

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

2-19-2020

Senate Meeting, February 19, 2020

Academic Senate, Illinois State University

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

Recommended Citation

Academic Senate, Illinois State University, "Senate Meeting, February 19, 2020" (2020). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 1264.

<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/1264>

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

Academic Senate Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, February 19, 2020
Approved

Call to Order

Academic Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

Roll Call

Academic Senate Secretary called the roll and declared a quorum.

Senator Kalter: All right. Before Chairperson's Remarks, we have Public Comment. So, I'm going to ask Trish Gudeman to come to the microphone and give her remarks first.

Ms. Gudeman: Greetings, Senators. I am Patricia Gudeman, Office Support Specialist in the Sociology and Anthropology Department. I represent one of about 170 clerical or office staff on campus that are unionized and negotiating a contract currently. We are all over your campus, providing necessary services. Our contract with ISU expired on July 1, 2018. We have been trying diligently since then to work with ISU to create a better contract, one that helped get better wages and so help a population of our work force who have to rely on food stamps and second jobs to make ends meet. We have also been trying to get longstanding issues resolved within our contract related to the hiring range. It is bad enough that we are not able to get wages that are comparable to sister institutions, wages that provide adequately for a family of four.

However, to their credit, ISU has recently made an attempt to at least break the mold regarding increases, but the hiring range remains a matter of respect that is not finding resolution. Today we met with ISU and proposed a solution we believe is truly in all of our best interests. I ask that you encourage the Board and the President to accept our final proposal so we can end our 18-month dance. This is not by any means the best that ISU could offer, but it is a start, and we hope will begin to mend the troubled contract we have been under.

In addition, I would like to inform the Senate of what bargaining is like at ISU. It has been a show of direct opposition to the values that ISU holds dear: values such as respect, collaboration and social justice. Where better to show these values than at a negotiation table? Instead of creating an environment of collaboration and shared ideas, we are treated like the enemy. We have stalled negotiations where we've had to wait up to three months at a time for ISU response. We sometimes have to wait up to 30 minutes just for ISU to arrive to a meeting. Graduate Students have their own horror stories. Disrespect at the table, where we get comments like, "if you don't like it here, you can work elsewhere," and many more. We are disregarded. We don't even get replies to emails or requests to meet; silence and dismissal.

A university ought to seek hard to manifest all these values for all of its employees. So, I'm asking you to be a part of the change in the atmosphere here on campus in regard to union staff employment and negotiations. Thank you.

Ms. Forsythe: Good evening all. My name is Rebecca Forsythe and I am a Sociology Graduate Student and member of SEIU Local 73, the graduate workers union. I'm standing here today to urge you all to support and stand in solidarity with the graduate workers union as we negotiate a contract that holds the university accountable in treating us fairly as workers. We struggle with poverty level wages, access to affordable childcare, access to better healthcare benefits, and student fees payments, which comprise a large chunk of what we make each month. Meanwhile, some individuals at this university are paid in surplus. For example, in 2017 President Dietz made

\$383,121. For context, I made around \$10,000 last year for my ten-month contract as a teaching assistant. That means President Dietz made more than 38 times what I made in a year.

An international graduate student told us this past week that it was cheaper for him to travel home to Egypt to get a root canal than to receive a root canal here in Bloomington Normal, all because we do not have access to dental insurance. Further, our student's fees can comprise anywhere from 20% to almost all of our monthly income depending on the department we work for, limiting what we can spend on basic necessities like food and rent. My rent comprises half of my monthly income. Students like me are having to use food stamps and become beneficiaries of food pantries in our community to make up the difference. As we contribute countless hours both in and out of the classroom for the benefit of the undergraduate students and faculty, we demand that the university acknowledge our struggle, and quickly negotiate our contract.

We would also like to mention that we stand in solidarity with AFSCME Local 3236 Clerical union, who have been negotiating for more than a year and a half for a contract, and AFSCME Local 1110 Food Service, Grounds, and Building Service workers, who are continuing to negotiate for fair wages, along with any other unions on campus, who continue to fight for fair treatment and respect from Illinois State University.

In summation, I hope you will acknowledge our struggle and push the university to quickly negotiate a fair contract for the numerous teaching assistants contributing to the academic success of our students. Thank you.

Chairperson's Remarks

Senator Kalter: I want to start just by thanking the speakers for their comments. Although we do not know all the positions being taken on either side of the negotiating table, I think that it is safe to say that I and the rest of the faculty, speaking in my role, speaking as the leader of the Faculty Caucus of the Senate, support a contract that is fair to all the parties involved. The Senate does not have jurisdiction over union negotiations and the Executive Committee has determined most or all of our civil service policies to be outside its jurisdiction. However, it is clear that our AFSCME clerical workers in many units support the academic mission and the ability of our students and faculty to succeed. And it's quite clear that graduate students are an integral part of our academic mission. So, I hope that the union and the university can come to terms soon.

The second part of my Chairperson's Remark is I just wanted to let people know that there were reports two weeks ago that there were many cars off the side of the road, so hopefully it was a good call not to have Senate that night. The Senate office has offered to help internal committees that might have needed that night's meeting. You can take Cera up on her offer of help to schedule a meeting anytime between now and April, if you decide that you need that. But whether committees hold a make-up meeting is completely up to the committee chair and the felt needs of the committee.

The third thing is I want to say thanks very much to all of you who were able to attend the Senate's interview with the Provost candidates who were on campus this week and last, and/or made it to one or more of the forums, and also to those of you who watched the recordings and sent in feedback in that way. We will obviously be looking forward to hearing the outcome of the search and moving into a bold new era with one of these external candidates. I thought they all had impressive records and met us with down to earth ideas and strategies for moving ISU into the 22nd

century, as I was thinking about it, sort of long term vision. So, that's it for my Chairperson's Remarks.

Student Body President's Remarks

Senator Solebo: Good evening, everybody. I hope you all are having a good week so far. So, just a couple of quick things. So, the Mental Health Week for SGA went really well last week. We were able to touch a good amount of students. Going off of that, Black Table Talk, SGA will be collaborating with this group and it's going to be an event talking about black mental health. So, I would encourage you all to come, and to encourage other students to come as well, and that will be March 26th.

As for the Career Closet, there were a lot of students who were able to get a lot of professional clothing. And donations will be held in the future. There's going to be more details on that later on.

And wrapping up the year, please encourage students that you either teach or know to vote for the incoming association. Having the student input on who's going to be in the new association is so important. So, I encourage you all to encourage other students to vote. And with that I yield for questions.

Administrators' Remarks

- ***President Larry Dietz***

President Dietz: Thank you very much. I wanted to say thank you to all of those folks who attended the event with the Governor on January 30, where he came up to announce the money for the renovation of the Wonsook Kim College of Fine Arts. The audience filled the room. And there was certainly excitement and gratitude, I think, all around. There were three of our locally elected officials at the event, in addition to the Governor. I was also pleased that not only did he announce the release of the \$52.3 million for the project, but that also added to almost a nearly \$9 million that was released last year adds up to the roughly \$61 million for that project. It's been a long time coming, nearly 20 years total, and ten years since it was approved. And so, we finally got that.

I was also delighted for him to mention the renovation of Milner Library in his remarks. There was not a mention of release of funds for that, but that it had been approved on the capital list as well as an additional \$40 million for a variety of deferred maintenance projects, that, again, the money has not been released but he talked about those as being approved and those are all positive things. But he had a pleasant visit here. I know he was very impressed with the warmth in the room, both physically and from the audience, and that makes a difference to the elected officials. So, thanks so much for being there if you attended that event.

I also want to say in my remarks, I had it for two weeks ago, that we're going to have Provost candidates come to campus, and they've obviously been here. We had our last one this week. And the search and screen committee will be meeting this Friday, and I expect to have some feedback gathered by our planning office that compiles all of that. And I'll be meeting with various groups and going over all the material that you provide about this important position. I would agree, I think we had a very strong and diverse pool. And I'm looking forward to what you have to say about who we should move into this position.

