**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

**Monday, April 15, 2019**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

***Oral Communications***

***Commentary on the Vice Presidents***

Senator Kalter: We have three Oral Communications. One is just to let everybody know that the commentary on the Vice Presidents is in the Senate office.

Senator Marx: So when we have time we should just go over and look at it?

Senator Kalter: Yes, and we'll do that at the next Exec. So that's just one announcement is to remind everybody to go take a look at that. And then the second thing is that Rules Committee asked about Athletics Council and they have gender-specific seating in their committee, and so I suggested that it should go to Athletics Council for discussion in their gender diversity and something-something committee first and then have the whole Athletics Council vote on it and send us recommendations about whether they need to keep that or not. So those are the first two Oral Communications.

And then the third one is from Tracy, who is not able to be here. She says, "In my first time as committee chair this year, there were a few points in the year where I thought that conducting an electronic vote might have been useful to move the committee forward in an effective and efficient way. For example, here at the end of the year as all committees are wrapping up their tasks, it could be that electronic voting could be useful in tying up final tasks after the final committee meetings of the year. In Planning and Finance in putting together the priority briefs you will review at today's meeting, we put the final touches on the document via email. This time around, none of those changes was large enough to require a vote, but it could be possible that a substantial change could be suggested that I would feel better about if we had a way to vote electronically to ensure the voice of the committee is heard. In searching through the bylaws, I could not find any indication about whether electronic voting is acceptable under the bylaws. I wonder if it may be time for the Academic Senate to consider the implications of electronic voting to determine if such a tool would be acceptable for the Senate."

Senator Marx: Right. We just did that in AABC to approve the AIF report via email. We just had everybody respond via email.

Senator Kalter: Yes, and I think it's kind of a common practice actually. One of the reasons it's being brought up is I know that for Council on General Education, one of our external committees, Jim Pancrazio was very concerned about them doing electronic voting because they had been having a series of meetings where they were not getting a quorum. So it wasn't just electronic voting to clean it all up and sort of based on a face-to-face meeting and then you do an electronic vote. It was literally getting the business done only electronically. And he basically kind of put the hammer down on that like, no, you can't do this anymore because essentially you're not doing true shared governance in this way. And I agree with him about that. In other words, it's one thing to do an electronic vote when you've actually had quorums and have been discussing things and you're just sort of finalizing stuff. It's another thing to do it instead of meeting. So I think one of the things, if we examine our bylaws (which will obviously go to Rules), is making a rule that's not an either/or rule but making it so that it prevents the CTE kind of circumstance but not preventing normal course of business kind of stuff.

Senator Horst: And I would also add that, for instance, Craig was out of town and he joined our meeting via Skype and these kind of modern things are happening a lot more often. And we had a student who was sick that wanted to phone in. So the next year's Rules Committee might also consider those items.

Senator Kalter: And we now have Zoom which we can use all over campus, which we didn't have last year. I think the license was new this year. So that's making that much easier to be able to phone it in in a good way.

Senator Horst: I know that the Service Committee I think does everything over email. The Service Award Committee.

Senator Kalter: Interesting. Of course, they meet once a year.

Senator Horst: Well, they virtually meet.

Senator Marx: They don't even have one meeting, huh?

Senator Kalter: Quote-unquote "once a year." So does that sound good to route that to Rules Committee for consideration for the bylaws?

Senator Blum: Route it.

Senator Kalter: So that we can have less ancient bylaws most of the time. All right, so that's our three Oral Communications.

***Distributed Communications:***

***04.12.19.01 From Senate Chairperson: CTE Bylaws- II.A.3 revisions Mark Up (Information/ Action 04/24/19)***

***04.12.19.02 From Senate Chairperson: CTE Bylaws- II.A.3 revisions Clean Copy (Information/ Action 04/24/19)***

Senator Kalter: This is because of the discussion that was happening about the CTE bylaws II.A.3 on the floor, and I have two amendments – one is from Tracy and one is from Craig. But does anybody else want to say anything about the CTE thing first?

Senator Horst: I would like it to be presented so that it's not coming from the Executive Committee but rather is a formal motion on the floor that's been seconded and all of that stuff so it's not appearing as if it's coming fully formed.

