

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

3-27-2024

Senate Meeting, March 27, 2024

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

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

Recommended Citation

Academic Senate, "Senate Meeting, March 27, 2024" (2024). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 1320.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/1320>

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
March 27, 2024

Secretary Mainieri called the roll and declared a quorum

Senate Chairperson Horst: Terrific. Good evening, everybody. Before we start our presentation, I just wanted to give some context to the report we're going to hear. We made a request to the administration in 2023 after Director Brennan resigned, and I issued the following request for action from the Academic Senate regarding the Athletics Department to then Interim President Tarhule in May of 2023:

- (1) The university must continue its investigation and make public any outcomes, including any obligations for Mr. Brennan and his participating assistant to pay back financial losses.
- (2) The Senate is aware that there's an earlier audit regarding spending and management issues in the unit, suggesting that the issues raised by Director Brennan's trip were one example of a broader problem. The Senate would like a report regarding what steps have been taken to address these concerns beyond those reported on April 26th.
- (3) The administration and the Academic Senate must re-energize the shared governance systems charged with overseeing the Department of Athletics.
- (4) Athletics and the ISU Foundation must learn about financial difficulties and financial restrictions on other areas of the university.
- (5) The administration must review what mechanisms are in place to prevent this from happening in the future.
- (6) Drs. Beggs and Tarhule should meet with student athletes so they can hear directly from them.
- (7) The university should review how it [sounds like vets 4:04] its potential donors.
- (8) The Foundation should discuss with the university community what types of oversight and audit practices are in place regarding its spending.
- (9) The administration should share the unfiltered results of the internal audit with the Senate if legally allowed.
- (10) The administration should use an external auditor to conduct a review of the Department of Athletics financial practices.
- (11) The Academic Senate and the administration should scrutinize the practices and culture of Athletics to ensure that their work aligns with the core values, goals, and mission of our institution.
- (12) The search for the next permanent athletics director must be open and transparent.

So that's the list we sent to the administration last year. Just regarding our other conversation about the budget, I've issued a second followup request to Interim Director Beggs as a result of our review of their budget, and she has not yet responded. President Tarhule has indicated to me that he will reach out to her on our behalf.

Tonight in your packet is a link to the Foundation's recently revised cash distribution guidelines. These revised processes address part of our request that we made last spring. Rob Blemler, the University Director of Internal Auditing is here to present this summary of an independent

consultant's review of the Athletic Department expenses. He will be distributing the public report issued by the external auditor. The Academic Senate Executive Committee did review the full report in closed session at our meeting on March 18. After his presentation, we will have a short time for questions. In order to accommodate all senators who wish to speak during this period, I'm going to strictly follow Robert's Rules pertaining to speaking privileges. Please, senators will have two times to speak, and everybody should get a chance to speak before somebody speaks twice, and each person will get a chance two times in total.

All right. So that's the context and how we're going to proceed, and now I'd like to invite Rob Blemler, the Director of Internal Auditing, to the microphone.

Presentation: Robert Blemler, Director of Internal Auditing

Summary of Consultant's Independent Review of Athletics Department Expenses:

Rob Blemler: Good evening. Due to questions surrounding expenditures related to the 2021 Big Ten Football Championship in Indianapolis, first ISU's internal audit completed review of athletic expenditures, and then the university engaged a global audit consulting firm. Internal audit reviewed expenditures from both university and Foundation funds for fiscal year '21, '22, and '23 through April 30th of 2023. This report provided management with an overview and an analysis of expenditures for key employees, significant trips and events, and expenses paid to vendors, university and Foundation credit card transactions and employee reimbursements. Internal audit concluded that the \$18,754 reimbursement for tickets to the Big Ten Championship in December of 2021 was an anomaly, and no other expenditures of this nature were identified. I would note that there were also expenses on this trip for hotel rooms and ride shares paid for with Foundation funds. And then I would note that the university has different travel rules and regulations, depending on the funding source. That is university funds or Foundation funds.

ISU then engaged a global audit consulting firm to provide forensic services on athletic expenditures to identify and report atypical or anomalous expenditures by analyzing expenditures for the two key employees as well as all other athletic employees. The consultants reviewed expenses from both university and Foundation funds for the same time period, fiscal year '21, '22, and '23 through April 30th of 2023, and these services were conducted in accordance with the statement on standards for forensic services promulgated by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. Forensic services generally involve performing procedures to analyze, evaluate, or interpret data and transactions and then communicate findings. As outlined in the terms of this engagement, the firm provided the university with a full report that is solely for the use of university management and the Board of Trustees and a summary report that can be shared. The full report has been reviewed with the President, the Cabinet, the Board of Trustees, and the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, and the terms of this agreement and report limitations are standard for this type of engagement. The report before you is the summary of the consultant's independent review of athletic expenses, and it's a summary report of the engagement. The report mirrors the executive summary in the full report with the consulting firm's name removed as well as any employee names. The consultants applied four data analytic techniques on expense data along with interviews of internal audit. First, the consultants analyzed transactions to compare the expenditures of key employees against all other athletic employees to reveal unusual expenditure patterns. Second,

they conducted a Benford's Law Analysis on expenses. Benford's Law is an advanced data analytics technique to detect anomalies within a data set that basically checks the frequency of the leading digit to expected logarithms of distributions and then examining those distributions for that leading digit for all expenditures. Third, the consultants searched transaction descriptions for specific key words. Examples include but are not limited to entertain, tickets, donors, and stewardship. And lastly, they searched for duplicate transaction amounts, which is two or more expenditures of the same amount incurred by the same employee. The consultants concluded, based on the analysis performed, that they did not find any atypical expenditures incurred by key employees or other employees during the scope period outside of those identified by internal audit. The consultant's full report identified transactions that met the analysis criteria, but these transactions were reported and deemed to be consistent with operations and not considered atypical. And I would just want to restate that the goal of the engagement was to determine if there were atypical expenditures or patterns of atypical expenditures, and the firm confirmed that the ticket purchase was atypical and other anomalies were not identified. This review did not assess the internal controls within Athletics or the reasonableness or business purpose of the expenditures. In addition, I want to point out that in addition to the reviews completed by internal audit and the external consulting firm, the university has taken steps to strengthen controls over entertainment and meals. University Advancement updated their cash disbursement guidelines in January of 2024, and these guidelines state that there are now per-person thresholds for entertainment and meals. Expenses exceeding these limits require pre-approval by the appropriate vice president, Athletic Director or President. Specifically, entertainment expenses such as tickets exceeding \$100 per person and meals exceeding \$80 per person must be pre-approved at least 72 hours prior to purchase date or the event date with a detailed business justification. Unplanned expenses exceeding those thresholds must be submitted within 72 hours after the event and include detailed explanation and justification. Any questions?

Senate Chairperson Horst: Any questions for Director Blemler? He said this was his first time in front of the Senate. And I said we'll try to go easy on you.

Rob Blemler: [laughter]

Senate Chairperson Horst: Are you satisfied with the new guidelines that in place for the Foundation?

Rob Blemler: I am.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Yes, Senator Pancrazio.

