**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

**MONDAY, March 15, 2021**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

Academic Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

Senator Kalter: I am going to skip around on our agenda today so that we use our time as efficiently as we possibly can, and also because the Caucus Executive has a meeting today and it has a long agenda as well.

So, I’m going to start by just… I did not tell Provost Tarhule that I was going to say this, but he and I talked a little while back about announcements regarding the continued pandemic ACT/SAT arrangements, and I believe that you were going to be (next Wednesday) making an announcement about that in your Provost Remarks, and then eventually bringing to us a motion to approve the continuation of that into the fall semester admissions. So, I just wanted to let people know that.

***Oral Communications:***

***Discussion of the proposed action items associated with the Engineering programs proposal***

Senator Kalter: And the second thing is, and this is really under Oral Communications on the agenda. We put this item about discussing the Engineering programs proposal on the agenda back in either January or February just to make sure that we had it there. So, I’m assuming that because we received unanimous votes in favor of the financial implications and the curricular model that that means that we’re ready for the organizational change and the site plan and the capital budget items, and you know, we’ll have possible debate over those. Does everybody believe that those are ready for the 24th?

President Dietz: I think so. Aondover, what do you think?

Provost Tarhule: I think so. I was going to ask Susan if you feel like… is there any more needed from us? Or is it going to be really up to the Senate to debate and maybe we answer questions? You don’t expect a formal presentation from us on that topic, do you?

Senator Kalter: That’s a very interesting question because I think we’ve got plenty of information about the site plan and the capital budget items. Maybe a couple of questions I had asked at the end of those meetings we never got to, so we might start with some of those. But for the organizational change let me ask other people. Do we think that we need any sort of…? We don’t have anything in writing about that, we just have whether or not to create a college. Do we need a proposal of any sort to create the college, or do we just vote on that?

Senator Horst: Can we review what was done for Mennonite?

Senator Kalter: I had a feeling that you might ask that. Cera can look for that. We have not looked for that yet. I hadn’t really thought about that question before hand.

Provost Tarhule: But Mennonite was a purchase. So, we basically bought a college and transferred it as a college in the same structure here. So, in some ways… I have the information. I had Sam pull it when we started talking about this, Sam Catanzaro, he pulled up what we did for Mennonite. So, I don’t know if that’s the same. It may be the same but there are some important differences that were basically absolving an existing college versus creating one in this case.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. The biggest analogy is actually back in the 1960, I think it was, when they actually expanded. I mean I think we have those records somewhere but I’m just not sure that they would be very…

Provost Tarhule: Yeah. The College of Business was in 1970. It’s the closest we have, I think.

Senator Kalter: So, let me do kind of a quick survey here. How many people think that we would need any sort of a write up?

Senator Mainieri: I think that there was information that Provost Tarhule presented in, I think the first presentation to Senate that had that slide that compared the three options; a department, a school, college. And I feel like if we were maybe even just to pull that slide out and put it back into senators’ materials and just highlight it. Because I feel like the pros and cons were fairly well laid out in there, and then explained by Provost Tarhule or President Dietz, I don’t remember, during that presentation. So, that would be my feeling.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Great. So, let me get a show of hands, this is not a vote, so Open Meetings Act is safe, but do you agree with Tracy? Everybody who agrees with Tracy that that’s the only thing that we need just give me your hand raise. (Counting) Obviously with Tracy, and I would say yes. Martha and Lauren, I think you’re the only two that I saw that did not raise their hands. Did you want to let us know what you’re thinking?

Senator Horst: I’m just thinking maybe a little bit more information (I’m sorry for interrupting Lauren), but just that we’re creating a college. It will have its own bylaws. It will have a dean. You know, we’re creating a structure, just what’s implied with that. It will have membership on these committees because of the bylaws of the Senate. And all of the stuff that Tracy was saying too. Just maybe augment it a little bit.

Senator Harris: For me, I couldn’t find my hand function, so I used “yes.”

Senator Kalter: Oh, I’m sorry, I didn’t notice that because I didn’t have my participants thing up yet. Okay. Gotcha. So, Martha, would you send myself, Dr. Tarhule, and Dr. Dietz just a quick email with that so that we kind of know what you’re looking for? And we’re also at the same time, if Cera is able to find anything in the ISU ReD archives about this, you know, we’ll let everybody know if it is at all applicable, but I think that that 1970s College of Business thing probably is not, so.

Senator Horst: I recall, I’ve heard discussions that the Mennonite might have been a condition of the purchase. So, I believe Provost Tarhule is correct in that. That it was a different scenario.

President Dietz: Right.

Senator Kalter: All right. If there’s nothing else about Engineering I’m going to turn to Kee-Yoon and ask him to fill us in a little bit on where we are with the Sound Amplification policy, and what the discussion has been in Administrative Affairs and Budget since that item was tabled. And then I’m going to say a few words as a follow up.

***10.22.20.02 From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Policy6.1.13\_Sound Amplification Clean Copy (Un-table/Action Item 03/24/21)***

***02.18.21.21 From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Sound Amplification mark up (Un-table/Action Item 03/24/21)  
02.18.21.22 From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Sound Amplification clean copy (Un-table/Action Item 03/24/21)***

Senator Nahm: So, we worked through the questions and comments that Martha brought up at the Senate meeting where this was brought forward. Some of the major changes is just creating a kind of preface that kind of lays out the purview of the policy and also just emphasizing that it doesn’t pertain to classroom activity. That was the major concern, right, that, Martha, you had, especially in Music about you know, this needing to create amplified sound as a part of classroom activity. So, that was one thing. And then, there were some questions about, well, what do we do in the case where, you know, like one faculty member needs to play music for a class, whether it’s a dance class, whether it’s a music class, and another faculty member, you know, feels like that sound is prohibiting their ability to teach their class. And so, we added language just trying to encourage, first of all, those individual faculty to work with one another, and then if that doesn’t work then through their department chairs and directors. So, those are the major changes that we discussed. And then we ran this by Legal again, and Wendy Smith had a couple more recommendations and language tweaks.

Senator Kalter: Awesome. So, I saw some emailing over the weekend between Senators Horst and Marx, and I’m not really sure where we are with that, or whether that issue can just be raised and resolved on the floor? Maybe with a friendly amendment by you, Martha. Is that…?

Senator Horst: Yeah. I wasn’t quite sure how many people you can have in an email chain before its not allowed. That’s why I started emailing David directly.

Senator Kalter: Ah.

Senator Horst: But my concern, not that the School of Music doesn’t have to get permission every time it uses amplified sound. So, I suggested something, he said that would be fine as a friendly amendment. And so, I think we are on good footing with the policy.

Senator Kalter: So, we’re going to do that on the floor then?

Senator Horst: I’m not sure how David’s going to handle it, but we worked out some wording.

