

Fall 10-21-2015

Senate Meeting, October 21, 2015

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

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



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting, October 21, 2015" (2015). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 907.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/907>

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

Academic Senate Minutes
Wednesday, October 21, 2015
(Approved)

Call to Order

Senator Kalter called the meeting to order.

Roll Call

Senator Lonbom called the roll and declared a quorum.

Approval of Minutes of October 7, 2015

Motion XLVI-21: By Senator Daddario, seconded by Senator Huxford, to approve the minutes. The motion was approved, with exception of Senator Troxel, who abstained.

Chairperson's Remarks

Senator Kalter: Good evening, everyone. Tonight, the Sick Leave policy, revised in response to our comments last time, will be moving to action. Because there were requests for clarification from multiple Senators on the proposed Protection of Minors policy, we won't be discussing that one tonight, but I do hope to see it move into the action item slot at the November 4 meeting. Executive Committee members agreed that we needed to move the proposed Sense of the Senate resolution regarding Advanced Placement credit up on the agenda in order just to get to it. (Advanced Placement used to mean placing UP rather than placing OUT of a class, by the way.) Then, we'll be tackling a proposal for a new external committee of the Senate and hearing two weeks' worth of committee reports. Since we have a Faculty Caucus following this meeting to continue our work on ASPT revisions, and some of those proposed revisions are fairly substantial, it is unlikely that we will have time for the Employee Assistance Program policy, but you have that to read for next time. We will try to end the meeting in a timely manner for the start of the Caucus, now that we have laid all our jay-walking frustrations out on the table. Senator Powers was eager to be here for more grilling, I assure you, but he had an important can't-miss appointment elsewhere.

As the budget stalemate continues in Springfield, I just want to thank our students, our administration, our alumni, and other vocal advocates of higher education who are tax-paying constituents in this land of Lincoln for their attempts during Lobby Day yesterday, and on previous occasions, to provoke movement, discussion, and compromise. Over the summer, I said to the SGA that I felt compromise was the word of the year, and I meant that both for some of our own governance issues and for Springfield.

In these times it is far too easy to look only one semester or one year ahead. I hope that we at ISU buck that trend, despite what is going on. As we have done toward our own advancement in years past. As we receive information, for example, in our Planning and Finance Committee about the shape and state of our finances as they relate to planning, we can be looking 20, even 30 years ahead. We can be imagining what kind of a university we want to be, not just shoring up the values of the university we currently are. We should fight complacencies. We should not fall into the habit of thinking—this is the way we have always done things, this is the way we should continue to do things. We **must** start more often to look at the university budget from a parents' set of eyes and a student's set of eyes. The bulk of the share that they spend should be directed to academics. If it is not, let's think about how to shift those priorities in the long run, and think about how, over the long term, we can make other highly important functions and benefits of a bricks-and-mortar institution that are symbiotic to academic achievement as self-sustaining as possible. If the pie chart of family contributions to an ISU education includes tuition, fees, room & board (whether that goes to the university or an off-campus

apartment), and textbooks & materials, what do we want that pie chart to look like and how might that differ from the shape it currently takes. And how do we move from the latter to the former.

A bit of a heavy thought to end with, perhaps, but I hope one that will elicit our creativity and vision and optimism for the future during a time when the state's purse strings are being drawn in tighter and tighter, dampening the will to look ahead, creating the tensions of fear and self-protection, and too often creating potentials for division when a collective, mutually appreciative spirit is called for.

That's it for my comments tonight. If you have any questions for me, I would be happy to take them.

Student Body President's Remarks

Senator Kalter: Since Senator Powers is not here tonight, we are going to Senator Johnson to deliver the student body remarks.

Senator Johnson: Ryan apologizes for not being able to make it tonight. He did want me to let you know that Lobby Day was a success yesterday. The group of students talked to both Democratic and Republican leadership as well as meeting with Secretary Purvis. They had roughly 8 to 10 meetings throughout the day to stress the importance of MAP grant funding and the budget.

Next week is going to be Meet Your Dean. It is Tuesday, November 27, from 4:00 to 6:00 in the Old Main, as well as our Kites on Quad event that same day in Schroeder Plaza. So encourage your students to attend. We are also working on amending our Constitution in our Student Government Association. If you could encourage your students to come into our office and sign it, because we need 10% of the student body to approve of the changes.

I would be happy to accept any questions on behalf of Ryan.

Administrators' Remarks

• *President Larry Dietz*

President Dietz: I just want to say happy Homecoming week to everyone. Many activities have already begun starting with Monday, the tree lighting ceremony, in Uptown Normal with Major Koos and later that evening an event on the quad that was very well attended by lots and lots of students. Today was the faculty/ staff luncheon and I am told that 1,100 faculty and staff showed up for that luncheon. We feed them all in about 45 minutes, so record time to get in and get out. But was our opportunity to say thank you so much for all that you do day in and day out for the university and a showing appreciation for all of that good work. So we appreciate those of you who were able to make that.

I also want to say thanks to student leaders. I saw them yesterday in Springfield. All of the university presidents were also there yesterday meeting with some other individuals. We met with the top legislative leaders on the House and Senate sides. I would love to say that they were moved by their passion and our vision for the university and maybe that will happen one of these days, but right now there is still a roadblock hampering activity. One of the themes that the students talked about and the presidents talked about yesterday was basically we need a budget. We need a figure; we need it now. Not only to continue for the current fiscal year and allay the anxiety that is out there among some students, faculty and staff, but also to assure the parents and students who are on our college campuses right now making decisions and considering what institutions they are going to be going to for next year and that the point is that those individuals also need to be convinced that the State of Illinois believes in them, wants them to attend our institutions in the State of Illinois and that every day that goes by that we don't have a budget sends a signal to the contrary. We are already the second largest exporter of students in the nation to other states. That's one area that we don't want to be number 1. Number 2 is bad enough, but we all delivered that consistent message; the student leaders did and the presidents did. We

are going to continue to stay at that. I go down again tomorrow and the presidents tomorrow meet with the governor. We are scheduled into a variety of different kinds of meetings. Tomorrow I join two other university presidents and three community college presidents. It is an interesting way they have us divided up and we have sessions with the governor tomorrow and the lack of progress is not for lack of trying. All of us are trying very hard to get some movement and I am convinced that will happen. The issue is just when and how much, but we continue to work on that.

On Friday, we have of Board of Trustees meeting here. Lots of Homecoming activities, of course. Thursday night before the Friday Board meeting, my wife and I are hosting the Homecoming Court for dinner at the president's residence. We always enjoy that very much. So, we also want to report a bit on a grassroots effort that all universities are attempting to try to pressure on legislators in the capital. The most recent effort in that regard has been a petition signing, an email that has gone out to alums from all of the universities, and that petition is being signed by people that want movement on the budget as well. So we are monitoring that very carefully. I continue to convene this group of presidents every Wednesday at 3:00 and that was the case again today talking about different strategies and we do that pretty much on a weekly basis. So stay tuned with that, but in the meantime, we hope that you take in lots of Homecoming activities, the parade on Saturday and the football game on Saturday afternoon. There is also a volleyball game Friday night and a soccer game on Sunday. While the budget is of great concern, let's remember to have some fun while we are at this.

I would be open to any questions that you might have.

Senator Crowley: I would just like to ask President Dietz something here. Is it possible that Republican Governor Edgar might be of assistance more than he has already, because he has come out purely stating that this is not a path that Illinois needs be on at this time or at any time? Is it possible that the presidents could invite Governor Edgar to join them?

President Dietz: I would say that anything is possible. Governor Rauner's staff has already reacted to Governor Edgar's comments in the newspaper. You never know the impact of these kinds of things, but Governor Edgar was a well-respected governor and his comments were pretty pointed, as were Governor Rauner's staffperson who responded to that. We try not to invite the different legislators to go with the presidents. The bottom line is that the universities, we are doing our job. Our job is to teach students, serve students and we are doing our job. It is really time for the state to step up and do their job.