Senator Pancrazio: This is for Senator Horst. Have we had discussions about what types of donors we are pursuing? And the reason I bring this up is because of the type of influence we've seen from outside donors on questions like academic freedom. However, in this case I think it's important to point out the type of donor that was actually being pursued. And background checks, risk analysis, all types of things are becoming more and more common for students and faculty. If you want to bring some middle schoolers or some high schools to campus, everybody has to have a background check. If we want to have student teachers, we have to have numerous

types of background checks. And did anyone actually recommend to the Foundation that they, too, should be looking into the types of donors that they consulting with. Like, for example, can we look at quickly the court records in Tazewell County, Peoria County, McLean County to see what type of individual that they are actually courting? Like, for example, not only we're talking of courting an individual that had just pled guilty to two felonies, but we're also talking about an individual who also agreed that the government could demonstrate that he was using meth during the time in which he was out on bail. So my question is are we actually looking into the quality of the people who are going to be providing funds to this university, because consistently we're talking about our faculty that are going to embarrass the campus by making comments on Twitter or X or whatever you call it. And are we not paying attention to what we're actually pursuing?

Senate Chairperson Horst: Well, we certainly ask the university to review potential donors, but we have in front of us the internal auditor director. So do you have any comments about that?

Rob Blemler: That was not part of the review. That's outside of the scope of this review.

Senate Chairperson Horst: But I can forward that question to VP Vickerman, because we did put it on our list last year. Senator Holmes.

Senator Holmes: From the sounds of how you were describing the audit, the data was checked against itself. So like the spenders were checked against other spenders within Athletics. Am I understanding that correctly?

Rob Blemler: That was the first step of the analysis.

Senator Holmes: Okay, so was there analysis of the entire department to ensure that there wasn't some sort of, I don't know how to describe it, but an environment that would allow for more than one spender within the department to be spending?

Rob Blemler: Yes. I mean we not only looked at the two key individuals, we looked at the spending of all employees within Athletics . . .

Senator Holmes: Okay.

Rob Blemler: . . . as part of the analysis, not only the internal audit but the external consulting firm as well.

Senate Chairperson Horst: And you also considered their job position.

Rob Blemler: Yes.

Senate Chairperson Horst: So if they were a coach of the football team, you might see a big ticket for the restaurant fee.

Rob Blemler: Right.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Further questions? Okay. Well, thank you very much for your work. Thank you for coming in front of the senate. You did great. And we hope not to see you again. [laughter] Okay. Very good.

Next item is approval of the Academic Senate minutes of February 7, 2024. Motion: Senator McHale. Second: Senator Cline. Corrections: I noted the correct spelling of McLauchlan. The minutes were approved.

Chairperson's Remarks

Senate Chairperson Horst: Thank you again to Rob Blemler for coming this evening. Thank you for your comments. I will certainly forward that to Vice President Vickerman. And tonight we have six action items and five information items, so thank you all to the committees for all the hard work you're doing, especially to the Academic Affairs Committee, which is putting forth quite a lot of policies. So I really appreciate it. At our next meeting on April 10th, we will be having a short celebration for the 50th anniversary of the Academic Senate, which we actually missed during COVID. And so there will be some special guests. I'll just put it that way and some special treats. So stay tuned to next meeting to find out who is coming. Are there any questions? Senator Roy.

Senator Roy: So this question might not be best directed at you, but I figured you'd have a good response to it. We talked about this in previous senate meetings. Has there been any discussion amongst administrators about canceling classes for the April 8th eclipse?

Senate Chairperson Horst: I'll turn that over to Provost Yazedjian. And we have a meeting during the eclipse. Just want to let you know about that. No? There's been no discussion. But certainly you can have a private conversation with your instructor.

Provost Yazedjian: I'm happy to provide more reasoning about why not, but, you know, the short answer is no.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Okay. Very good. Any further questions? Seeing none, we'll go to the Student Body President and Senator Monk.

Student Body President's Remarks

Senator Monk: All right. Good evening. Thank you very much, Chairperson Horst. It is wonderful to see you all again. I hope you're all settling well into the spring semester, even if it may not fully feel like spring just yet. I am excited to announce that the Higher Education Committee in the senate has passed SB2606. The bill has been assigned for its third reading in the senate where it will be voted on by the full senate in the coming weeks. It is expected to pass and be sent to the house where Representative Sharon Chung will pick up with bill, and the SGA Lobby Team, a group 18 members strong, will begin meeting with members of the Higher Education Committee, leadership and sponsors of the K-12 law in the house. Meetings are currently being arranged by ISU Director of Public Policy, Brad Franke. Fox News Illinois has also published an article covering SB2606. Senator Braxton Myers has completed a press release to be sent to media outlets across the country and has begun to coordinate a witness list

campaign as we prepare for the bill's hearing in the Higher Education Committee in the house. If any students, staff, or faculty are interested in filing a witness [sounds like lip] in support of the bill, please let him know. I'd like to thank Senator Dave Koehler, Representative Sharon Chun, and all of those part of the Wellness Days Coalition for supporting students in the ongoing mental health crisis, and I'm thrilled to continue seeing this project through. Last week, the student caucus began our review of Policy 2.1.28, Medical Amnesty and Good Samaritan Policy and Policy 2.1.28A, Medical Amnesty and Good Samaritan Procedures and will be meeting immediately after Academic Senate tonight to prepare revisions and questions for Jeannie Barrett from General Counsel, who will be joining us next week. I am also excited to present Policy 2.1.27, Student Bereavement, later this evening. I'd like to thank Rob Blemler for joining us tonight and presenting the report of the external audit of the Athletics Department expenses. As mentioned, the Executive Committee had the opportunity to view the report in its entirety, and I'd like to thank the administration for its transparency toward students on the matter. While every penny may not have been disclosed to the public, Athletics deserves the full benefit of the doubt, and while trust is earned they have my full support as they begin a new era. I'd like to thank Secretary Ross Vancil for his work organizing the Resource Awareness Fair, which took place last Thursday from 11 a.m. to 1 p.m. on second floor of the Bone Student Center. We enjoyed delivering Resource Awareness directly to students, and I am pleased to see the fair grow into an annual tradition. I'd like to also thank the full Diversity Week Planning Committee for organizing an exciting slate of events for this year's adding, taking place April 1st through the 5th. We have an assortment of activities taking place on each day of that week, including Game Night, Panel Event, and a Movie Night featuring the film *Everything, Everywhere, All at Once*. Information will be coming out here real soon, so keep up with the SGA Instagram, and we'll be able to get all that information to you here shortly. I'd like to thank Senator Tasdan, Senator Hofstetter, and the full Civic Engagement Committee for hosting the annual Town Hall last night, which featured speakers from College Democrats, College Republicans, and Young Democrat Socialists answering questions from a variety of organizations, including the Grey Matters Collective, Student Veterans of America, the Cannabis Club, and more, bring multiple perspectives to the tables paramount for our democracy. And I enjoyed the civil and informative discussion of the issues facing the student body. With that, I will happily accept any questions.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Questions for Senator Monk? Senator Helms.

Senator Helms: Senator Monk, has there been discussion among the coalition and our administration or other administration about how this may be put into operation once passed?

