

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

3-4-2020

Senate Meeting, March 4, 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, March 4, 2020" (2020). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 1265.

<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/1265>

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, March 4, 2020
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: Wonderful. We have a quorum. Chairperson's Remark is very short. And I'm going to repeat it at the end of the meeting. And it just is have a great and well-earned Spring Break when you have one. So, we'll go to Student Body President Remarks.

Student Body President's Remarks

Senator Solebo: Good evening, everybody. Just a couple of quick things. So, we held our elections this week. So, the new incoming association will be taking these seats in April. And we're working on transitioning right now. So, just making sure everybody's comfortable with their new positions. And as we wind down this year, please just remember the Success Week policy. And just make sure that you're enforcing that, and not assigning anything above 10%, the week before finals to make sure your students aren't extremely stressed out, because it's already a stressful time. And with that, I yield for questions.

Senator Horst: Can you announce the names of the who was elected?

Senator Solebo: I can send that in an email, but I don't have the names off my head.

Administrators' Remarks

• ***President Larry Dietz***

President Dietz: Thank you very much. I too, want to wish everyone a safe Spring Break, and some rest, and come back ready to go after the break. I have a couple of information items today.

Yesterday, I appeared, as did Vice President Stevens and Vice President Murphy at the Senate Appropriations Committee in Springfield. That was well attended, and I want to tell you that ISU was very well received by the Senators. We are generally well received, but this year, we were very well received, and that they were very complimentary about all the good work that all of you do here at the university. I have given a presentation talking about all of our success stories and a couple that I pointed out to them that's in our metrics of excellence, but one is that 93% of the students who are enrolled in Illinois State University are from Illinois. So, I continue to bang on the idea that we're an Illinois public university, and we're educating predominantly Illinois students.

And I was quick to also mention at the end of my remarks, that despite all the successes that we've had, whether you're looking at recruitment, retention, faculty, productivity, and research, the low amount of student debt that students come out of here with, all the other criteria that most people would look at as being positive, that we're doing all that while we receive over \$2,000 less per student than any other public university in the State of Illinois, and people were writing that down. We noticed folks taking note of that. And then I said, our sister institution to the east of here has gotten great press by claiming that if a student from a family that makes less than \$61,000, they can go to the University of Illinois free. I said if we got another \$2,000 per student, I would venture to say that we could blow that \$61,000 figure out of the water completely. And so, there never has been a funding formula. Now, you've heard me talking about that before. But the current funding is just flat unfair for ISU. We're knocking it out of the park by most measures that other people would think would be the kind of criteria that we ought to have to be a successful institution, both in terms of student performance, faculty performance, staff service, etc., and yet we're getting \$2,000 per student less, and that's simply not fair. And so, I offered to be able to sit down and talk with them about a formula that, one, a formula just generally, but any kind of a funding model that would be more fair than the one that we have. And so, I'm going to continue to advocate for that. We're working on a plan with our local elected officials that would put together a bit of a proposal that would try to address this. And we've also included information on our presentation yesterday that talked about how many students are from their various districts, that's what elected officials look at, is how does this impact me in my potential election, so we're sharing information with them about how many students are in their districts, and how many alums that we have in their districts. And so, they did take note, whether or not they're going to do anything about that, I can't predict that. But we're going to continue to advocate for that. And I will tell you, this was my seventh time to appear before this group, and it was the time that they were the most flattering about this university. And I say kudos to everyone in this room who've been involved with shared governance and to many, many people who are obviously not in this room for the good work that you do every day. It's not been reflected in funding. But I'm telling you that that group that of Senators yesterday were very, very impressed with Illinois State University. So, I'm always proud to represent this place but yesterday was... even prouder yesterday.

The second thing related to that, it wasn't in the testimony yesterday, but I do know in terms of funding that the Governor would like to increase the general operating budgets again by another at least 5% for this next year. And that's fallen on, you know, really positively with all of us that hopefully he'll be able to do that. Some folks are targeting that with the graduated income tax. And so, we're saying if... many people are saying that unless that passes, there probably won't be the 5%. So, don't go out and spend 5% that you don't have yet. And some people are skeptical as to whether or not that graduated income tax will pass. But at least there's movement in that direction, and there's no conversation at all about not having a budget again. That's music to our ears, so, and having a budget that's going in the right direction, which will increase our budget would really be terrific. So, yesterday was a good day in Springfield.

The second thing I want to talk about is not quite so positive, and that's the Coronavirus. I've spent a lot of time, and a lot of our staff have spent a lot more time than I have, trying to grapple with this issue of the Coronavirus. I was on a conference call on Monday with presidents and chancellors of public universities in the state, and again this afternoon, and everybody's struggling with kind of what to do, but they're, I think, we're all in kind of similar situations. And I think we're taking fairly similar stances but much of this is going to be day by day kind of a situation as, you know, we struggle trying to contain the Coronavirus and then trying to find some kind of vaccine for that. But I want to read something that will contain some information. And I don't want to go off script for fear of either leaving out something or not being accurate about this. So, I want to read something. And then, Eric Hodges is here tonight with us as well. And Eric is our Director of the Emergency Management Center. And he and many other staff members, both across Academic Affairs, and Student Affairs, out of my office, and also in Finance and Planning have all been working on all of this. So, here's the statement, and then I have a couple of other additions that I'll make, and then I'll open this up for a Q&A about anybody that has any questions about this, and Eric is here to help with that.

So, here's the statement. "The university has been monitoring the progress of the Coronavirus across the globe since January, and began to work on contingency plans should it spread. The Incident Management Team under the direction of our Director of Emergency Management Eric Hodges began meeting daily last week as concerns heightened for students in study abroad programs in particular. Our immediate concern was the safety of students in countries with a CDC (Center for Disease Control) travel notice of two or higher. China is ranked at a four, Iran is at a four, South Korea's at a three, Italy's at a three, and Japan's at two. Fortunately, we do not have students studying in China or Iran or South Korea this semester, which means that we do have people studying in Italy and Japan. University strongly recommended, an email that I sent out this week, that students studying in Italy and Japan return home from those countries. The study abroad office has had regular communications with students studying in Italy and Japan over the last week, including emails and Zoom meetings. It is my understanding that most, if not all, of these students have chosen to return to the United States at this time. The Provost office is working to assist these students in being able to complete this semester. One of the institutions in Florence, Italy is moving their classes online so students can complete those classes. In other cases, we will need the assistance of faculty to help these students complete the courses that they are taking. We do not want a student to lose the semester because of the situation. The university has not canceled University related international Spring Break trips. All of those are going, as far as we know. None of the planned trips are going to the CDC travel notice two or higher countries. There've been a couple of trips that have been canceled by the... because countries have canceled the in-country tours. So, we've had a couple of trips that have been canceled, but for the most part, the Spring Break study abroads are leaving. We have some, I think, that are actually leaving tomorrow. Based upon CDC travel advisories though the university is restricting all University related travel by faculty, staff, and students to countries with the CDC travel notice two or higher outbreaks for the foreseeable future. As I said earlier, the incident management

team continues to meet daily to continue to develop plans to address a potential outbreak on campus, and we are working closely with the McLean County Health Department on protocols. And in addition, a number of work groups have been formed to further plans regarding academic continuity, enhanced cleaning potential, employment benefits impacts, Student Health Care housing, dining, research continuity, and other large events.”

So, to me, the bottom line is that Spring Break plans are going as had been planned, other than to those high-level countries. And right now, summer study abroad, we're having discussions about that. And I would fully expect within the next day or two, we'll take a position on summer study abroad programs. So with that, let me stop, and see if Eric would mind coming to the table. And, Eric, do you want to make some statements feel free? And then, if you have questions, several of us have been involved in those discussions, certainly Provost Murphy. I'm seeing Katy Killian over here from Student Affairs, Sam from the Provost office, as well. L.J.'s been involved. Dan's staff has been involved. Brent Patterson from my office has been involved in a lot of those. Legal Counsel's been involved and on and on and on. So, we've had a lot of people around the table on trying to figure out how to deal with this issue. But let me turn to Eric. So, if you have some statements you'd like to make.

