**Academic Senate Executive Committee Meeting**

**MONDAY, November 11, 2019**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

Academic Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

***Oral Communications:***

Senator Kalter: Obviously, Dr. Dietz is still away as well. I just wanted to do one Oral Communication, and we don’t have to spend time on this if you don’t want to do it all today. But I was thinking logistically about what’s procedurally correct about the Student Code of Conduct, because of Alex having asked, can the SGA just start on changes that it’s interested in making, right. And so I called John Davenport of Friday, and I said, I just wanted to kind of get some updates about where we are, and he actually said that the Title IX stuff is about to come through, interestingly. That apparently the federal government is nearing the end of its, whatever they call it. Of course, that means nothing, right. Because they’ve done that before like with the IRB stuff, and then it got delayed for like an entire year. But he’s optimistic. But I was thinking that we’ve put an awful lot of… we’ve piled an awful lot of stuff onto the ad hoc committee over the years, just because it existed, and now we’re in kind of a… do we really want to wait that long kind of thing. So, my question is whether we, as an Exec, want to formally transfer the items that came in in either April 2017 or later from the ad hoc committee to SGA, so that they can work on them? And, let me read them from the Issues Pending list. So, there is one about campus illiberalism from Robert George and Cornel West, talking about speakers on campus and stuff like that, as I remember. There was one about acts of dishonesty with respect to our… faculty being targeted for online harassment. One about—which I think actually Senator Campbell might have brought up—when is it a good time to bring the Code through and what is the process, should you do it bit by bit or the whole Code at once, the hate crimes, and the hate speech, and then the hazing, and that’s it. So, and I’ll pass this around, I have the ones… The ones that I’m suggesting we might want to formally change are with a little blue star next to them, like a little asterisk. Does that seem like something we want to do formally, just to sort of procedurally have it be that the ad hoc committee goes back to dealing with the Title IX issues, and the other issues that came out of 2014-2015, and then SGA deals with the rest, or not?

Senator Mainieri: What was the charge of the ad hoc committee?

Senator Kalter: It’s on there, but it was basically to look at statistics related to cases, procedures related to cases, have a feedback forum I think, or like a feedback loop somehow, and then there were two other things, one of which was disbanding the committee when it’s over, and I can’t remember what the fourth thing was.

Senator Ferrence: Yeah, it’s very general here, “This committee is charged with reviewing the newly implemented Student Code of Conduct and all of its processes,” stop.

Senator Horst: Wasn’t it a reflection of not being happy with the way the review of the Code went?

Senator Kalter: Yeah. It was partly that, but it was also the fact that the Code is a policy, and that they were concerned with procedures. Right. That they were… there were things where the Code changed but it was really the procedures of how the policy is carried out that they were concerned about.

Senator Mainieri: I mean, to me it makes sense to have the Student Code of Conduct, these changes be reviewed first by the student… by SGA, by the students. That seems natural to me.

Senator Kalter: Remembering that the ad hoc committee was an SGA initiative, right, they wanted it, but yeah. Generally, most years, we would do it that way.

Senator Horst: I’m a little confused what your question is. So, you’re asking if we should send the items that we’re holding for the task force, or the ad hoc committee, straight to SGA? Is that your question?

Senator Kalter: So, Alex had, or, Senator Campbell had asked a couple of Exec’s ago, how do we go ahead and make changes (as in SGA), and you’re the President of the Assembly, right?

Senator Campbell: Correct.

Senator Kalter: And so you were asking in that capacity. And we kind of said, well, you can start working on it at any time. But then I started thinking about it as I was preparing for this Executive Committee meeting, and I thought, wait a minute, if we’ve already sent some things to that ad hoc committee that were not in its original charge, then there’s a conflict, procedurally, because this committee (Exec) has assigned those to the ad hoc committee, so we formally have to de-assign them from that committee and go to SGA, if SGA’s going to work on hate crimes, hate speech, the campus illiberalism, and whatever the other ones…

Senator Horst: Hazing.

Senator Kalter: The Hazing, if they’re going to do that right away, right. They could work on almost anything else, but they wouldn’t be able to really work on that without it also going through that committee.

Senator Ferrence: So, our perception is that our ad hoc committee is unlikely to get to these before the end of the year here…

Senator Kalter: Yes.

Senator Ferrence: And so rather than stalling SGA from moving, if we pulled it out of their charge, let SGA work, and then we can come back later and recharge the ad hoc committee…

Senator Kalter: If needed, yeah.

Senator Ferrence: If needed.

Senator Horst: Particularly, because the way the Hazing debate went.

Senator Kalter: Yeah.

Senator Horst: I think it’s already on the Senate’s docket, and we’ve already had a large discussion on that language, so it makes a lot of sense to take those items, like you said, and just send it to SGA so they can move forward with the will of the debate that happened a couple weeks ago.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. Okay. And it looks like, Senator Campbell, you’re agreeing with that?

Senator Campbell: Yeah. I think it makes a lot of sense for most of the topics that are covered in that document for those charges to be sent to SGA. The only, like, if that’s a permanent thing that you kind of want to send charges mostly to SGA to have them initiate it there and move through that process… The only thing I would say is… and I’m not a great expert on the Student Code of Conduct, but there’s also things in there that expand outside of just students, like there’s stuff for faculty, correct, and stuff like that. So, I just don’t think in the future, not necessarily those specific charges, but future charges, SGA might not be the sole place for…

Senator Kalter: Oh, I see what you’re saying.

Senator Campbell: You know what I’m…

Senator Kalter: Yes. I think the reason there are faculty issues on there is that if students do certain things in classrooms that impact faculty, we need to have a process for the students to be disciplined about that, right. And they could impact both faculty and fellow students in the classroom. So, but yeah, I… and also, it doesn’t… just because you are not charged with something by Exec doesn’t mean that you can’t do it, right. If there are other things that come up in your discussions about the Code that aren’t there, then you can… every internal committee has the ability to just add things to its own Issues Pending list, or to have somebody from the outside add it without even going through Exec, right.

Senator Horst: Susan, are you saying it then wouldn’t go to the Senate?

Senator Kalter: Oh no, it would go to the Senate.

Senator Horst: Yeah. It would go to the Senate.

Senator Horst: Yes. Senator Horst is answering that part of your question. So, the… that’s why the Code starts with SGA and goes to the Academic Senate because…

Senator Campbell: Right.

Senator Kalter: …student behavior issues impact staff or faculty sometimes, not usually, but sometimes.

Senator Campbell: True. Very true. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: So, Senator Solebo, what we’re talking about is whether we should formally (as an Exec committee) take things out of the ad hoc… The Student Code of Conduct ad hoc committee and put them in SGA, so that you can (as an SGA) start working on them immediately without a kind of, oh they’re doing that, we should be doing that, kind of thing. Does that make sense?

Senator Solebo: Uh-hum.

