Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

12-6-2023

Senate Meeting, December 6, 2023

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

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

Recommended Citation

Academic Senate, "Senate Meeting, December 6, 2023" (2023). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 1332.
https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/1332

Academic Senate Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, December 6, 2023
Approved

Call to Order
Academic Senate Chairperson Martha Callison Horst called the meeting to order.

Roll Call
Academic Senate Secretary Mainieri called the roll and declared a quorum.

Public Comment: All speakers must sign in with the Senate Secretary prior to the start of the meeting.
None.

Approval of the Academic Senate minutes of 10/25 and 11/08
Motion by Senator Fulton, seconded by Senator Myers, to approve the minutes. The motion was unanimously approved.

Amendment to Minutes of 9/27
Motion by Senator Helms, seconded by Senator McHale, to approve the amend minutes. The motion was unanimously approved.

Chairperson's Remarks
Senator Horst: Good evening everyone and thank you for coming out. It's almost finals week, and I know many people have many things to do and activities to complete. So, I really do appreciate you all coming out; I'm always impressed when we get a quorum in December. I do want to welcome Senator Bonilla and Senator Su-Russell, thank you for joining the Senate and let me know if you'd like to have further conversations about how our organization works.

Due to the long agenda, I'm going to be brief. First, several senators and I are on the presidential search committee; the deadline for submission of applications for this critical position for Illinois State University is January 10th. It is important that we all try collectively to recruit for this position. As a former fundraiser used to tell me, you never know who your friend's friends are, so please take a moment in the next few days to post the job description for this position on your various social media sites and may be found at illinoisstate.edu/trustees/.

As we have our conversations about an items on today's agenda, please be aware that as members of the state of Illinois policy making body, we must comply with the Open Meetings Act. Even though we all communicate via text and instant messaging, all the time in our daily lives, all conversations regarding Academic Senate business at this meeting need to be in front of the public and on the record. No texting regarding Senate business with fellow senators during the meeting, please. It is against state law.

Faculty, we will have a short but important meeting after the Senate to endorse the candidates for the Distinguished Professor Award, so please stick around. We have seven action items I believe this evening -- one information item and some consent agenda items. When we get to the action

items, I would encourage everyone to listen to all sides and keep an open mind. Roberts Rules of Order state that each member has the right to speak twice on any given question. Let's all be courteous of each other's time and try to be efficient and succinct when making our points. Finally, I wish to thank acting Provost Yazedjian for the cookies over to the left. Thank you very much. That's very thoughtful.

Student Body President's Remarks
Senator Monk: Good evening, it's great to see everyone again. I hope you all had a restful Thanksgiving break and are hanging in there as we approach Winter break.

I'd like to begin tonight with sharing that our thoughts are with the students of the University of Nevada-Las Vegas, who have tragically endured yet another chapter of the gun violence that America suffers from. We pray for the full recovery of those injured and for a day when gun violence can finally cease to exist. I encourage any student affected to reach out to Student Counseling for further resources.

I'd like to welcome College of Education Senator Lu Bonilla to the Association. With her nomination, I am excited to announce we have a full Association for the first time for, at least, as long as I have been apart of SGA, so I'm thrilled to see what this Association will be able to accomplish with a full Senate.

The Student Caucus has begun our review of policy 2.1.17 Residency Status and will be joined by Alice Maginnis from legal at our January 17th meeting. We have concluded our review of Anti-Hazing policy 5.1.13 and are awaiting legal's review. Human Resources and Student Conduct and Community Responsibilities has provided further insight and will be incorporated into the policy to prepare for the next Executive Committee meeting.

I would like to speak on the revisions to the Student Code of Conduct coming to the floor tonight as an action item. This is an area our students feel particularly passionate about, and I would be remiss if I did not stand alongside them as Vice Chair of the Academic Senate. The Student Caucus, after extensive research, interviewing stakeholders, and hearing information on generative AI and the Student Code of Conduct, concluded that the current wording regarding plagiarism is sufficient in its scope to properly process cases of students utilizing generative AI. In fact, the Student Conduct and Community Responsibilities office has already processed numerous cases regarding the unacknowledged usage of AI.

Now, our resistance does not mean we unilaterally oppose any revisions to incorporate language regarding generative AI into the Student Code of Conduct. The reason we cannot approve such a revision at this time is due to the rushed and reactionary process that has led us to this language, which was sent to the floor by the Executive Committee without language having been finalized at the time of the approval of the agenda. There are simply too many questions that remain surrounding these revisions that, if left unanswered, will put students at risk. A false Code of Conduct allegation proven "true" due to a faulty code could lead to irreversible and life-altering effects for students. Additionally, the rapid development of AI will render any current definition obsolete within just a few months, requiring consistent updates to the Code of Conduct. Updates

must keep pace with the development of AI and such a constant revision schedule is unrealistic and would overburden the Academic Senate. Further discussion to address these issues, and the many more issues you will hear from students later this evening, deserve the time and attention that only a full review of the Code of Conduct can provide.