Senator Kalter: So, let's see. This is sort of a modification of the wording that I suggested based on what I was hearing on the floor so I'll read that first. It would replace the first come, first served basis clause, that sentence, and say instead, "Students who apply will receive equal consideration by the CTE Executive Committee, and the Committee will strive to select student members so that there is a diversity of perspectives represented with one seat for each college…" (listing the colleges) "filled by the CTE Executive Committee." So that was the thing that you guys got in your packets. Tracy proposes a slight change so that it would read, "…and the Committee will strive to select members so that there is a diversity of perspectives represented and so that one seat for each college…" (I think she means) "is filled by the CTE Executive Committee." She says, "I'm not sure the current proposed wording truly captures the diversity that Senators were calling for." And she says, "I feel this wording…" (in other words, her new wording) "separates the diversity expectations from the college seats expectations so that the diversity of perspectives could encompass a variety of dimensions of diversity."

So then, the other one is from Craig, and he's suggesting, "Students who apply will receive equal consideration by the CTE Executive Committee, and the Committee will have a search process for prospective student members that encourages students from a diversity of perspectives to be considered, with one seat for each college…" (naming the colleges) "filled by the CTE Executive Committee." So, those are our three options.

Senator Breland: The first one read my mind. When I read this, the first email, I was thinking the same exact thing. I don't like that…. Because it seemed as though the diversity of perspectives was the diversity between colleges, and that can definitely get misconstrued. But also, I feel like the second one… Who was that email?

Senator Kalter: Tracy was the one that suggested what you're saying, and I told her over email I consider that completely friendly in what I meant even though I might not have worded it correctly.

Senator Breland: But I was also going to suggest that it be two separate sentences so that way there's no commas so no one can get confused. That way it can be two separate sentences. I know the second one you read, the recommendation, is repeating kind of exactly what this is just with a few extra words in between. So I would suggest just a period. Like, "We strive to select student members so that there is a diversity of perspectives represented." And then, "There will be one seat for each college…" Like totally two different…

Senator Kalter: Yeah, something like "CTE Executive Committee will fill one seat for each college" or something to that effect.

Senator Marx: I like that idea very much.

Senator Kalter: To divide the sentences.

Senator Marx: Exactly.

Senator Kalter: Okay, and then what about Craig's suggestion? Do you want to describe how yours is different?

Senator Blum: Yeah, dividing the sentence I think is a good idea. I just kind of used what was there. But I will say when I read this it says "equal consideration" and then I felt like in the second part of the sentence it says we're not really going to give equal consideration. We're going to make it diverse perspectives. So I feel like if you kind of looked at it sort of like… How I was kind of framing it for myself was, okay, we want to have a diverse applicant pool for a job, right? But the best qualified probably for something like CTE is probably the most interested, right? So I don't know how… It's probably not like they're having 25 students for five slots, right? But I do really think that probably what they do need to do is talk to SGA. They need to talk around to try to get more perspectives, and as a possibility… But to me it sounded a little bit like a litmus test rather than that the best possible candidate for being a student on CTE should be the person that feels… Because it's not really like an election or anything. So the way that process works is that that Exec Committee will discuss it, hopefully they'll have more than five, but if it's five it should be the best five, right? Or six or seven or whatever it is. But they should also have a process which makes sure that they're reaching out and providing opportunity.

Senator Kalter: I don't disagree with that. My concern with yours is that we not impose on the CTE leadership a work requirement without first consulting them.

Senator Blum: I can talk to CTE tomorrow.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, because "search process" could be extremely extensive, and I'm not saying that it shouldn't be, but I'm not sure that talking to one or two people is right.

Senator Blum: No, the whole CTE committee.

Senator Kalter: Oh, is it the whole CTE you're meeting with tomorrow? Is that the meeting?

Senator Blum: Yeah. So I can talk to them. I mean, by search process I didn't really… Maybe that's too strong language. I was actually really just thinking… Because CTE, like they do with a lot of things, they have sort of their bylaws and then they have lots of little procedures for lots of things. And I didn't necessarily mean that they were going to have to have an extensive search process. I just really meant whatever they're going to do, they just need to make sure that they have ways of reaching out, basically.