Senator Monk: So this is a conversation that'll be had among individual universities after the bill is passed. So Senator Dave Koehler has been very clear in his approach. We don't want to add in too many stifling rules into the bill. We want to allow as much brevity for individual universities to implement it best, given their structure, their resources. So a lot of those conversations are going to be had on the individual university level. So once the bill is passed, administrations, student leaders, staff, all them can have those conversations. Currently the way the bill is written is that there are two days per term that are offered and can be offered in three different avenues, either class cancellation days that are scheduled, individualized days that students can work with faculty (tracking will be done on the individual university level), or it can be a combination of those two. So we are allowing for as much dexterity for universities as

possible, so I don't have a direct answer for that. You'd have to ask to individual administrations what their approach will be after the bill is passed.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Senator Monk, you're very familiar with the contents of the bill, so I'll just ask you because Senator Koehler isn't here. So the two days per term – so for instance in the spring semester we currently have a spring break. Would that count as the two days per term, or would there potentially have to be two additional days?

Senator Monk: They would not. So the goal is days that are already currently scheduled to be allocated as off days for students will not be allowed to be re-purposed to Wellness Days. So it ought to be additional days.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Okay. Thank you. Further questions for Senator Monk? Senator Yazedjian.

Senator Yazedjian: I have a clarification. So this would go into effect in the '25-'26 school year if it were passed?

Senator Monk: It'll be in the '26-'27 school year. So there will be a one-year delay.

Senate Chairperson Horst: And just to comment on what Senator Helms said, this is the period where Springfield passes things, and then in the fall we often have a lot of random policy changes having to deal with what was just passed in Springfield. But kudos to your group for putting this forward. This is very impressive, and also I want to echo your comments about this being a new phase of Athletics, and we are reflecting on some of the things that happened in a prior administration. So thank you for that statement as well. All right. We have a Redbird Caucus event happening – no that's another day that he's going to miss. We don't have all of our administrators here. They have different obligations, and so we do have Provost Yazedjian here, so I'll turn it over to her.

Administrators' Remarks:

Interim Provost Yazedjian: Thank you, and I have two brief remarks for tonight. I just want to give a shout out to the folks who planned the Women as Transformational Leaders event this week. It happened on Monday and Tuesday. It was a fabulous event that brought in three alumni for sessions with faculty and staff and for a couple different sessions with students. We would have loved to see more people at all of those events, but I can say personally it filled my cup. And so I'm looking forward to this event in the future and more people getting to experience the great things that happened over those two days.

And then since Dean McLoda is the Dean on Duty today, I first want to thank him for the efforts he has put into the College of Education this year. He's done a tremendous job so far. He has one more year. So it's not that he's going anywhere. He has one more year. But because a search for a college dean is a Panel of Ten search, this serves as my announcement to the senate that we will be doing a national external search for a College of Education dean, and we'll be moving forward with the college doing elections, etc. and selecting a chair from next year's Panel of Ten. So thank you, Dean McLoda, for your work. We appreciate it.

Dan Petree: Thank you. I have one announcement. We're scheduled to provide testimony before the Appropriation Committee of the house and the senate – house on the 4th of April and senate on the 10th. I'd be happy to take any questions.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Questions? Senator Myers.

Senator Myers: I saw that there is a joint commission of the senate, I believe, that has finished the Higher Education funding formula. Could you tell us a little bit about how ISU is going to factor into that?

Dan Petree: Most of the work was done before I arrived, so what I'm going to tell you is second hand or third hand in some cases. The working group was put together. It's actually a joint group from the senate and the house. It was representatives from all the campuses there as well as other public members and other stakeholders. The idea was to see whether the current funding formula that the state has used did a good job of capturing state policy and aspirations toward equity. It's not surprise that the funding formula is older than perhaps we'd like it to be. And the report was submitted to the respective house and senate for their consideration. Don't know yet what the outcome of that's going to be. The one thing we heard, and all this is subject to formal action by the legislature, is that the intent at this stage is not to penalize any campus. So there's essentially no . . . Their position is we're not going to make the appropriation we give to any campus smaller than it currently is. I don't know if that means relatively smaller or actually smaller. But in any event that's where we stand.

Senate Chairperson Horst: I believe I sent the report at some point like two weeks ago. Further questions? All right. Very good. We will now go to our consent agenda.

Consent Agenda

Senate Chairperson Horst: 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. Tonight we have artificial intelligence and decision making. Is there a motion and a second to approve the items on the Consent Agenda? Senator Nikolaou. And a second by Senator McHale. All those in favor of approving the items on the Consent Agenda, please signify by saying aye.

Multiple people: Aye.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Opposed? We have an AI and decision-making program. Terrific. And now we will move to our action items.

Action Items

Senate Chairperson Horst: Our first one is coming from the Rules Committee and Senator Blum.

Senator Blum: Yes. As we said before, this has to do with the voting and also some minor change. So this is in unusual circumstances. An item may be moved from a review and circulation stage and information stage. So it allows if for some reason Exec was unable to do

this, that this could be done by the senate. And so we'd like to put this forward from the Rules Committee. Make a motion.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Thank you. This is coming from a committee. It does not need a second. And so is there any debate? Hearing none, all in favor of approval of the changes to Article 5 put forward by the Rules Committee, please signify by saying aye.

Multiple people: Aye.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Opposed? Terrific. We have new language to Article V. Senator Blum, I'm just going to note that there are some potential changes that might be changed to Article V in two or three weeks, so I'm just going to ask that we pause on forwarding these to the President until we see if we have additional changes to Article in particular.

Senator Blum: Absolutely.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Thank you. All right. Our next couple of items come from Senator Nikolaou and the Academic Affairs Committee.

Senator Nikolaou: The first policy we have is 2.1.20, Equitable Treatment of Students Participating in University-Authorized Activities. We saw this as an information item on February 21st. There are two small changes compared to the draft that you see in front of you. The first one is under item C, just before the Requests. The last sentence – we're going to put it as item D, and it's going to read fine arts marching band and Gamma Phi Circus performances as well as competitions related to a major or an academic department school. So we're just going to remove the examples include but are not limited to.

Senate Chairperson Horst: So it's just going to say fine arts marching band and Gamma Phi Circus performances as well as competitions related to a major or an academic department/school.

Senator Nikolaou: Yes. So we are just removing examples include but are not limited to. So then there it's going to go D, fine arts, and then the remaining of the sentence. And the other one is under Appeals. Where we mentioned to the department chair/school director, we are going to add comma or the Dean of the Mennonite College of Nursing (when applicable). Because nursing doesn't have, you know, departments or schools. So, the department chair/school director, and we are adding comma or the Dean of the Mennonite College of Nursing (when applicable). And this is the same language that we had approved for Policy 4.1.5 for final examinations. So these are the two changes compared to the markup that you have in front of you. So we would like to put it in front of the senate for your approval.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Thank you. It's coming from a committee. It does not need a second. I'm going to offer one more editorial remark. Contact Academic Senate. The number of the Academic Senate is actually 438-8735. Is there any debate? Seeing none, all in favor of approval of 2.1.20 as amended, please signify by saying aye.

Multiple people: Aye.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Opposed? Terrific. And now 2.1.26.

