

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

2-21-2024

Senate Meeting, February 21, 2024

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

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

Recommended Citation

Academic Senate, "Senate Meeting, February 21, 2024" (2024). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 1326.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/1326>

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.

**Illinois State University
Academic Senate Meeting
February 21, 2024
Approved**

Senator Mainieri called the roll and declared a quorum.

Senate Chairperson: Next on our agenda is Public Comment. As per our bylaws, the Academic Senate of Illinois State University welcomes constructive communication from the members of the university community and citizens of Illinois. Students, faculty and staff are encouraged to provide information relevant to the academic mission of the university. The Academic Senate allows up to ten minutes in total for public comment and questions during a public meeting. An individual speaker will be permitted two minutes for their presentation. When a large number of persons wishes to speak on a single item, it is recommended they choose one or more persons to speak for them. The senate accepts copies of the speaker's presentation, questions, and other relevant written or visual materials. When appropriate, the senate may provide a response to the speaker's questions within a reasonable amount of time following the speaker's presentation. Further comments according to our bylaws will be carried over to the next senate meeting. People may also submit written comments tonight. Just a reminder to our public commenters to please keep their presentations to two minutes. If needed, Secretary Mainieri will provide a 30-second warning before your time is expired. Our first public commenter is Diane Zosky, community member. Is that your title now? Dean. [laughter] Not dean.

Public Comment

Diane Zosky: Community member. Indeed a community member, and I'm here on behalf of the School Street Food Pantry and all of our students that we serve. And I just want to express our gratitude for your generosity in conducting a food drive for our students. Many of you know that we're kind of right next door in the First United Methodist Church, and we serve about 110-120 students every Friday. These are students who do not have enough food to eat. And we know from the Government Accounting Office that about 30-40% of college-aged students are food insecure, and we know of those about 47% of those students who identify as food insecure will not complete to their degree. So please know all that you do really does make an impact, and you really are contributing to the success of our students. So thank you very much.

Senate Chairperson: Thank you. Our next public commenter is Rebekah Mangels.

Rebekah Mangels: Yes. Hello. I'm here tonight as a graduate student. I'm also a graduate teaching assistant in the School of Communication. I've spoken here several times, so several of you might know my face already but hello. I just want to talk a little bit more about the School Street Food Pantry. The Graduate Workers Union is the entity that helped organize that with School Street Food Pantry, which we are very grateful to, and we are very grateful to everyone who has helped donate. We also are looking for support in terms of our contract bargaining, because right now the very reason for the School Street Food Pantry is graduate students not being paid a living wage. This is how School Street Food Pantry actually began. If you don't know, if you weren't around at this time during the School Street Food Pantry's actual beginning

was organized by graduate students who were not being paid a living wage. So they chose to organize themselves, and I'm glad they did because I think that the organization of graduate students has been far more effective than anything that Illinois State has thus far provided for us, unfortunately. There has been an offer on the table for a very long time that is not satisfactory for our membership, and so I simply ask for your support in supporting better wages for our graduate student body. Please do not fail us. I have nearly quit this degree so many times because of my chronic health condition which might be long COVID. I'm undiagnosed and I don't have the money to afford living and paying for medication here with what I'm being paid right now. And there are lots of other people like me. I'm just one example. So please, please call for higher student wages for undergraduates and graduates alike. Thank you.

Senate Chairperson: Thank you, Rebekah and Diane. Our next item is a presentation. We have here this evening the Interim Director of Intercollegiate Athletics, Jeri Beggs, and also Leanna Bordner who's the Associate Director of Intercollegiate Athletics. They took time out from the basketball game which is also happening right now to give us an update about Athletics. There are lots of things happening in the national level and also just to review the budget. Please be aware that we are having a separate session with Rob Blemler, who's the university auditor, on the audit findings, so we are not going to treat that item this evening.

Presentation

Jeri Beggs: So thanks for having us, Jeri Beggs and Leanna Bordner from the Athletics Department. I'm going to give you a little update on Athletics and what's going on over there and then take a look real quickly at the three-year budget that was provided and discussed with one of your subcommittees. So first I want to talk about academics, which is near and dear to my heart. Our student athletes work very hard at athletic endeavors, but of course they are students first, and so we're very proud of their academic achievements. They work really long, hard hours, and I think sometimes balancing those two things is very difficult, but yet they've really been performing. We had a record GPA in the department last semester of 3.44 for all student athletes. We had 117 4.0 GPAs. So just to give you a little perspective, we have 400 to 450 student athletes and 117 of them had perfect 4.0 GPAs. So these are some really good students. Our Women's Golf had a high GPA of 3.83. That's not very many Bs out of a bunch of young women. And our Men's Basketball has set a three-semester-straight record GPA, three semesters in a row of record GPAs, ending in the fall with 3.22. So we're very proud of their academic performance. Next Wednesday night's men's basketball game, we're going to have an Honor Roll, and over 300, I think, of our student athletes have earned the right to be a part of that Honor Roll. So great things happening on the academic side. On the athletic side, good things happening there, too. In the spring we found out that we were once again the Missouri Valley Conference All-Sport Trophy winner, so all the teams that participate in Missouri Valley compete against each other in all the different sports, and we won it for the fourth straight year. So we're really happy. We won it mostly on the backs of our women's sports. Our women's sports have done very, very well for us, including our Women's Basketball team, Gold team, and honestly our Women's Track team – I hesitate to use the word dynasty. They have been very, very successful in indoor and outdoor track, so we're really proud of them. Just last weekend, both the men's team knocked off the 23rd best team in the nation, Indiana State, which was really exciting, and then won again over the weekend against Evansville. Our women's team also won two games last week, and so to have them go 4-0 is really exciting for us. Our Men's Golf team

just yesterday wrapped up a tournament in Laredo, Texas where they beat the likes of Michigan, Houston, and other big schools and set a tournament team record for the three-day event. And so our Men's Golf team is off to a really, really great start.

I also want to tell you a little bit about facilities and what's going on there. I think all of you are aware that we built an Indoor Practice Facility and opened that in the fall. It's been fun to kind of learn how that building operates. It's not a traditional building, so there's been a lot of learning. For example, you cannot shoot fireworks near that building. I guess that probably wouldn't be surprised if you really thought about it, but we have a tradition of shooting fireworks off during football games. Can't do that anymore. We also found out that you have to heat the building to a really high degree when it's icing or snowing, that you can't allow any kind of ice or snow to land on the top of that building, because it's a balloon essentially, right? It's a large balloon. And so typically it's about 60 degrees in there, and that's in an effort to save money, one reason. But then also students who are running around don't really need it to be warm. They just need it to be not freezing. We had to get it to 80 in order to keep the ice and snow off of it. So we had some really sweaty student athletes during those days, but it's really had a huge impact on our sports. I think most of us recognize that football would benefit from that. So it's had huge impact already on our teams, and we're looking forward to see other ways that we can continue. The other that it's done is actually just take pressure off of our other buildings. Horton is a well-used building. Not only do we use it. K&R uses it. Campus Rec uses it. Gamma Phi, the military ROTC groups. Lots of people use that building, and so having some of our teams go over to the IPF have actually made it possible. We're looking for a naming rights opportunity, so if any of you would like to see your name in really big letters on the side of that building, come talk to me, and I'd be happy to talk to you about what that would cost. [laughter] Thanks.

So let me also talk about some community events for the fall. When I took over as the Interim Athletic Director, one of the things I really wanted to do was to see us be better campus partners and better community partners. And so we hosted two events in the fall that I'm really proud of. The first one was called Ballin' on Beaufort, which was a replacement for the old Hoop Fest, which is the introduction to the men's and women's basketball season. And so we've always had those, and we had them in Horton a couple times. We've had them in CEFCU Arena. But they'd gotten a little tired in a lot of our opinion, and so we took it to the streets. So uptown Normal partnered with us. We bought a sport court, and we hosted the event out in the streets, and it was so much fun. It would've been an A+ if the weather would've been a little bit better, but it was a fabulous event, and we got a lot of good community sport, and uptown Normal loved having all that crowd show up. The other one that honestly, in my opinion, was just a win, win, win was the Illinois Wesleyan-Illinois State University exhibition game, the community event. And so those two teams had not played each other in a very long time, probably because we lost to Illinois Wesleyan the last time we played. But the women played first; the men played second. We had 6,800 people at an exhibition game. I think that's still maybe our largest attendance this year, and the money was split between the Western Avenue Community Center and then a mental health initiative between Illinois State Athletics and Illinois Wesleyan Athletics. It was so much fun. The two student governments got together beforehand, the SAC members talked, the presidents of the two universities sat side by side at center court, and so it was a real, true community event with really good outcomes. We won both games, and so again, win, win, win, win, win. Great, great events for us.

