines by race and you can see that most of those trend lines are in upward motion, so we're happy about that as well. So on one other good note, for recruitment at least, we are seeing significant increases in applications and admits of students of color for the fall 2019 term, and some of them are significant increases, and so I'm really excited to see where deposits end up for this coming fall.

Moving on to retention and graduation, those particular charts start on page 5 as well. So we do show a bit of a downward trend for retention and for graduation. (Actually, we saw a little bit of an uptick for graduation this year.) But we're focusing a little bit more on retention, and we know it's very important and we want those numbers to increase for us. And I will mention that if we compare retention and graduation rates on a national level, we still are very favorable. We do really well when we make those particular comparisons. So retention rates on the national scale are at about 61% overall, so you can see where we're almost 10 percentage points higher than that. For public, four years, that's about a 71% retention rate, so we do better as far as retention rates go. And for graduation rates, on the national level it's about 59%, so we do significantly better for graduation rates as well. Not saying that we don't have some work to do. We know that. We're putting, like I said, a large focus on retention for this coming year. A couple of the initiatives that I just wanted to point out, we have a Thrive course that is brand new for the fall term. Senator Noel-Elkins, if I misspeak, feel free to add anything that you would like to add. But that course in particular does a lot for careers and for study skills and

just helping students transition from the high school experience to the college experience. So we're hoping that we're going to see really good things from that particular course.

We also added a Persistence Committee this year, and this speaks a lot to the collaboration that we have on campus. In the Persistence Committee, there are individuals from every area of campus. They meet once a week or once every two weeks, depending on how many students that they're trying to look at, but they're coming up with a holistic plan for students. So students might have issues with financial aid, and mental health, and in the classroom. So that particular group gets together and tries to help these students get through to retention and to graduation. Did you want to add anything about… Okay. Additionally, we have some additional funds for hardships. So students that are going through hardship with their financial aid and with their bill, we have some additional funds that we're using towards those students as well, and those are happy conversations that we typically have with those students on campus.

The Provost's office has also created a new position that's focused on diversity, and Dr. Yojanna Cuenca-Carlino has started in the office and we're really excited to hear about some of her ideas to move us forward in that direction.

The Division of Student Affairs, I won't mention a ton about that, but they do start on page 18. I had a partner in crime that was going to be here, and I think Senator Johnson is here so if there are questions we can get that answered, but she couldn't make it tonight. But there is some good information in that section as well.

And just as a last point, I want everybody to know that we continually monitor and evaluate and re-evaluate what we're doing. The things that aren't working, we don't continue, and we're constantly asking students what they want, what they need, what's missing, and we try to accommodate as best we can. So thank you.

Senator Kalter: Wonderful, thank you. Do we have questions about the report or about anything that – what is it, AVP Albrecht? – has just said?

Senator Smith: So as I was going through this, I noticed that there's not any information about students who come from LGBT backgrounds. Is there any plan to add that in the future?

Ms. Albrecht: So, the hard part about tracking LGBT is that we don't have anything in the system that would indicate or allow us to pull that information easily. We could come up with probably some statistics in a few of the areas on campus, so I'll try. I'll take that back to our group and talk about it and see what maybe we can come up with for the report, but that's a great idea.

Senator Smith: Okay, thank you.

Senator Kalter: Other questions?

Senator Breland: So I know you mentioned… I see a decrease in the retention rate for people of color, and I know you say you all are doing this to focus on diversity, do you all have ways in which you are going to… It says you are seeking them out. Have you all figured out strategies into keeping them here?

Ms. Albrecht: To keeping students of color here?

Senator Breland: Yes, as far as what are faculty doing to make sure that this is a safe place for students of color.

Ms. Albrecht: Sure. Do you want to talk about…

Provost Murphy: So, you know, it is a big initiative of the University to close that retention gap – not only to maintain high retention rates for all students, but to close that gap between the retention rate and graduation rates for underrepresented students and then the entire student population. So, for us, one of the things I would say… You asked specifically about faculty. When we hired and created the position for Dr. Cuenca-Carlino, the primary purpose of her job is professional development for our faculty and staff in the areas of diversity and inclusion for just that reason – to help a faculty and staff understand their role in student success, their role in ensuring that we provide all of the support services and the academic services that we can to help all of our students (but particularly underrepresented students, again), so we can close that gap. So from the faculty perspective, like most universities, we're really starting to move forward on that. I just spoke at the budget presentations today to all of our chairs and directors and deans, and that was a major topic of conversation, that we've got to start to think more about what role faculty play in students' success globally on campus. In terms of other initiatives that are more focused not so much on the faculty but on services that students provide, that's something that Dr. Noel-Elkins can talk about or that AVP Albrecht can talk about. So we have started initiatives. The President doubled the funding for some of our support services this year because we know which ones seem to be working, and so we can double those programs that we know are working. So it is an ongoing effort, and we know we have a lot of work to do.

President Dietz: If I might add briefly, in addition we've been selected as one of only 120 institutions across the country (and there's about 4,200 colleges and universities in the nation) by the American Public and Land-grant University organization (it's a national organization) to be one of those 120 that will share best practices with each other. So, to me, this whole issue is really about doing the best that we know how to do but also educating ourselves about how we can be better, and so I think being a part of that cohort will really help us as well.

Senator DeGrauwe: Hi. I'm looking at the information about the veterans' group. It's page 14 through page 16. And I was reading through, and I see a lot of information about 2018 (so this past year). It's saying how we have received a lot of awards and we're doing great things, but I don't see any information about the past to see where we're going. So I can't see are we improving or are we staying consistent? Do you have any information – are we increasing the numbers of veterans that we have in the campus – or any information along those lines?

Ms. Albrecht: Sure, and we can get you the information about number of veterans on campus. We do have a little bit of a steady trend line with veterans on campus. We have received some of these awards in the past, and part of our goal is to continue to be a veteran-friendly school always. Our Veteran Service Center is relatively new, and that's been extremely popular with our veterans, but I think we have seen some marginal increases in that population. But we'll get you that data.

Senator DeGrauwe: Thank you.

Senator Kernan: Is there a similar report for recruitment and retention of diverse faculty?

Provost Murphy: There would not be a report, but that is something that we take very seriously. For example, this year we had 46 successful tenured/tenure-track faculty hires in the College of Arts and Sciences alone. Thirty-three percent of those faculty hires were from underrepresented groups. So that is certainly an initiative on campus. We don't have benchmarks that we set, but we certainly know that as we've increased the diversity of our student body, we have a commitment to the student body to increase the diversity of the faculty and staff.

Senator Aduonum: I have a question. So you just mentioned that you just hired some faculty members, of which 33% is faculty of color/diverse background. I want to know what is the school doing to maintain and retain these faculty members because there's been quite a lot of faculty of color leaving this institution, and I want to know what the school is doing to retain them.

Provost Murphy: Well, as Jana has mentioned and I have mentioned, we've actually created a position in the Office of the Provost who's been charged with our diversity and inclusion planning both for our students and our faculty. And I think, Senator, you've met Dr. Cuenca-Carlino and know that that is a big percentage of her job, so that's what we've charged her to do. I'm not saying that she does that alone, but to help plan, to help determine what we are doing well, where are the gaps, what are we not doing well, what does the institution need to do, what is it we can do better, in order to retain faculty and staff (really to retain all faculty and staff). We hate to lose faculty and staff, but certainly to develop an environment that helps retain our faculty and staff of color.

Senator Horst: I'm picking up again on the questions regarding the graph of Figure 7 on page 5, and you mentioned committees that you've created and the Thrive course. I was just wondering if you've done any sort of… Are you able to diagnose exactly why there was such a dramatic decrease particularly in the African-American students? Is it a financial cause?

Ms. Albrecht: Sure, and I can speak to this and Senator Noel-Elkins, you can add if you'd like to. We do surveys to try and determine why students aren't returning to the University, and on the top of the list always (regardless of race or ethnicity) are finances, mental health/personal issues, and then the third one is probably grades, I think. Is that correct? Third is grades?

Senator Noel-Elkins: Access to majors and access to courses is typically up there. One of the things that's emerged over the last year is mental health issues.

Ms. Albrecht: So a lot of the programs that I spoke about certainly try and look at what we know those issues are.

Senator Kalter: All right, are there other questions?

Senator Smith: So this sort of goes off of what was just talked about. So with students leaving because of mental health issues, is there any sort of plan to kind of combat that and address that other than just what we currently do and offer the counseling services and things like that?

Ms. Albrecht: Sure, where is Senator Johnson?

Senator Johnson: Is this specifically for additional speakers?

Senator Smith: It was just… Is there any sort of plan to address that students are leaving due to mental health reasons other than just what we currently do by having the counselors available? Is there any sort of University-wide plan for that?

Senator Johnson: Well, we have a step process for addressing mental health issues and so we've been incorporating everything from we've got a new web type of – and actually what do you call it? – an app that we have just launched. And you may all have been a part of that, as a matter of fact, for students to self-diagnose and to get some self-help in that sense. We're partnering with additional departments on campus as it relates to outreach to our students. We're looking at new things that we can do as far as maybe increasing the number of interns that we have within that area, looking at other options of increasing the number of staff and psychologists that we have in that area. Right now we have psychologists who are actually on a nine-month contract. We're looking at maybe issues of maybe taking them to ten months in order to provide some additional time for our students. But there are definitely a number of things that we are looking at in order to address that area. One of the major challenges, though, that we have (that you will find), probably we can throw a lot of additional bodies at this. It's hard to find additional folks to serve in those roles, especially within

communities like ours, and even if you do a national search. And so we're not sure that even if we were to have as many positions as we can possibly have available that we could even fill those. So our main focus right now is to make sure that, and we've heard this from the students, to get that turnaround time for when a student needs help and can get in and can start some actual treatment, to get that down so that there's not a wait list. So that's one of our major priorities that we have at this point.

