

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

4-10-2019

Senate Meeting, April 10, 2019

Academics Senate
Illinois State University

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

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academics, "Senate Meeting, April 10, 2019" (2019). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 1253.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/1253>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISUReD@ilstu.edu.

Academic Senate Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, April 10, 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: I'm going to start by tuning the floor over to our Provost, Jan Murphy, to introduce our distinguished guest.

Introduction of Vladimir State University Rector Anzor Saralidze, Russia

Provost Murphy: So, it's my pleasure to introduce an honored guest this evening, Anzor Mikhailovich Saralidze, Rector of Vladimir State University. So, Rector Saralidze has led Vladimir State University since 2013. He joined the university in 2000 as an Assistant Vice Rector for General Affairs. From 2001 to 2012, he served as Vice Rector for several units at VSU with a formal education in economic sciences. He has held the academic title of Associate Professor in the Department of Management since 2010. Under his guidance, Vladimir State University has been named the flagship university of the Vladimir Region by the Ministry of Education and Science of Russia, one of only 33 such institutions in Russia. Rector Saralidze is the author of numerous publications focused on the housing and utility sector in his region. He has been extremely involved with social causes in the Vladimir region and has won numerous awards for his work in the field of higher education. He and his wife are spending several days visiting Illinois State University. Several members of the institution, like the President, have had the opportunity to visit Vladimir State University, and we have sent several cohorts of students over to Vladimir State. So, we have a wonderful student exchange with the institution. I am pleased that Vladimir was able to see the shared governance that we so highly value at this university. So, please join me in welcoming Rector Saralidze to the Academic Senate and to Illinois State University.

(Applause)

Senator Kalter: Wonderful. What a wonderful Sister Cities initiative we have as well. So, welcome, Rector Saralidze. Illinois State University operates, as the Provost mentioned, on a very open system of shared governance, in which faculty, students, and staff share a responsibility for the direction of our university, with the President and his administration and with the Board of Trustees. We hope that you'll find our meeting interesting, and if not, that you will feel free to daydream in Russian or in English or in any other language you may know.

Chairperson's Remarks

Susan Kalter: All right. And I have just a very short Chairperson's Remark. I just want to thank all of the committee chairs, committee secretaries, all of the members of the Senate, for their very hard work this year on the internal committees. Tonight was the last meeting of those committees as we begin to wrap up our year and head into a new year, starting with our final meeting in May. I am impressed, almost worn out, even, by the number of items that we tackled and the amount that we accomplished. So, pat yourselves and one another on the back and take a nice long breather until next August.

The only other thing that I wanted to say is that we will have a hard stop time tonight at 8:30 p.m., and we will go back to our usual order of business compared to last time. So, we will do our Action Items first, after Administrator Remarks, etc. So, with that, I will yield for any questions.

Having no questions, we'll go to Student Body President Remarks.

Student Body President Remarks

Senator Rubio: Welcome. It is an honor for you to be here with us. I hope you enjoy your time visiting the university, and hopefully the weather isn't too bad while you're here. Definitely. Thank you.

Just one quick announcement from me. Student Government did have their elections last week. A number of outstanding students were elected to the association, and a number will be returning. I would like to acknowledge some outstanding women who I've been lucky to serve with. Trustee Sarah Aguilar, who has done a phenomenal job being a student voice, will remain on the Board of Trustees for yet another year. And Ms. Samiat Solebo, currently Senator Solebo, made history as she joins Senator Woody and Senator Turner to be elected as the first all-female Student Government Association ticket. And Ms. Solebo will be the first African-American female Student Body President. So please join me in congratulating them.

(Applause)

So, it's definitely awesome to congratulate them all, and I am very excited for our new association to represent our student body, for you all to meet and work with them, and to see all the wonderful work they will accomplish. With that, I will yield for any questions.

Senator Kalter: Questions for Senator Rubio? I didn't want to steal Senator Rubio's thunder, but a very hearty congratulations. It really truly is making history. I'm excited that we will have our first African-American Student Body President, and as I said to you just a moment ago, it's been a really long time since there has been a female President of the Student Body. So, congratulations to you and to all of your team.

Provost Remarks

Senator Kalter: Senator Dietz is not here tonight. He is coming back from a trip, so we will start with Provost Murphy for Provost Remarks.

Provost Murphy: You bet. And before I make my remarks, I do want to also welcome Professors Dave Thomas and Karen Dennis, who are here with the Rector. Dave Thomas is a former Senator. So, we do have to recognize that there is life after Academic Senate service. And also, you know, Jenny, I don't know your last name; I'm so sorry. But Jenny, the interpreter, who is an ISU student in Exercise Science from Wheeling, Illinois. So, we also want to thank Jenny who has found that being an interpreter—three days later—it's a lot of work. For those of you that do that, you know that is a lot of work. Thank you all so much for being here.

Just a couple of things. Enrollment deposits for fall of 2019 are still lagging a bit. We're down 1.9% from one year ago at this time, which translates to about 45 students. So, admissions is busy, busy, busy doing what they do to recruit and make sure that we get all the enrollment deposits in that we need. Preview registrations are also down by about 10%. And, so, I know if Senator Noel-Elkins was here—I don't think she's here—she would tell you that there are a lot of things that we look at with Preview, and one of the things we know is that we probably have more students who are unable to attend Preview, so we're starting to look at alternative ways of offering a Preview-like experience for incoming students who simply can't come to Preview, can't take two days off, or certainly don't have parents that can do that. So, we continue to try to refine and do what we're doing better, serving more students.

We ran 46 successful searches for tenure-track faculty, so 46 new colleagues who will join us this coming fall. That's almost a 90% success rate, which is about as good as it gets. And anecdotally, I hear that we're getting more and more of our top picks as we interview candidates. So, thank you all, to those of you that serve on search committees and help to recruit new and outstanding faculty to the university.

Last week, there was a comment made that we are not retaining our underrepresented faculty, and that didn't sound right to me. So, we asked PRPA for some data on that. And, so, I would tell you that our retention of

new minority professors, looking at cohort data, has been 100% for five of the last seven years. The two years that it was not 100%: one year it was slightly below retention for all faculty, and one year it was slightly above. So, we continue to try to look to ways to diversify our faculty and staff. We continue to make that a priority, both recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty and staff. But I do think it's important that we look at the data, and I think those numbers tell us that when we think about retention of all faculty, it's important to have the data right.

The last thing I would tell you is just kudos to one of our own Senators: Senator Aduonum performed a solo version of her performance art production of *Walking with my Ancestors* at the Illinois Theater Association. She received the award for outstanding performance, outstanding use of music, outstanding original work, and she was the state champion. So, she will head to Kokomo, Indiana, in a couple days to represent the State of Illinois at the regionals. So, congratulations to Senator Aduonum.

(Applause)

Senator Aduonum: Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Do we have any questions for Provost Murphy? I just was wondering if you could repeat one part of that retention. Did you say that's retention from the first year to the second, from...

Provost Murphy: It's looking at cohorts of faculty, so looking at faculty as they progress. So, they gave me seven years of data, and of those seven years, five of those seven years we had 100% retention. One year we were slightly lower than the university total faculty retention, as we look at cohort; and one year we were slightly above.

Senator Kalter: Gotcha. Okay. Thank you so much.

Provost Murphy: You bet.

Senator Kalter: All right. And we'll go now, if there are no other questions, to Senator Johnson for Vice-President for Student Affairs remarks.

Vice-President for Student Affairs Remarks

Senator Johnson: All right. Good evening, everyone. I also want to send my congratulations to the newly elected slate of SGA officers coming in. Who runs the world?

Female voices: Girls.