Mr. Hodges: Sure. So, we actually first started meeting about a month ago on this. And we met weekly for about three weeks until the issue started getting a little bit bigger about a week ago, and we decided to start meeting daily. So, we do have a group of nine or 10 people, it's a core portion of our Incident Management Team that is meeting every morning, going over anything that happened yesterday, overnight. So, we do a bit of a briefing to get ourselves up to speed, and then go over any of the topics that we need to cover that day. And then, hand out assignments or any sorts of to-dos to folks in our various work groups. And then, off we go from there, and let people do their work throughout the day. So, the work groups, we have about 16 of them that we formed, and they do represent areas all over the institution that are each working on their own plans, contingency plans, guidelines, on how their areas might address different contingencies that could come up. So, my job is to try to coordinate all of this, and one big piece of that is getting good information, and good guidance. And to be perfectly honest, that has been tough. From our federal partners and our state partners, the messages and the guidance to all of us has not been very consistent until about yesterday afternoon. That's when we saw the guidance really start coming together. And leading into today, we have a lot better idea of what the public health officials are expecting of institutions of higher education. So, I think we're in a lot better position today in terms of past forward. That's kind of a high level overview. Any questions?

Senator DeGrauwe: Question for Senator Dietz. If a member that was overseas... were students that were overseas given any sort of financial aid, if they had to come home a lot sooner than early than a... like what they thought before. So, like, if it was May, and now they're coming home next week, it's going to be a lot more expensive. Did the university plan to help out with any finances for that?

President Dietz: We have... the answer's yes. We made some offers. The issue is that it's going to vary by student, and vary by, in many instances, vary by carrier, airline carrier. Most of the airline carriers are becoming more flexible with change fees and those kinds of things. But for those students who we're trying to bring home now, and the numbers are not huge, I think we had 14 from Italy and a couple from Japan, thereabouts. So, we're only dealing really with about 16 students. I talked to colleagues from University of Illinois today, and they're trying to bring home 800. And so, the magnitude is obviously a lot different there, but we've offered to help with up to \$1,000 per student to try to get a ticket changed or something of that nature. But we're going to need some documentation and you know, those kinds of things where we have offered financial assistance. Now, having said that, I asked the question of my colleagues today, are the rest of you offering anything to students that you're trying to bring home, and University of Illinois was not on that part of the call. My understanding is that they're considering that, but none of the other public universities are offering, at least at this point, any financial help. We thought that would be a good faith gesture to try to help those students get home

Senator DeGrauwe: On the same guidelines. If for some reason this summer study abroad does get canceled. I'm not sure if students already started the payment process. Is their reimbursement policy, or have they only just done a deposit. Do you know the policy on that?

President Dietz: That's part of the discussion that we're having right now. Students are in different places on that. Some are beginning to pay a portion now. And every day that we wait to make an announcement about that, there are other dates that are coming up that would want them to pay more. And so, we don't want to delay that, but for fear of that, then if the thing gets cancelled. I do know that we have some students who've paid for a summer experience in full upfront. I'm not sure what we're going to be able to do with that. What we would love to do, because there are different groups that we contract with for these different experiences. While we would love those organizations that we're contracting with to do is what one has offered to do, which is to say, if this is cancelled now, that you would have, you know, the next year to go on the same kind of excursion, and so that's a pretty good faith effort. I would imagine there'll be some that won't offer that. And there's usually language in those kind of contracts that say that there... some will not have any refund at all. So, that's a worst case scenario. But right now, we're just trying to determine where folks are on that. But I fully expected in the next day or two, we'll have an announcement about that.

Senator Wall: This is actually kind of a question for you, Eric. I know you might not be able to share this, especially given just how, like, fast this has evolved. But is there anything you can share in regards to a plan if a case were to occur? Or maybe even the better question is when a case is to occur on this campus?

Mr. Hodges: So, we're actually meeting with the McLean County Health Department tomorrow afternoon, specifically to talk about those various scenarios. What... and it's not just if a case is on campus, but what if a case is off campus? What if the cases in the community? So, we're

going to ask a whole series of those kinds of “what if” questions tomorrow, now that the guidance has gotten a whole lot better on what the response would be we’re in a position to ask those questions, and I think they’re going to be able to give us some good guidance. So that’s going to be tomorrow,

Senator Wall: I guess. And then, the response to that. Do you foresee it even possible for the university to operate in an online functionality such as the Italian organizations or the universities Senator Dietz was speaking on?

Mr. Hodges: So, the university has a pandemic response plan. This isn’t a pandemic yet, but there is a response plan that was written in 2009 for H1N1, and one of the biggest things that’s changed between then and now is the IT component. It is so much more capable than it was back then. So, one of those work groups that we have up and running right now is specifically tasked with that question. So, it’s a partnership between Administrative Technologies and Academic Affairs to look specifically at what courses can go online. What courses can’t go online? What accommodations can we make on the IT side? If for whatever reason we needed to go down that road. So, there’s a group that has been working on that for several days now, actually,

Provost Murphy: Thank you so much. I would add to what Eric is saying, that tomorrow morning, we have a 90 minute meeting with chairs, directors, deans, associate deans, a group of probably about 70 to start to look, to think about how would we move classes online? What classes could go easily, what classes would be difficult, but it’s still possible. What areas might we need Zoom classes, you know, how could we help a student who has been quarantined? Or how can we help a faculty member who’s been quarantined. So, our goal is whenever possible to keep a student moving forward, to keep them on track in the classes that they’re registered for. But we need a lot of information from our faculty, from our chairs, directors, to start to even decide how best to move forward and do that. But truly, our goal is to support the student and to make sure that we’re keeping the student moving forward. We also have to think about what would happen if the university shut down for two weeks or four weeks, you know, what are the resources we don’t have yet? What do we need to start to move, support for faculty farther ahead. So, we think that these are the starts of some really good conversations that we’ll have with all of the department chairs and school directors so that they can come back and start to ask those questions and have those conversations with their faculty.

Senator Kalter: Are we looking there for also for fall 2020 and spring 2021?

Provost Murphy: I think it would be whenever. So in other words, you know, I’m hoping that this, you know, if there’s a good thing that’s come out of this, it’s going to force us to plan with even more detail, because this may not be the last time that we have to worry about an incident like this. So, it’s a great question.

Senator Solebo: So if a student were to contract this in the dorms, is there a plan for that as well?

Mr. Hodges: Yes. So, if a student that lives in residence hall gets a positive assessment, then they actually don't leave the hospital. So, if they end up in the hospital with the signs and symptoms of a Coronavirus and a test is indicated, they wait there until tests come back one way or another. It's usually about 24 hours since we have a lab in-state now. And if it's positive, they will wait in the hospital for those 14 days to come out. But they will not go back to the residence halls.

Senator DeGrauwe: I'm not sure if the Student Health Services has the appropriate rooms. I don't believe we have the negative pressure rooms. So, is there... is the staff being trained to, like, for the questions or like is our website being trained? That if they are answering yes, I have this, yes, I have this, yes, I have this, to go to the hospital instead of going to Health Services.

Mr. Hodges: Yeah, so the Student Health Services does have the questionnaire that comes from the health department. So, they know to screen people and ask those right questions when it's time to do that. Both on the phone, which is their preference if somebody is concerned, their preference is that they call them rather than show up in person, wait in the lobby and all that. So, that instructions are already on the Student Health Services website.

Senator Degrauwe: I know a lot of when, like, as a student, whenever I make appointments, I make it online through their website. So, is there a way that on that website, a few clicks, like the red flags, it'll tell you do not make an appointment, go to the hospital?

Mr. Hodges: I don't know that but I can reach out to them and ask that question.

Senator Kupitz: Yeah. What are you doing about the students who are refusing to come home from those countries? Are you having any problems with that? Or is it just...

President Dietz: No. We haven't had anybody refuse.

Senator Kupitz: Okay.

President Dietz: One other comment I'd like to make, and we had representatives from our INTO partnership group that helps us recruit international students here. We have an annual meeting with them and that INTO group was on campus last week. The CEO of that organization is from the UK. And we were talking about this issue and they literally have staff all over the world. And as we were talking about this. He said, you know, the frustration is that you have to take this seriously, because it's obviously a safety issue minimally. And the fatality rate on this particular virus is higher than the usual flu. But he said in the UK, they had 19 cases that were reported in the UK. And the percentages, I remember is about a 6% fatality with this virus right now. Am I right on that, Eric?

Mr. Hodges: The World Health Organization, finally published the number last night, they call it 3.4%.