Senator Kalter: They do have a gazillion non-members on their sub-committees now. We went to 46 members altogether out of 32 seated, so we've got – what is that – 14 committee non-members, some of which are faculty or staff. So when you say they may not have 25 students for five slots, I sure hope that they've got students for all of the other slots that they fill.

Senator Breland: Just a comment back to that. I think the keyword is strive. It's not that we're going to do it, but we're striving to do it, and I think that that's the word where it separates from what you're talking about. Also I think it's problematic. That point is valid, but I think with that kind of mindset it could be problematic because it kind of sounds like with the whole affirmative action, like oh, these people just got it because of affirmative action, not because they're qualified. So I think we kind of want to be careful with that language and I think that having this word "strive" makes it differentiate between what our goal and our value is and then have that being a part of the process. And then I think the assumption, they kind of assume that because it's diverse perspectives it doesn't mean that they are qualified. They can be diverse and also qualified. So I think that we want to be careful with that. But I do really like the first suggestion that I made, and I think the strive word differentiates from that point.

Senator Kalter: I don't want us to think that there are “best” people to sit on committees either.

Senator Blum: Well, I think that probably they're going to have… I mean, there's a limited time they'd be... I don't know. I tried to find somebody today to ask about this, but there was no one around. I feel like I'm sort of operating… like I don't know how difficult it is. I don't know. There's a lot of questions I feel like I can't respond to, but I do meet with them tomorrow.

Senator Kalter: All I can say is that over the years I've been watching Deb Garrahy, and she works her nails to the bone, let's say, doing all kinds of stuff. So, I don't want to put something on the person who is going to fill her shoes that's going to make that job so much harder. But I also want us to make sure that we do cast a wider net as the Provost suggested.

Senator Marx: What I wanted to ask is what the current process is. Do they just have names and they just select names, or do they have more information than that when they assign students?

Senator Blum: I'm pretty sure they ask around. So they would ask chairs and things like that. I'm not 100% sure. I'm pretty sure.

Senator Horst: Via a teacher education with an all-call process.

Senator Marx: So what I was going to suggest is that they have a little bit more so if a student wants to volunteer that they perhaps could indicate what their background is and then why they want to be on the committee, and that would provide some more information to those selecting.

Senator Kalter: And frankly, while I'm thinking about it, SGA does the seating on other things for other committees that need students. Have you ever been involved in the CTE seating?

Senator Rubio: I don't recall that.

Senator Kalter: I find that concerning. I find it concerning about how faculty are chosen as well, which was the discussion we had before about whether they should be appointed or elected seats. I can see the arguments on both sides, but what that means is it can really lend itself to word of mouth appointments, and that can lend itself to unconscious biases in appointing. So one thing that you might suggest to them is that SGA should be much more involved than they already are. I know that the TE programs obviously need to be sending their students because you should be a TE student, right?

Senator Blum: I won't put this on the floor as an amendment, but I would like to offer kind of a separate sentence or whatever to them tomorrow. I'll be able to talk to all of them at the same time, and so I'd like them to at least weigh in on it.

Senator Campbell: Just to clarify, all of our seating for external committees in SGA goes through the Vice President. So Jack Whitsitt would have been the one that is in contact. I don't know. But I don't know what that process is like for him to communicate with committee chairs and stuff.

Senator Rubio: Usually how it's been done is I'll get an email about it and I'll give him the head's up that we need someone and typically we work together to get it done. But that may not always be the case in SGA.

Senator Kalter: I think this could be a stage-by-stage improvement process where we put something in the bylaws next Wednesday that's somewhat simple and ask them to continue to work on the process underneath it because if what I'm seeing in the faculty selection process is any indication of how the students get selected, I'm concerned about how the net is not being cast all that wide. It's not well known that people are being looked for.

Senator Blum: I think that's a legitimate concern. Again, I don't know exactly so I don't want to speak to it, but my sense is that from talking to people, but I don't know. I always hesitate before I actually really know something because I could be totally off base.

Senator Kalter: Let's go back to Martha's concern about who should be putting this forward because it sounds like most of us are leaning towards Tracy's wording with the amendment of splitting the sentences in two. Is that correct? So, how should we put it forward? Without attaching it to somebody's name and just saying this came out of the discussion last time?