Senator Johnson: That's right. Okay. So, congratulations to you all. That's been going through my head ever since the elections and so forth, as a matter of fact, to the point where folks in my office are getting tired of it. But I will continue to do it. All right?

I only have one set of announcements, and, really, it's to make you aware, again, of the cultural graduation ceremonies. I want to make sure people have that on their calendars. We will start with May 5th with Nuestrros Logros in the Bone Student Center here at 11:30 a.m. I believe that is a Sunday. May 7th at 8:00 p.m., MAPS, that's the Middle-Eastern, Asian, Pacific Islander, and Southeast Asian Students will be celebrating on that day, May 7th at 8:00 p.m. here in the Bone Student Center as well in Old Main, right in this very room. On May 8th at 6:00 p.m., the Lavender Graduation Ceremony, and that's celebrating our lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, gender-non-conforming, allies, ya, da, da, da, okay. But that celebration will take place, again, May 8th at 6:00 p.m. Then the last one will take place on May 9th at 7:00 p.m. Umoja will take place on that date, celebrating our African-American history and culture, then, at that place. And that will be in the Brown Ballroom. So, I hope you all can mark those on your calendar. There should be information posted at the

university website as well, or you can go into Diversity Advocacy as well. Okay. And at that point, I will lend the floor for any questions that you may have.

Senator Kalter: All right. Questions for Senator Johnson? We're going to have to have you send us the spelling for "a da, da, da," so that we can put it in the minutes.

Senator Johnson: There are so many, remember. There are so many identities, and we want to make sure we acknowledge them all. Okay.

Senator Kalter: Oh, excellent. Thank you very much. And Senator Stephens for Vice President for Finance and Planning remarks.

Vice President for Finance and Planning Remarks

Senator Stephens: Thank you, Senator Kalter. I only have one comment. This is really more of an announcement around some continuous improvement our division is trying to do from a fiscal-reporting perspective. Just within the last few weeks, our Budget Office, in working in concert with our Administrative Technologies team, released a new fiscal reporting tool, budget tool, called Budget Center. It has been a longstanding need on our campus to have more readily available fiscal information, either at the department level, the college level, and probably most importantly, at the grants level. And, so, for the past few years, a number of staff within Administrative Technologies and the Budget Office has been working on a fairly robust reporting tool that's based off of Cognos, and so I was fortunate enough to see the new application a few weeks ago, and it's a very exciting tool which should make a tremendous improvement, especially in the grants environment, gathering a lot of information, especially for PIs to be able to see all of the transactions that have hit their grants and be able to ensure we've got quality compliance reporting. So, I'm very proud of the teams and also proud of the departments across campus that helped with piloting the program and testing the program before its release. So, we're in the training phases now, and we really appreciate everybody's support in that. And we will be moving on to our other avenues of continuous improvement where we can. That's all my comments for the evening.

Senator Kalter: Excellent. Do we have any questions for Senator Stephens? I'm not sure, but I believe I saw the Budget Center a couple of days ago, and it is much easier to read than the Budget Wizard.

Senator Stephens: Yes, it is.

Senator Kalter: Much, much easier. So, our eyes thank you.

Senator Stephens: Yes, thank you.

Senator Kalter: All right. So, we're going to move to our action items. The first one is the one that we skipped last time. It is the Employment in Excess of Full-Time Appointment from the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Action Items:

02.20.19.06 Policy 3.2.11 Employment In Excess Of Full Time Appointment Current Copy (Faculty Affairs Committee)

03.12.19.01 Policy 3.2.11 Employment in Excess of Full Time Appointment revision MARKUP (Faculty Affairs Committee)

03.12.19.02 Policy 3.2.11 Employment in Excess of Full Time Appointment Clean Copy (Faculty Affairs Committee)

Senator Crowley: Well, I'm very happy to finally be able to move that we approve the revisions to policy 3.2.11 Employment in Excess of Full-Time Appointment, as indicated on the markup and the clean copy.

Motion from Senator Crowley, on behalf of Faculty Affairs Committee, to approve the revisions made to policy 3.2.11 Employment in Excess of Full-Time Appointment.

Senator Kalter: All right. So, putting the motion on the floor on behalf of the committee, it does not need a second. Do we have any debate about this motion? All right. I have a very tiny, friendly amendment. There is a need for a space after a comma in D, on the second page. And then the Senate Office will clean up a little bit of a formatting issue with D as well. It just needs to be pushed over. And when it goes on to the policy website where the policy is underlined, we'll probably just hyperlink that whole thing, including the policy number and also the name, just so that that's a complete hyperlink.

Senator Crowley: Sounds great.

Senator Kalter: So, it's very small changes. All right. It looks like we have no debate.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: Excellent. We move, now, again to Faculty Affairs Committee for what was called the Administrative Increment policy. I believe it's now being called the Acting and Interim Compensation Policy.

02.20.19.03 Policy 3.1.4 Administrative Increment- Current Copy (Faculty Affairs Committee)

03.22.19.01 Policy 3.1.4 revision proposal MARKUP (Faculty Affairs Committee)

03.22.19.02 Policy 3.1.4 revision proposal Clean copy (Faculty Affairs Committee)

Senator Crowley: Okay. Again, I'm very pleased to move that we approve all revisions as indicated in the markup and clean copies for policy 3.1.4.

Motion by Senator Crowley, on behalf of the Faculty Affairs Committee, to approve the revisions to policy 3.1.4 Administrative Increment.

Senator Kalter: All right. And putting that on the floor on behalf of the committee, it does not need a second. Do we have debate about that one? All right. And, again, I have just a tiny set of cleanups. We're going to de-bold the bolded stuff in there, just put that into normal. We're going to do the same thing with the hyperlinks. And then there is a "compensation" instead of "compensation" that we're going to change. It's just a little spelling error.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: Excellent. We got two policies down. We've got, now, the Administrator Selection and Search Policy coming out of Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee.

01.03.19.04 Policy 3.2.13 Administrator Selection and Search Policies CURRENT COPY (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)

03.20.19.01 Policy 3.2.13 Administrator Selection and Search Policies Mark Up (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)

03.20.19.02 Policy 3.2.13 Administrator Selection and Search Policy Clean Copy (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)

Senator Marx: All right. Thank you very much. The Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee brings the policy 3.2.13 with revisions for a vote.

Motion by Senator Marx, on behalf of the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee, to approve the revisions of policy 3.2.13 Administrator Selection and Search Policy.

Senator Kalter: All right. And placing that on the floor for debate, do we have any debate? All right. I do have a couple of, I think, minor substantives. On the second page, in I.E.3.b, where it says, “provide each of the persons or groups interviewing a candidate with the names of all the finalists for the position”—do you see that?—“the credentials of finalist candidates will be open to inspection by any of these persons,” and then it says, “other than those who are active candidates.” But at the final stage, the public stage, we don’t need to make that restriction in parentheses, because they are public. So, I would suggest striking that.

Senator Marx: That is true.

Senator Kalter: So that sounds like a friendly... Okay. The next one was, I believe, that in the Targeted Searches, F, that second sentence says, “However, there may be instances where the President has identified...” I believe that at the last meeting, where we discussed this, we were going to add, “or designee” partly because there are chair searches that are covered by this policy. Is that correct?

Senator Marx: No, I indicated that we wanted to make sure that if this were used that it was the President approving that. So, yes, it could be the President’s designee in that instance, but we want to make sure that the President is involved with declaring that targeted search.

Senator Kalter: Okay. So, I think it’s the wording of that that I got hung up on because it says that the President, him or herself, has identified an individual. But you’re saying it would be an unfriendly amendment to put “or designee” there.