President Dietz: Okay. But his point was, let's use round numbers and say it was 10%, which is three times the rate. So, you get to a point of two people potentially losing their life out of the 19 cases that have been reported in the UK. And that's, you know, that's loss of life. So, that's a serious issue. But he said last year alone in the United Kingdom, 15,000 people lost their life with a common flu. So, it's a contextual issue, but it's a safety issue. And it's impacting all of us. So I'm not sharing that to diminish the seriousness of what we're dealing with here. But I think that it's a little bit out of context, in some respects, when we're dealing with this in a very serious way. My hat's off to all the folks that have been around the tables that have been hashing all these issues out. And I do think that we'll have a position in the next day or so, hopefully, by the end of the week, which would be the next day or so, on the study abroad issue. For the summer, summer study abroad.

Senator Midha: Just a clarification from Mr. Eric, when you mentioned that, yes, we're in a better shape than yesterday, what you meant by that.

Mr. Hodges: So, what we know now, finally, we have some alignment from the Centers for Disease Control and the Illinois Department of Public Health, what happens when a traveler returns from one of those level three nations. So, when they make their way back in the States, it was really back and forth for a couple days on what would happen. So, now we know what will happen. When they come into the states their first port of entry, so their port, or wherever that may be, they'll undergo medical screening and a travel questionnaire. Based on that, one of two things will happen. If they're symptomatic, they'll be given a 14 day mandatory quarantine period, which will be an order from the CDC, or if they don't show any signs or symptoms they will be allowed to continue on to their final destination with a 14 day voluntary isolation in place. And where that translates to us is they will have to stay at home wherever their home is, not inside the residence hall, but wherever their permanent home is somewhere else, and not come on campus for those two weeks, for that 14 day period.

Senator Midha: (inaudible)

Mr. Hodges: Yes, it was. That was 48 hours ago, that guidance was all over the place. And now it's nice and clear. And all the agencies are saying the same thing. So, we can share that. And we have. We've shared that with our students, specifically in this case from Italy, that are coming back from Italy.

Senator Midha: Thank you.

Mr. Hodges: Sure.

Senator Pancrazio: Yeah. It's very unfortunate, but I want to speak also, specifically for the students that are planning to study in our study abroad program in Bologna, which is a new one. That if the situation continues, it's unlikely that those students will be able to do that and it's tragic. At the same time, those students have a plan of study that they want to be able to finish;

they're minors. And what I perhaps, being that Senator Zosky is here, perhaps sending some encouragement to that department to look into the ability of Plan B, so that those students can finish that, and perhaps having an Italian camp on campus might be an option, so that they can finish that degree. Because that's a small program, but it's also very meaningful to students so that we don't lose those. And we continue to support the notion of study abroad so that we're ready to do it when the situation lends itself to that.

Provost Murphy: I think that is very much a part of the conversations we're having about students, if we either bring, are bringing students home, or if we end up having to cancel some student trips. We are absolutely talking about the plans of study and the piece that that curriculum plays in the plan of study for students. And I know...

Senator Pancrazio: This would be for this summer that we had a new group that was going.

Provost Murphy: Yes.

Senator Pancrazio: But to be able to turn that into an on-campus type of arrangement, so that we don't lose those students that can finish their degrees.

Provost Murphy: Sure. And, you know, we'll look for guidance from the faculty too who can help us help the students in that way.

Senator Pancrazio: Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Further questions? (Pause) Senator Dietz, did you have any other comments?

President Dietz: No. Unless there are other questions about other issues, I yield.

Senator Kalter: I think we should simply mark the fact that this is the first Senate meeting since the completion of a successful search. And I'm very pleased at the Provost who we're going to have coming in, and very happy for all of the people here and across the university who were able to go and meet all four of the candidates and see that competition, so to speak,

President Dietz: I was remiss in not mentioning that Dr. Aondover Tarhule, is how you pronounce his last name, Tarhule, is very excited to be joining us July 1. I'm very excited that he's joining us as well. So, it'll be tough to replace the Provost to my right, but Dr. Tarhule in my estimation will make a terrific contribution here. Thank you.

- ***Provost Jan Murphy***

Provost Murphy: My only remarks were about kind of let you know where we're at with Coronavirus and to have, you know, just make sure that you are sending us your concerns. Don't ever hesitate to email Ani Yazedjian, or me. If you have questions, you know, we want to make sure that everybody's got as much information as possible, but we will keep working and keep planning. So, thank you.

Vice President of Student Affairs Levester Johnson

Senator Johnson: Just briefly, I've got a couple of updates as it relates to the Bone revitalization project. Much excitement and anticipation for your return after the break, because we will be opening up Timbers Grill, as well as the Birds Nest on that Monday as soon as we returned from Spring Break, so very excited about that.

If you did not notice, walking into this room, the first floor concourse furniture has begun to arrive. So encourage you all to test it out, give us feedback. We were excited about filling in the gaps as relates to furniture on the first floor and for it to become even more a vibrant type of environment for our community members.

The last piece of this is that Tech Zone, printing services, Redbird ID, and the credit union will all be taking on their new homes on the first floor as well, sometime after the Spring Break as well. So, very excited about this portion of the Bone Student Center revitalization project, coming to completion.

And then, I will end by wishing you all a great Spring Break as well. And to tag on to the Coronavirus discussion as well. Remind everyone to again, continue to do all those great habits that really kind of prevent the spread of any type of viral type of disease and things of that nature, as far as washing our hands, and good hygiene. Okay. And I'll yield.

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

Senator Stephens: Thank you, Senator Kalter. I've only got one item for this evening. I'll make it quick. We've been pretty fortunate that our winter season this year was significantly less damaging than the prior year. And so as the wind, as the temperatures have warmed up, and we're beginning to get an early spring, from a campus maintenance perspective. One of the things that happens over the winter time, as you can imagine, is potholes, or areas across campus as they begin to thaw, it creates a safety hazard. So, you'll be seeing our campus teams, facilities teams, and grounds team beginning to do what's called a cold patch. The material is, it's a temporary material. It's designed to just simply fill in, whether this is a pothole in a parking lot, or a street, or even in a walkway. It's a temporary fix until we can get warmer weather and the asphalt companies can open back up. They won't be operating until probably April timeframe, but any areas that you see across campus, now that it's thawing, please don't hesitate to contact the parking division, and they can make sure that they can reach out to ensure that we address those safety issues as quickly as we can.

Senator Kalter: All right. And are we anticipating any financial implications of this virus? We were seeing the stock market crashing and crashing. But people saying that our fundamentals are great.

Senator Stephens: From the university's perspective, our, the investments that the university has are not invested in the stock market. They're invested in treasuries. And so, they're backed by the by the US government. So, we're not, we don't have an influence there. Our Foundation or any university's foundation that has a much more higher need for investment returns, would certainly have a, what I would believe an unrealized loss. But things were coming back, and if Pat Vickerman was here, he would state that the university's distribution provides from its investment returns as a rolling period of time. So, I think it stretches over a three year period. So, situations like these won't limit the foundation from distributing scholarship funds. You would need a significant multiyear event like that in order to have that negative impact.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. Any other questions for Senator Stevens?

Senator DeGrauwe: I know this question gets brought up every winter, but the only gravel lot we have on the campus... I can't remember when you said that it might be able to get paved over due to the old gas station. Do you know how much longer that will be before that's not going to be a gravel lot anymore?

Senator Stephens: We actually are... Thank you for the question. We are. We're doing a parking study right now. And part of the analysis is identifying those areas. We'll be doing a parking renovation project at the Bone Center this summer. And we're looking at having to go to the debt market in order to borrow those funds, so that we don't use all of our reserves. And so I'm working with our financial advisors to identify some additional projects on campus that we can renovate, for example, like that, and stretch those type of cost over a longer period of time. So that is one of our main goals is to eliminate any gravel lots. And so, I hope, hopefully by this fall or next year, we'll actually have that lot completed.

Senator Kalter: Thank you, Senator DeGrauwe, for reminding me of a parking comment that I had for Senator Stevens. The other day I went to the Planetarium for the first time actually, ever, and it was quite delightful. I went to see the Mayan Archaeoastronomy exhibit, and tried to park in the Alamo lot at first, but then realized it's only an hour even after hours. And I was going... at least if you're not doing it by phone, I think if you're doing it by phone, you can update it, but I was doing it by credit card, and I was gonna suggest that maybe in order to get more revenue, just even a marginal amount of more revenue, it might be a good idea for that Alamo lot to have it be one hour only during the day, but then in weekends and nights, to open that up to be able to park for longer.