Senator Horst: I think it belongs to the body, the Senators that were proposing it. You did this work of revising the wording that you mentioned on the floor, but I'm really hesitant to, at all, the Exec taking over this process. I think we can have it on the agenda. I certainly think it should be on the agenda because of the way it was passed. I think the wording can be read, but I think it needs to be a motion to a document from the floor and not from Exec because I don't think Exec should control the process, like I said. It should be coming from the body that proposed it.

Senator Kalter: So we should put out a written thing, in other words, but have it not be claimed by any one person?

Senator Horst: Or you could read your wording from the floor.

Senator Kalter: I'm not comfortable with that. We've had two weeks, and it seems like people are entitled to have a written document if you have two weeks.

Senator Horst: But what about the Senators that actually were proposing the motion?

Senator Kalter: Khalya, you're one of them. Would you like to sponsor it?

Senator Breland: I was, right? I think what you're saying is… I don't know. I get that, and I'm leaning more towards that, but I also get that as well. I don't think it can work like this. I feel like this should go… Is there a way we can underline the changes and have it go on the floor and then let them know that this is what has been changed and then it can go into a statement where someone can amend whether they disagree or agree?

Senator Kalter: Yeah, that's our normal process.

Senator Breland: I think that should be instead because, like you said, in the meeting we're going to put this on hold and then figure out language and then bring this back. I think Lucey brought it up as well. He was one of the Senators, and we couldn't come up with language to make it. So since this is now language that we probably already were thinking, we can propose this and then have that be voted on.

Senator Kalter: Okay, so what we can do is just (I think what I'm hearing you say is) send it forward with no name attached and just say this is what was on the recording and then some of us worked on it and are offering this, but we want to hear your feedback. Is that right? All right, we don't always have to put parentheses next to everything.

Senator Marx: I think that accurately represents what happened.

Senator Blum: Susan, can you send me what you think that language is going to be so I can…

Senator Kalter: Yeah, let me make sure I have it correctly. It would say, "Students who apply will receive equal consideration by the CTE Executive Committee, and the Committee will strive to select student members so that there is a diversity of perspectives represented. CTE Executive Committee will seat one student from each college." Does that sound correct?

Senator Blum: Yeah, and I will read that tomorrow and whatever CTE tells me, I will represent that on the floor of the Senate.

Senator Kalter: Awesome. And I think that you should give them your thing about the search process and ask them to consider that over the next year either as a procedure or as a change to their bylaws. I'm not disagreeing with your thing. I just want to make sure that they are in on that if we have a search process.

Senator Blum: I'm okay with that. I was okay with actually the original language. The only thing that just kind of… I mean, what I'll say to you about strive is strive means something that you're trying to do. Right? But is it trying to allow people into the process, or is it trying to pick people that are certain people into the process? To me, you want to get as many people as you can from as many perspectives as you can, and then from those people you select versus I'm going to select this person because they're that voice.

Senator Breland: So then my question would be what would be an ideal situation that you feel like… Then, what would it be? So you're saying it's not okay to…

Senator Blum: So I'm saying that there needs to be a process just like a job or something, that you would have a process where you allow for diversity and allow for equal consideration, and then in this case I would say probably the most interested parties. So I don't know what that would be. If you were most interested in CTE… I mean, we have a slate of people that we vote on Rules. That's basically by interest, right? I'm highly interested in this committee. I'm highly interested in that.

Senator Breland: I guess my question was how do you allow for diversity if it's not implemented through policy?

Senator Horst: I would also just chime in and say the experience we had with the Athletics Council is that we were thinking about not seating people based on their gender. That was very disturbing to the Rules Committee. So if you set up a grid like it is in the Athletics Council right now saying there must be this many women and this many men, you risk not being able to seat women because there's a male slot. So I do like the word strive, and I would say that the University Hearing Panel also has similar language, that they requested diversity of opinions or something like that. So there is precedent to have such a language. But we want to be careful not to set up the Executive Committee in a situation where they have to pick certain people because you could actually not pick people in a discriminatory way.

Senator Campbell: But I don't think we're too close to that in this case. I don't think we're anywhere near that.

