

Illinois State University

## ISU ReD: Research and eData

---

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

---

11-6-2019

### Senate Meeting, November 6, 2019

Academic Senate  
*Illinois State University*

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

---

#### Recommended Citation

Academic Senate, "Senate Meeting, November 6, 2019" (2019). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 1261.  
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/1261>

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

**Academic Senate Meeting Minutes**  
**Wednesday, November 6, 2019**  
**Approved**

***Call to Order***

Academic Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

***Roll Call***

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

***Chairperson's Remarks***

Senator Kalter: All right. We have a quorum. Thank you. And I have a very brief Chairperson's Remark. Just wanted to thank everybody who came yesterday to the first interview for the Associate Vice President for Academic Planning. We've got another one of those tomorrow morning, so hopefully you can attend.

And then the other thing I was going to say is that we're going to start winding down by 8:15 tonight, and a definite hard stop by 8:30. We'll see where we hit in the middle there. Maybe we'll even make it before that. So, those are my two comments tonight. And are there any questions?

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

Senator Solebo: Good evening, everybody. I hope you all are having a good week. As the semester winds down just a couple things to keep in mind. So one thing I wanted to mention, we have a couple open positions for SGA. So if you know of any students that would be interested in being a Student Life Senator, College of Education Senator, or the Tri Towers Senator please refer them to myself, because we are really looking to close these gaps, especially before the start of next semester. Yeah. So if you know of any students that would be interested, please refer them to me.

And with so many tests and projects coming up, we're going to be focusing really heavily on mental health, and just making sure that students know the resources, and are in just a good mental state to keep going throughout the semester.

And It's Just a Period campaign, which gives feminine hygiene products to students on campus, that's going to be starting up really soon as well.

Then the mental health initiative which will be starting up next semester, but we're making sure that students know their resources and what's available on campus.

And then regarding the last meeting, so we had... we were able to have a meeting a couple weeks back, and we pretty much talked about what we want the committee to look like, and what we're going to be doing for the future. So we scheduled another meeting for next week, and there's going to be updates for that in the future. And with that I yield for questions.

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

- ***President Larry Dietz***

Senator Kalter: All right. Seeing none. Dr. Dietz is in either Vietnam or China right now so we will move to Provost Remarks with Senator Murphy.

- ***Provost Jan Murphy***

Provost Murphy: Very good. Good evening, everybody. Believe it or not, we're very busy into the recruiting season for next fall of 2020. Applications for fall of 2020 are up 1.3% for first time in college students (or FTICs), and up 5% for transfer students compared to last year at this date. FTIC and Transfer admissions and deposits are also up from a year ago. Graduate applications are up 45% over one year ago at this time. So... and we have a prospective graduate student open house this Friday, so we're hoping that trend up continues.

A reminder that the Culturally Responsive Campus Community (CRCC) conference registration will close this Friday. This year's conference is on November 18-19, and will be back here in the Bone Student Center again. There are over 60 presentations, discussions, workshops to choose from this year, so you will find something of interest if you attend the conference. You can find out more information, including information about all of our keynote speakers at the CRCC website, which can be linked off the Provost homepage. So I encourage you to go and attend as much of the conference as your schedule would permit.

This year's Robert G. Bone Distinguished Lecture will be held at 7:00 pm next Thursday, November 14, and will feature W. Fitzhugh Brundage, an eminent U.S. historian who is an expert on violence and policing.

And this past Monday, I sent an email out to all students asking you to fill out a survey to gather feedback as we try to identify ways to support instructors, so they can help you learn in a positive classroom environment. Each mail has a link that's specific to a student so we can use things like class level and majors, but not individual, anything individually identifying. It will help us better plan, and deliver meaningful professional development opportunities for our faculty. There's also an option for each student to volunteer to participate in a focus group with Dr. Yojanna Cuenca-Carlino who plans professional development support for the faculty. So, I think, the first day it was open we had 400 students who filled out the survey, and 72 who volunteered to participate in focus groups. So, please, I encourage you to fill out the survey, and to encourage your constituents to fill out the survey for us. So, be glad to answer any questions.

Senator Mainieri: Senator Murphy, I'm interested in the survey that you were just referencing. Will faculty be able to see the results of that survey?

Provost Murphy: We can certainly do that. We'll use the survey... I'm trying to think of how Yojanna was going to do that. But the survey results should be available. I mean, I think that's the kind of thing that we should make available. Again, we'll have the survey, and then do focus groups, to kind of verify and to flesh out what the survey is telling us about the classroom

environment, about the needs of faculty. And again, the main purpose of it is to really try to tailor faculty professional development in a way that helps us think through different majors, different course. But I certainly think so, and let me talk to Yojanna, and I will respond to you on that. I'll just have to ask her how she envisions that working. So, thank you. We also did, if you remember, a survey for faculty, and one for staff. So then, this was the third part of that planned information gathering for her. So, thank you.

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

Senator Johnson: All right. Good evening, everyone. I also want to follow up on the discussion that we had during the last meeting related to African American or black student concerns. As was mentioned earlier, we do have a meeting scheduled for that group that was formed, in order to get back together again. Specifically at that last meeting, there were concerns raised regarding the housing program, specifically the staff, and equipping individuals with the skills in order to mediate difficult type situations. That is something that that group spoke to. We have identified a third party to come in and do some additional training before the semester is out. To honor those individuals who are serving on that group, I informed them that I would share that information with them before we shared it with anyone else. So, I intend to try to do that before our meeting or at that meeting as to the firm that we are looking at. But they will... and they have done this before with universities throughout the country, working on issues of implicit bias, discrimination, providing practical skills, and skills on how to mediate difficult situations. So we're looking forward to sharing that information with you, and getting that training done before the semester is out.

Second item involves housing as well. We are moving quickly and aggressively, we continue to do so, on our P3 housing project. Again, a team between facilities staff, student affairs staff, housing staff, and the like are working on a weekly basis in order to work on the design phase of the project, as well as a small group working on the finance piece. Currently, we are, again, looking at South Campus, the space right next to the recreation facility. We're kind of focusing on a two building type of split. Each one of those buildings would be somewhere between five to seven stories high. We're talking about, and we're leaning towards a 1,200 bed type of a complex. We are still looking at a pod style living type of environment that would have private toilets, showers, community sinks, and so forth. We're looking to bring a lot of light into the lower floors and lounges that we have throughout the facility as well. We will have multi-purpose space hopefully on the first floor, as well as a dining center that would seat probably up to 700 individuals. Again, we are in the design phase, some of this might change as relates to how this looks, which is why I'm not sharing pretty pictures, and things of that nature. All right. So, I hope, and would love to be able to do that during the second semester. Again, after we come back from break, we'll probably be a little bit further along with our design plans, and I think it would be something very exciting to share with this group.