Senator Smith: Okay.

Senator Breland: My question was kind of about where do you all get input from students. So, we talk a lot about where the students are failing and things of that nature, but where is the input that you all get from how can faculty… Like, the perceptions of the people that are affected, their actual input and what's actually going on with them in their lives and that way you can have more insight and also if there is a role, and how high of the percentage of the role, would be for faculty reasonings? Does that make sense?

Ms. Albrecht: Yeah, sure. So I can talk about recruitment and then I might hand it over to you. So, for recruitment we typically send a survey to all students that indicate that they aren't going to attend or that didn't attend the University. And so we'll look at those evaluations and if students indicate that they want more RSOs, or whatever their wants or their desires are, then we try and figure out as far as recruitment goes how we can either get them the information (because maybe they didn't get the information that we have these groups on campus) or where we have these services. So we try and evaluate all of that each year and then update any of our recruitment materials to make sure that they're informed about what we have on campus. For retention, do you want to talk a little bit about…

Senator Noel-Elkins: Sure, I can speak to a few of the things. Most of our programs have embedded in them program assessment. And so for the Preview Program, if you ever attended Preview you filled out an evaluation at the end, and we take that information and weave that into improving the program from year to year. We run a number of smaller mentorship programs: the MASAI program that some of you may be familiar with, the LSAMP (Louis Stokes Alliance for Minority Participation), and the STEM disciplines. A number of programs, and with the students in those programs we capitalize on those program assessments because typically what we're seeing is the students in those programs are highly successful and they are typically retained, so we want to take the information that they're giving us and then weave that back into the larger programming that we're doing. The other thing I would say is that the Academic Advising Council across campus just finished up a survey of all students on campus as to the quality of academic advising, so you should have received an email about that, and the academic advisors on campus look at that, give the information to the department chairs, school directors, and the deans, to improve academic advising on campus also. That's just a few of the things that we're doing.

Senator Kalter: Senator Breland, I think your question was also going to people who are more upper class who may get to a certain point and then not be able to stay or something like that. And I think – Senator Johnson can tell me whether I'm wrong – but I think the Dean of Students is also a really important place and the individual advisors who learn sort of what's going on, and often it's just faculty who are talking to the students and understanding sort of what is it that's going on in your life that's making it hard for you to stay or what have you. But I think your question is really important because you're kind of asking how do we get that information centralized and to the right place to start addressing patterns, right?

Senator Breland: Yeah, that and then also just kind of where is faculty to support those things? So you're right on the first part.

Senator Kalter: Other questions or comments about the report or presentation?

Senator Evans-Winters: I was just curious. Looking at page 6 and looking at the six-year graduation rates, how do you all disaggregate the data especially as it relates to black or African-American students and Hispanic students? For example, I noticed between 2007 cohort and 2012 cohort, that's a significant increase but then a significant decline in graduation within six years, and that looks like a real, true equity gap when you're looking at those numbers. That's a major dip. So how are you all accounting for that dip, which is very significant? And also considering it's over six years, when you start talking about income, mental health, and you're talking about availability of majors, well, some of those majors may not be there. Some of those supportive faculty may not be there, or of course isolation and exclusion and marginalization might cause some mental health issues. So how do you disaggregate all these variables?

Ms. Albrecht: We don't. Actually, we are working on improving our data analytics and getting better information for us to actually look at and to use as we are moving forward. Right now we're just starting sort of in pulling some of that data, but I think… Would you say that we've made some significant progress probably in trying to determine what students are needing and where we're… Yeah. So we're working on it, but I would say that a lot of this data is just hard numbers. What did they indicate on their admissions application? What's their race or ethnicity? And are they here or they not here? But we are doing a little bit more with EDA to try and get that data in a better place where we can use it more efficiently and more effectively.

Senator Breland: My last question. Are there people of color included in those conversations or the conversations that you two have? Do you all have people who look like and represent the people who it affects?

Ms. Albrecht: Meaning…

Senator Breland: So with these rates… You want me to elaborate on the question?

Ms. Albrecht: Sure, that'd be great.

Senator Breland: Okay. So we're particularly talking about people who are marginalized, people of color, right? And different, like you said, economic status and things of that nature. So when you two have these conversations, I think you referred to her as progress we made, I assume it's between you two. Do you all have people in those conversations who it would affect? So, do you have people of color in those conversations? Do you have black women in those conversations? Do you have people who are in the lower social economic status in those conversations?

Ms. Albrecht: Absolutely. I mean, when we get people around the table, it's not just the two of us, it would be representation from everywhere on campus to talk about what kinds of things should we put in place, what do students need. Yes, there is representation at the table for those conversations.

Senator Breland: Okay.

Senator Kalter: Other questions or comments? All right, I'll just make two… I wanted to follow up on something that Senator Smith said and just let him know that a couple weeks ago at the Board of Trustees meeting, the Campus Communication Committee has been wanting for a couple of years to have the Director of Student Counseling Services come to present issues about student mental health to the Board, and so thanks to Senator Mainieri we finally were able to schedule that. So we think about that as important enough for our Board of Trustees to be aware of this issue. And then I also just wanted to point out on Figure 5 that American Indian and Alaskan Native students, only 22 (in other words, 0%)… We've had this conversation before in this body, and I'll just sort of repeat what I've said in years past (maybe not every single year), but I would suggest to have some intentional efforts to increase that number to the national percentage, not to the Illinois percentage, because the history of Illinois is that it essentially ethnically cleansed its entire state. There are no

reservations. There are no tribes here. So trying to gauge that to what the Illinois percentage is will not bring a critical mass of American Indian/Alaskan Native students, and it's really important with that population for them to be able to find one another in order to create a sense of community. And thank you. You have been helping with that this past year and one of the things that you've sort of been doing I think is trying to rebuild back into our admissions systems the ability for people to identify by their tribal affiliation rather than just as American Indian or Alaskan Native because we often get names where it's clearly continental Indian, or people are confused about what that category is. So it's important for us to mark in our admissions, hey, this is about tribal people in North America, essentially, and elsewhere as well. All right, thank you so much, again, for this yearly report. We'll move on to very brief Chairperson's Remarks.

Chairperson's Remarks
Senator Kalter: Because we have a somewhat packed meeting, if there are no objections, I'm going to, once we get to this, go first to the two Information Items because we have guests here to talk about those, then back to the College of Applied Science and Technology bylaws (I don't know if we have a guest here or not, but getting those done), then to the other Action Items. So as long as there are no objections, that's how we'll proceed. I'm going to sort of mix it up like I do sometimes in the Executive Committee meeting to make sure we get to the most critical business first. Then also I just want to thank the Provost's office for the last two days of the open budget hearings. It is healthy for budget processes to be done in the daylight, and we're an institution that does that. ISU has a long and proud tradition of openness with respect to ours, so it's nice to be able to go to those and see everybody making their budget requests and telling everybody else what they did with their money last year and sometimes in past years. Any questions or comments from my Chairperson's Remarks? All right, seeing none, we'll go to Student Body President's remarks.

Student Body President's Remarks
Senator Rubio: Good evening, everyone. Just a couple announcements from me. Last week I joined some students down in Springfield where we met with different Representatives, Senators, and the Lieutenant Governor. We had well-rounded conversations about the importance of MAP grants, higher ed funding, and capital for our campus. We hope to see changes our state policymakers may implement for continued success on our campus and, as always, will advocate for our campus in any capacity or opportunity that presents itself.

Also last week, SGA held its annual Diversity Week featuring a number of programs and events showcasing our dedication to the values of diversity and inclusion. It was a wonderful, insightful week, and I look forward to the continued dedication to fostering events around these values. In an effort to make sure our students are feeling well and seeking help if needed, I'm happy to say that SGA will be starting a parking initiative for students using Student Counseling and/or Student Health Services. We've partnered with the Office of Parking and Transportation and have come up with a program where any student who parks at the Bone lot will receive a voucher for the duration of their counseling or doctor's appointment. We hope this will prevent any hesitation students have about making an appointment and allow them to feel comfortable driving to those spaces. And finally, SGA elections and ARH will take place next Monday, April 1st and close Wednesday, April 3rd at 4:00. Students can vote through myilstu. And like any election, it is a civic duty and right to vote, so I ask that you all encourage our student body to look into who is running to represent them and that they vote during those days. Thank you. I will yield for any questions.

Senator Kalter: Questions for Senator Rubio? All right, seeing none, we will move first to our Information Items, and we're going to start with the Council for Teacher Education Bylaws.

Information Items:
07.24.08.01 CTE Bylaws Current Copy 2008 (Rules Committee)
03.21.19.03 CTE Bylaws Mark Up (Rules Committee)
03.21.19.04 CTE Bylaws Clean (Rules Committee)

Senator Horst: Thank you, Senator Kalter. First off, I want to clarify what you're looking at. This is titled the "Bylaws of the Council for Teacher Education." Up to this point, this has existed as a separate document, and we also then had a Blue Book page that talked about the construction of this committee. That's led to some confusion, and they have separated and not gotten updated at the same time. So one thing that the Rules Committee is proposing is that this become the Blue Book entry for the Council for Teacher Education analogous to the Athletics Council bylaws, which are also in the Blue Book – the Blue Book being Appendix 2 of the Academic Senate bylaws.