Senator Nikolaou: Student Absences Due to Service as a Volunteer Emergency Worker. We saw this policy on February 21st, 2024. We are going to have the same change as in 2.1.20 under Appeals. So there are two occasions where it is mentioned department chair/school director. So for both of them we are going to add comma or the Dean of the Mennonite College of Nursing (when applicable). So based on this change, we want to put it in front of the senate for your approval.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Thank you. And this is coming from a committee. It does not need a second. And so just to be clear, the student may file an appeal to the department chair/school director comma or the dean. And then the second one is a little bit later, correct?

Senator Nikolaou: Yes. So it's going to be when it says no later than ten business days, when it talks about the written decision and then when it talks about the written appeal for the five business days.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Okay. Thank you very much.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Okay. Very good. Is there any debate? Seeing none, all in favor of Policy 2.1.26 as amended, please signify by saying aye.

Multiple people: Aye.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Opposed? Okay. We have that one passed. And I understand the Academic Affairs Committee would like to skip 4.1.20.

Senator Nikolaou: There is one item that we want to skip.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Okay.

Senator Nikolaou: So we are going to see it next meeting.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Very good. And now we will go to Policy 4.1.12.

Senator Nikolaou: So this is the Sale of Instructional Materials. We had it as an information item on March 6th. No changes. So on behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee we want to bring it to the senate for your approval.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Thank you very much. This is coming from a committee. It does not need a second. Is there any debate? Seeing none, all in favor of approval of Policy 4.1.12, the changes presented by the Academic Affairs Committee, please signify by saying aye.

Multiple people: Aye.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Opposed? One more.

Senator Nikolaou: And the last one is 2.1.10, Dean's List, which we had as an information item on March 6th. There are no changes compared to what you see in front of you. So on behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee we would like to bring it forth to the senate for your approval.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Was there any changes from the last draft that you couldn't tell us about?

Senator Nikolaou: Oh, these are the changes we mentioned on the floor the previous time. So where we removed, because before we were talking about the top 10%, and we changed it to the minimum of 3.65. And then we also added the specifics about the grade point average and which course grades are not counting.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Okay. And you made a motion on behalf of the committee?

Senator Nikolaou: Yes.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Okay. And so it does not need a second. And so any debate?
Senator Bever.

Senator Bever: Yeah, so I do have some questions and a little concerns on this particular policy. I kind of researched our other schools in state, public and private, and I kind of thought it was a bit low. For example, Governors State has a 3.7, University of Illinois Springfield is 3.75, Northeastern 3.8, Northern Illinois 3.75 (except the College of Engineering is 3.5). Northwestern is 3.7. UIUC is top 20%. I particularly had two questions if possible if they could be answered. Was there consideration of possibly raising it so it's a little higher? And, also, particularly was there consideration to having a different GPA individually for each college, assuming that certain colleges might have lower or higher GPA standards? Having a generic 3.65 across the board might be difficult for some people to reach in certain colleges and maybe our new College of Engineering. It might be easier for other colleges.

Senate Chairperson Horst: So Senator Bever, we are in debate. But certainly, Senator Nikolaou, you can answer, and then you can propose to amend it if you'd like.

Senator Nikolaou: So for the second question about having different cutoffs based on the college, the policy recommendation came from the deans themselves. So they all approved it, and my understanding is that there was not a recommendation to have different cutoffs. I don't know. Dean McLoda.

Dean McLoda: Yeah, that's correct. The deans did discuss this, I think, pretty thoroughly. The Dean of Engineering was present in those conversations as well, and we wanted the same cutoff for the entire university rather than different by college.

Senator Nikolaou: And for the first part, let me find . . . because Senator Hurd had given us the numbers for the last meeting. Let me find the numbers unless you remember them by heart.
[laughter]

Senator Hurd: I do not. We did benchmark with other universities, and we landed on 3.65 because someone who graduated with a 3.65, they're going to graduate with honors of Cum Laude, and we felt like someone shouldn't graduate with Cum Laude and not be on the Dean's List.

Senate Chairperson Horst: So you have some numbers that you're looking in your e-mail, Senator Nikolaou?

Senate Chairperson Horst: So before I do that, let me do the research, because it seems like the number is the thing that you're concerned about?

Senator Bever: I was kind of curious how we got the number.

Senator Nikolaou: Yep. Because I remember when, because Senator Hurd had calculated. It was 3.65, if it was 3.8, if it was 3.7 and how many additional students would benefit. And actually with 3.65 much more students are going to benefit compared to if it was at 3.8 or 3.7.

Senator Bever: Okay, thank you.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Senator Roy.

Senator Roy: I'm going to give a point of debate. I'm going to give a point of negation on this. I really think that a 3.65 is too low. I like top 10% better personally. I'll give a personal example. I've gotten on B at ISU, and it was end of semester, and it would've put my semester GPA to 3.8 and I wasn't on the Dean's List that year. I think that on a school-by-school, college-by-college, I think it's better to have higher academic standards than to lower our academic standards. And seeing how other universities have higher, I think ISU should aim to be higher, you know. That's just my personal opinion, and I will not be voting yes on this one.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Thank you, Senator Roy. And you're not proposing an amendment. You're just giving a point of information, correct? Thank you. Further debate. Senator Blair.

Senator Blair: Thank you. So this is a point of information, I suppose. And I don't remember the exact figures, but during the Academic Affairs Committee and this is in response to Senator Roy, we did mention the top 10%. And one of the reasons why we're moving away from that from what I recall (and if someone on the Academic Affairs Committee has a better memory with the specifics, I'd invite them to respond to that) that there were instances where you'd have students with very high GPAs, but because it's top 10%, who would basically never on the Dean's List even though as it was mentioned that they are graduating Cum Laude that they are otherwise academically very high performing. So I remember that conversation occurring. If somebody has more details, I'd encourage you to give that. But I believe there are students with very high GPAs who would never be able to meet the Dean's List.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Thank you, Senator Blair. Senator Nikolaou, do you recall that logic as well?

Senator Nikolaou: Yes.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Okay. Yes. Further debate? Senator Tasdan.

Senator Tasdan: I guess going off of that note, were there discussions . . .

Senate Chairperson Horst: Remember, we're in debate.

Senator Tasdan: Yes. A point of information regarding this specifically being about GPA rather than about shifting the percentages even what Senator Bever mentioned of top 20%. I don't frankly understand why it was not shifted rather to 20% rather than specifically shifting to GPA requirements. I have a point of disagreement on that regarding for it being shifted to GPA rather than percentage.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Senator Nikolaou, do you have any response?

Senator Nikolaou: So for this one, if I remember correctly, there was only one other comparative university that was using percentage rather than a specific GPA cutoff point. So that's one of the reasons for using the GPA instead of the percentages. And also if we are using the percentage instead of the . . . because at 3.65 and at 3.66 are not that much difference from one another. But if we put the percentage, it might mean that you are at 3.66 and you're not going to be added on the Dean's List. Or it could be that you have a 3.89, and in that specific year the 10% or the 15% is at 3.9. So is the 3.89 not deserving to be on the Dean's List compared to a 3.9?

