**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

**MONDAY, March 30, 2020**

**by Zoom**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

Academic Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

Senator Kalter: So, I’m going to call the meeting to order, and let everyone know the reason I’m on twice is because I’ve been having connectivity problems. So, sometimes both computers go out, but on a good day one computer goes out and the other one is still there. So, if I disappear or you can’t hear me, I might come back on, or if not, Martha can sort of take over while I’m trying to get back on. And just to, again, let everyone know Cera does not have audio, so she’s going to be with us by chat.

***Oral Communications:***

Senator Kalter: And I wanted to start with some Oral Communications. Just reminding everybody, because it was on my calendar for this week, but the budget meetings for Academic Affairs have been postponed, as far as I understand it. Is that right, Jan?

Provost Murphy: We’ll meet with the deans… we have Deans Council on Wednesday morning just to see from their perspective how they wanted to move forward with those. If they want to do them as Zoom live presentations, if they’d rather record a Zoom presentation and post it, or if they’d rather postpone them and do those later this summer. So, we’re going to see, kind of, get some input from them.

Senator Kalter: Great. And then the other Oral Communication, I just got this from Amy Hurd, who’s on with us as a guest so that she can help us with the pass/fail conversation later on. The search for the AVP for Student Success was suspended essentially. And she’s decided to appoint Amelia Noel-Elkins as the interim Director of Student Success. And then also appoint another person to take Amelia’s place as the Director of University College. Amy, did you want to say anything else about that?

Senator Hurd: Not really. You know, we just decided it was going to be too hard. We couldn’t get people in here, and we had external candidates and I didn’t really feel comfortable doing a Zoom interview and offering it… if I offered a job to someone outside here, them taking it and never stepping foot on campus. So, we’ll just… we’ll do an interim for two years, get the office established, and then do a search.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Thank you.

***Distributed Communications:***

***02.01.18.10 From Academic Affairs Committee: Policy 4.1.4 Dress Codes CURRENT (Information Item 04/08/20)***

***03.05.20.01 From Academic Affairs Committee: Policy 4.1.4 Dress Codes AAC MARK UP (Information Item 04/08/20)***

***03.05.20.02 From Academic Affairs Committee: Policy 4.1.4 Dress Codes AAC CLEAN Copy (Information Item 04/08/20)***

Senator Kalter: We’re going to start by getting through our March 16 agenda. So, we’re going to start with the Dress Code policy. And basically, as we go, we’re going to ask the question whether or not this is ready and appropriate for the April 8 meeting. So, I’m going to turn that over to Dimitrios, with the comment that I have two minor comments about it.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. So, we saw this policy last year, and we also discussed it during fall. So, what we did, we looked at all comments we got from last year, all the comments we got from the fall. We tried to incorporate all of them in the policy. Then we sent it to Legal to make sure that there were not issues, because when we’re talking about OSHA and we require something, we were not sure if there are any legal implications. So Wendy Smith looked over it and what you have in front of you, it’s pretty much all the comments that we have received incorporated with the approval of Legal.

Senator Kalter: And you’re recommending that we do this on the 8th, right?

Senator Nikolaou: Yes. So, that… I was thinking that we should try and put it for voting, you know, it may be a favorite one, it may be against it, but either way to put it for a vote for the Senate this year, because we already have comments from the previous year, and we have comments from this year. So, if we postpone it for the fall and we have new Senators coming in, then we are going to get probably a different set of comments, and the policy is just going to be going and going for forever. And that’s why the idea is to try and put it on the floor during the spring.

Senator Horst: Is the next meeting the last meeting with the current student Senators?

Senator Kalter: No. We have, well, depends on how we go, because we could decide that it would be best to try to get business through efficiently on the 8th so that we could potentially cancel the late April meeting. So, one option would be to do it as an Information Item, but because it’s had so many Information Items, immediately move it to Action if there are no controversies. But no, the late April meeting is the last one with all of the “old Senators.” (Pause) All right. It looks like that’s an agreement to put it on the agenda that way, and to potentially move it to Action the next time.

The two comments that I had, we need to get a cleaner, new markup. In other words, not a clean copy, but this markup has multiple iterations that are not showing the actual difference between the current copy and what will becoming the clean copy. So, I think we either need to not distribute this one, or in addition distribute a mark-up that’s a real mark-up, that shows just the changes from the current to the clean. So, if you… I’m trying to think the most efficient way to do this. My recommendation would just be to have one mark up. Does anybody have any objection to that? (Pause) Okay. Great. So, we’ll make another mark-up that gets rid of all the sort of history of comments, and have that one go to the floor. And then there was one comment that was there that says, “What if the external entity does not require something?” I think it was the dress codes that might come out of external standards. Can departments and units require based on internal standards?” And I don’t know, Dimitrios, if that needs to be discussed on the floor, but I kind of was resolving it in my head as that’s taken care of by number three, so that that might be a comment that’s already been dealt with. But I just wanted to know if that’s something that we need to call attention to?

Senator Nikolaou: Partly, that’s when Wendy came to our meeting and we were talking about the policy. Because if you see it, that’s why it is this mark-up. Before, it was saying likewise obligatory. And then Wendy put this comment saying, well, what if the outside entity does not require it. And that’s why it was changed to, “typically required by contractual agreement with the entity.” So that… that’s what the comment represents, that before it said “obligatory,” she had this question, and then it was rephrased to represent that. It might be, but it’s not necessarily always the case that it is required.

Senator Kalter: Okay. So, it sounds like it doesn’t need to be brought up on the floor unless somebody had a question about it, but we won’t call attention to it necessarily.

Senator Nikolaou: And when I create… I’m assuming I’m going to create the mark up, right?

Senator Kalter: No, Cera will create the mark up.

Senator Nikolaou: Oh, okay. Because I was not planning to not have all the comments on the side. All the comments on the side, it was for the Exec just to see all the changes that have taken place. And then, on the floor, I’m going to refer to some of the big ones.

Senator Kalter: Terrific. Okay, great. So that one will go on the agenda.

***03.10.20.03 From Martha Horst: Policy 6.1.37 Naming of University Facilities and Entities Mark Up MCH Motion (Information Item 04/08/20)***

***03.10.20.04 From Martha Horst: Gies renaming at U of I (Information Item 04/08/20)***

Senator Kalter: The next one is the Naming of University Facilities and Entities policy, and I’ll turn that over to David.

Senator Marx: All right, last time at the Senate meeting, we had Martha propose an addition to the policy, in terms of requesting a written report from the entity that might be named. That is included in the mark-up that we have for our folder today. The AABC is in favor of this proposed change.

Senator Kalter: So, it started on the floor as a regular amendment, but we’ll be able to shift it to a friendly amendment.

Senator Marx: Yes. The committee voted that they’re in agreement with it.

Senator Mainieri: I wonder if, and I don’t know if it would be Martha or David, if you can provide just a little bit more context as to, in the amendment, it mentions proposed naming from the leadership within the entity and tenured faculty. And I wondered what the kind of thought process was behind only listing tenured faculty?

Senator Horst: That was a suggestion from Senator Kalter.

Senator Kalter: No, it was a… I think you had put it as, how did you put it? “Senior faculty” in your original.

Senator Marx: Right. Senior faculty.

Senator Kalter: And so, afterwards I suggested that senior was not specific enough, and that if that’s what you want was senior faculty that it should probably say something like tenured faculty.

Senator Horst: Right.

Senator Kalter: But that was not my idea. That was, I think, coming from the original amendment.

Senator Marx: Right.

Senator Horst: Okay.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah, I guess I wonder if we’re going to add this in, I wonder if there is a specific reason why we need to limit where the leadership within the entity is getting the feedback from? Because depending on the entity, non-tenure track faculty, other instructors could have just as much stake and input into that decision.

Senator Horst: I would just say my general perception is that tenured faculty might be a bit more straightforward, and not perceiving that if they give input that’s not what they’re thinking the administration might be wanting to hear, that they feel that their tenure case is in jeopardy. So, the perception of senior faculty and tenured faculty is that they would be the longest serving and the most secure in giving an honest opinion.

Senator Marx: Yeah. And I think we do want to limit the amount of people involved in knowing what’s going on too, because of the confidentiality part of this.