The last piece, speaking of excitement for the campus community, guess what, E-sports is coming. That's right. We have made a decision to form an official E-sports varsity team on

campus; we're very excited about that, to compliment the various club groups that we have here. It will be managed by the Campus Recreation Department (part of Student Affairs), and we actually just posted the position. We will have a Program Director for E-sports, and just posted that position, and hope to have a person identified before the end of the semester. It's very critical to have that person in place in order to assist us in figuring out what specifically we need to do. In the meantime though, since it's reporting to recreation, Dawn (I'm going to blank on her last name because she recently got married) Pote, Pote, Sanner Pote is going to be heading it up. And it's actually received, I think in the first day that we did a press release, she received like 28 or 38 inquiries from various universities, media, and the like, about our program. Which, again, we're extremely excited about, because it will be the first varsity program for a public institution within the State of Illinois. So, more to come on that. We remain extremely excited about that program. And on that note, I will end, and yield to any questions.

Senator Kalter: Terrific. Do we have any questions for Senator Johnson? (Pause) I can't believe you had two housing things in there and no questions.

Senator Johnson: Well, you know, I think I set it up pretty well. They just can't wait to see the pictures. Then you got to be critical at that point, right.

Senator Kalter: That's right. I got it written down that we might have a presentation about that in the spring. So, duly notified.

Senator Johnson: Sounds great.

Senator Kalter: Wonderful. Seeing no questions for Senator Johnson, oh!, oh I shouldn't have said anything. Kosberg, Senator Kosberg.

Senator Kosberg: It's not about the housing, but do you know like what games or sports these sports teams are going to be playing?

Senator Johnson: You probably know... thank you, shaking your head. Is there anyone who is involved... I know that there are some specific games that these type of teams focus on. I am not going to go there.

(Laughter)

Senator Johnson: I'm not. I see my kids playing them like every night. My son's probably at home right now playing on it. But I can provide that information for you at a later date.

Senator DeGrauwe: What's the rationale behind having it be managed by Recreation and not Athletics? I feel like if it's Recreation, I feel like it's going... like, Department of Recreation, it will be taken less seriously than if it was managed by Athletics, or maybe that's just a misassumption on my part.

Senator Johnson: Yeah. I think if you look at how these programs are popping up, they are reporting to one of two areas, either Recreation and/or Athletics. Where we're at right now, and where the Missouri Valley Conference is at, we're not there. Big East on the other hand. Big East is out there, and big. Okay. And it is in many respects managed by either Student Affairs or that Athletic department then on that campus. So we decided to go with our Recreation department because it will be considered just that, taken extremely seriously. Not that Athletics would not on our campus, but we take that very seriously, and I think we're going to gear this program up real quick, and get it up to speed so that we're launching this thing by the fall of 2020.

Senator Wall: Is there additional space allocation being made for that within the rec center, or are you going to be utilizing the space already in Julian Hall, called the DIGGS space?

Senator Johnson: Great questions. Actually, we're going to leverage space within the Bowling and Billiards facility. You know that space that's on the south side of that, that multipurpose space...

Senator Wall: The activity room?

Senator Johnson: Yeah. The multipurpose space, you know. So, that's what we're going to leverage. And if we go ahead and do that, as it stands to date, we would probably be the second or third largest facility in the country. To date. By 50 square feet.

Senator Horst: Are there going to be, I think I heard that there's going to be scholarships, and if so, will it be a coed team? Will it be a balance between men and women?

Senator Johnson: There will be scholarships, and yes, it would and should be coed. We're looking for the best, the brightest, and the most skilled, in order to go into those roles. I do know that there's a mix that we're looking for, as far as in state, out of state as well, so that plays into it also.

Senator Kalter: Further questions? All right seeing none. We'll move on to Senator Stephens for Vice President of Finance and Planning Remarks.

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

Senator Stephens: Thank you, Senator Kalter. I've only got a couple of items. Just one update on some renovation work. You're hopefully seeing on the first floor of Julian Hall the Cybersecurity building. We finally got through all the permitting process, and allowing for the contractor to begin work. So, they just started this past week, and you're seeing a closure being put up around it so that they'll be able to heat the interior part of the complex while they work on the inside of it. So that, and talking with our facilities team today, we're looking at about a 15-18 month construction process, as well as outfitting with furnishings and equipment. So, we're looking at the project being... and the classroom, and all that area being available for the fall of 2021. So, we're just glad it's starting to move forward now.

The only other thing that I was passing along is really a community issue for anyone that may be interested. We just got some emails today where the Town of Normal has a Bicycle / Pedestrian Master Plan that they've had in place now since 2009, and they've actually reached out to the community across all of Bloomington Normal to ask for individual input in order to update that master plan. So, if you're actively involved in, you know, bicycling here around the community, and want to provide some input, on Wednesday, November 13 from 5:00pm to 7:00 pm at the Community Activity Center on Douglas Street they are having a... The Town of Normal's having a meeting. So, if that's important to you, and you want to provide input for that, then please do. So, that's really all I have for the evening.

Senator DeGrauwe: Less of a question and more of a concern. When you ask pretty much any student what is their biggest problem on campus, most of the time they're going to say parking. And I know parking is very limited due to the space, because you can't park where there's no space. My concern right now is Athletics is happening, basketball is happening, women's basketball is happening, and when Athletics comes and events happen, specifically in Redbird Arena, all of those parking lots are null and void to anyone that is not a donor, or has previously bought a parking spot there for that specific game, or you have to pay \$10 extra. When you have a night class at Turner on a Wednesday or a Tuesday, so if you have a night class right now in Turner, you have nowhere to park. So, if you are a commuting student, you would have to find somewhere else on a side street, which is being parked on by the basketball team and/or their spectators, or you probably just don't come to class, because you don't want to have to worry with that hassle. So, my concern is we are putting Athletics and their spectators above education for some students, because there's no place for those students to park anywhere near Turner. Even Marching Band today got moved to a different field, thank God it was Hancock Stadium (not complaining), from our specific classroom area which is lot G82, so it could be open to, I think, the top level donors for Redbird Arena. And when I left, there was no parking on that... I mean, there was no car in that spot, but we got moved because of Athletics. So, that's just a concern that I've had from some of my fellow classmates, that sometimes it feels that Athletics, and trying to get money from parking spots, even though we already paid for our green lot or red lot, overtakes our educational and our importance here.