Senator Marx: Again, I think we’d need to have some additional wording to explain the circumstances under which a designee could have a targeted search.

Senator Kalter: Okay. I can withdraw that one, unless somebody else wants to put it out on the floor for debate. It doesn’t seem maybe that big. The other one was under G.4, just a wording issue, I think, here, because I think this is relatively new language. It says, “Any person who has agreed to serve as a member of the search committee may not become a candidate for the searched position. In the event that the committee is dissolved and a new search for the same position occurs...” Right now, it says, “then this restriction does not apply.” But I think it might be unwise to make it that broad, and, instead, I would suggest that we say, “In the event that the committee is dissolved and a new search for the same position occurs, members of the previous search committee may then put their names forward as candidates.” The reason for that is that when you say this restriction does not apply, it would actually take out all of number 4, whereas we’re really just allowing the former search committee members to then go up. Does that make sense?

Senator Marx: It does. I kind of fail to see the difference. That negates 4 entirely? I’m not sure how that happens.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, because it’s such a general way of saying that. Right? As though, the next time that you form a search committee, you don’t have to follow that restriction.

Senator Marx: Oh. Now, I do understand.

Senator Kalter: See what I’m saying?

Senator Marx. Yeah. It specifically means members that were on the committee can then apply. You’re correct.

Senator Kalter: Right. So, you accept that as a friendly.

Senator Marx: We accept that friendly amendment.

Senator Kalter: Okay, terrific. And then, I believe there was only one more. And I'm not sure I have an absolute clean copy on this. Let me just make sure. So, in H.3, we have crossed out something that I think is not meant to be crossed out in total, but I'm not sure. "In all other searches covered by this policy, the President or the President's designee shall make the final selection and inform the search committee in executive session," but it doesn't really quite say what that means. I think that's what I was worried about was, inform them of what. Right?

Senator Marx: Oh. Of the final selection.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. Who the candidate was, or something like that. Right? So, I think it should probably read something like, "In all other searches covered by this policy, the President or the President's designee shall make the final selection and inform the search committee in executive session who the," you know, who that person has chosen. Again, I'm sorry I did not have this written out, but, "who that person has chosen." Right?

Senator Marx: Right.

Senator Kalter: Of the person that has been hired.

Provost Murphy: What does "executive session of a search committee" mean?

Senator Kalter: Good question.

Senator Marx: It's assumed that none of the public are there. When we go into executive session for the Senate, all guests are told to leave, and everything that is done is confidential.

Provost Murphy: That seems an odd phrase for a committee.

Senator Kalter: In other words, I think what your point there is, Provost Murphy, is that, already, search committees are not covered by the Open-Meetings Act. Right? They don't fall under it.

Provost Murphy: I just think it's odd to say that a committee would be meeting in executive session. It's just the committee is meeting.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. I have a feeling that given what was in the previous policy, that originally it said the person would inform the Academic Senate in executive session. But, of course, that doesn't make any sense because, as we discussed, by the time that happens, you've lost the candidate. Right? You should have been in negotiations in getting them here. You don't want to wait until the Academic Senate meets every two weeks to tell them first, and then try to hire the person. So, Senator Marx, can you think of good language there? Simply inform the search committee and just cross out executive session.

Senator Marx: That would be the easiest way to do it. "Inform the search committee of the selection."

Senator Kalter: Of the candidate chosen.

Senator Marx: "Of the candidate chosen," and leave it at that.

Senator Kalter: Okay. So, we'll have it read, "Make the final selection and inform the search committee of the candidate chosen." Okay. Terrific. Any other debate on that one? All right.

The motion was approved, with friendly amendments.

Senator Kalter: We move on to the CTE Bylaws and Rules Committee.

07.24.08.01 CTE Bylaws Current Copy 2008 (Rules Committee)

04.03.19.01 CTE Bylaws Mark Up (Rules Committee)

04.03.19.02 CTE Bylaws Clean (Rules Committee)

Senator Horst: Yes, thank you. I want to thank Cera for spending a lot of time making the new markup, which you have in front of you. As I stated before, it was very difficult to do that because of the reordering of the document. So, she spent a lot of time making a new markup.

Also, because of Senator Kalter's comment regarding the membership of the committees of CTE, Craig Blum and Stacey Jones-Bock, did a lot of work investigating exactly what kind of membership profile we have for each of those committees, and that has led to some wording changes, even to the markup that you have in front of you. To make it clear, I've made a document that shows those changes, and so I'm hoping that we can distribute that at this time.

Okay. And, so, the document that you have, basically, is going through and articulating with each committee, and I would be happy to have questions about this in an informal way before we make a motion to vote since we are doing some rather extensive word changes. But we are going through and notating on each internal committee of the CTE, exactly what the membership profile is, and so that is what this document does.

And as we made this document, we sent it forward to Senator Kalter, and in her infinite wisdom and editing skills, she did notice some slight issues with the content of the committee, so there is going to be one change to Article 5 Section B, as you receive these edits. Article 5 Section B, Student Interest Committee: the text of the first part of this committee section will now say that the Student Interest Committee shall consist of "eight CTE members," not "8 to 10." And then under D, "Three student CTE members will serve," not "3 to 5." There's a very limited number of CTE member students. And, so, we wanted to make that clear.

Again, as we were looking at the committee structure of the CTE, we noted that the CTE has an extensive amount of people participating in their committees that are actually not formally part of the CTE. So, we are also proposing that we would add item 6 under Article 2 Section A. And item 6 will basically describe these nonvoting committee participants, and then that led to some number changes. So, before I make a motion, are there any questions about the document that I just distributed?

Senator Kalter: I'd just like to clarify a couple of things. So, thank you for recognizing that we needed to reinsert the College of Business back into the Curriculum Committee description. What I was emailing you and Senator Blum about this afternoon, it sounds to me like what you're wanting to do is to have on the Vision Committee, in terms of student members, one CTE student and the other two could be non-CTE students. And then that would allow the Student Interest Committee to have all three of their students be CTE members, and then that would get us to the magic number, I believe, of 32 seats for 32 members. Is that correct?

Senator Blum: Yes, that's correct. So, there's, in terms of student membership, there's five students. One is on the Curriculum Committee, three would be on the Student Interest Committee, and one would be on the Vision Committee. But as noted, the kind of different thing about the committee structure in this particular council is that they bring in non-members in the committee process. So, the Vision Committee is a good example. So, they'll recruit students that aren't to be on that. And, so, I know that there're actually various examples that are not necessarily student related. So, for example, there's a committee that deals with assessment, and so there's a lot of various assessment stake holders for teacher education that come in and are non-voting members of that committee. So, there are a number of instances like that. One thing that I am noticing is that of the number of 32, that actually puts them one short when you're seating, based on their numbers now. But if you change the Student Interest Committee, they have a total of 5 faculty. So, if you change that to 4 faculty, so from the 4 to 3, that would actually make their committee numbers work.

Senator Horst: This is the language that has been approved by the committee, and this is the language that Stacey Jones-Bock's reviewed, and there is a practice that is going on with seating these committees, and we're trying to align it with that. And it continues to be difficult. But I'd like to go forward with this language.

Senator Kalter: So, are you agreeing or disagreeing that they are creating the Vision Committee having one CTE student member and two non-members and then that would allow there to be three CTE student members on the Student Interest Committee. Is that correct?

Senator Horst: That's right.

Senator Kalter: Okay. And then I believe the only other question I had about the Student Interest Committee was whether that at-large member had to be a CTE member. It's not specific in either one of the things. It says in your handout under Article 5.B.1.c, "one at-large faculty or staff member from CTE." So, that means they have to be a member? Is that correct?

Senator Horst: Yes.