The other thing I want to clarify is that due to the large amount of reshuffling, I apologize, but Word did not create a perfect inline representation of the changes. It just underlined everything, and I discovered that this afternoon. So I will be going through and highlighting what exactly is changing, but there has been a lot of reordering basically to make it look a little bit more like a Blue Book entry as opposed to a bylaws.

All right, so the first entry, Article I – Purpose, we clarified… There is some language at the beginning that's added. "The CTE," which is a very longstanding committee from the 60s, "is an established external committee of the Academic Senate that reports to the Academic Affairs Committee and the Provost." That language was added, and the word "reporting." Moving on, the next entry used to be Article II – Functions and Responsibilities, and again, to make it look like the Blue Book entries, we moved up the membership so hopefully the Senate Clerk and the Rules Committee chair can easily see who is on this large committee. All right. So there are 31 voting members and 34 total members, and that is increased by one. The faculty membership, previously there used to be 11 faculty that were appointed and one was recommended by the Dean of the College of Education, so that was 11 plus the 12th. We increased that to 12 and then the 13th appointed by the Dean of the College of Education. The reason is that we're doing away with the Senate liaison position. Craig Blum is not here, but he conferred with other people who held that position, the liaison from the Senate. This is a very busy committee that basically serves as a mini Academic Senate. I don't know how often they meet, but it's… Once a month?

Senator Kalter: They essentially meet every week, but the whole committee meets every other week and the subcommittees meet every other week, and I think if you have a fifth week in the month it's like, that's enough. We're not going to meet that day.

Senator Horst: So the liaison, we always would turn and look at the College of Ed faculty because it was more appropriate for them to serve on this and it's a great burden. We also conferred with Jim Pancrazio and his committee. So we decided to eliminate the Senate Liaison Committee, and if it's appropriate to liaison with the Council for Teacher Education, the committee chair can certainly invite them to the committee. But we felt that the burden of attending that many meetings and also being a faculty Senator was too great. So we're eliminating that position, and that's why we've increased the number of faculty to 12 plus the 13th member, who is recommended by the Dean of the College of Education and approved by the Provost.

Going on, we then included in that faculty count the Faculty Associate position, which is now a voting member, and that's how we got from 33 voting members to 34. And we also included these ex officio voting members that have been there before, but now we're including them in this faculty count. We're including the UCC faculty chair, who is an ex officio voting, and the Graduate Curriculum Committee faculty chair, who is also ex officio voting. Also, some language was added to clarify that if they cannot serve, it would be a faculty designee who would take that slot. Shall I stop for questions or go on?

Senator Kalter: We could if we want to stop and take questions for Articles I and II. Is that what you were thinking?

Senator Horst: Why don't I…

Senator Kalter: Or get to the end of Article II maybe?

Senator Horst: Yeah, I'll get through the end of Article II. All right, the next position is a brand new language under II. There was a desire from CTE to have people who serve as coordinators or directors of teacher education programs… There's a feeling that they have a certain specialty knowledge, and they desire to have those people be part of the body. However, it's tricky because sometimes they are faculty members but sometimes they are not. So what we ended up doing is creating a special position of the coordinator or director of teacher education programs voting, and you see the language describing this new position. It's rotating among three colleges. They're appointed by the Dean of the College of Education and approved by the Provost. Also, there was a desire to have people who would potentially represent programs that aren't being represented by faculty.

Going on, under the Student section, the first seven lines are new. There was discussion I believe in the Rules Committee about what if students stepped off. How would they fill those positions? So we added language to clarify how that would work. Also, the language was added – "Five teacher education student members…" – the language "who represent teacher education programs across campus" was added.

All right, moving on to the AP Voting Positions, these are essentially the same. The sentence, "There are nine ex officio voting members representing the University administration" was added. And also there is a potential that the designees, just like happens in this body, the designees might be serving to represent those deans as opposed to the actual deans. Also, the Provost might have a designee. So the word "designees" was added. And then the ex officio non-voting members language, that was in the previous 2008 bylaws, which is how far back these bylaws go without being revised. So it's been ten years.

Going on, under Officers, we have the CTE chairperson. And again, because of the shuffling around and reordering, all of this is underlined (it's not necessarily new), but we do have new language describing the CTE chairperson. "The CTE chairperson shall be appointed by the Provost from among the CTE membership in consultation with the college deans and confirmed by the CTE voting members." This was a process that the CTE approved and decided upon. They felt it was important that as opposed to the Academic Senate approving the chairperson, the body who works with that chairperson approve the chairperson. So that's new language there. B and C were added. That's just clarifying how they're elected.

Under 7, Attendance, this is language. This is, again, an external committee of the Senate. This language here is, I believe, coming from the Academic Senate bylaws. "Notification before a scheduled meeting shall constitute an excused absence. The CTE member shall contact the chair of the CTE in person, by telephone, or in writing." That's all new language. "CTE shall follow the bylaws of the Academic Senate with respect to absences and declaration of vacancies."

Okay, trying to get through Article II now: Eligibility for Membership. Again, a lot of this is underlined that should not be. Under Faculty, the phrase "non-tenure-track faculty shall be eligible for membership" was added, "and a Faculty Associate shall represent the University Lab Schools" just to clarify that they are faculty but not necessary tenure-track or non-tenure-track. And under Students, the word "teacher" was included before "education program." Finally, under Ex Officio after the word "Provost," the phrase "need not also be tenured faculty" was added. Throughout the document, a lot of CTEs have been inserted just to clarify we're not talking about, for instance, the Senate chairperson; we're talking about the CTE chairperson. So I'm just going to make a blanket statement that a lot of CTEs have been added. Okay? And under Students, "CTE members shall serve a one-year term," that phrase was added. Now I'll stop if we're going on to Article III.

Senator Kalter: All right, so let's take questions or comments on Articles I and II. Any questions or comments on those?

Senator DeGrauwe: I actually have a couple questions. So I'll start off by the process on which a student is chosen for this position. It says that it is a first-come, first-serve basis. And I was wondering the thought process on that because I feel like a first-come, first-serve basis isn't necessarily the best way that this can be done considering some classes have classes in the morning. So if you have a teacher say, "Hey, we have this open" and five people in that class want to apply, no one else has the opportunity. So I feel like having a first-come, first-serve basis removes the opportunity from other individuals that want to apply.

Senator Kalter: I wanted to say, Dean Borders, if you want to come to the table at any time, please feel free. If not, we can take in… If you don't want to respond to things that come up, we can just take it in and sort of have it be… This is the Information stage, so things can change between now and the Action stage. But if you do have responses or rationales that you want to articulate, please come to the table and feel free to do that.

Associate Dean Borders: Okay. I don't have a response to that right now, but I will move to the table.

Senator Kalter: All right, thank you. And Senator DeGrauwe, you had more?

Senator Horst: I'll just also say that many of the decisions the Rules Committee made, we deferred to CTE. That's the process that they wanted, so that's why I'll defer to them.

Senator DeGrauwe: Another question is, I'm sorry for my ignorance, but I'm looking at the ex officio voting member status. It says six college deans. Does the College of Business put out education, like educators? Because I was trying to figure out why the Mennonite College of Nursing was not represented.

Senator Kalter: Yes, they do. They have one Business Ed program.

Senator DeGrauwe: Awesome. That's amazing. Did not know that. And finally, is there a GPA requirement for students? I know a lot of the times if there is a committee, a student has to have a 2.0 or 2.5, and that's not listed. I'm not sure if there is a requirement for a student to be a part of this.

Associate Dean Borders: There is a GPA requirement to be a teacher ed student on campus. So, yes. It's 2.5?

Dr. Garrahy: For a teacher candidate, there is not a GPA requirement to be a CTE student.

Associate Dean Borders: Did you hear that?

Senator DeGrauwe: Yes. Thank you. That's all I have.

Senator Kalter: Other questions about Article I or II? Okay, Senator Horst, almost all of my questions are on these articles, so if you'll bear with me. The first thing that I just wanted to note is in the Student section. It says department chairs and directors rather than department chairs and school directors, so we probably ought to add the word "school" there. The first thing I wanted to ask about was the 12 of 16 and then the 13th faculty member. So we're flipping the Senate person to just another one that's elected, or appointed, in the normal way. In the current Blue Book it says that there are 5 members from the College of Ed rather than 4, and we have this kind of phrasing here in this A.1 that separates the 13th faculty member from the first 12. I would suggest that we just put it back at 5 College of Ed faculty because it seems like they need representation there anyway and the person recommended by the Dean of the College of Education is likely to be an Ed person, and especially because the Senate member has almost always, if not always, been a College of Ed person. And then just fold

those two into each other so that it's 13 of the 16 members will be appointed and then they will all be confirmed by the Caucus. That would be my suggestion there.

Senator Horst: So this is the way it's been in the Blue Book for a while and I was just… The CTE did not propose that change, but we did propose eliminating the liaison. So is there any comment regarding that suggestion? You're saying that instead of 4 College of Education spots it would be 5, and then we would change it to 13 and do away with this legacy idea of the 13th member being recommended by the Dean of the College of Education?

Senator Kalter: Yes, because there is still one at large member that rotates among the colleges, and so that would seem to take care of all of that. And in any case, the people coming up from the College of Education are essentially the same as somebody being recommended by the Dean of the College, I believe.

Associate Dean Borders: So, correct, Senator Horst, that the CTE has not discussed that change and so I would rather wait and bring that informational item back to CTE to discuss.

Senator Horst: Okay.

Senator Kalter: Ready for the next one?

Senator Horst: Wait. Just hold on a minute.

Senator Kalter: Oh, sorry.