I want to turn my attention to talking to you just a little bit about college sports in general and how they're funded, and then that will lead into my conversation about our budget. So you hear a lot about what's going on in college sports, I'm sure, especially if you're a fan. You hear about the NIL, you hear about transfer portal, you probably hear about huge amounts of salaries for coaches and student athletes and TV money. I just want to talk to you a little bit about what you're hearing versus what actually happens here at Illinois State. So just a couple examples for you. TV money. We don't make really any money on our TV productions, less than \$20,000 last year for us. Every team in the Big Ten, even the ones who aren't good at football, like Indiana (that's one of my schools, so I can say that), made \$60,000,000 last year off of a TV contract. So there are huge TV contracts out there that have nothing to do with the NCAA. We are not participating in that. The other big pot of money is the NCAA Men's Basketball Units you get from the tournament, and the Missouri Valley does participate in that but again in a much smaller way than the Big Ten or the SEC schools might. Every time we earn a unit, it's worth about \$2,000,000 to use over the six years that it's paid out. Last year, the Big Ten earned 14 units, which was worth \$28,000,000 over the six-year period of time. So we participate in that, but we don't get huge amounts of money from that. There's also an academic unit now, and I'm proud to say that Illinois State has earned that every year along with almost all of the Missouri Valley schools. That's in the \$140,000 range now, which we're happy to have, and I love that they are finally rewarding academics, not just athletic performance. There's an NCAA Special Assistance Fund, and then there's some additional funding based on the number of sports and student athletes that you have. We participate in a lot of that. We also spend a lot of time and effort trying to raise money for ourselves to try to help our budget. So, of course, ticket sales, the premium seating fee attached to really good seats at football, really good seats at men's basketball. We seek donations for scholarships and funding specific causes. We are participating in Birds Give Back tomorrow, just like many of your programs are, to try to raise money for a specific cause. We have a sponsorship program. Redbirds Sports Properties is a third-party entity that we contract with that goes out and tries to get us sponsorship deals. So if you've been to a game and you've seen a Jimmy John's free throw promotion, that's Redbird Sports Properties that's out there trying to help us with that money. And then, of course, we rely heavily upon student fees, just like most schools at our level. That's where we get our dollars, and so we are very appreciative of the students and their willingness to help us in this area. I participated in student fee review committees, and one of the best questions I was asked, I think, was what about the students that aren't interested in athletics. What would you say to them? And I said here's where I think Athletics benefits the university as a whole. It is in the news, right, on a regular basis. There's no academic segment on the 5:00 news. I wish there was. I was an academic myself, right? But there's a sports segment on the 5:00 news, and Illinois State gets its fair share of time there. It's a venue for bringing people together from the community, for bringing in government officials, from bringing in donors. It serves a purpose in that it gets attention outside of our little community, and it also serves our community. So I hope all the students participate and come to the games. They're fun. I would love to see you all there, but I also think Athletics brings a lot to the table regardless of whether you actually attend a football game or not.

I also want to talk just a little bit about where we're spending that money. As you might imagine, costs have gone up dramatically over the last couple of years. We have 400 student

athletes. We are the largest family on campus, because we house those student athletes. We pay tuition and fees for student athletes. We travel student athletes, and all of those numbers have gone up across the board. I'm sure most of you are very aware that hotel costs and transportation costs and food costs have gone up, and so likewise our budgets have gone up across the board. We're also seeing increased costs because the NCAA is asking more of us. Pressure from society, pressure from legislature has forced us, has encouraged us, demanded that we take care of our student athletes because they're obviously providing a service for us. And so we're seeing increased demands for mental health coverage, increased demands for nutrition and medical care and life skills. And so they're asking us to do these things, and some of those cost money. Okay?

You all have the three-year budget in your materials, and I'm happy to answer questions about anything you have on there. I am not the CFO of the Athletics Department, but obviously I work with the budget on a regular basis. I do want to point out a couple of things to you before anybody asks me any questions. We have seen, again, some increased costs. And you're also going to see a year in that three-year comparison where there essentially were no sports. Right? That '21 fiscal year was COVID, and so ticket sales were non-existent basically. NCAA income was very low because we didn't have a men's basketball tournament that year. And so as you start to compare those, if you see noticeable increases, that's because that first year was a really unique year for us in Athletics. We divided it into revenues, and of course you'll see student fees and income fund as coming from a direct institutional support. And then on the other side you see, we call it self-generated or Foundation revenue, and those are tickets and sponsorships and NCAA income that we get. On the expenses side, just like most of your departments probably, salaries make up a huge portion of our budget. But we also have buildings that we need to take care of and travel that we need to pay for. Guarantee expenses, for any of you who are interested in that, it's common in college athletics that you either get bought or you buy. Right? And so in football we frequently get bought, right? So we're going to Iowa next year. I don't know what the dollar amounts is, but they range 400, 500, 600, \$700,000. It's a nice chunk of change that we get in order to go and play there. Of course, they're planning on a win. We're planning on an upset. But, regardless, we get paid. We more frequently buy in men's basketball. We actually buy games, and that's a conference philosophy that if we will buy home games in the off season, that will put us in the best situation to get multiple teams into the final tournament, into the March Madness tournament. And so if you have any questions about guarantees when you see that, that's what we're talking about. It's a guarantee to play a game. And there are a few other places where we see those, but they're much smaller numbers. Okay?

You see the financial aid, of course, on there. We have scholarships and financial aid limited by the NCAA, what they'll allow us to do, but we do fully fund our sports, which sets us apart from some of the other schools in the Valley. And our theory has always been if we're going to put a sport on the court, on the field, we're going to give them the best chance that they can to win, and so we fully support up to the limit that the NCAA allows us to support them.

So I'm going to take a deep breath and give you a chance to ask me any questions.

Senator McHale: I just have a question about the increasing commercialization of the announcements made within, particularly, football. Well, CEFCU Arena. I don't understand in the budget that I'm looking at where the amount that CEFCU pays us to call it that is.

Jeri Beggs: It would be in sponsorships.

Senator McHale: Okay. And, likewise, the Toyota First Downs. Do they pay us by first down?

Jeri Beggs: [laughter] That would be a sponsorship opportunity, also, but that would come through the Redbird Sports Properties. And so they go out. Again, they're a third-party company that we've hired. They go out and sell sponsorships, and they essentially sell our assets. So you mentioned the Toyota First Down or whether it's a game at a men's or women's basketball game, like a promotion, Chick-fil-A drops cows from the ceiling. That's a sponsorship. So we're getting paid for that.

Senate Chairperson: Is that a national trend?

Jeri Beggs: Oh, yeah.

Senator McHale: Could you give us any idea, do you have any idea, I'm just wondering out of curiosity how much do we get for a Toyota First Down?

Jeri Beggs: I don't know that one off the top of my head.

Senator McHale: I understand.

Jeri Beggs: I know most of our sponsorships are all under \$100,000 a year. Some of them range 30, 40, 50 is a common number for us for a sponsorship. And that might get them a lot of different assets, right? So you get signage, the announcer says your name, you get some tickets. You know, it's a combination package that they put together.

Senate Chairperson: Senator Holmes.

Jeri Beggs: Yeah, and Toyota is a national one. So that's one of the things that Learfield is able to offer us is some national deals.

Senate Chairperson: Interesting. Senator Holmes.

Senator Holmes: You talked about the new athletic facility and some things that you learned. It sounded as though you didn't know them before construction. Is that how that happened?

Jeri Beggs: No. I'm new. I'm sure the engineers knew all of these things before, but when we have our Facilities – Marc Martindale is our Facilities guy. We he comes to meetings and tells us these things, it's just been kind of interesting for those of us who aren't engineers and didn't know all the details going in. It's just been fun for me. It's been fun to learn about this building and the caretaking of it. No, somebody knew. I just didn't know.

Senate Chairperson: Director Beggs, could you go through, that was like a \$11,000,000 facility. How is that cost reflected in this budget, and who was the main sponsorship of that?

Jeri Beggs: So we worked with donors to raise the money. I think everybody's quite aware that not all of those have come through for us, and so it was a finance deal where we're paying it over I think a ten-year period of time and making payments on it. And so, you know, some of that donor money will continue to make payments, and then we're looking for other ways within our budget. For example, we collect premium seating fees for men's basketball and football, and that goes into our Foundation accounts. We'll be using some of that along the way to make the payments.

Senate Chairperson: So is the finance, is that in the operating expenditures, or is it going through the university?

Jeri Beggs: I don't see it listed here, Martha. I'm sorry. I don't.

Senate Chairperson: Senator Petree, would that finance payment traditionally be on their budget, or would it be on the university budget?

Senator Petree: I don't know the answer to that question. I have to find out.

Jeri Beggs: I can get an answer for you for that.

Senate Chairperson: Sure.

Jeri Beggs: We finally hired our new cabinet member who's in charge of the business office. She started on Monday, so I didn't ask her to come today because I didn't think she would be prepared to start answering these questions, but I can find out.

Senate Chairperson: Okay. Very good. Further questions? Senator McHale.

Senator McHale: I just wonder, I'm trying to figure out where this sponsorship money is in terms of our income. I see rentals, student fees, investment income.

Jeri Beggs: It says sponsorships.

Senator McHale: Oh, okay. Thank you very much. Pardon me.

Senate Chairperson: Did I have a question over here? Senator McLauchlan.

Senator McLauchlan: So congratulations on a perfectly balanced budget. Which aspect of the expenditures changes with the varying revenues?

Jeri Beggs: Say it again.

Senator McLauchlan: So you managed to perfectly balance your budget. Congratulations.