Senator Kalter: Further questions for Senator Dietz?

- ***Provost Janet Krejci***

Provost Krejci: Congrats to the students for getting through midterms alright. I have heard good success there. Also congratulations to Dr. Ani Yazedjian who has gotten a \$5 million grant from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services for at risk youth. It is really incredible for this campus. She is putting together a great team. Again, a great luncheon today to celebrate faculty and staff. Thanks to the President's Office for all of the support for that. Lots of good pictures on the website and some of you might be there.

A couple of updates. IBHE has been working with the universities to look at some reports that they are going to require every year. This was actually passed in legislation in 2012 that universities would report to IBHE and IBHE would report to the legislature on completions, enrollments and costs of programs. They were not doing that for the first couple of years, so they began this past year and we have been talking with them and they will for the spring be looking at benchmarks for numbers of enrollments and graduations for bachelor's, master's and PhDs and we will continue to keep you updated on that. We will be working with chairs and deans.

Enrollment updates for fall 2016: we have admitted 2,500 students with 100 paid deposits, so that is great and that's up. We are not comparing that to last year because we had some of the glitches with technology, but it's

up from two years ago as well. Spring 2016 numbers are a bit down right now and we are working on that. Right now we are 28% down. That is a little less than 300 students I believe because the numbers are smaller for new students in the spring. We believe that they might rebound as they did in a trend we are seeing where transfer students are coming in much later, but we will keep you updated with that. Our enrollment management division is working with chairs and deans on that. Registration is going very well as of 6 p.m. today. We had 10,886 students registered for spring, so we are very thankful that is going well. I just thank you for all of your support in welcoming students as they come to look at open houses. On Monday, October 12, we hosted nearly 2,000 students and their families and many commented on how welcoming faculty and staff are, so we appreciate that continued support. We are doing some new outreach for international students and we have some of our staff visiting different countries. At this point from those fairs, we have 300 new prospective students from the Middle East, Mediterranean, Asia and Latin America and we will continue to update you on that.

As far as the searches, we have several searches going on as you know. The College of Business dean search finalists have been announced and they will be interviewing October 29 and 30, and November 2 and 3. Detailed information can be found on the Provost's Office website. The Mennonite College of Nursing dean search is going forward. The postings should happen soon and the search for the AVP for Research and Graduate Programs is moving forward as will be the Cross Chair search. So we are busy on searches.

No real update on ReggieNet, which I think is good news. Things have been very stable and things have been going well. We continue to plan at this point to move ReggieNet to a hosted environment over winter break. We will be in close communication with Administrative Technologies to identify the dates for that because that will entail ReggieNet being down for a specified period of time. We are working closely with them to finalize a date and get that out to you as soon as we possibly can. I think just another reminder, there has been an ad hoc group of students, faculty and staff working on moving student email to Office 365. Several emails will be going out to students to remind them of that and there will tables set up in many places on campus with information about the change and we are going to be having free pizza out on Schroeder Plaza from 11 to 2 on Monday to ensure that students get good information about that. One other search I didn't mention was the Honors Director search. That has been switched to a new model. Instead of a full-time faculty director, we are going to be aligning with similar programs of ours across the country that has a faculty director part-time. That posting is coming.

I will be ready to take questions.

Senator Kalter: Questions for Senator Krejci?

Provost Krejci: Can I give one more shout out to the wonderful presentation last night on the Multi-Faith Activism that Senator Mike Gizzi helped to sponsor, along with some people from Student Affairs. It was well attended by the community. Just a fabulous speech with Christian, Muslim and Jewish leaders talking about peace.

Senator Gizzi: I actually do have a question. With the enrollment in the spring, is the bulk of that normally transfers?

Provost Krejci: Our new freshmen are at low numbers.

Senator Gizzi: I have done my part on that since my son is starting in January. His tuition waiver will be in tomorrow. I am just curious.

Provost Krejci: It's about half of the number of students that we are down is transfer students because our new freshmen is much smaller in the spring. So you are right that most of it is transfer students.

Senator Gizzi: Thank you. It really was a great event and it's a unique thing when Diversity Advocacy, the Dean of Students Office, Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution can partner with local churches to bring together an event. That is something I don't think we do a lot of at ISU in terms of the partnerships with faith-based communities. It was really a neat thing. I was going to do that in Communications, but she provided the...

Senator Kalter: I am sorry I missed it, Mike. I sent one of my interfaith...one of my former grad students to you. Any other questions for Senator Krejci? I have a feeling, Senator Krejci that you are being discreet about this, but I think maybe we should announce this, sort of pseudo-announce this. Is it correct that Mark Walbert this morning suggested that we may have about two weeks with ReggieNet down?

Senator Krejci: He did announce that. We don't know the specifics about that, but it is his perception that ReggieNet would be down for approximately two weeks over winter break, but I am trying to clarify that. There is some question about whether there would be some simultaneous running, so that would shorten that time.

Senator Kalter: I mention it just because I think that a soft rollout may be better than suddenly finding out during finals week, for example.

- ***Vice President of Student Affairs Brent Paterson***

Senator Paterson: I also wanted to congratulate Senator Gizzi for a great program last night. It was very interesting and really motivating to hear the speakers. More importantly, I wanted to say that Senator Lessoff has been very good at not jaywalking over the past few weeks. We have had several discussions about that over that time period.

Senator Lessoff: I confess.

Senator Paterson: The night after the last Senate meeting, I saw Senator Lessoff jaywalking and tried to run him down.

Senator Gizzi: You wouldn't have been the first.

Senator Paterson: I wanted to mention that the vice presidents and President Dietz have had the opportunity to meet the Homecoming Court Monday night. It is a very impressive group of students that are very active at the university and are very good students as well and you still have the opportunity to vote for the King and Queen. You can go to MyISU online. You can put your vote in there. So if things get boring later, you can use your computers or iPads to do that. I also wanted to mention Student Affairs Support for the Textbook Affordability Committee. We recognize that textbook affordability and affordability of education for all students is very important, so we are anxious to be a part of that and move forward and try to find ways to improve those opportunities for students to have more affordable textbooks. Senator Kalter mentioned about room and board and this week I received the comparisons for room and board rates at the public universities in Illinois. Illinois State's room and board rates are 7th among the 12 public universities. So we are trying to continue to hold down those rates and we did that this year in special recognition that we need to have some more flexibility in tuition as we move forward. That concludes my comments.

Senator Kalter: Are there any questions for Senator Paterson?

Senator Lessoff: Regarding jaywalking, now I have reformed and I don't cross anymore from the parking lot behind Milner Library, which is across School. So I very patiently go around and cross College and then over School. Today, I was very patiently waiting after having gone out for dinner at College and School where last

time people said they didn't want any fines and weren't crossing and while I was waiting for the light to change, there must have been six or seven people crossed against the light and I was thinking where are the people to give them their \$50 or \$120 fine. So not to beat a dead horse, but clearly the warning only lasted a brief time, which is human nature.

Senator Paterson: That is very true and actually the corner that you mention is one that we have continued to have discussions both within the university and Town of Normal on how we might be able to improve the lights at that section to provide better crossing. Hopefully, we can come to some resolution on that specific area because I agree with you. That is probably one of the worst corners certainly around campus. There are too many directions that people are trying to cross and not very clear on that. So I don't know what the resolution may be, but I know that Senator Alt has been having some discussions with the Town of Normal and we are continuing to have those discussions.

Senator Ellerton: I have a related question, but this one to do with bicyclists across campus. Today, a colleague and I were walking across to the luncheon and the colleague was about one step ahead of me and I screamed because there was a cyclist and without some warning, my colleague would have been knocked to the ground. The cyclist never saw, never heard. He had earphones on and kept going. Little did he know that by stopping about 20 yards further on, we had time to catch up and confronted him. Totally, totally oblivious of what had nearly happened. My question is this. Is there any possibility that on the cycle racks that maybe there could be a notice, some warning please take care, or some way of reminding students that there are other users of those paths?