Also want to mention that appropriation hearings have been scheduled, first part of March, I'll be going back down to Springfield, again. The first group that I'll meet with will be the House Appropriations Committee, followed by the following week the Senate Appropriations Committee. And we have not been give themes that we're to address yet, but they've been fairly similar for the last six years that I've been doing this, so we're preparing our testimony before that committee. I will mention though that one of the things that I'm going to continue to bang on with our local elected officials, as well as all of our elected officials, is the amount of funding that we get per student that we get from the state compared to other institutions in the state. We are clearly over \$2,000 per student less than the next lowest institution, in terms of per student appropriation. That simply is not right. And so, I've been trying to make that pitch for a long period of time. The difficulty is that the impression of that is that they look at the appropriations as a defined high, if you will, and the response has typically been that if in fact a slice of our pie gets to be a little bigger, who should we take that slice from? And my response to that is that first of all that's not my job. They've gotten us into that situation and they should take responsibility for getting us out of this situation. But there is a model in Missouri, where Missouri State University was in this same kind of situation and the State of Missouri is as Illinois State is in Illinois, in that they were also getting the lowest amount per student appropriation for many, many years. And the politics align differently in Missouri, and they were able to up their appropriation on a onetime special appropriation. And, I think, that's the direction we're going to be heading, rather than looking at, you know, the pie analogy, as to looking at a onetime appropriation and try to make this more fair for the university. So, that'll happen the first part of March, and I'll keep you apprised as to how those things went. With that, I'll stop and yield for any questions.

Senator DeGrauwe: On Monday, you sent out an email to the university and part of that email was talking about a new position to your cabinet, the Interim Assistant to the President for Diversity and Inclusion.

President Dietz: Yes.

Senator DeGrauwe: Does that position... right now Dr. Doris Houston has that position for two years. Does that position go away in two years or is that position going to permanent from now on?

President Dietz: My sense is that it'll be permanent. The reason of the interim position is that we will know more after a couple of years of working with that position and Dr. Houston helping further define that, and so I think the job description in the couple of years might be different than the one right now. But really looking forward to her contribution, she's been a champion of diversity and inclusion, has worked diligently in that area for a long period of time, and this will allow her to focus her complete attention to that. So, we're looking forward to it.

- ***Provost Jan Murphy***

Provost Murphy: Good evening. Just a few remarks. Dr. Craig McLauchlan has been named the Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies effective July 1. McLauchlan has served as department chair of Chemistry since 2013, and he will replace our own Senator John Baur who will be returning to a faculty position in the Department of Chemistry. So, Dr. McLauchlan has served as a mentor to over 40 students in his time at ISU. His research, which has been supported by grants from the National Science Foundation, and the American Chemical

Society, spans bioinorganic chemistry, materials chemistry, structural chemistry, catalysis, often involving vanadium-containing complexes. Please don't ask questions. That's all I know. It has something to do with vanadium, which is the best kind of catalysis, I'm sure. So, McLauchlan earned a bachelor's degree in chemistry from Harvard University, and his master's and doctoral degrees from Northwestern University. And he began his career at Illinois State in 2002. So, we're sorry to see Dr. Baur go (he's not sorry at all) to go back to the faculty, but we're excited to begin working with Dr. McLauchlan.

The General Education Task Force will be conducting focus group meetings with various stakeholders to gather perspective and experiences with the general education program. They're going to start with faculty focus groups, and Monday we sent an email out to all faculty inviting participation. There are only two sessions listed but they filled up immediately so there is a waitlist and they will be adding more sessions after spring break. So, we'll try to make sure we're accommodating the faculty who are interested in meeting to discuss general education.

We're conducting microaggression training for all units in Academic Affairs. Working with all departments and schools this fall, and then we'll hit other academic units over the summer. Dr. Cuenca-Carlino is organizing these workshops to be conducted by a team of trainers. These are three-hour workshops and they're done at the unit level. They're preceded by a survey to help customize training for the unit, and then they follow-up with a survey to see how those went, what we could do better, what we need to do the next time. So, I'm going to ask our faculty Senators, encourage you to attend those workshops as they hit each of your departments. I think there's three departments we have left to schedule, but 32 departments that signed up pretty immediately. And so, I encourage you to attend, encourage your colleagues to attend, and then encourage you to provide good feedback so that we can continue to try to do... kind of update and revise those as we progress through the plans that Dr. Cuenca-Carlino has. So, I think that's all for tonight.

Senator Kalter: All right. Wonderful. That is wonderful news about the AVP for Research and Graduate Studies, and I have to say that there was more than one candidate that would have been a wonderful choice.

Provost Murphy: Absolutely.

Senator Kalter: But he was certainly one of them. Do we have questions for Senator Murphy?
(Pause) All right. So, the only question left is whether the Chemistry department has a monopoly on that role or not. (Laughter) We do not have the Vice President for Student Affairs here tonight and so we go directly to Senator Stephens for Vice President for Finance and Planning remarks.

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

Senator Stephens: Thank you, Senator Kalter. I would like to focus my time this evening to address some parking changes at the South University garage pay lot. I have Nick Stoff with me, our Director of Parking, to address some questions that came from Dr. Mainieri, and I felt it would probably be easier for him to address those changes here, as opposed to send that through in an email.

Mr. Stoff: Thank you, VP Stephens. Thank you, Academic Senate. So, the first question that arose was, would you be able to provide some background as to motivations behind the changes, and

how are they communicated to the units on campus? The equipment at South University garage pay lot was past its useful life and had become unreliable. And installing the pay stations and utilizing the passport parking app that we already have on campus was a more cost effective way to operate the pay lot. New parks equipment, which is the equipment that allows you to pull a ticket, gate arms, all that good stuff would have cost between \$250,000- \$400,000 compared to the \$40,000 that it cost us to convert the lot to a pay by space lot. This change also allowed us to reduce additional cash handling in the field, which we're always eager to do, and I'm sure the auditors appreciate as well.

The office communicated the changes through the Parking Advisory Committee, through department listserv, direct email contact with the units utilizing our currently chargeback system, Twitter, signage in the pay lot, Vidette article, and an open house held on January 21.

Another question was, will parking services be able to provide some step by step instructions? Yes. We will gladly do that. Step by step instructions have been created and print outs are available on our website. If you go to the pay stations and pay by cell tab, under the parking tab, you will find printouts that you can click on. Also, when requesting, when a requesting department receives a validation code from our office, the step by step instructions, a map of the pay lot including the locations of the pay stations, and a validation procedure handout are attached to the email.

And finally, are there concerns about abused codes, if they get out. As they are used more often, how can that be monitored? If at any time a department feels that their code has been compromised, they can contact our office and we will have it deactivated immediately. We have that ability. Departments may also request a specific expiration date for their code so they know it's a onetime use and it's done. Units participating in new validation process will receive monthly statements as they currently do with the chargeback system that we had in place, and it will show the dates and times the validation were used, and they will be able to monitor their usage. What I'd like to end with is if there are any concerns with the new system, the validation process, parking for visitors in general, or any other parking related issues, please do not hesitate to contact Parking and Transportation directly, so we can address and work with you to solve any issues you might be having. So, I thank you for your time.

Senator DeGrauwe: With the old system that was in place, with the tickets, was there a maximum amount of time that you could be in that parking lot?

Mr. Stoff: No, there was not.

Senator DeGrauwe: With the new passport system, is that lot locked the two hours, like a lot of the other lots are?

Mr. Stoff: No, it is not. There is an eight-hour maximum with a re-up of another eight-hours. So, you can have 16 hours total.

Senator DeGrauwe: Thank you.

Senator Marx: The question that I have is that the fee is \$0.37 on the first dollar, 37%. I suppose that's a negotiated fee and was wondering if that would be reduced in the future and negotiations with passport?

Mr. Stoff: We certainly can look into that. The passport agreement was signed prior to my arrival so I'm not sure how those negotiations took place but we will certainly see what we can do to address that in future negotiations.

Senator Kalter: Further parking questions? (Pause) And Senator Stephens do you have other Vice Presidential comments? All right. Seeing none. Does anyone have any questions for Vice President Stephens about anything else?

Senator Stephens: Oh. I apologize, I do. I have Janice Bonneville here with another topic. I was thinking that you were going to introduce her so.

Senator Kalter: I will. That's actually under our Advisory Items.

Ms. Bonneville: There's more than Parental Leave.

Senator Kalter: Oh, there is.

Ms. Bonneville: Yes, ma'am.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Looked like Senator Wall, though had a question for Senator Stephens so let's do that first and then go.

Senator Wall: All right. I was just wondering, seeing that you oversee Finance and Planning as well as I'm guessing HR also falls under you, if you could comment a little bit on the statements we heard during public comment tonight.