Senator McLauchlan: You can't perfectly predict revenues.

Jeri Beggs: Right.

Senator McLauchlan: So which of the expenses is the discretionary one?

Jeri Beggs: So a lot of our marketing can be discretionary. Right? We also sometimes have Foundation accounts where we've raised money and put that into Foundation account.

Senator McLauchlan: Those are two separate. You don't comingle Foundation and . . .

Jeri Beggs: No, we do not, but for like a team budget, if a team gets to the end and they have already spent all of their money that we've allocated to them, they might dip into their Foundation account to pay for something that they need to do at the end of a season. And so we have the ability to tap into some of those Foundation accounts for some of the things that we do. Obviously some are not appropriate. Some of them don't meet donor intent. But each of our teams do have Foundation fund-raising dollars that they've raised that they can tap into, and then we also can delay projects. Right? Facility projects. We are the caretakers for 12 buildings on campus. And so as you might imagine, we can't perfectly predict what our expenses will be in those areas. We now know, for example, that the lower bowl of CEFCU Arena, you cannot hear a fire alarm in that lower bowl. We're going to pay \$1,200,000 to put in a fire alarm. And, of course, we need to because it's a liability issue and a safety issue. But what's kind of sad to some of us is nobody will even know that we've ever done it. Right? There will be no, no student athlete will really feel the benefit. No fan will walk in and say, "Isn't it better in here because we have a fire alarm?" So we struggle oftentimes to budget those things because we just don't know. Very old buildings and sometimes things happen. A garage door broke in CEFCU and cost us \$80,000 recently. It just happens with old buildings.

Senator Holmes: I'm noticing a million-dollar difference between last fiscal year and this fiscal year in salaries. Can you explain that?

Jeri Beggs: So I actually went and talked to our business office today because I noticed that, too. What we had in the first one, the first one that you're seeing, is a little bit of a COVID year where some people were not replaced right away. We weren't really operating at full capacity. The second year, we left the budget number the same and then actually blew past it in personnel. And so the third year was kind of a right sizing of our personnel dollars. As you all know, people get raises, and minimum wages go up, and so there is quite a big jump but it was actually a reaction to real expenses in the second year.

Senate Chairperson: And you talked about compliance. Were there any counselors you had to hire or new positions you had to hire?

Jeri Beggs: Not a lot, no. Maybe a few new positions honestly. One of the things I have done since moving into the area is look for efficiencies and look for ways we can combine some

positions. Some of you may have seen that we had some promotions in January, and I want to kind of give the caveat to that, as we actually had someone retire. And instead of adding that person back to our salary base, we allocated those responsibilities across several other people and then rewarded them by giving them some title changes and small salary bumps. But we're looking for efficiencies everywhere we can right now in personnel.

Senator Holmes: A quick followup to that. So the budget for fiscal year '22 is not exactly accurate to the amount of money that was spent in those line items?

Jeri Beggs: No, it's not. No. These are budgets.

Senator Holmes: I just didn't know whether the past ones would be updated after.

Jeri Beggs: No. These are always budgets.

Senator Holmes: Okay.

Senate Chairperson: Further questions? Jeri, can you talk about the travel fee, because I know there was a statement about how travel would have to increase because of Missouri Valley expanded, but I note it went up like \$7,000. Was that the Missouri Valley Conference cost that you guys talked about?

Jeri Beggs: Yeah. We, again, weren't really able to give our teams a big increase because we just didn't have the money. And so last year, actually, many of them ended up tapping into their Foundation accounts to cover their costs, because we do have two new schools. Right? We have three new schools, actually, but two new total schools, and some of them are much greater distance away as Dr. Horst is pointing out. We now travel to Murray State and Belmont and all of those are farther. It used to be Loyola, right? That's a much shorter one. That was the other reason why we really needed the student fee increase and we needed an increase in our budgets because we are seeing increased travel expenses.

Senate Chairperson: Some might be curious to know if you had an estimate, because I know that was a rationale for the fee increase. And I would be curious to hear if you had a perfect scenario how much it would cost to do. It sounds like the travel is being funded in a different way?

Jeri Beggs: Well, our goal this upcoming year was to add a little less than \$500,000 across all 19 sports to their budgets. And that would be travel, meals, you know everything that goes with it. I can't remember the exact number; \$470,000 I think across 19 sports, 450 student athletes budgets.

Senate Chairperson: \$500,000.

Jeri Beggs: Yeah.

Senate Chairperson: Last question. Senator Holmes.

Senator Holmes: Yes. So there's like a section for Foundation revenue and Foundation expenses. I'm just confused like when the line item doesn't match, it can just magically come from the Foundation if that's not listed under the Foundation revenue and Foundation expenses.

Senate Chairperson: Remember, we are going to do the Foundation audit and that we're going to do that in a separate session.

Jeri Beggs: Yeah, just like almost every department on campus, we have Foundation accounts where money is held. Is that what you're asking?

Senator Holmes: Well, I'm just confused because there's a section labeled Foundation. Like if we're spending money out of the Foundation budgets and that's like being accounted for in this budget, why would it not be included under Foundation expenses, if that makes sense, as it's being charged to the Foundation if I'm not misunderstanding that.

Jeri Beggs: So you're looking at the part where there's Foundation revenue at the top and then there's Foundation expenses at the bottom.

Senator Holmes: Yes. And then we were talking about like travel and you're saying that teams are pulling from the Foundation to spend on travel, there's \$699,000 listed, which is the exact same as last year, that's supposed to come from the Foundation towards travel. So if there's more than that coming towards travel, why is that not included on this budget is my question.

Senator McLauchlan: If I may, can we see the actual expenses when Rob Blemler comes instead of just budgets? Senator Holmes's question is about actual expenditures, not what you budget. Is that auditable?

Senate Chairperson: I'm having a meeting with him, and I can put in that request if that's fair.

Jeri Beggs: Yes, but his audit did not cover these. It covered expenses of staff. It didn't cover expenses of teams.

Senate Chairperson: So I think what you're saying is that there's a Foundation stuff in the revenue, there is the Foundation travel line down in the expenses, and so are there additional travel fees that are coming from somewhere else, I guess is what you're asking.

Senator Holmes: My main concern is when student fees are being increased, and the main reasoning behind that is travel costs are going up, and then we're raising \$1,000,000 from student fees and that entire \$1,000,000 is being budgeted towards salaries. That was not what the students were sold. The students were sold a fire alarm system in the Redbird Arena and they were sold travel expenses due to inflation, but all of our student fees are going toward salaries, which is not what we were told.

Jeri Beggs: Oh, they are absolutely going towards travel and towards the other issue, like the buildings. For example, the \$0.25 is going into an account that is only able to be used for the buildings. We cannot use it for salaries.

Senator Holmes: But what I'm seeing right now is under student fees, under direct institutional support, so how much money you raised. Last year was \$10,000,000. Next year will be \$11,000,000. So it's going up by \$1,000,000. And then under that section, under where the expenditures are for student fees, where that money is going, has gone up \$1,000,000 under salaries. That's directly where that money is going to. That is not what we were told.

Jeri Beggs: Okay. First of all, this is FY23, so this is last year.

Senator Holmes: I reviewed that student fee as well, that student fee proposal.

Jeri Beggs: Okay.

Senator Holmes: That's not what we were told.

Jeri Beggs: Okay. The total budget in Athletics all pours into one spot for us versus academic units may have personnel lines that can only be spent for one thing and other support services can only be spent for one thing. It doesn't work quite the same way in Athletics, and so our money all ends up being pulled into one spot except for Foundation. So we have money inside the Athletics, and they have money in the Foundation. And so I think what you're seeing is an increase in salary, but it's not necessarily a one-to-one from student fees to salary. It's the overall budget, and we're spending it in lots of different ways. That student fee, I think, was allocated between operating expenses and also again one of our building funds. And so those are regulated. Like, again, the building funds cannot be spent for anything else. We have to spend them on the buildings.

Senator Holmes: Yes.

Jeri Beggs: And so if somebody else could give a better answer to you, I can get that for you, but I don't want you to leave here thinking that we took \$1,000,000 of student fees and turned that into salary, because that's not what happened.

Senator Holmes: Okay. I mean that's what I'm pretty sure I'm looking at.

Senate Chairperson: So you know that you have a budget person. So maybe she could give us some sort of more refined statement after looking into the issue a little bit further.

Jeri Beggs: Sure.

Senate Chairperson: Okay. You have a game to get back to.

Jeri Beggs: Yes, I do.

Senate Chairperson: I hope we are ahead.

Jeri Beggs: I hope we are, too.

Senate Chairperson: Thank you very much.

Jeri Beggs: Thank you.

Chairperson Remarks

Senate Chairperson: All right. We're at Chairperson Remarks. Thank you to Interim Director Beggs and Associate Director Bordner for joining us. In the constitution it says that we're supposed to recommend policy for intercollegiate programs and activities, and we delegate most of this to the Athletics Council. But nonetheless I think it's important that we remain aware of current issues and engage in a dialogue with the Athletic administration. So I hope we can make this an annual event so that we can really develop a sense of understanding.