With a review by a nationally recognized Code of Conduct firm upcoming, it would be prudent of the Academic Senate to forgo making hasty revisions and allow a full discussion for revisions that benefit all stakeholders. In other words, proper and responsible governance. We understand the urgency of an issue that truly has world-altering implications. We will need to reimagine education as a concept entering the AI era as species, meaning revisions to the plagiarism policy is only the tip of the iceberg of the adjustments necessary to maintain academia as an institution. I encourage the University to invest greater resources into the research of the implications for AI within the classroom will be, including what plagiarism can be defined as.

However, none of this can occur with a fractured process so bewildering a written timeline is necessary to explain how we arrived at this point with a violation of the Academic Senate Bylaws to boot, as Function 7 of the Student Caucus Bylaws states that the Student Caucus reviews and approves bylaws created that carry out the Code of Conduct, a step entirely omitted from this process. I, along with the rest of the student senators, will be voting no on the revisions and I encourage faculty to give each student speaking up tonight their fullest consideration. With that, best of luck on your Finals and I will happily accept any questions!

Administrators' Remarks
Interim President Aondover Tarhule
Interim President Tarhule: I do have a few remarks to make. I note that the Senate has busy schedule, but please bear with me as I make these updates very quickly. So, as you all know, Dan Stevens, Vice President for Finance and Planning, is retiring; and so we utilized The Registry to aid in hiring and Interim Vice President for finance and Planning. The Registry is made-up of prescreened veteran executives who are immediately available to be matched to add needs and requirements. So, I'm pleased to announce that we have hired Dan Petree for the position and he will begin on January 2nd 2024, Dan Stevens retirement is effective January 1, 2024.

Dan Petree has been CFO and Vice President for Finance and Planning at various colleges and universities since 2015. Before that, he was Dean of the School of Business and Economics at Brockport State University in New York. He also served as founding Dean of the College of Business at Android Radio, even Medical University in Daytona Beach, FL. I hope we will all welcome him and give him our usual support.

Sandy Cavi, Associate Vice President for Budgeting and Planning, is also retiring, effective April 30th of 2024. I'm pleased to announce that Amanda Hendricks, who is Executive Director of the Budget Office, has accepted the role of Interim Associate Vice President for Budget and Planning once Sandy retires.

Doug Schnittker, who is Associate Vice President, Financial Administration and Controller, is also retiring on July 31st, 2024. We will initiate a national search at during the spring semester to hire a new controller to succeed Doug. I'd like to say thank you very much to Dan Stevens,

Sandy and Doug and congratulations on your upcoming retirements. We're very grateful for your dedication and commitments to Illinois State University, and I'm grateful to Amanda Hendricks for being willing to step up in an interim capacity during this transition.

I got other good news to share. The Illinois State Tutoring Initiative led by ISU's Dr. Christy Borders was recognized in the December 5 issue brief from the White House for its high impact tutoring for students at 125 schools disproportionately impacted by the pandemic. I'd like to congratulate Dr. Christy Borders. I know she has worked incredibly hard on this project. I've been involved in this project since the time of conception, so I know exactly how hard Christy has worked on this. This success would not have been possible without her. We are fortunate and proud of her leadership, and I would like to express my heartfelt congratulations to Dr. Borders and the entire team.

I'm also pleased to share that Doctor Byron Craig has accepted my offer to serve as Interim Chief Equity and Inclusion Officer until a permanent CEIO is hired. Doctor Craig will replace Dr. Doris Houston, who will return to her faculty role. Doctor Byron Craig serves as an Assistant Professor in the School of Communication at Illinois State. He is a Co-President of the Queer Coalition Affinity group for faculty and staff, and is a member of the President's Diversity and Inclusion Council.

I've also received a final report from Grant Thornton of the Athletics issue that we discussed last year, so at this point it's a matter of setting a date with the Academic Senate about when we will present that report, but I've got the final report. Tomorrow, Dr. Jana Albrecht, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management and myself will be attending the higher education future stable kick off hosted by Deputy Governor for education Martin Torres. Presidents and chancellors from the Illinois public institutions will be attending this event. Doctor Friedman Roboski, president emeritus at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County UNBC and a lifelong leader in educational equity will be speaking at that event under his 30 years of leadership. UNBC became a nationally recognized university and is now considered one of the most innovative universities in the nation and is in the nation's top producer of black PhD and in science and engineer.

Finally, I'd like to say thank you to all of our senators for your hard work during this past semester for a very productive session, and I wish you very best and a restful winter break. I'd also like to say thank you to all faculty and staff for another semester of hard work and commitment in the service of Illinois State University. Your efforts on behalf of our students are deeply and sincerely appreciated. Speaking of students, I wish all of our students success on their upcoming final exams and extend my congratulations to our December graduates. For those who are interested, Illinois State will award approximately 1025 undergraduate degrees and 255 graduate degrees.