Senate Chairperson Horst: But the Academic Affairs Committee is the one who approved this revised language, correct?

Senator Nikolaou: Yes.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Thank you. Further debate? Seeing none, all in favor of approval of the Policy 2.1.10 as amended, please signify by saying aye.

Multiple people: Aye.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Opposed?

Unknown speaker: No.

Senate Chairperson Horst: The ayes have it. Any abstentions? All right. Very good. And so now we will go to our information items.

Information Items

Senate Chairperson Horst: Senator Blum.

Senator Blum: This was put forth as an information item, once before. And at this time one of the additions was to add a tie-breaking procedure. After listening to feedback from the senate before, we decided to do a couple of things, which was to move the locus of the decision to the body. For example, if it was Faculty Caucus, they would decide more about the tie rather than. And then we presented what is before you is a series of options and some ways to handle that. So given that said, tonight we were given a suggestion on a slightly shorter way of doing that. And it's a bit more parsimonious. The tie-breaking language is in E. The rest of the language that has been proposed has already been put before and was clarification of the procedures that reflected actual voting procedures. The suggestion was rather than to go into the multiple different types of ways but to rather focus it. If you read from E, I'll read it out loud. Use of a tie-breaking procedure is not mandatory. And if no tie-breaking procedure is adopted, the election shall continue with the standard balloting procedure. After a tie, an election continues for three consecutive ballots for the remaining candidates on every one of the three consecutive ballots. And then the suggested language, which Rules reviewed tonight, would say an Academic Senate body may choose to determine the outcome of the election via a coin toss or other similar method. And then it would delete all the election. It just kind of makes it simpler and makes the motion. All that other language explained about how to motion it and have options and all that, and it seemed like that was a much more parsimonious, and Rules agreed to that. And then you could delete all of that and come down to the final line which says once a tie-breaking procedure is completed, the candidate or possibly candidates who won a tie-breaking procedure is declared elected and the election is closed. So I'm going to leave that open for questions.

Senate Chairperson Horst: All right. So we're in information item because of the large amount of text you added. And so are there any questions for Senator Blum? I would appreciate a revised version of this document before it goes to action next time. Thank you very much. And now the Student Caucus and Senator Monk.

Senator Monk: What you all have in front of you is the Student Bereavement Policy. Student Caucus completed its review a couple of weeks ago. Had the Dean of Student's Office with Jill Benson add some editing as well as Legal took a look at it as well. So definitely already had the Executive Committee look at it, so they've added a few editorial changes that are in there. I'll run through the substantive changes. So to start, the background, introduction and the keeping with the truest intentions, we've gotten rid of that. So it goes right into the policy. We've included celebration of life, a memorial program, etc. as appropriate documentation for bereavement. We have added in language that upon the notification of absence, proper documentation in that paragraph, we've allowed that courses that allow dropping a low grade, faculty must offer student reasonable arrangements for making up missed work due to bereavement and may not require that missed work be counted as the low grade to be dropped. Underneath the excused absences section, we've now included that the bereavement days can be taken consecutively or non-consecutively. We've also removed the parentheses of not including weekends and holidays, because there are some courses that will be taking place on weekends. We've included legal guardian as one of the acceptable deaths for bereavement to be taken. We've also expanded out the number of travel days so verified funeral services between 150 to

300 miles from ISU campus are not two days. Verified funeral services over 300 miles is now three days, and verified funeral services outside the 48 contiguous United States is now up to five days. We've also included a provision that a student may request additional excused days for travel or general bereavement. The Dean of Students can take case by case. This is a policy that the Dean of Students is already currently following, so we're simply adding that into the language now to allow for that accommodation and to make sure students are aware that that option is available to them. Students are also going to have to submit appropriate documentation to the Dean of Students no later than the last day of the semester in which the leave occurred. And under Appeals, we've also included that appeals are going to go through the department chair and school director before it comes to the Provost Office. So those are all the substantive changes. I'm happy to take any questions on the policy.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Questions for Senator Monk? Senator Pancrazio.

Senator Pancrazio: Yeah. I'm looking at page 1, the paragraph that begins with upon notification of absence and proper documentation. It said, and I'll read it. In courses that allow dropping a low grade or grades, faculty must offer the student reasonable arrangements for making up work missed due to bereavement and may not require that missed work be counted as the low grade to be dropped. Does this mean that only in classes that allow the dropping of the low grade, faculty have to be reasonable, offer reasonable arrangements?

Senator Monk: So if you read the sentence before that, the faculty member shall excuse the student from class according to policy and provide an opportunity to complete missed exams, quizzes, and other required work. So that is already in the policy.

Senator Pancrazio: So it looks like that then, what the sentence should say is in courses that allow dropping the low grade or grades, faculty may not require that the missed work be counted. But the whole question about reasonable doesn't seem . . . the way it is in this sentence it only applies to classes that have the policy of dropping the lower grade. I don't think that's what you mean to say. But if you do, then fine. Then if we don't have that policy of dropping the low grades, there's no reason to offer a reasonable arrangement, even though 99.9 are probably reasonable.

Senate Chairperson Horst: So you're saying, Senator Pancrazio, that the faculty must offer the student reasonable arrangements . . .

Senator Pancrazio: Period. Period.

Senate Chairperson Horst: . . . for making up the work. And then get into the business about dropping the low grade.

Senator Pancrazio: That would make sense to me.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Right.

Senator Monk: Okay.

Senator Pancrazio: I don't think you want to restrict reasonable to a policy of dropping low grades.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Thank you.

Senator Pancrazio: I have one more question about logistics. In this is the section called, entitled Process, it says if a student will be absent because of death, the student is responsible for notifying the Dean of Students Office as soon as possible and in no event later than the last day of the semester in which the leave occurred. So the leave has already occurred and then they notify. From faculty, if I have to grade something and we're at the end of the semester and then I get the authorization that you missed that and should be given a grade, what's the logistics for that? Many faculty members as of right now are counting the days until they leave the country. So if you wait until the last day of the semester, who's going to be around to grade it?

Senator Monk: And this was certainly a lengthy conversation with the Student Caucus. We went back and forth in getting rid of the non-consecutive part completely. We were going back and forth between do we want to have 14 days before the last semester to allow for reasonable arrangements. In the end this was an edit that was included by Jill Benson in the Dean of Students Office, so we opted to remain with her change. Now, Dean of Students, Dr. Andy Morgan, is in the room tonight. So if you would be willing to, I'm sure even kind of explain some of the more logistical side.

Senator Pancrazio: I mean 99% of the time I want to work with the student. Something happens at the end of the semester, take an incomplete. But if I'm not on campus, I mean this, if this something is not approved until the end of the semester, how's the student going to get a grade? So I'm just, I just don't know the logic here.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Senator Helms.

Senator Helms: So my first exam is in week four. A student was off on bereavement but doesn't notify me until the day before the last. Now I recognize that there's a trust in the Dean of Students Office to be able to say, well, wait, that's not really reasonable. But the reality is the way this is written that I would have to make a reasonable accommodation for my exam eight weeks ago for that student. And that seems to present an unfair advantage to that student, because they've now had eight additional weeks to study for an exam or to prepare for whatever. So I'm struggling here.