Senator Kalter: And it sounds…

Senator Solebo: Let me sit on that for a little bit.

Senator Kalter: Okay. It sounds like Senator Mainieri’s saying yes, like, Senator Campbell, Senator Horst is saying yes, Senator Ferrence, Senator Nikolaou. But we’ll come back to it, because it was an Oral Communication not on the agenda.

***Distributed Communications:***

***Planning and Finance Sense of the Committee Statement (11/20/19)***Senator Kalter: All right. So, Planning and Finance… starting with the Distributed Communication, remind me to get back to that one. Planning and Finance, the Sense of the Committee Statement, and Senator Mainieri if you want to talk about that.

Senator Mainieri: Ah, yes. The meeting after the October 16th [9th] meeting in our Planning and Finance Committee, we just decided to debrief the conversation that happened in the October 16th [9th] meeting within the scope of Planning and Finance Committee, so thinking about long range planning type issues. And we’re talking about were there things that were brought up in the variety of concerns that related to our committee’s charge. And we identified two themes that we really felt were within the scope of our committee, that we wanted to start by crafting a statement about from the perspective of our committee, which you see in front of you. And the intention, I reached out to Senator Kalter, and then Senator Horst, to get an idea of the procedure here. So, we loosely called it a Sense of the Committee, but I don’t think that is actually is a thing. And so, the idea would be reading this, or talking about this during our committee report, so that all of Senate can hear it, and then we have some ideas for some Issues Pending items to come out of the statement, as well as be added to the Senate.

Senator Kalter: So, let me clarify something. We have it right now on the proposed agenda under Communications as a Sense of the Committee Statement, maybe that would be reading Sense of the Senate, but you were planning to do that first option which was not have it be a Sense of the Senate and just talk about it as a Sense of the Committee, or did you want both?

Senator Mainieri: We felt it would be appropriate to start (since it’s coming from the committee) to start it in our Committee Reports, and then if other Senators felt like it needed to be moved to a Sense of the Senate then…

Senator Kalter: Gotcha.

Senator Mainieri: Motion that certainly that could happen. But we thought since it was a statement from only the committee members that it would be more appropriate to start it in our Committee Report.

Senator Kalter: Gotcha. Okay.

Senator Ferrence: Basically, we discussed so then it’s clearly something from the committee that was generated, and if the full Senate doesn’t have a Sense of the Senate, well, then it’s still captured as something from committee. But, on the other hand, if people are like, wow, this is great, we’d like to attach our name to it, so to speak, then let the will of the Senate decide that, rather than the will of the committee.

Senator Kalter: Gotcha. Okay.

Senator Mainieri: And so we decided that we wanted Exec to see our statement. One, if there was any input for us to consider, also make sure that the President and Provost had seen it as well, and then, if you had any input in regards to process that we should be considering.

Senator Kalter: Senator Horst, were you about to say something?

Senator Horst: (Laughter) I’m always about to say something. I personally would like to see diversity as a topic, for instance, in the whole committee’s report for the end of the year, and a lot of these items are really good, but this is the kind of stuff that I think that your committee should be generating. Sort of large-scale visions.

Senator Mainieri: Uh-Hum.

Senator Horst: Like I was thinking of a Chief Diversity Officer, that’s an idea. So, it seems to me you’re drafting elements of the end of the year report.

Senator Mainieri: So the process for our committee has evolved…

Senator Horst: Right.

Senator Mainieri: So, we are doing reports throughout the year. And so we have added to our own brainstorming list for our next priorities, we’ve added diversity related items, but we’re not necessarily going to have one end of the year report.

Senator Horst: Right.

Senator Mainieri: So, we’ve changed that process.

Senator Horst: Yeah. But one of the downfalls of that process is you’re always dealing with, sort of, back issues that are… have a historical lineage, and so this is a new item, and I’m glad that you’re going to add it to your list, but it seems to me that you’re the brainstorming committee, and this is a very important topic. And like I said, I would like to see more work in this area on a sort of…

Senator Mainieri: And I would say, I think I can speak to the committee, that we see this as a start to our work rather than an end to our work.

Senator Horst: Right.

Senator Mainieri: And we thought it was too important to not have a statement crafted and put out there too. Because our investigations take many, many meetings, so we wanted to have this as kind of a start of a dialogue, as opposed…. As inspiration.

Senator Horst: Yep.

Provost Murphy: I’m wondering, would it make sense, I’m looking at the large paragraph on the Multicultural Center, and would it make sense to perhaps… I think John Davenport and Senator Johnson would like to come and meet with the committee to talk through the process that they use. You know, for a couple… for example, like the LGBTQ+ institute, that group themselves, their Board is thinking of disbanding, and they want, you know, right now that space… it is a bad space, and it’s not a safe space. It’s used primarily by PRIDE as a meeting space, but they very much are a part of the conversation with John Davenport about the resources that will be available for that group in the Multicultural Center, rather than having a smaller space.

Senator Mainieri: Uh-hum.

Provost Murphy: So, I mean, this sort of reads like we hadn’t thought that, and yet I think that group is quite a bit further ahead.

Senator Mainieri: Uh-hum.

Provost Murphy: The other piece is Diversity Advocacy. It’s my understanding that the bulk of individuals who work in Diversity Advocacy will actually have offices, and have their space in the new Multicultural Center.

Senator Mainieri: Okay.

Provost Murphy: Although, they’re thinking about still keeping that Diversity Advocacy spot available so that, I mean, because the Bone Student Center is also a place, a gathering place.

Senator Marx: Right.

Senator Mainieri: Sure.

Provost Murphy: So, again, I think they could maybe provide, I’m kind of saying this second hand, so I think they could maybe provide more information…

Senator Mainieri: Okay.

Provost Murphy: About kind of the plan for the Multicultural Center.

Senator Mainieri: Okay.

Senator Solebo: I’m kind of confused on this paragraph about the Engineering program.

Senator Mainieri: Uh-hum.

Senator Solebo: Because, like, I’m reading it, and I’m trying to understand, like I think it’s trying to say that the University is valuing diversity and inclusion into like the planning of the Engineering program. But to me it doesn’t read like that. Like I can’t really under… like I can’t really get that from this paragraph, but I think that’s what the purpose of it was.

Senator Marx: Yeah.

Senator Mainieri: Okay. Were there specific areas that, because that is the purpose of this paragraph?

Senator Marx: Yeah. Could you elaborate on what you intended there?

Senator Mainieri: We have, I think the intention from the committee was, we see an opportunity with a brand new program to, from the very inception, be thinking about infusing diversity and inclusion ideals throughout the entire process of that program process.

Senator Marx: That’s the part, I’m not sure what that refers to.

Senator Mainieri: For example, infusing it into administrative selection, how is diversity and inclusion topics being infused into the curriculum, as faculty are hired…

Senator Ferrence: Building design.

Senator Mainieri: Even building design, how are we thinking about inclusivity, so.

Senator Marx: That part I understood.