Senator Paterson: At same time the campaign was for jaywalking was also bicycle safety. So both the Town of Normal Police and the ISU Police were issuing reminders to people about bicycle safety and I believe they also issued some tickets. I think, as you mentioned Senator Lessoff, we are all creatures of habit and people go back to doing what they have always done. They don't see a police officer around. We know that for people who speed in their vehicles as well. So the campaigns help to reduce it for a while, but they don't always have a lasting effect.

Senator Kalter: Is there a speed limit for bikes on campus or a rule that you should get off your bike when you are on a pedestrian walkway, as you would on a sidewalk for example in the Town of Normal?

Senator Paterson: I am not aware of any policies specific to bicycles on campus.

Senator Kalter: I might suggest that because I somehow survived a campus that was very bike friendly, partly because of bike paths, but also because people understood that when you are in a pedestrian zone... I don't know how fast the person was who almost hit Senator Ellerton's colleague, but perhaps having some signs around the perimeter reminding bikes to go slowly might help.

Senator Winger: It would seem to me as somebody who occasionally cycles, that a bike lane would be a better idea. You are never going to catch up with enforcement anyway. The thing about bikes is when you slow down, they eventually fall over. So, I don't know. That seems lost on some. So, yeah, in Europe, one sees bike paths all over. If it is a big problem, and I don't know that it is, then that would be my preferred way to go.

Senator Kalter: We offer our condolences to you, Senator Winger, for not knowing how to slow down without falling over. Any other questions for Senator Paterson?

- ***Vice President of Finance and Planning Greg Alt***

Senator Alt: The previous comments by President Dietz provided a good update of the continuing budget stalemate and the numerous ongoing efforts to advocate for higher ed, so I don't have anything to add that other than to note that our Board of Trustees is going to move forward this Friday with action to approve our FY16

operating budget, but they will do so in a way that it will contain a contingency clause to address any appropriation reduction that the state might eventually make. And the Board will also move forward with approval of our FY17 operating and capital appropriation requests, which was discussed at the last Senate meeting.

I have a few facility updates. If you have gone to the south end of campus near Main Street this fall, you will see that demolition the south campus residence halls is finally well underway. Abatement of asbestos containing materials will be completed late this fall. The actual demolition of first the Feeney Food Center is scheduled for completion by mid-February. Hamilton-Whitton residence hall will be down in April with the Atkin-Colby Hall down in May. In the summer there will be landscaping and site improvements to be completed before next fall. The progress of the design work and eventual construction of the Fine Arts renovation is not as good. In case you were not aware, this project finally did get approvals this past spring and contracts in order to complete the planning and design work, but unfortunately because of the state's unsettled budget, all work on that effort was stopped effectively June 30 and has not been started since then. Once the budget is finally passed, it is hoped, though it is not certain, that work can begin again on this project to continue completing the planning work, design and development and the development of construction documents, but that will still take 15 months, so this is really delaying that project. Even at that point when those documents are completed, the next major step for that project will be for the governor to then release the construction funds in order to for the construction portion to be bid. I will occasionally update you on the project, but at this point, until the budget impasse, we expect no progress. Finally, if you are wondering what has been going on at the entrance at Milner Library, late this past summer, our Environmental Health and Safety noticed that there were some cracked and broken bricks on the overhangs at Milner Library. So caution tape barriers were installed for safety while an engineering firm was hired to do an assessment of the work required to do the repairs. That assessment has been completed and the repairs will be completed by end of November.

Senator Kalter: Any questions for Senator Alt?

Senator Dyck: Yesterday morning, I was giving a test in Horton Fieldhouse and both the ceiling and floor were shaking from the noise on the roof. I am wondering what is going on because it was not a conducive teaching environment, especially for a test.

Senator Alt: There is a portion of the Horton flat roof portion, the roof is being replaced.

Senator Dyck: How long will that be so that I can plan for my next test?

Senator Alt: It should be finished this month.

Senator Dyck: Okay, then we should be okay. Everybody was looking at the ceiling. It was like the sky was falling.

Senator Thurman: I can confirm that. I was in that. I was taking the test.

Action Item:

10.18.15.01 Sick Leave Policy - Revised (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)

10.18.15.03 Sick Leave Policy: Return to Work Procedures – Revised

Senator Kalter: You have received copies that were revised since our discussion last time. I was hoping that Senator Powers would be here while I read for the first time this year the reminders about action items, which I neglected to read the first time we did them, but I just want to remind people that you have to first be recognized by the chair to call the question. Don't say it in my ear, Senator Powers. Don't say it on the floor. You actually have to raise your hand, and I recognize you and the chair can determine that there are still members waiting to debate, so I do have the power to rule that motion out of order. I am not going to read the

rest of it unless it gets totally out of hand, but I just wanted to remind people of that and I will hand it over to Senator Lessoff on behalf of the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee with the Sick Leave Policy.

Senator Lessoff: How much explanation of the revisions since the last meeting is in order?

Senator Kalter: I think just going over the main points would be fine.

Senator Lessoff: We introduced the policy last time and I met on behalf of the committee with Janice Bonneville of Human Resources to try after Ms. Bonneville had drafted some revisions based up on the conversation last time and we tried to accommodate all of the points that were raised both in the policy itself and in the attached return to work procedures, which are not something we have to vote on. Those are procedures followed by HR based upon the university policy, but one of the main innovations that came out of discussion with HR and university legal counsel was that employees would really benefit if in a very public place, procedures and explanations were readily available so that the internal process that was followed HR when somebody wanted to return was articulated clearly to everybody. So people can look through that and both of the substantive comments that were made on the floor by Senator Ellerton and Senator Brauer on behalf of Senator Soeldner, we tried to make the Return to Work procedures very precisely address them.

In the policy itself, we also tried to accommodate all of the comments that came up. In the version that was sent to the Senate, for some reason, comments that I had deleted reappeared in the version that you received. So this particularly matters on page 3, under extended sick leave can be used in the following manner. After consultation, the committee agreed with HR to delete the sentence “Usage of extended sick leave by an employee may be subject to FMLA at the discretion of the employer” and only one comment—there were three comments there because it was an internal conversation--only one comment matters and it is the comment LA4, which I wrote, which is essentially based on discussion in Senate, October 7, FMLA Policy itself needs revision, which is one of the things that came out of these conversations and the section below makes the intended point more clearly and one of the things we are hoping to do, based upon this discussion is that at a future point, whatever committee of the Senate gets ahold of it, again work with HR on revising that other important policy. The significance of that is that people were concerned. The question was asked before by Senator Kalter about employees being pressed into taking FMLA and what effect that would have on the amount of time available during the year. The rationale for that, and Ms. Bonneville can correct me if I am incorrect, but the rationale is to access the extended sick leave, which is that 150 hours that everyone gets, you have to have documentation of a personal illness of sufficient severity and FMLA is prima facie. If you apply for FMLA leave, that prima facie counts as certification that you have a personal illness of sufficient severity to access that very important benefit, but we felt we could delete the sentence because the next provision, sick leave used in sequence, explains the whole matter adequately.

The only other substantive issue, which is on the next page, on page 4, under Return to Work, some Senators suggested that the revised phrase from last time “for the same medical reason” was ambiguous. The idea is that as a matter of university policy, and HR thinks this is necessary for both for the university’s purposes and for the protection of the employee, if somebody has been off for five consecutive work days, they should have some medical documentation. The phrase itself is ambiguous and we might accept as a friendly amendment, if this were the sense of the Senate, substituting “same” for a “single” medical reason, but HR is pretty clear and Ms. Carlson can talk about this better than I, that they need that release for returning to work after having been off for five consecutive work days, people should provide documentation and that is their position.

Motion XLVI-22: By Senator Lessoff, on behalf of the committee, that the Senate adopt the Sick Leave Policy with these various changes.