Senator Ferrence: Thanks for that clarification, David, because I was thinking, oh, there’s nothing to stop them from sending out a general message to the department to have anybody’s feedback. But, right, you don’t want the entire feedback of everybody because you don’t want to make a public announcement effectively that you’re considering something.

Senator Horst: It’s been a while, but I can’t remember what my amendment said, but I think it said… it still says that the department will develop procedures. Is that right, David?

Senator Marx: Yeah, I think it was the college.

Senator Horst: Yeah. So, a particular college, for instance Nursing comes to mind, might come up with a different kind of process.

Senator Mainieri: I think, to that point, maybe in the actual policy then, we should leave it a bit more broad, to allow the college or entity to come up with a process that best reflects their make up. I just worry that they’re, you know, just depending on the entity, there could be different stake holders that might be most appropriate to ask, given the donor or whatever the case may be.

Senator Horst: So, senior faculty (in most cases senior or tenured faculty)? Something like that?

Senator Kalter: So, I’m a little uncomfortable debating it as Exec. I’m wondering if we should put it out on the floor and have Tracy offer an amendment?

Senator Mainieri: I’ll do that. I just wanted to just get kind of… I wanted to understand the background as to the current wording before I thought about an amendment.

Senator Ferrence: The wording doesn’t really preclude others from being involved, it’s just that the people that are writing the letter would be the leadership and the tenured faculty.

Senator Marx: That’s correct.

Senator Ferrence: Which to me makes a lot of sense, not to debate here, but the point being that we’d want to be somewhat consistent with who were the people that were asked to be the writers of such a report.

Senator Kalter: And it sounds like you’re setting out a minimum but that the college deans and/or the chair/ director could discretely ask for other people’s opinions.

Senator Mainieri: I appreciate the information, and I will consider whether and what type of amendment I would propose on the floor.

Senator Kalter: The other thing I was thinking, Tracy, is that you might want to consult with Dr. Dietz. In other words, if you can write an amendment before the meeting and send it to him and me, and David, and Martha since she’s the proposer of the amendment, because the President has been emphasizing the need for confidentiality, so to make sure that we don’t end up debating something that’s not going to fly. That’d be great.

Senator Mainieri: For sure. Thanks.

Senator Kalter: Awesome. Anybody else have anything on that one? (Pause) Because unfortunately, I have a bunch of stuff on that one. Larry, it looks like you might have had something. Do you want to unmute yourself?

President Dietz: Okay. I just want to say that I think this is a better policy. I know we’ve had a lot of back and forth, and I think this is a better policy than the one we had. And I just hope we have a lot of opportunities to test this out.

Senator Marx: Hear, hear.

Senator Kalter: Awesome. I think mine are all quick. First one is that given it’s a friendly amendment, we’re also going to redo this markup, because the big box and the way it’s presented isn’t really intended… it was intended to show that it was a proposed amendment, but now that it’s a friendly amendment, we’ll make that look more incorporated into the policy. And so, Cera again, David, will be able to do that. The second thing that I want to just suggest here, and I might suggest it on the floor of the Senate is whether the 6.1.37 number is adequate given that this policy also names entities and not just facilities, and should we cross list it under the four point policies so that it’s in both places, like some of our other policies, like some AP/ civil service policies, you have two policies up, it’s basically the same policy under different numbers. So, that’s a suggestion sort of for the next week and a half to see if we can figure that out. The third one was just to make sure that we’ve checked in the, under II., third paragraph down, we say something about the President may submit the entities to the Board of Trustees as an information item only. I just want to make sure since some people use the information item in one way, and some people use it in a different way, that that’s actually the Board’s terminology for what we would call on the floor of the Senate an Advisory Item, just to make sure that’s the correct term. The fourth thing that I had was on the fifth page of the mark-up, there’s just a redundancy that can come out, where it says on the top “any member of the university community may submit a written proposal for the assignment of or change in a functional/general name with a explanation of supporting reasons,” and then you can take out the “may be submitted.”

Senator Marx: Uh-hum.

Senator Kalter: And then I think the last.. oh, that number three about the Board of Trustees as an information item is also on that same page, three paragraphs from the bottom. Within the box, the closed parentheses is after department chair/ school director, and it ought to be moved to being after tenured faculty.

Senator Marx: That’s correct.

Senator Kalter: And then finally, I think this is final, these, I think, are all editorial. On the last page under Implementation, where it says, “Upon final approval of a name for a facility or entity, the office of the President will notify the campus community of the new or changed name, any new signs, plaques, or markers shall be provided,” and rather than say that, I was going to suggest saying “and shall,” because it would be a little but clearer, right. So, “…shall be provided and shall conform.” And that was it for my editorials.

Senator Marx: Okay.

Senator Kalter: So, does everyone feel comfortable putting this one on the agenda?

Senator Marx: Yes.

Senator Kalter: All right.

President Dietz: I just want to clarify, that the language about the Board of Trustees, they don’t have Information Items the same way the Academic Senate does. So, it’s really meant ‘for their information.’ But the wording means different things for Academic Senate, so. But it’s just ‘for their information.’

Senator Kalter: That’s exactly why I wanted to check, because it’s not for their debate or getting questions, comments, or suggestions.

President Dietz: No. There are other things that I submit to them that I need their approval on, but other things, like this one, I wouldn’t.

Senator Kalter: Awesome.

***04.02.16.01 From Faculty Affairs Committee: Policy 3.2.8 Sabbatical Leave Current Copy (Faculty Caucus)***

***03.10.20.01 From Faculty Affairs Committee: Policy 3.2.8 Sabbatical Leave Mark Up (Faculty Caucus)***

***03.10.20.02 From Faculty Affairs Committee: Policy 3.2.8 Sabbatical Leave Clean Copy (Faculty Caucus)***

***03.16.20.03 From Senator Kalter: Items raised on the floor of the Senate or Caucus with respect to proposed changes to the Sabbatical Policy***

Senator Kalter: All right. Next one is the Sabbatical policy. My view about this is that we probably shouldn’t even talk about this today, because it’s not ready. Of the 21 items that got contributed from the floor, or in other ways, I think only five or six of them were addressed clearly. Plus, it seems to me that this is going to cause a lot of conversation on the floor, and that we won’t have time for it. And that it’s not really a policy that’s urgent to change this year. So, that’s my recommendation. What do people think?

Senator Ferrence: Well, I want to just input quickly because I agree. Because if we were doing it still this year, I’d be putting a line of questioning in, so for those approved for sabbatical in the fall who were planning to travel internationally all this summer and all this fall, what do we have in it? But by the time we hit fall, the point will be moot. I hope. Right. Because the question is of course relating back to the, you know, that issue that was brought up of, can somebody defer a sabbatical, and then not have the clock be pushed back, and this is a great example coming up. Now, I might be the only one, there might be only a few of us, but, you know, there are people that were planning sabbaticals for this fall that are approved, and you don’t really want to short them a year, but on the other hand, is it a must that they all head out and do what they propose to do this fall given that circumstances are a little unknown right now. It’s a small subset of people, but I think that’s where it’s worth waiting on the policy, because some of the things that aren’t fully answered in there, and where some of the discussion is. What about exceptional circumstances? And to be discussing exceptional circumstances right now and something like sabbatical, seems a little bit… I don’t want to say petty, but you know, down in the weeds from the things that we should be thinking about right now.

Senator Kalter: Um-hum. Looks like we have agreement about that one. So, let’s move past it quickly.

***03.12.20.03 From Associate Provost Ani Yazedjian: Request for additional one-year term Academic Planning Committee for 2020-2021 (Information Item 04/08/20)***

Senator Kalter: The next one I think we can also move past quickly. It’s from Ani Yazedjian requesting an additional Academic Planning Committee for 2020-2021. This happened probably eight years ago, or so. And we just have… because we have an eight-year cycle on IBHE program reviews, sometimes things bottleneck, and so we have this one year right now where there are more self-studies coming in than one committee can really handle. In fact, we just barely got through our agenda this year, I think, I can’t even remember whether it’s half the proposals or what, but. So, Ani is just, as, I think, eight years ago, it was probably Jan who was asking, if I remember correctly, they are asking for a second APC. Any conversation about this one? (Pause) Good to go on the agenda? (Pause) Great. Okay.