Senator Stephens: Certainly. I appreciate the question. Our teams that are involved in negotiating with unions, we've got, I believe, 16 bargaining units across campus, and a very dedicated staff to that, not a very large staff for that, and we've got to align not just one agreement with each other but we definitely have to align our agreements in a way to where they're equitable, not only for the employee, equitable for the school. So, you know, unfortunately some agreements do start out and last quite a long time. In this particular case, both parties were negotiating given the initiatives that are necessary from both ends, and just unfortunately, it's taking quite a bit of time. But we're feeling pretty positive, as the comments she made this evening, that we're getting very close, and that the university's very dedicated to not only to this union group but also the rest of the unions across campus to make sure that we have a fair and equitable, you know, compensation agreement going forward. So, I'm optimistic. I hope we can settle this one, and all the other remaining ones that we have. We still have others that are outstanding, and we're continuing to try to manage as many as we can.

Senator DeGrauwe: Piggy backing off of Senator Wall's questions, one of the comments that really concerned me during public statement was the statement that they received the comments, "well, if you don't like it, you can work somewhere else." I'm curious if you're going to look into that, and I'm curious if you're going to look into how these conversations have been going and if they are respectful, understanding that there's two different point of views at all times, and making sure both are heard without just throwing them to the side.

Senator Stephens: Yeah. We will. It's never been a practice or policy of the university to ever negotiate from, you know, from those types of vantage points. What actually happens in some of the agreements is just the context by which terms and conditions are discussed. And will we as a university be able to meet financial terms and conditions that somebody that may want to work for a private corporation that may have much higher compensation levels than the university will ever have. To compare our organization and our compensation, even compensation at other institutions across the state or even within our region, it's not as... It's nice to compare that, but at the end of the day, you have to deal with trying to compare apples to apples, as President Dietz spoke to earlier. If we were able to get the state to increase our state appropriations to the levels that we feel they need to be, it would certainly allow our institution to make improvements, not only with these unions, but also compensation across all staff and faculty positions across the university. So, it's never been a practice, and it never ever will be a practice where we'll use any type of negotiating strategy that attempts to create a negative situation with the opposite party.

Senator Wall: Going off of that comment you just made about comparing apples to oranges, I believe, have we done any significant benchmarking with other institutions of similar size. You mentioned we couldn't compare within region or within the state, which I would agree, we are not University of Illinois, but could we compare to other equally sized institutions with similar funding sources and discuss and see what are they getting paid and the support staff over there getting paid, compared to here. Same thing with graduate students. Has that been something that's been a focus, or has that even been a consideration yet?

Senator Stephens: Our Human Resources team does compensation analysis on a daily basis. Whether it's with all positions, we're always constantly watching for market conditions and we try to reach those marketing conditions, compensation conditions, where we can. We've had a struggle and each year we would report out on our faculty, especially our full tenured faculty, that we are still behind from that perspective. We do a lot of research there, recognizing that we're behind that level and trying to work toward, but we still have limited funds, and limited opportunities, to address everything. But we have a practice to always try to provide data that gives us a reference by point, in order to make negotiations. So, we look locally. We look regionally. And even when we find places, for example, like the University of Illinois, they do have a significantly higher funding source. There is a compensation much higher there. They also get, we get \$70 million dollars a year in appropriations, theirs is about \$600 million, and so it's quite a difference. And so we'd love to be able to lead the market in compensation everywhere. We just, unfortunately, we just don't have that luxury.

Senator Kalter: All right. I'm going to turn to Ms. Bonneville for your remarks.

Ms. Bonneville: Thank you. I'll introduce myself. I'm Janice Bonneville. I'm the Interim Associate Vice President of Human Resources. I come to you this evening for a couple of reasons. One of which I know is on your agenda, but another one which I feel compelled to kind of give you some information about some things that are coming from us. There are a number of things that are coming from our office, particularly from the benefits area, that I think are going to be pertinent to all of you, as well as your staff. For the AP and Civil Service Council members that are here, after I speak this evening and as we gather more information, I'm happy to either come to your meetings or send Kelly Walker, my Benefits Director, to your meetings as well so that we can

go through some of these things. But essentially what's happening over the next couple of months are a number of changes or a number of initiatives for benefits that I think is relevant for everyone to know, and we're trying to get the information out as much as we possibly can, as we get the information into our office.

The first is long-term care, which I know that Senator Stephens spoke with you about a number of months ago, that we were going to launch a long-term care benefit for our benefit eligible employees and their families. So, it's a rather broad benefit. We're ready to kick that benefit off. In fact you should see the first of I think three emails about enrolling in that benefit if you so desire, coming here in the next week. It talks about: we'll be enrolling from March 2 until April 3. We have a group rate, but it is an individual contract between the enrollee and the company. It's not a payroll deduction, so you're able to choose what you want to enroll in or what you don't want to enroll in. There will be some underwriting required. They are open to employees who are eligible under CMS and the retirement system. There's spouses, partners, parents, including in-laws and step-parents, grandparents including in-law and step, children and siblings including in-law and step. So, it's very broad based. I know that when Senator Stephens talked about this previously some comment was had about a plan that the state used to have. That plan eventually sunsetted. It is available still for the individuals, who hold that plan, but because of changes that were made as far back as the passage of the Affordable Care Act, long-term care policies kind of took a backwards step in the market, and now they're coming forward again. And because this is not a benefit the state offers, we thought it was prudent from a university standpoint, to offer the benefit to our employees. So, that is item number one that's coming.

Item number two that's coming, conveniently at the exact same time, is the second dependent audit from CMS. So, those of you who have been here for a while and who have children may recall that we have a dependent audit six years ago. We started it... They started it at CMS. I apologize, I say we because at the time that this started I was actually at CMS, and we audited all dependents. They're going to audit again this year, except for natural children that were audited previously. So, all spouses or partners that are enrolled in the group insurance plan, as well as all children will be audited. Again, you'll have to provide proof of relationship with these individuals. If we have the documentation in our office and you don't have an ability to put your hands on it quickly, you can reach out to our office and we can produce for you what we have. Keeping in mind that for employees who have hired more recently, we're not going to have that documentation, because with the new online system that CMS uses, we don't hold documentation anymore. So, we may not have it. For spouses, or partners, marriage licenses, civil union partnerships will not be sufficient. They will require you to produce the tax return, because you may still have your marriage license in the exact same file as you have your divorce decree, so they want to make sure you produce your tax return. Okay. So, that's coming out as well, and it's going to overlap, so we want to make sure everyone's aware of it.

Two more things, sorry. Sick Leave Bank enrollment is coming in April, and that is directly pertinent to the item on your agenda, because I want to talk about Parental Leave and how that interplays with Sick Leave Bank enrollment. But Sick Leave Bank enrollment is coming the first part of April, before we get into Benefit Choice.

Benefit Choice is coming. And unlike the last six years, there will be changes this year. There will be significant changes this year. There will be changes to salary bands. There will be changes to premium costs for members and their dependents. There will not be changes to health insurance plans except that... rumor has it, there'll be another option. Okay. I say rumor has it, because CMS holds the information very close to their vest. My benefits team has a meeting with them next Tuesday. All of the universities are in this meeting. They're hoping to get some information, but we will not have the full information for benefit choice until the April 7, which is when the state will train the group insurance teams in the field. We will host a benefits fair here at ISU on May 5. I understand that is not a convenient time for faculty. I get that. We scheduled the date to guarantee that we would be able to have a fair with the vendors here before we broke after graduation. Thankfully we did. Because two weeks ago, CMS put a message out that said nobody can hold a benefit fair until May 22, and we said we already have one scheduled. So, we get to keep our fair. CMS is running fairs all over the state for the first two weeks of May, which is why they've locked everybody down. Okay. They've got a list out there, which means we could well have people here who don't work at ISU, because we're the place to come for the fair; But CMS will be here. So, it's very important that we're passing this information onto you, because if they do have significant changes they're going to present on them. We're going to ask them to present more than once, but we don't know that we're going to get that. So, I would ask that you share this information with folks, so that they know and they're paying attention. We know that when we send you the benefits choice email every year, you might not pay a lot of attention to it, okay, especially since we've gone so many years without changes. But I implore you, this year there's going to be a lot of them, and we need people to pay attention so they can come over and get the information that they need. Everything's going to be in Brown on May 5, from 9:00- 3:00 p.m. Once we have more information, I'm happy to share it with Senator Stephens or come back here as we get closer so you have even more information once we have it. But all of these things are coming in essentially the next eight weeks and we wanted to make sure you had some advance information that we could give. That's what I have, ma'am.