Senator Kalter: Okay. So, he may incorporate it into the copy that we send out beforehand possibly. Because it seemed to me, let me see if I can clarify this, is the question why there isn’t an explicit statement that the academic departments do not need to request permission for ordinarily scheduled classes? Is that kind of the nub of it?

Senator Horst: I was a little bit confused because of the four points that he listed, they’re all outdoor events and that’s the way the original policy read. But now they’re including all indoor events as well. So, I suggested some wording that was something along the lines of what they did for the Athletics program that just says these things are not… you don’t need permission for this but all of the principles of the Sound Amplification policy still apply.

Senator Kalter: Got it. Great. So, I had some little questions, but I wanted to find out first if other people had questions or comments about this one before we put it on our agenda. (Pause) All right. It looks like not.

So, let me give mine. The first two are small. There’s an “of/with” in the third paragraph. I think it’s either “of or with” if I remember correctly it was supposed to be “with” rather than “of.” And we kind of need a second comment in that same paragraph between the “to” and the “the,” where it says something like including but not limited to. So, that’s a small one.

Kee-Yoon, you might want to bring this one back to David, I was a little bit confused about why the resolution between faculty… it was either resolution between faculty or between units and then it jumps up to a resolution between deans. And so, there’s no step in there for chairs to resolve together. So, I was kind of confused about that, because I think there could be instances were it’s, in fact a lot of instances where it’s in the college. Or even within a department where you have to get your chair involved because you’re not actually communicating well with one another, or what have you.

And I wish I had noticed these two before we got into the Action Item on this before, but I am kind of curious about… and maybe I’ll just bring these two up on the floor but why are we allowing amplified sound outside of a library? And how come we don’t know who is on the University Events Review Committee and how they are appointed or elected? It seems like that’s one of the things we often ask but we don’t have that in the policy yet. So, that might be a friendly. I think that library thing is a long-standing part of the policy, but it is a little bit odd that you would allow disruption outside of a library. All right. If nobody else has any comments about that one, I’m going to move into the CAS Bylaws.

***01.21.21.06 From Rules Committee: CAS Council By-Laws Current Copy (Information Item 03/24/21)  
03.08.21.01 From Rules Committee: CAS Bylaws Mark Up (Information Item 03/24/21)   
03.04.21.03 From Rules Committee: CAS bylaws CLEAN revised March 3 2021(Information Item 03/24/21)***

Senator Kalter: And I just found out before the meeting that I must have misread the most recent copy. So, I think what I have prepared to say some of it is not necessary, but I’ll sort of bring you all where we’ve been. You might remember that three of us on Exec gave feedback. Martha then brought that feedback to the college council chair and the dean, who is with us today actually, Dean Zosky. They first determined as a duo, in other words Aaron Smith and Dr. Zosky, determined which items they would accept, reject, or modify. Then it was sent back directly to me as the chair of Exec without going back to the Rules Committee, and I determined that it wasn’t quite ready to come back onto the Executive agenda because, you know, give the great length of Senator Nikolaou’s comments we kind of needed to have an executive summary of what was rejected or modified and Dean Zosky had offered that at a certain stage. So, we got that and I also had suggested that, you know, given the timing that they might want to run it back through the college council just to make sure that the council was on board with those accepted, rejected, modifieds. So, that would have all happened in exactly that same way if Senator Nikolaou had waited until the Senate floor stage, but it would have taken a great deal of time on the floor to discuss all that, so it’s really fortunate that he’s on Exec and we were able to save time for about 62 people plus guests on that one. My understanding is that they discussed it on the 19th and got this back to us on the 22nd.

So, the rest of this, I think now is moot because for some reason over the weekend when I read it, I thought that the last issue had not been resolved, but apparently it has been resolved. Because Dimitrios was online first and we were talking about it and so, not much more needs to be said. I will just let Diane know, my second suggestion has been accepted but I think it might have been misunderstood a little bit or worded a little bit incorrectly. So, I’m going to raise that on the floor as a clarification. And I’m probably going to raise the question of whether we should stagger our CFSC and council elections so that people who go up for both of them don’t have to choose between them. Other than that, does anybody else have any observations about this one?

Senator Horst: Yeah. I would just sort of echo that the Rules Committee did address Dimitrios’ concern with Diane Zosky. We did that the last meeting. And she accepted the language change to incorporate the language from Policy 3.2.13.

Senator Kalter: So that essentially if somebody is serving on the search committee and they become a candidate you have to dissolve the search committee and recreate it, right? Great. Wonderful. Anybody else have anything they need to say about these?

Senator Nikolaou: It’s just a small thing on page 11. That it should be I, II, III, IV, V. For some reason, now it is I, II, I, IV, V. And then a similar one on page 13. It’s V, VI, VII. Because the last two go to IV, V again. So, it’s just the numbering of the items. But other than that, no. Diane and the college council, they pretty much addressed all my questions.

Senator Kalter: Awesome. And, Dean Zosky, did you want to say anything?

Dean Zosky: Just thanks to each of you.

Senator Kalter: Excellent.

Senator Mainieri: I just had one thing that I had brought up I think the last time that this came to Exec and I’m happy to just ask the question on the floor. I just noticed in Appendix G talking about associate deans and assistant deans that who the position would be distributed to is different. Associate deans will be sent to all tenure track faculty. Assistant deans posting will be sent to tenure track, non-tenure track, and staff. And I just wasn’t sure if that was deliberate or if they should be the same?

Dean Zosky: May I respond?

Senator Kalter: Yes, please do.

Dean Zosky: They actually are different, Tracy. It’s customary in the college that associate deans are from the tenure track status, and an assistant dean (we only have one assistant dean) and that can be staff or faculty. So, its intentional.

Senator Mainieri: Thank you.

Senator Kalter: All right. Anybody else? Okay. Terrific.