There are more than 935 students, both graduate and undergraduate, who will participate in the winter ceremonies on December 16th. I encourage our faculty and staff who can, to attend. It means a big deal to our students and their families. Also, more than 3000 of those undergraduate students will be graduating with honors, meaning they have a GPA of 3.65 or better. So an outstanding class indeed, congratulations, and I wish everybody a very happy day.

Senator Horst: Sandy Cavi was serving on this committee that was looking at the formula for the IBHE. Is Amanda Hendricks going to be replacing her on that committee?

Interim President Tarhule: That's a good question, we are not that far. The Commission's work was supposed to be completed in November obviously, it's not. So, there's a good chance that it might be completed before she retires. If not, we would move to have Amanda as replacement.

Acting Provost Ani Yazedjian
Acting Provost Yazedjian: Thank you. I'll just keep my remarks brief and say again thank you to all of you for coming every other Wednesday. There's a lot of other things I'm sure you could be doing and so the cookies and refreshments are a small token of our gratitude. Thank you. Don't feel embarrassed about going to get some.

Vice President for Student Affairs Levester Johnson
Vice President for Student Affairs Johnson: I will follow my colleagues lead and just wish everyone the best going into finals next week. Both faculty issuing and students receiving. Then after that, I wish you all a great winter break and happy holidays and I'll take any questions.

Vice President for Finance and Planning Dan Stephens
Vice President for Finance and Planning Stephens: This represents my last Senate meeting here at ISU. I do want to express my sincere appreciation for all the support I've received from the members of this governing body over the past seven years. It's been an honor and a privilege to serve in my role, and although I will not miss Wednesday night meetings every two weeks, I will certainly miss working with each of you. I wish you much success in the future for the students graduating this winter and next spring. My best wishes to you and your career endeavors. That concludes my remarks for the evening.

Consent Agenda: (All items under the Consent Agenda are considered to be routine in nature and will be enacted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion of these items.)

- *Educational Administration & Foundations: [Post-Baccalaureate Teacher Leader Certificate](#)*
- *Educational Administration & Foundations: [Teacher Leader Sequence (M.S & M.S. Ed.)](#)*
- *School of Communication: [Sports Communication](#)*

Senator Horst: Do I have a motion to approve the items on the consent agenda? Senator Cline and second by Senator McHale. All items under the consent agenda are considered to be routine in nature. There will be no separate discussion of these items, all in favor of the items on the consent agenda. Motion passed unanimously.

Action Items:
From Kate Sheridan: University Policy Committee
10.29.23.11 Policy 3.1.52 Personal Plus Time (Mark Up)

10.29.23.12 Policy 3.1.52 Personal Plus Time (Clean Copy)

Senator Bonnell: I move on behalf of the University Policy Committee to approve policy 3.1.52 Personal Plus Time.

Senator Horst: Thank you senator Bonnell; because this is coming from the committee, it does not need a second. I have some friendly amendments that I conveyed to Senator Sheridan that are editorial in nature, so if you could accept them on behalf of the committee? The implementation date will be January 1, 2024. Strike policy procedure guidelines statement as this is the policy procedure guideline statement. If that's acceptable as a friendly amendment? And the other one was a sort of a typo, 1234 paragraphs up it says "Personal Plus Time may be requested orally or in writing may used it should read may <u>be</u> used. Is that accepted as a friendly amendment?

Senator Bonnell: Yes

Senator Horst: Is there any debate? Seeing none all in favor of the approval of Policy 3.1.52 Personal plus time, please signify by saying aye. We have a personal plus time policy.

09.28.23.04 Policy 1.15 Whistleblower (Current Copy)
10.27.23.24 Policy 1.15 Whistleblower (Mark Up)
10.27.23.25 Policy 1.15 Whistleblower (Clean Copy)
10.27.23.26 Policy 1.15 Whistleblower UPC Memo

Senator Bonnell: Yeah, I move on behalf of the University Policy Committee to approve Whistleblower policy 1.15.

Senate Horst: Is there any debate? Seeing none all in favor of approval of the whistleblower policy, please signify by saying aye. Aye opposed. We have a whistleblower policy.

<u>From Craig Blum: Rules Committee</u>
10.27.23.18 Memo regarding Disbandment of Honors Council
10.27.23.19 Honors Council Minutes 02.03.23
10.27.23.20 Memorandum from Rules

10.27.23.10 Bylaws 6.8 Honors Council Deletion (Current Copy)
10.27.23.11 Bylaws 6.8 Honors Council Deletion (Mark Up)
10.27.23.12 Bylaws 6.8 Honors Council Deletion (Clean Copy)

10.27.23.13 Appendix II B Honors Council Deletion (Current Copy)
10.27.23.14 Appendix II B Honors Council Deletion (Mark Up)
10.27.23.15 Appendix II B Honors Council Deletion (Clean Copy)

10.27.23.16 Appendix II Honors Council charge Deletion (Current Copy)
10.27.23.17 Appendix II Honors Council charge Deletion (Mark Up)

Senator Blum: On behalf of the Rules Committee, I'd like to make a motion for some changes related to Honors Council deletion. As you recall last time, the Honors Council, basically no

longer had its function; and there are three specific the deletions that I'd like to ask the chair and this body to consider at one time. One is in the Appendix 2, which is the deletion of the entire committee. In section 6.8 in Appendix 2B they are the word Honors Council is used. So, we need to delete those as well. So, I'm wondering if we could just make all those at one time.