Senator Horst: Okay.

Senator Kalter: Let's see. The next one, I just wanted to… And many of these may be the same where it may need to be for the next iteration of the bylaws.

Associate Dean Borders: Right. I think that that's a good way to put that. These bylaws have been with the Senate for a couple years now, and so we would kind of like to move these forward in the way that CTE has voted and approved and then to consider the changes that you're proposing for the next round of revisions.

Senator Kalter: For the next round, yes. Let's see. The second one that sort of may have to do actually with this round is I'm a little bit concerned with absolutely removing the Academic Senate as approving the chairperson since that's been happening for so many years and because of the importance of this position and the unusualness of it being usually a dean. I don't want to get rid of the idea that it would be also approved by the CTE, but I am kind of concerned to be writing the Senate out of that process.

Senator Horst: Yes. Well, that's the process that CTE came up with, and we thought it was parallel with what goes on in other external committees. For instance, the University Curriculum Committee, the Senate doesn't approve… Does the Senate approve any other chair?

Senator Kalter: Right. Yes, I thought that that might be the response. My concern is that, as you said, the CTE is a fairly unusual committee. It's very large. It meets all the time. It's sort of connected to the core of what made ISU, ISU – you know, its education mission – and so that's where my concern lies there. I don't know if you wanted to respond.

Senator Lucey: So I have a question and I'm not sure if it's related to what you're talking about. In terms of membership for CTE, what is the percentage of students who are actually teacher education majors within each program, and how does that relate to the membership of the council?

Senator Horst: Can somebody from CTE answer that?

Associate Dean Borders: I'm phoning a friend.

Dr. Garrahy: All of the students who sit on the Council for Teacher Education are teacher education candidates, and they represent various programs across the 28 initial-level teacher education programs representing 3,600 undergraduates.

Senator Lucey: Right. So my question is how many students are served by each of the programs on CTE, and how is that service represented by the membership of voting members on CTE? So, for example, how many students in the program are elementary education majors? How many students in the program are music education majors? How many students in the program are business education majors? And how is the faculty representation representative of that student enrollment?

Associate Dean Borders: At this point, the faculty membership is not in relationship to the percentage of students within a program. The representation ensures that there is representation across all of the colleges that do have teacher education programs. So it is not proportional at this point to student enrollment.

Senator Lucey: Okay. So is that a consideration we should have? That the representation of the CTE should be representative of the student enrollment in teacher education programs?

Senator Horst: I mean, I personally think that's a good idea. That could be something… Again, they have a bylaws committee and that sounds like a potential direction that they could go. It's a rather large committee.

Associate Dean Borders: It is a rather large committee, and again, that would be something that we would like to consider on a future iteration of a bylaw revision after this round.

Senator Lucey: Is there representation on the CTE for underrepresented students, I'm sorry, underrepresented teacher education students and their teacher education needs?

Associate Dean Borders: Not by the bylaws in terms of appointed positions or elected positions.

Senator Lucey: So, I think that would be a good discussion for the CTE to have as well.

Associate Dean Borders: Thank you.

Senator Kalter: And I have some that will piggyback on that but also go in a different direction. Since the CTE was first formed, Milner's school librarianship shifted to TCH. So two places where I think that the total membership could be scrutinized a little bit are the Milner representation and the College of Business representation if we want to increase faculty representation in other areas. Perhaps rather than having two people from Milner and two people from College of Business, given the numbers in both of those places, it might be better to bring that down to one and sort of reallocate those. (Another one for discussion rather than right now.) But along with that, one of the things that Senator Lucey is bringing up is that a kind of House of Representatives type of representation, but there's also some push-pull on that because there's something of a need for more Senate-style representation because not each and every one of the TE programs around the campus has a seat. So that, I think, should be pulled into that debate about whether it should be proportional

representation by the number of students or perhaps making it more something where every single program has a seat in some way. I have more comments about Article II, but does anybody else have anything like Senator Lucey just added or otherwise?

Provost Murphy: I have a question about the comment, too. I don't remember that. I'm sorry. I need a refresher on Provost confirmed it would need to be from outside CTE. I do remember having a conversation about the chair does not have to be the college dean, but I'm going to apologize. I don't remember having a conversation about whether or not the chair needed to come from the current membership of CTE.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, sorry. I don't have in front of me what comment you're looking at, but I remember the comment.

Provost Murphy: This is in the mark-up. It just says Provost confirmed it would need to be from outside CTE, and I just don't remember. I apologize.

Senator Kalter: That shouldn't be what it says.

Provost Murphy: Oh, that's good because I thought, I don't remember that.

Senator Kalter: What it should say is that the Provost… You and I had a one-on-one where I asked you, is there any reason why it would ever be outside of CTE? And you were like, I can't think of anything, and I said I can't think of anything. So why do we have it in the current bylaws that it could be from outside CTE and therefore strangely change the membership of the body? So that note should say Provost confirmed that it would probably never be from outside CTE, and so we've changed the bylaws in that way. Yeah, sorry.

Provost Murphy: Okay, thanks.

Senator Horst: And I'll just apologize. I'm still a novice at track changes no matter how hard I try. I probably tried to delete those comments, and they just continue to show up no matter what I do.

Provost Murphy: No worries. I just thought I had forgotten the conversation. So thank you very much.

Senator Kalter: Okay, so my last several comments are kind of in a lump of these things came up when Executive talked about it, and I just wanted to put these on the floor. One is, do all of the ex officio administrative… Do all of those need to be voting or could some of those be non-voting, particularly when you look at College of Ed has a number of administrators who also are voting? So that's one option of something that could be shifted. There was also a discussion about whether the committee members should continue to be appointed or whether they should be elected out of the interested pool of people who are involved in teacher education programs. Also, whether the chairperson of CTE should be elected or appointed. And then the final one had to do with the fact that we noticed that this year something strange happened, and it turned out a member of the UCC is also sitting as a member of the CTE, and in our bylaws that's not supposed to happen. We're not supposed to have people sitting on two different external committees. However, it was logical because, as we kind of confirmed at the CTE meeting a couple weeks ago, it's kind of helpful for somebody who's sitting on UCC to also be sitting on CTE and especially on their Curriculum Committee. So looking at those two places – the UCC rep and the GCC rep – whether those continue to be the best uses of those faculty seats or whether there's another way to configure those. And one of the things that they talked about throughout this entire process was that sometimes it's hard to get faculty to serve, but we also brought up that one of the things that needs to be kind of talked about on CTE is whether the time of the meetings is the best time since it occurs in one of the most highly subscribed times for classes. And so perhaps gradually figuring out a way to

put it later in the day or on a Monday, Wednesday, or Friday might be helpful. So those were mine for Article II. Does anybody else have any comments or questions about Article I or II?

Senator Horst: I just wanted to comment a little bit on that. We did discuss the appointment of the chair, and in our discussions we commented on this is a highly technical committee, and the work that they do ensures accreditation and really it has very serious consequences if it's not done correctly and we don't comply. So we felt that because of the accountability of the committee, it needed to be done most likely by a dean. And so we felt that there could potentially be a faculty member also that could do that, but we felt like it could not necessarily be elected; it had to be selected because of all of the highly technical work that the committee does. Whether or not the ex officio members become voting or non-voting, I would hope that that would be a discussion point for CTE itself, and then their committee can make a recommendation. But we stuck with the pattern that had been in the bylaws for the past ten-plus years.

Okay, Article III. Again, a lot of CTEs were added. Under Elections, the term "fall semester" was added, and "they shall be elected by their respective committees," that phrase was added. The Duties of the CTE Officers, some slight clauses or phrases were added. Provide leadership for the development and enforcement, the term "academic standards" was added, and "can provide education preparation" was added in number one. In number two, the verb "review" was added and "make and serve." But certainly it does not have as many changes as are reflected in the mark-up. I will do my best to work with Cera to get an accurate mark-up next time. Under Liaison, basically the verbs at the top of the three points were changed. In the Planning Development, description of… Am I in the wrong section? I skipped one. Sorry, I apologize.

Okay, let me try again. Article III: Officers. A lot of CTEs were added. Now I'm in Duties of CTE Officers. We have the chairperson. Item D was added: "Send letter specifying the members work with CTE at the request of the department, chairperson or director in December of each year." That was added. The word "academic" was added to that point. In number 2 and number 3, just the term "CTE" was added. Three B, at least four, the word "four" was added. I believe now there are five standing committees. There used to not be five standing committees. Am I correct about that?

Associate Dean Borders: I think there are five, yes.

Senator Horst: So a lot of times the word "five" was added. Chairpersons of Five Standing Committees, B, "report activities of their respective committee to the CTE on a regular basis." That point was added. And now we're to the Executive Committee. I'll go through what was added and then discuss an important point. Under Membership, again, the word "CTE" was added. The Director of the Cecilia J. Lauby Teaching Education Center was added. Could you clarify, was there a title change or something? Could you talk about the background of that?

Dr. Garrahy: It is the Director of the Cecilia J. Lauby Teacher Education Center.

Senator Horst: Okay, but was that… Between now and 2008, was the title of the center changed?

Dr. Garrahy: The name of the center has not changed, no.

Senator Horst: Okay. So that was added. The Executive Committee of CTE used to serve as an Appeals Board, and perhaps Debrorah, could you talk a little bit more about that function and why it's going away?

Dr. Garrahy: Well, the function is not going away. It's just not being maintained within the document of the bylaws per earlier conversations with then Senate chair Dan Holland and I believe General Counsel. The appeals process is not going away.