Senator Kalter: Before we move to debate, thank you also on the first page for putting in the link to that FMLA Policy. Whether it is updated yet or not, it is nice to have that link. I will also mention, we do a soft move into

action items. If you do have questions, they are welcome. Senator Lessoff has brought up the one on page 4, but let me ask first is there debate? Is there argument for or against this policy?

One thing you had brought up on page 4, this was not in the policy last time, it originally read under Return to Work, second sentence, “an employee returning to work after being off work for five consecutive work days or more will need to provide,” and I think as a result of that conversation was added “for the same medical reason.” My only concern there was the clarity of that since there is no antecedent to “the same,” like same as what? So as you said, I just wrote down you were suggesting potentially a friendly “for a single medical reason.” I had written down “for a continuous medical condition” or “for a serious medical condition.” I think also “ordinarily” had been suggested without that phrase. So I am wondering if it is the sense that that needs to be clarified so rather than just the people in HR reading this policy, the people outside, the employees, when they read “for the same medical reason,” they make think “same as what?” as opposed to “a single medical reason.” Would it be a friendly amendment to turn it into “for a single medical reason”?

Senator Lessoff: We would consider that a friendly amendment.

Senator Ellerton: My only question there would be what if someone has complications arise as a consequence of a particular medical condition. I can imagine an employee wondering does that qualify as the same because it isn't a single medical condition because it is something that was compounded. It is a technical question, but it is a question of word crafting around that to avoid any confusion.

Ms. Bonneville: If the employee is out for a condition to begin with, then we have some flexibility. We do have those situations where maybe someone is out for a procedure and then something happens, then we can adjust the paperwork accordingly without any penalty to the employee. I agree that changing it to a single medical reason makes it a little bit clearer for the employee.

Senator Kalter: Is there any further debate? Alright, seeing none with that friendly amendment, so we are having it for a single medical reason, we will vote.

The policy, as amended, was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: Thank you Tammy Carlson; thank you Janice Bonneville for your great work on this policy and we can finally put that third of three policies that came off the website years ago back on. Wonderful.

Communications:

AP Credit - Public Act 99-0358 Sense of the Senate Resolution (Senator Ellerton)

AP Credit Sense of the Senate Resolution Information (Jonathan Rosenthal, Associate Provost for General Education)

AP Credit Policies

AP Credit – University Catalog – pg. 47

Senator Kalter: We move on to the Senate of the Senate Resolution. I understand that there has been word crafting all day for possible alternate language, so if you will pull out from your packet what you received as the AP Credit - Public Act 99-0358. Senators Ellerton and Daddario have a handout to pass around for you as well. I suppose I should give the background on this and hand it over to Senator Ellerton since she crafted the Sense of the Senate. Basically, over the summer, which I think is interesting timing, the state legislature, while they were not getting a budget for us, decided to impose upon us and all other public universities the requirement that if a student gets a 3 on an advanced placement exam, and that can be whether or not the student has taken an advanced placement class, that they must get college credit. So, even though...I want to first of all thank Jonathan Rosenthal, Jim Jawahar, Jonathan Lackland who all tried to lobby against this bill and who had some success in getting the language shifted so that it was not quite as onerous as it had been originally,...essentially, I think I have stated my position on this. I believe that this is a blatant violation by the state of a university's

institutional academic freedom and I don't agree with states legislating things that professors understand better. Senator Ellerton, do you want to say a little bit about your crafting and then your work today with Senator Daddario to come up with slightly different language.

Senator Ellerton: I thought it might be helpful to read a little of the actual law to give people a background. I won't read it all, but I will read part B, which is the one in question and then part C, which alludes to what is going to happen in the future. So part B of this act reads "Beginning with the year 2016-2017 academic year, scores of 3, 4 and 5 on the College Board Advanced Placement Examinations shall be accepted for credit to satisfy degree requirements by all institutions of higher education. Each institution of higher education shall determine for each test whether credit will be granted for electives, general education requirements or major requirements and the advanced placement scores required to grant credit for those purposes." Part C starts "By the conclusion of the 2019-20 academic year, the Board of Higher Education, in cooperation with the Illinois Community College Board shall analyze the advanced placement examination score course granting policy of each institution of higher education and the research used by each institution in determining the level of credit and the number of credits provided for the advanced placement scores," etc. and it goes on a little more. In other words, although they have conceded a little of the language as to what we can give credit for, they have said they are going to monitor this and examine what institutions are doing in 2019-20, so it is not over yet. The reason for wanting to have a Sense of the Senate to express our concerns about this arose because it is one aspect of an interference with the academic mandate of institutions of higher education. So we cannot change it, it is law, it is a public act, but that does not mean we should not express concern about what has happened and particularly I believe in light of what they are foreshadowing is a continuing monitoring and dare I use the word heavy handiness of the state saying what we should do.

The change in wording that Senator Daddario worked on was really a crafting to try to state as clearly as possible the level of concern, so we added the words "deep concern and disappointment." We had had "concern." I should add that in the second paragraph in the updated version that we handed around, it says "must be given college credit for that course." The words "for that course" should have been deleted and not be there because we are told that we have to give credit but not for a particular course. We took out from the draft that you had to this version, we specifically said "many faculty are concerned." In this version, we simplified that to say "we believe that for many courses, a score of 3 does not necessarily reflect," because some courses do have an acceptable score of 3. Many have 4 or 5, but some do have 3 currently, so that does not change what was on the books. So hence the words "necessarily reflect." We tried to strengthen the point acknowledging what the drafters of the act claim, that accepting scores of 3 will encourage students to stay in Illinois, we are stating that we believe the new law is potentially condemning them to failure and as such undermines any attempt to encourage in-state university attendance given that we believe a score of 3 may not represent adequate knowledge in that discipline. And finally we tried to strengthen the earlier statement by adding a final phrase so that now the last sentence reads this new law challenges and erodes that trust and raises concerns about the potential of the state to interfere with the academic mandate of state colleges and universities. With that I am happy to take, and I am sure Senator Daddario will join me, in responding to comments and questions.

Senator Kalter: Is there any discussion?

Senator Johnson: This isn't necessarily about the content, but I did notice that a few times in the document you put a score of a 3.0, which as far as I know, the scores are in whole numbers and also the public act that you read from had them referenced in whole numbers, so I think that should probably be changed.

Senator Ellerton: Very good point. Thank you. That shows my mathematics background.

Senator Kalter: Further discussion.

Senator Gizzi: I appreciate where the Executive Committee is coming from with this, I am just not certain that I see what the point is. The reality is that legislatures pass laws. They pass lots of laws that we don't necessarily like, but they possess the general police power. The power to regulate health, safety, general welfare and morals. We may not like it, but they possess that power. That is the power of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois and the time to be arguing about this is actually what we did when we sent, Jonathan Rosenthal's letter really captures the effort that universities made and IBHE made to say don't do this, but the reality is that the legislature chose to do this. Why? Because it costs nothing. These are easy things legislators can do. They can't pass a budget, but they can do that, but it's their power. Who are we sending this to? What message are we trying to make by this? I am just not convinced. We do this over and over again and I have encountered this for years in the IBHE Faculty Advisory Council. We get outraged about stuff, but it doesn't actually serve any good end. I think that the reality is I would prefer a Sense of the Senate Resolution that thanks Jonathan Rosenthal and others who worked so hard to try to combat this. I just don't think we need to spend a lot of time on this. Thank you. I'm opposed.

Senator Daddario: One of the ideas I brought up in the Executive Committee is that when you, my understanding of the potential efficacy of a document like this is not in the present moment to effect any change, but it is what I call writing for the archive. So we are essentially establishing a position that in the future can be referenced so that when further conversation comes up, for example, when they try to enforce what they have planned for 2018-2019, there is more material that we can build our case upon. I guess one could look at it as mostly a rhetorical strategy as opposed to an entirely substantive strategy, but I think when it comes to this, putting a document out like this, allows us to keep our foot in the door so to speak and give us the platform for related things.