Senator Mainieri: So, for example, we could imagine certain topics in the curriculum being really… as opposed to one section of the curriculum talking about diversity and inclusion, are we infusing it throughout our curriculum as we’re having those bigger conversations?

Senator Marx: Yeah. I could see a piece in the, you know, in the structure of the program where you want to make sure that people feel included and part of the education, the educational part of it. As far as hiring goes, that’s a much more difficult thing to address.

Senator Ferrence: Well, but for example, we already saw…

Provost Murphy: I agree.

Senator Marx: Because, I mean…

Senator Ferrence: Well, we already saw the statement about, what was it, group hires is that the…

Senator Mainieri: Cluster hiring.

Senator Ferrence: Cluster hires and things. So presumably of the most likely place for a cluster hire would be in Engineering because there’s not a lot of other departments that are likely in a short period of time to hire a lot of faculty.

Senator Marx: Well, that’s true.

Provost Murphy: I thought that paragraph, I mean, it made sense. It’s really just saying, you know, in a proactive way, don’t forget, and kind of be thinking about these things. So, it made sense to me, and it’s the kind of thing we should be thinking about anytime we develop new degree programs, or hire new faculty or administrators, those things.

Senator Campbell: I agree. I think the paragraph is really well written. The one like small critique I would add, and it’s very, very, tiny. But in the sentence that starts, “As a result...” in that paragraph, “we urge administration to ensure that the values…” there’s the part that talks about student recruitment, I’d also add “and retention” to that, just because I think that’s a really important topic that was very prevalent in that whole discussion.

Senator Marx: Yeah. True enough.

Senator Mainieri: Yep. I agree. Thank you.

Senator Ferrence: So, I got the sense while sitting on this committee that, you know, this is vague in many ways because it isn’t for the long range planning committee to be that prescriptive, but it was really trying to put out there that there’s a big opportunity with a new Engineering program, where we’re thinking from the ground up about something that’s fairly large to say… If we think about it from the get go, can we also document certain best practices that help to build something that the idea of diversity and inclusion is embedded from the get go, as opposed to having to look over extant programs, and say where do we backfill places that it’s missing. I mean, if we document that process, if we’re smart about it, maybe we can learn some lessons there that will make it earlier to, at a campus level, look back at existing programs and say, hey, here’s some of the things that, you know, if we had known about this, you know, when Chemistry came into being 53 years ago we could have put that in, but it would be fairly easy to adjust now.

Senator Marx: Uh-hum.

Senator Kalter: Senator Solebo, could you say a little bit more about what it was about the paragraph that was confusing, or not focused, or whatever?

Senator Solebo: I think it was mainly like the beginning of the paragraph, because I think towards the end I started to understand it more, but then at the beginning, I think, when I first looked at it, it didn’t give me what the end was talking about. But I think it was well written. I think the retention part is really important too.

Senator Kalter: So in other words, leading with the point…

Senator Mainieri: I can start with the purpose of that paragraph, for sure.

Provost Murphy: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: Got it.

Senator Solebo: Because like, do you think you could put like the… you urge administrations, could that be put at the beginning, would that still make sense?

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. We can look at that, or even the last sentence. Yes. Thank you.

Senator Horst: But just procedurally, it seems as if you’re documenting conversations that you had with the committee and you’re updating the Senate?

Senator Mainieri: Uh-hum.

Senator Horst: That’s kind of procedurally what you’re doing.

Senator Mainieri: Uh-hum. And also wanting to communicate them to administrators through that process.

Senator Horst: Right. Right. So, um, yeah. It makes sense that it would be part of your committee report.

Senator Mainieri: Okay.

Senator Kalter: So, one of the things that I think will be brought up is the Multicultural Center’s Task Force, and the care that they took to, you know, do surveys of various sites and all of that. I would hate to have us (as a Senate) start the Multicultural Center out on a “we’re on the periphery” foot, if that’s not the view of the student body. And so, sort of going to what Senator Murphy said about, have you talked to various people. It seems like it should be more than just a sense of some people…you know like 15 people in the room…

Senator Mainieri: Sure.

Senator Kalter: But sort of talking about where were the optimal sites, given the square footage requirements, the kind of symbiosis that needs to happen with other programs in proximity, or what have you. And I wonder if next time is the right time, or if the committee should keep talking to people in order to craft this in a way that doesn’t have this Senate that’s gotten briefings about this over the last year or two, suddenly sort of take another… a different turn and say, well, we don’t like all of the work that you just did, and we’ve already been briefed about it, but now we don’t agree with it, right.

Senator Mainieri: Sure.

Senator Kalter: So, that’s just the first thing that I observe. I’m not saying I agree or disagree with the periphery/center thing, but just wondering where it fits in terms of popular sentiment, and how it might affect popular sentiment if popular sentiment is going one way, and then the Senate goes another, or if popular sentiment is with the Senate, it’s hard for me to tell. Does that make sense?

Senator Mainieri: Sure. Yeah. I hear your concern and I think, that one that certainly would not be the committee’s intention at all as to, we celebrate the work of that committee and the coming task force. This item actually came from the student Senators, this idea of the periphery and that…

Senator Ferrence: And brought up to something that was brought up at Senate, and then they were reminding us several times in committee that this is what the students had said at Senate.

Senator Mainieri: Right. And then we have a member, two members of our committee who sit on various facilities committees…

Senator Ferrence: Well, one was actually on this task force, right?

Senator Mainieri: Yes. And she… her… she then was talking about, you know, we obviously have space issues, we need to expand, and so are we thinking about… as we expand we need to think about our campus differently, and if we pedestrianize our campus more, then the things that are now on the periphery don’t feel so much on the periphery. And so, this item did come from the students themselves, but if we… I can take Exec’s thoughts back to the committee and get their feeling on whether we’d like to move forward on this next meeting or not.

Senator Horst: It just seems like something you want to look into…

Senator Kalter: Yeah.

Senator Horst: With some conversations.

Senator Mainieri: Sure.

Senator Horst: That you discussed it. And you can document this, but it seems like you want to research it.

Senator Kalter: We have kind of the curse of the compact campus, right, because… I think at U of I, I’m not even sure I know where the center of that campus is. Same with a lot of other campuses, but we have a… I don’t know if our footprint is small or not, but it’s smaller than some others and so. But two things that I noticed just technically speaking, the date of the meeting was October 9th, not the 16th, and I think I saw that in at least two places, three places it looks like, maybe four. And then that part where you’re talking about pedestrianizing the campus, I really liked that a lot, but I thought maybe you might want to say something really concrete like, for example, closing off streets, things like that. Right. Now of course we can’t close off the street between where the current planned site of the Multicultural Center is, because that’s the main thoroughfare for town, right. That’s not going to happen. But I’m thinking about that road between the Rec Center and the rest of campus, and Rachel Cooper, and stuff like that. That that’s an interesting place to think about a potential pedestrian, extension of a pedestrian mall, that they’re… I don’t know what you could do to bridge Main Street but…

Senator Mainieri: Well, and it also, with the new resident halls, I think that’s going to become even more interesting issue.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. Well and that, having the residence halls there might make it slightly more central, but it’s also away from Watterson, right, so it’s like closer to Tri Tower, and the new places but still not… and still in a place where it’s hard to cross the street. I mean we have safety issues on that street also. Not as much in that particular area, but I always fear for our students lives when I’m coming up from McDonald’s, all the way up there, right, because people are…

Senator Mainieri: It’s like Frogger.