I want to thank Tracy Mainieri, who's just been out in the hall gathering all of the stuff that we just gathered for the Food Pantry, and I also want to thank all of you for all of the donations you made. It is really great to see that effort from the Academic Senate. So thank you very much, and thank you to Tracy for organizing it and the other student senator, Senator Gonzalez.

I also want to thank all the senators that showed up for our first presidential forum for Academic Senate in particular. I know it was hard because it was in the middle of the day, but nonetheless I thought we had a pretty good showing. So thank you to all who attended. We do have three more candidates, so your attendance will be greatly appreciated. If you can't make it to that, there is also public forums going on for the general community, and the Campus Communication Committee made a real push to have these. I think they were a huge success. It was a really great opportunity for the public to engage with the candidate, and if you weren't there it was standing room only. So it was a very successful event. Again, we have three more of those. So if you can't make it to the Academic Senate meeting in particular, which is smaller, there's the public forums, and it was great to see candidates live and in person interacting with the entire Illinois State community.

Tonight we have a few information items and some action items. This is our busy season. And after tonight, committee, chairs, we have four meetings left, three more internal committees left, and so committee chairs please plan wisely. There is no faculty caucus meeting this evening, however. And just a side note for the rest of you, we're going to be using a transcription service for the Academic Senate minutes, so please help me out and check for accuracy and also make sure that I'm calling on you so that the transcription service can get your name. Are there any questions for me? Okay. If not, I'll go over to Student Body President, Senator Monk.

Student Body President Remarks

Senator Monk: All right. Thank you very much, Chairperson Horst. Good evening. It is wonderful to see everyone again. I'd like to begin my remarks by thanking Senator Tasdan for his work in organizing and to all those who attended a fantastic Lobby Day in Springfield today. In the morning we had the pleasure of meeting with Senators Michael Halpin, Dave Koehler, Bill

Cunningham, Laura Murphy, and Representatives Katie Stuart, Sharon Chung, Maurice West, Jay Hoffman, and Treasurer Mike Frerichs. In the afternoon, Senator Blair, Myers, Meyers-Hoops and myself joined up with SIUC and SIUE for their lobbying efforts. Meeting with representatives Paul Jacobs and Adam Niemerg and stopping by to see Senator Dan McConchie and Senator Koehler once again. We focused our advocacy efforts on increasing appropriations from the state for ISU, a statewide 12-hour notice, and of course the Wellness Days Project. In short, we secured the support of representatives West, Stuart, Hoffman, Niemerg, and Senator Halpin for the Wellness Day Project. Representative Chung has pre-filed in the House, and Senator Koehler's staff is finalizing the language that will constitute the legislation. May remains the projected timeline to pass the bill through the General Assembly, and Senator Koehler's optimistic as he prepares to move the bill through the Higher Education Committee in the Senate.

I'd like to congratulate Student Veterans for America for becoming our newest ex-officio organization. Veteran Students are one of SGA's many blind spots, and I'm thrilled to find the proper representation for the 450 veteran students at ISU.

Last Wednesday, the Student Caucus completed its review of Policy 2.1.27, Student Bereavement. This policy has been provided to General Counsel and the Dean of Students for their review. I'm looking forward to passing Policy 2.1.17, Residency Status, and Policy 5.1.13, Anti-hazing later this evening.

I'd like to congratulate Emerging Leaders program member and Education Director for Students Ending Rape Culture, Isabella Tornabene for her confirmation as the Secretary of Health & Wellness last Wednesday. She will make a valuable addition to the collaborative nature of Wellness at ISU, and I'm thrilled to see what she will accomplish in the role.

The first meeting of the Steering Team for the Committee for the Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence at Illinois State University has been scheduled for Friday, February 23rd, where will finalize the committee's mission and criteria for subcommittee membership. AI continues to be a pressing issue for the university community, and I'm grateful for the administration for their readiness to begin conversations on how to best take advantage of the rapidly developing technology.

On Tuesday, myself and Kylie Wells, President of the Gray Matters Collective, which is a mental health RSO on campus, filmed our promotional video which will be used alongside Birds Give Back for fundraising purposes to support mental health resources on campus. The video has been shared on the Redbird Life and Redbird Well Instagram page, Facebook, and Twitter pages as well. Myself and Senator Meyers-Hoops will be participating as ambassadors for the program, and we're looking forward to a successful campaign tomorrow.

Finally, I am excited to announce that campaign season is officially here for student government. Elections will be taking place on March 5th and 6th, so I'm looking forward to welcoming SGA's new leadership, and I urge all candidates to run clean and fair races. With that, I will happily accept any questions.

Senate Chairperson: Busy. Very busy person. Any questions for Senator Monk? All right. Seeing none, Interim President Tarhule is traveling, so we will go to Acting Provost Yazedjian.

Acting Provost Yazedjian's Remarks

Acting Provost Yazedjian: I have no prepared remarks this evening, but I'm happy to answer any questions.

Senate Chairperson: Any questions for Acting Provost Yazedjian? All right. Seeing none, Vice President for Student Affairs, Levester Johnson, is hosting an event at the basketball game, so he is not here this evening. So we'll go over to Vice President for Finance and Planning, Dan Petree.

Vice President for Finance and Planning Remarks

Dan Petree: Thank you very much. I have one announcement. Today the governor announced his budget for fiscal '25, and in the budget he is asking for a 2% increase in higher education operating funds. So for us that would be about \$1,500,000 for next year. That's all I have to report. I'd be happy to take any questions.

Senate Chairperson: Any questions for Senator Petree? Was there any word on the project they're working on to realign all of the budgets and come up with (I forget the term they are using) the equitable plan?

Dan Petree: That's a great question. There has been a project that's I think a task force on basically trying to decide whether the way the state is allocating resources for higher ed is appropriate for the time. And I believe this task force has its last meeting next week. So the draft report is almost finished. I think it will be presented right after the last meeting.

Senate Chairperson: Okay. So stay tuned. All right. Moving on, we'll go to the 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. May I have a motion and a second to approve Legal Studies Language Integration Sequence, General Legal Studies Sequence, and Early Childhood Education Minor? Senator Blair and second by Senator Meyers-Hoops. All in favor, please say aye.

Multiple people: Aye.

Senate Chairperson: Opposed? All right. We have some curriculum. We now have a very important action item, and I'll turn it over to Senator Blum, Chair of the Rules Committee.

Senator Blum: Yes, tonight we're going to do the amendments to the constitution. So just to refresh you, we are increasing the number of senators from 29 to 30. This is in anticipation of the College of Engineering. There were various edits, such as for Academic Affairs, things like that, changing the name of Chairs Council to Active Leadership Council and adding the Chief Equity Officer and Inclusion. Campus Communication Committee was increased to nine members. And what text is about is it allows for three staff members, three student members of the Campus Communication Committee and three faculty members. So there was previously

three, four, and one, respectively. And so the idea was to make that kind of an equitable committee where it was balanced and for student representation. Actually the faculty number didn't change, and the AP and Civil Service came up with a system of where they would just have three instead of four.

Senate Chairperson: Okay. Thank you very much, and this is coming from a committee so it does not need a second. Is there any debate? Senator Holmes.

Senator Holmes: I had a question about this. Is that allowed during debate? Well, was there any consideration or is there going to be consideration of when there are students in the College of Engineering to add another seat for a student representative from the College of Engineering?

Senate Chairperson: That's not part of this proposal at this time. That's certainly something that we could consider in the future if we send a note to acsenate@ilstu.edu.

Senator Holmes: And I will.

Senate Chairperson: Further debate? Senator Blum, would you consider a friendly amendment to delete in the Executive Committee description...there's a Vice President/Student Body President and then the President of the Student Body.

Senator Blum: were proposing to delete the second President of the Student Body.

Senate Chairperson: Very good.

Senator Blum: So yes.

Senate Chairperson: And just another friendly amendment. You have a list of the ex-officios. You say the Chairperson of the Academic Leadership Council or designee and the representative of the Dean's Council and the Student Trustee. Could we delete the 'and' before representative of the Dean's Council?

Senator Blum: Yes.

Senate Chairperson: Thank you. Further debate? I appreciate your comment. When they get students it'll be interesting to see the trajectory of the number of students. Yes. Further debate? Hearing none, all in favor of approval of the proposed amendments to Article 5 of the Illinois State University Constitution, please signify by saying aye.

Multiple people: Aye.

Senate Chairperson: Opposed? Terrific. We will send that forward to the Office of General Counsel, and then it will make its way hopefully to the Board of Trustees in May. And so now Senator Monk and the Student Caucus.

Senator Monk: All right. So we will be getting with Policy 2.1.17, Residency Status. We will be proposing quick changes, remove the gendered language. So anywhere it says 'his' or 'her', we will be replacing that with 'their'. We also removed the repeat paragraph and included a sentence to direct out-of-state students who qualify for in-state tuition to Policy 7.7.9.

Senate Chairperson: Okay. So can you read that sentence, because I'm a little bit confused about this.

Senator Monk: So last sentence of the first paragraph. If you are an out-of-state student who qualifies for in-state tuition, please refer to Policy 7.7.9 of University's Policies and Procedures.

Senator Monk: All right. Making a motion to approve. . . To approve the proposed changes.