Senator Stephens: Thank you for bringing that up. That's an excellent observation that... I've only participated in driving over there to sit in those lots, and you're exactly right. Those are... if there are classes in the evenings at Turner, then that's a very good question about what is our policy around that, and trying to realize that there may be a need for those... if there's going to be classes held that evening, that we've got to consider what do we do for a possible student population. So, I'll take that back and talk to our parking team, and also through some of the Athletics to figure out what we can do, especially for that particular building.

Senator DeGrauwe: Thank you.

Senator Ferrence: This is just a short question and perhaps somewhat petty, but it goes back to the Julian Cybersecurity project, and you made reference to the first floor, and I know that Chemistry and Biology are on the second floor, so where does that leave the IT department on the space in between? I know it sounds kind of petty, but it's very weird, because right now everything is labeled first floor is above the parking, second floor is about that. So, are you planning on renumbering?

Senator Stephens: Yeah. We'll have to... We'll probably have to figure out, because, yeah, everybody's thought of that as the parking lot. You know, and so we'll have to think about... ground zero, I don't know, we'll think of something.

Senator Ferrence: I bring it up because I don't think we've thought about that.

Senator Stephens: Yeah. I don't think we've thought that far. But yeah, you're exactly right, what we call that floor, it'll likely become first floor, and we'll have to revisit that. So, thank you for bringing that up.

Senator Kalter: Senator Stephens, I might have missed this in your remarks but did the... you know how there were classes that were being moved out of Julian last week because of the... whatever you call...

Senator Stephens: Power issues.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. Did that get resolved?

Senator Stephens: Yes, it did. As far as the... Unfortunately, we had a... That particular incident was a switch, a major switch near that particular building that actually ISU ended up owning. It wasn't a switch that Ameren owned. And so it got damaged in some way, so it actually took a few days, we actually had to order, essentially order new parts, and thankfully we had a backup generator in order to allow for our systems to stay up, and our IT team essentially had to work from different buildings. So, it was very much a teachable moment. And matter of fact we're going to continue in working with Charley and his team to figure out this, how do we prepare for this? This is not the only switch we have that's like this on campus. So, it definitely was a teachable moment.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. Further questions? All right. Seeing none. We'll move on, thank you so much, and we'll move on to our Information Items. Our first one is Sabbatical Leave policy coming from Faculty Affairs Committee, and Senator Crowley will take that one.

***Information Items:***

- 04.02.16.01 Policy 3.2.8 Sabbatical Leave policy Current Copy (Faculty Affairs Committee)***
- 10.11.19.06 Policy 3.2.8 Sabbatical Leave policy Mark Up (Faculty Affairs Committee)***
- 10.11.19.05 Policy 3.2.8 Sabbatical Leave policy Clean Copy (Faculty Affairs Committee)***



Senator Crowley: Thank you. I'm going to give you a little bit of background to get us started here. Back in 2016-17, it was obvious that we needed to update the language in the Sabbatical policy. And when you look at the original policy, you'll see that it still allowed sabbaticals for completing your degree. And since we now hiring any new faculty member with the terminal degree, that language was no longer necessary, so it needed to be changed, and so that was where it began. And I'll walk through these things. Then, as the discussion went on, the previous Faculty Affairs Committee reviewed, or offered some additional modifications or revisions to the policy. And then it laid dormant for a little while. And last year then, in the second semester we brought it back, and began work on it in the committee, and made pretty good progress. We were close to wrapping it up by the end of term, and weren't able to do that. So we began work on it again this term, and we're now at a point where we have a markup that we're satisfied with, and that's what we're presenting to you. So, let me just quickly work through some of the changes that have been made, and hopefully I can kind of clarify the reasons for some of the changes.

So if you look at the Rationale first, you can see that there are a couple simple things in there where we made a couple of editorial improvements or corrections. And then we decided since the sabbatical program is really aimed at faculty development, as much as anything else, we decide to put that first and the university second. So, throughout the policy, we noticed that the university was always put first and the faculty member was always second. So we decided we're just going to reverse that to make our point that this is all... the Sabbatical policy is there for faculty members to develop professionally. That's the driving force behind it, and the benefits that the faculty member reaps from that will then be passed on to the university and the students. So, we made that simple change there, and then you'll see where we repeated that later on in the policy.

And then in the third paragraph is where you're going to see that we eliminated the old language that talked about a leave for an educational purpose, and now it's just a straightforward sabbatical leave that is really for faculty to pursue their scholarship, their research.

I want to skip over Procedures for a moment, and then go on with the other changes that were made, and then we'll come back to Procedures, because that's where the most complicated issues were. So let's look at the Proposals. You can see that there were a few minor changes made there. We would do things like clarify language or correct punctuation, but mostly what we did was take out any reference to educational leaves. So you can see that the purpose, a complete proposal for sabbatical leave shall be submitted that was previously sabbatical/educational. So that's a change that we tried to make consistently throughout the policy.

Then as you looked at Priority Categories, what we did was to move some things around, take some suggestions that were made by previous committees, and put them in locations that seem to make more sense. So, at the end of the first paragraph, you'll see there that we've inserted, "A project supplemented by an external professional grant will be given special consideration for the items below." That had been at the end of those items below. So, we thought it was important to

bring that upfront, and indicate that that is a priority that any review committee is going to take into consideration. Then we shifted the formatting there a little bit. We made the first priority, “A project which will result in scholarly or artistic productivity.” Shifted, “A project designed to enhance performance in teaching,” to the second position. And then the third one remains the same. And then, the fourth one, we added the language, “and university assignment,” to the fourth one. “A proposal principally involving travel directly related to the faculty members proposed project for professional improvement and University assignment.” So that was something that came up in the discussion and we incorporated that into the language.

The Criteria Used in Judgement, there’s a simple correction of a typo there. And then we just made a couple of other simple punctuation changes in that section.