Senator Kalter: It’s what?

Senator Mainieri: It’s like Frogger. The game Frogger.

Senator Kalter: Oh, Frogger, I didn’t hear you. Anybody else have anything on that?

***10.10.19.01 Email from Senator Isaac Hollis***

Senator Kalter: Okay. The email from Senator Hollis. We had this on just to make sure that we had a conversation about it. Didn’t skip anything. Do people have comments about it?

Senator Mainieri: I guess my question was what is our role in responding? I know that these items are being addressed through other avenues, but I was just wondering what the Senate’s role might be in making sure… or going through the process of considering these seven items.

Senator Kalter: Do you have ideas about that, Senator Mainieri?

Senator Mainieri: I see things on this list that are within the scope of Senate.

Senator Kalter: Yeah.

Senator Mainieri: For sure.

Senator Kalter: Like what?

Senator Mainieri: Like number seven with faculty training, professional development, task force, hiring practices are there. So, should we be creating issues for the Issues Pending lists from this?

Senator Kalter: Good question. Because when it comes to hiring, that’s either decentralized or in an external committee of the Senate, right, in the URC.

Senator Horst: I remember Provost Everts made a best practices document for hiring faculty.

Senator Kalter: That’s still in place as far as I know, right?

Senator Horst: Perhaps that could be reviewed.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, that would be like a Faculty Affairs Committee type of issue.

Provost Murphy: Would it be worth, you know the Faculty Affairs committee really, you know, kind of bringing in like Sam and HR and really talking through all the things that we’re working on and the things that we do to train search committees and to try to diversify the faculty, and then open it up for suggestions and ideas. I mean, we’re always open to new ideas, always open to changing what we’re doing. I mean, we have a lot of work to do in that area. So, I truly think that anytime we could get some input on that would be excellent. Kind of the same thing with the professional development. So Dr. Cuenca-Carlino has really developed a pretty thorough plan for training a faculty (training a faculty, that sounded horrible) professional development for faculty and then now it’s kind of layering on top of that, more training and development that could go out to department and schools that specifically addresses some of the concerns that we heard. But again, if at any point you want that information, you want us to share that, and talk more about that, so beyond the student group that we’re meeting with, we’re always… we’re glad to share that to get more ideas, so.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. I think my biggest thing with that one is we have… we were just updating the Ethnic Studies listserv and we have about 150 faculty who are in that area...

Provost Murphy: Uh-hum.

Senator Kalter: And so that kind of a one size fits all professional development probably isn’t going to work very well.

Provost Murphy: Oh, absolutely.

Senator Kalter: Because some of those people should be and could teach the training, so.

Provost Murphy: You’re absolutely right. No, you’re absolutely right. And that’s part of the growth model that Yojanna (Dr. Cuenca-Carlino) is developing and that is just that. It’s that, starting to find those people in each department and school, and academic unit that are interested in taking on, kind of helping us plan for professional development, because it does. It’s going to look very different in each department. So, absolutely.

Senator Horst: Can we ask for an update on number seven at some point to the Faculty Caucus?

Senator Kalter: That’s a good idea. Senator Murphy, did you hear that? Having an update on number seven to the Faculty Caucus based on Dr. Cuenca-Carlino’s work?

Provost Murphy: Yep. Anytime.

Senator Mainieri: I wonder if it could actually be to the full Senate? I think that students would be interested in hearing that update and what’s going on.

Senator Campbell: I would agree.

Senator Horst: Yeah.

Provost Murphy: I’m sure she’d be… I mean, and we have quite a bit in… Amy, kind of, plans in writing, and we’ll share it in whatever way, however you want. But I know that Yojanna would come at any time, so.

Senator Kalter: Senator Horst, was there a specific reason why the Caucus and not the Senate in your mind?

Senator Horst: It’s typically something that faculty are involved in and not so clearly students.

Senator Kalter: Ah. Okay.

Senator Horst: And we get the training, typically we’re the search committees.

Senator Kalter: So would it be something where we would need an update in both places?

Provost Murphy: Right. Because I was thinking beyond just search committee training, I was also thinking faculty professional development, right.

Senator Horst: Right.

Senator Kalter: Right. Right.

Provost: Right. Which is… But anyway, we’ll do whatever you guys think.

Senator Kalter: Because we already get search committee training every year, which includes implicit bias, you know, training against implicit bias and that kind of thing, but, yeah, I think it’s more of the professional development stuff. Other stuff where people are seeing potential to put it on Issues Pending lists and that kind of thing?

Senator Solebo: I have a question. So, for when faculty get tenured, there’s a committee that like reviews it and then approves that. Is there one person specifically that’s in charge of that?

Provost Murphy: There is a committee… well, I’m going to let… I’m sorry. I started answering that, and shouldn’t have. I’m sorry.

Senator Kalter: That’s alright. So, almost every university has a really decentralized kind of system, that then comes to a point in their Provost and President. Right. So when…. And it works differently in different universities. Here we have these things called DFSC or SFSC, which stand for Department Faculty Status Committee or School Faculty Status Committee. So, those are our always elected committees. Generally speaking, there are about five people on those committees, usually it’s either the chair or the director of the department or school, and then the elected members, and different departments elect members in different ways, right. So, like my department has a full professor, an associate professor, an assistant, and an at-large; others have it in a different way. And so, over the course of your six years towards tenure and promotion they’re constant…We get reviews every single year. So, we have to do what they call a Faculty Productivity Report every year, you even do it after your first like three months here and you’re getting feedback about how good is your teaching, how good is your research, how good is your service. And all of that kind of accumulates, you get an annual letter back. Your salary increases are based on your performance. And then two things can happen on the road to tenure. One is if your DFSC decides that it’s not working out for one reason or another, they can non-reappoint you, and you have a single appeal, and that’s only a procedural appeal, it’s basically, did the DFSC look at everything that they were supposed to look at in making that decision to not reappoint you. Or you can, when you go up for tenure, you can either get accepted or denied. Right. And the department chair has a lot of input in it, because that person, even though different departments have different mentoring situations, but certainly the department chair is always expected to mentor all faculty, right, and particularly to mentor pre-tenured faculty to make sure that they’re successful. So then, from there, they vote about whether you’re going to get tenure and first promotion. And then it goes to your college, and there are different representatives on the college, usually from each of the departments or each of the divisions, and the dean is the chair of that one for anybody’s college. So they [the CFSC] also have a vote, which is a separate vote. They can vote in the same way that the DFSC did, they can vote differently. And then if a faculty member has a negative vote in either of those places, they can appeal it to something that’s an external Senate committee, called the Faculty Review Committee, which then has a third vote. And then all of that information goes to the Provost, the Provost makes the decision, and then sends that to the President, and the President makes that decision. And so, once it hits the President’s desk, that’s the end, right. All of your appeals have gone through, unless there is, for example, an accusation of discrimination, or an accusation of either an academic freedom, or ethics issue, and then it has to go out to another set of processes. Does that make sense?