Senator Kalter: Because I think that was maybe unclear in the previous draft.

Senator Horst: That's correct.

Senator Kalter: Okay. So, that is correct. Okay. All right. And that's what the committee voted on.

Senator Horst: Yes.

Senator Kalter: Their committee. Okay. So, I think that we should move forward then with that, and if for some reason after the meeting we find out that they have 33 members instead of 32, we'll deal with that in a different iteration. All right. Are there other things that you wanted to point out in the draft?

Senator Horst: No.

Senator Kalter: Okay.

Senator Horst: So, this document hasn't been edited in 12 years, and this is a complex committee, much like the Academic Senate itself. So, much like last year where we went through a similar process of editing our own bylaws, because they were so out of whack with the practice, we are now editing the CTE bylaws. I'd like to make a motion to approve these bylaws.

Motion by Senator Horst, on behalf of the Rules Committee, to approve the revision made to the CTE bylaws.

Senator Kalter: All right. Motion coming from a committee does not need a second. Do we have debate?

Senator Lucey: So, at our last meeting, the suggestion was made that we provide for diversity and representation for members of underrepresented groups on the CTE. Diversity is not mentioned in this document. Underrepresentation is not mentioned in this document. Minorities are not represented in this document. And I think it's a shame that we're having an election where we have a student body that is progressive in its representation but it's not mentioned in the Council for Teacher Education in this membership.

Senator Kalter: So, are you recording that as you're going to be a no vote, or would you like to make an amendment?

Senator Lucey: Well, I think we mentioned it at the last meeting that we need to have that addressed, and I'd like to know why it wasn't addressed in the revisions.

Senator Horst: Yes, we made several comments last session, and those comments were recorded by the Associate Dean of the College of Education, and there's a committee devoted to reviewing the bylaws. My understanding is that that committee is going to take that suggestion and the other suggestions made last time and consider them for the next revision.

Provost Murphy: What you're asking for, Senator, is that we use that as criteria for membership, so we use race or ethnicity or gender as a criteria for membership on this committee?

Senator Lucey: So, what I'm saying is that we need to have a council that's representative of the needs of all students who are being prepared to be teachers. It's very difficult to have a council that meets the needs of all students if you don't have proper representation.

Provost Murphy: So, I'm going to throw my question back to you, though. I think that's the question I'm asking. Is that what you're suggesting?

Senator Lucey: So, I'm saying that needs to be a consideration, yes.

Provost Murphy: Then I think the concern we have is I don't think it's legal to have that. Legally, you can't dictate membership in that way. So, then what I think, is that becomes part of their goals more than anything, which I think would be a separate document from this. I'm not sure how you'd address it in the bylaws.

Senator Lucey: It's something that could be considered in the review or the evaluation process.

Provost Murphy: I hear you. Gotcha.

Senator Kalter: All right. Do we have further debate?

Senator Horst: Just to elaborate, there could certainly be a focus in one of the committees on issues such as you mentioned.

Provost Murphy: That's a great point.

Senator Marx: Exactly. And I'd like to add to that, just say it's a matter of how you recruit the students that are going to participate. You recruit for the widest diversity, to get that representation.

Senator Kalter: Students and faculty and staff. Do we have further debate?

Senator Blum: I just want to make a more generic comment. These are issues that both the Vision Committee in their work and the Student Interest Committee actively engage in. So, I think that the Senate suggested last time to continue that... I mean, I hear Senator Lucey's concern, right, but I do think that the CTE is working on those very issues that you're talking about and finding ways. Also, there're a lot of ways—in the way that the CTE is structured, there're a lot of ways to bring in people, whether they're members through the faculty process, but also certainly students, and a lot of different—so, to bring in different kinds of voices from different groups.

Senator Kalter: All right. Further debate.

Senator Solebo: Yes. So, I have a question. So, how would you be able to add—because I think what Senator Lucey said is a fair point—how would you be able to add students of diverse backgrounds without putting it in

here in the language? Because if you need to represent all students, you need to make sure that's in here. I think it should be a consideration into putting this in here. I understand what you mean with the legal language and whatnot. But is there a different way that you can make sure that other students are represented?

Provost Murphy: I think I'll come back to what Senator Marx said, and I think we have to make sure that as we recruit students to serve on all committees, including CTE, where we recruit faculty or ask faculty to provide service, that we cast as wide a net as possible and that we try to make sure that we are asking or getting the information out so that we get a strong and good and diverse pool of individuals willing to serve on committees. All I'm saying is I don't think, and I maybe should look over to Mr. Walesby, who is the Director of OEOA, I don't think legally we can put in the bylaws under membership, I don't think we can actually put in there that language, that we are requiring certain kinds of members. I just don't think we can. But I think it becomes a part of how we recruit, how we make sure that this information, for example, that we're looking for student members of committees, that we do our due diligence, we meaning whoever is fielding these committees, to make sure that that information gets out to as broad and diverse a pool of students as possible so that those opportunities are made available to as many students as possible. And I think that's the way to get as diverse a pool of students as possible, or as diverse a faculty and staff as possible on these committees.

Senator Solebo: So, would you be able to add that into the bylaws? Something about recruiting students from all areas, because I don't think that that's in here, and I think that needs to be a consideration.

Senator Kalter: Actually, during the debate, I was intentionally going to ask Senator DeGrauwe about going back to his thing as well, because he had brought up in the original session the problem with first-come first-serve language in there, and that may be a place where we want to debate about this. I don't know, Senator DeGrauwe or Senator Solebo, if you have any specific language that you'd like to replace the first-come first-serve with.

Senator Horst: We did not have time to discuss that particular point with the College of Education, but I don't know the history behind the kinds of student recruiting or the kinds of student pools they've had. And I, frankly, do not know why they do it this way, but the College of Education had a lot of important accreditation visits during this last two weeks, so I was not able to have a conversation about that. I'm sorry I didn't follow up on that.

Senator Kalter: So, I understand that. I think that as a Senate, since they report to us, we do need to not always defer to that committee regarding their past practices. If we see something that is something that we can change that is not going to cause a major disruption, I think that we should feel free to debate that. So, I think that Senator DeGrauwe's point last time was very well taken, and Senator Solebo's point now is very well taken. Right? That first-come first-serve is actually going to mitigate against further diversity, I would imagine, and is just a bad idea anyway. And then if you would like to insert what I would—I think that we could find a friendly phrasing for what you're talking about. Right? To try to increase the pool, or what have you. So, if, maybe, we can have a little bit of, like a sentence or so that would help that section, it would improve their process.

Senator Breland: Yes. I have a question about the same thing that she's stating. So, I get the fact that you can't put it in there, like you can't say, "I want a woman to do this." I get that, how that would be problematic. But my question is more so, can you put like the actual word "diverse"? I think that makes it, just kind of playing politics with that, because it can mean so many different things that you're not specifically coming for a different group, and I think it's problematic to say, "Oh, well, we can just make sure that they do it." Because you can't make anyone do anything. So, if we sit around and wait for somebody else to do it, it won't get done. So, I would strongly advise to put the word "diverse" or put something out, like when you're trying to seek out different people, you can look at the different areas, like kind of play around with that language. That way, it's in policy that you can go and tap into different areas and not just a specific one person. Does that make sense?

Senator Kalter: Absolutely. And I would say that the dictionary definition of diverse means essentially from different walks of life.

Senator Breland: Right.

Senator Kalter: Right. It doesn't necessarily mean race. It doesn't necessary mean gender. It simply means that you're trying to get different types of students from one another or different types of faculty from one another. So, yeah, I think we could put something in that has the term diverse in it, and it doesn't mean race, even though a lot of people interpret it to mean that.