Then the Obligations came up. And we decided to try to strengthen that a little bit, because one of the problems that I’ve heard from colleagues who are directors and chairs is that they can sometimes have difficulty getting faculty members to turn in their report. And the report may not come in until they are applying for their next sabbatical, and so that makes it a little bit difficult. So we felt it important to indicate that within three contract months of completing the leave they have to turn in their report. Now we made it contract months so that if somebody completes their sabbatical in May, and continues to work over the summer, we’re not asking them to write their report, and turn it in, when they’re not on contract. So, if I complete my sabbatical leave in May, and come back then the following August, I’ll have about three months to get my report completed, and turn that in to the director or the chair. That puts a little bit of... that provides a little bit of flexibility for the faculty member. Then we added the clause at the end, “and consideration for future sabbatical leaves.” So that, hopefully, will be a good motivational... a driving factor that will get a faculty member to turn that report in in a timely fashion, because if they don’t turn it in in a timely fashion that can have an impact on future sabbatical leave proposals. So, that’s where those things come into play, and I think they’re pretty straightforward.

Now let’s look back at the section on Procedures. You can see that we’ve made a couple of simple changes, but some of them are more complicated. Anything, again, that referred to sabbatical/educational leaves was deleted, and it’s simply sabbatical leaves. “b” is the language that addresses individuals who come to us and are given a couple of years credit towards tenure. So that means there will be a five-year window. They’ve got their two years of credit, and there will be a five-year window, and then, within that period of time, they can apply for their first sabbatical leave. Then if you look at “c”, there’s a change in the language. Previously that read, “No person shall receive a leave more often than once in seven years.” And that was changed earlier to read, “No person shall receive a leave more often than once for every seven years of employment.” Well, you’ll see that we have tried to both clarify and strengthen that, with our language, “A person is eligible,” is eligible, “to apply for a leave,” it’s not a guarantee, it’s not an entitlement, we are, “eligible to apply for a leave after seven years of full-time employment and every seven years of full-time employment thereafter, although no academic employee may have

more than one sabbatical leave in a seven year period.” So that language is attempting to clarify how this works. You are not entitled to a leave every seven years no matter what. You are eligible to apply for a leave. So, that is something we wanted to clarify. And there was language that was provided by that earlier committee that was fairly dense, and didn’t work particularly well. Now in my copy of the mark-up there isn’t any indication of what that language was, it just simply indicates that there’s formatting issues, and so on like that. So let me give you a little taste of what that was. I won’t read the whole thing, because it’s a bit wordy, but you can get a feel for what it sounded like, and what initially we started to address last year. “In cases where an individual has not elected for one or more sabbaticals, or has had to defer one or more, for example, taking the first sabbatical in the eighth year after assignment instead of the seventh, taking the first sabbatical in the eighth year, and the second in the sixteenth, or in cases where an individual due solely to limitations in university or department capacity to grant one has been denied...” and it goes on for several more phrases, words. And the idea there was that they were trying to suggest that, alright if there has been a delay in taking a leave, then you can apply more regularly, you can apply more often for that. In fact, it suggested that you could do it as soon as four years. “That individual may receive a sabbatical leave sooner than seven years, after any previous sabbatical leave, but not less than four years after the previous sabbatical, or any other extended leave, so long as conditions in “c” above is not violated.” All right. So now we’ve got a situation where we’ve got somebody who has the ability to essentially bank a sabbatical leave, and that’s problematic. That you could... If you didn’t get your sabbatical leave in the seventh, eighth year, you could come back then and apply for another sabbatical earlier than that. So that seemed to be problematic, and it was unclear in this kind of dense language exactly what was meant. So we then received a suggestion externally for a simpler way of putting it, and it indicated that if you weren’t able to take a sabbatical leave in your normal cycle, that you’d be able to be eligible to apply in the fourth year following the previous sabbatical, until that faculty member was able to catch up. And again that’s the same thing. You’re saying, well, if you miss an opportunity to take a sabbatical, then you’ve essentially got one in the bank, and so you can apply within four years of your last sabbatical if you’ve got one in the bank, and we found that that was problematic. But then the language continued, and it said, “In no case shall any faculty member have more than one sabbatical in seven years, more than two in fourteen, etc. Eligibility to apply will not necessarily mean that a faculty member’s application will be prioritized.” All right. So we looked at that and that was influential in reconstructing item “c”, “A person is eligible to apply for a leave after seven years.” That’s been consistent with the policy throughout its history. And then every seven years after that of full-time employment, again, consistent with our policy. And then picking up on what the external suggestion was, “No academic employee may have more than one sabbatical leave in a seven year period.” Well, that seems logical too. So we determined that we could use this language as we’ve written it in “c”, and that would take care of all the issues. We had incorporated a version of the external suggestion, the simpler external suggestion in our previous mark up, but then we ran into the issue of... a question that had been asked back in 16-17 of which we were not aware, and it came from Milner Library.

They would like to be able to take (full-time staff who have faculty status) would like to be able to take a sabbatical, but the policy as written didn't seem to address their needs. You know, during the academic year they are locked in. They've got to be here for the students. The summer is a more relaxed period of time for them, and they were thinking perhaps we can do some sort of sabbatical leave over the summer. And they provided us, through some memos, with a couple of options. They did some research, looked at other schools, and laid out some of the options, and some of them were such things as extra pay, which didn't set well with the committee. We don't get extra pay when we're on sabbatical leave as faculty members, so that didn't seem to tie into our practice here, and the others had different ways of structuring it. So we played around with language a little bit, and essentially what we did then in "d" ("d" is the one that indicates the timing and the period of the leave) we decided that that was the best place to locate a reference to what the Milner Library staff needed. So if you look at "2", that's the language that we came up to address this, and we had an extensive discussion about how to work this. All right, "2" reads, "Academic employees on twelve month contracts, i.e. Milner staff with faculty rank, are eligible to apply for a 3 month sabbatical leave following the same time table." So, after seven years of work they can apply (full-time work), they can apply for a sabbatical leave, and those three months can be over the summer. And that means, then, that they're going to have an opportunity to do what, it seemed to us, they wanted to do: reserve their sabbaticals for that time when they aren't in as much demand in Milner. So, that is where that came from. Well, it was that that made us review the external suggestion for some kind of a... an accelerated process, where somebody could catch up on their sabbatical cycle over time. And as we examined that more and more deeply we realized that language such as, "although no academic employee may have more than one sabbatical leave in a seven year period," or as it was put in the external suggestion, "in no case shall any faculty member have more than one sabbatical in seven years, more than two in fourteen, etc.," that seem to take care of that problem. And we also noted that, once you've got your seven years, you are eligible to apply for a leave any time after that seven year period, so you don't have to have a specific waiting period, or a four year window, or a five year window to do that. You can apply as soon as you are eligible to apply. Now if you aren't successful in seeking one after... let's say that you are unable to secure one for your seventh year, and you reapply in the seventh for the eighth, and the eighth for the ninth, and so on, presumably you're going to be improving the quality of your proposal, and eventually you're going to get one. But you can only have one every seven years. So if in your tenth year you get a leave, then you are eligible to apply for a leave seven years after that, after you put in another seven years of work. So that seemed to clarify that, and make it clear that it's a seven year plan, that you can't bank, or put in reserve, sabbaticals if you're unable to take one, either because you chose not to apply, or you were delayed because of the number that were available in a given year, and those sorts of things. You're still eligible to apply once you have those seven years in. So, that's where that came from, and that was something that was driven by our review of how to handle the Milner situation.