Senator Horst: Right, but I think the problem was that there was language regarding how the appeals should be handled, and then there were other locations where this language was being housed and they were not in sync. So there was a decision made to have one location for the procedures and due process of the Appeals Board, correct?

Dr. Garrahy: I cannot really speak to those conversations because I did not serve on the subcommittee that wrote these bylaws, but I can tell you that the Executive Committee of the CTE, when there is a student appeal, the first level of appeal goes to the Teacher Education Review Board, which is the Executive Board of the Council for Teacher Education. That is the first level of appeal.

Senator Horst: I believe what I just stated came in an email exchange with Wendy Smith.

Dr. Garrahy: I have not seen that, so I can't speak to that.

Senator Horst: Okay, sorry. All right. So I'm now going to…

Senator Kalter: If that's it for Article III, let's ask for questions. Do we have any questions or comments on Article III? I have just a couple. With regard to what we were just talking about with the TERB, what does it stand for?

Dr. Garrahy: Teacher Education Review Board.

Senator Kalter: Do we have explicitly in there how problems with the structure or the appeals process will be addressed if we remove it from the bylaws, and do we have it in there explicitly that it's the full CTE that has the power to adjust those processes? And I'm asking that sort of to protect students, to make sure that when and if we ever want to change that appeals process that the full CTE has to vote on that change. And since we're removing it from the bylaws we should make sure that it's written very clearly here that it is the full CTE that has that power. Do we have that in there somewhere?

Senator Horst: We have language – I can't find it right now but will get to it. We have language where it points to the College of Education website.

Dr. Garrahy: It's actually the Cecilia J. Lauby Teacher Education website, which represents all of the programs, and that full appeal process is outlined on the website.

Senator Kalter: So what I'm asking about is if we ever wanted to change the way that appeal works. So in the past we would've changed it by changing the bylaws. Now, it's not something that the Senate approves anymore. So do we have it in the bylaws that when the TERB process is changed, it has to be voted on by the full CTE? And if not, let's make sure that we have that somewhere in there. And then the only other thing that I had on Article III, one of these is, I think, a friendly amendment and one of them is more for a discussion. Under Membership 1, where it says that the five chairpersons of the standing committees serve on the Executive Committee, I would suggest as a friendly amendment that we make that "or their designees" because sometimes it's hard to serve as a chair of a whole committee and then also have to serve on an Executive Committee. And I think the point of that is to have each and every committee represented on the Executive Committee but to give the chairperson the power to designate another person on the committee to be that representative. Does that sound like a friendly amendment?

Associate Dean Borders: I think that sounds like a friendly amendment.

Senator Kalter: Terrific. What might not be a friendly amendment, so I think it's more for the longer-term conversation, is whether or not there should be a requirement that the Executive Committee of CTE be faculty majority. So if during the next bylaw debate you can sort of bring that up and ask about that, that would be great.

Associate Dean Borders: Okay.

Senator Horst: Moving on? Okay, now we're to Article IV, Functions and Responsibilities. Again, this was moved… Okay, I think I went through this already (sorry, because I went to the wrong page). Number one, the word "academic standards" was added, "can provide," and "education preparation." So just some clarifying words. 2, just the word "review" was inserted at the beginning, and "make and serve." So just some changes in the way it's stated with the verbs. Same thing for B, the Liaison and Advocacy. Under Functions and Responsibilities, "inform, inform, and develop" were the changes. So they just changed the way they said it. Planning and Development, C.1, Work with the Provost, and the Academic Senate was included and "un-specifying" was another word included. Under C.1, B, making the Provost and the University's academic planners aware of these anticipated changes, a word change that they inserted. And under C.1, E, the word "educator preparation" was included before programs. In D.1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, they changed the first verb. On 6, "Ensure the development of assessment plans related to the teacher education as mandated by the University, State," and then they inserted "and appropriate accrediting agencies." They also inserted the clause, "as well as analyzing and reporting the results to appropriate parties." And then E, the language "CTE reports to the Academic Affairs Committee," we clarified that that's an internal committee of the Academic Senate. So that clause was inserted.

Senator Kalter: Any comments or questions about Article IV?

Senator Evans-Winters: For the Functions and Responsibilities, and again, this might be redundant to what Senator Lucey has already pointed out. Keeping in mind some of the trends across the state and across the nation in teacher education in particular, 80% of the teaching force identify as white, and in Illinois alone we've seen a decrease of approximately 50% of African-American teachers in the classrooms and approximately 15% increase in Latino students, or Latino teachers. So I'm just curious when I look at that part especially, and I keep looking at other things like membership, we're kind of going on this good faith that students of color will be represented. And I know that someone over here mentioned already that we're seeing a decrease in faculty of color being tenured and promoted. So how are we accounting for diversity and inclusion equity in some of these teacher education policies and accreditation processes? It's almost kind of when I see it, it's just absent of any of that discussion.

Associate Dean Borders: That is not accounted for in our current membership discussion or what was proposed in these bylaws a few years ago, but we can take that forward as an Information Item as we look at amendments coming, future iterations of the bylaws.

Senator Kalter: Senator Lucey, did you want to say something also?

Senator Lucey: So I'd like to echo the sentiments just expressed. One of the challenges that we have in teacher education is a very small number of underrepresented students. And to me it seems hypocritical to have a public teaching education force that's largely white when we have an increasing number of students, or increasing percentage of students, who are students of color. And I think if Illinois State is going to be a leader in teacher education, we need to take responsibility to recruiting students of color and modeling that for our students.

Senator Kalter: All right, any other comments on Article IV?

Senator Horst: I would just like to clarify that in D.5, these are the words that we added: "Ensure students have the opportunity for due process in resolving problems related to teacher education. This is partially accomplished via the establishment of the Teacher Education Review Board and through providing a description of due process procedures via the COE webpage. Due process procedures will be reviewed by CTE" (that's what you wanted to say) "including student members during scheduled bylaw review or as changes are needed."

Senator Kalter: Yes, that's kind of what I'm concerned about because, first of all, it says "reviewed by" rather than "approved by" – "reviewed and approved by" – and I don't think that that language changed from the last bylaws, the current bylaws. So it's good that it's saying during scheduled bylaw review still, right? Because it sort of implies it may not still be part of the bylaws, but when we do the bylaws we also look at the TERB policy. But just to make sure that it's about approval also.

Senator Horst: Okay. Will be reviewed and approved. I believe we inserted the "via the COE webpage."

Senator Kalter: It's about 8:19, so let's go somewhat quickly through Article V because we do have guests for other things and still want to get to our Caucus.

Senator Horst: Yes. The organizational structure, I believe there's changes to the titles. Under the Curriculum Committee, and I'll just comment on the significant word changes now. And again, I apologize for not having an accurate mark-up. I'll send that forward next time. But under the Curriculum Committee, "All decisions are reported as information items to the CTE to determine if the CTE should consider them for a vote. If there is an objection by a member of the CTE, the item will be moved to a vote of the entire CTE." So that was inserted to sort of parallel our consent agenda format. The University Liaison and Faculty Interest Committee language is new. The University Teacher Education Assessment Committee language is new. The Vision Committee language is new. Certainly, I acknowledge your thoughtful comments and, particularly with the change to our Strategic Plan, it seems appropriate that one of these committees could incorporate that charge. Moving on to Article VI?

Senator Kalter: Let's do questions on Article V first. Do we have questions or comments on Article V? I have a couple of things to note for the record, and some of them can be taken care of, some of them maybe not. It might be helpful to add a line that says that when choosing or appointing the internal committees that people get to fill out preference forms. I think that you might already do that, but just to put it in the bylaws that that's how that process works – that the people can say I want to be on this committee or this committee or this committee. The other thing is, we noticed in Exec, and perhaps I should pitch this to Senator Nikolaou because he was the one who first identified it, that there seemed to be too few members of CTE to fill all of the subcommittee seats, and so it would first of all be helpful to very clearly clarify when somebody is or is not a CTE member because we sort of gleaned that there may be subcommittees where there are non-CTE members that are also on the CTE like the ones where the Lauby Center staff are serving on multiple committees. I was going to call you Senator Garrahy, but Director Garrahy, do you know why there seem to be not enough members for the number of committee seats that you have?

Dr. Garrahy: I can only tell you that this is my 12th year on the CTE, and the membership has always come from these antiquated bylaws from 2008, and it specifically says under UT the committee has to be at least, I think it's seven members. And that's the one committee where outside members do come from other teacher education programs because that is the committee that determines the key assessments that are used. So it actually does come from within the statement of the bylaws that a particular committee has to have a minimum of X amount of CTE members and then, for example, like the Vision Committee has two non-CTE members, and that is what is stated in writing.

Senator Kalter: So as much as we can clarify that and make sure that the counts are right and all of that, that would be good, I think, for this iteration. And then making sure that the student distribution across the committees is correct because you have way too many students on the committees for the number that are on the body. The only other thing that I noticed there was that the Faculty Interest Committee has now been removed… Its faculty interest function has been removed. I would suggest re-adding but re-working a phrase that was in there and saying something like that one of its charges is "working with faculty/staff in teacher education, department chairs and school directors and others as appropriate, to address issues concerning faculty workload, faculty evaluation, and professional stature of teacher education and its faculty." Now, that may be another one that's more of a long-term thing to discuss, but it seems odd to have a University Liaison and Faculty Interest Committee that does not do faculty interest work. So just sort of pointing that out. Any other comments?