***03.26.20.01 From Senate office: Recommendations for Pass\_no Pass from Q&A (Information/Action Item 04/08/20)***

***03.23.30.01 From Senator Jacob Rottinghaus: Email ISU Pass Fail petition(Information/Action Item 04/08/20)***

***03.25.20.01 From Amy Hurd: Email Hurd ISU Pass Fail(Information/Action Item 04/08/20)***

***03.25.20.02 From Amy Hurd: P-NP advisor feedback (Information/Action Item 04/08/20)***

***03.25.20.03 From David Marx: Email Marx ISU Pass Fail feedback (Information/Action Item 04/08/20)***

Senator Kalter: So, we get to the main event here. So, we want to talk about the pass/ no pass recommendations, and all of the stuff that goes along with them, because it’s also WX recommendations, and all of that. And in general, what is… how does the Senate play a role? What’s the timing? What are the mechanisms? Are meetings our only options? Should we have it on a meeting, or should we have some other kind of feedback? I’m not sure if I should do this now, but I sent a bunch of feedback that I collected from faculty, some of which I decided was probably not really appropriate for direct reading because faculty can say things to other faculty that they might say to other people. And so, I’ve distilled that… actually, I have two pages worth of sort of separate comments, but kind of a set of patterns. One of the pages is actually from the advisors collected by Amy Hurd, but I wrote down some of their things. And I think some of these, Amy, are students that were polled, if I read that correctly.

Dr. Hurd: Yeah. The Provost has an Advisory Council and we asked them their input, so that’s what that is.

Senator Kalter: Gotcha. So, I guess I will just go ahead and tell you what the, sort of, the basic summary was, or you know, the basic points. By far the biggest comment was a variation on “this might decrease motivation, and then therefore possibly result in more failure.” Although, I should say, actually, that’s not including the actual poll of people, which a large majority of people are in favor of this recommendation or some variation on it. Right. But the biggest detailed comment was about the potential to decrease motivation. Then the next biggest comment was the need for very thorough education of students thinking about making this choice, and a number of people suggesting that they shouldn’t be able to make the choice without having received that education through an advisor. A kind of a corollary to that was several faculty believing that it would be also imperative for the student to consult with their instructor. One that I think that was particularly salient was somebody who said that often students have inaccurate idea of where they are in the class, right. And so is there a way to make sure that they check in with the advisor, so that they don’t think they’re failing when they’re actually succeeding. Many, many people, although it wasn’t necessarily a majority, but the next, I think it was seven people, as far as I can tell, commented on not being in favor of it for graduate students. I thought that was interesting. Several people commented on the impact on the ability to learn in future courses. In other words, when you have courses that are stepping through, or where you need it either as a pre req, or because it provides a foundation, people commented on that. Several people commented on whether it decreased rigor, standards, whether it would decrease learning in general. Let’s see. Oh, sorry. Even with the issue of graduate students and some of the people who did not agree with that, several people were concerned that there would be confusion about the “D” being a no-pass rather than being a pass. Let’s see.

So, let me then just start going down and reading some of the other types of things that we got. An idea that there should be, and I’ve seen that there are some universities doing this, a window after grades are in to decide rather than just one beforehand. Impact on scholarships. Impact on GPA. Impact on applications to graduate, or professional school, or on employment, in other words, people concerned that it could have those impacts. One person who said half of the semester is already in, why are we doing this. One person who said, and this is kind of a variation on the first one, the current proposal does not allow you to switch back to a letter grade if you did better than you thought you were going to. One person said being without a grade can also be stressful. That students were unaware that it will not raise their GPA. The need for clarity that the changes are for spring 2020 only, not a precedent. A couple people talked about the benefits, but I won’t go over those, because we already know those. Two people saying only students excelling will keep their letter grade. One person essentially saying that a student can game the system, including being held harmless for pre-spring, in other words, work that was not done before spring break that should have been done, and then everything changed. Several people thought that there should be a shorter deadline rather than a longer deadline. That was an interesting set of comments, five people said that. Couple people gave alternatives. Those alternatives were relaxing the grading percentage structure so that what would usually be a “B+” would be an “A,” etc. Another alternative was to do a withdraw option only for individual courses or from the university, and be able to retake the dropped or failed courses for free. Another was that students with an “A” or “B” could keep that, a “C” or a “D” could opt for the pass/ no pass, and that only an “F” should be a non-passing grade. And then, another alternative was a “D” or an “F” would not count towards the GPA, the student could repeat for free. The second grade would replace the first, and we would write our software so that either grade can show, and the student requests a specific copy. That one was a pretty complicated one.

One person entered a concern about whether this impacts our deans’ lists. A couple people said it could send the message that gen ed is not important, or please don’t send that message. Some people said that there are some more privileged students who are not having as much work now, and so they should be able to excel. That professors are already relaxing their expectations. That there could be problems for programs with licensure requirements, I think Amy has checked those through fairly well. That we might need to exempt certain courses. There were some people who thought that we should leave it up to the departments, leave it up to them for majors course, or make an exception for majors courses, which of course is the opposite of the gen ed comment. Some people wondering why we would only allow 12 credits. One person who said, the students already think it’s a done deal. One person who said if you reduce the pressure on students, you should reduce the pressure on instructors. They should not be expected anymore to comment carefully, or grade carefully, given that the students are not expected to meet the same expectations. And another person who said, you’ll be adding to faculty workloads in courses that progress, so that if the students don’t learn what they need to learn for the next course, then you’ll have to add that to the next course. Some people said professors should decide course by course if they want it to be allowed in their own courses. Some people said not to allow it for advanced or senior hour courses. Some people commented, I think I already said this, on time to degree, negative impacts on that. One person said that we might have it counted against our DFW rating as professors. One person said poor performers will choose it. Another person said faculty and student morale will suffer. More students may fail. That it sends group work into untenable situations. The departments need to discuss how to support students, that was on the more positive side, assuming that it was going to go the way it was verbatim. That students would risk having worked their butt off the first half of the semester, and then lose that progress.

That some people… I think three people said that we should limit it to circumstances. In other words, do it on a case by case basis for illness, family illness, no access to technology, and things like that. Couple people said we should refund tuition and fees, lab fees specifically. One person wanted us to require participation; I thought that was a terrible idea. But, no editorializing here. Some people entered, again, issues specific to teacher ed programs, worries about that. One said (actually, this was from my department), students between course work and student teaching who are on probation would not be able to raise their GPA in the student teaching course. Uncertainty about whether it is “B,” was talking about GPAs, as opposed to some of the other things we’ve seen them talking about. People worried about the financial impact of the withdrawal decisions. Some people said it hurts high performing, motivated students. Will pressure faculty to turn a “D” into a “P.” That faculty should respond by increasing rigor and expectations, that was an interesting one. That it works better for some classes than others, this was specific to Studio Art versus Art Education. That is makes it harder to encourage students to switch majors in time in order to make a good career decision, I think that was specific to ed courses. Three people asked, where are we on any policy change for incompletes. For graduate students, why wouldn’t we just give an “A” or a “B” if the student earned it? How does the probation extension work for graduate students? I had a couple of questions from Physics, which voted five to one in favor, with two people ambivalent, and those questions were, will the 25 total pass/fail hours be raised, and how much work are faculty expected to do to calculate grades prior to April 30. One suggestion, this one is from me, actually, to change the April 30 date to May 1, because it’s a Friday. And then, that a “P” for a grad student could be interpreted by some as a “C” rather than a “B,” that that wouldn’t be good for employment. And so that was the faculty comment, although some of those were also APs who teach.

The advisor comments I thought were very, some of them were quite important, but it was also mixed in with student comment. How is this going to impact their workload? What are the implications on dismissal and reinstatement? Can students on probation repeating a course do a P/NP, given that they can’t right now? Nine people, I think, most of these were students wanting to be able to change after grades are in, rather than only changing before. By the way, I saw another university that disallowed once you change, you can’t change back. I thought that was also a bad idea, actually. Would students who switch back to a “D” go on probation and dismissal if they’re already on probation; I think that was. What are the ramifications for the Repeat policy? Will advisors have to petition to get Campus Solutions to accept these courses as pre-reqs or graduation reqs? How much people power hours is gonna to be expended on that? What about courses already online, should they be switched? There’s something about group one gen eds that I don’t understand, but I’ll mark that it was there. Possible time to degree for lock step majors. That it’s better to shift this advising to summer after grades are in, and fall registration is over. And that students could act on impulse. So, sorry that that was so long, but I wanted to summarize all the ones that not everyone saw. And then, it seemed to me that we’re… it boiled down to sort of four things that we ought to talk about, and another set of things that we may want to talk about. Does anybody want to say anything before I articulate those?