***\*\*Approval of Proposed Senate Agenda – See pages below\*\****

***Proposed* Academic Senate Meeting Agenda**

**Wednesday, March 24, 2021**

**7:00 P.M.**

**VIRTUAL MEETING per state law and Governor Pritzker’s Executive Order**

**Zoom Link:**

**YouTube Streaming Link**: <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCHV06CB2sqbSuee6hyaHlvA/featured>

*Request to make public comment at the meeting should be sent via email to* [*acsenate@ilstu.edu*](mailto:acsenate@ilstu.edu) *no later than 6:55 p.m. on the day of the meeting.*

***Call to Order***

***Roll Call***

***Chairperson's Remarks***

***Student Body President's Remarks***

***Administrators' Remarks***

* ***President Larry Dietz***
* ***Provost Aondover Tarhule***
* ***Vice President of Student Affairs Levester Johnson***
* ***Vice President of Finance and Planning Dan Stephens***

***Information/ Action Items:***

***Approval of the creation of a College of Engineering***

***Approval of the space needs, building, and site plans presented on February 17 (with allowance for changes recommended by Cabinet and/or to conform the proposal to the Campus Master Plan)***

***Financial Engineering Presentation to Senate 2-17-21***

***Action Items:   
01.03.19.02 Milner Bylaw Current Copy (Rules Committee)***

***02.04.21.02 Milner Bylaws Mark Up (Rules Committee)***

***02.04.21.01 Milner Library Bylaws CLEAN (Rules Committee)***

***11.06.15.08 Policy 9.7 Mass Electronic Communications Current Copy (Rules Committee)***

***02.25.21.09 Policy 9.7 Mass-Electronic-Mail-Policy Mark Up (Rules Committee)***

***02.25.21.07 Policy 9.7 Mass-Electronic-Mail-Policy Clean Copy (Rules Committee)***

***09.30.20.01 Policy 9.7.1 Procedures for use of Mass Electronic Communication Current Copy (Rules Committee)***

***02.25.21.10 Policy 9.7.1 Mass Electronic Mail Procedures Mark Up (Rules Committee)***

***02.25.21.08 Policy 9.7.1 Mass Electronic Mail Procedures Clean Copy (Rules Committee)***

***Tabled:***

***10.22.20.02 Policy6.1.13\_Sound Amplification Clean Copy (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***02.18.21.21 Sound Amplification mark up (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)  
02.18.21.22 Sound Amplification clean copy (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***Information Items:  
05.29.20.01 Policy 7.7.3 Course Material Fees Current Copy (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***02.25.21.02 Policy 7.7.3 Course Material Fees Mark Up (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***02.25.21.03 Policy 7.7.3 Course Material Fees Clean Copy (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***02.18.21.12 Academic Planning Committee Blue Book page Current Copy (Rules Committee)***

***02.25.21.05 Academic Planning Committee Blue Book page Mark Up (Rules Committee)***

***02.25.21.06 Academic Planning Committee Blue Book Charge Clean Copy (Rules Committee)***

***02.23.21.02 Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee Blue Book Charge Current Copy (Rules Committee)***

***02.23.21.03 Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee Blue Book Charge Mark Up (Rules Committee)***

***02.23.21.01 Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee Blue Book Charge CLEAN COPY (Rules Committee)***

***02.23.21.04 Planning and Finance Committee Blue Book Charge Current Copy (Executive Committee)  
02.26.21.01 Executive committee minute excepts 08-22-17 AFAC report***

***02.26.21.02 Planning and Finance IP list AFAC report***

***01.21.21.06 From Rules Committee: CAS Council By-Laws Current Copy (Information Item 03/24/21)  
03.08.21.01 From Rules Committee: CAS Bylaws Mark Up (Information Item 03/24/21)   
03.04.21.03 From Rules Committee: CAS bylaws CLEAN revised March 3 2021(Information Item 03/24/21)***

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

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

***Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Hollywood***

***Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Avogo***

***Rules Committee: Senator Horst***

***Communications***

***Adjournment***

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

Senator Kalter: Okay. Just a little bit of discussion here. I am wondering should we flip the script again to make sure that the Engineering programs have time for discussion? That’s one option. We could also simply pull the Engineering Information/Action Items up above Chairperson Remarks and leave everything else where it is. Or we could move all of the Action Items up above Chairperson Remarks, then do those and the Administrator Remarks, and the Student Body President Remarks, and then leave the Information Items where they are, including the tabled item I would think. Right? The Sound Amplification would stay down there. Or we could just leave it the way it is on the agenda right now. I’m curious what people would prefer?

Senator Nikolaou: Do we know… Should we talk about what we’re going to do about the email you sent us? About the Monday/Wednesday/Friday? Because I’m assuming this is also going to take some time. So, if we have the Engineering that’s going to take time. We have the Monday/Wednesday/Friday that’s going to take time. Then do we want to make sure that at least we go over the Action Items for sure, and then we move to the Engineering and the Monday/Wednesday? Because if we put both of them at the beginning, we risk not being able to do any of the Action or Information Items.

Senator Kalter: I have a feeling that we may need to table this, go to the next parts of our agenda, and then come back to the approval of the Senate agenda. Because I have the Monday/Wednesday, Monday/Wednesday/Friday discussion last, except for the annual reports coming out of Academic Affairs on this agenda. So, that seems like it’s a longer discussion that we might need to have. Let’s remember that, but does anybody else have anything shorter for the proposed Senate agenda before we sort of table this and move to those other couple of Action Items?

Senator Horst: I would just say the danger of putting the Administrator Remarks at the end we say is that they could get so late that people start wanting to just miss the meeting. Maybe what we should do is table this. I’m sorry, I forgot about how we needed to talk that through because there was the option of putting that as a Discussion Item at the Senate.

Motion by Senator Harris, seconded by Senator Nahm, to table the approval of the proposed Senate agenda. The motion was unanimously approved.

***02.26.21.12 From Susan Kalter: Executive Summary Individual Sequence  
02.26.21.13 From Susan Kalter: Liberal Studies Sequence  
02.26.21.14 From Susan Kalter: FIF Liberal Studies Sequence  
02.26.21.15 From Susan Kalter: Deletion of University Studies Major  
02.26.21.16 From Susan Kalter: Deletion of Multidisciplinary Studies Sequence***Senator Kalter: So, let me actually now move to the things that were taken off of the Consent Agenda. So, I was the individual who pulled these four sequences off of the Consent Agenda because I thought it was important to mark for the public record and in the public record the very important change that is being made here. As a result of a program review of the Interdisciplinary Studies and University Studies majors a year or two ago by the Academic Planning Committee, I thought it was important for example to bring to the attention of the SGA because this change ends what I have considered for many many years to be a separate but equal curricular arrangement whereby a disproportionate number of underrepresented students have taken what amounts to an Interdisciplinary degree but under the name of University Studies, while the actual title, Interdisciplinary Studies has been reserved only for students with high GPAs from the start of their studies. And these students who were in this sort of very very small IDS major tended to be disproportionally white, and there were at first very few of them, literally about 1 or 2 every 8-10 years for many years, until we had the edTPA created for Teacher Ed students. And that created a situation where a number of former Teacher Education majors were funneled into Interdisciplinary Studies when they decided either I didn’t pass the edTPA or I don’t want to be an ed major anymore. So, they went and got the Interdisciplinary Studies degree rather than the University Studies degree. And as we all know, Teacher Ed students are also disproportionately white and female. So, you know, I will just say over the years I’ve had a number of underrepresented students who have earned 4.0 GPAs or other quite high GPAs, but I also, because I’m the Ethnic Studies Director, I see many underrepresented students who have very high achievement in Ethic Studies courses but they find out major too late to either complete it or to turn it into a major through, you know, IDS or University Studies. And I also would say that, in general, students, whether they’re underrepresented or not, don’t always hit their stride, their GPA stride, until they’re past their gen ed courses and by that time it’s often too late for them to create their own major. So, that GPA requirement was really blocking a lot of students from doing that. I believe that what this change does is to almost eliminate the distinction, you know, eliminate except for the individualized sequence, the very high GPA requirement to receive an Interdisciplinary Studies major degree. So, all students are going to have Interdisciplinary Studies, that brand on their diploma and on their transcripts. Right.