Senator Kalter: Great. Thank you. Do we have questions?

Senator Dyar: So will something be emailed out to faculty?

Ms. Bonneville: Yes.

Senator Dyar: Okay.

Ms. Bonneville: So, when we do the mass emails out of the benefits division, they go to all faculty and staff. So, we don't divide them up based upon classification, or anything, not enrollment. If you're benefits-eligible, whether you're enrolled in the plan or not, you're getting all of this information.

Senator Dyar: And when do those come out?

Ms. Bonneville: Well, the long-term care one should be coming out, I think, perhaps as early as this week is the first one. The DEVA message has already gone out, the Dependent Eligibility Audit email went out, I think, two weeks ago, but you should get a mailing at home from CMS if you are subject to this audit. The Sick Leave Bank enrollment will be the first part of April. So,

that will come out around the end of March as a reminder. And then, the Benefit Choice email will come out as soon as we can possibly put it together, once we get the information on April 7. So, we're waiting for CMS to give us everything, and then, once they do, then we will send it to you. We have some general idea. I don't know how many people here are familiar with that process or not, but the benefits that we have, in terms of cost and the way the plans looks, and out of pocket, and all of those things are driven by the contract between the State of Illinois and AFSCME Council 31. So, whatever the state agrees to with the AFSCME state level council is what everybody gets for health insurance. So, even though we don't negotiate health insurance in our contracts with AFSCME, whatever is at the state level is what comes down. So, these are changes to health insurance costs that were agreed to at the state level between CMS and the union, and those pass to us.

Senator Kalter: Further questions? (Pause) Can we presume that you're anticipating increases in the premiums?

Ms. Bonneville: From what we have seen, although we haven't seen the final contract, we expect on average \$13 a month for member only, and \$18 a month for dependents. We expect for employees that make, currently the salary bands top out at \$100,000 a year. They're adding a new band that goes to \$100,000 to \$125,000, and then there'll be \$125,000 and higher. Those employees will see another \$35 per person added onto their cost. The \$13 and \$18 I actually expect to come in at \$23 and \$36, because the AFSME contract has language that anticipated an increase on January 1, and due to some issues with the external vendor that CMS uses for health insurance, those increases couldn't go in. So, we expect... well, they couldn't go in because the vendor couldn't facilitate an open enrollment. And CMS can't just change the rates without giving an open enrollment under IRS rules. So, since they couldn't facilitate an open enrollment, our anticipation is the January increases will be combined with the July increases for one great number for us in May.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. If there are no further questions, we can move to our Advisory Item, which also features Ms. Bonneville. So, she is here to talk about the proposed new Parental Leave policy. So, Executive Committee talked about this, we determined that this is (at least for now) has been determined to be a non-Senate policy. In other words, it does not go through committees. Most of our HR policies do not, you know; there are a few exceptions. If anybody ever wanted to have this go through Senate, they would make an argument to the Executive Committee about why, and it would get re-discussed. But for now, what we're doing because it's a rollout that's going to impact a lot of people, hopefully in a very positive way, we thought it would be very important for the full Senate to hear about it as an Advisory Item and have a chance to have feedback. And I want to say before I forget, please do send the draft of this proposed new policy to your constituents. Ask them for feedback, collect the feedback, and if you can send that both to HR and to acsenate, so that we kind of have an idea of what that traffic is, that would be very helpful. So, I'm going to turn it back to Ms. Bonneville.

Advisory Item:

02.06.20.03 Proposed New Parental Leave Policy (Janice Bonneville)

02.06.20.04 Proposed New Parental Leave Application Form (Janice Bonneville)

Ms. Bonneville: Thank you. So, Parental Leave. We don't have a policy. Okay. It doesn't exist right now. What we do have is rules under FMLA that allow for parents to be off to care for children, under federal FMLA guidelines. Generally speaking, that means you have a more extended period of time for the birth mother, and then you have a shorter period of time for either adoptive parents or the non-birth parent, depending on the situation. So, however, in looking at what we do, and in listening to individuals that come into our office and say, but how can I not have parental leave, we looked at the policy and looked at the kinds of leave that we currently have available that we think we can do a better job of making available to our staff. So, right now individuals have Sick Leave, everyone on campus earns sick. Some individuals earn vacation time. And then, depending on the specific situation, individuals have access to Extended Sick, as well as the Sick Leave Bank. So, that's why this is important for us as we talk about this, as we move forward, for Sick Leave Bank enrollment. However, our rules for Extended Sick and Sick Leave Bank are very specific. Okay. Extended Sick is for the individual's health condition only. If you're not the birth parent, you don't have a health condition. Okay. Sick Leave Bank can be used to care for someone other than the employee, but there are some specific rules around the access to that Sick Leave Bank with respect to how you have to burn your own leave first. Okay. So, we're looking at a couple of different things, but the goal of Parental Leave is to basically open this access to change our policies to say, this time is available for you for all the reasons we currently give you, but also if you need to take a Parental Leave. So, for the non-birth parent who perhaps they just arrived, they haven't been here long enough to avail themselves of FMLA. So, FMLA takes a year of service and 1250 hours of work. Okay. We only work... the majority of our staff only work around 1950 hours a year. So, it's difficult to get to that 1250 if you haven't been here and you can't meet the year mark. Okay. So, it's important for us to be able to give folks access to the kind of leave that we already have available. Extended Sick gives 20 days, Sick Leave Bank gives 20 days, so that's 40 days of leave that is out there available for employees to use and we're just simply not... we don't have a mechanism built for them to get to it. So, the goal behind the Parental Leave policy is to give folks access to that leave. It is not a new paid leave. I understand that that would be a phenomenal benefit to give more paid leave than we already give. But we think the first step is to make use of the leave we already have available in policy, that's already been granted to us through the Board of Trustees, to be able to allow people access to time off so they can spend that time with a newborn, a newly adopted child, a child that has been added as a member of their family.

I did get some questions in advance that I thought that maybe I could just kind of talk about, or if you want me to stop and explain something more thoroughly than I already have, based upon your reading of the policy, I can do that.

Senator Kalter: Does anybody have any questions that they want to have explained more thoroughly before Ms. Bonneville addresses the questions that were sent in advance? (Pause) All right. Why don't you go ahead and talk about those questions.

Ms. Bonneville: Okay. So the first question asked about leave usage with respect to FMLA. So, the question was, "If someone has medical necessity, why wouldn't he or she qualify for FMLA?" Well, that is simply that one year of employment, and the fact that they haven't used their allowable FMLA time already. Okay. So, it's 450 hours of FMLA time is what's available to an

individual in the course of 12 month period. That's a rolling 12 months. So, everybody's FMLA measurement period is a little bit different. For reference, our office processed just short of 550 FMLA leaves in FY19. It is a very, very used benefit. Okay. Some of those are continuous. Some of them are intermittent. I have two staff that process FMLA, so 550 FMLA leaves in a fiscal year, and that number continues to increase. It hasn't gone down over the last few years. The other part was this was in the Leave Usage section of the policy. And I know there is an indication in that that for individuals who don't qualify for FMLA, the goal of the Parental Leave policy is to give them no less than 8 weeks, which is what the Sick Leave Bank and the Extended Sick Leave policy offer. Okay. Now Sick Leave Bank does require someone to enroll and give up a Sick Leave day, but by giving up that day, you get 20 back in return. Okay. That's the idea behind the bank, it always has been, that there's leave out there magically somewhere in the cyber world that says we can give people more leave. It's just a code in our system that says someone can avail them self of Sick Leave Bank time.

"Does 'as soon as practicable' include less than 30 days in advance?" So, this is the notice if you need to take a leave, and it does include less than 30 days in advance if the person simply can't give us 30 days if something untoward occurs, then we can start the FMLA leave with less than 30 days. Everything that we've done in the Parental Leave policy, as it relates to FMLA, is exactly the same as we handle every other FMLA leave. So, if an employee has an automobile accident, they can't tell us 30 days in advance that they're going to have that. Okay. We find out when it occurs, and we begin the FMLA process right from there. So, the same situation would hold here, if something occurred, obviously oftentimes in a pregnancy you know, but in an adoption you may not. Right. You may not know. You may get the call saying, congratulations, we have a child for you, and you're not going to know 30 days in advance when that call's going to come. So, we're trying to make sure that we treat this leave the same way we treat all other FMLAs.