Senator Gizzi: For whom?

Senator Kalter: So let me also articulate some of what the Executive Committee talked about. I think I already said one of the reasons why institutional or academic freedom in general is an issue is because states can interfere with what is taught, how it is taught, who teaches it, etc. If we don't do this now, when it is this level of interference with things that have always been the purview of our faculty, when are we going to do it? As I also opened with, the fact that they pushed this through over the summer without giving any of the Senates any chance to comment on it at all, I consider that sort of a Christmas trick although it happened in the summer. So I think that is what is at issue is that not only are we having our traditional powers taken from out from under us erosion by erosion by erosion, but it is being done behind our back and at the same time in our face, so to speak, and I would be perfectly happy with having another Sense of the Senate Resolution giving high praise to Jonathan Rosenthal, Jim Jawahar, Jonathan Lackland, our president and the other university presidents who fought against this, but I think that we need to make a statement, both as faculty and as students because the students on the Executive Committee were also against this and thought that this was very important. I wish that Ryan were here to sort of speak to it.

I wanted to make just a couple of editorial comments about it. I think that when we say in the last sentence of the first paragraph "our deep concern and disappointment about the introduction," it is now more than introduced but actually enacted. So I would suggest changing introduction to enactment. It sounds like we are taking out in the first sentence of the second paragraph "through this act, all high school students who achieve a 3 or higher on AP subjects must be given college credit" without the "for that course," so taking that out. But in the next sentence, "we believe that for many courses." I would suggest changing courses to disciplines so that we don't confuse that issue about courses. What the English Department's undergrad curriculum committee is going to recommend to the department as a whole is that we have to give credit to a 3, but not to attach it to any particular course. That is about the minimal that we can do. I would also mention that the College Board considers that what they called junk credit. I told them that I thought that was offensive. Getting 3 units of college credit is not junk. It is basically passing out of a course. In other words, being able to not take a course in order to graduate. That is not junk, that's substance, and so for them to be calling it that. I also would remind

us, and I know that this tempts this fate, but I think they are probably going to go further than this and try to force it into which course you give it for and probably go to several different states to try to get this everywhere. So those were some of the reasons that I came out in favor of having a Sense of the Senate Resolution for this.

Senator Winger: For clarification, the they there in the last sentence was the College Board?

Senator Kalter: Yes.

Senator Winger: I didn't quite understand what you meant by the junk comment.

Senator Kalter: They helped a group of parents lobby for this legislation and apparently in the discussions about it, the way that the dissatisfied parents and the College Board were referring to it when you gave credit, but didn't attach it to a course was that that was junk. In other words, you get credit towards graduation, but you don't get credit for English 125.

Senator Winger: And they felt that that was junk?

Senator Kalter: That you should have it attached to a course. Even if the English Department says that if you get a 3 on the AP, it is essentially the equivalent of flunking our 125.

Senator Winger: Yeah, the College Board is getting pretty cheeky.

Senator Kalter: Yes.

Senator Winger: I would second your remarks. I think there is, slippery slope arguments are used too often, but here, it is just one step further to are they going to step in on, and they have been in other states, moves to step in on the way American History is taught, which is where I live, but also if you think you are exempt in the sciences, of course you are not. Darwinism or young versus young earth. I am shocked that the governance structure of the university even allows this. Maybe somebody has more experience with the Catholic universities, but I think back in the sixties, they got accredited by separating their academic institutions from the dictates of the Holy See. Otherwise, they wouldn't be accredited and I am kind of surprised that our governance structure through the Board even would allow the state to meddle at this level with an academic matter. Yeah, the police power. I guess it comes to the fact the State of Illinois rather than through the police power indirectly, the State of Illinois has a 17% stake in this place now. Is that it? I think we should say that we would be willing to obey 17% of the time. I would move that we add that. They are not paying the piper, they can shut up. But they really, just more fundamentally, I think that the governance structure of the university has to be redressed. This cannot even be possible. It is just contrary to the academic mission. I am reminded of the basic background for very fundamental documents like Weber's Politics as a Profession and Science as a Profession. The context of those famous documents was that the Nazi Party was brewing and taking over the university system in Germany and it was its undoing. Since then, Germany has ceded academic leadership worldwide to the United States and we are ready to cede it back, I think. It just should not be able to happen and I think we need a revisiting of the structure of the Board and its relationship with the state, but they are not paying for this.

Senator Troxel: I am in support of this documentation of this sense. My concern though is a curricular one more so than you are meddling in our stuff one. If we make claims that what we're doing is losing control of our curriculum with this and if the state is headed for the way other states have gone with performance-based funding and outcome-based funding and we lose both big C and small c control of the curriculum and what we scaffold in terms of the things we talk about here, critical thinking and success, then it will be important to not only document the concern but also start some baseline data with our Planning and Institutional Research Office and other areas that keep track of such things in the success of students through the curricular process. So I am in support of this.

Senator Kalter: Is there further discussion? Senator Gizzi, hold a minute. Is there anyone else who wants to say anything before Senator Gizzi, since he had one chance to speak?

Senator Rich: So a couple of comments regarding analysis. Number one, I wonder and I would be happy to be informed on this if there is any knowledge of any analysis done by the legislature on the revenue implications for universities. They are not tremendously straightforward. It is a little bit of a balancing act to understand the revenue implications, but I suspect that were probably no revenue analyses with regard to the impact on universities of doing such a thing. I see a couple of heads shaking no. Second, with regard to analysis and looking at Jonathan's memo, specifically the point that our approach is to base cut scores on student success in subsequent higher level courses, I would like to note that the analysis that this university does in terms of selecting those levels appears from that statement to be both performance oriented and data driven and as a parent of high school students in a number of AP courses this year, I am particularly pleased with a university that makes decisions on that basis. I generally am quite hesitant to endorse Academic Senate statements regarding legislative actions. I tend to be either neutral or speak out against them on frequent occasions. In this case, however, I think it is particularly appropriate for the Academic Senate to be emphatic on this particular item for all of the reasons stated by the resolution itself. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. Is there further discussion?

Senator Gizzi: More of a question. Is this coming from the Executive Committee?

Senator Kalter: We discussed, I believe it was the very first Executive Committee of the year. I asked if anybody on the Executive Committee had time, wanted to write resolution.

Senator Gizzi: Why didn't it go to one of our academic committees?

Senator Kalter: Because Sense of Senate Resolutions don't need to. They can come from individuals. So essentially it is really coming from Senator Ellerton, ultimately, who I think by two weeks later had decided that she wanted to put something forth.

Senator Winger: In spite of my support of the general resolution, I thought condemning the student to failure is pretty strong and also further up, I get the sense from the way it was drafted that we're talking about credit for major courses, inadequate knowledge base with which to begin study in the student's given academic discipline. Most of these credits if I am not mistaken are Gen Ed credits, so that might get tweaked. Finally, as much of a threat as AP could be, the Illinois Articulation Initiative does the same thing. Talk about junk credit. The word around town from students I talk to is the best way to get your Gen Eds out of the way is to take a summer course at a community college. It is both cheaper and easier. So there are a number of ways in which we are losing control of the curriculum, not just through AP.

Senator Kalter: Senator Winger, your point about the potentially condemning is an interesting one and I would suggest perhaps language potentially setting them up for failure and the other one that you brought up was the difference between in an academic discipline. I would potentially argue there. First of all, we just happened to be talking about this in English today and realized that it depends on the department whether this is Gen Ed versus major versus both. So there is a variety of stuff on the list on page 47 of the catalog. But I think the sentence there a score of 3 does not necessarily reflect an adequate knowledge base with which to begin study in a student's given academic discipline could potentially stand whether it is Gen Ed or not, or we could potentially add something like with which to begin study in a student's given academic discipline or receive credit in a General Education course or some simple addition like that. I am not sure what the sense of the body would be on that. Senator Ellerton, do you have any ideas there for that particular sentence?