Senator DeGrauwe: I think this is a great idea. But going back to the idea of first-come first-serve, when we have the application, the application most of the time asks for your name, your UID, why you want to do this. It doesn't ask for anything other than just your name. So, my concern, not concern, but my idea is now do we need to have separate things for your gender identity, your race identity, all these different things that make someone diverse? Or are we just going to assume off someone's name? Because a lot of the times, if you only have a name, it's kind of a color-blind, from a theatre point, that would be color-blind audition, where you only see a name, you don't see anything else. So, unless we have other sorts of descriptions for the people that are applying, I don't know how we would make it required to be diverse, even though I think that is an amazing idea.

Senator Smith: Just to add on to that point too, I think another thing that might be helpful to add there would also be experience in dealing with things like this. Hearing that it's only a name and the UID is a little problematic because then we don't know that we're actually recruiting people based on what they're good at, what their passions are, what they've done before, what knowledge they have. And those kinds of things are extremely important to a committee, so if it's just based off of a name, that really opens the door to a lot of name discrimination. So, that's very problematic. So, I'd like to see that changed as well.

Senator Kalter: I think, speaking to both of your points, when students are chosen for most committees on this campus, whether it's college councils or what have you, their names are often offered up through people who know them, who are saying, "We know who these people are," or what have you. And, so, one of the ways that we could change this sentence in 3.A.4, where it says, "Students who apply will receive membership on a first-come, first-served basis within their college with seats for each college filled by the CTE executive committee." I'd be reluctant to tell them that they have to have a form that they have to fill out that has their race or gender or what have you. Right? But to say something like, "Students who apply will receive equal consideration by the CTE executive committee, and the committee will strive to place members so that there is a diversity of perspectives represented." Something to that effect. Right?

Senator Horst: The thing you have to consider, though, is they probably want representation from the different education programs.

Senator Kalter: I think that's covered already by the—I'm sorry, I didn't mean to erase the thing that says, "from within their college." So that would help to cover that concern. So, by definition, each of the five would have to be from a different program.

Senator DeGrauwe: This is a different point of view. Please tell me if this is not plausible at all. A lot of workplaces sometimes have a preference for a veteran. They have a veteran's preference. So, if you have this certain discharge, blah, blah, blah, and you have the same application as someone else, but you are a veteran, you will get that job because that is their policy. Are we able to put a preference in for someone that makes it diverse? That way, we actually get the diverse. Because we always say that we want this diversity in our committees, or we want this diversity in classrooms, but unless they are specifically saying that we have this preference, it's not going to happen.

Senator Kalter: So, I'm here, and I'm looking at everybody's faces, and I'm thinking that what we should do here is, perhaps, pass the bylaws as they are now and next time, literally two weeks from now, have come up with wording that we can debate to insert simply that one sentence. Right? Does everybody see what I'm saying? Because trying to craft the sentence on the floor right now is going to take a lot of time. If we can go out, get this passed right now, but then have essentially an amendment to it next time, that's crafted and vetted, that that would probably be the most efficient way to go about this. Does that make sense to people? Yes? All right. So, putting that one aside about the student representation, do we have further debate? All right. Seeing none, all in favor of passing the changes to the Council for Teacher Education bylaws with those friendlies with regard to the numbers of students on each committee, please signify by saying aye.

The motion was approved, with friendly amendments.

Senator Kalter: Okay, great. And I just wanted to say something else. The Senate gets a lot of very justified criticism for how long it takes us to do bylaws, but there was an implication last time that these bylaws are not only ancient but that we've had them since 2008. I just want to clarify that that is not the case. They first came to us early in March of 2017, which is long enough ago, but not back in 2008. They were too late, obviously, coming in early March, to be worked on in the Rules Committee 2016-2017 agenda; and because our bylaws actually were ancient, like going back to the 1970s or '80s, we were unable to get to the CTE bylaws last year. Ours were much older; they had to take priority. So, it is good to have, now, a fresh version, and beyond what we're going to do in two weeks, I do look forward to seeing the new Dean lead a healthy, frank, and very serious discussion about these ideas for future changes that were raised last time here on the floor that have just been raised again this time—at least some of them have been raised this time—so that we're working towards continuous improvement in a governance process that relates to some of our most important academic programs across campus.

We're moving into our Information Items, so we've done a lot of action for tonight very quickly, at least, relatively quickly. We have the Amorous Relations Policy, and going back to Rules Committee.

Information Items:

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)

04.03.19.01 Amorous Relations policy Mark Up(Rules Committee)

Senator Horst: Yes, the draft you have before you includes some slight wording changes that are the result of the discussion we had last time. Also, because of the discussion we had on Rules this evening, on page 2 under this part that talks about supervisory responsibility, the last bullet point says, "Providing services." We'd like to add the phrase, "On behalf of the University," capitalizing University. I had a discussion with Leanna Bordner regarding the inclusion of trainers, and she said she had a discussion with Larry Lyons, and they did not think it proper to include them in this list of duties that are considered supervisory relationship duties.

I also added the sentence, "If a conflict-management plan acceptable to both parties cannot be developed, the case shall be referred to the OEOA," in two spots, and that's a change we made from last time. I also clarified what policy was being discussed under the Sexual Harassment part.

Senator Kalter: All right. So, we're in our second information item about this one. Do we have further comments, observations, questions? So, Jim Pancrazio was not able to be here tonight. Because he brought up a couple of things on the floor, I specifically responded to his email saying he wouldn't be here, to ask him to make sure that we had covered everything. He felt that changing the words "refrain from" to "avoid" was a good change. So, he liked that. But he did say that, essentially, the committee seems to have answered something that Jim did not ask. He says, "My original question was what happens in the event of 'one party refusing to go on record,' but the way that that question was responded to was as if I had asked what happens if both members of the relationship refuse to go on record." And he says, "It seems to me that the OEOA could

and should call the faculty member, but it seems to me that that office is less in a position to call in a student and oblige him or her to go on record if the student is unwilling. In contrast, that faculty have the obligation to avoid or go on record about any compromise in relationship.” I’m not sure, Senator Horst, that that changes what you added, but he wanted to say that. And I believe it refers to those pieces late in the policy. Where is it? I think I have the wrong copy, but where you added that it would be referred to the OEOA, essentially. But to me, the way I read that, simply saying that the case—and Mr. Walesby can confirm or deny this—saying that the case would be referred to the OEOA doesn’t necessarily mean that you would call the student in. Is that correct? It would be different if you had an employee/employee relationship, but if you had an instructor/student relationship, if it got referred to your office, would you call that person in?

Mr. Walesby: I don’t know what exactly that would mean, to be honest. So, what I’m more used to is, with these types of relationships, that, one, it’s the faculty or the staff member who is obligated to disclose it. Then what typically I’ve seen happen is that a management plan is developed, and then you speak to the student separately, and the staff or faculty separately, to see if the student, for example, is feeling pressured to be in this relationship, if they’re feeling pressured to sign the document. So, in that respect, we would be interested in knowing if that’s the case. But if the question is if neither one of them signs it, I don’t know what that means. Or if one person says, “Well, I am agreeing to the terms to avoid the conflict,” and the other person doesn’t sign it, it seems like it wouldn’t be a valid—you couldn’t have the relationship moving forward if there wasn’t agreement with the terms. The university then would say, yes, we agree that this is removing the conflict. So, I don’t know exactly what that means to refer both to our office, but we’re more than happy to serve in that role and then talk to the folks. Again, the question to be, if the student says, “Well, I refuse to meet,” then I think we’d have to decide, well, what does that mean? If the purpose of this plan was to make sure that the student wasn’t feeling exploited, and the student then doesn’t want to engage in the process further, I would be concerned about that. Like, what does that mean? And I’ve also seen situations where both parties have signed the document, and the student comes back later saying that I felt that I was coerced into signing the document, and I never agreed to this type of relationship. So, that also has happened on other campuses that I’ve been on.