Senate Chairperson: And because this is coming from a committee, it does not need a second. Is there any debate? I have just one more thing. I think there was a sentence that was deleted. There was a little bit of confusion with this bullet point list under Determination of Independent Status. So when I think when I inserted that, I deleted documentation that may be used to document residency. Colon. And that's why we have that list. Okay? So I inadvertently deleted that. Okay. So the amendments are: We're taking out all the his and her and replacing them with theirs except for one situation where it's they, we're adding the sentence that's at the end of the first paragraph that you sent me and read aloud, and we are including documentation that may be used to document residency above the bulleted point list in Determination of Independent Status. All in favor of these proposed amendments to 2.1.17, please signify by saying aye.

Multiple people: Aye.

Senate Chairperson: Opposed? Okay. We have that done. I'll double check with you before we move that forward.

Senator Monk: Sounds good.

Senate Chairperson: All right. And we have the Anti-hazing policy also from the Student Caucus.

Senator Monk: So Policy .1.13, the Anti-hazing. A lot of it is simply cleaning up in the definition of hazing, making sure that the definition is a little bit more specified and including a little bit more of the areas in which the policy will apply when it comes to the definition of hazing. So no major changes, just tightening up the definition of hazing. I'm making a motion to approve the amendments as is.

Senate Chairperson: Thank you. And this is coming from a committee. It does not need a second. I just want to note for the record that we will not be including all of the comments.

Senator Monk: Yes.

Senate Chairperson: And also I'm just going to note that the revised-on date will be February 2024. Is there any debate? Hearing none, all in favor of approval of Policy 5.1.13 as amended, please signify by saying aye.

Multiple people: Aye.

Senate Chairperson: Opposed? Okay. We have another one done. I want to thank the Student Caucus. That's two policies done, and thank you for your hard work. And we have a lot more committees this year, so it's really exciting to see all of this work being done on behalf of the Senate. I will now go over to Senator Nikolaou and the Academic Affairs Committee.

Senator Nikolaou: So the first policy we had is the Admissions proposed catalog. If you remember, that's when we moved around the wording about the Adult Learning Program, and also we added the section about the fraudulent documents. One small change which doesn't seem to have made it is what I mentioned last time, that we are going to change the title Student Conduct and Community Responsibilities. So that's on page 7. Because right now it has the old title, Student Conduct and Conflict Resolution. So page 6. So on behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee, we would like to move it forward for your approval.

Senate Chairperson: Thank you. And this does not need a second since it's coming from a committee. Is there any debate? Hearing none, all in favor of the Admissions Policy, Admissions Statement, please signify by saying aye.

Multiple people: Aye.

Senate Chairperson: Opposed? Okay. Very good. And now we'll go to Policy 4.1.18.

Senator Nikolaou: So for this policy we had the small change on page 6 when we deleted item 1 because it was contradicting the other items 2 to 5. So on behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee, we are putting forth Policy 4.1.18 for your approval.

Senate Chairperson: Thank you very much. I'm just going to note again the revised-on date will be 2/2024.

Senator Nikolaou: Yep.

Senate Chairperson: Is there any debate? Hearing none, all in favor of approval of Policy 4.1.18 as amended, please signify by saying aye.

Multiple people: Aye.

Senate Chairperson: Opposed? Okay. So those are our action items. And so now we have a very important information item coming from Planning and Finance and also a large task force. So we'll be hearing from both entities. So we'll start off with Senator Valentin.

Senator Valentin: The Planning and Finance Committee presents Illinois State University's draft Strategic Plan, Excellence by Design 2024-2029 as an information item to the Senate. The committee has reviewed and endorsed this document. However, as you may know, the development draft and review process for this document has been extensively worked on across the university. So I'd like to ask Chris Roberts, the Co-chair of the Strategic Planning Task Force and Planning Coordinator from Planning, Research and Policy to present a quick overview of the process that has led to the draft plan we have before us.

Chris Roberts: Thank you, Senator Horst, for having us here this evening. Hopefully many of you remember seeing us from both our consultation phases that have happened last year, which I will get into in a moment. I'm Chris Roberts. I'm a member of the Strategic Planning Task Force and a member of the Steering Team, and I'm on hand to address this body tonight. Normally, Angela Engel would be on hand to tag team present this with me, but she is right now traveling back from a family commitment this evening, so I'm here with Steering Team member, Dr. Craig Gatto, who is backing me up. He has graciously agreed to come and help us answer any questions you might have. I'd like to start by saying how much of an honor and a privilege it has been to be a part of this process. And on behalf of the Steering Team, I would like to especially recognize and extend our heartfelt thanks to members of the Strategic Planning Task Force, some of who are in attendance here today, particularly Senator Horst, Senator Valentin, Senator Roy, and any member who are here off to the sides. I don't see anybody, but I want to make sure I'm not forgetting anybody. We greatly appreciate all the work that's been done. I just don't want to leave anybody out. It's been through your dedication, your hard work, and the valued insight you've offered up that we've been able to spend the last 13 months coming together to craft the document that you have before you, and it's all been, again, greatly appreciated. Now, ideally, we would be here to seek your endorsement on the Strategic Plan draft. You are the last stop on what has been a very remarkable and interesting journey to create a document that will hopefully chart our course in the coming years. To date, the plan has been endorsed by the President's cabinet, the Administrative Professional Council, the Civil Service Council, the Student Government Association, and your own Planning and Finance Committee. As of last Friday, February 16th, the draft plan was presented to the Board of Trustees as an informational item for them, and their feedback has been equally positive with only one real question that they had for us. I'd like to now walk you through our process, how we initially created this plan, what we did with the campus community feedback that you provided, and basically entertaining questions that you have on the drafted plan, and then with any luck we can start moving this ball forward.

So in the fall of 2022, our then president charged a 22-person task force to come together to create a new strategic plan, one that would replace the sunsetting Educate, Connect, Elevate. Honoring our value in shared governance, the task force is comprised of a diverse group of faculty, staff, and students representing each of our shared governance groups, university divisions, colleges, including tenure track and non-tenure track faculty members, a dean, a department chair, AP and Civil Service employees, and an undergraduate and a graduate student. An eight-person Steering Team has guided this process and tried to keep the Task Force on track. The Task Force conducted a very comprehensive phase of collecting information from university constituents last spring. Task Force representatives met with nearly 30 internal and external groups to gather information on the university's strengths, challenges, opportunities as well as

potential aspirations we should be looking towards in the next five years. A survey was also conducted, seeking the same input. Over 1,700 faculty, staff, students, alumni, annuitants, and community member provided feedback for us. All in all, the task force had to sift through over 17,000 rows of coded responses. As one who had the unique task of reading those three times over, I'm going to say that number again: 17,000 coded rows of responses. Now to put this in perspective and all kidding aside, previously during the same process for Educate, Connect, Elevate, we received less than 500 feedback responses. So this is campus really coming together to voice their thoughts on what they wanted to see out of a new strategic plan. Taking this feedback to heart, the Task Force then worked on the development of Excellence by Design over the course of the next several months while continually seeking guidance from university leadership. The plan was designed to be an overarching framework for strategic directions and goals that would be worked towards. This was to be sort of our first high concept and ambitious first step that would allow us to go and take what we learn and then create an implementation and action plan after this, and it would further develop out those actions and metrics to make our collective goals a reality. Drafting of the main document happened over the summer of 2023. Excellence by Design 2024-2029 was released for campus constituents to review and provide us feedback that fall. The Task Force again sought input from the very groups we had initially met with in the spring as well as sending out yet another survey in mid-October, and that one generated over 1,100 responses. In addition, three public townhall meetings were held, two virtual, one in person, to inform participants of how the draft had come together and to get their feedback in real time. The good news was, on the whole, the plan was generally well received, particularly the concept that our next phase would allow for subject matter experts working together to help create measurable actions while also generating collective buy in across campus. At all levels, campus constituents would have a vested interest in Excellence by Design, and on behalf of the task force this was something we were quite pleased to hear. That said, though, we received information and insightful feedback from our campus partners on things that we had overlooked, unintentionally missed, or needed to clarify for our constituents. Reoccurring themes within that feedback emerged and showed that the campus consensus rightly warranted changes to be made. All in all, 24 changes were made in total to the document. Three were reordering choices for both strategic directions and objectives. Two were additionally new objectives that were added and suggested to be incorporated into the plan, and then we had 19 wordsmithing tweaks and substitutions for clarification purposes. Finally, as we wrapped our consultation phase, we made the suggested changes and we submitted the plan for design to University Marketing and Communications to create the finalized look and the document you have before you. And that really brings us where we are today. Excellence by Design will be shared with Illinois State University's Board of Trustees, seeking its formal approval and moving into the implementation stage later in May. As mentioned earlier, we have been going to our shared governance groups and asking them for thumbs up, thumbs down endorsements, and this body again is the final one on our list. Now, before I get into any further steps, I'd like to just open it up to you. Do you have any questions for Dr. Gatto or myself?