So, you know, and I’ll just say on a personal note, when I was an undergraduate I kind of wondered into Interdisciplinary English after deciding that I was going to switch out of International Relations into the English major. And I do think that ISU had been very far behind the curve of encouraging students to create majors outside of the traditional disciplines. So, I wanted to give credit to a number of people: the Academic Planning Committee, Bruce Stoffel who was on that committee as the recording secretary during the year that this was reviewed, and to Amy Hurd for really taking a considered look at those recommendations. She was also a member of that committee and she was also transitioning into her current role. And so, she did most of the heavy lifting or at least lead the heavy lifting that maybe Patrick McNulty (who is her co-author) did. So, I wanted to put that into the record. And then with all of that said, I wondered if we want to send these sequences to Academic Affairs for any further discussion or if we should put them back onto the Consent Agenda?

Senator Nikolaou: I don’t see any issues, so I say back to the Consent Agenda.

Senator Mainieri: I agree.

Senator Kalter: I’m seeing Todd and Martha nodding their head or heads I should say. They have two different heads. Let’s see Dylan, Avery, Taylor, and Lauren do you agree? Or should it go to a committee?

Senator Toth: Yeah. I agree. I was just getting confirmation. You pulled it from the Consent Agenda and then… for what purpose, I guess I should say?

Senator Kalter: To mark this in the record as an important achievement of ISU.

Senator Toth: Great. I was just making sure. Then yeah, that is good.

Senator Kalter: And because, Dylan, I considered it to be biasing, right. That students, if they had a lower GPA, were receiving a different degree even though they were doing the same thing.

Senator Toth: Right.

Senator Kalter: And that those students were disproportionately underrepresented.

Senator Toth: Great. Thank you for the clarification.

Senator Kalter: Great. And I’ve got a thumbs up from Avery.

Senator Harris: And I agree.

Senator Kalter: Lauren agrees. Okay. Terrific. And Taylor? All right. So, that one is over.

***Distributed Communications:***

***03.09.21.05 From Brian Rejack: Provost policy on MW vs. MWF class scheduling  
03.10.21.01 From Provost Tarhule: Provost response MW courses to be converted to MWF courses  
03.10.21.02 From Provost Tarhule: Provost email attachment Scheduling Category Table***

Senator Kalter: Let’s go on to the first Distributed Communications. So, we’re back up to the top of the agenda. So, this first Distributed Communication is from Dr. Rejack who is the associate chair in my department and from Provost Tarhule regarding a substantial change in the Monday/Wednesday course scheduling. At first report, it was apparently completely eliminating Monday/Wednesday course during a pandemic without any consultation with the persons impacted, whether they were students or faculty. It may be, I’ve heard recently, that what was intended was any Monday/Wednesday course prior to 2:00 p.m. I will say that I’m very concerned for how this is going to impact our English majors and our faculty given that almost all of our courses are 75-minute courses. So, this move would force all of our students to have to make very hard choices among either Tuesday/Thursday courses or to receive a pedagogically inappropriate 50-minute slot for courses that need a 75-minute slot.

I’ll also say many of our faculty have very heavy graduate student advising loads and the only way that they can keep up with them is to consolidate their classes on either Tuesday/Thursday or Monday/Wednesday. Again, classes which are most appropriate at 75-minutes already and using either Monday/Wednesday/Friday or Tuesday/Thursday/Friday for the heavy reading that accompanies that graduate advising. And this is for people who are already working Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday. I will say that I have barely taken a weekend day off, much less a full weekend off since I arrived here 21 years ago, and I don’t even have by far some of these heavy advising loads. That includes summers that we don’t get paid for. Right? Where they’re working a lot.

So, according to the data that was provided by Provost Tarhule, English is the single most impacted department. But I would say that we are far from alone in the potential fallout. Many years back, my understanding was that this change was going to be made gradually. That it was going to be applying only to gen ed courses that impact other majors, and that it would only impact morning courses, not all Monday/Wednesday courses. This appears on the surface to be being driven only by the pandemic, but I will say that it was raised with me by Dr. Tarhule in what I thought was as a more general long term issue back in the fall in one of our one-on-ones.

And I will warn everybody what I’m about to say is going to rub some people the wrong way, if what I have said already hasn’t, but I feel like this needs to be surfaced as a perception. Right? It seems like yet another instance where shared governance is not being honored by persons lower down in the administrative structure and something that a few people in the administration wanted several years back is being forced because they lost the argument at that time. You know, I’m not saying that about Dr. Tarhule. He may have heard the arguments mostly from one side because most of the people making them were in the administration. I’m wondering if we have considered other options: sharing classrooms, making classes hybrid where the class meets once per week online and once per week on-campus, you know, converting non-instructional spaces into instructional spaces, asking for volunteers instead of doing a massive sweep without consideration to the pedagogical needs and the departmental needs for Friday meetings. We could also have a different type of a schedule Monday/Thursday, Tuesday/Friday, Wednesday/Saturday. You know, other creative options.

So, I’ll put it out there, but I wanted to also just sort of read a couple of the statistics. English has 61 of these classes. And so, if anybody’s wondering why we are raising our voices loudly it’s because we often have so many classes that are impacted by administrative decisions. MQM and Finance, Insurance, and Law have 35 and 26. And they also, as I understand it, have Friday meetings. Marketing and Accounting had 23. Many of the IDS and WGS courses are taught by English, Languages, other Humanities or Social Sciences. And I’ll also just call out Theatre and Dance, which I believe does production work (according to Martha’s email over the weekend or last week). And so, I’ll open that up to discussion.

Senator Spranger: My reasons are going to be a little bit less articulate than all the ones that you just laid out but my Friday days off, it’s like when I remind myself that I’m like a person that exists. Like, I feel like the weekends are always super busy with social things and the weekdays are, yeah, just crazy in general with extracurricular meetings and classes and stuff. And I haven’t had a Friday class since I’ve been at ISU and I’ve really always cherished that time. And I know that a lot of other people in my department do too. I think I would be doing a lot worse in all my classes if I didn’t always have Friday’s off.