Senator Kalter: So, are you suggesting that we reexamine that wording?

Mr. Walesby: No. Like I say, I’m happy to serve in that role. In fact, like I say, I would be interested in especially talking to the student about the relationship and the agreement and their views moving forward. I actually think that’s important. I don’t know if, like I say, at the beginning of it, if there is not an agreement, if it can’t be developed, then the case is referred to our office, I just want to know what the expectation would be of our office with that referral. Like I say, my expectation would be that, okay, there must be something that’s influencing the desire not to participate in the official disclosure and the removal of the conflict. Is it a concern about privacy, something happening with the faculty member involved? I don’t know. But we’re more than happy to serve in that role. But I want to make sure that we’re meeting the Senate’s expectations of what we’d be doing.

Senator Kalter: It seems to me in rereading that, one of the things that we don’t say—so, if one or both members does not sign, we still need a conflict management plan. Right?

Mr. Walesby: Or, don’t allow the relationship.

Senator Kalter: In other words, the university has an obligation to ensure that there is not a conflict of interest.

Mr. Walesby: Correct.

Senator Kalter: So that one of the things that’s missing here is, sort of, after this meeting, after it gets referred to the OEOA, that there would be a conflict management plan that would be put in place whether it’s signed or not. Right? Whether the people are agreeing to it or not, the university is saying, “No, you can’t grade this student.”

Mr. Walesby: Right. Or, “You can’t engage in the relationship.” Right? If there’s not an ability to remove the conflict, again, this would not be necessarily for me to decide, but I would imagine the issue would then be for the Dean’s office, the Provost’s office, whoever might have ultimate say here, “Well, if the conflict can’t be removed, then either the relationship can’t move forward currently until the period of conflict would be—the student is no longer enrolled in the class, or something. Because, like I say, the signing of it is just to really make sure, okay, here’s what we’re doing. We’re making sure there’s no favoritism. We’re making sure nobody is feeling coerced. Everyone agrees on what we’re doing. Then we move forward. But without that, I would again think that it wouldn’t move forward.

Senator Horst: And also, as I’m hearing talk, I’m recalling that we are also including past relationships where there might not be so much desire to agree with the other party.

Mr. Walesby: Yeah, you know, these get interesting. At the last campus, again, it was bigger, but we had situations where a faculty member would come to the Dean. There, you’d have to go to your Dean or Department Chair. The faculty member would come three times in a semester and say, “Well, I would like to date a student.” Three different students. Like, okay, well, hold on a second. We’re not sure that that’s meeting what we thought these were designed for. And, so, these things then can occur. But we want folks to come forward. Right? We want folks to come forward and say, “Okay, this is the relationship.” But my experience has been, at least in investigating this, is oftentimes a person may be reluctant to come forward and say, “You know, I am excited about a new relationship that I have with a student, I’d like the university to be aware of it and sign off on it.” Usually, my experience, anyway, is that these have come to us from third parties: spouses of those who are involved in part of the relationship and other things that are going on. Then we get more involved in it. I’ve not seen a lot of folks who are coming forward and saying—but, again, they should, and I think these policies are important to make sure that everyone’s expectations are met in these situations.

Senator Horst: So, Susan, are you saying that we need some sort of step if the OEOA step fails?

Senator Kalter: Not exactly, but almost. That we need to make sure that the OEOA step does not fail. That a conflict management plan is put in place following or during the OEOA step.

Senator Mainieri: So, I’m looking at the paragraph at the bottom of page 3 that starts with, “Employees and students who fail to report,” and it talks about the consequences for failing to follow a conflict management plan, so I wonder if we also need to say, “fail to follow” or “fail to establish” via this policy, “a conflict-management plan,” that there will be consequences. I wonder if that would cover, and we could even mention “fail to establish” using this policy or after the OEOA referral. I wonder if that would address the issue that you’ve brought up.

Mr. Walesby: That’s a good point. Yeah, there’s also the possibility for discipline if you don’t, then, engage in the process.

Senator Kalter: And, Senator Horst, are there two places where that would occur? Because that’s under the instructional context where it says that. Here it is: “If the person with the power or status advantage does not report the relationship to their immediate supervisor, the individual may be subject to sanction.” So, it’s a slightly different case.

Senator Horst: “Does not report the relationship to their immediate advisor and does not establish a conflict management plan”?

Mr. Walesby: Yes. I mean, I’ve had situations where we have pulled the student to the side, and we’ve talked to him or her, and they’ve said, “Thank you very much. I would like to get out of this relationship as soon as

possible.” And so, it reminded us—I had this at another campus that they don’t have anymore—of that need to make sure that the student is being protected as well as the faculty or staff. Right? Knowing, okay, this is what you’re getting in to, you have to understand the implications of what this relationship might ultimately result in.

Senator Kalter: All right. So, it sounds like those amendments might cover what we’re worried about.

Mr. Walesby: Yes.

Senator Kalter: Okay. That’s good. So, any other comments or observations? I have a couple, as you would have guessed. First of all, I want to just make sure—Cera didn’t realize that reference 1 in the comments had been withdrawn in Executive Committee. She was there, but I think forgot that. So, we can withdraw that, that thing that says, “That portion is redundant,” etc. That was withdrawn during the Executive conversation.

We talked a little bit about needing to add back in just a very brief reference to the Faculty Associate Code of Conduct. And I wrote down potential language. Right after, “This policy is distinct from family relationships policy...”

Senator Horst: I forgot about that, sorry.

Senator Kalter: ... perhaps we could—I’m not sure if this wording will work, but “Faculty Associates must also abide by the Faculty Associate Code of Conduct.” Does that sound right?

Senator Horst: Yes. And I sent a note to Senator Pole and never received a follow-up.

Senator Kalter: Yes. I think Senator Pole is or was out of the country, and so previous Senator Mattoon was corresponding with me about this and said she recognized the Code of Conduct but wasn’t exactly sure where it resides, so was looking for that. But I think it’s best to just leave it as the Code of Conduct, because that’s how it’s been known since she recognized that.

The two other things that I had, although I agree with Senator Pancrazio that “avoid” is better than “refrain,” especially because I was the one that suggested that, he also was pointing out that that particular sentence targets the relationship rather than the conflict of interest, and I’m wondering, so we’re in the big paragraph on page 1, where it says, “They have an ethical obligation to avoid establishing and/or maintaining amorous relationships that constitute a conflict of interest.” Should it say, instead, “They have an ethical obligation to avoid conflicts of interest that might result from establishing and/or maintaining amorous relationships.” In other words, you’re avoiding the conflict of interest, not the relationship. Not that I agree with going for the relationship. Right? Just let me put that on record. I think it’s ridiculous. But, since we are, as an institution, right now, deciding that we’re not going to go to the extreme of forbidding all of the relationships, which some universities have been doing lately, it seems that it’s better to say, “avoiding the conflict of interest.” I’m just curious if the people agree or not agree.

Senator Nichols: Yeah, I agree with making the conflict of interest the main part, because ultimately, at the end of the day, the university has no power to terminate a relationship. Right? They have leverage on which to put on one or more parties that would be very persuasive in not going down that road, but there is no authority to just go in and say, “No, you two can’t interact on any personal level.” So, all the authority that we have is to remediate the conflict of interest. So that should be what the focus is on. And I agree with you, too. I want to go on record saying, “Don’t.”

Senator Kalter: Yeah. Just don’t.