Senate Chairperson: I plan on just doing this in big chunks. And so are there any questions? Of course, we have Interim President Tarhule's statement. Are there any questions or observations about the introduction? We gave a lot of feedback on the mission, vision. Is there anything about the mission, vision, values? Anything through page 3? All right. And so we have Strategic Direction 1. Are there any questions or comments about that? Moving on, Strategic

Direction 2, Foster Culture Responsible Stewardship. Any questions about that? Moving on, Strategic Direction 3 and 4 as well. Any questions about the second half of the document? Everybody seems to support what's in front of us. In that case, would anybody like to make a motion to move this to action? Senator Blair and second by Senator Meyers-Hoops. Is there any debate? We're making a vote now just to move to action. All in favor of moving this item to action, please signify by saying aye.

Multiple people: Aye.

Senate Chairperson: Opposed? All right. So now it's an action. I'm going to more correctly state it's an endorsement. We now have a vote to endorse. All in favor of endorsement of the the Excellence by Design strategic plan, please signify by saying aye.

Multiple people: Aye.

Chris Roberts: Thank you.

Chris Roberts: Well, thank you all. As stated, you were the last group, so that is significant in its own right. You just put your stamp on it, so we thank you. It feels good to say we'll officially present to the Board of Trustees on May 10, 2024 for their formal approval and adoption. We're not allowed to now rest on our laurels because we're already starting the transition to the next phase of the now Strategic Plan, and we're going to coordinate the naming of the action teams that will be composed of subject matter experts, campus volunteers, students, faculty, staff who are all going to come together and are going to start to figure out appropriate actions and measurable metrics that we can apply to this framework. This plan is meant to be a flexible living document, and we know it's going to fluctuate over time as objectives and goals are met and as campus conditions continue to evolve and change. And our progress is going to be tracked and reported on annually to ensure both transparency and accountability. So, again, we want to keep you abreast of what we're doing. And if things are not going right, we want to change it as we go. So I'll just say again, any questions on that next piece?

Senate Chairperson: Sure. I have a question as well. I'm just going to echo something that I've been hearing in Planning and Finance that there's a lot of interest in having a master plan review, given the expanding campus footprint and given the pedestrian issues that we've been observing. So I'm just going to throw that out in consideration of a master plan review as well.

Chris Roberts: Fair enough.

Senate Chairperson: Thank you.

Chris Roberts: Thank you all.

Senate Chairperson: All right. I'm going to throw it back over to Senator Nikolaou with the Policy 2.1.1, Student Records.

Senator Nikolaou: Policy 2.1.1, Student Records, is on our regular cycle for review. So Senator Hurd and Stacy Ramsey, they started looking at the policy. But then because there were changes based on FERPA, we thought, well, it should go to the Office of the General Counsel. So pretty much we sent it to the Office of the General Counsel. Alice is making its work on it to make it consistent with the law, and these are all the changes that you see in the policy. One other thing: During the Executive Committee, Senator Horst recommended to send it to our date group, the Data Governance Group within the university. So I reached out to Rachel Hart and then Dan Taube. The only recommendation that Dan Taube, the Chief Information Security Officer, had was with respect to the personally identifiable information. And he recommended making it clear that the definition included it is the one based on FERPA, not necessarily the one used within the university because there might be differences. So the change would be if we look on the markup, page 2, where it says personally identifiable information, and we're going to add, as defined under FERPA, and everything else remains the same. And we ran it with Alice Maginnis and said that's perfectly fine. I don't see Alice here.

Senate Chairperson: So we're in information item. And certainly if you can't answer the questions, we can forward them to Alice Maginnis. Are there any questions about 2.1.1? Let's see. In number 13....You have that one part in italics in connection with the disciplinary proceeding related to a crime of violence. Did you want that in italics?

Senator Nikolaou: I will check with Alice. I don't think it is necessary.

Senate Chairperson: And then on the next page, can you walk us through why all of that stuff requests for individuals, agencies, and organizations is deleted? And just all of the deletions. Like what was the rationale for deleting all of this stuff?

Senator Nikolaou: Yes. So for the item that is under request from individuals, agencies, and organizations, we checked with Alice and this is because whatever is mentioned is covered directly under the general principles. And that's why they are removed.

Senate Chairperson: Okay.

Senator Nikolaou: And then the part, previous section 4 where it says procedure for students, inspection, review and hearing, it's part of trying to remove procedure out of the policy documents, and these are going to be hosted at the registrar's website. Which, also, one of the reasons is when we look at the tables where it lists all of the different allocations, these are going to be potentially changing, so there is no reason to be on the policy. It's going to be updated on the registrar's website.

Senate Chairperson: So is the registrar going to be the one who's going to decide that the student has 15 calendar days after inspection? There's a lot of policy here as to the best practices for this review, and I appreciate, you know, removing the record locations, but I guess my concern is if we remove this from this policy then who's going to maintain that language and what role will the Senate have and the students have in maintaining this best practices?

Senator Nikolaou: Are you looking specifically 6, the review part? Okay. I'll check with Alice because the deletion came from Alice. It's not from the registrar. So I'll check because one of the notes that I have from Alice is that these provisions are covered under the general FERPA principles. So it is possible that they are included there and that's why it's recommended to be deleting the review section as well, but I'll check with her and see if it needs to be removed or not.

Senator McHale: Just have a question about Section 13 on Disclosure, Subject to Requirement, 34CFR in connection to disciplinary proceeding....a crime of violence. Four years ago, there was a student that was accused of a crime. And when he went to trial, it seemed that the university disciplined him. He was ultimately found innocent of that crime. And this may be non-related but still an issue that bothers me that it seemed that the university placed him in a disciplinary situation before he was found guilty of any crime. And now I see this says that only the outcome will be disclosed. And I guess it really goes back to that question. Are our students protected from disciplinary action when they're accused of a crime but later found innocent of that crime?

Senate Chairperson: So from the records being disclosed?

Senator Nikolaou: Yes. The record would say that he was academically suspended, and then the proceeding happened, and then according to this it would say that he was reinstated and the university apologized for the initial identification as a possible sex offender.

Senate Chairperson: Sounds like something you have to follow up with Alice Maginnis on.

Senator Nikolaou: I don't think I can answer that.

Senator McHale: Then I have a comment. Is that allowed at this point or no?

Senate Chairperson: Sure. Make a comment.

Senator McHale: I think it's very important that when a student is accused of a crime, it's very valuable they have a due process. Just the university in this case have due process before they suspend a student for the accusation of a crime?

Senate Chairperson: But you don't want to mix in, I mean we're talking just about the record of it, right?

Senator McHale: Okay, well, on the record, it said he was suspended for the accusation of the crime. And then, likewise, this says if he was adjudicated by the university, we would disclose that. Right? I don't see anything about recompense for a wrongful accusation.

Senate Chairperson: Okay, so that's really the core of your question?...so wrongful accusations with it. So how part of the record. Is that your question? It's unfortunate that we don't have

Alice Maginnis here because, you know, there are a lot of technical aspects, legal aspects to this. But I know Senator Nikolaou is taking good notes, and hopefully we'll have a followup.

Senator McHale: I appreciate the latitude on the breadth of the question. Thank you.

Senate Chairperson: Very good. Any further questions? Okay, we'll see if we get that followup in time. If we do, we could potentially have this as an action item next time. Senator Blum. Quite a lot of material coming from the Rules Committee.

Senator Blum: So first is about external committees. Kind of a background is that last year we passed the rules of absences for committees. And for Senate, that works. And we passed it also for external committees, but some external committees noted to the Senate office that maybe that number was too high. This has been an effort to rectify that by changing it to one-third. And also you should know that some of the external committees have subcommittees. CTE, Athletics Council, and so there's a clause in there that those committees that have subcommittees to define how they're going to count. Are they going to count, for example, a regularly scheduled meeting or not? And we just left that to them. In the interim from when this document you have before you, there's been some suggested language. And we also met tonight to look at those suggestions, and we believe there should be some improvements. So we thought it was too complicated to do all the revisions here, but we're going to send it forward.

Senate Chairperson: So we're an information item.

Senator Blum: Yeah, right.

Senate Chairperson: The essence is going to stay. That you're making it so that it's not just five. It's now one-third, and I think the Athletics Council will, in particular, appreciate that. They're the ones who actually brought it up. And then this thing about whether or not they want to consider their subcommittees. Are there any questions for Senator Blum? Senator Nikolaou.

Senator Nikolaou: I had a question for the very last sentence in the second paragraph, the added language where it talks about one more than one-third of the scheduled meetings or three absences. Is that one of the things that you talked about?

Senator Blum: That's one of the things.

Senator Nikolaou: Because it could be more general where it could say external committee where it could say, "when a member of the external committee reaches the maximum number of absences allowed based on the above process." Something like that.

Senator Blum: So yeah. Thank you.

Senate Chairperson: Further questions, suggestions? Okay. So I think that's well on its way. I just look forward to receiving a more cleaned up version on that. And now are we doing Article 3?