Senator Horst: You're asking if we can combine those three items. Are there any objections to combining these three bylaws items? OK, hearing none, you can proceed.

Senator Blum: Yeah. So I'd like to make a motion on that to delete those items.

Senator Horst: The three different items 6.8, Appendix 2B and then Appendix 2, the charge and the Honors Council. Is there any debate? Hearing none, all in favor of approval of those 3 revisions to the bylaws, please signify by saying aye opposed. Regrettably, we have now deleted the Honors Council.

From Dimitrios Nikolaou: Academic Affairs Committee
10.27.23.01 Policy 2.1.23 Transcripts (Current Copy)
10.27.23.02 Policy 2.1.23 Transcripts (Mark Up)
10.27.23.03 Policy 2.1.23 Transcripts (Clean Copy)

Senator Nikolaou: So, the first policy we would like to put on the floor on behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee is policy 2.1.23 transcripts.

Senator Horst: Is there any debate on the revisions proposed to the transcript policy? Hearing none, all in favor of approval of the proposed amendments to the transcript policy as amended, please signify by saying aye opposed. Very good. We have a new transcript policy.

10.27.23.04 Policy 4.1.6 Grading Practice (Current Copy)
10.27.23.05 Policy 4.1.6 Grading Practice (Mark Up)
10.27.23.06 Policy 4.1.6 Grading Practice (Clean Copy)

Senator Nikolaou: On behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee, we would like to put on the floor for your approval policy 4.1.6 Grading practice which will also have 12-23 other revised date.

Senator Horst: Is there any debate on the proposed revisions to the grading practice policy? All right, hearing none. All in favor of approval of policy 4.1.6, as amended. Please signify by saying aye opposed.

10.27.23.07 Policy 4.1.15 Sales/Solicitation of Academic Assignments (Current Copy)
10.27.23.08 Policy 4.1.15 Sales/Solicitation of Academic Assignments (Mark Up)
10.27.23.09 Policy 4.1.15 Sales/Solicitation of Academic Assignments (Clean Copy)

Senator Nikolaou: On behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee, we would like to put on the floor for your approval policy 4.1.15 sales, solicitation of academic assignments. The revised date would also be December of 23.

Senator Horst: Is there any debate? All right, seeing none. All in favor of approval of the amendments of 4.1.15 as amended, please signify by saying aye opposed.

10.27.23.27 Code of Student Conduct (Current Copy)
10.27.23.28 Code of Student Conduct (Mark Up)
10.27.23.29 Code of Student Conduct (Clean Copy)
09.30.23.01 Student Caucus Report
11.16.23.06 Resolution number 6 about AI From SGA
11.30.23.01 Timeline of Revisions to the Code of Student Conduct Plagiarism Definition From Academic Affairs Committee

Senator Nikolaou: The next item is the Code of Student Conduct, so the Exec Committee asked us to create a timeline of the revisions, which is the document that you see on the file. Just a quick overview; it started back in January when the issue came up. The then Exec decided that it's going to go to the student caucus, and then after the student caucus is going to go to the Academic Affairs Committee. So the first time that we looked at it on the Academic Affairs Committee was the September 27th meeting where we reviewed the recommendation from the student caucus, and we focused mainly on the "another's work" part.

And that's why the revisions that you see, they will remain just adding Degenerative AI and just cleaning what the others means. And then that's the meeting where we also looked at the different universities and what they have done. This was presented on the October 11th meeting as an information item.

On the floor, we had four specific recommendations for changes. Adding a specific definition about generic AI, examining the word possessing, whether it is necessary, adding AI as a separate sentence for the plagiarism, and also explaining what's going on for the corporate laws. In that meeting, the Chair of the Academic Senate asked if there were any additional questions to send them either to the Office of the Academic Senate or to me. In between, we were working on this specific for recommendations. Up until October 25th, we haven't gotten any additional recommendations that when we had the additional Senate meeting. On October 31st that's when the e-mail went out about the agenda and we invited Janice Blair to join the meeting and also Rory Magnuson. They both joined on the November 20th meeting, where there were specific discussions about the possessing the definition of the generative AI. And after that meeting, I had a meeting with Janice Blair and Rory Magnuson. That was actually the November 20th meeting. That's when the three of us met to address the specific comments that were expressed during the previous academic Senate meeting on November 8th.

And the items that you see as markup and clean copy on pages four and five of the timeline are the items that the Academic Affairs Committee discussed about today and we approved, and these are the ones that we are going to be putting forward for the approval of the Academic Senate with pretty much just to give you an overview for the definition.