Senator Ellerton: First of all, I think we should keep the wording as simple as we can, but I agree you don't want to assume certain about the academic discipline. Certainly there are specific subjects, so it is more than Gen Ed. Setting them up for failure I think would be a friendly amendment because that is what we are concerned about. Which to begin study...I value other's comments on whether that should include or receive credit for a Gen Ed course. That would be acceptable, but it gets very specific. I would prefer to keep it as fairly open because a student doesn't pursue Gen Ed. They are beginning study in some discipline. They have some plans even if they don't start it immediately. So I don't see a problem with leaving that and not covering all possibilities. I should add that my concern and my motivation for writing that is related to what Senator Daddario began with. It is recording our concern particularly in light of the foreshadowing of the 2019-20 review of how universities are dealing with this. That is very specifically into written to the act. That is not going to go away and I believe that we would be remiss not to record our concern of this ongoing interference. We have already seen it in things like the edTPA where students cannot graduate from this university unless they have passed, paid \$300, and passed considerable video, a report, all sorts of showing student work. They cannot graduate as teachers from this university and that score every year is going to be raised. The bar is going to be raised every year. That was government imposed. The change in courses for middle school and elementary has also been imposed. That is causing major changes in particular enrollments. That was government mandated. So the erosion is already there. I do think we need to speak, have a voice that is recorded for posterity so we can refer to it; we alerted you to this. Now you are doing this. We need to record it.

Motion XLVI-23: By Senator Ellerton, seconded by Senator Heylin, to approve the Sense of the Senate Resolution as amended.

Senator Kalter: Is there debate now?

Senator Gizzi: I move to table this until we can here from Senator Powers since you said that the student senators had a strong opposition.

Senator Kalter: Senator Powers was strongly opposed to this legislation.

Senator Johnson: Being on the Executive Committee with Ryan, I can tell you a little bit about what we talked about, the students. He said he studied hard for a lot of his exams, as I am sure many students did. If you really study and put effort into a course, you should be getting more than a 3. A 3 is kind of the average score. You can go into a lot of exams and get a 3 even if you didn't take the course. He is worried that that would encourage people to take more of the exams and get 3s and not necessarily have an adequate knowledge that you would get in a college course.

Senator Gizzi: I withdraw my motion.

Senator Kalter: Thank you Senator Gizzi for withdrawing that motion. Senator Heylin, did you want to add anything?

Senator Heylin: I was also going to say that it wasn't necessarily the score itself, but to again archive our displeasure just so that we can build a stronger argument. That was the biggest point for myself when I was talking on the Executive Committee.

Senator Bockrath: I am trying to understand what we are trying to pass or enact. Are we going to be voting on passing a letter to the state government?

Senator Kalter: Essentially when we do a Sense of the Senate Resolution, usually, it depends on what it is, but usually what we do is take this draft that you have in front of you with the amendments that we have already added and we usually will give it to our president so that he can convey it to the people he needs to. There also

interest on the Council of Illinois University Senates. When I brought this up on September 11, some of them hadn't even heard of it, but they were very interested once we decided what we were going to do for us to send that around to them so that the other public universities can also weigh in on the issue. So that is the second audience so that we could potentially have a united front with all of the public universities expressing their displeasure.

Senator Bockrath: Thank you. I have one more further question just to understand the clarification of this item. From my understanding, we have to enforce this no matter what happens.

Senator Kalter: Right now, we either comply or we don't comply and we get the consequences of that. We have never figured out what that might be.

Senator Bockrath: Do you have any ideas of what the consequences could be if we do decide to send this out.

Senator Kalter: I do and I think Senator Dietz does too. I think probably that they would cut part of our budget.

President Dietz: I don't know about the cutting of the budget, but I have talked to the Executive Director of the IBHE Director about this issue and folks are looking very closely at this as to whether or not we are going to be enforcing this and if not, the sense is that you will see more legislation on more issues, more deeply ingrained within the topic of what we all know as academic freedom. I think you invite that. The bottom line is that we are going to comply with this; this is law. We don't have a choice about that. There is some flexibility; there is some latitude with this that at times we may exercise as an institution. Those should be exceptions and I have been told that if the exception becomes the norm, expect some additional legislation.

Senator Bockrath: To understand, to summarize what we have been talking about, if we were to send this out, we could possibly be facing budget cuts?

Senator Kalter: I think we would differentiate between noncompliance and either facing further legislation and facing budget cuts versus exercising our displeasure, which is essentially to say that right now we are going to comply, but essentially back off. You are going too far.

Senator Bockrath: So we are going to comply and accept this item, accepting that students, we have to accept that a 3 on AP tests, correct? We have to accept this item no matter what, correct? We have to accept that a student who gets a 3 in an AP score, we have to accept that and enact that?

Senator Kalter: Each individual department of the ones that you see on page 47 of the sheet that you got, so Politics, Art, Biological Sciences, Math, etc., each department has to decide what they are going to do with this legislation. You might notice that some of them already accept a 3 for certain kinds of credits so they don't have much of a decision to make because they have already determined that if you get a 3, that is essentially the equivalent of the course that is next to that. Others, like the English Department, only accept a 4 or 5 as of now. Like I said before, that is just one example, but we decided that a 3 is not equivalent to any of our 100 level courses. It is not really even a D and so we decided to say we are going to do the absolute minimum and a student will get three units of credit, but they don't count toward the English major. They don't count towards Gen Ed, etc. So that is our recommendation. It hasn't gone to the whole process yet.

Senator Bockrath: So we are enacting this. We are just trying to make resolutions to it, correct?

Senator Kalter: I am sorry; say that one again.

Senator Bockrath: We are enacting this item. We are just trying to make resolutions to it from my understanding.

Senator Kalter: We are attempting make our voice heard about our displeasure at the interference of the state in our business.

Senator Bockrath: And then if we don't, well because we have to enact this, correct, no matter what happens? If we don't enact it...Are we voting to not enact this, is that what we are voting on, or are we just voting on the letter?

Senator Kalter: We are voting on the Sense of the Senate Resolution. We don't have any control over the legislation. Unfortunately, we are not that Senate. We are an Academic Senate, not a state...If were the state senate, we would probably have a budget passed already because we know how to compromise. We are basically just sending a message.

Senator Bockrath: So we are accepting a 3 as a credit hour.

Senator Kalter: Right now. As of fall of 2016.

Senator Bockrath: So we are accepting that?

Senator Kalter: Yes.

Senator Bockrath: Thank you.

Senator Ellerton: Just a small comment to clarify. That is why the statement begins although we recognize that all public universities in Illinois are subject to the control of the Illinois General Assembly and that the Assembly has the power to change, so we are saying we acknowledge this. We recognize you have the power to make those changes and they're law. So we are inferring we will comply, but we are expressing that concern. So I think the statement is clear that we are not saying please change something. We are saying we acknowledge that we can do this to us, but we believe you are overstepping what you should be doing for universities.

Senator Kalter: Is there further debate?

Senator Chebolu: I have a small question or clarification here. In the second paragraph when we say regardless of current entry scores established by the colleges, are we talking about ACT scores?

Senator Kalter: That is an excellent question. I think that maybe that should be reworded as 'established by the departments' for one thing and I would say perhaps current placement scores or current credit scores.

Senator Chebolu: That needs some clarification there.

Senator Ellerton: Yes, it should be current AP credit scores.

Senator Kalter: Yes, I might reword that as regardless of current placement scores. Let's go over, since the motion is on the floor, let's go over the changes that we have made. In the first paragraph at the point where it says we wish to report our deep concern and disappointment, we changed introduction to enactment. In the first sentence of the second paragraph, we crossed out for that course. Right after that, it says regardless of current entry, we are changing entry to placement. After current placement scores established by the colleges, we are changing colleges to department. In that next sentence, we believe that for many disciplines rather than courses. And then down at the bottom of that paragraph, rather than potentially condemning them to failure, we are saying potentially setting them up for failure. And I think that was it.