President Dietz: I’d like to add a little context. I brought this topic up to the presidents and chancellors’ meeting again yet today. And so, we’ve had several conversations about this whole idea. All of the public universities have adopted the concept of, some are not quite there yet, but all believe that this should be student run. Basically, the student ought to be the one that makes a decision about this, so there is continuity with that. There’s also continuity that there ought to be a pass/not pass option. There’s a little bit of variation on what all of that means. But the first one that came out was University of Illinois, that I think was the most vocal on this. The other issue that’s come out is that there’s some urgency about getting this going so the students know, kind of, where they’re headed. So, if we need to spend extra time with advisors, than we can spend that extra time educating advisors about the implications, whether that’s financial, or academic, or combinations of all of those. But that a decision needs to be made sooner versus later. Frankly, we’re not among the sooner group, because some have already done this, and they’re out there with their decisions. But I do think there’s some urgency with all of this. Where all the scenarios that you just described, there’s people in a lot of different directions and a number of people have a lot of suggestions that you couldn’t possibly integrate all of them, because some of them are just opposed to each other. So, I think the issue is as a result of some of those conversations I’d also ask Provost Murphy to in the context that some of these institutions that have moved forward before we did, is to draw some information from those, and to draft a proposal. So, that if people are upset about the proposal, I really ask her to do that because I didn’t think we were going to be able to write something within a reasonable timeframe that would essentially bring all of these ideas together. So, what she’s done is to put the proposal together, and, Jan, you can talk about this later if you want to. But the proposal really reflects quite a bit of the University of Illinois proposal that they implemented. And I think there’s one institution that has done the wait until the end of the semester, and that’s Northern Illinois University. Most of the rest are somewhere in the middle, and some have not… I’d say maybe of the 12 institutions, maybe four have not decided yet, but a lot are trying to wrestle with this week and make a decision this week on this issue. So, and I think those other four will probably come along with that too. And then, I asked Jan to, you know, not only develop a proposal, but to share that with department heads, and others, and try to get feedback from faculty and in that way. So, I think we are kind of where we are. If this group, I’m not trying to cut discussion short on this at all, because it’s not my prerogative to do that, but I do think, you know, there’s several options for the group. You don’t have to make a recommendation on this if you don’t want to. If you want to make a recommendation, I certainly am very open to that. But if you don’t want to do that, I think the most important thing is that people get an opportunity to provide feedback, and we’ve got quite a bit of that. And so, I think though it’s going to be important to make a decision on this within the next day or two. That’s the general context I want to provide.

Senator Ferrence: So, thanks, Larry, for the comments. I think, one of the things I want to capture on mic here just for the record, because this… I’ve read everything that you’ve sent my way, Susan, so there’s lots of comments in there. And part of this discussion, we have to be careful, because it runs the same hazard as when you lecture in a large course, and you get 150 students saying, hey, that was a great course, and then you get a few nay-sayers and the DFSC gives a balanced response saying some people were favorable and some people were against, and you’re like that wasn’t even proportional. And I think that overwhelmingly, I saw positive comments and general in favor, and then each faculty member in particular offering, as all of us faculty do, some tweak, because clearly if we didn’t give some suggestion how to change something, we haven’t done our job. And I also know that like when I was collecting from my department I kind of said, well, I had, you know, a bunch of people that all said yeah, it’s good and it’s fine, and then here were some of the specific comments where people had suggestions for improvements. So, I just wanted to capture that. I think the overarching consensus is good job, well thought through. And what I saw was, although lots of people had lots of suggestions, like Larry pointed out, they kind of go in, what I would refer to as mutually orthogonal directions. You know, we need to give it to everybody and no one. We need to back up the timeline, move the timeline forward, and so, by the time I integrate all that, I think pretty much where Jan’s document came down as a proposal in my mind is really, you know, where we ought to be. But I do think it’s important discussing, and I’m in favor of us taking a position just from the point of view of, I heard something the other day about legislation from the top down, you know, like a dictum for the world from the top down doesn’t work well, but when local groups make decisions, ideally they end up making the same decision, and it looks like it came from a dictum on high. And that really is a paraphrase, or a rephrasing of shared governance, right. Is that something was put together, and then people have looked at it, and given some thought, and I think on balance they’re kind of going, well, if I was the ruler of the world I’d tweak it here and there. But overall, I think we have more buy in than it might appear.

Senator Horst: I would like the Academic Senate to weigh in on this, and I’m wondering, I appreciate that there’s a short timeline, and that students need to know the choices, and I’m wondering if we can have some sort of Zoom meeting in the next 48 hours. And have a discussion just on this.

Senator Mainieri: I wonder since the proposal was sent out for feedback, based on the feedback that has been received, have there been any tweaks to what the proposal is moving forward? Just so that we know what we’re talking about here.

Dr. Hurd: Two things really. I think one version that went out early set a limit on 12 hours, and we ended up changing that, because we can’t figure out how to do it in the system to monitor it, so we just have to open up to all hours. And there was one version that said that the advisors would have to approve, and that would be okay when we have decent advising loads in some departments, but some departments just don’t have the advisors to do that. But students would be strongly recommended to talk to their advisors, because we would not want them to make a bad choice. Now, I’ve started drafting what I think an FAQ should look like for the students, especially based on those comments from the advisors, because they just know how the students think. So, really that’s all that it was, the only difference between the two, from what Jan sent and what Susan sent.

Provost Murphy: I think the May 1 deadline makes more sense than April 30. I don’t think April 30 was a magic number, other than also try to work with Charley Edamala and Jess Ray to figure out what the system would support. So, you know, there were a lot of comments that were, you know, people that wanted the deadline sooner, people that wanted the deadline after grades were submitted, but really part of that May 1 deadline will be what our system will support and not require a manual input of all of these conversions. What was the other… you know, we heard a little bit of comment about the graduate, you know, whether or not we would do this for graduate, and, again, we heard positives and negatives about that, so I think that’s one where we really didn’t… I didn’t change it yet, because I wasn’t quite sure what this conversation would be like, and again I heard both. I’m trying to think if there is anything else. Some of the comments that we heard, really, I think, are already answered in the proposal. So you know one of the things we know is that students on probation, we’re not going to see a change in their GPA if they take their classes as pass/no-pass, so part of the proposal was to extend their probationary period by one semester. So, I think there were a lot of answers in that already, so we’re not proposing any changes, other than what Amy has mentioned. And again, I think the May 1 deadline makes more sense. That’s a better solution there.

Senator Mainieri: The reason I ask is when we think about gathering everyone for Zoom meeting to talk about this and in terms of timeliness, right, it doesn’t seem like there’ve been huge changes between what was sent out, where everyone had the chance to give feedback including Senators, and what would be on the table now. And so, I wonder, you know, I agree with Greg that I think that having some type of Senate position would be helpful, but I wonder if there’s a possibility to do just more of a vote, as opposed to a lengthy debate. It seems like we’ll just get the same feedback that everyone’s been receiving. There seem to be a lot of similar comments.

Senator Nikolaou: So, for the point that Tracy also made, I was thinking that since the Provost sent the email specifically to the Senators asking for feedback, and also sent them to Susan directly, we have an idea of what part of the Senate thinks about this issue. So, I don’t know if we need a meeting for us to vote in favor or against, because I don’t think we also have the time. Let’s say, take the case where this… we say that no. What does that mean? So, we are going to be back to square one, and we’re not going to offer anything until the end of the semester. So, that’s why… because we already have heard from some of the Senators what they think. And based on what the Provost just said, and Amy Hurd also said, that there were just tiny tweaks which in essence they don’t change the content of the proposal. I don’t know if it is necessary or if, I guess, we could send it in an email just, you know, support or do not support, if we want to have a general idea, so that all the Senators say support the proposal or do not support the proposal, and that’s all, because we already have the comments.