Provost Tarhule: Susan, would you like to hear from the horse’s mouth before you guys start doing the discussions? Let me give you a little bit of context. So, one of the things that we’ve been struggling with, and we continue to struggle with, is what the fall semester is going to look like. It’s possible that we’ll be in phase 5 in the fall, in which case everybody is allowed to open 100% with no restrictions. There’s a lot of reasons to think so. The vaccines are increasing. If you listen to President Biden’s address it’s very optimistic. So, there’s a lot of reasons to think that come fall we’re going to be 100% in-person.

But we also know that the virus has given us a curve ball and has taught us to be humble. Maybe we’re not 100% in-person. Maybe we’re 100% in-person but with physical distancing. So, for us in the Provost’s office planning this, how should we plan the fall? What happens if we assume that we are 100% in-person and the state sometime in July comes back to stay, nope, you need to have a physical distancing. And the opposite also applies. What happen if we plan as if there is physical distancing, but then the state says, nope, you are 100% in-person? This is the question we are trying to resolve.

So, initially we said we’re going to assume because K-12 classes are being told they can use three feet distancing. So, we said let’s plan this as if we’re going to need three feet distancing. That turns out approximately, it’s not the same, but it turns out approximately to a 70% occupancy in the classrooms. But if you use a 70% occupancy in the classrooms, we have approximately 4,000 classes. So, work it out, it’s about 1,000 classes that you need to schedule extra. And there’s no room for it. Have we explored other spaces? Yes. We’ve even thought about building tents on campus to see if we could put those students in. We’ve talked about renting the Marriot. We’ve thought about the arena. You know, every space that we could explore, we’ve looked at. That didn’t get us very far and so we looked at time. Is it possible to do scheduling differently to allow us to accommodate more students? And let me talk about why we want to accommodate more students and then come back to that topic.

We think that a lot of students and parents want to be in-person. We think that if they are not in-person and other schools are able to figure out how to get them in-person that we might lose them. They could go to the competitor’s schools. Right now, we’re still running about 20% behind in applications, 18% in admits, or something like that. We think that the students are probably waiting to see how we’re going to be in-person before they commit. So, the more classes we get in-person the better off we think we’re going to be.

Where we stand now, we will have to put (if we assume three feet, it’s about 70%, again not quite equal) we have about 1,000 classes that have to go online. We’ve already told all classes that are 100% enrollment or more to go online. Originally when this started, we considered that if you ask all classes that have high enrollment to go online, you’re going to affect mostly gen ed classes. Those gen ed classes are exactly the classes that FTIC students need - those freshman, those classes. So, they would be disproportionately affected by online classes. And the fear that they may have if a student has four out of their five classes online, they’re just going to leave.

So, I convened a meeting where we identified the classes that we thought most gen ed students take. Those are in English, Biology, Mathematics, and Communication. So, I convened a meeting of the chairs and I said how can you help us put more of your high enrollment classes in-person. We looked at several options. We said if a class has high enrollments, say 150, can you break it up into two? Make it, you know, 75 or even into three and make it 50-person enrollment? We would pay, if you can find an instructor for them, we would pay for that extra instructor so that our students get the opportunity to have an in-person class.

So, this really… this entire discussion really began with those five chairs. And we talked about how you could schedule some things differently. It was a very very helpful discussion. Subsequently, when we saw exactly how many classes were needed to be more online, I convened another meeting last Friday of all the chairs and I shared the options with them. I said here’s what we’re looking at. If we plan as if we’re going to be 100% in-person but we’re not, here are the consequences. And if we plan the other way, here are the consequences. I took a straw poll and I said, you know, how many people think we’re going to be 100% in-person and, as you can imagine, the result was really split, which is exactly what we’ve been dealing with. Nobody knows whether we will be 100% in-person or not, and yet we have to plan.

One of our big challenge is we must decide this before registration opens. And originally registration was going to open on the 21st. So, actually, we were almost panicking. Eventually, we went to the President and we said, can we delay registration to allow us to consider these issues further, and the President graciously accepted that. And so, we’ve delayed the opening of registration to April 5 while we’re trying to figure out how are we going to deal with his. There is some expectation that maybe the state will come up with new guidance, maybe this week. We expected it last week. We didn’t get that. On the other hand, we don’t know that the guidance will really solve our problem for the fall. I think the questions will still remain.

The reason we started looking at the scheduling of classes as probably an option to go to is if you schedule those 75-minute classes in a slot that is meant for one hour you kill both of those. You kill two lecture sections. So, if you have a class, if we create a slot from 9-10:00, a student who takes that class can take the next class from 10-11:00. Or if we are scheduling in-person, we could schedule that class from 9-10:00 and we could schedule another course in the same venue from 10-11:00 that’s two classes. But if you then schedule a class there from 9-10:15 you’ve killed both of those slots. We can’t schedule another class from 10-11:00 whether online or in-person. So, when you calculate how many times those types of occurrences occur, we realized that that practice was taking hundreds of courses off the table that we could schedule in-person if only we didn’t have too many of these classes out of what we call, out of block schedule.

In any case, in discussions with the chairs I said let’s pause the decision making up until Thursday of this week. First of all, to see if the guidance from the state comes out and if it gives us other opportunities, but I also invited the chairs to look at their schedules critically and to suggest what they think we could do. So, it’s more about can you help us accommodate more students in-person? So, if you are scheduling a 20% class in a 60-person room, you know, can we swap that out so that we have more classes where students could be in-person.

So, there isn’t… I know the history Susan is refereeing to. That’s not what we’re looking at here. We want to try and offer students in the fall as many classes in-person as possible. And we’re trying to figure out should we plan as if we’re going to be fully in-person with no restrictions or should we plan as if there is going to be some restrictions.

So that’s the context. And where we are is, I’ve invited all the chairs after considering those options. Are there things that you can suggest to us based on your schedules that will allow us to get more students in-person with the least amount of disruption. And they were already coming up, in the meeting right there, lots of chairs already said yeah, we can do this, or yeah, I can swap out this class. And so, I’m hopeful that this will work. I think that they all understand why we’re doing this. This was a very very productive discussion. It’s still some difficult questions to answer, partly because nobody knows what the solutions are, you know, everybody knows what we’re trying to accomplish. So, that’s where we are.

President Dietz: If I could add one point on to that. I know that the Provost and his staff and some workgroups have been working diligently on this. One other addition I would say is that with the presidents and chancellors meeting last Wednesday we discussed this six feet distance versus the three feet distance that has already been approved by the Governor for K-12 but has not been approved for higher education. But the Executive Director of IBHE last Wednesday was putting together a proposal for the Governor that would allow us to follow the same three feet guidelines that the K-12 has. She was optimistic that that might be accepted, but we couldn’t just piggyback on the K-12 proposal that had been excepted due to protocols within the Governor’s office. We had to prepare a completely separate proposal, but we were using some of the same language of K-12. So, on Wednesday I will check in again with her and with the other presidents and chancellors. Because the three feet distancing would allow us a lot more flexibility on the scheduling part. But I just wanted to throw that in.