Senator Ellerton: A small extra point. 3 rather than 3.0.

Senator Kalter: I had already crossed that out so I forgot about that one.

Senator Crowley: During the discussion earlier, we used the word mission and we use the word freedom. I don't see those two words in this and my sense is that the mission of public institutions and the notion of academic freedom might fit very well down in the third paragraph: "entrusted with the mission and jurisdiction of education policies of that institution." So preserving the word mission that we used in our discussion and the other thought that I had was interfere with academic freedom mandate.

Senator Kalter: Senator Ellerton, would you consider those friendly amendments?

Senator Ellerton: Yes, I would.

Senator Kalter: And I can't remember who, Senator Heylin, you were the second. Would you consider those friendly?

Senator Heylin: Yes.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. Further debate?

The Sense of the Senate Resolution was approved by the Senate, with the exception of Senator Gizzi, who voted nay, and Senator Bockrath, who abstained.

Senator Kalter: The Sense of the Senate Resolution passes. That was excellent debate and discussion.

Information Items:

09.29.15.01 Textbook Affordability Committee Proposal (Senator Powers/Academic Affairs Committee)

10.08.15.01 Textbook Affordability Committee White Paper

Senator Kalter: My alarm just went off at 8:30, so we are going to go through the next things rather quickly. I am actually wondering, for those on you on SGA and especially the SGA senators on Exec, do you want to talk about textbook affordability now or wait until Ryan is back.

Senator Johnson: I have a printed out list of points that Ryan gave to me so that we could get through the information session tonight.

Senator Kalter: What I would suggest is that we talk about textbook affordability, have our committee reports, and then move to adjournment. This is just an information item. So we are just presenting both the white paper and the Textbook Affordability Committee. This is coming actually from Academic Affairs, so I am actually first going to turn it over to Senator Gizzi and then he will turn it over to Senator Johnson for Senator Powers' points.

Senator Gizzi: All I will say is that the Academic Affairs Committee considered this fully, fully supported it, and I am turning it over to Senator Johnson.

Senator Johnson: Senator Powers would just like me to state that a lot of the information he would cover is on the white sheet, so hopefully people got a chance to look at that. The main focus of this committee would be to research and educate. It would not be to pass policies or mandate any sort of thing. The committee is also longstanding because textbook costs will evolve throughout the years and costs of textbooks is too much and it is time to do something about it.

Senator Kalter: Thank you Senator Powers/Johnson. Is there discussion or are there questions? Now this is an interesting thing. I don't think that in all of the time I have sat on the Senate that there has ever been the creation of an additional External Senate Committee so this is big. This could be history.

Senator Winger: Maybe I would be out of order. The issue is the creation of a committee? Is that what is being proposed?

Senator Johnson: Correct. It would be an External Committee, so not like one of the committees that meet before this meeting.

Senator Kalter: In our bylaws, there are several different types of committees. Some of them are Internal Committees, like Faculty Affairs and Rules. Some of them are External Committees like the University Curriculum Committee or the University Review Committee. Those are called Senate internals and Senate externals. There are also things called Senate mixed externals, which means that there are some senators and there are some who are not senators. So, for example, most of our External Committees, a senator is not allowed to sit on those. It is against the flow of approval. Here what is being suggested is that we have a mixed committee so that some of the people on it will be senators and some will be non-senators. That is fairly unusual in our structure, but it is a possibility in our bylaws and I think the reason for it is that we have a fairly active SGA and we have a lot of Senators who sit here who understand and hear the issues and they can help with an ongoing committee like this if we decide to set it up.

Senator Winger: My question is we do not now need to have a debate about the merits of doing something about the cost of textbooks.

Senator Johnson: This would just be an information session for questions. We would have the debate at the next meeting.

Senator Winger: So the committee that's being contemplated would then look into the causes of textbook price inflation, for instance?

Senator Johnson: That could be one of the things they do and it would also be kind of suggestions of other things to do, open sources or things of that nature.

Senator Winger: I know that McGraw-Hill is going to go to all electronic simply because the used textbook market is so efficient that you get to sell your book exactly once. So a new edition has one sale to recoup the cost of making the edition. There are reasons for it. The other thing that has occurred to me in this whole textbook debate too is that isn't this really the insult added to injury given tuition cost inflation that the textbooks are really a drop in the bucket. It's an added insult, I agree, but isn't that really the real kick in the pants?

Senator Kalter: I don't know if Senator Johnson wants to address that. I was going to address it, but I am going to pass it to Senator Gizzi.

Senator Gizzi: The committee, when we considered this issue. First off the issue is not about the substantive debate about textbook affordability, it is about whether or not we should create a committee to look at these issues. I know at the beginning of the semester, the Provost in one of her comments spoke specifically about that need, that concern. When we discussed this issue, we looked at the original proposal. We actually fleshed it out a little bit. We asked Senator Powers to come back to us fleshing out the duties of the committee a bit more and at the end, the entire committee was universal in the belief that this was a good job that the student government had done and we were supportive that this is something that should move forward. It will be up to

that committee to make recommendations. Could policy come before the Senate someday because of it? Yes. We also insisted that this committee would report to Academic Affairs as other External Committees do. So I think from the standpoint of this issue, I was really pleased with the hard work that the students put into this and I strongly think that this is a good thing for us to be considering. These issues, they are out of control and regardless of how books are being delivered, we know that they are not affordable. We can't fix that. No committee can fix the affordability, but at least the committee could try to find ways to help mitigate and think about it to maybe just even educate faculty so that they actually look at the costs.

Senator Kalter: Before I go to Senator Bushell, I just want to say a couple of information things about Senator Winger's point. Tuition right now is in the \$350 to \$400 per credit hour range. Fees are I think in the \$70 to \$80 per credit hour range. Room and board is whatever you can find that is the cheapest. It is in the thousands of dollars per year range. Textbooks, as you read this white paper, are in excess of a thousand dollars per year and sometimes twice that much. That's not peanuts, so I agree with Senator Winger that it is sort of a drop in the bucket, but it is becoming a bigger and bigger drop in the bucket and you also see in the white paper that it has increased 82% where the consumer price index has only increased less than 30%. So I think that is one of the things is how can a committee help students on an ongoing basis control costs and help the university and faculty understand how we help control costs. Just float different ideas out there. Apparently, there are some other universities that have this kind of committee. The other kinds of things that we should be thinking about as we look at this proposal, can we afford having a Senator on the committee. Are people going to be willing to spend their time? Is the structure correct? Are the goals and functions that are here, are they correct? So if anybody has anything that they observe about any of that, please let us know. You will notice that there is the Dean of the Library, who happens to be here tonight, Dean Ward. Either he or his designee is one of the members as well as somebody from the Vice of Student Affairs Office and the registrar. So we have a bunch of people with knowledge about, for example, can we go to digital course reserves for some types of books in order to save money there and then get sort of copyright kind of clearance on various things.

Senator Bushell: My understanding of the External Committees and the structure there is that they are essentially ongoing. They are in our structure and they work year after year and so forth. I am wondering if this committee could be ad hoc. That it is for a certain amount of time to kind of begin the research and begin to find out and so forth. Have you guys looked into that and seen that as a possibility?

Senator Johnson: Yes. Ryan has talked about that a lot and he thinks it would be better for it to be a longstanding committee because textbook costs will always be an issue. It will evolve and change, so we will always need research going on. He doesn't see that it would need to meet every week. He thinks that even once per semester just to talk about the changes and what they can do about them.

Senator Bushell: Or a lot in the first year or years and less later?

Senator Johnson: Yes, that is exactly what is being considered.

Senator Kalter: Further comment, discussion, questions?