We just cut it. We remove the more technical terms, which was one of the main comments that was provided by the Student Caucus and also Janice Blair. Then for the possessing, we had a

specific language that came from the SCCR to our clarification. We just rewarded the plagiarism. We just separated the one long sentence into two separate sentences under item C. So on behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee we would like to put on the floor for your approval these changes to the code of the student contact.

Senator Horst: Is there any debate?

Senator Cline: So I realize that we're in a debate, not a question answering period, but may I ask Chair Nikolaou, did the student members of your committee vote on this today or prior meeting?

Senator Nikolaou: We voted on these changes today because we already had the previous changes that came to the floor. Then since we are holding a vote today, we discussed, and we said that the policy might pass, it might not pass. If it passes, what is going to be the best language that we want to include in the code.

Senator Cline: OK, so the student members of your committee voted in favor of the wording you suggested.

Senator Nikolaou: we had 2 abstentions.

Senator Roy: I'd like to give a point of negation on this, echoing everything Student Body President Monk said. I want to talk less about the language of the policy and more about procedure and what this means for precedent on changing the Code of Student Conduct. I very strongly feel that we need a very clear and fair process for amending the Code of Student Conduct that fits precedent. On how this has been changed, does not fit the precedent of how we previously changed the Code of Student Conduct. Past procedures had a Code of Student Conduct Review Committee where stakeholders from across campus were given the opportunity to comment on the policies to suggest change and it was a holistic review of the entire Code.

And my argument is, why should this change be different? Why should we break precedent? The Student Caucus gave a review on this as outlined in the Academic Senate bylaws, and this review was kind of ignored in crafting this policy; we recommended that it stay the same, and it has not stayed the same as obvious by the fact that this is on the floor.

I feel that we need to advocate right now for a clear and consistent process that does not break precedent. The policy right now is working as intended in reference to the AI policy. AI cases are not going unpunished. There's no reason to rush this right now. I think we need to take a step back and allow this to go through a proper process.

My argument is why do we need to rush the policy if it's currently working a rush policy for no reason doesn't make a lot of sense to me. I think we need to advocate here at the Academic Senate that this goes through a Student Code of Conduct committee, a review, and I think for the sake of students, faculty and the Code of Conduct Office, it's important that we put a lot of effort into something so important as plagiarism. Thank you.

Senator Blum: Yeah, I'd like to speak in favor of the change. The change is actually relatively minor. It is a point of clarification. Nationally these changes are happening; to not change is in fact to put us out of step with what's going on nationally. That it is important to clarify the Code of Conduct is more than just about a set of rules, but it's a set of rules that propels us to know what to do, how to teach, what to teach in a certain way, that if we don't have clarification, essentially we lack consistency as a university. One class AI and what is plagiarism will be focused one way and another class. It may be focused in another way. That it's pretty simple in terms of the discussion around technology, changing technology changes all the time, but it doesn't give us the right to stick our hand to the head in the sand and say "Oh no, well, we can't do anything."

So we will have changes. AI will change, I sort of doubt that AI is going to be so dramatically changed within three months, six months or even 2 years. All right, that we are not able to understand that there are times for its application and times for its not. This change actually allows for that application. It encourages when it's appropriate for it to be used. It also says when it's not appropriate for it not to be used. If we don't make those kinds of clarifications, students will not know. Students currently do not know. This will ultimately have to become a matter of teaching.

Senator Bounds: Thank you. So my concern regarding this policy comes from more of the student perspective and specifically what I'm going to talk about is the disenfranchisement of students. And before I talk, I want to make it clear that I'm not coming from the perspective that faculty and staff want to have gotcha moments with students and their work. I just want to make that clear, but I also want to make clear that I find it pertinent that others don't view this through the lens that students merely wish to cheat.

I am not a proponent of cheating. It is not my intention to promote it and it is not my intention to shelter people from the consequences if they cheat. I have taken the time to meet with my constituents. I've talked to them about this policy and I have gathered their thoughts and opinions. I spoke with students actually accused of using AI, one of whom is a friend of mine. She is incredibly intelligent, ambitious and passionate about everything she does, and she's someone I look up to. She was accused of using AI in a paper when she did not, and I don't even want to begin to think about how terribly that could have affected her and her chances of getting into her dream law schools if a faulty code had resulted in her being found in violation. These students I spoke with are people who, like me and my friend I mentioned before, would be insulted if a professor told us that they thought we used AI to write something. Because the idea that our writing is as hollow and as shoddy as what AI can produce right now is insulting.

This policy makes me worry about students who are looking to graduate, and students who want to go to grad or law school. They could be falsely accused of plagiarism using AI and who, because of a policy that uses vague language that has the potential to affect livelihoods, can have their chances of being accepted or being able to graduate drastically diminished. And all of this would be due to an inadequate and faulty code, the impact of which can be potentially devastate. Combination of the implications of the vague language and the fact that the Student Conduct and Community Responsibilities Office has found no issues with the policy as it is right now for me and for many others, speaks for itself. My job in the Senate is to represent students, and I've

taken the time to sit down and meet with them, and I have heard their voices. And I could not in good faith call myself a representative of the of the student body and vote in favor of this policy.