Then finally in “e”, there we had a memo that came from a faculty member who wondered how one could handle a grant, because, as our policy states, if you’re going to be on leave for nine months, you get half pay. If the grant exceeds that half pay, then theoretically you cannot take that grant. You can’t take the entire amount of that grant. You can only take what equals your nine-month salary. So we had a lengthy discussion about that, and wanted to address that, and the language that we have there in “e” is our solution. “When an individual receives a grant (e.g. Fulbright, National Endowment, National Science Foundation) that is directly related to the focus of the sabbatical project, that person may be give sabbatical leave with pay and may accept the grant provided the amount of said grant allocated to salary plus the salary for the period for the sabbatical does not exceed the normal salary for the period of the sabbatical.” That’s been our policy all along. “The individual may be allowed to accept some amount as summer salary with appropriate planning and institutional approval.” So, what we’re indicating there is that you may be able to structure your plan for your sabbatical leave so that you can accept the full grant, but you do it in the context of appropriate planning and institutional approval, you don’t do it sort of on the QT, you’re straightforward about it, and you work with the appropriate offices on campus and with your department or your school. So, that summarizes the changes that we made and gives you a little bit of insight into why we made those changes. So, at this point, we can certainly open it up to discussion.

Senator Torry: On page three under Obligations, the very last sentence, “Individuals who fail to return to the university for one full academic year subsequent to a leave agree to reimburse the University for any salary paid during the leave.” Which I understand that takes care of revolving door and senioritis, but I would imagine there are circumstances where injury, something may occur, and I’d like to see some sentence referring to appropriate HR, where people can seek out disability leaves for things that are beyond their control. Because the way this is written is, I’m kind of stuck. I’m sure there’s things in HR that cover this, but I’d like to see a sentence directed towards... so individuals know where to look in case they’re in that situation if it should happen.

Senator Crowley: All right. If let me indicate... say this about it, those are handled on a case by case basis, and that a faculty member who has that unfortunate circumstance occur can certainly bring that to the attention of his or her department or school, and that can be addressed through the school or department with HR. My concern is that, if we put that into this, we’re going to have to start listing all kinds of potential situations. What might be simpler would be, if we’re going to put anything in there, just make it general enough to say that any unexpected occurrences that have an impact on the sabbatical will be handled internally, or something like that. Would that be enough?

Senator Torry: I guess I’m always for educating the person who reads this that there are options, whatever those are.

Senator Crowley: Okay. I’d be interested in other comments regarding that.

Senator Kalter: Looks like we have an expert witness over here. Dr. Catanzaro, would you like to move to the table?

Dr. Catanzaro: I appreciate that question. That would be unusual, but it would be an important situation. In that scenario, the individual would still be considered to have returned to the university. You know, there'd probably be a period of time where they would... almost invariably a tenured faculty member, which would almost always be a person returning from sabbatical, would have sick leave to run out, and FMLA, before they would go on disability, and to do that you'd have to be an employee. So the return provision would de facto be fulfilled.

Senator Trites: Thank you, Senator Kalter. I wish to thank the Academic Affairs Committee for their thorough review, and I wish to know the name of the Senator to whom I'm addressing since I can't see your name.

Senator Kalter: Crowley.

Senator Trites: Ah. Senator Crowley. Thank you. The esteemed representative of the deans sitting to my left has pointed out a discrepancy I also notice. In "b" a faculty member says... it says, "until he or she has completed five or more years," but in "c" in the very elegantly reworded "c", which is a very, very fine rewording, "A person is eligible to apply for a leave after seven years of full-time employment." I would like to point out on behalf of the department chairs, directors, and the deans that these two time periods seem to be at odds with one another. I would personally prefer to see the language seven retained to... because I do understand that when assistant professors apply in some departments, they are granted sabbatical, and when assistant professors apply in other departments, they are not. I would prefer that the committee please consider some consistency on that matter, because this is the very type of ambiguity that once left my own department in very great disarray on that exact issue. So please consider that matter.

Senator Crowley: Very well. Thank you.

Senator Trites: Thank you.

Senator Stewart: I'm just wondering, this is presumably a very unusual situation, but is there any mechanism for a faculty member who, say, already has a terminal degree (a PhD) but maybe is earning a second PhD. Perhaps you have a Chemist who's earning a Physics degree, Physics PhD, because they're hoping to expand their research in a very specific direction. Is there any mechanism for sabbaticals in that presumable unusual sort of situation?

Senator Crowley: My response to that, and I'm certainly open to correction from the Provost, my response to that would be that if the terminal degree has been earned, and the person has chosen to pursue a second PhD in another discipline because it's beneficial to his or her scholarly program, research program, that that, from my perspective, would not fall under sabbatical leave,

and educational leave, because it's closely related to the individual's research. I'd be interested to hear some other perspectives on that.

Provost Murphy: I would agree with Senator Crowley. I would want to be careful about awarding sabbaticals, because we have administrators and faculty throughout academic affairs who might, for example, decide to get an MBA because perhaps they want to be an administrator someday. I mean, I could see where it would be hard to play that out, and use sabbatical leaves for advanced education, that's not necessarily spelled out in the contract for which you've been hired. Now, I'm open to have the committee certainly discuss that, but I guess that would be my caution to be careful about opening that up.