Senator Stephens: Okay.

Senator Kalter: And it would also be really convenient to the Planetarium but also to some other places like the Normal Theater and that kind of thing.

Senator Stephens: Thank you for that observation. I'll pass it on to Nick, and we'll look to see if our technology...it should allow for some type of variability. So, thank you for that observation. We appreciate it.

Senator Kalter: All right. Seeing no further questions for Senator Stevens. And we'll move on to our Action Items. The first one is coming from Planning and Finance committee, the Program Priority going to Institutional and Program Priorities and from Senator Mainieri.

Action Items:

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

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

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

Senator Mainieri: So, this is the item we looked at last time in Information. The only changes between then and now were those mentioned on the floor. So, we added some additional language from the MOU, as well as added the word "moreover," at the beginning of the sentence that Senator Horst had indicated. So, those are the two changes that happened since last time we've seen it. And so on behalf the committee, I put this on the floor as motion to approve.

Motion by Senator Mainieri, on behalf of the Planning and Finance Committee, to approve the revisions to the Programs Priorities policy. The motion was unanimously approved.

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

02.27.20.03 Policy 6.1.37 Naming of University Facilities and Entities Markup (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)

02.27.20.04 Policy 6.1.37 Naming of University Facilities and Entities Clean Copy (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)

Senator Marx: Since the last meeting, we added a member to the committee and that's the Assistant to the President for Diversity and Inclusion, as was requested, and the President was agreeable. And therefore, we bring the policy to the floor for a vote.

Motion by Senator Marx, on behalf of the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee, to approve the changes to the Facilities Naming policy.

Senator Kalter: Terrific. I have a very friendly amendment that I'll just put out there first, I don't usually go first. But we had brought this up a couple of weeks ago, in the third paragraph down, under the definition of terms, where it says, "University entity refers to any college department/school, including all programs within such entities." And I had brought up that I was a little bit concerned that that could be misinterpreted in the way that it is worded. So, that if you say, the Wonsook Kim School of Art, that you would have to name each and every program within the School of Art after Wonsook Kim or whoever may be the donor. Let's say that, you

know, you said the Ronald McDonald College of Arts and Sciences, or something that you'd have to say that for the Ronald McDonald Sequence in Creative Writing. So, I'm just going to suggest that instead of saying, "including all," that we say, "or any," so that people can, in other words, name individual programs, but just because they name a school or department doesn't mean that they therefore umbrella all of the programs within it. Does it sound like a friendly amendment?

Senator Marx: Yes, it does.

Senator Kalter: Terrific. Do we have any other debate? I think you put it on the floor already. Right? Correct. Okay. Any further debate?

Senator Horst: I'd like to continue to push back on how the faculty are involved in this process. Last time, I talked about how I think that the faculty should have some sort of voice in this decision. And the response from the administration is that you don't want to embarrass a donor, you want to keep it confidential.

I actually researched some situations parallel to ours. And there was actually a case with the Penn Law School where they changed the name. They rolled out the new name after the donor had given a substantial fund. And then there was actually a lot of pushback, because there was no involvement. It led to protest letters, and in fact, they just in 2019 had to reverse that decision. So, it could make sense that there could be some problem if the donor name gets rejected, but it also can make sense that it would cause problems because the faculty weren't involved in some way. There was a case that the U of I recently where they took a large sum of money for the College of Business, they renamed the College of Business to the Gies College of Business. After that decision, the faculty realized that this was actually a very good decision, but that they decided that they did not have any way to be included in that decision. So, the University of Illinois Academic Senate, Faculty Senate rather, recently revised their procedures so that all units can participate in a fashion that they decide if there's a name change. I think that we should consider that our faculty can have a similar process, that we can somehow be involved. I do appreciate that it could be, you know, that there's a confidential element, but faculty all the time deal with confidential situations, and hopefully we can keep our mouth shut. So, in the spirit of trying to consider how we can include the faculty, but ensure that... the administration and President Dietz did indicate that he wanted to maintain a confidential process. I'd like to make the following motion.

Senator Kalter: This, I assume, is a motion to amend, yes?

Senator Horst: Yes. Under Procedures B, after the insertion from the appropriate Vice President or Director of Athletics. I'd like us to consider adding this statement.

Senator Pancrazio: Could you tell us which paragraph, please.

Senator Horst: It would be a new paragraph, kind of right where there's the deletion of a proposal to recommend.

Senator Pancrazio: Thank you.

Senator Kalter: And could you say what...? Oh, there it is. It's roman numeral V, yes.

Senator Horst: Under Procedures, "In the naming of academic entities, the committee shall request a written report on the proposed naming from leadership within the entity, such as the college dean, the department chair/school director, and senior faculty. Each college should develop a procedure for responding to such requests for a written report that will maintain the required confidentiality of the naming process." So this is the procedure. This is the type of process that the University of Illinois has now adopted, that the entity that's going to be renamed decides ahead of time, how they would handle this situation, and how, and who would be consulted. And at the end of it, there would be a report by the leadership of that entity, according to the processes that were decided ahead of time. I'll stop there and see if I get a second.

Motion by Senator Horst, seconded by Senator DeGrauwe, to amend.

Senator Kalter: And so ordinarily, we would move on to debate, but I do have a question for all of you. That was a very long paragraph that Senator Horst just read out. And I'm a little bit uncomfortable with having a debate over that paragraph without people having it in front of them. I'm thinking that what we ought to do, perhaps, is to table this Action Item. Get that in writing and have this come back for the next Senate to debate. Do I have any objection to that to moving forward in that way?

Senator Horst: I would just say if we actually do this, then there would be some additional language for the Procedure that would be added in relation. Okay. So, in other words, if that were to succeed, then you would also have another piece that you wanted to debate.

Senator DeGrauwe: I see a lot of the Senators have their computers with them. Hopefully, they have Teams on it. You could type out the paragraph and send it through Teams. If you don't have Teams on your laptop, you can open up Teams on your phone.

Senator Kalter: I'm just thinking in the interest of time, that it might be more efficient for us to simply table the motion right now and then come back to this in the March 25 meeting.

Senator Horst: There's no rush, unless there's a billion dollars gift.

Senator Pancrazio: Could I ask a question? Did I hear correctly that there were additional things that you wanted to add to this?

Senator Horst: Just if we did...

Senator Pancrazio: So this is the beginning? This is just one issue in a series?

Senator Horst: If we did add this language, then the additional piece would be to just say, “each proposal as is feasible shall be accompanied by a written report from the academic entity leadership if required.” So, there's a list of things that are required for the application and the written report from the academic entity leadership, would be added to those lists. In V.C. and V.D.

Senator Pancrazio: But all of that is referenced in the paragraph that you're proposing be inserted. I mean the basic concept...

Senator Horst: This paragraph that I'm proposing would require a written report, and then the written report would be listed in...

Senator Pancrazio: Thank you.

Senator Horst: ...what would be in the proposal.

Senator Pancrazio: Okay. Okay. I understand now.

Senator Kalter: All right. So I'm gonna look for a motion to table.

Motion by Senator Hollis, seconded by Senator Kosberg, to table.

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 Markup (Faculty Affairs Committee)

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

Senator Crowley: I have to apologize that I was focused on our other issue. And so I'm not prepared to address this. Perhaps somebody else on the committee can help me out, clarifying what it is that we're addressing here. Is this the one that we put forward last time?

Senator Kalter: Yes. So, this was Grants and Contracts; it's now at the Action Item phase. We had Janet Goucher come in to answer the questions that didn't exist. And so, now we're moving this just onto the floor for debate and vote.

Senator Crowley: All right. Thank you for refreshing my memory.

Motion by Senator Crowley, on behalf of the Faculty Affairs Committee, to approve the revisions to the Grants and Contracts policy.

Senator Kalter: I have one item that I think is a very friendly amendment. The initiating body right now is listed as the AVP for Research; that position doesn't yet exist. It is the AVP for Research and Graduate Studies at this time. It may change at some point. We don't know. But I would suggest that we make that for now, Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies. Does that sound good?

Senator Crowley: That's acceptable.

The motion was unanimously approved, with the friendly amendment.