Senator Solebo: Yeah. Yeah. Because I was wondering, because I think it should be brought up at Academic Senate too, because I understand that faculty would be the one experiencing it, but students are the ones that it affects. And I think that that would be best to have it at Academic Senate. But then also, would you want to talk about that? Because I think that that should be talked, like that should be talked upon too. Because you seem like you’re pretty knowledgeable about all of it.

Senator Kalter: You mean, would I want to do at Senate what I just did, is that what you mean?

Senator Solebo: Yeah. Yeah. So, I don’t remember what… you said about, what was that about?

Provost Murphy: One of the things that we have suggested, so the (and correct me if I don’t say this quite right but) you know, the kind of policies and the guidelines by which faculty are evaluated are developed by a faculty committee called the University Review Committee. So, one of the things we suggested would be having the University Review Committee consider incorporating… enhancing the diversity and inclusion language in the expectations of faculty. But that’s a faculty committee that would look at that and see what are some other, maybe what are other universities doing in terms of evaluating faculty in their areas of scholarly work, and teaching, and service, having them address issues of diversity and inclusion. But again, all we can do is recommend that URC consider that, and the URC is the faculty committee that then will really update those evaluation policies, the processes, if that makes sense to that committee. Did I say that okay?

Senator Kalter: Yeah. And one more thing that you just jogged my memory that I should add is that policies are also created on the college and the department levels, so specific disciplines, you know, determine what you need for tenure and promotion in their areas because they know Chemistry better than English professors do. They know Economics better than Music professors do. So, the URC does the broad university wide ones, the colleges have fairly short policies, but they have policies with regard to their college and then the departments also create. So, it’s very decentralized in that way as well. And I think the standard for hundreds of years has been research, teaching, and service pretty much.

Senator Horst: Are you suggesting that the student Senators might want more information on this topic?

Senator Solebo: Yeah. Yeah.

Senator Horst: I mean, maybe you and I can just go to the SGA and…

Senator Kalter: Oh, that’s a good idea.

Senator Horst: And talk about the process…

Senator Kalter: That’s a great idea.

Senator Horst: I think the faculty Senators are quite knowledgeable about the process just because like last year we…

Senator Ferrence: We’re handed a book when we get here and we read that book, and we’re basically told to memorize it.

Senator Horst: And the last year we spent an entire year working on edits of that book.

Senator Kalter: Actually, we’ve spent over… we usually review that book every five years, but we added disciplinary policies in the last whatever, three years or whatever, so we ended up having two major reviews in the last five years. The other person if we did that that should come…

Senator Horst: Sam.

Senator Kalter: Well, Sam, but also the current chair of the URC would be an excellent person, and I think that’s Rachel Shively, right, from Languages, Literature, and Cultures. If I remember correctly.

Provost Murphy: I should know that, but I don’t. I’m sorry.

Senator Kalter: I just met with them and I… with a little subcommittee of them.

Provost Murphy: And the other thing to remember too is that our non-tenure track faculty are evaluated differently than our tenured/ tenure track faculty, but non-tenure track faculty also, particularly full time, are evaluated annually also, and certainly in the areas of teaching… and again that kind of falls in the hands of the department chairs and school directors. But also there are disciplinary processes for faculty, for non-tenure track faculty. So they are also held accountable for teaching in other kinds of work that they do for the university, but it’s kind of a separate process then for our tenured and tenure track, our assistant, our associate, and full professors.

Senator Kalter: And then there’s also graduate assistants who are students.

Provost Murphy: Um-hum.

Senator Ferrence: Well, and even pre-tenure versus post tenure tends to… I mean I don’t know all departments, I know in ours, we tend to encourage pre-tenured faculty to meet annually with the promotions committee. But generally once you’re tenured, particularly once you’re full professor, letters become very terse, and barring something horrific you almost never meet with your committee again in your career. It’s just…

Provost Murphy: That’s department specific, I would say.

Senator Ferrence: Is it?

Senator Kalter: Or maybe faculty specific. I think that that would be true if there’s not an issue. If there is an issue, it might be less than terse.

Senator Ferrence: Yeah.

Senator Horst: Back to the original conversation. Number 2. I’m wondering if we want to have a conversation with the Risk Management people. I’m just throwing out an idea regarding how they evaluate insuring, you know, the requirement of insurance for events.

Senator Kalter: We could do that with the faculty use stuff that’s coming through right now, actually.

Senator Horst: Right.

Senator Kalter: If we want to invite Risk Management to that. I was stunned that there were no questions about faculty use and space, whatever the thing is called.

Senator Horst: Yes.

Senator Mainieri: Facilities?

Senator Horst: Yes, facilities.

Senator Kalter: Yes. Sorry. Am I saying faculty? Facility. Yeah. So, would you like to invite Dave Marple to that discussion?

Senator Horst: I’m just… When we were on the task force, he gave this interesting and thought provoking presentation on how he and his team came up with an assessment for how to insure an event, and I think it goes to the heart of number 2. It’s almost a little late for that policy, because it went through the Information stage so quickly, and I didn’t want to derail that necessarily.

Senator Kalter: No. I don’t want to derail it either.

Senator Horst: But that’s how we could address number 2, well, one way.

Senator Kalter: Um-hum. We could maybe put that down for a future Senate, and then if need be revisit the Facility and Space Use policy. I have a feeling that we’re running out of time. So do we want to say anything else about Senator Hollis’ list? Or are we ready to move to the Neubrander statement? Okay.

***10.31.19.01 From Dean Neubrander: MCN supports Engineering (Advisory item 11/20/19)***

Senator Kalter: Okay. So, Dean Neubrander’s statement sort of speaks for itself. It’s just going to be… Because we were originally planning to save it until the Spring, because it came in after what we thought was going to be the last Senate discussion of Engineering, since it looks like we’re going to plan for one for next time, we’ll send it out with those materials.

***11.02.19.03 From Academic Affairs: Student Leave of Absence policy Markup (Information Item 11/20/19)  
11.07.19.04 From Academic Affairs: Student Leave of Absence policy CLEAN COPY (Information Item 11/20/19)  
LOA Committee Structure\_ Exec excerpts from 04.01.19 (Information Item 11/20/19)***

Senator Kalter: Student Leave of Absence Policy.