"I don't understand the second provision under the FMLA in the application form." So, there's an application form as well. I'll assume that was shared with the group, Senator Kalter. Is that correct?

Senator Kalter: Yes. Yes.

Ms. Bonneville: So, this is a courtesy... so this has to do with taking continuous leave and converting it to an intermittent leave. This is a courtesy we do in our office with every FMLA leave. If someone is out on a continuous leave, when they return with a full return to duty, we automatically hold that leave kind of in abeyance as an intermittent, so that if something occurs and the employee needs to be off for that same care, or that same incident, they have an intermittent leave available to them. So, think of my car accident example. The employee's in a car accident, they break their leg. Well, they get released to come back to work, but maybe they still have to go to therapy. Okay. Maybe they still need some kind of treatment. So, now they have an intermittent leave in place that allows them to continue to use the FMLA time that they haven't already exhausted. If they've used all their time that's not available, but if they have time available it is available. We do that right now for the birth mothers that are out for the pregnancy leaves. Okay.

I have two on here that are... I think it might take a little bit more discussion so I'm purposefully skipping them right now, Senator Kalter, I will come back to them.

"What was the process that led to discussions in the policy, for example, some companies do not require the employee to run Parental Leave concurrently with FMLA leave? You can run them sequentially. Why does that not seem to be an option here?" Again, we ran this policy the same way we run FMLA. Under the FMLA law, it is the discretion of the employer, not the employee, to determine how the leaves run. In fact, an employee can specifically say I don't want to use FMLA time, and the employer can specifically say, but it's an FMLA leave, and we're going to count your FMLA time. Okay. That may seem a little bit unreasonable, but it is the way the law is structured to allow for the employer to determine when the FMLA time was run. You wouldn't be able... the question followed up to say, "wouldn't the smart employee figure out to run the FMLA first, and then run the other leave, and have 20 weeks of consecutive leave?" Again, this would not occur because the person's got to be FMLA eligible, except for the birth mother who may have a medical condition related to the need for the leave. The other parties that are eligible under the Parental Leave policy for FMLA leave would not have a basis to be off of work but for the FMLA right. So, that is... the policy is designed to run exactly the same as we treat every other employee on this campus, with respect to FMLA leave.

Senator Kalter: I'm going to pause and ask Senator Mainieri, because I'm not quite understanding that. I'm wondering if you're understanding that, that was your question. Right?

Senator Mainieri: I don't think it was. I don't know if it was or not. Can you, I'm sorry, that just blew my mind for some reason. Can you explain that again in terms of the Parental Leave and then the medical need for Parental Leave? I feel like we're interlacing these two things, and I'm getting confused. So, the previous question was, why can't someone, you know, add the Parental Leave at the end of FMLA. And part of your answer was the person would have to have some medical reason. But isn't Parental Leave for others without medical reason as well?

Ms. Bonneville: It is. So, for the individual who would have FMLA protected leave under this policy, unless that individual is the birth mother, that FMLA protected right to leave doesn't begin until the child is born. The only individual that would have the potential to have something begin before the birth of the child is the birth mother, because they would need potentially their own care, prior to the birth of the child. So, their FMLA leave may start sooner than the actual birth of the child. Okay. We encourage the birth mother not to start their leave if they don't have to, to use their normal sick leave, or whatever the case may be, for their appointments. But obviously if something occurs and the mother needs to be off, then they would be off in advance of the birth and that would begin their FMLA run time. So, then we would have to look at guaranteeing that individual a minimum of eight weeks under the Parental Leave policy, so that it's not to take away their parental leave right, because of complications from the pregnancy. Does that help?

Senator Mainieri: Yes, thank you.

Ms. Bonneville: Okay. I have some more still, before I get back to the other two. This one talks about the requirement that the individual burn their leave first. So, in the policy, it says that in order for an individual to remain in paid status while they are on the leave, they must use their own payable time. Okay. So, there is no other payable time except for your own payable time. So, I

don't want that section to be misconstrued to mean something other than, if you want to be off and be paid, you have to use some time to do that. However, I do understand that unlike Extended Sick... So, under the Extended Sick policy, employees are required to either use all of their sick time or 90 hours before the Extended Sick leave comes into play. For reference, 90 hours is what an employee earns in one year. If an employee has less than 90 hours, they must burn that time. If they have 90 hours or more, that stops at 90. So, 90 is the most that employee would be required to burn before they can get access to the Extended Sick. The Sick Leave Bank policy doesn't have that same limitation. It says you have to burn all your own time. We understand that's a concern, and we are willing to take a look at that policy moving forward. I don't... given the fact that we're rolling up on a Sick Leave Bank enrollment, we don't want to look at that policy right this second to say should we change all the rules with that. Okay. For two reasons. First of all, it's very close at hand. Second of all, that policy is derived from a Board of Trustees ruling many, many years before I was here, and many, many years, I'm guessing, before many of the people in this room were here. And so, before I commit to making a change of that policy we have to go back at how that policy came to be in the first place. There's another part of that policy that talks about how many days of Sick Leave you must have on the books in order to enroll, and it sets a minimum at five days. We want to look at that number as well and see if there is some opportunity to make some adjustments to that policy, so we can give more people access to that bank, for purposes of this new Parental Leave policy. So, those two things we can commit to, but for now we have the policies as they are written in order to move this Parental Leave policy forward. I can tell you, we have an individual right now who is chomping at the bit with my benefits director saying, is the Parental Leave policy going to get put in place so that I can take advantage of it when my child is born sometime later this spring. So, we're trying to get to that point as we move forward on this policy.

“Continuous time and no less than five day increments unless an intermittent schedule is improved by the employees department.” Follow-up question, “If a faculty member wanted to take six weeks of leave at home, and then come back on campus part time for service/ research obligations, could they spread out the remaining more two weeks of time, for example take every Friday off.” Yes. As long as the department is okay with the schedule, and if this particular individual is the birth mother, they have a release from their doctor that says they can come back to work after six weeks, we can do this. We do it all the time right now with moving the consecutive leave to an intermittent leave. So, that is absolutely allowable. For the individuals who aren't the birth parent, they can return to work without a doctor's release, and then they can work with their department if they want to take additional time off, in an intermittent basis to move through the Parental Leave. So, we're trying to make this as flexible as possible. We understand, we want to have parents home with their children as much as we can. But we also understand that perhaps maybe the mom's going to be home for six, dad's going to be home for two, and then he's going to take every Wednesday off or he's going to take every Monday and Friday off, or whatever the case may be, to be flexible. As long as it works with their department needs, the employee can take that leave. We leave that to a conversation between the department and our office.

And then, the last one is employees are required to use available time (I already talked about that one) and then one about concurrent with that leave (and we've already talked about that one).

The other two questions I have is one related to foster children, and one related to GAs. Okay. The GAs are not included in this policy. GAs don't earn any leave time currently, and for purposes of their absence from classes and/or work, the work absence is driven by what their absence needs are as a student. They're not driven by what their absence needs are as an employee. So, everything for a GA derives from their status as a student, not their status as an employee. So, if we have a GA who is pregnant, then the rules under the student handbook, and any rules with Student Health Services, come into play. There's this little thing called a Pregnancy Discrimination Act, so if a GA is pregnant and they need to be off work, they get to be off work. Okay. Just like any other employee would be. But for purposes of this policy, because there is no, currently—we are at the bargaining table with some GAs—there are no benefits, there are no leave benefits for GAs. They do not fall under the Parental Leave policy.

And the last question is about foster children, and the question is, “Why aren't foster children included in the Parental Leave policy?” And essentially at this point, at this juncture, foster children are not included in the leave policy because of the frequency and the short duration by which a foster child could be put into or removed from a household. So, to put that into the Parental Leave policy, it's a brand new policy, and it is open for revision at a future date. But to have a move where we're bringing foster children, potentially, in for a week, or two days, or three days, that do not end up being a permanent placement, after discussions in our office, reviews of other policies and reviews with the General Counsel's Office, it made the most sense for us not to put foster children in the Parental Leave policy. However, what we have done, because this policy requires changes to both the Sick Leave Bank policy and the Extended Sick policy, as we have expanded language in both of those policies that say if a staff member needs time off to care for a foster child that term will now be included in those policies moving forward, so that we can allow access to similar leave, we're simply not putting the foster child term in the Parental Leave policy.