08.19.02 Policy 2.1.14 Withdrawal Current Copy (Academic Affairs Committee)

02.20.20.03 Policy 2.1.14 Withdrawal policy MARK UP (Academic Affairs Committee)

02.20.20.04 Policy 2.1.14 Withdrawal policy CLEAN Copy (Academic Affairs Committee)

Senator Nikolaou: This is the policy we had as an Information Item during our January 22 meeting, and we have incorporated the comments we received from the Senate floor. Some of them, they were more about providing clarification. So for example, for the first paragraph, we substituted saying that our students are encouraged to speak with their academic advisor and the Dean of Students, so that it is clear that they are not required to meet with the Dean of Students. Then, in the second to last paragraph, in that same page, we clarified that the return request is going to the Office of the University Registrar. Then in the last paragraph that you see on page one, we clarified that the grade for the WX refers to the specific courses and it is not for all the courses that you may have been taking during that semester. The biggest change, and that's what we had most of the comments, was about the, "or classroom disruption violations." So, thank you to the Dean of Students, John Davenport and Bradley Pearson for the information that they gave us. So, we looked at the Code of the Student Conduct to see either something specifically referring to classroom disruptions. So, the Code only refers to disruptions. And then, within the disruptions, there is another clause that talks about disruptions in research, or teaching, or other university activities. So, that is item 6.8.2.A in the Code of the Student Conduct. And then, we ask the Dean of Students to tell us if we have any data about how many of these disruptions we have, and during the last three years, we only had three cases for each year. But these three cases per year, it does mean that they refer to classroom disruptions, because the paragraph actually reads, "disrupting or obstructing, teaching, research, administrative or other university functions, including its public service functions or an off campus or other authorized non University activities when these activities take place on university property." So, the three allegations that they will present, it might be that they refer to disruption of research or disruption of administrative activities. Not necessarily disruptions in the classroom. And that's why the committee decided that it made sense to remove it from the policy. And also we talked with the Dean of Students, and they also said that there was no objection from their end.

And then we also thought that since the Classroom Disruption policy 4.1.17 was brought up, that it might be a good idea from the Academic Affairs Committee to look at it and see if we may need to make an adjustment for our next review cycle. So, that was the main things in the policy.

And then we just renamed the second section in the policy so that it is the Withdrawal from the University since we are withdrawing from all the courses. Another question we had was about the 12th week of classes. So, what we did is we looked at some other universities to see if we are far away, how different we are from these other universities. So, for example, U of I talks about 13 weeks. Eastern is the 11th week. Southern, Western, UIC, it is the 10th week. NIU is the eighth week. So, we are more on the upper end as to when the students can withdraw. And because we also have the clause that either any other extenuating circumstances that you can still

apply for a late withdrawal. The committee decided to keep the 12th week since we are consistent with other universities in Illinois. The other change was that on page two, the third paragraph, we remove the last sentence, because it was not as clear in the policy. So now it reads much more clear about how these withdrawal guidelines work. And that's pretty much it. Oh, and also, at the end of the page two, we also remove the reference to our classroom disruption violations.

Motion by Senator Nikolaou, on behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee, to approve the changes to the Withdrawal Policy.

Senator DeGrauwe: So, for the WX for the academic integrity violations, that was changed for the first half, but it looks like for the withdrawal from the university is still very broad. So, I think it needs to be changed, saying that it's still for that class, even if you're withdrawing from the university, if you have academic integrity, it only affects that class and not the other classes that you're withdrawing from. And the way this is reading, you can take it either way. It's not specified. So in all honesty, you could probably just copy and paste the first paragraph and repost it down in the bottom one. It doesn't look like it wasn't changed like the first paragraph was.

Senator Nikolaou: So, you mean to just add in this course of the WX?

Senator DeGrauwe: Yeah. Something along the lines of in the course that the academic integrity violation is in, or something along those lines?

Senator Kalter: Senator DeGrauwe, I'm sorry, could you repeat that? I'm maybe not following on the pages. I'm on the markup. Are you on the mark up or the clean?

Senator DeGrauwe: I'm on the clean.

Senator Kalter: Oh. You're on the clean copy.

Senator DeGrauwe: Uh, it's the last paragraph in section two.

Senator Kalter: Oh, in section two. That's where I missed it. So, right now, it's the one that reads, "If a student has pending academic integrity violations a student's request for a grade of WX will be placed on hold until the alleged violation or violations have been resolved by Student Conduct and Conflict." Is it that sentence or the next one?

Senator DeGrauwe: It's pretty much that whole paragraph. It needs to say that it only is for the course that the academic violation it is from, that way you won't get F's in all of your courses if you withdraw from the university with one academic violation,

Senator Kalter: Okay.

Senator Nikolaou: And so in this paragraph, put after the WX to add in these courses, similar to the first paragraph.

Senator Kalter: So, you're in the second sentence, I think, Senator Nikolaou, "If the sanction is imposed a grade of WX in the course in question or..."

Senator Nikolaou: "... Or for a grade of WX in this course(s) will be placed on hold until the alleged violation(s) has been placed." So we've just adding in these cores parentheses s.

Senator Kalter: Wonderful. All right. So, you consider that a friendly amendment, clearly.

Senator Nikolaou: Yes.

Senator Kalter: Further questions, or debate, I should say?

Senator Noel-Elkins: I gave Dr. Davenport about a one hour heads up to see if he could find an answer to this question, so he may not have an answer yet. My question is, then there's a related follow up question. Do we know approximately how long it's taking CCR right now to adjudicate academic misconduct cases? So, essentially, how long would a student have to wait before they would know whether their academic misconduct case is resolved?

Dr. Davenport: At this point, it could be anywhere from one to three weeks. It's hard to come up with an average because the entire process could take up to three weeks that go to a hearing, not agree to the sanctions at the hearing, or go to an appeal, go to a board hearing and appeal that. So, if a student took every bit of time allowed to them in the process, it can be up to three weeks. We have had some cases that have been involved, because of the nature of them, and the level of them, involved participation by General Counsel, and those have taken up to a month. On average about a week and a half. But there are some that have gone, we've had several in the last semester that have gone three to four weeks.

Senator Noel-Elkins: So my follow up question, and I don't know that this is under Dr. Davenport's area to answer, is how does this then relate to a student's ability to recover tuition charges? Should the adjudication process last longer than the student accounts deadlines for receiving refunds? And if the student is found not in violation, is it going to be backdated, and they, are they then going to then recover those charges? And again, I don't know if you can answer that.

Dr. Davenport: I can say in several other instance if it's due to the process that has moved a student beyond the deadlines, we've worked in Student Accounts in their appropriate offices have been great with allowing us to, we asked them, because of these circumstances, we would ask you to backdate this withdrawal, this thing, to this particular day. And to this point, we've never been denied for that request.

Senator Noel-Elkins: Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Do we have further debate?

Senator Wall: I made this point previously about that section that we're talking about with the grade of WX. And I was just wondering if we could further discuss why it is necessary to... for the potential for a failing grade rather than a WX to be given by the professor. Why it is necessary to have academic based sanctions, as well as SCCR based sanctions, placed upon a student. So, to me, this policy reads that academic integrity violations will have the potential for two sanctions to be placed: one from student conduct, and then another from the professor's willful F that they might give the student. I just don't understand as to why this policy needs to include the academic component in there. I don't think that... That was my initial point that I made last time. I don't know that it was given consideration, because to me, if SCCR is already a body and a committee that is making these decisions, why one professor should be allowed to make a potentially biased decision on a student's academic performance. And while I do understand the severity of academic integrity violations, I just do think that that is an important component to this, is that as SCCR is like a group of people, it's not one person making decision, whereas the professor could potentially have a known bias that there's no way to really check that. And that's the point I'd like to make is that consideration be made for that.

Senator Kalter: So, since it was the preference of the committee to put this in under Action, I'm going to take your comment as an argument against that change, and ask if we have people who want to argue in favor of that, of that change.

Senator Nikolaou: Just to clarify, if there is a case of an academic integrity violation, it's not that I'm going to fail the student, it will have to go through the appropriate channels, decide if it was an academic, if it was, you know, they copied an exam or they copied an assignment. And then if they are the SCCR find that yes, indeed, it was an academic integrity, then the sanction is going to be imposed. So, myself as an instructor, I cannot say I'm going to fail you if the body says that you have not been found guilty for the academic integrity violation.