Senator Monk: It's completely fair, and it'll be definitely a conversation that we can have with the Dean of Students Office, whether or not we include that next time we bring this forth.

Senate Chairperson Horst: I mean most notifications come in a timely manner, right? If somebody is sick or somebody has to not be in class because they have a contagious disease, most of those notifications come in real time. Senator Yazedjian, did you have a comment?

Senator Yazedjian: I had a few. Just a couple. Has there been consideration for a timeframe to submit the notification? Number one. Number two. Are we assuming that all faculty are reasonable? If so, maybe we don't need that information in the policy at all. I mean I'm joking. Right? And you could just cut it and say "upon notification each faculty member shall excuse the student." And then in courses that allow dropping a low grade, faculty may not require that missed work be counted as the low grade to be dropped. Or we feel it's necessary to say that all faculty should be reasonable, in which case we'd put that first. Right? But to me, I think, just sandwiching reasonableness in between those two when you're talking about some classes requiring and others don't, it seems kind of an interesting placement. So you could just cut it or put it first if we feel like we need to put that in there. And then just lastly we do have a student complaint process. It's on the very bottom of our university web page that suggests that students need to talk to the faculty member first, then to the chair and director, and then to the dean before it would go to the Provost Office. So I wonder if there's consideration for after the department chair or school director that the student could appeal to the dean before appealing to the Provost Office. That's it. Thank you.

Senate Chairperson Horst: I do believe, Senator Nikolaou, there were a couple of policies we just did where it went from the director to the Provost. Is that right?

Senator Nikolaou: Yes... There are some policies where they don't refer to the dean. They just say it just goes to the chair, the school director. The one comment was to add the same language about the Dean of the Mennonite College of Nursing. And several of the policies do not include the dean before they send it to the Provost. I don't know why.

Senator Yazedjian: Sure. I am not suggesting we should do that but if we wanted to consider that. Sorry, one more thing. And perhaps in addition to talking to the Dean of Students about the feasibility on their end, we could talk to also some faculty members about the feasibility since they're teaching the classes about something like what we currently have about letting them know at the last day of classes. Thank you.

Senate Chairperson Horst: And you understand, like Mennonite does not have director and chair, so that's why you have to put the Dean of the Mennonite School of Nursing.

Senator Hollywood: Just to add another little wrinkle into this is the non-tenure track faculty that are on contract work. And so if you wait until after the last day of classes, by the time we get notification and can do it, we are no longer contracted to the university, therefore not being paid. And so we do not do work over the summer.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Thank you. Any comments to that?

Senator Monk: So are we wanting to add in a deadline then where students are not allowed to submit bereavement after a certain date? Would that solve that problem?

Senator Hollywood: Yes. If we get that while we are still contracted to the university, but legally really we cannot do work for the university if are not employed by them.

Senate Chairperson Horst: But then there's the comment that if somebody is taking a test in week 12 and the bereavement was in week 2, there's an unfair advantage. I'm going to go to Senator Holmes again.

Senator Holmes: Yes. I wanted to talk about the process section and what we discussed in the Student Caucus. So that sentence specifically, the one that everyone's taking issue with in no event later than the last day of the semester is intended because . . . so if you were to make it a two-week limit after the bereavement was taken, what happens if I take bereavement on finals week? Do I have two weeks after finals week to submit my notification? And then, if you make a deadline that's before the end of the semester, that's before Success Week or something like that, which is something that we discussed in length, actually, what happens if you take bereavement during Success Week? Am I not allowed to make the notification to the Dean of Students Office because it was after that deadline? So essentially the idea of this policy is the student will submit as soon as possible to the Dean of Students Office to be kind of accommodating for students that are experiencing bereavement. And in no event later than the last day of the semester is because you can take bereavement in no event later than the last day of the semester. So you have to be able to submit your notification of bereavement during the entire time that the policy applies.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Thank you. Senator Nikolaou.

Senator Nikolaou: So one comment was about what Senator Pancrazio mentioned about that sentence. So if we are going to rephrase it, we should make a note because it is literally the same wording from three other policies. So it would make census in the wording of this policy. We should make an adjustment to 2.1.30, 2.1.26, and 2.1.20.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Which wording are you speaking of?

Senator Nikolaou: The one about the low grade or grades. Faculty must offer the student reasonable accommodations. The other comment was about everyone is mentioning about the last day of the semester. And I had a question. Did the Financial Aid Office weigh on that, because it might be that I got, let's say, the bereavement – it was for today, but then I waited until the end of the semester. Does that mess up somehow my financial aid? Don't they have specific time periods by when they need to do certain things? And then the other part is . . .

Senator Monk: I was going to respond to that, because this was about a 30-minute-long conversation between the Student Caucus on that specific wording. And we started off with wanting to remove it entirely. However, given Jill Benson's inclusion of it, we opted to keep it in. So I'm going to check in with Jill. I want to understand why she included that specifically, so I'll be able to give that information to you.

Senate Chairperson Horst: But you might want to also touch base with Financial Aid is what he's saying.

Senator Monk: Sounds good.

Senator Nikolaou: And the other part was if there was any updates for the travel requirement, what we were discussing in the Executive Committee. Because now that we say there are non-consecutive days, it is potentially that I'm going to ask for a day today. But if I live, let's say 300 miles away, then I'm going to take today plus three days. And then I can take my second day next Thursday, which is going to be an additional four days and then the week after. So it is not really five days. It is five days times the number of the extra days I get because of the distance. Just before the non-continuance, the idea was that I'm going to get five continuous and then I have three extra days because of travel. So it is eight days. But now the number could potentially increase significantly.

Senator Monk: Yeah, because the travel days are not attached to bereavement. They're attached to verified funeral services. So it reads verified funeral services. So you have to verify the funeral service, and then you get those travel days. So that loophole would not be allowed to be taken advantage of.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay.

Senate Chairperson Horst: So if travel is required for funeral services, right, to make it clear that that's what it's for. Does that do it, Senator Nikolaou?

Senator Nikolaou: Yes.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Senator Pancrazio.

Senator Pancrazio: The types of things that Senator Holmes had brought up have happened before. I mean we've been around for 30 years. This type of stuff happens. And in the event of a student having an unfortunate incident like this, my recommendation, last year I did. Go home. Do your stuff, and then we'll get it straightened out. So it's not like there aren't mechanisms to deal with this. Things happen. You know, if it hasn't happened yet on this campus, I don't think we've invented it. The one thing I would like to kind, another question I had, when we're talking about granting additional days, and it's more a kind of psychological question when it says student may request additional excused days for travel and/or general bereavement. I think when we start talking about general bereavement, we're talking about grief. And grief's not on a timeline. So at some point, at what point are you saying that it's time to get back in the rhythm of things? I mean you've probably heard me before. I really emphasize the importance of regular class attendance and getting back into the rhythm of things. And if going to a psychologist and scheduling is part of that regular rhythm of getting back involved with life, I would suggest that's the road a person should take. But I mean the way this is being phrased, when is the bereavement going to end? Because the way it, you can just keep asking for more and more excused days. I think we should encourage people to re-embrace life. It's tough. I know.