Senator Kalter: Thank you.

Ms. Bonneville: Yes, ma'am.

Senator Kalter: I'm going to ask you about that last one. I beg you to reconsider. Your initial—I was the one who asked that question—your initial response was very receptive, and then, in the course of talking to your team, that changed. Doris Houston is one of the experts on campus about foster care, and I did ask her to look at that, and the assumption behind that with regard to short term and frequency, as well as the need to bond with foster children, which is known in the literature to be extremely important. So, I think, personally, I think that it's discriminatory to make that distinction, and I think there are ways that we can word our policy language that mitigates against what the university is concerned about, but also honors the relationship between a foster parent and a foster child, and could potentially make those fostering situations more stable. So, I wanted to make that statement, and to let you know that I asked Doris if she had comment. She wanted to get comment back to me today, obviously she's been busy this week, so, did not get that, but hopefully we'll have that for you at some point.

Ms. Bonneville: Okay.

Senator Kalter: Do we have other questions for Ms. Bonneville?

Senator Mainieri: I don't have a question, just a comment in response to all that information. I really appreciate all the additional information, it gives good context as to what the office thinks in terms of this policy right now, and I'm hopeful that some of the things that you've been saying are that this isn't the end of this discussion, and I would just urge that it not be the end. I'm so pleased to see that we are considering and have a Parental Leave policy here in front of us. But I think that we can do better, and I think that particularly running it concurrently with FMLA, and burning sick time, in some ways penalizes parents who then also have other things come up that they then need to use FMLA or their sick leave for. So, I'm hopeful that this is just a start to this discussion and that we can consider some of the bigger changes as we move forward.

Senator DeGrauwe: With the conversations going on with GAs about benefits and all those long slew, if for some reason they are granted benefits, do you foresee the policy changing to include them in the Parental Leave? I know you touched on that a little bit, but incoming students and employees, it's a wishy-washy topic.

Ms. Bonneville: Yep. It's a difficult response to give because everything is driven, as I said, by their status as students first. So, it's a difficult... I don't want to commit to you here one way or the other here because I don't think that would be fair to you, until we know how things will progress at the bargaining table.

Senator Evans-Winters: I just think that I would be remiss also not to follow up with your comment about foster children in foster care or being foster parents. I mean, keeping in mind that the State of Illinois has one of the highest foster care placements in the country, and where we're located, we are always in need of foster parents. I think that we have a very limited notion of who a foster child is and who foster families are. So, I just wanted to go on record, and also to concur with you, that we really need to reconsider that policy. It's not fair and it's biased. And I'm saying that as a licensed clinical social worker.

Senator Kalter: Further comments or questions? (Pause) All right. Thank you so much. And thank you to you, your team, Senator Stephens, for the policy itself. I think everybody thinks it's long overdue and it's really great that we're seeing it at all.

All right. I'm going to switch things a little up here in terms of our order of events, because we do have two guests that have come. So, I'm going to go all the way down to the bottom of the agenda, first to go to the Grants and Contracts discussion which is currently under an Information Item. So, it's just the session when we talk about questions, comments, concerns. Janet Goucher has come to help the Faculty Affairs Committee if they can't answer the questions that we might have for them. And she is from the RSP, the Research and Sponsored Programs Office. She's sitting back in the chairs here. And I'm going to turn this over to Senator Crowley who I think is to my left.

Information Items:

02.01.18.19 Policy 7.4.1 Grants and Contracts CURRENT (Faculty Affairs Committee)

01.28.20.01 Policy 7.4.1 Grants and Contracts Mark up (Faculty Affairs Committee)

01.28.20.02 Policy 7.4.1 Grants and Contracts Clean (Faculty Affairs Committee)

Senator Crowley: Thank you. And thanks to Janet for coming tonight to help us out with this. The FAC reviewed the policy as soon as we received it and were highly impressed with the clarity and the focus of the revisions that were made. It improved the policy substantially, from our perspective, brought it up to date, and so we had no hesitancy whatsoever about approving the

policy and passing it on. And any questions that you might have, I would like to direct to those who have more expertise in the development of the policy and the revisions that we reviewed. And that would include, obviously, Associate Director Goucher and Senator John Baur.

Senator Kalter: Questions on the changes to this policy? (Pause) You'll be happy to know that I warned Janet Goucher that that may be the case, that nobody would have any questions. So, thank you for making the trip to help us out. Going once. Going twice. Are we sure we have no questions? Excellent. I agree with Senator Crowley that this is much improved. So, thank you very much for your work on it, and for your team's work on it.

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

01.23.20.03 Policy 6.1.37 Facilities Naming Mark up (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)

01.23.20.04 Policy 6.1.37 Facilities Naming Clean Copy (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)

Senator Marx: We brought this policy before the Senate as an Information Item. There were several comments made here in the Senate about the policy, which we took it back to our committee. I had a meeting with President Dietz to discuss some of the concerns that the Senate had. And those included, perhaps some kind of a way in which people associated with an entity to be as proposed to be named would have some voice in the decision. Secondly, whether the Board of Trustees would need to approve the naming of entities. And thirdly, a specification that individuals or corporate sponsors should be representative of the core values of ISU. So, taking all of that into account, we did revise the propose policy (policy changes), and you have before you the current mark up.

Senator DeGrauwe: I think it goes without being said that any policy here at ISU or anything that we do at ISU should uphold our core values, so the fact that that was written in is a great thing, but I do believe that it would be more beneficial to add a person on the committee, either that being the newly appointed interim chair to diversity and inclusion or maybe the assistant dean Dr. Christa Platt for the Diversity Advocacy, Because I feel like we can always put in the paper that we want to go with our core values, but unless we have someone specifically there that's making sure that we are going with our core values, we can always miss it, and those two are, I believe, the biggest... like should be one of our major focuses to understand that we're not missing that topic itself.

Senator Kalter: I'm wondering if Senator Dietz or Dr. Paterson have comments on that, because this has obviously been going through the process before the naming of an Interim Assistant to the President for Diversity and Inclusion. Does that seem like a friendly amendment... it's not in amendment phase right now, but does it seem like a friendly suggestion to you?

President Dietz: Sure. I think Dr. Houston might have the broader view side of that, being assigned to my office. And so, it's not any demeaning of Dr. Platt at all, I just think... perhaps, either one of them would be fine, I think, with me. Brent, I don't know if you have anything, but I think Dr. Houston might have a different broader view. But either one would be fine.

Senator DeGrauwe: Just for clarification, are you saying that you're okay with adding the position to join the committee?

President Dietz: Sure. That would be if everyone thinks that a good idea, sure.

Senator Horst: I recall you saying in Exec that you considered having notification of an entity that was being renamed, and you considered consulting with them but that was not possible. Did you consider having either a faculty or an administrative representative from an entity that's being renamed on the naming committee?

Senator Marx: Yeah. The committee is a standing committee, and they certainly would be consulting with units and individuals within those units that are proposed to be named, as I understand it, that would be a normal practice. The issue is whether or not the entity would then be able to have some say in whether or not the name would be accepted, and that seems to be not a possible thing. That the whole process of working with donors and negotiating, and it's a long process of developing those relationships. It's not possible to include that kind of... like a veto power, that's what I was talking about.

Senator Horst: You're saying that the entire faculty group couldn't have veto power. Is that what you're saying?

Senator Marx: Correct. That the...

Senator Horst: But what about the idea of having like a faculty representative and an administrative representative from an entity on that naming committee, if they're considering renaming that faculty entity? How about having them as an ex-officio on that committee. If you're going to rename CAS, don't you think the dean of CAS should be part of that decision and vote on it?

Senator Marx: As a voting member?

Senator Horst: Yes.

Senator Marx: No. I don't believe that's going to be possible. The people in the entity such as the dean, chairs, and so forth would be consulted by the committee, and would have input to the committee. But as a voting member, I don't see that as being workable. But I can leave this for Dr. Dietz to respond to.