Senator Nikolaou: So, we incorporated the comments that we got the last time that it was on the floor. And yeah, we added what Senator Mainieri also talked about, the housing, because it’s also referenced in the withdrawal policy. We also talked about changing the name of… instead of a committee to advisory group, because of one of the main comments that we got that, you know, if you say committee, it shows that it is, we approve or we don’t approve you. But based on what John Davenport said that it’s not that we are not going to approve you, we just want to make sure that we are helping you so that you have the easiest possible transition. So, that’s why we went with advisory group. Then we added the clarification for, that you maintain your position in the program. For this one, are you going to mention it now or…

Senator Kalter: Yes, I can mention it. I emailed Senator Nikolaou as I was preparing for this meeting and I said, you know, the wording that I’m reading there doesn’t seem syntactically to mean what it says, and so here’s a suggested sentence. And Senator Nikolaou, I think on behalf of the committee, has accepted as a friendly change. But it’s basically saying exactly the same thing, just in a different place and with different wording.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. And to if you want me to read it is that right now it says, “Requesting the leave of absence will allow the student to retain their place in the university for the length of the time approved. Students granted the leave of absence will not be required to reapply to the university.” And now the addition is going to be, “…and will retain their admission to the major(s) and minor(s) in which they were enrolled during the last term prior to the start of the leave of absence.” So that, you know, what we have added in the first paragraph, we’re going to remove it, and then add this wording instead, because it’s more clear, and it seems that it matches better where it was supposed to be. And I think we, also in the committee, we said if it should be that further down or it should be further up.

Senator Horst: I’m sorry, major and what was the other thing?

Senator Nikolaou: Major and minor.

Senator Horst: Okay. And that takes care of the word “program.”

Senator Kalter: Uh-hum.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah.

Senator Horst: Okay. So, Ethnic Studies.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. It should take care of that, I think.

Senator Horst: That’s a minor, or what’s it, concentration?

Senator Kalter: Currently, yeah. Yeah.

Senator Horst: Okay.

Senator Kalter: Apparently, I bat about 0.030. What is it? I bat 0.030 when it comes to clarity. So, this one was a home run. Any other thoughts, questions about that one before we put it on the agenda?

Senator Campbell: I’m good. I’m good.

Senator Kalter: Senator Horst has something to say, what is it?

Senator Horst: I’m just reluctant to say it. I did bring up in committee that the support person, it might not be advisable for it to be a lawyer, and I recalled a lot of conversations I’ve had with Lisa Huson, where she talks about the dynamics of having a lawyer in the room, but my committee didn’t seem to support me.

Senator Nikolaou: So, for that, I called Wendy Smith and I asked her about that one, and she said, actually, we do not want to say anything people who are allowed or not allowed. We want to leave the student be free to choose whoever they want to bring because they are a support person. So, that person, it’s not going to be doing the talking for the student. And then, she also mentioned that if they decided that they are going to bring a lawyer because they are going to be like a legal situation, then Wendy Smith, or Lisa Huson, or someone from Legal would be present. But otherwise, we don’t want to make it sound that we don’t want you to bring a specific type of a person in the meeting.

Senator Horst: So then, is Legal on this list?

Senator Kalter: But wasn’t it a non-comprehensive list?

Senator Nikolaou: Yes, because we say…

Senator Horst: Which may include but are not limited to.

Senator Nikolaou: Which may include but are not limited to, yeah.

Senator Kalter: All right. Any other questions or things about that one?

***09.25.19.01 From Academic Affairs: Repeat policy Current Copy (Information Item 11/20/19)  
09.25.19.02 From Academic Affairs: Repeat policy UCC revision (Information Item 11/20/19)  
11.07.19.06 From Academic Affairs: Course Repetition(s) AAC Mark Up (Information Item 11/20/19)  
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Senator Kalter: The Repeat policy.

Senator Ferrence: I did have a question that was more of a clarification. Because there’s a new paragraph, the very last paragraph, where it talks about not applying to courses that might be taken for credit more than once. And I was wondering, does that refer to courses that, we used to call them decimalizations, I don’t know if we call them A-izations or whatever, because for instance…

Senator Kalter: A-izations!

Senator Ferrence: I don’t know what you call it anymore, there’s no decimal anymore, it’s just an A. But I know that it’s the same course number, they’re different decimals, and you can take sometimes multiple different decimalizations. And we certainly have had a habit in our department (it doesn’t happen often), but a student may end up repeating one specific decimal, but I wasn’t sure, since the decimal isn’t what defines the course, if this would preclude the ability to repeat a decimalized, one decimal of a decimalized course.

Senator Nikolaou: So they… well, they could take it but it wouldn’t replace the grade.

Senator Ferrence: Correct. So, that would be a major change in the way we’ve traditionally done things, because…

Provost Murphy: Say that again.

Senator Mainieri: Can you give like an example?

Senator Horst: Yeah, composition lessons… like lessons, okay. We have 205a02. That’s it. But they’re required to take it five times.

Senator Mainieri: Uh-hum. Sure. Sure.

Senator Horst: They take the same lessons over, and over again. It’s the same course over, and over again, but it’s different, because they’re writing different music.

Senator Mainieri: This policy doesn’t apply to that. Right? That’s what that paragraph is saying?

Senator Horst: I don’t know how you would, if you take the class… if you don’t… I guess you couldn’t grade replace that.

Senator Ferrence: Ours is a little bit different, right. So we would have… you could take, like I teach 380.45 which is an Inorganic Chemistry offering of 380, and there’s Organic Chemistry offerings that’s a different decimal, Analytical. And every student has to pass, well, they’ll take.. So, if a student were to for some reason not pass my A45, and I’m reoffering it, they might want to repeat A45 to replace the grade they got in A45. And it wouldn’t be appropriate obviously for them to take, you know, A37 and replace A45. But it also would present a problem, because often times it’s graduate students, if it cease to replace the grade because we have students that will get an F, and right now they can replace the course, and they’ll come back and replace an “F” with a “B” now you’re… Now if you’re not replacing it, you’re now averaging, and in perpetuity,, that “F,” and that makes it a lot harder for the graduate student to get back on good academic standing.

Senator Nikolaou: So, just for clarification, this one is going to be for undergraduate students only. It’s not for the graduates.

Senator Ferrence: But this policy is for all students here.

Senator Nikolaou: No. This is going to be only… so the memo mentioned the undergraduate and the graduate catalog, but then the Graduate Curriculum Committee was not advised, was not asked to give input, so this is going to go to the undergraduate catalog and…

Senator Ferrence: But I thought the policy already applied to all students, that’s why it’s in…

Senator Nikolaou: No. Right now, it appears only in the catalog. We don’t have it as a numbered policy.

Senator Kalter: It’s not on the policy page.

Senator Nikolaou: It is only… yeah. So, that’s why it’s only for the undergraduates.