Senator DeGrauwe: Article V starts off by saying that all members of CTE must be on at least one committee, so I'm going to assume that that applies to the students that are sitting on the CTE. So if a student is sitting on a committee, we can say the Student Interest Committee, if they're part of the CTE and they're sitting on the committee, does that count as one of the students that is represented on that committee? So are we losing a spot, a student voice, if the student from CTE is sitting on a different committee, or does that count as a member of CTE? Because these committees, a lot of them, just say a member of CTE… If a student from CTE is sitting there, does that replace the student that is also supposed to be on the committee?

Dr. Garrahy: The Student Interest Committee is the one committee that obviously has more students on it, but not all of the students have to be CTE members. But I will tell you that this year they are. I will tell you that one of the other issues for this committee is getting students who can serve. We don't have a problem with them serving for a semester, but usually there's a change in the second semester and finding a replacement.

Senator DeGrauwe: So I think using that Student Interest Committee was a bad example. So for the Vision Committee, there's four representatives from CTE. If one of those CTE representatives is one of the students that is on CTE, do the three students, one of whom must be a GA, does that go down to two students because we already have that student?

Dr. Garrahy: No. The Vision Committee is two undergraduate students and a graduate student. So there can be… There's representation from… But I will tell you we also have trouble getting graduate students from teacher education programs.

Senator DeGrauwe: Thank you.

Dr. Garrahy: Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Go ahead, Senator Horst, unless there are other questions on Article V.

Senator Horst: Moving on to Article VI, the quorum language came from the Academic Senate bylaws. Under Voting 1, with the exception of the chairpersons for the Education, that's just clarifying who's a voting member and who's not. The language under 3 is new, and those are the significant changes. Then under Article VII, we moved all of those changes from the head of the document to here.

Senator Kalter: Any questions on that article or the rest? All right, thank you very much. You can see why I rearranged the agenda. I knew that one was going to take a long time, and they have been waiting a long time because we were doing our bylaws last year and for other reasons. So, what we're going to do now is move to the Consensual Relations Policy because we also have Tony Walesby to help us with that one. That's also

Senator Horst, Rules Committee. By the way, thank you to Rules Committee for doing all that work on the CTE bylaws.

03.19.19.03 Policy 3.1.44 Consensual Relations In The Instructional Context And Outside Of The Instructional Context- Current Copy (Rules Committee)
03.19.19.02 Policy 3.3.12 B Consensual Relations In Instructional Settings- Current Copy (Rules Committee)
03.19.19.01 Amorous Relations policy-approved by Rules on 3.6.19 (Rules Committee)
Senator Horst: All right, now switching gears. The Consensual Relations Policy, there's two current policies that have the word consensual relations in them: 3.3.12B, Consensual Relations in an Instructional Setting, and 3.1.44, Consensual Relations in an Instructional Context and Outside of an Instructional Context. The Rules Committee from last year began the process of, I believe, reviewing 3.3.12B, and as we started reviewing it we started really noticing inconsistencies between these two policies, and we had many meetings about this process. We had about five meetings, and we decided to really radically change it and merge it into one policy. So the two former policies that you see in struck-out version are now being merged into one policy.

I just wanted to talk a little bit about the process. As I said, the Rules Committee of last year had about five meetings discussing these policies and what to do about them. During that process of discussing Consensual Relations, I decided to turn to my husband. Maybe you don't know this, but my husband is a former Academic Senate chair, and he was the chair during 2004 when both of these policies were passed. And I had a lot of discussions with him about some of the wording choices he made, and he threw up his hands. But I, in particular, was sort of shocked that 3.3.12B said the entire University community may expect that extra care be given to assure grading and evaluation is performed in a fair and partial manner or that the faculty member may elect to have the department chair review grading – these sort of objective "maybe" clauses. At the same time, the other policy, 3.1.44, demanded accountability, demanded reporting, and said if they didn't do it there would be sanctions. And my husband sort of discussed what happened way back when. There was a large discussion in the community. It first came from the administration, who actually wanted a zero tolerance policy, but the Senate had a lot of discussions and they decided to go for this positive reporting direction, acknowledging that there is a conflict of interest but coming up with a mechanism for what to do to partially mitigate the situation. Our committee had a lot of discussions, and we decided that's the direction we wanted to go, too. We did not feel that we wanted to go into a zero tolerance direction, so we're continuing the direction that was set out by the decisions made in 2004. However, as I noted, there's really different standards going on in these two policies and we thought there should be equal standard. So we came up with this concept of a Conflict Management Plan, that there would be a formal document drawn up. So that's a major change that we made is that we made the processes for the faculty and the AP and civil service equivalent.

Another thing we had a lot of discussion about is what is mentoring or supervising students. We thought it important to include language that was a little bit broader. Through my personal experience, I've seen faculty who were on committees where they wielded influence over a student, but they weren't necessarily formally grading them. And this faculty member in my school was actually having an affair with a student and at the same time negotiating to try to get her a scholarship. So we really thought it important to expand the notion of when there's a conflict of interest, not necessarily just formal grading activities.

We came up with a draft, and then the draft was reviewed. Tony Walesby was in on the discussions. It went through the Executive Committee, this year's Rules Committee, and before we get into the nitty-gritty I want to just thank last year's committee and this year's Rules Committee for really doing a lot of thinking and hard work. It also went through the Civil Service Council, the AP Council, the Chairs Council, Student Government Association, Larry Lyons, OEOA, the General Counsel Office, and also the Culture of Respect and Campus Leadership Team. So a lot of people have looked at this policy, but certainly every time somebody looks at the policy, there's new insight. So I'm glad that we finally got to this moment where we can put it in front of the Academic Senate.

I can now start going through the policy in detail? Okay. So this is, again, a merger of the two policies, so a lot of the language might be picked up from these older policies but then there's some new language. The first thing we wanted at the head of the policy, we wanted to put up front that this is distinct from the Family Relations Policy. This is the policy you would go to if your wife was reporting to you, or if your wife was your student. We decided to include a definition that didn't have all of the words amorous, consensual, sexual. We started getting in a word sort of problem, so we defined "an amorous relationship exists between two individuals mutually and consensually" and then used that term "amorous relationship" throughout. So amorous represents a mutual, consensual relationship that could be romantic and/or sexual in nature. So we have sort of a placeholder for all of that concept.

The next thing we wanted to do is define conflict of interest. We came up with four bullet points, and we added number four really as a response to what I talked about – the idea that you could exert an opportunity to exert influence on a student or a member of the community without necessarily being their direct instructor. In the next part, because of the advice of Legal, we talked about the idea of… And see, the Rules Committee does not talk about bylaws all the time. We talked about amorous relationships and we talked about the idea of the influence of past amorous relationship and if you had an ex as a student, the dynamics of that, and Legal also… Lisa Huson really suggested that we include the concept of a conflict of interest existing when you have a past amorous relationship person in your supervision. This gets also rid of the potential problems, you know, they're in your class and then not in your class. Or, you know, the borders, it can be very gray. What if you just break up and then take the class kind of thing. So we're now encompassing it to include past amorous relationships, and that's a major change. Any questions about that first part before I go into the instructional context?

Senator Pancrazio: Yes, I'd like to start. I'd like to commend the committee and all the work. This is obviously the type of policy that the more you unpack it, the more work it becomes. And it's certainly high time to make some very strong statements. Anyone who's had these types of situations in their departments will really breathe a little easier because it brings a level of drama to departments. It just gets in the way of our jobs. So first of all, in a very positive point, it's great that it's gotten this far. I did have a question about the phrasing of a policy, and this is in the fifth paragraph, and I forwarded my comments earlier. I don't know how other people see this, but in line six, five paragraphs down, five hard stops down, it says, "They have an ethical obligation to refrain from establishing and/or maintaining amorous relationships that constitute a conflict of interest," these relationships automatically constitute a conflict of interest, but it says it here in such a way that it's almost a cease and desist. If individuals are in these relationships, they should refrain from them, meaning… That's how I read this. Then later on it adds the possibility, three lines down, it said they can still have them, meaning that if they still have them, they're not being ethical. And then later on, two more lines down, "This policy directs employees on how to go about having these relationships." So the question I have is that, is that statement to say that the following statement – "They have an ethical obligation to refrain from establishing and/or maintaining amorous relationships that constitute…" (well, they all do constitute a conflict of interest) – is that a consistent statement throughout the rest? Because I read that as almost a very strong statement saying cease and desist.

Senator Horst: Yes, so first off we really wanted to make some strong statements and really be a little bit more assertive as opposed to the previous language – "they may expect extra care." But to address your question, the sentence that you read, the policy directs employees how to mitigate the conflict. So just to let me finish, we are not going in a direction that says that there is an ethical obligation to refrain and we say everybody must refrain. We're saying that we're going in the direction that there is a conflict of interest; what are you going to do about it? And so that's the decision we chose to go, to come up with a game plan for people to mitigate the conflict of interest that we see.

Senator Pancrazio: I agree entirely. I'm questioning "they have an ethical obligation." I think it would read better, and I would propose this as a friendly amendment, that "they have an ethical obligation to avoid the problems of conflict of interest" I think would be a more consistent statement. I think it's very strong throughout that these are terrible ideas to one, get into a relationship that has a high potential for abuse, that could be career-ending and interruptive of what we're supposed to be doing (education). Entirely in favor of that and that we should avoid those problems of conflict of interest. But it says "refrain from establishing or maintaining" but then later on, "if you have one." I mean, it's almost stating that if you're in one, here's a way to deal with it (which I agree with), but if you're in one, we're saying get out of it. Am I the only one reasoning it like that?

Senator Horst: Well I would contend that if you're having a relationship with a student as a professor, yes, I would say get out of it.