Senator Wall: So, I guess my question response to that is the specific sanctions that we're talking about what are those? Could you provide an example of a sanction? These depends on I think there are four different levels. And probably, John, would know better, what are the four levels.

Dr. Davenport: A sanction could involve a censure. A sanction could involve going with the grade being suggested by the faculty member if it is determined that this is multiple instances of this type of academic integrity violation; it could be suspension, or things like that. So, yeah, it could be any one of those levels depending on the amount, the number of times, the severity of the case, and we're in a particular program, some of this, and these incidences may have occur. But to echo what was stated, SCCR doesn't have the ability or the right to assign grades. And so, in a lot of ways for protection of the students. And so, if a faculty member accuses them of an academic integrity violation, the student believes that they were not in violation, if SCCR, if they decided that there was no academic integrity violation and there isn't going to be a failing grade assigned.

Senator Wall: I guess my point to what you just said is, if suspension is the sanction imposed, the faculty member is also allowed to assign an F, correct, based on how this policy is written?

Dr. Davenport: Yes.

Senator Wall: So, that's what I'm saying, in terms of this double sanction. Not only are they capable of suspending, but you're also capable of changing the student's GPA. I'm just arguing that potentially should those academic... like, I'm fine with one or the other, but maybe not both. Or just a discussion of that. I think that that's the not necessarily the purpose of that, or I don't think that was your intention with this. But I think that the way it's worded reads that it's that sanction, in addition to academic sanctions placed by the singular professor: SCCR can decide for a suspension and the professor can decide to give an F.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. So, it is not an additional one. Because if you go on the online system, for example, it says you are alleging that the student has an academic conduct violation. What are the actions you are proposing? And there are four different levels. So, the first one, I think it was where they said, just a meeting to, like, to reprimand the student, and explain why this is a concern, and so on. So, the second one was more of a written reprimand to the student. The third one was... I think the fourth one was the suspension. And I don't remember what it was the third one. So, it depends on how severe the academic integrity violation was. And then, what the specific instructor is recommending. He doesn't mean that they are going to follow that choice that the instructor is making, then the SCCR is going to say, okay, you have the violation. Then you need to repeat, for example, the assignment that you are accused of.

Senator Pancrazio: Yes, I'm agreeing with that, Senator Nikolaou here, is that there is a recommendation when a faculty member fills out something like for plagiarism or something like that. We put the reasons why we believe so, attach the additional supporting evidence, and then make a recommendation. And usually those recommendations are based on if this is a first offense, a second offense and a third offense. So, when you're talking about suspension, you're talking about something that isn't repeated as well. Or there's some additional circumstance, aggravated to circumstances. So, as a faculty member, I think it's very important that we really emphasize the academic integrity. We're not... if someone is not turning in their own work, we're really not educating the person. So, I would stand at, that that is an important aspect, and is very much part of that culture. And then recommend to students that really, that they really need to be very careful and being able to make the distinction of between intentional and just fret, that's what's called the freshmen faux pas, where they just forget to make a citation, we take that into consideration as that part of that process. But when we get into the serious things, it's because it has been repeated.

Senator Kalter: Further debate? (Pause) I'm just going to say it in a slightly different way. I would actually think about it, Senator Wall, as the academic penalty is primary and the other

stuff is additional, rather than that the other stuff is first and then there's also on top of that, an academic penalty. I had an instance in another institution where several people colluded with one another on a final exam, and we caught them in the middle of the exam looking at stuff. They should not pass that course when they're doing something like that, right? Now, whether they should get suspended, or have other types of penalties, educational, or what have you is, I think, another question. But it's really about, did you earn a passing grade in the course, and if you are found guilty of having, you know, having violated academic integrity, there is a fairly significant question about whether you have earned that grade in that course.

Senator Wall: I would push back to that, only on the point that we're not talking about the difference between a passing and failing. We're talking about the difference between a failing grade and a grade that is a WX, which has effectively no effect. Right? So I'm saying that academic sanctions, such as suspension, do not need to be in addition to a failing grade when the other option, the ulterior option is just a withdrawal from the course. I agree with you. I don't think they should pass the class. We're not talking about passing classes here. We're talking about failure or WX. I just don't think that failure affecting a student's GPA permanently, as well as suspension, sanctions such as suspension, which Dr. Davenport already addressed as being in addition to. I don't know if those are necessarily two components that need to be intertwined with one another. And that's, that's I guess, the argument I'm making, but I take your point.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. Do we have further debate?

Dr. Davenport: If I could make a point to clarify, because I understand Senator Wall's question. What would happen is, and I tried to go from least to the most severe to give that sense of the four levels. I understand what you're saying. And in most cases, we try to adhere to the recommendations. The case where a suspension or even expulsion would take into place was if there were factors that are in evidence to SCCR that the faculty member isn't aware of. And so, if in the class that, you know, the grade of course, the appropriate grade will be an F for failing grade on that exam, or that class. But if the professor's... the faculty member is only aware of what happens in their class. If in the process of multiple instructors have submitted information, and this has been, the student has received failing grades in other classes for the same things, of which the faculty members isn't aware, and SCCR happens to be aware of that, this is a pattern, this is a fourth class in a row that this has happened. That's when something...it would be an additional section but that's when it would be applied. Because that would be something that wouldn't be in evidence to the faculty member in that particular case. That is extremely rare. But again, I was just trying to give, you know, an example of all four levels. And so, that would be a case where there'd be something else. But that would be because... the reason for that, the factors involved in that would be things that that current faculty member might not even be aware of, because it could have occurred in four different classes. And so, in that situation, it would be two things, but it's a very extreme circumstance, that has to be evidence that the student is demonstrating such a disregard for the academic integrity policies that we feel the separation from the university for a period of time might be necessary. So, hope that clarifies.

Senator Meyers: I would just also add in response to Senator Wall's original comment about the potential for faculty bias is that if the grade of F is awarded, and it's biased, and it's not warranted, there's procedures for students to appeal that.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. That's the Final Course Grade Challenge policy, I believe.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Information Items:

02.11.20.04 Alcohol Policy Current Copy (General Counsel)

02.10.20.01 Alcohol policy Mark Up (General Counsel)

02.10.20.02 Alcohol policy Clean Copy (General Counsel)

Senator Kalter: We have now an Information Item that is sort of unusual. The Alcohol policy would ordinarily go through the Rules Committee. The Rules Committee has a lot to do in the next couple of sessions. And because General Counsel is changing this in a way that essentially Dr. Dietz will be needing to sign off on changes before fall semester, tailgating season and that kind of thing, because it is the Alcohol policy, the Executive Committee put this straight to the floor rather than putting it through a committee. This is kind of an unusual thing, but looking to get Information Item feedback on the changes for the Alcohol policy, and then we will decide once we hear the feedback, whether or not this can move forward as an Action Item at the next meeting, or whether something else needs to happen, including it going to a committee. So, do we have, and I... I was thinking that we were going to have legal counsel here, but it looks like Wendy Smith is not here tonight. So, I'm wondering if we have in her absence, do we have questions, comments, concerns, suggestions for this one?

Senator DeGrauwe: My only concern is, I guess it's number one under the following regulations. So, it's saying that no students, or RSO, or other student groups, will be allowed to hold events where alcohol beverages are served. etc. And I feel like that's a very broad statement. I can understand why, because most students on campus, traditional students, most of us are under 21 at the time, but there are certain organizations like the Veterans Organization, where if you're a veteran and you're going to college, you're more than likely over 21. And if they are having an event, they can't have alcohol or things like that. So, I wonder if this is too broad, and it's not allowing any sort of leeway with that for specific groups that a majority, if not all of their members are over the age of legal consumption.

Senator Kalter: I'm actually going to ask Dr. Davenport, since he was involved in the discussions about that, if you have any comments about Senator DeGrauwe's comment.

Dr. Davenport: Actually, at this point, I don't. I can certainly take that down and share that with legal counsel, if that's a concern. But, yeah, at this point, I don't have anything else to contribute really to that particular bullet point.

Senator Kalter: Okay, thank you. Other comments, questions, concerns about the proposed changes?

Senator Baur: I was just gonna add on that, graduate students are another example of a group that, you know, should be able to have whatever, tailgater, or whatever.

Senator Kalter: So, for example, the Graduate Student Association, which is an RSO, might be an issue there.