Provost Tarhule: If we’re at six feet, we’re exactly the same as last year. So, that’s not going to help us. So, the three feet, at the provosts’ meeting, I think all the twelve provosts that were there, everybody is struggling with exactly the same thing. So, I would invite this body to not think about this as anything other than we’re trying to solve a problem that everybody else is dealing with. Now, it may connect to something else that has some longer history. That’s not what we’re working on now, you know, whether it’s connected to some longer history. We just have to try to figure out how many of our students can we get in-person and what are the options for doing that?

Senator Kalter: Martha, I think I saw your hand up.

Senator Horst: Yeah. I have two points. The first one is the issue goes back, as I mentioned to this issue that we talked about in the Senate many years ago. And part of the reason that I believe the School of Music brought it up is we have maintained the traditional hourly schedule versus English has for instance not, has maintained the blocks. And as you described, the problem I realize potentially the solution could be that everybody could go to larger blocks on Monday and Wednesday. The issue really is that there’s these hour blocks versus these other blocks and you can’t, as you said, schedule something in the two hours. So, maybe it could be the reverse. Maybe we could all go to larger blocks. The issue is that there are two different systems going on. But I do think it’s something for the Senate to discuss because as Susan Kalter brought up, there’s some pedagogical issues, and it seems like it’s in the academic area broadly conceived. So, I do think that it’s important that the Senate have the say.

Provost Tarhule: Let me say, Martha, there was no attempt to bypass the Senate here. Remember, our registration was on the 21st. When we were discussing this was by the 11th. We had to decide this. We had to make a discussion before registration opened. This was before we extended the registration. So, the idea of trying to convene the Senate to decide and make a decision in 9 days, we didn’t feel like that was going to be feasible. So, even now, the Senate can still weigh in, but we must decide this, as long as we get some recommendation before registration opens. So, that’s April 5th. Now that we have extended that maybe we’ll have some additional time. This decision was made, I believe, on the 11th at that time we were looking at a 9-day window, that was why we didn’t come to the Senate because I couldn’t see how we would work through the Senate and get a resolution, and communicate that decision to the students. So, sometimes when the information goes out it’s not because shared governance has been ignored or disrespected it’s the timing at which information comes out and has to be made, and sometimes it just doesn’t line up with when your meetings hold with when how a decision is going to be made. So, if we had to do the 21st, we would have had to make a decision one way or the other.

Senator Mainieri: If I may, I just add this conversation into the conversations since last March. Right. Of people making impossible decisions with changing and no information. Right. So, I just want to acknowledge that this is one of those wicked problems that…So, I want to acknowledge that that’s what we’re operating in still, right, for all of us.

I do think that there is value in having the Senate discuss this, and not just Monday/Wednesday/Friday but maybe getting input on the other options that you’re also considering. I think that for me, one of the things that’s happening is there’s so much disconnect I feel like with the information that’s out there. Right? So, I feel like sometimes faculty or students hear rumors of what’s going on because of x, y, or z meeting and then it just snowballs into this is what’s happening. Right? And so, for example, a meeting with the chairs and directors that talks about all these different options, it’s just inevitable, right, that something in that meeting is going to be then misconstrued or snowballed into this is what happening. Right? And so, I do wonder if there is a way to be more specific in the communications to our campus community about what the conversations are. Even if it’s like the chairs and directors had a meeting, we discussed these options. Because I feel like the communication to our internal stakeholders and our external stakeholders is still largely the same, in terms of we’re trying for a more traditional fall semester. And I feel like our internal stakeholders in particular, right, our faculty, our students, and our staff just want some more detail and want to know where we are in the decision-making process. And so, I think that’s where some of this tension can come in. Right? Because there’s different levels of knowledge inevitably about what the decision making process is but when we have a big meeting where we’re talking all sorts of options, we just know, right, that things are going to snowball in ways that are not productive. So, that’s what I would ask for is just more specific explicit approach perhaps to the communication that happens inside our campus community to maybe stem off some of the rumors and things that leads to this type of conversation.

But to go back to probably the point that Susan wants to focus on there, right, is I do think that there’s value, and given that we have the registration pushed back, I think there is value in having some discussion and some presentation here to Senate and getting some feedback to help guide those decisions.

Senator Kalter: I saw I think it was four head nods to that one. I saw Martha, Todd, Dylan, and Avery nodding their head. I agree with that as well. Taylor?

Senator Phillips: Yeah, I was just going to say that I also agree with Tracy. And I understand that we’re trying to look for continuity and add enrollments and stuff like that, but for all of the students and faculty that are here right now and being affected by it and would be affected by scheduling changes and the people that are going to have to work on that and just the concern that I’ve heard from my own professors, I think it would definitely be important to have a discussion in Senate or really like anywhere that we can communicate more, because I think a lot of the faculty feel similarly and that they want to do what’s best for students and to keep themselves safe as well. And I just think, I don’t know, it was a little concerning when I was going through the PDF email from… I forget who was emailing the Provost’s office or maybe he emailed you Dr. Kalter, but just the idea that people don’t really know what’s going on and then something big gets passed down feels kind of counterproductive. So, it’s a long-winded way of saying I agree with Dr. Mainieri.

Senator Kalter: Taylor, for Larry and Aondover, I had emailed you both this morning and then I also emailed the Exec so that they would understand what was going on. But I didn’t want to have your inboxes flooded, you know, by that. So, we’re talking basically about Dr. Blum’s set of questions as well. All right. Anybody else want to weigh in on this? Because, again, Tracy has sort of brought us back to the question is whether we put this on the agenda, right? And it looks like we’re saying yes. Anybody else have any comments about anything?

Senator Nahm: I agree with Tracy. I think this warrants a discussion at the Senate. I would like to say that I understand, Provost Tarhule, what you’re saying and kind of the urgency of dealing with this matter. The thing that I am struggling to understand, from the perspective of my school (the School of Theatre and Dance) that Martha mentioned, right, we need those Friday’s to schedule meetings so that we can, you know, do our productions. And it’s not just the faculty and staff that are impacted by this, there are students who if they’re taking a class that might mean that they are unable to work on a production. And for our recruitment at least that is equally as important a factor in our recruitment as, you know, whether we have classes in-person or not, whether students are able to work on productions and get that experience here. So, for us, it’s not simply a matter of, well I need Friday’s in order to do all of these things that I can’t do on the other days. It become a practical logistical challenge because there are meetings that involve faculty, students… it’s basically a class that we have scheduled on Fridays that would be competing with a Monday/Wednesday/Friday schedule. So, I know that this doesn’t apply to all units, but at least in the School of Theatre and Dance, it’s a challenge not just because of, you know, tradition or the labor that goes into transferring Monday/Wednesday course into a 50-minute class it’s really a scheduling issue for us as well. So, just wanted to bring that up.