Senator Ferrence: The one that caught us off guard years ago, is when the repeat policy came into force, we didn’t realize we had to honor it for graduate students. So, I thought it was fundamentally linked. You’re saying that they’re actually not linked.

Senator Nikolaou: And then once we, you know, when this policy is done, then we’re going to send it to the graduate committee, and tell us, you know, give us feedback, and then we’re going to adjust the graduate version. So, if they end up being the same, then maybe we’re going to bring it as one common policy, but because they haven’t been advised, we cannot just ignore them and say, oh, by the way that’s your policy.

Senator Ferrence: Now, of course, a 380 course is still… it’s an undergraduate listed course, so shouldn’t those students be allowed to repeat the decimalization?

Senator Nikolaou: But does it have the… does it say multiple enrollments allowed?

Senator Ferrence: Well, yeah, because you can take 380.45, 380.57, 380…

Provost Murphy: But I think that’s a different situation than what Martha is talking about. Martha’s talking about… yeah.

Senator Ferrence: Yeah. She’s talking about same decimal, when I’m saying a course is defined, I thought as the left of the decimal, not the right.

Provost Murphy: I don’t think so. That would be the main question. I don’t think so. I think that, making the number up, 301a16 is different than 301a45.

Senator Kalter: They’re considered separate courses now.

Senator Ferrence: Now. Okay.

Senator Kalter: It used to not be that way, but they are now considered separate courses.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah, because we have some of these courses where it is A19, and they told us that in the past it used to be that these are temporary courses, that you were trying out to see if they were going to work, and then eventually you would take them out, and make them permanent, you know, without the decimalization. But they appear as two separate courses, with their own grade and their own credit hours. So, it wouldn’t be a problem there.

Senator Ferrence: That’s useful. Some of these things don’t quite make it down to departmental level when the changes happen. Because that’s one, for us, this has gotten weird in the catalog because they are completely free electives for our students as undergrads, and so they no longer even show up in the catalog at all.

Senator Kalter: Well, and in our department, that change is actually detrimental, because it makes it very difficult for us to keep courses on the books. We have stuff like creative writing where we break it into prose, or fiction, or creative non-fiction, those are easy to keep going because everybody wants to take creative writing when they go to college, right. But if you have like certain literature courses where you want to break them out into… this one could be about American Lit, this one could be about British Lit, this one could be Trans Atlantic, or whatever, we can no longer decimalize that, and sort of clarify that for the students, because then all of those have to always make every single four years or whatever. So, it would be nice if we had a different, a local policy, that wasn’t a university policy.

Senator Ferrence: We’re aware of that too, because we offer a course once every five years, which means we have to re-propose every time we offer it.

Senator Nikolaou: And a clarification, so we got a response from the comment on the side in the Repeat policy. If it should be just “WX” or all these other letter grades. So, Jess Ray said that we didn’t… so in the past we included all these extra grades just to be on the safe side, and make the list exhaustive. But he said that if we want to include them, just make sure that there are no questions about, oh, what happens with all the other grades. There is no hidden problem with actually listing all of these grades. So probably, we’re going to end up putting all these.

Senator Horst: I had another thought, just to clarify our discussions about the pass replacing the grade, I thought we could say a grade of P may replace a D, F, or NP, but will not count in the GPA. And we could say, see university catalog for further information on pass/no pass grades.

Senator Ferrence: So a P could replace a D?

Senator Horst: Yeah. That’s what we decided. We’ve decided to go that route.

Senator Kalter: We who? You two?

Senator Horst: The committee. The committee discussed…

Senator Kalter: Music or some other committee?

Senator Horst: The Academic Affairs Committee

Senator Kalter: Hunh.

Senator Horst: Discussed the idea of having a pass replace a grade or, yeah, a pass… something, taking something pass/no pass after you’ve taken it for a grade. Right, Dimitrios?

Senator Nikolaou: But it would still not replace the grade. So the catalog—I was looking at these policies during the weekend—the catalog says that if you get the “P” or the “NP,” the “P” is not going to replace.

Senator Horst: Right.

Senator Nikolaou: So, that under our university grading system, that’s where this one is stated.

Senator Horst: Oh, so that won’t work to have that.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. So, they can repeat the course for a pass/no pass but it would not replace their grade.

Senator Horst: Oh.

Senator Campbell: So, what would the purpose of retaking it be?

Senator Nikolaou: Well, what would be the purpose of taking it under “P/ NP”? So, pass/ no pass. So, probably they wouldn’t retake it under pass/no pass, because it doesn’t count.

Senator Kalter: To pass it, like if you want to go to grad school or whatever, I mean that’s an unlikely one, because they probably wouldn’t accept a “P.” Maybe it’s a prerequisite for something else where you can get a “P” into something else, I don’t know. Senator Murphy, can you think of other reasons?

Provost Murphy: Yeah. I don’t have an answer. I think there are so few times that a student might take a pass/no pass. We used to see a little bit more of it when we had students at large and… but I just don’t think we see it as often as we used to.

Senator Kalter: It might be like an AMALI course, and they didn’t pass the first time so they, you know, they wanted to get a pass/ no pass the second time. It might be a gen ed course.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. But you wouldn’t usually have someone who took a course, they got a “C” and then they repeat it under the option pass/ no pass.

Senator Ferrence: Right.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. So that one would make sense because…

Provost Murphy: Yeah, you’re right. Yep.

Senator Horst: So, are you saying we have to put back this sentence that’s deleted?

Senator Nikolaou: No. Because if they want to take it under pass/no pass, it’s fine, but then the third paragraph, it makes it clear that if you get, you know, if you repeat it and you get a “P” it will not replace the grade, nor the hours earned. So, it doesn’t make sense for you to take it under pass/no pass.

Senator Mainieri: So, adding in back all those letters?

Senator Nikolaou: All these, yes. So instead of being “WX” it’s going to be “AU, I, CR, CT, NC, P, NP.”

Senator Solebo: So, just to go back to this, because I think I’m still confused. If you take a no pass/pass class after you’ve gotten a grade that you don’t like, it doesn’t replace the grade. You keep the grade, you just get the credit?

Senator Nikolaou: So, the grade, it’s still going to appear on your transcript no matter what.

Unison: Yeah.

Senator Nikolaou: I asked Jess about that part, if… how the credit hours is going to work. So do you get three hours for when you first took the class, plus three hours? Or is it just three towards the graduation option?

Senator Ferrence: Like if you got a “D” and replaced it with…

Provost Murphy: I think it’s three total.

Senator Nikolaou: I think it’s three total, but I just asked him for… to be on the safe side, just for clarification.

Provost Murphy: That’s a great question. Yeah. It’s a great question.

Senator Horst: We might want to have him there when we talk about this policy.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. Because Amy Hurd also had a, she emailed me a question, so probably we want Jess Ray to be in the meeting for this policy, because when it comes with all the different grades and how they work.