Senator Bever: Thank you, Chairperson Horst. I will be referring to this whole speech on Page 3 on the term generative AI. If you want to go to that. I want to talk about what I've done here at this university. I used to be a part of the University Hearing Panel here on campus for about a year. What I'm about to say is not representing SCCR in any way, but on a personal experience with the University Hearing Panel is if those who do not know. You are part of a panel of students, faculty member and staff that you know are part of a case regarding conduct policy. I have chaired cases I have been on cases of multiple times. I understand the Code of Conduct. A lot of it is interpreting what the code of conduct is in these cases. On my personal history of doing this you have to interpret these terms to the single word. Are they in violation of this, are they not? Words matter.

I'm lucky enough. I'm a cybersecurity student. I understand a lot of these words that are kind of advanced deep learning techniques, neural networks. Most of us don't understand what that means. Think about down the road here. There will be cases referring back to is it general AI? I would be the one, for example, having to figure is this tool deep learning using deep learning techniques or neural networks? Not all of us have that you know, expertise.

These students rely on us to figure what figure out what this. I don't think we need to keep on bringing in someone from, you know, our IT department, Doctor Magnusson to, you know, determine is this tool AI think about down the road in this instance. And my second point I want to make here tonight, let's look at some of the examples we include in here chatGPT everyone knows that, google Bard, Microsoft Bing. Microsoft Bing is a web browser. I encourage everyone here in the university owned computer. Go open up Microsoft Edge. What pops up? It's Microsoft Bing. Every single university lab computer, every university computer here on this campus that's ranked by Microsoft has Microsoft Edge pre-installed, and you open up is Microsoft being the first thing that opens up. And if you use that search feature in this eyes of the code of conduct, you are technically using generative AI.

And I also want to bring up another thing. Google as we speak publicly, it has announced they are experimenting with generative AI and it will be in the future of Google search. Anything students do searching wise on the Internet will be technically using generative AI. We will have to go back to the books, head over the Miller Library and start hitting the books because we need to update this policy constantly.

This policy goes after a search engine, a search engine that students currently use, professors and faculty need to start educating their students. If we pass this policy that you need to be careful with how you search now; you need to ignore the whole feature that pops up immediately using generative AI. And we don't even know what google is going to do. AI is changing so fast even today, Google Now Google Gemini, which is huge. I encourage everyone to look up afterwards and check out videos of what Google Gemini does. We are changing so fast and so rapidly that we need to be careful on what we do here today; because down the road we do not want to be, oh, we screwed up.

Senator Horst: I just want to clarify that the language that you referred to is not being proposed. The language that's being proposed is the term generative artificial intelligence parentheses. Gen. AI encompasses a variety of services that create novel content such as text, images, speech or video and then ChatGPT and Dolly. The second point I wanted to clarify is that Doctor Magnusson is a music professor, not an IT professor. He's my colleague.

Senator Blair: Thank you. I'd like to offer a little bit of insight as a member of the Academic Affairs Committee. So I'm not trying to be redundant with the timeline, but, very briefly, when this topic was first discussed in the committee, that was at the time that the Student Caucus had delivered their report to the committee, the same one that's in our packet tonight where we suggested no changes be made.

And during this discussion, several members of the committee raised valid concerns, such as chairperson and Nicole pointed out, what is the meaning of "another's work" and other concerns like that that are very valid. Those led to the initial languages that the Senate received some time ago. This has been weeks ago; and as I reflect on this process and the discussions that happened tonight and in the previous Senate, I can't help but feel that we are rushing through an incomplete answer to try to solve a complex problem. For me, the problem lies that I think this whole process has been disjointed and that has led us to the current language that we have. I believe that communication on all sides have been for even at times from SGA regarding this. But when we're changing something as impactful as a student code of conduct, I think it's necessary that all stakeholders are properly consulted and that decisions are evaluated with composure and thoughtfulness before we actually commit to them. I feel that at sometimes we've operated almost in silos rather than in the collaboration with one another. That's necessary for a change like this. That could have serious consequences for our students and the SCCR office.
I think there are still too many questions that are left unanswered, even during the Academic Affairs Committee meeting tonight. We discussed this policy for almost 40 minutes with representatives from SCCR and Dr. Magnuson. In my impression, I think we had far more confusion than we did clarity on just the meaning of words, details. Why is this here? Why are we putting that there? I think that we need to pause this discussion and that it should resume with the full review of the Code of Student Conduct as some other senators have alluded to previously so that we can allow more stakeholders to be consulted in a just a more in depth manner than we've been able to accomplish up to this point.

Nobody here denies that we might need to change the code of conduct in some way. I don't believe this is an attempt to stop changes forever; but rather that we recognize that the influence of AI and academia is going to be so unpredictable. And that's exactly why we don't need to have a rush process and why this doesn't have to be an urgent matter that must be solved.
Today, I think it's crucial to our students, the administration, and to our faculty who are teaching that we need to have a comprehensive, thoughtful and a measured process. As we discussed this, and I just can't help wonder why does there always seem to be enough time to go back? Do it over and fix it, but not always enough time to do it right in the first place and take that measured approach.