Senator Monk: Well, that will be up to the discretion of the Dean of Students Office.

Senator Pancrazio: This is a policy that affects Academic Affairs, too, and one of the things is that the last time this policy came up, and I was the chair of the committee, it came up in

Academic Affairs. So this is something that is part of the general discussion of the body. So I would like some clarification on that. How many years can this go? People can grieve for the rest of their lives.

Senator Monk: Again, it is a case-by-case basis. The Dean of Students Office will review each individual student's case. And if they have determined that, hey, you know what, you're time for getting back into it . . .

Senate Chairperson Horst: I just want to pick up on what Senator Pancrazio is saying. And, yes, we acknowledge that the Dean of Students is taking over this responsibility, but there does need to be a dialogue with the academic side of the house. So I sent you an e-mail previously. I'm suggesting that at that point where there's additional days potentially being given that there be some discussion with the instructors as to what's the plan for making up the additional work. So I suggest that prior to requesting additional excused days, students must work with each individual professor and develop a plan for completing any required work upon their return. The Dean of Students Office may grant such days on a case-by-case basis and may request documentation from the student of continued communication with faculty prior to granting these additional days, just so we make sure that it's not just the Dean of Students in a silo and the faculty aren't involved in this decision. And, you know, we deal with a lot of this kind of stuff. As you're saying, you could do an incomplete. I do feel like we're having policy language to regulate how we deal with students, and we do this all the time. But this is the direction we've already gone, so let's just try to make sure that the academic side of the house is talking to the Student Affairs side of the house. Senator Midha.

Senator Midha: I just have a suggestion for this policy where the time confusion can be resolved that the policy could use whichever comes earlier clause. Like the student could inform within two weeks or the last day of the semester and whichever comes earlier of the two. So that would resolve the issue of which day should be used for the information.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Senator Cline.

Senator Cline: I don't have a specific policy, like language, to offer. But I wonder if it might be helpful to make some clarification about what actually is the last class day. Some people (me) might assume that the last class day is the last time the course meets. But one could also interpret the last class day as the university-designated final exam period during final exam week. And obviously I wouldn't want to disadvantage a student who had significant death during final exams week, right? So I think you might think a little bit about that timing and that language to be sure that there's some sort of acknowledgement about what might happen in that case. I mean I agree that reasonableness and that the Dean of Students Office can help mitigate this. But if . . . say we had, for instance, a student who is graduating, there is an incomplete. [laughter] Right? I mean this is a much more complicated environment, right? So I think maybe just sort of thinking a little bit about that. What does the end of the semester mean? How does that interact with final exam period, and how does that interact with graduation?

Senate Chairperson Horst: The last day of the semester is published by the registrar on the academic calendar.

Senator Cline: Yes, it says last day. But then there's finals week. Right? So on the calendar it doesn't include finals week in the semester. But I would assume if the student's parent died during the finals week, we would want to provide them the most accommodation we could. Right? So I just think some clarity around what that day is.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Thank you, Senator Cline. Further questions? We're in an information period. All right. So lots of things to think about. We still have some time to work this through and get it through the senate. Thank you very much. Okay. And Senator Lucey, right over there for the Classified Research Policy, formerly known as the Classified Research Policy.

Senator Lucey: First of all, thank you to Senator Craig McLauchlan for his hard work on this policy and several others that will be appearing at meetings to be coming forth in the future, not only for Craig's diligence and eye for detail but also for his light sense of humor and engaging conversation.

The first thing that I'd like to talk about is obviously the change in the policy is now restrictions on research and contracts rather than classified research. And the first change I'd like to also mention is something that's not in your notes. We decided, the committee decided, to add some language at the start of the policy that reads as follows: It is the policy of Illinois State University that, absent extraordinary circumstances, teaching, research and service will be accomplished openly and without provisions or restrictions on the publication and dissemination of the results of academic and research activities. However, circumstances do exist where restrictions may occur. So I will read that again for you. It is the policy of Illinois State University that, absent extraordinary circumstances, teaching, research, and service will be accomplished openly without prohibitions or restrictions on the publication or dissemination of the results of academic and research activities. However, circumstances do exist where restrictions may occur. Okay. And then we go into the rest of the policy. So in terms of the changes, it is now restrictions on research and contracts. The policy reads we've included the word *no member of the university*, instead of the university, *will enter into research for the purpose of maiming or incapacitating human beings. The university will not enter into any contract.* We added *grant or service agreement*. We also included grants and service agreements related to the freedom to disclose.

And then under Part 2, we said the identity of the sponsor clause.

And then the third paragraph where the university will not enter into any contract. We also added grant, service and agreement.

Grant or service agreement is also added in the fourth paragraph.

And then we also changed the name of the Review Committee to the Restricted Review Research Committee. And then the Review Committee will consist of the Director of Research, Ethics, and Compliance. So these changes are consistent with the names of the committees. Any questions about the policy?

Senate Chairperson Horst: Any questions for Senator Lucey? Senator Mainieri.

Senator Mainieri: I notice the change to no member of the university in what will now be the second paragraph. And then the other paragraph starts with the university. So I wonder why those paragraphs are different.

Senator Lucey: Because we had oversights in our review of the policy. So we can amend that to be consistent.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Well, is Legal here? I'm not sure who enters into contracts.

Senator McLauchlan: The Board of Trustees.

Senate Chairperson Horst: So they're the ones who would enter into the contract, grant, or service agreement?

Senator McLauchlan: So even if I sign, I'm always signing on behalf of the Board of Trustees of Illinois State University, and I have to always change every contract I sign on behalf of all of the faculty who get grants and contracts. It's always the Board of Trustees of Illinois State University. So in some ways, the no member part is the anomaly, but we did try to change that, so perhaps we were wrong in changing that part?

Senate Chairperson Horst: So we can consider that. Further questions? Senator Torry.

Senator Torry: So I'm having a hard time opening the document, but on the second bullet point you said will not enter a grant or service to disclose? I believe it's the second bullet point that you mentioned.

Senator McLauchlan: It's grant or service agreement.

Senator Torry: And then there's something . . . Basically I would not enter a grant or service to disclose, meaning I forfeit my ability to disclose information? Is that what that meant? I believe it was the second bullet point.

Senate Chairperson Horst: The university will not enter into any contract. The proposed insert is grant or service agreement which would restrain its freedom to disclose (1) the existence of the contract, grant, or service agreement or (2) the identity of the sponsor.

Senator Torry: Okay. I misheard what he said.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Further questions? I was hoping we could come up with a policyowner. Is it the Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost? Who would like to own this policy?

Senator McLaughlan: I believe the Provost is indicating Research and Sponsored Programs is going to own this. Or is the Provost.

Interim Provost Yazedjian: Whichever you all think is fine. If you would like more specificity with Research and Sponsored Programs, that's fine. Otherwise, it can be the Office of the Provost.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Okay. Provost. Okay. So we had a couple of wording suggestions, and we'll look into those. Otherwise, we'll see this hopefully next time. And now we have Senator Valentin from the Planning and Finance Committee and Smoke- and Tobacco-Free Campus.