Senator Topdar: So, just going off that point, so even if somebody was to not do a PhD, which you know would be very long process, I'm thinking more like a historian (and I'm sure you know there might be others in the room who might have similar examples that they could provide), but what if I want to, you know, learn about museum curatorship, and take a nine month long program. If we eliminate the provision for education leave, then how do I do that? Suppose I want to open an archive on visual history of South Asia, and I don't have the expertise for that, and I can go to, say, the University of Michigan which offers a nine-month Museum program. How can I fit that in while I keep my job?

Senator Crowley: All right. So you're talking about pursuing this certification, or this degree, and it is directly related to something that you want to do that is an extension of your scholarship, or is it a different field?

Senator Topdar: No. It's, you know, Museum Studies would be part of History.

Senator Crowley: Well, yeah. So what you're saying is that you want to take your work in History, and you want to get the education and background that you need to develop an archive in your subject area.

Senator Topdar: And that would be a public archive, you know, students can...

Senator Crowley: Exactly. So, that sounds to me like it would be directly related to your scholarship.

Senator Topdar: It may not entirely be. It could be very broad, right. I mean, if you're thinking about building an archive, it can be larger than my research project. Right.

Senator Crowley: Yeah.

Senator Topdar: So, in that case, how can we weave that additional qualification and expertise as part of professional development?

Senator Crowley: Susan, could you... either... Sam seems to have.

Senator Kalter: Senator Kalter. Yes. Dr. Catanzaro.

Dr. Catanzaro: Yes. Thank you. I think in such a case, it's a matter of framing the proposal. So, is the proposal to get a degree, or is the proposal to develop expertise and make contributions in a new area or sub-area, if you will. So, it is not uncommon, for example, for... and this is one example, for scientists to visit a lab at another university to learn how to use a piece of equipment that we don't yet have. And there may or may not be a formal certificate attached to that, but, you know, in the course of learning to use that equipment, or do that new kind of essay, or imaging procedure, they would also start a research program. So similarly, I could imagine a historian who's interested in developing an archive, visiting colleagues at an archive. Figuring out what are the methods I need to learn, and developing that research, and teaching agenda as part of the sabbatical. And the sabbatical proposal would be about that research and teaching agenda, not about a degree or certificate, which might result along the way, if it were available. In brief, I don't know that the policy needs to carve out a special niche provision. It's may be a matter of mentoring proposals that speak more directly to the purposes of the sabbatical program, if that makes sense. That's just one suggestion.

Senator Kalter: So right now it's 8:00, and I'm thinking that because we have guests in the room for the other Information Items, that we should put this one on hold. I hate to do that because it's been waiting for a while, but I also don't want Vice President Vickerman, and Chuck Scott, and Alice to be sitting here without being able to help us with our other things. So, let's put this one aside and we'll bring it back, unless we have time tonight. And move on to our Facilities Naming policy changes, Senator Marx from Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee. Thank you so much, Senator Crowley.

***03.02.16.03 Policy 6.1.37 Facilities Naming Current (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***11.01.19.02 Proposed Policy 6.1.37 Naming of University Facilities and Entity Markup (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***11.01.19.01 Policy 6.1.37 Naming of University Facilities and Entity Clean copy (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

Senator Marx: Okay. Policy 6.1.37. The members of the University Naming Committee in 2016 worked to revise the policy to better align with the desired practices of the naming of university facilities and entities, and to be in alignment with procedures. Our committee began work on this policy in the spring of this year, but did not complete its work until about two weeks ago. And I will now go through some of the proposed changes. The title is changed to reflect that the policy deals with the naming of both university facilities and entities, which are defined within the policy. The sections are now labeled with capital letters, and subsections with numbers, and some portions have been moved around to be in logical order and to make the policy easier to read. Another change is that the initial approval must be made by the Vice President responsible for a given facility or entity, or the Director of Athletics, if it's something within that area, where before it was the Vice President for Academic Affairs. In Section B, the composition of the



committee, which is appointed by the President, has been changed at the request of the President's office. Under the proposed new composition, most members are on the committee by virtue of the office that they hold, with only the appointed members being one faculty and one student that are subject to term limits. The committee is advisory to the President, who makes the final decision on the naming of four facilities or entities, with functional or general names, and all other namings require Board of Trustee final approval. And, with that introduction, the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee brings this policy to you for your consideration.

Senator Horst: Senator Marx, I was wondering if you considered having an entity whose name is being changed, such as a department, if you considered giving them a say in that decision? I was all in favor of the change that happened to our college, and I support it wholeheartedly, but it really made me reflect on what it means to have the name of your entity, which is really a definition of what the faculty are, being named and renamed. And I'm just wondering if your committee at all considered giving the faculty a voice in that decision?

Senator Marx: Within the policy, it's left up to the naming committee to seek input from those entities in making their decision.

Senator Horst: Did you at all consider having faculty representation from the entity being renamed as an ex-officio on the committee with a vote?

Senator Marx: No, we didn't.

Senator Kalter: Senator Horst, are you suggesting that they should consider that?

Senator Horst: Yes.

Senator Kalter: And Vice President Vickerman, did you want to say anything about that suggestion?

Vice President Vickerman: As far as having representation for faculty member if their department is affected by the change? We can certainly take that under consideration. Mostly, my involvement has been from the gift standpoint, as I chair it. So, looking at private gift support, but from a functional standpoint, certainly I know that there are opportunities to get input on the new functional name.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. Further questions or comments?

Senator DeGrauwe: Under the E, Procedure spot, underneath 3, Facilities or Entities Named in Honor or Memory of Specific Individuals, that paragraph, I just wrote "what?" next to it, because it was very hard to decipher, because I felt like there is just so many people you can send it to. I'm not sure if that would be able to be rewritten so it makes more sense, and I don't have to like try and understand what it's actually saying. Or, I'm not sure if I'm the only one that...

Senator Marx: Um. I'm not sure. If somebody wants to make a proposal that needs to be signed by ten or more members of the university committee, and that is then sent to the Vice President whose area that entity or facility falls. I'm not sure what's not clear.

Senator Kalter: Senator DeGrauwe, could you repeat again where you are? You're in number 3 on the third page, is that right?

Senator DeGrauwe: Number 3 on the fourth page. It's underneath Procedures, number three at the very top. I'm in the clean copy also, because I feel like it's easier to read.

Senator Kalter: Gotcha. Gotcha.

Senator DeGrauwe: I just... me doing a brief reading of this, it took me like five or six times to reread that paragraph to try and understand what it even said. That's just my opinion, so.