President Dietz: It's difficult trying to talk in the abstract about all of this. If we had a specific kind of case that we were working on... The other difficulty comes with that is the confidentiality that a lot of donors want to have around whether or not they're going to be making a gift. So, I can't imagine a circumstance though where... say we're naming a college, where the dean wouldn't be involved with that. If we're naming a school within the college where the head of that school wouldn't be involved in those kind of discussions. There are times that you can't divulge everything that the donor wants to do, because they don't want you to do that. And if you begin going down that road, you're not going to have a donor in many instances. So, it's a... I understand what you're saying, but I don't have a concrete way of addressing that, other than to tell you that in working with donors over the last many years, they're all very, very different. But I

also don't think that many donors would want their name to go onto something that the people that are teaching and working in that particular unit would be opposed to them having their name on it. So, I don't think it's... it's not clear cut, but I think it's where judgement enters in, and, you know, I have faith in the folks that would be on this committee, and the people that are negotiating with donors to make sure that we're not creating an embarrassing situation for the University or for the donor.

Senator Horst: I appreciate the part about the confidentiality, and that's why I'm suggesting that it would be limited to, for instance, the administrator and perhaps a faculty representative. But I would think that if you, for instance, to make it a concrete case, if you wanted to rename a college and the dean was against it, and they were not included, and they didn't have a say in that, I mean, they'd basically de facto have to have a vote in that. I don't see how you could rename a college without having the dean sign off on it. So, I would just suggest that I think you could limit it to an administrator and a faculty to keep the confidentiality, but I can't envision having an entity such as a college renamed without having the dean having a voting say in that.

Dr. Paterson: If I may speak, I want to go back to some of the changes that originally came about and why they came about, because I think it partially addresses your concern, Martha. The current process is that the recommendations go up to the President and then to the Naming Committee. And we wanted to change this process so it came up through the Vice President responsible for that area, with the assumption that the Vice President or in the case of Athletics, the Director of Athletics, would have a better understanding of how a college, or school, or department might feel about a naming, would have those conversations with the dean or director, or chair, before it would come to the Naming Committee. Personally, I can't imagine a situation that it would come all the way through a process without a dean, if it's a college, or a director or chair if it's something in a school, to the Naming Committee when that dean/director/chair would be opposed to it. I guess that could happen, but we tried to establish a process where all that would be addressed before it would come to the Naming Committee.

Senator Kalter: Do we have further questions, comments, suggestions? (Pause) All right and I'll just remind everybody of the existence of amendments when this comes back as an Action Item, we can have a debate on that. Since we're still in Information, I'm going to move up to the Program Priorities that may eventually become the Institutional and Program Priorities and go to Senator Mainieri for Planning and Finance Committee.

10.12.18.02 Policy 4.1.8 Program Priorities CURRENT COPY (Planning and Finance Committee)

01.30.20.01 Policy 4.1.8 Institutional Program Priorities MARK UP (Planning and Finance Committee)

01.30.20.02 Policy 4.1.8 Institutional Program Priorities Clean Copy (Planning and Finance Committee)

Senator Mainieri: Thank you. I tried to provide some context in the comments to understand how the committee reached the changes that we did. We consulted with the President's office, who also got feedback from the Provost's office on these changes. When the policy first came to us, and we first did the reading of the policy, we couldn't really make heads nor tail on exactly what the intention of this policy was. So, as a committee, we went into the archives to look at the committee minutes and Senate minutes from the origins of this policy, as well as two other times during the

Senate history this policy has been brought up, to better understand its intentions. And so, the changes that you see here are trying to make the policy into something that makes a little bit more sense and basically says that if institutional or program priorities are being made that the Senate needs to be consulted and have input in those priorities. And so, we referenced our Memorandum of Understanding and the Constitution and the Bylaws of the Academic Senate which also enumerates our scope, as well as explaining the idea from the program priorities to institutional and program priorities, because the meaning of program has changed since this policy was written in 1971. So, those are the main changes that we made.

Senator Horst: Thank you for your changes. I looked at the Memorandum of Understanding and I'm wondering if there's wording that was dropped when creating this policy. You say, "The Academic Senate shall be the primary body to recommend educational policies of the University related to academic issues, faculty affair issues, and educational issues." The Memorandum of Understanding actually says educational issues related to student life, and I think that's an important clause. So, I'm wondering if that just got dropped.

Senator Mainieri: Thank you.

Senator Horst: I would suggest adding that back in. And then, I was wondering if you could talk about the word specific priorities. You say, "When facts of the disposal of the administrators indicate specific priorities, these should be fully aired in the Senate." Would you talk about that wording, please?

Senator Mainieri: That is wording from the original policy, and so we as a committee didn't have any issues with the way that was worded. Basically, talking about if there are priorities that are being discussed that Senate needs to be involved with them. So, that's not wording that we as a committee really had an issue with or changed. But if there were specific questions...

Senator Horst: Yeah. Well, again, I'm looking at the Memorandum of Understanding, and it just says that the President will communicate with the Academic Senate concerning any rationale from modification or rejection of our recommendations. And I don't see any limitation on, like, they come to us with specific priorities. It's just a general sense of communication, and I'm just wondering if the Memorandum language is stronger.

Senator Mainieri: From our reading of the genesis of this policy, it really was focusing in on priorities, making big changes on campus, and so I would say this is looking at something that's more specific than the MOU, but we can definitely discuss that.

Senator Horst: Because the Memorandum is 1999, I'm wondering if this document was in place and then the Memorandum came along. I just think that's very strong wording that we have in 1999, and this seems to limit it.

Senator Mainieri: Thank you.

Senator Kalter: I'm actually going to argue a little bit against that, because to me the sentence that begins "as such" is encompassing the general. So, "As such, University administrators shall consult the Academic Senate when making significant institutional and program priority judgements," etc, etc. Then it says, "When facts at the disposal of administrators indicate specific

priorities, these should be fully aired in the Senate.” We have just gone through a terrible budget crisis in the state and there were public institutions that were literally ranking their programs, which ones would get cut first, like their majors etc. I think that we need to keep something about specifics in there even if we added something in there, like, in addition when facts at the disposal, or something like that, to clarify that those are two distinct thoughts, but I think that that first sentence tends to cover what Senator Horst is getting at, but that it would be a mistake to take out the word specific.

Senator Horst: Thank you.

Senator Ferrence: It’s not so much a question but a comment. But I thought for the larger body here, when we were working on this, I found it very interesting that we were trying to clarify things that were said in 1971-1972, and we actually reached out to an ex-Senator from that time asking for them to explain what they meant by what they had stated that were in the minutes. So, just keep in mind, for you Senators here, 40 years down the road somebody might be getting back to you. (58, Can’t do Math).

(Laughter)

Senator Kalter: I just wanted to say that I thought the Planning and Finance did a great job, partly because they went back to 1971 and to the people there. So, thank you very much and we’ll see that, again, as an Action Item in two weeks, hopefully.

Action Items:

01.09.20.13 University Curriculum Committee charge Current Copy (Rules Committee)

01.09.20.05 Undergraduate Curriculum Committee charge Mark up (Rules Committee)

01.09.20.04 Proposed Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Clean Copy (Rules Committee)

Senator Seeman: Yeah, this is my first time doing this, so. It’s been awhile, it was back in January since we didn’t have that last meeting. So, we made some minor changes over all to the University Curriculum Committee. So, a lot of things were just some terminology, there was things like a recording secretary and executive secretary, so we simplified some of that, and replaced it simply with secretary, Provost designee. And then, we made some other changes to make it more consistent with other external committees of the Academic Senate, reorganized description of membership, and how officers are selected. And then, added language about staggered elections. So, that was the majority of our changes that we did. And we added a function about, concerning appeals for rejected program proposals.

Motion by Senator Seeman, on behalf of the Rules Committee, to accept the revisions to the University Curriculum Committee charge.

Senator Seeman: We wanted to add a friendly amendment to the changes. And so, last time on the floor when it was as an Information Item, Senator Kalter, brought up the point that some of the Functions spelled out in this document perhaps we needed to add the work undergraduate to a number of those items. And so, we went back, since there was a little bit of time, and tonight we looked at that with a little bit more detail, and it looked like if we added that term undergraduate a number of times to the Functions, that we noticed that there were a couple of Functions in there that seem to be more global in terms of would apply also to graduate curriculum as well as

undergraduate curriculum. And so, I know the other change that I didn't mention is that we proposed to change it from University Curriculum Committee to Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. And so, now we're kind of had proposed to strike that and keep it as University Curriculum Committee, although it would reduce the confusion on people that make Graduate Curriculum change thought they had to always go through the University Curriculum Committee, but it seemed like there were some important functions, and I can point those out that may be more applicable to all curriculum changes not just undergraduate.