Senator Pancrazio: I agree with you. But if that's the case, then why would we have a whole series of steps saying, okay, now if you weren't ethical to begin with, now here's how you make it ethical?

Senator Horst: Because, as Sam Catanzaro points out, people fall in love and there can be situations where you need to mitigate the conflict.

Senator Pancrazio: I agree. Well, my suggestion would be to, rather than give a cease and desist order, say let's be ethical from the beginning.

Senator Horst: What we were trying to do there, and thank you for the comment, we were trying to link it to the Code of Ethics which also links to the Amorous Relationship Policy at the same time. So we were trying to describe the conflict of interest that is arising from the amorous relationship. So they have an ethical obligation to refrain. It's the refrain and/or establishing or maintaining, that's the clause that you don't…

Senator Pancrazio: Yeah, I read that as kind of like "you ought to break up," and if as a senior faculty member somebody comes up and says, hey, I'm thinking about… Stop! Do not do this. Okay? Save yourself. Save everybody else. You know, you do not want your personal life involved in interfering with education and with your students and with your faculty. You don't want your colleagues to have to deal with this. At the same time, if that's the case and if we want to go and say cease and desist, we don't need the rest of the policy saying well, here's how you legitimize it. So I'm saying it might make more sense, a better policy, to say we should avoid the problems of conflict of interest and manage them appropriately. And the advisory statements, I think, are outstanding. Essentially, when I read these advisory statements, it says, "Guess what? You're going to regret it." And I thought those were… And bringing in the power differential as part of this was outstanding, and to be honest with you, I think those advisory statements say quite a lot. I do have some difficulties with telling people do not maintain or establish, but if you do, here's how you go about it. I think we'd be better to state the problem and then say this is what you have to do, and leave those strong advisory statements saying you're probably going to regret it.

Senator Smith: So this was just something that might clear it up just a little bit because I was on the committee that reviewed this and I kind of had the same thought, that it seems odd to say don't do it, but if you do it, here's how. So the justification behind that, I think, is that this is a way to protect students. At a certain point, we had to be realistic and acknowledge that these relationships are going to happen. So it's better that we have a plan in there for when they do happen that would keep professors from hiding those relationships. So it's sort of like a way to… The policy says don't have these relationships but it also says if you're in one, report it so it won't go unnoticed and that we can try to protect the student each step along the way. If that makes sense.

Senator Pancrazio: I get your point.

Senator Ferrence: So my thoughts on this, and I've done a lot with ethics within our chemical society. We do ethics training even with our students in freshman chem, and one of the issues that comes up… And I appreciate what's in the document and I think it's generally well done and it's impossible to sort of foresee every type of scenario. What I worry about when you start talking about the idea of the kind of ageist impression that you have presumably an older faculty… The only way you would have somebody in an instructional capacity is if they were old, and the only way you would have somebody in a student capacity is if they were young, and if old and young become amorous, that's somehow ethically wrong – there's plenty of people who would disagree with that. But the other factor is that it's pretty routine, at least in my discipline, that you may have a senior undergraduate, or even a junior undergraduate, say, chemistry major, who is in an instructional capacity as a teaching assistant in a laboratory who is instructing a senior, somebody who is above them in class, and they may have in fact been dating before the class was enrolled or things. And to say that a student… You know, to just say don't do it is to say, okay, no two individuals who are present at ISU should ever engage in an amorous situation. There are all kinds of situations. They could be the same age; they could be different. And so I think it is important to leave the escape language because we might not foresee the idea. And I've certainly seen in our discipline the case studies we present the students are… For example, what isn't covered here is the idea of what about the person in the instructional capacity who the student that they have power over has not in any way been amorous with them but perhaps they were their current amorous relationship's ex. Well, now there's no amorous relationship present, but there's certainly a conflict of interest and the potential for retaliation. So it gets messy in a hurry, and part of my point is you can't foresee everything. And I think some of the language is, well, if it's there, at least try and disclose first is really important because once you disclose, people can advise you on whether you should worry about it or not. But we do need to be careful about just saying we don't support any kind of relationships, period, because maybe there's two individuals at ISU that do engage in relationships.

Senator Kalter: So I just want to call everybody's attention to the fact that it's quarter to nine. So we may have to continue this conversation, but do we have any comments that people want to put out on the floor right now?

Senator DeGrauwe: I have comments that are continued on into the article. Is that okay?

Senator Kalter: Yes because I think we shouldn't go step by step through the article from Senator Horst, but if you have comments from later in the policy that's fine.

Senator DeGrauwe: I have a question on what you mean by "in an instructional setting." Does that mean a teacher-student? Because it goes in to say even coaching. It is instructional, but at the same time it's not providing services or supervision of job duties. If you're my boss, that's not an instructional setting. So I'm confused on that term because that's how it's broken up in this document.

Senator Horst: I'm interpreting that "supervision of job duties" right there as, like they said, internship or student teaching or something where you're a supervisor. Like I supervise grad students. They're technically an employee, but there is an instructional component.

Senator DeGrauwe: Okay. So I also have a question on I believe in that same area. We have something regarding coaching and then we have providing services, which is a very broad topic, and when I think about something that is always missed when it's talking about consent and amorous relationships, I think about athletic trainers. I feel like that's never brought up, and I believe that is something that is missed often. Or people in the athletic community as a whole. We always talk about the coaches, but do we talk about the other positions that are on the teams? And I think that's something that we should look into and that we should maybe go more into depth in than "providing services."

Senator Horst: So just regarding that, we thought that coaching actually encompassed, and this is not an all-inclusive list, so it could be what you said. But coaching, I believe athletic trainers are sort of coaches. I believe we discussed that in our committee. And the providing services, the concept for that was like a professional counseling service.

Senator Torry: I think one of the main things to keep in mind is the power differential. Athletic trainer reports to somebody, so who's the relationship with? Another student? Then there's a power differential between maybe the athletics trainer and the student athlete. So the term "power differential" here is the key. It's not about age, as was spoken before. So whatever the relationship is – athletic trainer, coach, instructional capacity – it's whether the power differential means there's a conflict of interest. That's really what this document stipulates. The choice was do you say you shouldn't do this and draw a line, and we agreed that you cannot do that because, as we agreed, love finds a way. So you say you must disclose to try to mitigate the conflict of interest. Trying to figure out all the ways to do that and all the given possibilities left us with a very vague document, which is what we're sort of going around here a little bit. So we took the stance of you cannot stop it so you better have ways to mitigate, or at least disclose, because you'd rather have it out in the open because it's going to happen rather than be a secret. And when it's a secret, everybody's going to lose. So these methods were to disclose and allow an avenue for disclosure. If they choose not to disclose, then there can be some severe penalties with career. And that's really the intent of this document. It's very hard to write a document that covers all positions across the University. You have positions that are established; you have positions that are promoted. People could be dating and be equal peers and one promoted to a chair, dating a faculty member. That now becomes a power differential that has to be disclosed. So there are so many ways that things can become a conflict of interest besides the professor/younger student, which we all think about. We don't like that concept, but really the problems are more severe like a graduate student being hired as faculty dating a current faculty member when they were dating before, and it becomes a problem. Those are really the more common problems that occur in power differentials.

Senator Martinez: One of the concerns that I would look at is the indirect influence possibilities. Like you could have maybe a minimal power differential, but let's say that you have a faculty and a student who really aren't faculty/student (they're dating), but the faculty knows the other faculty that the student is learning from, and he or she can influence those faculty members indirectly. So that's kind of like an indirect…

Senator Horst: And that's the number four in the conflict of interest, "has the opportunity to exert influence on." So for instance, there's composition students right now that are in my studio but that are not directly in my class. But I can certainly exert influence on them because I work closely with the faculty in that area. So that's why we wanted to broaden the definition of when there was a conflict of interest between, in particular, instructors and students.

Senator Martinez: I think it would've been clearer if you would have said "influence the outcomes."

Senator Horst: Has the opportunity to exert influence on another individual…

Senator Torry: Outcomes.

Senator Horst: With whom they first… Okay, outcome.

Senator Kalter: It seems to me that it should be both because it could also be the exerting influence directly on the individual but also what Senator Martinez just brought up.

Senator Horst: And just to clarify, the outcome… Could you clarify what kind of outcomes?

Senator Martinez: They could be positive or negative.

Senator Horst: Exert influence on outcomes?

Senator Martinez: Sure, like grades.

Senator Horst: Instructional outcomes?

Senator Martinez: Whatever, yeah.

Senator Kalter: Be careful about where you put that since this is for the whole policy. So that section in the beginning also defines the non-instructional settings as well.

Senator DeGrauwe: I'm looking at the Sexual Harassment portion. It's at the very end of this. And I'm just thinking about is it appropriate to have this whole Sexual Harassment at the end of where we're talking about a consensual relationship? This is a quote-unquote "it should be a healthy relationship," and now that we're just throwing in, oh, here's sexual harassment, I feel like that puts a bad taste in my mouth at the very end of this article, or this policy. So I'm not sure if that… In my opinion, I don't think this would be the best place to have that because I'm sure we have this Sexual Harassment Policy somewhere else as its own policy. That's just my thought on it is the fact that right now we're talking about how to have the steps to take to make sure that this is healthy, that this is doing everything in the correct way, and at the end we're like, oh, so now if you believe that you were sexually assaulted, here's the steps that we're going to take and here's what we can and cannot do.

Senator Horst: Could we invite Tony Walesby to address that question?

Senator Kalter: The Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access is going to address that one.