Senator Ward: As a student-centered university, this is both a symbolic and substantive kind of thing for us to pursue. I don't know how the committee would work, but there are a lot of very easy things that are awareness raising kinds of activities that a committee could help the campus with, both students as well as faculty. A lot of opportunities that can make textbooks less costly. I think every institution is approaching this issue very differently and it all depends on the culture of the university. So there is no right way, no mandate about how this is to be done. It is really an investigation, but a continuing one because the field of scholarly publication is changing and it is going to continue to change over the next 10 or 15 years. So there is an important role for a continuing group, whether it's an External Committee or another kind of group to pursue this.

Senator Crowley: I am wondering about the interface between this group, this Textbook Affordability Committee and the Library Committee. The current Blue Book has a Library Committee written into it and I am just wondering wouldn't the conversations that would be happening on this committee be informative for Library Committee. That way, the knowledge and discussions might enrich our library's work.

Senator Kalter: I am going to pitch that question first to Senator Ward and then give a couple of thoughts as well.

Senator Ward: I think that can be an important conversation for the University Library Committee. It is made up of students and faculty. It may not have all of the representatives that we would want to have on this committee, but it is a place to have conversations and it has been a conversation when we have a full contingent of students, it has been a robust conversation.

Senator Kalter: I would also say I think that is a good idea to have ties between the two committees formal or informal, but to me both of them seem to have separate charges. In other words, the Library Committee has been working very diligently for the past five years or so, maybe a little bit less, trying to talk about what kinds of resources should we invest in in our permanent collections. Where do we need to have open spaces in the library versus quiet spaces and other sorts of issues that really don't have to do with the purchasing and affordability of books, although they relate to them obviously, but that are slightly different. Because obviously, for example, if you have an 80 person section of a Gen Ed class, the library is not really the best place to have 80 books. You can't store all 80 books, check them out to everybody and check them back in, physical books or what have you. I would see personally those two charges as different and being two different committees, but definitely with some discourse between them. Further questions, discussion, comment?

Senator Johnson: I would just like to add that the Student Government Association did a Select Survey on this to research the average costs of textbooks to students and we are compiling the data and will bring that information with us next week.

Senator Kalter: Wonderful. Thank you. One of things I love about our SGA is that they do tons of research before they bring stuff to us. So thank you very much for that. You have some of the best prepared proposals, most researched proposals, that we get. Any further discussion? Seeing none, we will move on to committee reports and that item will come back to us as an Action Item next time.

Committee Reports:

Senator Kalter: We are going to start two weeks of reports with Senator Gizzi for the Academic Affairs Committee.

Academic Affairs Committee

Senator Gizzi: There's a lot, but I will try to be quick. At the last meeting, we met with Mark Walbert and Claire Lamonica to talk about technology issues. Not a gripe session about ReggieNet, but to talk about technology issues in general and to figure out how to best ensure faculty and student input into issues involving academic technology. We were particularly interested in finding a way to improve shared governance so that there is formalized faculty and student input in the wide variety of technology issues that impact the institution. Mark Walbert shared that in the past he has thought about having a faculty advisory group, but he has been concerned because he doesn't control a budget to make things happen when a committee says we want to adopt this technology, he was hesitant to move forward on that. We thought what was really more important. The purpose of an advisory group wasn't to say let's adopt the next great technology so that we all get Apple watches. It was more about the fact that we wanted to have a formal mechanism for input and advice. There was a consensus that we should work with Mark to develop a proposal for an advisory group of faculty and students. This week the committee discussed the possible organization of that and the next step will be for me to sit down

with Mark and formulate a proposal. So on that I would say stay tuned. That will come to our committee in two weeks and hopefully we will have something for you by the end of semester if all goes well.

This week, we had a very good discussion with Dr. Art Munin, Dean of Students, about the new Inclusive Community Response Team and the need for a faculty representative on it. He did a really good job explaining the substance of what this team does and what it is supposed to do and what it doesn't do. It is not thought police and stuff like that. He agreed fully that we should add a faculty member and the question was how to do that. It was our proposal that we thought we had really two options for this. We thought that there might be interest within the Senate of a faculty member on the Senate to serve on this committee. If there wasn't since we are in the middle of the year and have done a whole bunch of elections already, if there wasn't anyone here who wanted to do it, we would simply put out a call to faculty and have the caucus select someone. We thought while the rest of the committee members that are on that, they are voting members but they are basically ex-officio by their position, the faculty member and the student members would be termed in the sense that they would serve for like a three year term. We figured something like three years made sense. It would be renewable if they wanted to. Of course, this committee has been around for ten weeks, so it is just starting and so that is where we ended up with that. We can take questions in a second. We also talked about our long awaited ReggieNet survey. We got great feedback from University Assessment Services. Senator Daddario has agreed to take that from me to develop the next draft of it. We hope to approve our survey and then be administering it in November. I think that is two weeks of Academic Affairs.

Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee

Senator Lessoff: On October 7, the committee endorsed the operating and capital budget requests, which we then sent to the Senate last time. We discussed an amendment to the Employee Assistance Program Policy and we discussed a draft of a proposed Food Service Policy. Today we did not have a quorum, so we held an informal discussion with representatives of Environmental Health and Safety and with Food Services on the draft of the Food Service Policy.

Faculty Affairs Committee

Senator Bushell: In the past couple of weeks, we have been working on policies related to financial exigency, and we have policy 3.3.10, Termination Notification of Faculty. There was a slight edit and that is ready to be forwarded to the whole group here. Also, policy 4.1.9, Disestablishment of Academic Units. We have worked on that for a couple of weeks and we have that ready as well. Our third item that we will be working on related to all that is the Blue Book description for the Financial Exigency Committee and that will be ongoing. I will figure out how to get those to the whole group, whether I try it all together so that we can have a full conversation about it or a few at a time.

Planning and Finance Committee

Senator Winger: On the 7th we met with Senator Krejci and Alan Lacy from Academic Affairs to try to get our heads around where Academic Affairs gets money and where money goes. Deb Smitley has promised to construct some new pie charts so that we can get our heads around that. It would be a seemingly simple question and also the question of where tuition money comes from and goes. It would be nice to have that in a clear form, which is easier said than done. We also discussed the possibility of creating some bullet headings at the front of the annual Institutional Priorities Report and tying them more closely, at Senator Krejci's suggestion, to Educating Illinois as a way to make the document more user friendly and making it an actual set of priorities rather than in some ways it is a very long laundry list now. That is not to disparage the importance of any particular item on the list, but we need to try to get our hands around it and make some clear statements of what the institutional priorities of the institution could be. So we will have ongoing discussions. We met with the Provost and Alan Lacy to further discuss that proposal.

Tonight, we met with Mathew Helm, Mark Walbert and Senator Alt about institutional technologies and Academic Technologies and again this is a very complicated world to get our head around. They provided us

with some very useful charts and diagrams pretty well laying out how money is spent and where it comes from and it was a very useful meeting. That's all we have to report.

Rules Committee

Senator Crowley: The Rules Committee has been very diligently working on very large tasks, one being the CAST Bylaws. I am happy to report that you will be seeing them as an Information Item next time around here. We also have been working on the Milner Library Bylaws and we had guests from CAST, guests from Milner and our committee has given responses following a read of the bylaws to the Milner committee and we are looking so forward to receiving their revisions and hopefully you will be seeing them shortly. We had a couple of guests here tonight, one being Dr. Thomas Burr, who came to us from the Library Committee and gave us some wonderful information on what we might indeed look to as revisions of Blue Book entries regarding representation on the Library Committee. We also had a very wonderful visit from Dr. Alberto Delgado and he is from the AFEG Committee and we are so looking forward to finding our way through a huge AFEGC revision and we are just trudging along through our huge list. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: You do indeed have a huge list and you are trudging along nicely. We have food coming in so are there any communications for the Senate before we adjourn? Seeing none...

Adjournment

Motion XLVI-24: By Senator Dawson, seconded by Senator Gizzi, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.