Senator Baur: Right.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Thank you. Other questions, comments, concerns, suggestions?

Senator Nikolaou: I'm on the markup. On page two, four. I had a question, because it says the procedures for resale serving of alcoholic beverages events can be obtained by contacting the BSC event planner handling the coordination of the event. So, this suggests that the procedures may be different based on the event planner who is handling the event. So, we don't have common procedures no matter who is the coordinator of this event. So, that's one question I had over there.

Then on page three, I guess it's item nine, where he talks about the sponsor and how they are responsible for ensuring the sale or serving alcohol beverages, and then says, "...and the demeanor of the participants and their invited guests are in accordance with state law and university policies." So for that part where it says, "...the demeanor of the participants and their invited guests..." so I'm thinking if I was hired as the server, how can I be held responsible for the demeanor of someone who is participating in the event? How can I have liability, I'm just hired to serve whatever it is that I'm serving.

And on page four, where it gives the time limit in the first bullet point, I was just wondering, what happens if we have an hour long event, and let's say that everyone in this event, they want to get an alcoholic drink. So, there is the long line, and then in the 30 minutes, it stops. What happened with those who are in line? Are they still allowed to continue getting the drink? Or they say, okay, no, closed because we are 30 minutes before the closing of the event. And then, I had some other smaller items that I can just send.

Senator Kalter: So, thank you. The one that you just said seems to me perhaps to be a wording problem or something that they haven't thought of in terms of how to put that in. And the same a little bit for the first one that you mentioned, that perhaps rewording that is what you're suggesting, so that it does not imply an inconsistency. In other words, that it's the Bone's policy and not the event planner's decision is what you're saying there. Right?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: And, and I'm very glad that you mentioned the one in number nine, because I had a problem with that wording as well. That how can somebody be responsible for the demeanor of another? Do we have other questions, comments?

Senator Kupitz: Yes. So what are the precautions that are going to take place if someone gets out of hand? Is Illinois State Police going to be called? Are there going to be breathalyzers on like the side of the event? Like what's going to happen if someone drinks too much? How are we gonna know? And like, as Senator Nikolaou was saying, like, how are servers gonna hold these people responsible? That's what I want to know.

Senator Kalter: I don't know if any of the administrators here have an answer to that right now. I'm thinking that we need Wendy Smith to answer that part.

Senator DeGrauwe: Going off of that, underneath the tailgating spot, it says, "Illinois State Police may be contacted for suspected violations of state law or university policy." I'm not sure if that needs to be in another place. That way, it doesn't only fall under tailgating. Maybe that should be its own topic under this policy. And going off of that, does the university still own apartments? Do we still have students living in university apartments?

(inaudible)

Senator DeGrauwe: Okay. And then, my last thing, the bullet points are just really off in a lot of places. So specifically the venues, which are on page four of the clean copy, or page four of the markup copy. It's the venues of Illinois State campus where alcoholic beverages may be served are Alumni Center. And if you go down, there's one that says the University Art Galleries and the next bullet point Ewing Manor. Next bullet point and next bullet point. They're just messed up. So, they need to be fixed.

Senator Kalter: Gotcha. Thank you for that one. You asked about the apartment living just to make sure that that made sense.

Senator DeGrauwe: No. I just wasn't sure if we still offer that housing because if we didn't, I wasn't sure why it was still in the policy.

Senator Kalter: To strike the word apartment living, but since we do have people there, it was moved. Okay. Further questions, comments? All right, seeing none, we will collect those. Yes. Sorry.

Senator DeGrauwe: I do actually have a question. Have we ever thought, and I know this is probably a question for the student policy, the Student Code of Conduct Committee. Have we ever considered the option of allowing legal age of consumption, so 21 year old students or over, that are living in Cardinal Courts who do have their own mini fridge in their own room which they can lock. I'm not sure if we've ever considered that. Because I don't understand if you live in Cardinal Courts, that's more of an apartment style living. Although, it is ISU campus related, you

can have your own lock, and you have your own locked room. And I don't understand why you wouldn't be able to have beverages in your own mini fridge in your room.

Senator Kalter: I'm going to pitch that to Senator Johnson.

Senator Johnson: I think based on the history of who's really occupied the spaces within that facility, it's been predominantly sophomores. We've really not had enough room on campus for juniors and seniors. In particular, seniors are folks who would be 21 and over.

Senator DeGrauwe: Well, I would argue that, because I was a 21 year old freshman that lived in Cardinal Court. So, my thing is there might not, like the majority might not fall under those circumstances, but there might be someone like me, so I don't understand why we wouldn't be able to have a small policy like that for those outliers?

Senator Johnson: And again, for those outliers, there's apartment style living where we do allow that. So, you can choose those type of options.

Senator Horst: I was just gonna say, I recall an extensive conversation in Rules in like 2014, with Farzaneh Fazel being chair, and we talked a lot about fridges, and exactly what you were proposing, but at the end of the day, it didn't work. We couldn't make it work. And Cera could maybe dig up those conversations for you.

Senator DeGrauwe: That was six years ago.

Senator Horst: I'm just saying it did at one point Rules did consider that.

Senator Pancrazio: Yeah. I think the comment that people were talking about, about number nine, about demeanor, it took me a second, I was looking it up. And I'm reading here it says, "It is the law in all the United States to refuse service to someone who is visibly intoxicated." This is standard bar rule. And it was in the old policy as well. And I think that that's what this refers to. Responsible bartenders will refuse service to someone in that condition. The logic is not to throw gasoline on a fire, and typically that's the same standard they use in airlines, if someone is already visibly intoxicated, at their limit, they have that right to refuse.

Senator Kalter: So, given the differences in the wordings of those, would you suggest, Senator Pancrazio, that we might want to change the word demeanor to something that is more in conformity with what you just read.

Senator Pancrazio: I've worked in a bar. I know what it meant. I didn't have any difficulty with it. We knew when to cut them off. We knew when to tell them, time to get up, get them a taxi. So, I understood it. So, I mean, but if people feel that way. I think that's fine.

Senator Kupitz: Yes. I just want to say on top of Senator Degrauwe, I'm a former student of Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. And I know they had a rule where if you were 21 years of age, and you had your own apartment style living, they had a rule where you could have,

you could possess alcohol if it was in a mini fridge, and they were pretty successful with that. So, I know it's not the case at ISU, but other schools are doing it, and they're turning out fine with it. Just to put that on the table.

Senator DeGrauwe: Just a point of inquiry, is this policy going to go to the Rules Committee to do a cleanup? Or are we just going to get a cleanup next month?

Senator Kalter: Well, Exec will talk about that. We may send it just to Legal to respond. So, we'll get a transcript of this, you know, this piece of the minutes, and send it to them, and then talk about whether it needs to go through a committee, or if it can just come back to the floor for, as an Action Item with changes made, and that kind of thing. Yep. Further comments, questions? All right. Seeing none.

01.23.20.05 - Policy 1.6 Religious Observances CURRENT Copy (Academic Affairs Committee)

02.25.20.01 - Policy 1.6 Religious Accommodations AAC MARK UP (Academic Affairs Committee)

02.20.20.02- Policy 1.6 Religious Accommodations CLEAN Copy (Academic Affairs Committee)

Senator Nikolaou: So, this is a policy that was distributed for review last year, but due to the change in the OEOA office with Tony Walesby leaving and Jeff Lange serving as the interim director, we didn't get the changes until the mid October. So, we got a copy that went through OEOA and Legal, and then the committee made some changes. It went back to Legal, the OEOA looked at it again. So, what you see in front of you, the main change is that we split it for the student accommodations and the employee accommodations. When we're talking about the student accommodations, it was added that the requests are going to go to the Student Access and Accommodation Services Office. And then, any appeals, they are going to go to the OEOA. And then, when we talk about the employee accommodations, the requests go to the OEOA office, and then any appeals are going to go to the director of the OEOA office. That's one of the changes.

The other one was the use of the wording "undue hardship on the university." The first time that we saw it in the committee, we were not really in favor of the wording hardship. But then Legal told us that it is the actual legal term that it is used, when we are talking about religious accommodations. Because initially we were thinking to include something about changes that may fundamentally alter the education environment, but then Legal told us that these are changes that the Office of Student Access and Accommodation may face. So, if I need an accommodation that doesn't have to do with religious aspects, so if I need more time for my exams, this is more of a semester long change that's going to take place. But if I need a change because I need to observe a holiday, and I know that this holiday is on that specific day. This is more of a short-

term change, and that's why it is an undue hardship. And again, that was the legal term. I cannot say anything else about that.