Senator Kalter: And, Dimitrios, I think I saw you unmute.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. I was going to say that I also agree that we should have a discussion in the Senate. And it might be that when the chairs and directors meeting took place there was a discussion about if the concentration of the class is Monday/Wednesday mornings. And that’s why we think that Monday/Wednesday/Friday is going to work if they go to 50-minute. Have we thought about if some of these classes they can actually move to Tuesday/Thursday either empty classrooms, or even on Monday/Wednesday in the evening as potential options? And I guess that goes back to what Susan mentioned that we can ask for volunteers for those who are teaching on Monday/Wednesday, I think we said before noon it is the main problem, and see how many of these classes we can accommodate in a different way, and then move forward.

Because one of my concerns with the Friday is partly what Avery said but it’s mainly for students who are working, and I think the letter from the English was also mentioning it. Some students they need to work. And they know that they are taking the Friday’s so that they can work the whole day. But now if we say you need to take classes, well some of the employers might say, well, if you cannot do your shift, I can find someone else who is going to be able to do it. So, that’s a different complication over there.

Senator Mainieri: Just very quickly. I have lots to say about the different ideas. I had the privilege of being part of the work group, right, thinking about the calendar. So, I know all the different ideas that the Provost office have been working through and trying to problematize. Right. For me, I just want to reiterate that when I think about a discussion on Senate floor I don’t think it should just focus on Monday/Wednesday/Friday, right, particularly because I think there’s a lot of misinformation going around about what is actually on the table in terms of that possible change. But, you know, for me, hearing from Provost Tarhule today, right, that the message to the chairs and directors was, hey, we know that your unit has its own context, right, and its own issues that are going to be so different from other units, so here are some ideas to consider. Can you go back and consider them within your own context and then come back with some ideas for us? Right. That seems like a very sound approach to me. But I wouldn’t have known really that that approach is happening if I weren’t sitting in this meeting today. Right. So, I wonder if sharing some of those, not just Monday/Wednesday/Friday, right, but I know that there were other ideas that were shared maybe with chairs and directors to be considering. And also sharing that the attempt is being made to keep these decisions as local as possible. Right. To acknowledge the differences between units, I think, is also a really important message that I got out of today’s conversation that I think the larger campus community would really like to hear is happening. So, I just want to put that out there. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Let me follow up with a couple of things before, I think Dr. Tarhule was about to speak. But as I’ve been listening, I’ve been writing some things down. I just want to clarify that although I brought up the history, this is also about pedagogical and workload issues in a number of different ways. As Brian pointed out to me privately it got dropped on us as we were supposed to be going into our two days of rest mental health days. It also is affecting staff in my department and in other departments who are going to have to scramble about this. So, I just wanted to put that out, that, yes, there is a history but the reason there’s a history is more important than the history itself. The reason there’s a history is because of the pedagogical and workload issues.

The second thing that I wanted to observe to the Provost has to do with the time versus space problems. So, to me the space issue is actually strangely a little but easier because we’re not actually eliminating two space with one class when we schedule a 75-minute class as long as we are scheduling all of the 75-minute classes in the same spaces and all of he 50-minute classes in other spaces. That got brought up many years ago, a decade ago when this first came to us. And so, I just wanted to point that out that that needs to be done smartly, you know, on the backend because I’m pretty sure it’s not being done smartly because of the haphazard way that this has grown up. Right? And so, that’s one of the ways to sort of address that.

The time issue is a different one. One of the things I would say about that is that we are more concerned about the face-to-face for first year and second year students, some of whom will not have had any face-to-face this year. I have a couple of students in my class who have never seen our campus. And they’re transfer students or they’re in their first year and they don’t know what ISU looks like, they’ve never walked on our campus, and so it’s as much the second years as the first years, and in some cases the transfer students. But one of the things that I’d like on the backend before the next meeting to be thought about, if it hasn’t been already, is how can we start with 100 level classes, with the classes that are mostly frosh and sophomore, and not have to disrupt every single Monday/Wednesday class, even if this turns out to be Monday/Wednesday converted to Monday/Wednesday/Friday only.

I wanted to also say these kinds of discissions that are made during these kinds of times can lead to permanency. That’s actually how we got our current schedule because Schroeder Hall was being renovated and we had to go to a Monday/Wednesday, Tuesday/Thursday schedule at that time almost 20 years ago, or maybe 15 years ago, because Schroeder was one of the two largest classroom buildings in the University and they couldn’t find the space. So, we used to have a little bit more of a regular schedule. We went to a little bit less of that. And because it was actually better for a lot of departments it caught on.

Dimitrios had mentioned the moving of the Monday/Wednesday to Tuesday/Thursday. So, that would help in some instances. But in our major you would basically, if all of the Monday/Wednesday classes moved into Tuesday/Thursday, you have students who cannot take what they want to take. So, one of the things that spreading it out from Monday/Wednesday and Tuesday/Thursday does is allows our English majors to have a lot more choice and be able to get through their major with the preferred courses that they need and in the wonderful time to degree that we can boast of. And so, in some cases that solution would work. In other cases, it would not work. One of the things that could work is moving some of the morning Monday/Wednesdays into late afternoons and early evening Monday/Wednesdays because we haven’t yet opened up the idea about, you know, partial early evening classes as a possible solution.

And then I would also just mention, Tracy had said about local conversations, English is not having one. Our leader probably for good reasons has been trying to keep our email to a minimum, keep our meetings to a minimum because we’re in a pandemic. But this conversation, if it’s supposed to be going on locally, it’s only happening at the top top administrative levels of departments. It is not happening, as far as I know, on the ground. And I think what we’re talking about is that sometimes the people who are in administrative roles do not know all of the issues or are not bringing up in their minds all of the issues that the faculty and students would know by heart. And so, I will just say, you know, this has come up through English, but other than information conversations, English is not having a formal brainstorming about this. So, if the directors and chairs are supposed to be doing that with their faculty we need to have a directive to those chairs and directors to be doing that, because I don’t think we would have known about this except that Brian Rejack happens to be our associate chair who does our schedule; and in many departments the chairperson does the schedule rather than the associate chair. And so, we wouldn’t have known that this was going on until it already happened because only the administrators would have known about it.

So, let’s go back… let me make sure that either the Provost or other people didn’t want to say anything more before we go back to the tabled agenda.