And I had one slight question, because we’re talking about the advisors. And Amy mentioned that for some of the departments or schools there are going to be too many students compared to the advisors, and how the advisors will be able to handle all of them. So, I was thinking if some of them are going to be overloaded on top of their teaching responsibilities that they might have, have we thought, you know, if they’re overworking, are we going to compensate them somehow. Is it that we’re going to say, you may do more hours now and you can take some time off towards the end of the semester, because I don’t think that it would be fair if we are asking the advisors to do all this work, and they’re working more than what they are supposed to, and they do not see any return.

Dr. Hurd: We haven’t had that discussion yet. One of the things that I’ve thought about doing is maybe doing some, for lack of a better word, like an open forum, give the students some dates that they can come in for a Zoom meeting or something, and get some of their questions answered, and I would have several of the advisors there, because I wouldn’t be able to answer the questions that the student had for the most part. But I think we’re going to have to do a really nice job of communicating what that impact is. I can’t predict what that will be. I don’t know how many students will take advantage of it. I think a few will. But I think when they sit there and really think about it, they might find that it’s not in their best interest, grades wise, because it won’t… if they went straight across the board pass/no-pass their GPA isn’t going to move at all. And I’m guessing they’ve got some classes in there that they may want that GPA. They’re going to get an “A” or a “B” in a class, I would go that route rather than the pass/no pass, unless I’m an honors student and I don’t want a “B,” so. But yeah, I am concerned about the workload on advisors, especially places like College of Business, Psychology, Technology, where their advising load is really high.

Senator Kalter: Okay. If there aren’t any comments, let me go back to a couple things. So, I agree that it’s very important that we did poll all of the faculty, partly to make sure that they actually knew that something was going to change in their classes, specifically because we got so many comments about the potential decrease in student motivation. And I just received something, I think it was from Alan Bates over in TCH, about how in universities where they made this decision a week ago, they’re seeing fairly drastic impacts, with regard to student motivation. And then it might cause a cascade of people going to pass/no-pass because when other students are not working hard, like on group projects, it can, you know, cause that cascade while, why am I, you know, trying this or whatever. So, that was an interesting comment, and so I think it was really important for us to have put that out there. I wish it had gone out sooner, I think it should have gone out on Monday, but we are where we are with that. It went out on Thursday. I’m glad to hear about the 12-hour limit change, the May 1 change, and I’m not as happy about the advisors not being able to approve. I totally appreciate it because of their workload, so I’m happy in that way. But there was so much feedback about, really, the students should kind of be required to go through an advisor and a faculty member, just to make sure that they’re making a good decision. It’s too bad that we have this as a direct access into CS right now.

One of the things I’d like to say is, whatever happens, I think it would be really a good idea to give a heads up to the Executive Committee prior to an announcement going out so that we can help you to see whether there are problems with the announcement as it goes out, before it goes out. One of the biggest things that I wonder if we should talk about, because as Martha said, or actually it was Dimitrios just mentioned this I think, we’ve heard from some Senators but we definitely have not heard from a majority of Senators yet, which I think Jan was trying to get a majority of Senators to weigh in and that has not happened yet. So, I don’t know whether that means that they’re expecting to talk about it, if they’re not paying attention to their email, you know, what’s going on there. But the idea that many students and some universities have allowed people to change after grades are in might be something to be considered as another tweak. I know that I talked to… Amelia stayed at the kind of hang out after Wednesday’s meeting, and said, well, we will be doing that, it’s just going to be after grades are in because of running probation, and dismissal, and that kind of thing. But if the students don’t know that, it makes a difference in their decisions, and it can make a difference in their motivation. So, it might be something to really strongly consider to go with that model of having some sort of window whether it’s large or small after grades are in, so that students can basically toggle between things. And one of the worst policies that I saw go out was one were you can’t change back after you’ve made a decision. I thought that was really unwise, because people are making impulsive decisions right now, and so, it might be helpful to sort of think about that, whether that’s a tweak that we can offer or some messaging that can go out to them, like this is not the last time you’ll be able to look at this, right.

Couple of the other things I had written down is some of the main points, as opposed to the whole dross of points, messaging and education seemed like a huge concern of the people who responded, especially with regard to things like students potentially misunderstanding that a “D” is actually a non-pass. With regard to motivation, with regard to the need to talk to your instructor or advisor, and with regard to the implication for future plans and future courses. So it seems like in many ways a formal… now that we’ve had what we would call the information session among the whole faculty, a formal tweaked proposal going out to the Senators would be helpful if this committee decides, as Martha was just suggesting that Senate should weigh in. Dr. Dietz, I think, was the one who said Senate doesn’t have to weigh in as Senate, right. So, one of the things that we need to decide about is process and what should happen in a case like this, because, you know, sort of where is the decision-making role of a Senate in this kind of environment. And then the other thing was about, you know, whether the grad student recommendation is one of the tweaks that should be recommended out of this committee. I’ll mention some of the other ones I had written down, but I wanted to sort of talk about that, you know, what is our process if only six to eight Senators have even weighed in on the original set of recommendations. In other words, boiling it down to one question, should the Senate weigh in as a Senate, or should it simply be that the faculty, students, and staff gave their feedback to the President.

Senator Ferrence: You know, I think it would be useful, I hate to put the three of you on the spot, Isaac, Jalyn, and Alex, but we haven’t really heard any comment from our student people, and you might have a very different lens, because you’re having different types of conversations than we have. And it would help me to hear what your thoughts are, you know, sort of what you’re hearing from the trenches.

Senator Jones: Well, I obviously am in favor of the pass/ fail option, but I don’t plan on using the pass/ fail option. But I don’t understand why we would wait for students, like I don’t get the recommendation for students waiting until after grades have been posted to choose it, because if we’re talking morale and motivations, like I just don’t get… like I feel like this option is for students who know already that they’re not going to be able to do their best work, or give their best foot forward because of the way their classes are set up. For a lot of students, I don’t feel like that’s necessarily true, so if we have it so that grades are posted afterward, I don’t get where the motivation would come from. I mean as a student who… my first half of this semester went really well for me, I can just see there being a drop off because the idea would be, well, why would I try harder if I know that if things don’t pan out for me I can just choose this option. I mean, I’m not trying to be insensitive, because obviously I know things come up, but I feel like we’re getting away from why we’re actually doing it, and it just seems like… I don’t know.

Senator Kalter: Jalyn, let me clarify, that suggestion was not to only have it afterwards, but to also have it afterwards. In other words, there is a risk that a student might pick a pass/no-pass and then find out they got a “B” in the class and not be able to go back.

Senator Jones: No, I like that option. I think that definitely should be… like, if we have the deadline be what it is, but then a student switched it, I think that should be a thing. But waiting is what I meant. I thought you guys were going to change the deadline.

Senator Kalter: No, I…

Senator Jones: Okay.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. It really was, why not have it be extended until after grades are in, not just stop basically at the end of Success Week, right.

Senator Jones: I guess my confusion was just about the deadline then, because… but if what you’re saying is just that making it so that students can switch then, yeah, I get that. But, yeah, my confusion was just about the deadline.

Provost Murphy: My conversation, again, with Charley Edamala today, I think I mentioned this earlier, is that he is not sure we can go beyond a May 1 deadline, that the system, Campus Solutions, would not support a later deadline. So, we’ll have to… I can check with him again, but I talked to him today.

Dr. Hurd: Yeah. Jess Ray said the same thing, and they’ve been looking into the system to see how to make that work and they’re not positive it can.

Senator Hollis: Well, what I was going to say, if we’re able to, I do like that suggestion, because I do feel that it shouldn’t be, like, completely final, like how you said, like some universities were having students not opt to change it. But for me going back, like looking at the comments, I do see more positive than negative. And then for me too, if this is something that is optional for me, the negative comments are just a little bit confusing if this is an optional thing, and it’s not like every student is being forced to do pass/ fail, it’s an optional thing. And with GPA, I have friends that was talking to me about it, and, you know, wanted updates about this because, you know, they’re actually afraid… worried about their GPA going down, and so they do want this option of pass/no-pass, because they are in classes that they needed that interaction, and it being online is going to make it more difficult for them, and so they worried about their GPA. And they are aware of the things that come from pass/ no-pass, and I do feel if we do make an announcement about it, we can include these things that come with no pass. We can create a page about it that says if you are going to make that… since it’s going to be too much work on the advisors, to talk to your advisor before making that decision, you can always create a page, like how we have the coronavirus@illinoisstate.edu page, we can always create a page that’ll let a student know what no-pass/pass entails for the students that are not familiar with those things. But for me, it seems like that the majority’s in favor for it, other universities have adapted it, and I just know from friends… because I personally, I don’t think I would be using this, but just from friends, I do know some that do need it, and the fact that a petition was made shows that other students do need this option.