Senator McHale: Yes, I appreciate the time and the consideration of this issue. This may not be under the purview of the current conversation, but I do want to draw attention to number three in

the change here on the timeline (and this would be section 6A1A is as follows and in the clean copy). I just want to highlight that what it says is that "utilizing any means of assistance books notes papers, articles, third party generative AI, etc. to complete any class assignment or academic assessment unless specifically authorized by the instructor." So that means a coming on us on the first day to say "hey it's OK to use books to do research papers, and it's OK to get notes from your fellow students when you when you miss a class." My thought is that either this language is overly restrictive or we need to make sure that the first day of class we tell the students. For instance, I teach script writing. I have to tell the students, "Do not look at any YouTube about how to write a movie; don't use any book besides the books that I've suggested." I think this language is far too constricting, or we all need to make sure that we say to our students, specifically, that they can use a myriad the plethora of resources that are available to in a wide variety of student learning environments. So I'm just concerned about that language and how would it's prohibited, or we as instructors need to say and open the door explicitly saying you can go to the library and use books. So I just find and find exception with that language. I think we should reconsider that.

Senator Horst: Thank you very much, Senator McHale, however the language that currently stands in the code is possessing or utilizing any means of assistance, parentheses, books, notes, papers, articles, third parties, etcetera. to complete any assignment, quiz, or examination unless specifically authorized by the instructor. So that language is not being proposed to be deleted. It's just, you know, the general edition of AI. Thank you very much for your comments.

Senator Fulton: So I would just like to talk on my experience as a graphic design major. By the time I will be graduating, it will be necessary for me to be used utilizing generative AI within my workflow in order to stay competitive within my industry. All Adobe products have already implemented generative AI within their programs. By having the student code of conduct create a one-size-fits-all rule to generative AI, students like me must hope that our professors are forward thinking enough to allow us to experiment with this developing tech. My worry is that when an institution creates a rule, it becomes a default, allowing professors to not have to innovate their classes and make other professors and students who are not aware of how the code of Student Conduct works feel that they cannot utilize AI due to feeling that they will be going against the university policy. Currently the code of conduct allows for cases to be investigated that includes generative AI. By leaving the policy, as is professors and students will not be losing out on learning, but with this language edition I can only see more issues being caused. There is a reason most of the 112 universities Senator Nikolaou research left it up to the individual professors in terms of the code.

Senator Roy: I'd like to kind of add on what Senator McHale said about that specific line about utilizing and the removal of possession. To my understanding that isn't a change related to AI. That is an entire change related to the Code of Student Conduct; and I think when we're removing words like possessing, you know, which is an important word and how that is enforced, you know whether or not you're possessing an iPhone on your, on your tablet or something like that. I think it's important that we have a holistic review of this policy. If we're changing only things relating to AI, I think that would be different. But this is changing the entire process for plagiarism in the Code of Student Conduct, and I think we really need to take a

step back here and put some more effort into and analyzing this and seeing how it's going to impact the process of the code of student conduct.

Senator Horst: Just to clarify again, the proposal which is in the timeline revisions #3 includes the word possessing, possessing or accessing any unauthorized means of assistance. So, it's been inserted back in.

Senator Cline: I would like to make a motion, although I'm very happy to pause my motion if other people feel that they want to say other things, but I would sort of guide ourselves to the possibility of tabling this. At least into the New Year… but encourage the chair and the vice chair to consider the formation of a special task force that is composed of both student and faculty senators who are particularly interested in the topic to address these issues at length and to the depth that they feel is necessary, so there's no sense that there is a rush. Because, although it's an extremely important topic, a month or two won't hurt. I'd like to make a motion, but if people feel they need to speak, I will withdraw.

Senator Horst: OK, we have a motion to lay it on the table and second by Senator Monk. All in favor of laying this proposal on the table, please signify by saying aye. Aye opposed. Okay it's tabled. I know there's a lot of discussion about AI and how to handle AI across the state. I conferred with some of my Senate chairs in other Illinois Senates; some of them have passed generative AI language for their code. So, we're discussing it and I encourage the President of the University to consider how to tackle this at the university level and perhaps implement a task force such as Senator Cline just suggested. I think it's a complicated issue that needs a lot of people at the table.

Information Items:
From Tom Lucey: Faculty Affairs Committee
11.09.23.01 Policy 3.3.2 Faculty Hiring Current Copy
11.09.23.02 Policy 3.3.2 Faculty Hiring Mark Up
11.9.2023 Policy 3.3.2 Faculty Hiring Clean Copy

Senator Lucey: The Faculty Affairs Committee had the pleasure of discussing policy 3.3.2. Faculty hiring procedure. We had the pleasure of inviting Craig Gatto to our committee meeting, and we had conversations with him and he consulted with Janice Bonneville and Human Resources about the policy and recommendations for change. So what I'd like to do is go through the policy and mention the changes that we proposed. We'd like to change the policy name from faculty hiring procedure to just faculty hiring because the policy doesn't really talk about faculty hiring procedures. We would like to change the types of faculty appointment from three to two and removing a terminal faculty appointment and sequencing non tenure track and tenure track in an alphabetical sequence in the next paragraph, we would like to amend to remove the explanation of the terminal faculty appointment, because if we're not including the terminal faculty appointment, there's no need to explain it. We'd also in the third paragraph, we'd like to remove the individual teaching for academic credit overseas.