Senator Horst: Could you reread that again?

Senator Kalter: Yes. “They have an ethical obligation to avoid conflicts of interest that might result...

Senator Horst: That “do” result.

Senator Kalter: I would say, “...that might result...”

Senator Horst: Okay, “That might.” Okay.

Senator Kalter: I think. Because you have to think forward into the future, right? You might start a relationship with a student, and they’re not your student, and then they become your student because they’re in the same program. Again, don’t do it. “... that might result from establishing and/or maintaining amorous relationships.”

Senator Horst: Okay.

Senator Kalter: And then the only other question that I had was, we collected not very much feedback from a mass email that we sent out, which I thought was instructive and interesting, that we got almost no feedback. And we did that because we weren’t sure, based on the Culture of Respect Committee, that they had sort of indicated that a lot of people don’t even know about this policy. So, when we broadcast it, either it was April or March and nobody was paying attention or, really, they were fine with it, or they didn’t read it. So, could you just describe a little bit how the feedback that we did collect from that mass email got incorporated? I may have missed it. You may have already said it. But was there anything significant that you can remember that we should know that got incorporated?

Senator Horst: If I could find my notes. So, we had an email from a retired philosophy professor, and he was wondering if number 4 was too broad. But then he said, “Might it be rethought a little bit more about what number 4 was trying to say, what kind of influence,” he said, “might it be that the power to potentially unfairly influence what educational or occupational opportunities are available to someone?” So, he thought through it, and then he said it made sense. That was Professor Machina.

Senator Kalter: Kenton Machina.

Senator Horst: I had Jim Pancrazio’s comment. He also had an interesting comment regarding LBGTO, the potentials to an area where somebody might be outed because they would have to have a conflict management plan. But this is all a confidential arrangement. So, I didn’t bring that one up. Those are the ones that I have in front of me. Recently, somebody from my department said, “Why go to all the trouble with a grad student? Why not just, you know, say, ‘Hey, I’ll grade that.’” And part of what we tried to do in the committee is make a statement that we, as a university, are not necessarily condoning that kind of approach, that we want to have it be acknowledged through this formal process. And, actually, it’s not okay to just slide the paper to the left, because there is a poisonous atmosphere that can result if such a relationship is going forward and people feel that they’re a student in a class and somebody else is getting favoritism because of their status. And that also comes from direct experience. That happened with some of our students in the School of Music. But those are the comments that I have right in front of me.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, I would say we did not get many substantive comments. And we did refer one to another committee regarding faculty/faculty relationships. The only thing that I would say is that if the conflict management plan is confidential, you’re still going to have the perception among the other students or the other people because they won’t know that it was even established.

Senator Ferrence: So, to contextualize, just this week, and literally yesterday for me, in freshman chemistry, we do a three-hour laboratory exercise on ethics, where the students would go through some scenarios. And then the students propose their own scenarios. And many cases, the scenarios the students propose and so we talk

about, basically come down to amorous relationships and how you navigate that. So, I was doing that yesterday, and it's one of the things that I'm curious—because I don't know that it's covered here, but I'm wondering where it's covered—the amorous relations in a university setting, it talks about the two consensual individuals, and then it says, “has the opportunity to exert influence.” And so far, all the discussion has dealt with faculty-to-student or staff-to-student. But what about the scenario where you have groupwork, and so you have student-to-student, and you have lab partners. And as an instructor, you would have no idea who's dating who in the classroom, but it probably happens. And if that goes sour in some way, those people are definitely exerting influence on one another, and we do a lot of groupwork on campus. So, where would an amorous relationship that has “exerting influence” and starts out as consensual but goes sour in some way, fall, if both parties were students in the same classroom setting?

Senator Kalter: I'm going to direct that to Tony Walesby.

Mr. Walesby: I can't imagine that being manageable at all, right? So, our students are dating each other and breaking up with each other and all those things in between. But I don't dismiss that point. To me, I'm most concerned, at least as I think about this policy, about a student being taken advantage of and our ability to step in to make sure that that's not occurring. Again, I assume that a faculty member is not doing that intentionally. But, again, there is the possibility that, either through a misunderstanding or an expectation, that the student thinks they have an obligation. I've had students from other parts of the world who we've talked to about some of these things, and say, “Oh, well, it's more expected that I have this type of relationship with a faculty member from where I'm from.” I'm like, “Oh, well, just so you know, you have no expectation here to do that.” And, so, there's a lot of opportunity to have that discussion. Right? And, so, I think that's important to the policy. The notion that you're describing certainly is important. I think if there's a disruption, for example, in a lab or something that's occurring, which happens often, then there's a way that the PI can try to address it or great folks from Student Affairs, SCCR coming in with a conflict resolution and say, “Okay, we've had a fracture of the relationship.” It could be because of a consensual relationship. It could be two groups that have known each other for a long time and now there's a break in the view of a discipline. I mean, all those things that can come with a fracturing of relationships, I think, are managed day to day, as they are now on campus, through faculty, through PI, through our college and Student Affairs.

Senator Ferrence: So, my concern on it has to do with—and I can't come up with a very specific example, but I can think of sort of general things from over 20 years of being here, where you wouldn't be aware that something was fractured, but the rumor mill picks up later that one of the people in the relationship was suffering extreme coercion to basically do the lion's share of the group work, and unless those parties disclosed it, nobody would even be the wiser. So, you're right, if you find out, you can go to Community Rights and things, but it just strikes me that that seems like the more probable event.

Senator Kalter: One of the things that I would say to that as a professor is designing the group work appropriately so that if somebody is doing the lion's share that that person gets that credit. I think that's about managing how we do our assignments and how we give credit for them.

Senator DeGrauwe: Can you explain the comment about the LGBT community? I'm sorry, I missed that.

Senator Horst: Yes. This was coming from Senator Pancrazio, and he said, “Also, how would the committee respond to the concern voiced by LBGQTQ faculty that this kind of policy would oblige them to out themselves and potentially expose them to other kinds of discrimination?” And I asked him specifically if he had heard of some specific concern from LBGQTQ faculty. He said no. It happened in a conversation he had potentially regarding, I think, an ASPT matter. He was relating a conversation he had in another scenario with this policy. So, he was inferring that there could be a concern.

Senator DeGrauwe: I think that's a very accurate concern to have, coming from someone that identifies a part of that community, that an outing like that, per se, by being required to fill out a piece of paper, a form, even if

it is confidential, that can be traumatic in a multitude of ways, emotional, financial, if it's a student and their home isn't safe, it can be problematic even if it is confidential. Not everything always stays confidential when it's supposed to be. So, I think that is definitely an opinion that we should look into more and think about and keep in the back of our heads.

Senator Horst: As I was thinking about this comment, I also thought about the concern for this student and the rights of this student to make sure that there is a power differential and it's being managed correctly. And, so, there's competing interests.

Senator Smith: So, I just want to kind of add something to the record. And this is going off of what Mr. Walesby said, but the comment was made that it should be ISU's priority to prevent the conflicts of interests, and I disagree. That should not be the priority. The priority should be protecting students from situations where they are being preyed upon. And I think that that's what the goal of this policy is, is to protect students from those situations, because in situations where there is a conflict of interest, oftentimes there comes with it a blurred line of consent, and sometimes negated consent in general. So, I think that the focus in this entire conversation should be about how we can protect students and how we can prevent people from preying on other people on this campus, regardless of position.

Senator Horst: Tony Walesby, do you have any comments regarding the conversation we just had with Senator DeGrauwe?