Senator Blum: Well, we're going to talk about Article 3. So Article 3 is stamped, it actually says voting procedures, and we added which standard validate in voting procedures, which comes from later works on the bylaws. It really wasn't clear if we were just talking about. The voting procedures didn't reflect what we were doing. So there's an effort to update the language. And so there were a couple of things that have been put in the bylaws around present voting members, and that offers people opportunities or exceptions to when someone could be present. There are other changes from used to say 50% plus 1. We changed the language to simple majority. There were other problems with this in the sense that it referred like step 2 and there was no step 2. The issue came about in reviewing this is that in these balloting procedures as proposed that there is no way of breaking a tie. We talked about this in Rules, and Senator Horst sort of suggested we talk about it as larger Senate. Kind of the issue here is that we've really never had a controversy sort of emerge in voting procedures. So it really hasn't been a need to break a tie. One suggestion is, let's say we're lacking a Chair and something controversial happens. Right? So half the faculty, the Faculty Caucus is divided. There's something controversial with one of the candidates or something. And so you get deadlocked. One possibility is to try to break that tie with the larger Senate. There's sort of pros and cons to that. The other thing is to leave it alone and just allow the tie, and essentially that's sort of what we've done before. So there was an election that I was running for Exec. We went through several of the sort of normal balloting procedures and got the last two people. There was a tie. In that situation it was Exec. I just pulled out [cannot understand] the last person, and that was pretty easy. We auditioned. I thought it was a new position for me because there was no controversy around it per se. We've always gone without having a tie breaker or a way of breaking a tie. There's a traditionalists that say, you know, we've always done it. We don't need it, right? On the other hand, there are plenty of reasons that we could say, well, there might come that day where there is a controversy. So I think I would like to hear any questions or comments about that.

Senate Chairperson: Sure. So the AB&C is what cleaning up what we currently do or current process and D, they're adding this tie breaker. And the tie breaker is really referring to the process that happens in the Faculty Caucus before it goes to the full Senate where we as a Faculty Caucus get together and decide nominees for the Executive Committee and Chair and Secretary. So the Rules Committee is proposing a tie-breaking scenario that would go to the full Senate. Are there any comments? Senator Nikolaou.

Senator Nikolaou: I'll come to that second part in a little bit. The first one was under D, 1, 2, 3, 4th sentence where it says candidates who will be placed on the ballot will be determined by those candidates receiving the highest number of votes cast on the previous ballot. Do we want to reconsider the wording, because the way that I'm reading it, someone can interpret it that literally, that people who received the highest number of the ballots in the previous round, they are going to determine who are the candidates at the second round. So the parentheses, I know what we are trying to say up here, but then it can be interpreted as, let's say Senator Blanco and myself, we got the highest votes, then we determine who is going to be on the second ballot.

Senate Chairperson: The ballot will include those candidates receiving the highest numbers of votes cast. Something like that.

Senator Nikolaou: And then I had a question for the tie breaking. So I can understand it for the Chair of the Academic Senate because it's, you know, the leader of the Senate. I had a question. Was there a specific reason why we add the Executive Committee members as well? And the way that I'm seeing it is because in the Exec we have the student senators and then we have the faculty senators. The student senators determine who are going to be their representatives on the Executive Committee. The faculty senators determine who are going to be the faculty members on the Exec Committee. But then, in theory, we would have a situation where we have a tie. We bring it to the Academic Senate. And then, let's say for whatever reason, the students do not support the specific candidate. So my question is we are involving the students determining if faculty representative will be on the Exec Committee when the faculty do not vote to determine the student representatives on the Exec Committee. So if we are trying to have like a mirroring process, again I can understand it totally for the Chair of the Academic Senate. My question is more about the Exec Committee.

Senate Chairperson: But that's not really. . . I mean we already do that. We already send the Executive Committee faculty members. This is about the tie breaker that happens in the Faculty Caucus. Why the faculty members go forward and not the students, I'm not quite sure, and I'm actually looking at the constitution for that.

Senator Nikolaou: Oh, no. I'm actually saying why would we, assuming that we have a tie breaker. So I can understand why we are going to bring the Chair of the Academic Senate, because the Chair is going to represent all the procedures on the Senate. But then my question is about the Executive Committee faculty members. If, let's say, if there is a tie between Senator Blum and I, the Faculty Caucus should be able to determine who is going to be the one who is going to move forward because it is a faculty representative.

Senator Blum: I think it's a fair point like you did limit it to the Chair only, right? That you could, if you couldn't break the tie through re-voting with the Exec, you just keep re-voting, and you could probably function without an executive member until you break the tie. So I would say that's a reasonable suggestion. I do think there's a larger question of like whether we should have tie breaks procedures at all, all right? And I mean that's how we have. We've not had a tie-breaking procedure. There is a tie-breaking procedure in external committee, but it's obvious these are more sensitive positions and more potentially impactful and controversial. Certainly the Chair is. If we don't have them and eliminate all the tie-breaking language and just leave it and essentially just conduct re-votes until you break the tie. . .

Senate Chairperson: Or you could make a motion to send it to the full Senate. But it's never happened in 12 years since I've been on the Senate. And the one time it almost happened, we were on Zoom, so I think our ability to communicate was limited. Yes, Senator Peterson.

Senator Peterson: Just a question here. If it goes to the Senate as a whole and it cannot be determined by a vote, it's a coin flip, why couldn't that just happen in the Caucus?

Senate Chairperson: The Chair?

Senator Peterson: No, no, the Executive Committee positions. It essentially says if it doesn't, you know, it has to be sent to the Senate as a whole, if it's not conducted or not concluded by a vote there, it results in a coin flip. Why not just do the coin flip in Caucus?

Senate Chairperson: Did you consider that, Senator Blum?

Senator Blum: No. I don't think it's a bad idea. The only thing I was thinking is that a coin flip to determine the Chair is what I was kind of concerned about.

Senate Chairperson: Yeah. [laughter] Let's not do that.

Senator Blum: Right. I mean that was why the idea of the body, right? It means there was someone voting. You know, I think Rules felt like there should be a tie breaker, but I also understand this is a sensitive topic and that if we can leave the bylaws the same, as Senator Horst has mentioned, we've never needed it. And so maybe we should just leave it alone.

Senate Chairperson: Or something maybe if both parties in the tie situation consent, they can do a coin flip. Right? Something like that. Make it so it's not like after two votes you have to do a coin flip. Because the one time it happened, right, we went through about six rounds of voting. but it was all on Zoom, if you also remember. Yes, Senator Holmes.

Senator Holmes: I would just note in like a case study, SGA, when we do our elections for Exec, if there's a tie which there actually was last year in my election, it's actually just assigned to one person who's going to vote. It's one of our non-voting members, our Vice President of the Study Body, who is elected. They just select who they pick of the two.

Senate Chairperson: I think I was there for that meeting.

Senator Holmes: so that is like essentially the way you're going to determine it in one vote. You tie, and then it's one person's vote. So that can't tie.

Senator Blair: Yeah, this isn't specifically related to tied races, but it is in the realm of the electing of persons. So when you do have more than two candidates for one position, was there any discussion on the potential use of rank choice voting or a similar method? And I mention that because I wonder if that might be simpler to word and to operate?

Senate Chairperson: The Faculty Caucus does a lot of elections. So this pertains to the Panel of Ten. This applies to all the AFEGC, all the search committees we do, but it could be something interesting for the Executive Committee. There are apps that do it for you, says Senator Mainieri. Senator Holmes.

Senator Holmes: Yeah, I'll also note that SGA did adopt a rank choice voting thing this year for our executive members just to make it easier. Because when there's like three people running, I believe we have to receive a plurality of the votes, or not a plurality, a majority of the votes. So you'd have to vote multiple times in order to receive that. So under rank choice voting it just

eliminates automatically the third candidate, like who receives the least votes and their second choice. So let's say in a world the three people running are Senator Helms, Senator Blum, and Senator Peterson. Everyone's voting. If Senator Peterson is the third choice, people who voted for him, if they vote for Senator Helms second, he receives all their votes or whatever, and then maybe he has enough votes to win. That's essentially a brief rundown of rank choice.

Senate Chairperson: Okay. So now we'll go to Article 5.

Blum: Yes, there are some copy edits here. The biggest change that faculty was in the adoption stage. It's just a clarification that is now in other parts of the bylaws as well. Those who abstained do not count as casting a vote.

Senate Chairperson: Thank you very much. Are there any questions about the changes to Article 5? I'm going to throw out that before this year we never had a situation where Exec didn't meet. But if you recall on the Tuesday meeting that was cancelled, for the first time we were facing these items that needed to be information because of the timely thing with the Board of Trustees meeting and the constitution change. And I looked through the bylaws, and we were unable to have an information item unless it was approved by Exec. So I would propose at the bottom of C you maybe say something like in unusual circumstances an item may be removed from the review in circulation stage to the information stage by a two-thirds vote of the Senate or Faculty Caucus so the body would have the ability to move something to the information stage if we needed that, if Exec can't meet. Otherwise, it only can be done by Exec. And if Exec can't meet because of snow or whatever, we almost didn't have an agenda.

Senate Chairperson: One more from the Rules Committee, Article 7. This is just more clarification of the voting process and the fact that people who are joining by Zoom can . . .

Senator Blum: Yeah, this is language that's elsewhere. All right? That it adds language about, 'cause the way the bylaws are, this voting is in several places. So this portion is about that amendment and so that there needed to be clarification on abstention. There needed to be some language about voting members present. And then once you put the voting members present language, there has to be all this other language about OEOA and accommodations that leads to that other piece. And that's already in other parts of our bylaws that's already approved.