Senator Jones: Yeah, I agree. I think a lot of the comments, and I think it was mostly positive, for sure. I feel like there is a consensus that this something that should pass, and the proposal should be made. But I think the few comments that were negative, I think it’s just like a lack of trust when it comes to students. And I feel like there’s kind of like an over-exaggeration of the amount of students, I think, that are actually going to choose this option. I feel like most already know if they’re able… or if they’re adapting well, because we’re in the second week, right. I think student who are going to choose this option have probably already made their minds up. So, I agree, we just need to get that literature out so that students are aware about… especially if we can’t switch, like if the deadline is where it’s at, and we can’t switch it back, we’re going to have to make it very clear the ramifications of what choosing this option is going to be.

Senator Campbell: I agree a lot with what Senator Jones and Senator Hollis are saying. I really think Senator Hollis’ idea about adding this to the website, and obviously I’m sure there would be a major email that would go out, just like the ones that we’ve seen previous. I think that education portion is key to that. Students need to know what they’re getting into. But overall, I think that Provost Murphy really gave a great plan. I think it moved quick enough, very quickly, because everything is changing so quickly. I think the plan was well thought out. I think Senator Ferrence’s comments about how, sort of, we can’t make everyone happy is true. I think that not just in emergency cases, but overall a lot of what leadership in a specific governing body should be… so we’re really in uncertain times and there are students that need this option. So, I think that… I don’t know if like a full Senate or a Zoom meeting with the full Senate to discuss this is necessary, in my opinion. I think getting full input is always good, but we’re looking at, I mean what do we have, four or five weeks of this semester left, and some students are very worried, and some students very much need this option. And I think the plan that was rolled out was more than solid, and I think we can implement it swiftly enough that we can limit that major impact on our most vulnerable students. And so, I really, I love the plan. I’m in favor of it. And to Senator Hollis’ point, just to reiterate, I mean it really is… it is an option. So, I think that the option being available is the important part. And then the second most important part is just that educational piece.

Senator Kalter: Okay. So, it sounds like we’re at the process question again. Because I agree, boiling down, sort of the various points, like I said, I came up with sort of four potential tweaks and then five things, or a set of fifth level things that the administration should probably be keeping in mind as we move forward. As I said, extending the window to after grades, the, in this case, apparently, it’s going to have to be rather than forcing it through an advisor and a faculty member to really… so, strongly encourage that that students will do that. That goes along with messaging and education, and I already listed the specific things that people seemed most concerned about. And then the question of whether it should apply to grad students. Those were the four that sort of rose to the top. The ones that I had written down as potentially needing to be on the radar screens, and some of these you may laugh, right. Like the first one I look at it and I’m like there’s no, it’s not going to happen, right, the local departmental control or having the instructor decide course by course. That’s just not practical, but it’s important to know that there were, you know, significant comments about that, and how to manage that. The other ones that I had listed were the comments about don’t do it for upper division courses. The potential to actually increase time to degree. The group work problems. The comment about why aren’t we doing this case by case, the comments about giving people refunds. And one of the one’s that’s kind of outstanding is that we don’t have a new policy for incomplete grades that several people asked for. And then there was the one about, why don’t you do it as just a withdrawal and a free alternative when they, you know, if they withdraw from a course. There are significant things imbedded in that, in all of those, that don’t necessarily change the proposal, but that might need to be considered as we move forward with messaging.

I am not particularly in favor of a Senate meeting about this. I am particularly in favor of hearing from all of the Senators. So, we’ve only heard from Kalter, Horst, Blum, Crowley, Pancrazio, Seeman, Vickers, both the staff Senators Palmer and Noel-Elkins, and Jenkins, in term of the faculty/staff, oh, and Lahiri. So, I think that was something like seven to ten of the faculty/staff. We have 16 student Senators. Except for the ones that just spoke here, we’ve heard from none of them. And so, you know, I think that the way that the Senate gives feedback can be in multiple, you know, it doesn’t have to be necessarily though a meeting, as some of you are saying. I’m not sure it’s a comfortable thing to move forward without having anybody, you know, without having a majority of people from the Senate have weighed in. So, what we can do is try to drum that out of the woodwork, or we can say it’s not a concern, and we’re just going to bypass it. I’m not sure I feel comfortable with that second option, but maybe all of you do.

Senator Mainieri: Are you thinking about getting feedback on these particulars, or yay or nay? You support this proposal, or you don’t support this proposal?

Senator Kalter: I guess, what I had mentioned before is, if we could get a final proposal with tweaks, and then find out how many of the Senators support it.

Senator Mainieri: I think that would be the thing that I would be comfortable with. I think getting like full replies again in terms of qualitative information replies, I think that in the interest of the students, and the faculty, and instructors, getting this information out as soon as possible, and having this decision made, so that advisors can prepare, and everyone can understand what’s going on, I think, is the best possible outcome. So, I would support a quick email to the Senators, and just a ballot that says yay or nay, you support or do you not. But beyond that, I feel like, and it would have to be a really tight deadline, so that our folks that are going to have to implement this can move forward as soon as possible.

Provost Murphy: I’m gonna ask… I’m not sure I understand exactly what to tweak. So, one is, you listed four things, one is the deadline, although as we’re saying, there may not be anything to tweak there if we get confirmed from Charley and Jess that the system would not support, that Campus Solutions would not support moving beyond May 1. The grad school, our recommendation is to allow pass/ no-pass for graduate courses, so I’m not sure, are you telling us as a group that you want that pulled? I don’t know… I guess I’m not getting a direction one way or another. A few people commented on that, but I don’t think that the preponderance of people who responded said to pull the option away for grad students. So, again I would look to direction from this group on that. We agree on the education piece of that. And so, we can add a little bit more wording in the proposal, we do have that in there, but we can a little bit more wording on that in the proposal. What’s the fourth thing?

Senator Kalter: And then you had some other tweaks that you’ve already made. I think those two things could also go, if they can’t be done formally, they could also go into the messaging. In other words, sending us… if the administration feels that students should be able to switch after grades are in, to let students know that there will be a window even if it’s not something that… that we’re going to have a deadline, but they’ll be able to review their choice afterwards, if that’s, you know, a possibility. And also, I think Craig Blum’s comment about the graduate student piece is the one that is probably most salient, that he couldn’t figure out why it would even be helpful. If a graduate student is already going to get either an “A” or a “B” presumably as a pass, what difference does it make whether they get an “A” or a “B” and especially… there was somebody else who said other universities might interpret a “P” as a “C.” Now I’m not as worried about that, because our transcripts ought to be clear about that. But his comment was really interesting of why would you even offer it if it doesn’t matter. So, considering that. But the first one about the, sort of, being able to realize, oh my gosh, I made a mistake, I got an “A” in that course and I switched it to a “P” too soon. That might go in the messaging.

Provost Murphy: You know, and I think we’d have to think about that. Again, I’m not sure the system will allow that. But I think that’s very different than saying that as a student moves to the end of the semester, if they’re concerned about their grade, if they’re having a tough time with a pedagogy that they didn’t sign up for to begin with, that this would be an option for them at the end of this semester at May 1. That’s different than saying to students, if you’re not happy with your grade you can switch it. I think that’s very different to me, even philosophically, I find that to be a very different scenario than, where you’re monitoring your grades, you’re worried about the course, you’ve got all this other stuff going on, as our students do right now, and you can make a decision on the last week or two of the semester that, you know, you can switch to pass/no-pass. And if we can do that, extend that out to finals week, that’s fine, but I’m very worried about saying grading is done, transcripts are done, now a student can come back in and change a grade. I think that’s a very different, philosophically, I find that very different.