Senator Kalter: And so, to extend that, one thing that we talked about was that that doesn't mean that it will never turn into the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee but that we decided that there were some things that needed to be worked out first that had to do with the Graduate Curriculum Committee that we couldn't do immediately, but we might as well make the other changes and then go back to the question of the title of the committee. Is that accurate?

Senator Seeman: Correct.

Senator Kalter: Okay.

Senator Seeman: Correct. So, it may evolve that this committee is an external committee of the Senate, and my understanding the Graduate Curriculum Committee's not. So, some of those functions seem like this was the only place for that kind of communication with the Senate leaving that alone. So, that was kind of the mindset on that, with the discussion tonight.

The motion was unanimously approved, with the friendly amendment.

Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Nikolaou

Senator Nikolaou: The Academic Affairs Committee met this evening and we finalized the Withdrawal policy we saw last time, and the Religious Accommodations policy. And we started talking about the Textbook policy.

Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Senator Marx

Senator Marx: The committee met this evening to discuss the results from the survey on the President's performance, and we're working through analyzing the data.

Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Crowley

Senator Crowley: We reentered our discussion of the Sabbatical policy revisions, and had a highly productive discussion, largely in part to contributions made by AVP Catanzaro. Did a lot of research over the break and consulted a number of his colleagues, brought that information to us, and it made things a lot more clear, and gave us a stronger direction to address all the issues that were brought up in a previous discussion.

Rules Committee: Senator Seeman

Senator Seeman: Yes. Rules had a guest speaker tonight; Shari Zeck from Milner Library came over to give sort of her input in terms of the changes to the Milner Bylaws. So, that was pretty much all we did.

Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Mainieri

Senator Mainieri: Covering what we did tonight, we received responses from the administration in regards to our 2019 Priority Brief: Increasing the number and value of student scholarships and

financial aid. So, we discussed what the next steps for that priority brief are. And then, we almost agreed on what our next priority that we will be tackling will be.

And then, on behalf of the committee, coming around to you now is a copy of a statement that I'd like to read on behalf of the committee.

“As explained in Appendix II of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate, the functions of the Planning & Finance Committee of the Academic Senate include:

Evaluate the progress made in allocating campus resources (both new and reallocated) to the University's highest priorities as defined in its academic and capital strategic plans.

Review overall institutional planning including staffing plans, external relations, and co-curricular programs such as intercollegiate athletics, residential life, and student life.

The members of the Planning & Finance Committee have reflected on the concerns raised by students and faculty members during the Academic Senate meeting on October 9, 2019 in relation to our committee's charge. We respectfully request that the University administration consider two of the outcomes of this reflection process, explained below.

We heard from the students and faculty members on October 9, 2019 that they hope that the campus community can take steps to be more proactive to issues of diversity and inclusion. As we heard from students and faculty members that evening, minoritized students, faculty, and staff on our campus crave safe, inclusive physical spaces that reflect the University's core values of Diversity and Inclusion, as outlined in *Educate • Connect • Elevate Illinois State 2018-2023*. Decisions related to space and location allocation, facility design, and facility renovation can serve as strong indicators of our institution's commitment to these values, if consideration of diversity and inclusion is infused from the outset and throughout the decision-making process. In consideration of the above, the members of the Planning and Finance Committee request that these considerations be given priority as future facility decisions are made. In doing so, celebration of diversity and commitment to inclusion will not be restricted to one building on campus; but rather be infused throughout all of our spaces, ensuring that minoritized students, faculty, and staff feel safe and welcome in every space on campus.

The members of the Planning & Finance committee also see a unique opportunity to take a proactive approach to diversity and inclusion as the University moves forward in developing the engineering programs at Illinois State University. We know that the field of engineering is one of many fields in which women and minoritized groups are underrepresented. As a result, we urge the administration and campus community to ensure that the values of diversity and inclusion are built into the engineering programs during all aspects of the planning process, including, but not limited to: administrator selection, curriculum development, student recruitment and retention, faculty and staff hiring, faculty and staff development, and building design. These considerations would allow the engineering programs to be proactive in building a diverse and inclusive learning environment and in preparing future engineers to be professionals dedicated to those values in their own future work. In doing so, the engineering programs could provide a model for university-wide efforts to infuse the values of diversity and inclusion throughout all of our learning spaces.

We recognize the complex factors involved in both facility management and program development and appreciate the administration's consideration of the above items. In her message to the faculty on October 21, 2019, Provost Murphy aptly stated, "We all must commit to change our University for the better. I invite you to reflect on what it means to gladly learn and teach in the 21st century, and to join me in seizing this opportunity to make a positive difference for our students as educators and citizens." The members of the Planning & Finance Committee put forth the above items in the spirit of Provost Murphy's message and are eager to be part of the solutions that will make a positive and lasting difference for our campus." Thank you.

Communications:

Senator Geoffrey Campbell: As a follow up from what Trish was saying earlier for her public comments, I wanted to give a personal statement on behalf of my wife Stephanie who is a former employee of Milner, and she was also represented by AFSCME. So, back in May, she made her decision to leave ISU after more than a decade of service at Milner. It was quite a heartbreaking decision for her to make. Her time is even longer than that if you consider it what she did as a student employee. With her leaving ISU, we lost another alum as an employee. Milner, which sorely needs racial diversity, lost its only Latin American employee. And Sigma Lambda Gamma also lost its RSO advisor. So, you're probably wondering what leads such a dedicated Redbird to leave. Right. So, for our family it was a choice between staying at ISU or the possibility of having a second child, so. Many of you are parents as well and you know the cost of childcare, right. So, with childcare costing, you know, up to or more than \$1,000 a month per child, her take home pay was \$1600, doesn't even cover two children, right. So, even after being at Milner for a decade, having double majored at ISU, getting her masters at U of I in Library Science which is the most prestigious in the nation, she took a job at the University of Illinois. And in the same job classification, same position title, you know, which are the same across the state, she earns 40% more now. So, I understand there is a disparity between ISU and U of I but 40% is quite a difference, right. So. Trish said in her email from a couple of weeks ago, before we were snowed out, of the disparity, I think that's pretty glaring, in my opinion. So. When you hear that departments may or may not have the money to do that, keep in mind things like Stephanie's replacement was hired in at a higher rate than she was with less experience, and I know that also true of many other employees. So, the replacements start at a higher rate. I have friends who work across campus who joke about quitting their job so they can apply to the vacancy just to earn more money. I know our struggle was just about childcare. I think other families out there are dealing with much more. With the contract expiring 18 months ago, I think, I would like to see more leadership from President Dietz and Vice President Stephens on the matter. I think it's gone on long enough. That all.

Senator Kalter: Thank you, Senator Campbell. Do we have further Communications?

Senator Baur: Three Minute Thesis tomorrow at 6:00 p.m. at the Normal Theatre. In an hour you can see, I think, nine presentations of graduate students and their theses, and it's a really fun and fast paced event. Hope to see you there.

Senator Kalter: I can testify to that. It's really fun.

Senator Mainieri: Next Wednesday in our beautiful Campus Recreation facility, we are hosting Adaptapalooza from 5-6:30 p.m. This is an event that celebrates recreation that can be inclusive to everyone. There will be a Paralympian there as well as a wheelchair racer. It's a great opportunity to learn about therapeutic recreation and all that they do to support everyone, everyone's pursuit of recreation. And for those who are faculty, if it aligns with your course learning goals, they will have stamps available. So, if you wanted to offer incentive for students to go, if it aligns about your course learning goals, if you're talking about accessibility and things like that, there is an opportunity for that.

Senator Hollis: Hello everyone, my committee, the UPB the enrichment committee, we're having an event this Monday it's called Check your Privilege, we will be bringing Tim Wise here. He is an anti-racist educator and writer. It's from 6-8:00 p.m. in Braden Auditorium. And so, I encourage you all to attend as well as encourage your students to attend, Because as we all know this is a topic very prevalent to the campus climate. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: All right. My communication is that the Caucus that follows this meeting is going to be very short, I hope, I believe, and do we have a motion to adjourn?

Adjournment

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