Then in response to recommendations from the Executive Committee, we would like to delete the word policy, which appears below the policy title and the first paragraph. In the third

paragraph, we would like to change the order of the types of faculty appointment to be consistent with their listing under the first paragraph. Under the last paragraph we'd like to remove the word the before human Resources in both instances, and then we also like to change the date and the font of the revision date.

Senator Mainieri: Thank you. Senator Lucey, did your committee discuss also the final paragraph changing the order of tenure track, non-tenure track to reflect the list?

Senator Lucey: Yes we did and we approved it.

Associate Vice President Bonneville: We don't use terminal faculty, so it's not a term that we use; it's outdated language that just needs to be removed from the policy.

Internal Committee Reports:
- *Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Nikolaou*
  Senator Nikolaou: The Academic Affairs Committee met this evening. We approved policy 4.1.5 Final Examinations that we discussed last time. So, we are going to be sending it to the Exec. We are also going to be making a recommendation about the Reinstatement Committee report and then we also talked about the Code of Student Conduct and the recommended provisions.

- *Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Senator Mainieri*
  Senator Mainieri: This evening, our committee discontinued our discussion of 3.2.13 and approved the updates that we have to send to the Executive Committee.

- *Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Lucey*
  Senator Lucey: Faculty Affairs had a highly stimulating and intellectually and engaging conversation about the intellectual property policy. It was so engaging that we decided we invite some legal counsel to the next meeting so we can further have a deeper conversation. OK, we also discussed the executive committee's recommendations on the faculty hiring procedure and approved those.

- *Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Valentin*
  Senator Valentin: The Planning and Finance Committee voted to endorse the Strategic Plan Mission statement and began review of policies on our issues pending list.

- *Rules Committee: Senator Blum*
  Senator Blum: Tonight, the Rules Committee voted to make several changes to the Constitution. Most notable changes to the Campus Communication Committee, as well as some other changes. We also voted on to make changes to the bylaws regarding who can serve as chair. And some clarification on voting rules and also some updates to the policies for absences for committees.

- *University Policy Committee: Senator Sheridan*
  Senator Horst: The University Policy Committee does not have any report they did not meet.

Communications

Senator Hollywood: OK, I have a message from the History department that I was asked to deliver to the Senate. So, we have been trying to get one of our classes passed through the IDEAS. To have it qualify as an IDEAS class. And what we're getting is it is not being approved and this is from my understanding from the history department, that is not being approved because somebody on the committee said their child is in an A/P History course in high school and believes that what we teach in our classes is equivalent to that. But they have not actually attended any of our classes or asked, as far as I know, any of us who do teach that class whether diversity is included. And so we are wondering why would we have majors in history, Ed, that are required to take 135 and 136? Why are we going to ask them to spend additional money to satisfy the IDEAS course?   and what it's going to do? it's going to push them to take it at Heartland and transfer it in and satisfy it that way. So we will have a whole bunch of history of majors who are going to have to go somewhere else to satisfy the IDEAS and spend more money, which we were guaranteed they wouldn't have to do. But I can guarantee you 135 and 136 are as every bit as diverse as American diversity, which is history 111. Any student who has taken my class knows that. Everything I put into my American diversity class, (which is going to be phased out by the way because it does not satisfy any course requirements). I teach in my 136 class. There is an African American history unit. There's an immigration unit, there's a women's history unit. So it is a diverse class regardless of how generic the title is or whether or not somebody has a child in an A/P class.

Senator James: Hello, senators. Given that we will not meet directly after winter break, I wanted to let you know that the Finance Committee within the Student Government Association is having a fundraiser on Sunday, January 21st, 2024 from 5:00 to 9:00 PM at Chipotle on South Main Street and Normal for the School Street Food Pantry. The School Street Food Pantry has been very gracious for providing students with the substance that they need to thrive during these years. As you know, the community of Normal faces food insecurity every day, and allowing students to have access to free, nutritious foods is one of the many things that the school street food pantry works towards. Because of this, they are very short on some of the basic necessities to support the 100 plus students that go with this fundraiser. The Student Government Association will use these funds to go buy the foods that do not get donated and are too expensive. When you go to Chipotle on that day, say you're supporting the Student Government Association for online orders. All you have to do is input a code that I have on the fundraiser flyer, the members of Student Government Association would love your support for this fundraiser if you would like a copy, e-mail or picture of the flyer, please let me know and I can get that out to you as soon as possible.

Adjournment
Motion by Senator Fulton, seconded by Senator Hofstetter, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.