Senator Kalter: And will you have messaging about if they decide, let’s say, on April 10 to change it to a “P,” and then by April 30, they’ve changed their mind, that they will be able to do that?

Provost Murphy: I don’t know. That had not occurred to me that that would happen. But that we can certainly look into, and I understand that. We can certainly look into that. And that’s a question we’ll ask Jess and Charley.

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

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah, I was going to say that I agree with the point that the Provost made about that if the purpose is that some students may not be comfortable with doing online classes, by week 1,2,3, they will know if that’s the case, so they will have until May 1 to make the decision if they want to switch to pass/no-pass. But then if we allow it after the final grades are posted, that defeats the whole purpose, because then you are not making a decision based on the instructional methods, you’re making a decision based on, well, I decided not to work hard enough, let’s say, for the final exam. I did really bad in the final exam, so now I’m going to switch to the pass/no-pass, which is not because of the COVID-19. It would be a different story, let’s say, you know, I contracted the virus on May 2 and I couldn’t do it, so I may do it as an exception, because of something that happened, but then this would be like on a case by case scenario. But then, for the majority, it would be May 1, and then that’s your deadline. And then I had a question, because I think we said that we cannot change the online system for the students to do it themselves and say I want to opt in for the pass/ no-pass, but the students would still need to, let’s say go to the Registrar to submit their application, right?

Provost Murphy: I’ll answer the first one, but first let Amy answer that second question about process.

Dr. Hurd: We’ve talked about two different things, neither will be easy. One would be a Formstack, them indicating which courses that they would want to switch. And the other one would be buried within MY, so then the student would go to MY and fill it out that way, because then it will self-populate and it’ll, you know, it’ll put their numbers in and everything, so it’ll make things go faster.

Senator Nikolaou: Oh, because for this point, I was thinking that if we are going to send the messages about what are going to be the implications for changing to P/NP, but then I was thinking that if it goes through a Formstack or through MY, we could have like a first page, repeating all this information, and at the end saying, I acknowledge that I have read carefully all this information, and then if they agreed move forward with the pass/no-pass. Instead of just taking them directly to choose the pass/no-pass without repeating the information, just as a double check, like a letter of understanding.

Dr. Hurd: Yeah. We’re also going to have then once that petition or the form was filled out, an acknowledgement would go back to the student but it will also go to the advisor, so the advisor can see who it is.

Provost Murphy: Also, in terms of… I want to go back to your first point about… you know, I talked a little bit about changing after grades are submitted, and two things, one in absolute full disclosure, I believe that Northern Illinois University is doing that. I think they are allowing students to pick the pass/ no-pass option, like until the end of May.

President Dietz: They are. May 20th.

Provost Murphy: Yeah. May 20th. So, in absolute full disclosure we… but, I don’t agree with that, but again, that’s my worry. The other thing to remember is if a student feels when they get that final grade, they feel that that grade is unfair, either something in the teaching method or going online or for some reason the grade was unfair, there is a final grade challenge process that students can use. And it’s… you go onto the Provost website, and there is a place there where you can see that final grade challenge process, so. Now that’s not to say, I wish I had changed it to pass/fail, because I got a “D,” or I got a “C.” But this is more something about the semester, as we move through it, I was graded unfairly, or there was something about the change to an online process that, you know, I was hampered, and I didn’t have a fair chance. I mean, there’s still that grade appeal process that can occur throughout the whole summer.

Senator Kalter: I would recommend that the administration look very carefully at the wording of that policy because it allows for the first thing, the unfairness.

Provost Murphy: The unfairness, yeah. That’s what I’m saying.

Senator Kalter: But it does not allow for the second thing. I don’t think there’s any provision in that policy that says, well, my class moved online, and so, because there was a change in circumstances, my grade was unfair. It just isn’t set up to do that.

Provost Murphy: I mean, if they feel that through that process the course itself caused them to be graded unfairly, that’s what I’m saying. I’m not saying just because it moved to online, I’m just saying if a student ends a semester and feels they unfairly were assigned a grade, that’s what that means. It doesn’t mean that they’ll win that appeal, but.

Senator Kalter: I think it specifically says that the instructor has to have done it, not the circumstances.

Provost Murphy: Oh, okay.

Senator Kalter: So, that’s where I would be cautious about that. I also wondered if, Senator Nikolaou, you were uncomfortable with students being able to change to a pass. One of the ones that I had in mind was, what if you chose a pass but you got an “A.” Is it as bad to be able to change back, you know, to say, gosh, I don’t want to give up that “A,” as it is to change to a grade to a “P/NP,” or is it sort of something that, because the one thing is bad you shouldn’t do the other one either?

Senator Nikolaou: I think that as long as they do it by the May 1, let’s say, or the April 30th, whatever the deadline is, I don’t see a problem switching from if they said I want to get the pass, but then they say, oh, no I just made a mistake, let me go to my “A” or my “B,” I don’t see a problem with that, as long as they do it within the deadline.

Senator Kalter: So, I keep getting away, I’m sorry, from the process question. Are we okay with having Jan’s office put out a final, you know, here’s the final shape of the policy? Do we want that sent to Senators and having Senators doing a yes/no vote? Or do we want to say, you know because shared governance happens in a lot of different places, and a lot of the departments have voted as departments, so we could leave it at that. Right. That the faculty has weighed in through their departments and that’s a different kind of a vote, it’s not a Senate vote, so we could go with that.

Senator Ferrence: If I can, I want to go back for a moment, just before we got into the last kind of exchange. You had brought up the interesting point about the graduate students, and how they’re impacted. And I think that’s maybe a bigger point than we give credit, and maybe Amy can fill in, but when I start thinking about it, I’m doing the math in my head and I’m like, it sounds like a switch to pass/no-pass for graduate students can only do harm, because whether they get an “A” or a “B” is somewhat inconsequential in graduate studies. And since anything less than a “B” would be a not pass, whereas if they were actually taking for a grade and they got a “C,” they would at least have the credit. I mean, I suppose the only advantage would be that if they took something, if they were going to get a “C” or a “D” in a course, if they took the no-pass option, they wouldn’t have to then when they’re trying to bring up their GPA later, they wouldn’t have the averaging of it. But you’d want to strongly advise any student who thought they were likely to get an “A” or a “B,” why would you want to change it. The only time you’d want to risk changing as a grad student is if you were pretty confident that you were going to get a “C,” “D,” or an “F,” because then mathematically, you’re just trying to take that course out of the calculation for your GPA moving forward.

Dr. Hurd: Yeah. Unless someone wanted to protect a 4.0.

Senator Ferrence: Yeah, but it’s grad school. Who protects 4.0 in grads school? 4.0 in grad school, like, you can’t be hired because people think there’s something wrong.

(Laughter)

Provost Murphy: But Greg, isn’t the example you just gave why student might want this?

Senator Ferrence: Yeah, I think so.

Provost Murphy: Because of this change in pedagogy, they think they’re going to get a “C,” or a “D,” or a “F,” this allows them to do at least a no-pass but with a qualifier on it that goes in the transcripts about, you know, this is the COVID…

Senator Ferrence: Yeah. I agree. Now scenically, I think grad students they kind of know what they’re destined for, and they’re not going to be choosing it because of COVID, if they’re a wise consumer they’re going to go, yeah, I’m not going to be getting an “A” or “B” in this class regardless of whether it’s online or not, and it gives them the opportunity. But, yeah, I think that’s it. We just may have to make sure the messaging is very clear to the grad students who are “A” or “B” if they think they’re likely to be there that they should talk with their instructor very closely. Because I know my colleagues in Chemistry have said they’ve really backed off in their grad classes already. So, to get an “A” or a “B,” because they didn’t realize this was going to be a possibility, so two weeks ago when they had a week to retool their courses they made adjustments to make the course more palatable for the sudden shift. So, I think students should be very cautious about opting that, particularly in the graduate side.

Senator Mainieri: I was just going to move away from the graduate school discussion back to the process. Is that acceptable? I want to clarify what I said before, if we decide that Senate needs an input, the yes/no, quick decision would be the only thing that I would support. But I am very confident that Dr. Hurd, our Provost, the President, have sufficiently got in a variety of feedback, and have carefully considered that. So, I am comfortable moving forward without an official Senate endorsement, because of the variety of different avenues that feedback has been gathered through. So, I just wanted to clarify that about my comment earlier about the process.