Senator Nikolaou: I had a question about the two co-chairs, under the University Naming Committee, because under A in the last paragraph, it says that it is the Vice President for University Advancement and then the Vice President responsible for that specific area. So, would it make sense then, the co-chairs to be the VP for University Advancement and the VP for that specific area? So that it mirrors what it said under the Authority? So, that was one question. And then I was also wondering, because, in the Authority, it starts talking about university entities and university facilities, if it would make sense to move section C about the Definition of Terms at the beginning of the policy, so that we know what a university entity is. And then describe who the authority is.

Senator Marx: I'm not sure.

Senator Nikolaou: So, these are two different items.

Senator Marx: Okay. The assumption that you're making is that the naming committee is looking at one proposal, when really the committee is set up to... it may consider any number of proposals that come along. The vice president that's responsible for the facility or entity is on the committee, and certainly has a voice, but they have to give the initial approval before it goes to the committee. So, I'm not sure what the issue is with that. Secondly, the definition of entity appears in the first section under... In A, I think. Yes. In the third paragraph it says, "The University may also have opportunity to name programs, institutes, departments/schools, centers, positions such as endowed chairs and professorships to be known collectively as 'university entities.'" So it's defined in that section there.

Senator Kalter: If I can make a suggestion there. So, we talked about that second one in Exec, and we were talking about how maybe we should start standardizing where we put our definition of terms. Either moving it all the way to the end of a policy, or putting it at the beginning. The next one coming out of your committee has them all at the end. So, maybe one thing that we could do is have them at the end, and then we were also talking about, gosh, we could move into

the 21<sup>st</sup> century and have hyperlinks, so that, if you want a definition of terms, you click on that, and it takes you to the end. Because I think, Senator Nikolaou, am I sort of iterating what you're saying, that either having them upfront, so that you know what the terms are, or be able to quickly access them?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. So that you can quick... because one of the other policies that we saw, it was at the end, and there was actually a sentence saying that, for the definition of the different terms used in the policy, look at the end of the policy.

Senator McClellan: Is there a reason why, like, under the University Naming Committee there isn't a person that has to do with diversity under here? Because I think that's an issue with naming buildings and other entities on campus.

Senator Marx: Can you provide an example of that?

Senator McClellan: An example, Watterson. All the floors are named after slave owners, so I don't think that's inclusive.

Senator DeGrauwe: So I believe what Senator McClellan was trying to say is having someone from maybe like the Diversity Advocacy. Someone from a different organization that brings in a different point of view than everyone else. I think that was the main point. Sorry if I'm over speaking.

Senator Kalter: This sort of gets to something that was brought up at Exec, which was a concern to have so many people so close to the President as the people on the committee, because you can see the change being made from the other people not being named as specifically the University General Counsel, Director of Athletics, Assistant to the President, et cetera, and then the possibility that all four of the Vice Presidents could be on the committee, rather than designees. And so, I think this is part of what you're bringing up, Senator McClellan, is that very easily, rather than having somebody from Diversity Advocacy for Student Affairs, it could be the Student Affairs Vice President, and so then you don't necessarily have somebody whose role is to think about the implications for diversity. Yeah?

Senator Wall: I kind of had the same point as Kianna, but I was actually going to suggest (or Senator McClellan, I should say) I was going to suggest that potentially move that into Section 3 the Facilities and Entities Named in Honor or Memory of Specific Individuals. And add a statement in there of the importance that the university is upholding their commitment to diversity and inclusion as one of the core values, just to basically reiterate that we shouldn't be naming university structures after people who violate our core values, whether that be diversity, or if we have someone who comes out and we find out that specific person was a known rapist. This information is, you know, valuable and maybe those names should be changed, so that, when they're thinking about this, they're not putting up statues or spaces in commemoration of those people.

Senator Marx: So, that sort of appears in the paragraph above section 4, where it says that the committee will determine whether the proposal is responsible, appropriate, and consistent with the governing document. But I suppose it could also include, you know, we could add in that it's consistent with our core values.

Senator Wall: [Inaudible] the governing document and there is really not much mention of diversity and inclusion. I mean, it probably says something about the core values, but if you control for diversity, there's not... I think it's mentioned twice, and it's really not like they will uphold those values. I mean I'm sure that's a component of it, don't get me wrong, but I just want it to be more explicitly stated, so that I feel like that way the committee is seeing that as a guiding opportunity for their decisions.

Senator Noel-Elkins: Just a small change. Throughout the document, it refers to Vice President (singular) responsible for programs and activities housed in the facility. We have many facilities that cover different vice presidential areas. It might be appropriate to have that be plural throughout the document.

Senator Kalter: Or potentially a (s).

Senator Horst: Yeah. In the first part of the policy, you quote the governing document, and you say the Board shall approve the naming of all facilities of the university. And then later on, you in section E under Procedures, you say they have final approval of facilities and entities. And I'm wondering why the Board got the power to name the entities?

Senator Marx: Yes. In the original... in the governing document, it's limited to facilities. In this policy, it's being extended to entities.

Senator Kalter: Senator Horst, I'm a little bit confused because at the end of my E, I'm on the mark up, oh no, actually it's at the end of number 2. Okay, so you're just above 4, "The Board of Trustees shall have final approval of the naming of facilities or entities named in honor of or memory of specific individuals." Do you see that, Senator Marx?

Senator Marx: Yes.

Senator Kalter: And so I think what Senator Horst is saying, this is sort of different than the one that came up in Exec where we noticed that entities wasn't where it should be. But, in other words, that this is now giving the Board... that one sentence is giving the Board final approval over the entities when it didn't have it before. Before it was that the naming committee recommended to the President, but really, right now the policy up until that point is saying that the President has final decision over the entities themselves. Do you see that?

Senator Marx: Within the Procedures? Is that what you're looking at?

Senator Kalter: Yes. It's in E. 3. At the very bottom.

Senator Marx: Uh-hum. Yeah.

Senator Kalter: It would just take a strikethrough for that.

Senator Marx: Right. In the first two, that involves functional and general names, and that's... the President has the final approval for those. I'm not sure if I see a conflict there. It's general or functional names for entities, not all entities.

Senator Horst: I would support the decision staying with the President and not going through the Board of Trustees.