Then we also aligned the time period, so that we state now that as soon as possible a student or an employee knows that they may want they may need a religious accommodation, they should make the request. But not later than 10 business days. So, we made it consistent for both groups.

And one question we received from Exec was if you look under employee religious accommodations, the first sentence where it says, "A reasonable religious accommodation is a change in the work environment, or a change in the way a task and/or a responsibility's performed, that enables an employee to participate in the religious practice..." etc. The question was, if we want to include something there about when a task is going to be performed. So, for example, if I need to pray at a specific time period because of my religion, this is going to change when I can perform the task. And also, whether a task is going to be performed. So for example, if I cannot handle pork, or if I cannot serve pork, or even if I work in the Student Health Services, and there are certain activities I cannot perform because of my religion. So, we talked about it in the committee, and then we also talked with General Counsel. And we thought that these, the whether and the when, it's going to be captured by the change in the work environment. So that the change, it's going to take into consideration when you're going to perform the task, and whether a task is going to be performed.

And then another question we got from Exec was, if you're in the markup, it is totally at the bottom of the first page and towards the beginning of the second page, where it says, if accommodations cannot be granted, employees may use vacation or dock time consistent with the university policy to observe the event. So, the question was, that part, if accommodation cannot be made, if it is consistent with the actual policy itself. So, we asked the General Counsel why an accommodation might not be able to be made. Unfortunately, Wendy could not make it today, because she was going to provide some examples, what this case might be in an email and the response that she gave me was that the ability to allow an employee to use vacation time is consistent with Equal Employment Opportunity Commission guidance if the vacation's approved. She doesn't necessarily have examples from other universities, but said I can provide examples when I came here. And then, for example, the EEOC does not require an employer to violate seniority rules, or a collective bargaining agreement in order to grant a religious accommodation. So, that's an example that's she gave. And I think maybe John Davenport might have a couple of other examples, but otherwise, these are the changes for the policy.

Dr. Davenport: Just one example I can think of for the employee section is if, say, there was an opportunity, certain religions involve... certain days are considered that you can't work on certain days, but if a requirement of a particular job, the job of a specific key component of a particular job involves work on those particular days. That's when you're going to think about undue hardship on the part of the university. And so if an accommodation can be made that allows the person to either continue into the primary functions of the role with this, again, as we

talked about the basic or adjustment, or things like that, then those are the types of things that will be granted. But it will be, if it's difficult to... if it changes the very nature of the work that is done, or the purpose of the job, or the role, that's when it becomes an undue hardship. And that's why we're asking for the time for it to be reviewed so that it can truly be assessed and managed to say, okay, can we make some accommodations here, and without altering the structure of the job or the role?

Senator Kalter: Great, thank you. I think this is the time to go to questions, comments, concerns. Anybody have any suggestions?

Senator Meyers: Two questions. The first is could there be a scenario where a student needs an accommodation but doesn't have 10 business days to work with because it's so close to the beginning of the semester.

Senator Nikolaou: So, we talked about the time period. Initially we thought about a week. But then, we talked with the Student Access and Accommodations and they say that actually, they wanted much more days, but so we cut it down. But the idea was that if it is a religious accommodation, most likely you will know within a month, if there is a specific event that is taking place.

Senator Meyers: I'm thinking of holidays that happen sometimes early in September, where there might not be 10 business days of planning time, once a semester has started.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay.

Senator Meyers: And my second question actually was, does the Office of Access and Accommodations have the capacity to handle all these requests? Because this is a big change. It's making it much more formalized than how it was before. And it could put a burden on that unit so I was curious about their capacity.

Dr. Davenport: To answer your first question, the practice we take, or the position we take is not the same but very similar to how accommodations are granted. Student Access and Accommodation Services is in operation 12 months. And so as with accommodation, we have many students who come in new to us, or at any point, have accommodations that are ready to roll the first day of class, even though traditionally take a little bit longer to verify. And so what we would hope is by, if and when this policy has passed, and make sure students are aware of it, if it's returning student or a new student who'll be coming in and they'll be aware of the policy. So, if they knew there something happening in early September, even mid-August, they could submit it to the Student Access and Accommodation Services in July or June. And we could, we can get that process. The other part is, there is a capacity to make sure we're handling these. We have some staff whose work will be dedicated to this. So, I'm, the capacity to deal with what we anticipate might be a small to medium influx is something that the office can handle.

Senator Reese-Weber: I just had a question about what is dock time. I don't know what that is. And then, related to that, faculty do not get vacation time. They get sick leave, they don't get vacation time. So, depending on what dock time includes, faculty may not have any of this kind of time available to use. So, I just, if somebody can tell me what dock time is, that might answer that question.

Senator Kalter: Senator Stevens, did you have a feel on what dock time is and how it's defined?

Senator Stephens: Rather than offer an uninformed or fully informed response, I'd rather speak with Janice and get a more definitive answer, given the complexity and making sure don't want to mislead anyone.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. Other questions, comments?

Senator Meyers: So, I guess the motivation behind my first questions is it seems like this policy is making it more difficult or putting more red tape in front of people that want to ask for these accommodations. And I'm curious if you could explain the rationale for that.

Senator Nikolaou: I have no idea. That's the policy; it came from OEOA and Legal. So, I don't know, I think John has a background.

Dr. Davenport: What we're hoping to doing in particular, the part I was most involved in obviously was a student part. What we were hoping this does is provides a definitive timeline and gives a process, and then, also an opportunity for due process. And so, we have a process by which the student can apply, and then if that decision isn't upheld, now we have a formal appeal process for that. And so it does create a process where before, it was a little more nebulous, but we would like to think that this gives, at least in the student case, I believe in the employee case as well, a clearly defined path to go to, who to go to, how long it's going to take, what's going to happen, and then that gives them recourse that if they believe that the initial decision wasn't fair, and just, they have an appeal process. So we like to think that by creating a little bit of a process, we're giving the students more rights and more clarity about what the process is for apply for it.

Senator Meyers: Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Further comments, questions? (Pause) I just want to say that both of those last two comments were also brought up in Exec, the one about faculty not having vacation or dock time and how that works. And also the concern, it wasn't expressed quite as eloquently, but it seems like we should be bending over backwards to give accommodations for religious purposes rather than putting roadblocks in. So, I just wanted to sort of say that it's... even though one or two people may be asking these questions. I think a number of people are concerned about those aspects of the changes. Seeing no other comments or questions? We move on now to committee reports and Senator Nikolaou for Academic Affairs Committee.

Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Nikolaou

Senator Nikolaou: This evening, we talked about the Textbook policy. We are going to be bringing you the Dress Code policy next time. And we finally started talking about IDEAS.

Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Senator Marx

Senator Marx: Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee met tonight. We were joined by three guests. Nicholas Stoff who is the Director of Parking and Transportation, along with two of his staff. The committee is now looking at some parking policies. The Parking Advisory Committee recommended changes to those policies. The committee is looking at those and we'll be bringing them to the Senate very soon.

Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Crowley

Senator Crowley: The committee has completed its review and revision of the Sabbatical policy, with the exception of a couple of items that need a little bit of tweaking in the language. Once that is completed, we will be submitting a new mark up for review.

Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Mainieri

Senator Mainieri: Planning and Finance is getting awfully close to wrapping up their current priority brief on enabling more students to enter their desired majors. And we also decided on what our next priority will be.

Rules Committee: Senator Seeman

Senator Seeman: Rules wrapped up our discussion of the Library Committee charge and as well as the Milner bylaws.

Communications

Senator DeGrauwe: I'm not sure if this was brought up before, but congratulations to the university for being awarded The Silver Award Designation from the Victory, which is the veterans, like, organization. So, ISU was nationally recognized, again for being military friendly for the 2020- 2021. And I'm not sure if that was brought up in the last couple of meetings. I have a very bad memory.

And if you are free this weekend, specifically tomorrow, come down to St. Louis and watch the men's basketball team compete against Drake for the first game of the NBC tournament.

Adjournment

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

Senator Kalter: All in favor of adjournment have a fabulous spring break, and we'll see you back here in about three weeks.