Mr. Walesby: I think it's important to include because the premise of these is, right, so there's a power differential, but we're able to take steps to remove the conflict of interest. But let's say that the person felt coerced, they felt that they really didn't have an opportunity to not be in the relationship. Ultimately, that's what sexual harassment looks like. So at least in my mind is to remind the reader and those who are involved in these relationships, okay, as you enter into these, if you choose to, we want to make sure that no person is feeling coerced. But ultimately this could end, and it could end in a way which results in a sexual harassment complaint. It doesn't mean that it would be proven, and it doesn't mean that it wouldn't be proven, but it's reminding the reader and those who participate of the possibility of that. I've had these cases over the years where it starts out consensual, things are ending, then it starts to turn into a stalking situation. And so we're like, okay, we had a consensual relationship, it ended, but now another policy is kicking into place. And so at least in my mind, when I've seen these (and I wrote the one at University of Michigan before they rescinded it last year and decided not to allow these relationships), it's a nice reminder that this is the possibility. I think to one of the earlier statements, sometimes when we think about our careers and things that we're engaging in, to be fully informed of, okay, this seems like a good idea right now and I'm managing the conflict, I'm doing everything the University expects of me, but also know that there could be consequences for this relationship as it's ending, or during it even. Right? So I could be in a relationship and all of a sudden I'm expecting things that the person doesn't want to do or doesn't consent to. By the way, the Sexual Harassment Policy is still very much applicable in any of these relationships, including these types of relationships.

Senator Pancrazio: Tony, I have a question. How much of this section of Sexual Harassment is verbatim from another policy?

Mr. Walesby: The main Sexual Harassment Policy is 1.2, and so that's a fairly lengthy policy itself.

Senator Pancrazio: The only comment I have is that in policy review, if you have two segments of the same policy, it does complicate it sometimes. It's best to just cite that and direct a person to that so that you don't have two versions of the same policy that get out of sync.

Mr. Walesby: That sounds great. I agree. So if you think of the non-discrimination statement, we have a paragraph and then if you go to 1.2 you have definitions of sexual harassment. Here's what stalking is, all those kind of things that really kind of let the person see, okay, I see what this is. Of course the main part of sexual harassment where it differs from these is that it's non-consensual, right? So a consensual relationship is as it sounds like. Now, there are discussions oftentimes with a power dynamic and what exactly that means, to the earlier point. Well, the student who I'm dating is not in my class but happens to be in my best friend's class who is teaching this course, and what does that mean? So there's a lot of things that go with this. Often, as others have said, we'll assume that they're adults who are involved in these situations (otherwise we have other issues, right)? Folks are making decisions, but we want to make sure these are informed decisions as possible. That's why when we talk about these, when folks sign off and we have these agreements and these management plans, it's really to take both persons aside and say, okay, is this something that you want? These are the parameters around it. We're trying to make sure that we're protecting both parties and then things go forward. Like I say with many relationships, hopefully things are okay. When they end, they usually end badly. We'd like them not to end badly and end up in some type of legal issue which we also have to address, but we will if we have to, if that's what it comes to.

Senator Kalter: Further comments?

Senator DeGrauwe: On the last page, page 5, it talks about "Employees and students who believe that they have a basis for a complaint or grievance resulting from a violation of this policy should contact HR." Is that talking about the 1.1, Equal Opportunity, or is that talking about this policy as a whole? I think the word saying "this policy," because that's under the section of Sexual Harassment where it starts going to 1.1 and talking about what the University can't do, to me that's confusing.

Senator Horst: So you would suggest it would say this Amorous Relations Policy?

Senator DeGrauwe: I'm not sure what policy it's talking about right now, so I think it should be brought into the table.

Senator Horst: This Amorous Relationship Policy.

Mr. Walesby: My only point with that, I don't think it's a bad idea, at least in my mind this is written in a way that provides an avenue for folks as they think about ways that they might want to go to get some help. So if I go to the Provost's office, if I go to the Dean's office, I go to Human Resources, I go to OEOA, I go wherever and ultimately it gets to the proper folks. At least, as I was looking at this, I would imagine a staff member might think, oh, I'm to go to HR or there's some issue that's going on, but maybe not. But at least that's what I was thinking of when I read that.

Senator Kalter: I'm going to try to wrap this up. Does anybody have anything that they need to put on the floor right now?

Senator Smith: So, this is kind of a friendly amendment. I would appreciate help with some wording here. So on page 5, number 5, under Advisory Comments, it gives a definition of informed consent and it says, "Per Illinois State University Policy, informed consent cannot be obtained through physical force, compelling threats, intimidating behavior, or coercion." I would amend that we add "persuasion" to that, and what I'm

trying to get at here is the fact that ten nos and a yes does not equal a yes. So perhaps persuasion isn't the right word there, which is why I would love input from the body as a whole.

Senator Kalter: It looks to me, from the reaction of some of the body, like that would not be a friendly amendment; it would have to be debated.

Senator Smith: That's fine.

Senator Kalter: When it gets to that point.

Senator Horst: Since Tony Walesby is there, we did discuss the scenario that Senator Pancrazio brought up that what if the parties involved do not come to an agreement and cannot sign a Conflict Management Plan, and the proposal I sent via email was that it would then be sent to your office. Do you agree with that? Thank you.

Senator Kalter: By the way, I see Senator Lucey is about to speak, but I just wanted to say I think that we're going to have to have another Information Item on this one anyway. So if you haven't said what you need to say, you can wait until two weeks.

Senator Lucey: This is just a minor editing item but a substantial observation. So, on Advisory Comment number four where we talk about in the event of a charge of sexual harassment, the University will etc., etc., we list professional faculty/student, staff/student, supervisory/employee power differential, I think we also need to be cognizant of SFSC or DFSC relationships and tenure-track or Associate Professors and relationships with Assistant Professors, and I'm not sure how that would fit into that list.

Senator Horst: Yes, we thought about that on Exec, and I researched what it said in the ASPT document about being on an SFSC or DFSC and evaluating an amorous relationship, and there is nothing. But that kind of evaluation process is governed by the ASPT document, so we sent that question to the URC. And then regarding faculty/faculty, we did not address anything unless there was a supervisory relationship.

Senator Kalter: All right, we're going to wrap this up. You might notice that this went out in a mass email to the entire campus because of some feedback that we got from the Culture of Respect Committee about the fact that the existing policies are not very well known. So please make sure to have very intentional conversations with your constituents in your departments or divisions about it, if you are representing a division rather than just a department. For example, in the College of Applied Science and Technology, if there are some departments there that are not represented, please make sure to reach out to those departments to gather feedback and bring it back and we'll have another Information Item on this one. I want to make sure that we get to the CAST bylaws to move to approve those. Can I take it from Faculty Affairs Committee and also from Administrative Affairs and Budget that it's okay to defer those to next time as Action Items? Is that good? Does that work?

01.24.19.07 CAST Bylaws Dec 2015 (Rules Committee)
03.21.19.05 CAST Bylaw Proposed Changes Summary 3.7.2019 (Rules Committee)
03.21.19.06 CAST BYLAWS MARK UP (Rules Committee)
03.21.19.07 CAST Bylaws 3-7-19 - Proposed Changes- Clean Copy (Rules Committee)
Senator Kalter: Okay, so let's do CAST bylaws. I'm going to steal Senator Horst's thunder and say you may remember that these went out for a vote to the entire College of Applied Science and Technology, so there's no room for any more changes for this iteration. So we're either voting the changes in or out, and if you have anything that you see, that would have to go back to the College Council for further consideration.

Senator Horst: I just want to clarify that there are some wording changes that were made since the Information Item. On page 14 under the CAST Election Committee, there's now the insertion of the clause "three or more

council members, a majority of which must be faculty or staff" and also "the membership of the CAST Elections Committee is obtained on a volunteer basis." And the other change that was made was that on page 21, the Search Committee, the language that at least one NTT faculty member would be part of that committee was added.

Motion by Senator Horst, on behalf of Rules Committee, to approve the CAST bylaws. The motion was unanimously approved.

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

Senator Kalter: Excellent. All right, we're going to move to… We're not going to do exact administrator remarks. We're going to ask if anybody has any questions for the administrators or if the administrators have any comments for us as a group. Let's start with the questions. Anybody have any questions? All right, and administrators, do you have anything that you'd like to put on the floor? It's been a long night.

Senator Dietz: I have no report.

Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Pancrazio
Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Senator Marx
Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Crowley
Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Mainieri
Rules Committee: Senator Horst

Senator Kalter: All right. Thank you very much. We're going to skip committee reports and do those, two of those, in two weeks. And communications, do we have any communications for the Senate?

Communications
Senator Solebo: Hi, everyone. I just wanted to remind everybody that there is a week called Success Week and that's where faculty is not supposed to give out assignments worth more than 10%, and I don't think that's been enforced in the past and I just wanted to remind you all. So if you could pass this along to the professors and teachers within your colleges and what not because that's been a concern that's been raised to me by many students and I just wanted to make awareness to this issue. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. Any further communications for the Senate?

Senator Beer: I'll be very quick. Just a reminder that the last day of early voting for the municipal election is tomorrow at the Bone or then on April 2nd if you haven't done that already. It's very important.

Senator Kalter: Great, thank you. Any other communications?

Senator Breland: Okay, so just kind of like, you know, we talk a lot about diversity and all this kind of stuff, so I felt like this would be a great space to do so. So on Tuesday April 2nd, I will be teaming up with the Black Student Union and having a Black Lives Matter vigil. So I would love to see you all's faces and to come in to solidarity with the violence that has taken place against black and brown bodies here in America, specifically due to injustices within the Police Department and the violence within those areas. So it will be April 2nd from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. in Felmley 133.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. Further communications? All right, seeing none.

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