Senator Ferrence: So yeah, like what’s the difference between credit/no credit and pass/no pass?

Senator Campbell: Yep.

Senator Solebo: No credit is a waste of time. I’m just going to say that, because my experience… I took a class. I didn’t know it was no credit when I took it, but it was a math class, and it was a pre-req to get… Because I got a low score on my… the test that you take before you take a math class here, and then I had to take Math 104 to get into Math 113, but I didn’t know that I could take Math 113 at a junior college, and it was a no credit class. I got an “A,” didn’t matter but…

Senator Ferrence: So, I thought credit/ no credit was usually meaning like if you flunked the class you got no credit, and if you passed the class you got credit, because that’s like how we do our 290. You either get “CR” (credit)…

Senator Kalter: That’s what it sounds like, isn’t it? No credit.

Senator Solebo: Really? I didn’t know.

Senator Campbell: It does sound like that.

Senator Ferrence: As opposed to a zero hour course. It might be something different.

Senator Kalter: That’s why Jess needs to be here.

Senator Solebo: That’s a department thing?

Senator Ferrence: What’s that?

Senator Solebo: That’s a department thing?

Senator Ferrence: I don’t know. That’s just the way we do undergraduate research. I mean, anywhere in 290s…

Senator Horst: Here it is. Credit assigned to students who do satisfactory work in a course which is offered only on a credit/ no credit basis.

Senator Ferrence: Ah. So pass/no pass is when you do it in a course that could, is an option in a course that is graded, as opposed to credit/no credit is course that is exclusively limited to that.

Senator Horst: Like probably when we have recital attendance. You either do it or you don’t.

Senator Ferrence: Well, thesis, you know all our graduate thesis work…

Senator Horst: You don’t get a grade on it.

Senator Ferrence: It’s deferred until you graduate, and if you don’t graduate, you lose all the credit. It’s really weird.

Senator Kalter: I have, I hope, what is the simplest question of the day on this one. So, we got four items: the current copy, the UCC revision, the AAC mark up, the AAC clean copy. I got pretty confused about the difference between the UCC revision and the AAC mark up, and I’m suggesting that we might want to not have the UCC revision there. Is that right? Because that’s what your committee got. You changed it into the AAC mark up. We no longer need the other one.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah.

Provost Murphy: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: Because otherwise everybody’s going to start reading the one, and we’ll have debates for half an hour.

Senator Nikolaou: Oh, okay. Yeah.

Senator Kalter: Okay. So, we only send three things. We’re going to send the current copy, the mark up, and the clean copy. We’re going to ditch the UCC review, right.

Senator Horst: In fact, that’s what I was doing. I was looking at the wrong mark up, and I was on the committee.

Senator Kalter: Ah. Right.
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LOA Committee Structure\_ Exec excerpts from 04.01.19 (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***09.25.19.01 Repeat policy Current Copy (Academic Affairs Committee)  
09.25.19.02 Repeat policy UCC revision (Academic Affairs Committee)  
11.07.19.06 Course Repetition(s) AAC Mark Up (Academic Affairs Committee)  
11.07.19.07 Course Repetition(s) AAC CLEAN COPY (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***Consent Agenda Items: None***

***Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Nikolaou***

***Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Senator Marx***

***Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Crowley***

***Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Mainieri***

***Rules Committee: Senator Seeman***

***Communications***

***Planning and Finance Sense of the Committee Statement***

***Adjournment***

Senator Kalter: Okay. It’s time for the approval of the proposed Senate agenda.

Motion by Senator Horst, seconded by Senator Campbell, to approve the proposed Senate agenda.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Let’s see, we are taking off of Communications the Planning and Finance Sense of the Committee Statement, is that right? Okay. And otherwise we’ve got the Engineering discussion. We’ve got the Facility and Space Use, continuation of the Sabbatical Leave discussion… Oh, I had a question about that one. Is there any sense that that should be pulled into Caucus for debate? I got the impression that the students were like (snoring) a little bit, but on the other hand I don’t want to take it away from Senate. I also don’t know whether APs and Civil Service are impacted by this policy.

Senator Mainieri: I know there… isn’t there a separate leave policy for AP? I feel like Amelia and I pulled it up while we were in Senate actually. I don’t…

Senator Horst: We can invite them to Faculty Caucus.

Senator Solebo: I don’t think we… I mean I think the first time we heard it, it was a good introduction and we understood it, but I don’t think that there’s much we can say about it or…

Senator Kalter: Contribute.

Senator Solebo: Understand, so.

Senator Kalter: It seems like it might get a more productive debate and discussion in Faculty Caucus. So, what… should we take that one off for next time? Okay.

Senator Horst: But probably then bring it back to the full Senate because it is technically still a…

Senator Kalter: Right. That’s exactly right. That’s exactly what I was thinking. That we can say, yeah. Okay. So, we’ve got Information Items, the Leave of Absence Policy, the Repeat policy, and then we’ve got our committee reports. Does that sound good?

Senator Horst: What is the proposed Facilities Use Policy Crosswalk? Did we see that?

Senator Kalter: That’s what you asked for.

Senator Horst: Okay. That’s the deleted, one of the deleted policies?

Senator Kalter: It’s showing that… where… how the, whatever…

Senator Horst: Oh, okay.

Senator Nikolaou: There’s a table.

Senator Mainieri: It says from Legal.

Senator Horst: Oh. I thought it was a crosswalk policy. I was like is… Yes. Okay. The table.

Senator Kalter: The table.

Senator Horst: Yeah. Gotcha.

Senator Kalter: Alice was being cute.

Senator Horst: I see.

Senator Ferrence: We could use a crosswalk policy.

Senator Horst: Yeah. A crosswalk policy.

Senator Kalter: Does that look like a good agenda for everybody?

The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: Excellent. We’ve got an agenda. We’ve got a meeting.

Senator Mainieri: Did we need to go back to that Issues Pending.

Senator Kalter: Oh. Yes. Thank you so much. We do. So we were talking about the Student Code of Conduct Review Committee’s Issues Pending, and taking off the asterisk things, and putting them over on SGA’s Issues Pending. Senator Solebo, are you thinking that’s a good idea?

Senator Solebo: Uh-hum.

Senator Kalter: Okay. And Senator Campbell said yes.

Senator Campbell: Yes.

Senator Kalter: Senator Mainieri, I think, said yes.

Senator Mainieri: Uh-hum.

Senator Kalter: I think you said yes, Senator Nikolaou.

Senator Nikolaou: Yes.

Senator Kalter: I don’t think I’ve had a chance to ask Senator Marx, but you said yes.

Senator Ferrence: Yes.

Senator Kalter: So, we’re all in agreement about it. Great. So, I just wanted to make sure we did that formally, so that the procedures would go well. Excellent.

Senator Ferrence: We like to give students more work.

Senator Kalter: Well, especially if they want to volunteer for it.

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Solebo, seconded by Senator Campbell, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.