Senator Trites: Just a point of information that brings me pride. Julian Hall was named after an African American chemist, Chemistry professor. The Julia N. Visor Center was named after an African American colleague that Senator Kalter and I both knew. Angie Milner, one of the strongest women in the history of Illinois State University, and of course, now we have a new name for the College of Fine Arts and the Department of Arts. I would like to point out that I support Senator McClellan's interest in seeing us celebrate diversity and inclusion, and I take great pride, both in what you've said, and the fact that we have made some strides (not enough) but we have made some strides in that area. Thank you for your good comments.

Senator Nichols: So, with respect to naming in memory of someone, at some point in the process presumably family or friends might be involved in that. Whose responsibility would it be to touch base with surviving family members and at what point would family be so distantly related that it... that obligation wouldn't be in affect anymore.

Senator Marx: Obviously, that's left to the Naming Committee and University Counsel is part of the Naming Committee, so I would suppose that whatever covers that within the law would be taken into consideration.

Vice President Vickerman: Yeah. Thank you. Just to comment on the previous statement, when we look at names, we do look at, is it meant to honor someone, if it's memorializing, and, if there is going to be any kind of name change, there will be discussion certainly with the family. That's what we're looking for, to get family to understand if there's going to be a name change, or if there's an opportunity for us to memorialize or celebrate someone's success and accomplishment at the University, we look to do that. That may happen through a grass roots effort of bubble up through a proposal, but we do want to contact family and let them know of any change, if that is going to take place. And I've been co-chair of this committee for a very brief time now, and that conversation had come up as far as what does happen if there is a proposed name change and who will we go to, much like the recent naming opportunity that we had for the College of Fine Arts. There is a certain amount of background check and research that we do before we put someone's name on a facility or a prominent entity even at this university. And that extends a little bit beyond the naming committee, but certainly we want to have conversations with those folks that are around. And I don't know if that's so much, and maybe General Counsel or

University Counsel would have comment on it, but I think, from our perspective, making sure, if there are family members, and people connected to the family as best that we know, and have been involved, that we include them in the conversation and thought process of any change or recognition that we'd like to bring to the family.

Senator Kalter: Further comments or questions? We're about 10 minutes to our hard stop time. 9, to be exact. All right. Thank you so much, Vice President Vickerman. Thank you Senator Marx. And we'll move quickly on to the new proposed policy... or the proposed new policy, University Facility and Space Use. I have a feeling that we're going to have to pull this over on to two nights as well, but do you want to start by introducing that and we've got Alice Maginnis from University Counsel's office, and I believe Chuck Scott is here for this one, right? Terrific.

***11.01.19.04 Proposed University Facility and Space Use policy (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***Proposed Facilities Use Policy Cross Walk (From Alice Maginnis- Legal)***

***10.30.19.01 Policy 6.1.7 Use of Grove Street Property- To be DELETED Markup (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***10.30.19.02 Policy 6.1.30 Homecoming Float Storage- To be DELETED Markup (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

Senator Marx: Okay. The proposed policy is one of the outcomes from the work of a task force appointed by the President last year. The task force was asked to review the use of University Spaces and Facilities and related First Amendment issues. The task force included representation from offices that manage facilities and spaces, areas responsible for campus security, safety, and risk management, the Academic Senate, Student Government, the Office of University Counsel and others. The new policy seeks the deletion of ten existing policies, and incorporates or replaces eight of those. The two policies to be deleted completely relate to the use of the Grove Street property, which is located in a residential neighborhood, and the storage of Homecoming floats. So, in your packets, we included a document called the proposed Facility Use Policy Crosswalk that explains how those various policies have been incorporated or referenced, and provide some commentary on the proposed changes. The sections mentioned in the crosswalk were originally numbered one through seven, and are now labeled with the corresponding capital letters A through F. In the proposed policy, you'll note that there are several places where an internet link is to be inserted, and in checking with various people recently, I believe the intent is to create a single website that includes procedures, contact information for those with approval authority, online forms, etc. Current websites and events management, facilities, and the Dean of Students areas do not cover all of the necessary information. And with that introduction, I now open up the floor for questions.

Senator Kalter: Terrific. Are there questions for Senator Marx? Or for any of our guests? Are you absolutely sure, you have no questions?

(Laughter)

Senator Kalter: They did a perfect job? This is good. All right. Seeing no questions. I just wanted to make a comment. Previously 6.1.4 and 6.1.14 (actually currently), those are Senate reviewable policies, the other ones have not been Senate reviewable policies. By folding these all in together, this one will become a Senate reviewable policy, because those two are folded in.

Senator Marx: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: And I wanted to thank Brent Paterson, who's not here tonight, the Assistant to the President, for forming this committee. Also Senator Marx, Senator Horst, previous Senator Haugo, and myself were all on this committee, and the work was really interesting, and really important to ensure free speech in our spaces, and a fair way of making sure that, when people ask for the spaces, they get those. All right. And we will bring that one back next time. And I think we're going to sort of blow through the Committee Reports. For the committee chairs, if you could send me your committee reports, and we'll send them out. And same for Communications, so we can hit our hard stop time. Actually, we've got four minutes, why don't we do Communications.

### ***Communications***

Does anyone have Communications for the Senate? All right, wonderful. Seeing none.

### ***Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Nikolaou***

[The Academic Affairs Committee met on October 23 when we had Jess Ray from the Office of the University Registrar to discuss feedback the Committee collected from advisors (undergraduate and graduate) across campus. The Academic Affairs Committee met yesterday (November 6) and we finalized the changes to the Student Leave of Absence policy and the Course Repetition(s) policy for undergraduate students, both of which AAC will be submitting to the Executive committee.]

### ***Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Senator Marx***

[The AABC met with Dan Elkins from the Provost's Office to receive and discuss the AIF Report. The committee had many questions and the discussion was quite interesting. We look forward to bringing the report to the Senate early in the spring semester.]

### ***Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Crowley***

[The Faculty Affairs Committee began our review of the annual reports for which we are responsible. Tonight, we completed reports from the FRC, the URC, and the Ombuds Council. We completed our review of four of the five subcommittee reports of the Athletic Council and will address the final subcommittee report at our next meeting.]

### ***Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Mainieri***

[The Planning and Finance Committee discussed a committee statement in regards to the issues raised by students and faculty in the Senate meeting on 10/9, continued work on reviewing

Policy 4.1.8 Program Priorities, and continued discussion of our current priority: Enabling more students to enter their desired majors.]

***Rules Committee: Senator Seeman***

[Rules committee met from 6-6:50 pm and discussed the University Curriculum Committee's charge revisions and the committee's structure/membership. We are going to continue this discussion next time.]

***Adjournment***

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