Senate Chairperson: And this is all coming from the Open Meetings Act.

Senator Blum: Yes.

Senate Chairperson: Any comments on this? All right. Thank you very much to the Rules Committee for all of that work. And we'll see what we can accomplish in the next couple of meetings. And so now we are going back to Academic Affairs and the Final Course Grade Challenge Policy.

Senator Nikolaou: So as you can see, we haven't reviewed this policy for 12 years. So we looked at this policy, and the recommendation, as you can see, is apart from the gender language

is to eliminate the procedure portion of the policy. Now, during Exec, we had some discussion about whether everything under the procedure is really procedure or some of it is actually policy. And after our committee talked about the final course grade challenge policy, the Chair of the committee who handles the appeals for the final course grades, Mike Gizzi, e-mailed us some changes they would want to make in the procedures side of the policy, and one of the main concerns is that they have several students who appealed the grades but then they could not provide the appropriate information, so they had several situations where they needed to take much longer compared to what it should be because they do not check, for example, the syllabus for the course. They did not turn in some documentation that they've tried to contact the instructor, they don't turn notification, the letter from the Chair, but the Chair has reviewed the process. So initially the recommendation was if we can add in the procedures side that the students need to complete a form that is going to be available on the Provost's website, and they do want the form to be on the Provost's website, not part of the policy, because they will be able to update the information on as-needed basis. And then the other recommendation that their committee had was to clarify what happens with eight-week courses and winter courses. Now we can make these adjustments in terms of the procedures, but the question that we would want to hear more from you is because if we think that we're going to be removing the whole procedures section from the policy, then it wouldn't fall under our committee to update the procedures based on what the Final Grade Appeals Committee recommended. We talked a little bit about the policy in our committee today, whether we could potentially add a smaller paragraph instead of the procedures where we just outline really briefly where we say that in order to appeal the grade, the student should have communicated the issue with the instructor. It has to be reviewed by the Chair. Then if it's going to be this committee with this composition and also make sure to keep in the policy that the Provost has the final determination for the appeal, there cannot be any other appeal beyond the Provost level. So that's our . . .

Senate Chairperson: Senator Roy.

Senator Roy: Yeah, thank you. With the procedure being removed from this markup copy, there was part of the procedure that I really liked that was in the last copy, which mentioned that if a professor doesn't respond in like ten days or there's just kind of the wording was like if you don't get a communication in ten days you can still appeal; I wonder if that is in this current policy. And if not, the wording the student must discuss their concerns or a student may challenge a final course grade only if the student has discussed the concern with the faculty member, I wonder if that would present issues with like maybe if a student's grade was given under arbitrary means in a way that needed a Title IX or something like that and they're unable to communicate with that professor, I wonder if this policy still handles it with the removal of that ten-day segment.

Senator Nikolaou: So whatever you see under the procedures is that it would be leaving on the Provost website. So actually the procedure is already on the Provost website. So that instead of outlining the procedure within the policy, student would have to go to the Provost website. And so the part that you mentioned that if the instructor is not responding, it would still be part of the procedure. But then after a certain period of time, then it would go directly to the Chair and then follow the process in that way.

Senate Chairperson: Senator McLauchlan.

Senator McLauchlan: I regrettably held comment. If you get rid of that section, what committee, there is no committee anymore that would set the rules, right? Wouldn't the Provost set all the rules if you get rid of all the section that defines who maintains these rules of procedures?

Senator Nikolaou: So I'm going to . . .

Senator McLauchlan: You did sort of comment that you would propose some alternative line that might recreate this committee, but if you banish this whole section, there is no committee.

Senator Nikolaou: That's what we want to hear, that if we think that the policy should include that there is going to be an Appeals Committee that is going to have this conversation, we can . . .

Senator McLauchlan: Who sets the rules?

Senator Nikolaou: You mean the procedure?

Senator McLauchlan: Who sets the procedures?

Senator Nikolaou: So if it is removed from the policy, that would fall with the Provost Office.

Senator McLauchlan: 'Cause I do try to remove procedures from all the policies in my control, but I still need to indicate someone who's setting the procedure in the policy.

Senator Nikolaou: Yes. That would fall with the Office of the Provost. Yeah, and that's what we want to hear a bit more, because, yeah, usually we say that we want to remove procedure from the policy, but then if we think that this is a pretty specific procedure that should be part of the policy, since the website is also called Policy and Procedures . . .

Senate Chairperson: If you really want to make it clean and just have it be the policy, you could establish that the committee and some other details about the Provost having the final say and then maybe say the procedures will be developed by the committee and approved by the Academic Affairs Committee or the Senate. Something like that. But I'm hesitant to relinquish all of the control of these procedures and timing to nobody. Senator McHale.

Senator McHale: I may have this incorrect, but it seems that the final course grade challenge procedure, according to number 5, the Provost shall have the standing Committee designated as the Final Course Grade Committee which consists of five members (three faculty members, two students appointed by the Provost or designee). Is that not the committee that we're talking about?

Senate Chairperson: They're proposing to strike all that.

Senator McHale: Okay.

Senate Chairperson: Further comments? Yes, Senator Holmes.

Senator Holmes: I understand it's like general practice to eliminate procedures from policies. But if it's like going to cause issues, is there like something wrong with leaving the procedures in?

Internal Committee Reports

Senate Chairperson: So if there's no objection, I'd like to do the Internal Committee Reports and we could postpone 2.1.20 and 2.1.26, if that's acceptable. Is there any objection to that plan? So let's do our committee reports. My apologies to Senator Nikolaou. And so Academic Affairs Committee and Senator Nikolaou.

Senator Nikolaou: So today we talked about the e-mail from the Final Course Grade Challenge Committee Chair for Policy 4.1.20. And then we also talked about Policy 4.1.12, Sale of Instructional Materials and the Dean's List as 2.10.

Senate Chairperson: we'll go to Faculty Affairs Committee and Senator Lucey.

Senator Lucey: Faculty Affairs congratulates Mary Hollywood for being the committee member who brought the most food items tonight, and because of her generosity she receives an overnight barbecue dinner from Memphis, Tennessee. Our committee also discussed the Intellectual Property policy and the Export Control Property Policy.

Senate Chairperson: Any questions for Senator Lucey.

Secretary Mainieri: AABC met and continued what seems to be a never-ending saga related to 3.2.13 and 3.2.16, and I thank our committee members for just continuing to soldier forward that the bulk of our meeting was with guest, Dr. Dan Elkins, Associate VP for Academic Fiscal Management, to begin our work to review the Academic Impact Fund and prepare our annual report.

Senate Chairperson: Thank you very much. Any questions besides the announcement of the results? Okay. Planning, Finance, and Senator Valentin.

Senator Valentin: The Planning and Finance Committee reviewed policies 5.1.1, Concealed Carry and Prohibited Weapons Policy and 5.1.19, University Violence Policy. And we will be forwarding 5.1.19, Force and Violence Policy to Exec to discuss 5.1.1.

Senate Chairperson: Okay. Even though there was an animal question?

Senator Holmes: That was about a separate future policy.

Senate Chairperson: Oh, okay. Any further questions for Senator Valentin? Hearing none, we'll go to Rules Committee and Senator Blum.

Senator Blum: Yes, tonight I think we finally refined the Absence and Vacancy policy for external committee. So we got that done, and we did spend some time discussing issues around time, and we made a commitment to work on the College of Engineering bylaws [cannot understand 1:55:06].

Senate Chairperson: Thank you very much. Any questions? Hearing none, we'll go to Senator Bonnell, who's filling in for the University Policy Committee.

Senator Bonnell: University Policy Committee met. We reviewed 3.3.12A, Appendix to Code Ethics, Faculty Responsibility to Students.

Senate Chairperson: Okay. And are you forwarding that to the Executive Committee?

Senator Bonnell: No. Sorry, we are not.

Senate Chairperson: Okay. Thank you very much. Are there any Communications? Secretary Mainieri.

Secretary Mainieri: I actually have two. The very first one is next Wednesday in the Student Fitness Center is the annual Adaptapalooza Event hosted by our Therapeutic Recreation students in RPA. Come out. Do adaptive rock climbing, wheelchair basketball, relay races, and goal ball and win some prizes. That's very important, but I know you're also wondering who won. First, I want to say congratulations. Together we collected 767 items for the School Street Food Pantry this evening, in third place. Okay, so it's points divided by the seated members who are present tonight. Okay? So try to make this fair. In third place with an average of 44.67 points per member, Faculty Affairs. In second place with an average of 52 points per seated member who is present tonight, AABC. So congratulations. And drum roll, please. In first place with an average of 91.25 points per member, Rules Committee. So congrats to the Rules Committee. I'll reach out to you over the next couple of days for some details for your tasty surprise at your next meeting, and thanks to everyone.

Senate Chairperson: Senator McHale.

Senator McHale: I motion that we adjourn.

Senate Chairperson: And is there a second? Senator Holmes. All in favor, please signify by saying aye.

Multiple people: Aye.

Senate Chairperson: Very good. We're adjourned.