Provost Tarhule: Susan, I agree with many of the points that you raise. The one hour versus the 75-minutes problem, would not be a problem at all if we have a block of time that says all classes in this timeframe are 75-minutes. And that’s why in many schools you have Tuesday and Thursday set aside for that. Because if you mix, it’s the mixing that is the problem. It’s not the 75-minute that is the problem. And what we have is this, a lot of mixed classes. When you have one-hour class and the next one is 75-minutes. It’s not only a space time issue, it’s actually a student success issue as well. Because the students can’t take the classes that they would have taken next because you kill the space, you kill the time slot, and you killed the opportunities for students to take any class that follows. So, that is the issue. If we could say from Wednesday 2:00 p.m. for example all classes are 75-minutes, and in the morning from 8:00-2:00 p.m. all classes are one-hour. That would be fine, and this would not be a discussion. But when you say one class at 9:00 a.m. is one hour, the next one is one hour fifteen minutes, that’s where the inefficiency arises, in terms of time.

I think about the University as a whole. Right. If you see, just not to call on you guys, but if you look at all the objections that we have discussed in this meeting it’s all about the challenge to departments and faculty and students and we haven’t talked very much about the students coming in and the need to make sure we get as many of those in-person as holds. So, would say that if we need to make that happen there’s got to be, something has to give somewhere, and the question is what can give? What are we willing to give to make sure it would bring in more students and give them that in-person opportunity?

And I couldn’t agree with you more, Susan, within my office we are, I think, even more concerned about the students going to year two than the ones coming in for exactly the reasons that you have mentioned. Some of them have not seen the University at all. They haven’t yet learned how to study in the University. So, given that increase, making sure they have as many options as possible would be beneficial.

I don’t want to defend the directors, with respect to your last comment here, but the meeting we had was on Friday with the directors. That was Friday, maybe 2:00 p.m. and this is Monday. So, if the directors haven’t yet called their departments to a meeting, maybe they’re still working on it. It’s really just been a weekend. So, there may yet be time for them to do that. I will say, again, that that meeting was very productive. I came away feeling very encouraged that people knew exactly what the challenges were, and they were all willing, they were suggesting all kinds of things, they’d talk to their departments to help the situation. I really like that spirit. People were thinking about, here’s what we can do to help the University as a whole. So, that’s were we are. I’m really just asking for departments to look at how they operate and come up with suggestions that will help us solve this problem. Will we solve all of it? I don’t know. But if we can reduce a good amount of it so that at once we have to deal with is a little bit more manageable, that would be encouraging. We will meet again I think by Thursday this week at which point maybe we have heard more from the state, if not maybe people have had more time to process what we discussed and to think about what might or might not work for their departments, and we will continue that discussion then.

Senator Kalter: I’m going to object to the suggestion in any way that the people on this committee do not think about the University as a whole. The longer that people are on the Executive Committee the more we think about the University as a whole. And I hear every single person here, I believe, talk about concerns about our students. What I object to also is the characterization coming out of some of the Provost’s office staff that student success can only be thought of in one way. We are talking about student success here. We’re talking about potential roadblocks to student success, that’s how Avery began was student success. So, a very narrow definition of student success is beginning to be promulgated in this University and I think that that is sort of dangerous. I am mostly concerned about the student success in English and that’s what I talked about most. So, I just want to correct those two things for the record. We always try to look at the whole University here, and if we’re coming from particular points of view on it, that’s because those points of view speak to the whole not because we’re neglecting the whole. Larry, you were going to say something.

President Dietz: I wish I could say I’ve listened a lot, and learned a lot, and I have this magical solution to the dilemma that we all have, and obviously I don’t. But I have listened a lot, and I have learned a lot, and I think this kind of discussion is an important piece of all of this. We’re going to continue to push for this distance piece with the IBHE and with the Governor’s office. I think if we had a discussion next Wednesday, I think it would be productive. So, I know the Provost is working hard. His staff is working hard. And I know that Provost Tarhule is transparent in what he does. And so, I think though we can learn from each other with this kind of a discussion and hopefully we’ll come to some solution. It probably won’t be just one. It may be several.

I agree with Tracy to the extent that we can solve these issues at the local level, if you will, departmental level that would be terrific. But we really collectively have to come together to see if we can’t solve the larger issue which is basically to try to serve the students that are here, making sure that we’re concerned about their retention. But that we also not have this 20% reduction in enrollment, because that would be a significant piece for the fall. So, I know that we’re all wanting good things to come out of this and my sense is if we keep talking good things will.

Senator Kalter: All right.

Motion by Senator Horst, seconded by Senator Mainieri, to un-table the proposed Senate agenda. The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: Let’s see. We’re going back to the question about whether we should flip the script and also now where we should put the discussion about this? I would suggest putting it in Administrator Remarks as the most efficient. Right? So, underneath Dr. Tarhule’s name put a line there about discussion of Monday/Wednesday, Monday/Wednesday/Friday scheduling, but I think I want to accept Senator Mainieri’s suggestion that maybe we should word it in a different way. Right? That maybe instead of wording it like that, we should talk about scheduling and space logistics for the fall so that it’s a much broader discussion than whether or not it’s Monday/Wednesday, Monday/Wednesday/Friday. Does that sound good to people? Okay. Lots of nods. Good. So, I think Cera got that on the recording. So, now the question is should we move anything in the agenda for example moving either just the Engineering stuff up or just the Action Items up before Chairperson’s Remarks?

President Dietz: I would encourage moving Engineering up just simply because it’s been up before, and we spent two good and long meetings discussing that. So, I think we ought to probably keep it kind of where it’s been so hopefully, we can wrap that up. I guess my question was how do you perceive this ending up satisfactorily? Would it be an endorsement? I’m sure some of this will come from the group, but how do you see this… the culmination, at least at this point of the discussion, about Engineering?

Senator Kalter: I think that we would do approvals for both of the… you know, we would do approvals certainly for the organizational change and I would say it the same way for the capital plan.

President Dietz: Okay. Very good. Me too. Thanks.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Anybody want to make an argument for moving any of the other Action Items up or should we leave those the same?

Senator Mainieri: I was going to advocate for what President Dietz just suggested, to move the Engineering up but leave everything else the same, because I think in terms of timing the discussion that we just had and will continue on Wednesday obviously is urgent. So, that would be my suggestion.

Senator Kalter: Sounds good. Does anybody object to that? Just keeping all the Action Items where they are, except for Engineering? All right. We’ll, again, I think we have that as an Information/Action Item. I only had one other question and this one can be taken care of outside the meeting. But I just wanted to say about the tabled one, I think we need to check in Robert’s Rules of Order whether we should put that on the agenda as tabled or whether it should go back on as Action Item or what have you. I don’t think we’ve ever seen tabled on the agenda before, so I’m not sure what’s appropriate there, but I have a feeling that we ought to put it under Action and just note in parentheses or something that it was tabled rather than having that be a separate title. All right.

The motion to approve the amended Senate agenda was unanimously approved.

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Nahm, seconded by Senator Horst, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.