Mr. Walesby: I definitely agree. You know, I don't know what the answer is, though. Right? I think that our ability to protect all of our students is important. Right? And, so, I would want to know from any student if they're feeling coerced to be in a relationship. From our perspective, it would be kept completely confidential. I understand, though, that with any relationship in any setting, folks talk to one another. They talk to their friends. Disclosures get made that way, inappropriately. But definitely from my perspective, the importance of the confidentiality and the importance of making sure that all of the students are not feeling coerced would outweigh anything else. Having said that, I don't imagine a scenario, at least from our office, where any type of outing or disclosure would ever be made. I'm very, very sensitive to that. That's the last thing that we would want to do. Again, I could imagine that such disclosure may occur through a rumor mill and folks talking about it. You know, I've had situations in these cases, again, at a different campus, where—again, a third-party disclosure—two roommates have the same academic advisor. The one roommate comes forward to our office and says, "Listen, this isn't my business, per se, but my roommate is having an affair with our advisor, which is fine, but she's already getting published, and I can't get a meeting with him." And, so, these are the ways for which, again, these things will come forward. The person had no interest in terms of any, you know, the relationship and all that. It was just how it's impacting that person. And, again, I've had spouses and partners from other parts of the relationship say, "Hey, I believe my spouse or partner is having an inappropriate relationship with a student of yours," and those kinds of things. But I definitely agree with you about the concern that this would have or bring forward.

Senator Horst: Would it be possible to make a scenario where the case could go to the OEOA office to develop the conflict management plan as opposed to the chair or immediate supervisor?

Mr. Walesby: I mean, it would be whatever you all think would be appropriate. That's typically not our role. Right? So that's more of a kind of local governance of, okay, this is more of an understanding of what the relationship would be and the various potentials of impact and conflict would be. I would just hate to disadvantage the student with our lack of knowledge of what exactly that means during their interactions with each other.

Senator Kalter: This is at the Information stage, and I'm quite aware that we're three minutes from our hard stop time. I think that's a good thing for us to think about, Senator Horst, a good suggestion, possibility, that there be an either/or there.

Senator DeGrauwe: I'd just like to clarify that the original comment made by a different Senator was on a staff being outed, but I also think it is very possible and even more possible for a student to be outed. So that's where my concern is, not necessarily for the staff but for the student.

Senator Kalter: Does anybody else have anything on the Amorous Relations stuff before we move on? I do want to make sure to get to Mennonite College of Nursing bylaws, since we have Denise Wilson here in the audience. So, let's do that, and then we'll close the meeting right after that. And we'll do committee reports by email or next time, or what have you. Actually, since this is the last meeting of the committees, I might as well do committee reports. So, we'll do those, and then we'll close. So, again, to Rules Committee, we've got the Mennonite College Council bylaws.

04.05.19.01 MCN College Council Bylaws Mark Up(Rules Committee)

04.05.19.02 Revised MCN Bylaws 3-27-19 clean copy (Rules Committee)

Senator Horst: Before we start, I do want to say happy birthday to Denise Wilson if she's here, and I would be happy to sing to you later. The Mennonite College of Nursing has put forward their bylaws. Here's a summary of changes in the document. There are some title changes, administrative title changes have been corrected. They replaced "instructional assistant professor" with "non-tenure faculty." A standing committee was added. The simulation faculty section was added on how to create standing and ad-hoc committees. They added the notion of having vice chairs of committees. They added share responsibilities. There was a revision to committee functions throughout. They simplified the CFSC and DFSC sections at the request of the Executive Committee and the Rules Committee. And that's a good place to start.

Secretary Kalter: All right. Do we have any comments or questions, concerns about these bylaws?

Secretary Horst: (singing) Happy birthday, dear Denise...

Secretary Kalter: Wow, a composer singing. This is unusual. All right. If there is nothing, we will move to committee reports and then to communications and then adjournment.

Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Pancrazio

Senator Kalter: So, Senator Pancrazio is not here. Did the Academic Affairs Committee meet? They did not. Excellent. That is their report.

Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Senator Marx

Senator Marx: The committee only had four members present, so we did not have quorum. But we reviewed our report on the AIF and the report on the commentary on the President. Those two things will be delivered to the Senate office shortly.

Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Crowley

Senator Crowley: We had a quorum because we are such deeply dedicated individuals, and we continued our discussion of the Sabbatical policy, and there are two primary areas now that we're focusing on, trying to develop and polish the language. And we will obviously be carrying that over into the fall.

Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Mainieri

Senator Mainieri: Planning and Finance finalized some revisions to the Foundation Policy which will be moving forward, and we have finalized two priority briefs, one on increasing student financial aid and one on enabling more students to get into their desired majors, both of which will be moving forward.

Senator Kalter: Excellent.

Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Mainieri

Senator Horst: The Rules Committee completed the External Committee slate, and we will be sending that forward to the Executive Committee. We'll also be sending forward one item regarding the Athletics Council and the wording in the Blue Book regarding the Athletics Council. And, finally, we reviewed all the documents that you just reviewed.

Senator Kalter: Terrific. And, do we have any questions for any of the committee chairs? All right. Seeing none.

Communications

Senator Aduonum: Yeah, Provost Murphy, could you give me those numbers again that you gave earlier on when we started, please, about retention?

Provost Murphy: I have to find them.

Senator Aduonum: Yes. If you have them, please.

Provost Murphy: Yep, I got them there.

Senator Aduonum: Thank you.

Provost Murphy: These are PRPA numbers data that they provided, for the last seven years. Retention of new minority professors has been 100% for five of the last seven years. In a sixth year, it was slightly under the average for the university as a whole; and in the other year, it was slightly over the university average for the whole.

Senator Aduonum: Okay. And what is the university average, please?

Provost Murphy: Oh, let us see, here. I have to find it. It varies. So, gosh, it varies. The university as a whole for all new professors, it would vary anywhere from 90%, one year it's 92%, another it's 96%, another it's 89%. What I would tell you, though, is the number of new minority professors is small. So, we do have a priority to increase the recruitment and retention of faculty and staff, to diversify faculty and staff. So those numbers are small. But in terms of retention, PRPA looked at them as cohorts.

Senator Aduonum: Okay. So, where can I find this information?

Provost Murphy: You know, that's a good question. I don't think it's data that is on the Factbook, but I can get a report. I'm glad to get those numbers from PRPA and share those with you. That's no problem at all.

Senator Aduonum: All right. Thank you.

Provost Murphy: Of course.

Senator Aduonum: What is pep, perp? Can you share with us?

Provost Murphy: PRPA. It's Planning and Institute—it's our institutional research office.

Senator Aduonum: Oh, PRPA. PRPA. Got it. Okay, got it. Okay. Sounds good. Thank you very much.

Provost Murphy: Absolutely. Of course. Of course.

Senator Aduonum: Thank you.

Senator Kalter: And those faculty, again, were tracked for how many years?

Provost Murphy: They gave me seven years' worth of data.

Senator Kalter: So, seven cohorts, but were they tracked for two years, five years, eight years? Did they say?

Provost Murphy: Five. Tracked for five.

Senator Kalter: For five years.

Provost Murphy: Yes, tracked for five.

Senator Kalter: So, in other words, when we hired somebody, they stayed here for at least five years, if they were part of that 100% cohort.

Provost Murphy: We tracked them year to year.

Senator Kalter: Gotcha. Okay. Terrific. Any other communications for the Senate?

Senator Marx: Yes, I just want to point out that the Gamma Phi Circus is celebrating its 90th year, and this weekend is their annual performances, and I'd like to encourage everybody to attend. They've had some just awesome shows the last few years. I expect this year will be equally awesome.

Senator Kalter: Excellent.

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

Senator Kalter: Have a great evening. And, faculty are going to stay here and learn about our salaries. Have fun.