Senator Marx: Okay. My comment is about the process as well. I agree with Senator Mainieri, that at this point I think that we’ve had sufficient shared governance all across the campus and I’m comfortable with just allowing this to move forward.

Senator Kalter: So, let me do a show of hands on that, so that we can move to the approval of the proposed agenda, and then to adjournment, so that the Faculty Caucus Exec can meet. So, all in favor of allowing the departmental votes to be the vote, as opposed to the Senate voting, please raise your hand. Is that a clear motion? In other words, if you are okay with what Senator Mainieri said raise your hand. (Pause) That looks like a majority. So, we’re going to go with as long as we’ve got the majority of the departments voted, and we’ve also got the student vote by the way, because obviously the departments do not have student votes in them. So, SGA, you guys might want to do a vote of some sort on your own, since the student voice is not in that set of department votes, does that make sense? Okay.

Senator Horst: I was just going to say, my department hasn’t had a discussion at all. I don’t know how many departments haven’t had a discussion at all. So, that’s why I was not in favor of having that substitution, because I’m not sure… I know a lot of them have, but I don’t know if all of them have. And also the Senate’s role is to weigh in at the academic area, but I’ll go with the will of the committee.

Senator Kalter: I kind of think that the question there is, would it change anything for, you know, the departments that haven’t voted to vote. And do we have, so to speak, a quorum of either instructors, or a quorum of departments, depending on how we want to look at that, right. Obviously, it’s easier to meet a quorum of departments, than it is to meet a quorum of instructors, right. In other words, my guess is that if English met, we haven’t even talked about it, actually, at all, it hasn’t been brought up except through me sending the email the other day, and it looks like Greg is nodding his head about Chemistry. My guess is that…

Senator Ferrence: I don’t think we’re scheduled to meet for a few weeks, so you’d have to wait.

Senator Kalter: And it wouldn’t change anything necessarily, based on the feedback that we got. Okay. So, I’m going to take that vote as a, we are not putting it on the Senate agenda. We are also not sending out a yes/no vote for Senators. Does anybody want to say anything about that, or is that the right conclusion? (Pause) Okay.

President Dietz: May we also assume then that that’s a vote of support of the tweaked document?

Senator Kalter: Not by Exec. I think there are people on Exec who are extremely uncomfortable with Exec making a decision about the actual subject.

President Dietz: Okay.

Senator Kalter: And wanted to either send it to the Senate or not, rather than voting as Exec as though Exec can speak for the Senate. I think we all, as far as I can tell, all nine of us, although not all nine of us said this, but the voting members basically were saying, we feel pretty uncomfortable with having Exec go beyond its own charge and vote as though we’re voting on behalf of the entire Senate.

President Dietz: Sure. But there would not be… what I’m gathering from this then is that based upon the discussion, the feedback, that we’ve gather thus far, that with a tweaked document that we can go forward with this? Without a vote. But we’ve had a good discussion. And we would clean up, you know, the document here. We’d add in the new dates. We would do all the things that we talked about here, but we would move forward on this.

Senator Kalter: I would really, as I said at one point, appreciate if Exec…

President Dietz: Sure. Yeah.

Senator Kalter: Could get at least a 24-48 hour heads up.

President Dietz: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: That you’re moving forward so that we can give you advice about your messaging.

President Dietz: Yeah, that’s fine.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. So there will be no Senate vote, you know, Senate vote, electronic or otherwise.

President Dietz: Yeah, and that’s fine. I think we’ve got some drafting we need to do, but that would get this out still mid-week Wednesday, Thursday, somewhere around in there. If we can do it sooner great, but we need it… it’s a good discussion. I appreciate everybody’s patience, it’s a thorny issue. Appreciate, you know, all the staff work on this. We’ll go back and make these changes, and work on some messaging, and send it out for feedback from Exec. Jan, you okay with that?

Senator Kalter: She’s nodding her head, mic off, thumbs up. Okay.

President Dietz: Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Terrific. Thank you all so much for the long conversation. I know it is a complex issue.

***03.12.20.02 From Martha Horst: Academic Senate Bylaws Current Copy***

***03.10.20.05 From Martha Horst: Academic Senate Bylaws medical emergency additions Mark Up***

***03.12.20.01 From Martha Horst: Academic Senate Bylaws medical emergency additions Clean Copy***

***03.16.20.01 Academic Senate Bylaws medical emergency additions Mark Up with SK suggested revisions***

***06cc - 03.16.20.02 Academic Senate Bylaws medical emergency additions Mark Up with SK suggested revisions***

Senator Kalter: So, we’re going to skip… In order to make it to the end of the meeting, I’m going to skip over the emergency bylaws addition because it’s not gonna matter at this point, with a Pritzker order out there.

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

***Proposed* Academic Senate Meeting Agenda**

**Wednesday, April 8, 2020**

**7:00 P.M.**

**OLD MAIN ROOM, BONE STUDENT CENTER**

***Call to Order***

***Roll Call***

***Action Items:***

***03.02.16.03 Policy 6.1.37 Facilities Naming Current Copy (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***02.27.20.03 Policy 6.1.37 Naming of University Facilities and Entities Markup (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***02.27.20.04 Policy 6.1.37 Naming of University Facilities and Entities Clean Copy (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***03.10.20.03 Policy 6.1.37 Naming of University Facilities and Entities Mark Up MCH Motion (Senator Martha Horst)***

***03.10.20.04 Gies renaming at U of I (Senator Martha Horst)***

***02.11.20.04 Alcohol Policy Current Copy (General Counsel)***

***02.10.20.01 Alcohol policy Mark Up (General Counsel)***

***02.10.20.02 Alcohol policy Clean Copy (General Counsel)***

***01.23.20.05 - Policy 1.6 Religious Observances CURRENT Copy (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***02.25.20.01 - Policy 1.6 Religious Accommodations AAC MARK UP (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***02.20.20.02- Policy 1.6 Religious Accommodations CLEAN Copy (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***Information/ Action Items:***

***Recommendations for pass/ no pass***

***Information Items:***

***02.01.18.10 Policy 4.1.4 Dress Codes CURRENT (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***03.05.20.01 Policy 4.1.4 Dress Codes AAC MARK UP (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***03.05.20.02 Policy 4.1.4 Dress Codes AAC CLEAN Copy (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***03.12.20.03 From Associate Provost Ani Yazedjian: Request for additional one-year term Academic Planning Committee for 2020-2021 (Information Item 03/25/20)***

***Consent Agenda Items: None***

***Chairperson's Remarks***

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

***Administrators' Remarks***

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

***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***

***Adjournment***

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

Senator Kalter: All right. And we have to take some things off, move some things around. So, the first thing I see is we’ve got to erase the place of the meeting and put “by Zoom.” My understanding is that the Alcohol policy is ready, that I think it was Wendy Smith emailed Cera today and said that that is going to be ready for us. If it’s not, we will take it off the agenda. So, we’ve got Facilities Naming, Alcohol policy, Religious Observances as Action Items. We’re going to remove the recommendation for pass/no-pass. We decided to do the Dress Code and the Request from Ani Yazedjian. I would suggest that we move those flipped. Is that okay with you Senator Nikolaou, so that we don’t end up talking a long time about Dress Codes, and then Ani never gets her request?

Senator Nikolaou: Yes, that’s fine.

Senator Kalter: Awesome. And you might notice that I asked Cera to put Chairperson Remarks, Student Body President Remarks, Administrator Remarks all at the end. If we don’t do that, we will never be able to get our business done for the year. Is everybody okay with, well, does anybody see anything else that needs to be tweaked on our agenda? (Pause) All right. Now, I can’t tell, is Isaac raising his hand?

Senator Hollis: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: I’m sorry. Sorry about that.

Senator Hollis: So, Action Items, because I know it was, like, talked about briefly about the Naming and University Facility and Entities, didn’t Senator Mainieri have something that needed to be said?

Senator Mainieri: I will, if necessary, bring an amendment to the floor on that.

Senator Hollis: Okay.

Senator Mainieri: Thank you.

Senator Hollis: That’s just what I wanted to ask.

The motion was unanimously approved, with friendly amendments.

***Adjournment***Motion by Senator Mainieri, seconded by Senator Horst, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.