Senator Valentin: Yeah, this policy was reviewed by General Counsel, and they had no recommended changes to the language and verified that the state statutes that this policy is in accordance with have not changed since the initial implementation of this policy. There is some language in this policy relating to the initial implementation of the policy, so some of the items to remove – we suggest removing the smoke- and tobacco-free campus map comment in the first paragraph of the policy. And then in the compliance section, this is not indicated in the document to have, uh, the first paragraph under compliance, the successful implementation of this policy and so on. Committee reviewed this and believes that this whole paragraph should be removed from the policy because it's a description of successful implementation. This policy has been implemented, so this is language sort of left over.

Senate Chairperson Horst: So you're also proposing to strike those two sentences and start with *If a member?*

Senator Valentin: No. The successful implementation of this policy sentence, the paragraph starting with that. If a member of the campus community observes an individual violating...

Senate Chairperson Horst: So you're proposing to strike the two sentences after compliance, correct?

Senator Valentin: In addition to the third sentence.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Yes.

Senator Valentin: Yeah, the third sentence, initial compliance of this, which is already marked.

Senate Chairperson Horst: So we'll begin with *If a member?*
Questions for Senator Valentin? As a former member of the Rules Committee who used to look at this policy and there was no state law, we used to talk a lot about this policy. Senator Blum, were you on the senate when we talked about the smoking map and debated about the smoking map? I would be interested in the committee's thoughts as to whether or not it's necessary for the senate to still review this policy. If you guys can talk about that and send me a note, because certainly now it seems like it's state law. But we used to debate the map and have a lot of interesting conversations.

Senator Valentin: And the policy, though, as drafted in 2015, was in response to the state policy, right? So this is all, most of the language within here is connected to the smoke-free campus act, Smoke-Free Illinois Act.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Right. But I've been on the senate since 2010, so I remember when there was no policy or smoking act. Senator Nikolaou?

Senator Nikolaou: I'll ask the Exec Committee question. Under the exception to the policy, where it says that smoking is permitted when traveling in a public vehicle through campus. Fine. Or part of the campus in an unenclosed parking lot. Does it mean that it is not allowed if you're parked on campus in an enclosed parking lot?

Senator Valentin: Yes. And these exceptions are actually taken from this Smoke-Free Campus Act. So these exceptions are not generated, right? So these come from the state policy. And so, yes, enclosed parking lots. So that would be parking decks or parking garages are considered enclosed.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. So, for example, the south School, it's going to be considered an enclosed parking lot.

Senator Valentin: Yes. I mean there was a question about an exception to the theater. And, again, the exceptions, so for performances, whether or not smoking could be allowed for that. So the policy as it stands has not included that exception, and this is also based on the Smoke-Free Campus Act. And so theater productions are not an exception within the Smoke-Free Campus Act. So the only two exceptions are these: Smoking in a private vehicle and smoking permitted in closed laboratories. Those are documented. Then I reached out to School of Theater and Dance Director Ann Haugo, confirming that School of Theater productions use prop devices rather than actual cigarettes. And this is a widespread usage in the theater community now in many jurisdictions. So there's no need for exceptions to allow cigarettes because they don't use those in theater productions.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Thank you for looking into that, Senator Valentin. So hopefully we'll see that next time. And we can also consider whether or not that should remain a senate policy. And our last one is from Senator Mainieri and the College of Ed Dean Evaluation Form.

Senator Mainieri: What you see in front of you is a carryover from last year's AABC work on updating the Dean Evaluation Forms for all of the deans. I think this is the last one to come back here. As you can see, there were some minor changes made to the evaluation, primarily editorial changes, particularly that first paragraph and throughout for unnecessarily gendered terms. Another change within the items is previously the Diversity, Equity and Inclusion item asked about on those efforts regarding students, faculty and staff all in one question. And so the suggestion was to separate out support for EDI with students, support for EDI with faculty and staff as two different items to rate. And then finally, again in accordance with the changes made to these evaluations across the board, at the very end of the survey an option was added *prefer not to respond* for folks who did not want to identify what their status was within the college. So

those were the primary edits. Again, these are in line with the work of the committee last year to update all of these evaluations in similar ways.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Thank you very much, Senator Mainieri. Are there any questions? And now we'll go to Internal Committee Reports and Academic Affairs Committee with Senator Nikolaou.

Internal Committee Reports

Senator Nikolaou: In the Academic Affairs Committee we had three guests tonight: Cooper Cutting, Assistant Vice President for Academic Planning, Alice McGinnis, the Deputy University Counsel, and Emily Jones, Professor of the School of Kinesiology and one of the Provost Fellows to talk about the Policy 4.1.21, Distance Education. We are not sending any items to the Executive Committee.

Senator Mainieri: Tonight we approved updates to Policy 3.2.13, Administrator Selection and Search Policies as well as updates to Policy 3.2.16, Academic Dean Responsibilities, Appointment and Compensation and Evaluations, both of which will be lined toward the Executive Committee tomorrow. As well, we finalized and approved the Academic Impact Fund Report that is part of our annual charge, which we'll also be heading toward Exec, and preliminary discussions about our annual responsibility to put together a summary report of the Annual Commentary of the President.

Senator Lucey: Faculty Affairs discussed Policy 4.1.11, Export Control. We had a lot of wordsmithing and some very capital ideas related to the topic. That policy will be coming Exec's way. We also had a conversation about Policy 3.3.4 and [sounds like Teaching 1:30:06] Faculty Classifications and Performance Evaluations. Janice Bonneville, you will be getting an e-mail from me. And then we also had a conversation about Policy 4.1.13, Classified Research and Judicial Language, which we talked about previously. And I will be sending that policy to the Executive Committee.

Senator Valentin: Planning and Finance Committee continued their review of Policy 5.1.1, Concealed Carry and Prohibited Weapons, and Policy 5.1.19, University Violence Policy. And we will not be sending anything to Exec just yet.

Senator Blum: Yes, we had two guests tonight from the College of Engineering, Vijay Devabhaktuni, the Chair of the Department of Engineering there, and he came to discuss new College of Engineering bylaws. And we had Patricia Pence come to discuss the revised Mennonite College of Nursing bylaws. So we had good discussions about both of those, and we also reviewed suggested changes to the elections.

Senator Sheridan: UPC met this evening and concluded our review of Policy 1.19, Protection of Minors Policy. And this will be forwarded to Senate Exec tomorrow. We also had a discussion on 3.2.11, Employment in Excess of Full-Time Appointment, and determined that the policy would need to be tabled to allow additional time for consultation with the Office of the Provost.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Political Activities. Okay. Thank you very much. Are there any communications? Yes, Senator Myers.

Senator Myers: Yeah, I just want to reiterate. If you're interested in helping advocate or filling out a witness slip for SB2606 as it goes into house, feel free to reach out to me, contact me, you know, pull me aside after senate. I'd love to get you plugged in.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Thank you very much. Further communications? Again, Executive Committee, if you could come touch base with me. Again, I'm going to remind everybody we're having a little party next time to celebrate the 50th, so stay tuned for that. May I have a motion to adjourn? Senator McHale. Second by Senator Holmes. All in favor of adjourning, please signify by saying aye.

Multiple people: Aye.

Senate Chairperson Horst: Opposed? We're adjourned.