Senator Horst: No, right. But I'm just saying the Athletics Council is sort of your extreme example where actually the people picking that committee, our hands are tied in an uncomfortable way. That's why we sent forward the language.

Senator Kalter: I guess I'll pull out something from the English department. It seems to me that when it's unmarked that people are already being selected in a discriminatory way. So in other words, the unmarked category looks like it's a process where we're just picking the “best” people or whatever, but what that means in practice often is that institutional racism continues. So I think that what the people on the floor were saying, including Khalya, was how you need to be conscious about turning that around. And you have a very legitimate concern. You don't want to turn it around so much that all of a sudden we're picking people based on their race or gender or what have you. But it's hard to imagine a process where you don't surface what types of diversity you are looking for, whether that means having students write a short paragraph – this is why I want to be on this committee – or something like that regardless of their identities to sort of say these are the kind of perspectives that I want to represent, and then having the Executive… But if you have an un-diverse Executive Committee, that then leads to we know that people hire people who look like them, for example, which then leads back to the question of whether or not the students should be elected rather than appointed, and elections can also result in very lacking in diverse types of situations. So that's why I think it's a longer conversation than just what we're going to be inserting. This was actually all supposed to be talked about in CTE next year in their next iteration of the bylaws or what have you, but I think that there are several people on the Senate who, I think somebody said it, if we don't do it now, it would be easy for it to get lost and swept under the rug or what have you. Not that that's going to happen, but the perception that that could happen.

Senator Blum: Right. Well, I never liked the first come, first served.

***04.12.19.03 From Rules Committee: Request for exception to seat UCC member***

Senator Kalter: All right, so we have a plan. We're moving forward. Rules Committee is requesting an exception to a seat for a University Curriculum Committee member.

Senator Horst: Yes. The University Curriculum Committee times were posted this time, that they meet every Wednesday, and I think that might have limited the pool so we didn't have a lot of volunteers. When I sent this email, we had nobody… There's two spots open for College of Business. We only had one volunteer, and so I asked the College of Business Senators to come up with some more volunteers, and Joe Trefzger volunteered. He is stepping off as is required because he just completed two terms. So when I wrote this email, he was the only other volunteer that I had. Also, the chair of the UCC is stepping off, and another couple long-time members, so it makes sense to have him. Since then, I think on Friday, Ajay Samant sent me another name. But I personally would still like to go forward with Joe Trefzger because, as I mentioned, there's senior members stepping off of that committee.

Senator Kalter: Who is the other name?

Senator Horst: Martha Cook.

Senator Kalter: No, who was the other name that Ajay sent?

Senator Horst: The other name. No, this is something else. I don't have it here. He sent me a name of somebody else. I don't have it.

Senator Kalter: Do we have to do this now? I'd like to sort of know what the option is a little bit. I understand what you're saying because Jean Standard, who has been the chair more than once, is retiring, and then Martha Cook either is retiring or stepping off the committee. Joe is one of the few members who has been long-term, but I also feel like we don't want to be… That Ajay went out of his way to find somebody so that we should talk about both names.

Senator Horst: I could look it up on my email right now.

Senator Kalter: While you're doing that, let's move, if we can. Or is it going to take a few seconds?

Senator Horst: It'll take a little longer.

***Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Academic Impact Fund Report***

***Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Academic Impact Fund Statement of Priorities and Guiding Principles***

Senator Kalter: So let's move to the Academic Impact Fund report and go back to that one. David, do you have anything you want us to know?

Senator Marx: This is a report that comes every year. After meeting with Alan Lacy and he delivers a report to our committee, from that we extract a few things we'd like to point out, some important things. And then what we've added to this this year is some of the findings from the ad hoc committee of the Faculty Caucus so that the whole Senate is aware of some of these things. Then we also have a recommendation based on a survey that we conducted of department chairs, which I hope you've all had a chance to look at this. I think I'll just leave it at that unless you want to ask questions about it.

Senator Kalter: I just wanted to make sure Tracy had nothing. She has no comments. I have one small comment and one that might be for the floor. The small comment is when you're talking about the promotional increase as an expenditure somewhere in here. Let's see, it was…

Senator Marx: Initially we had it as part of the SBC, but it's part of the permanent funds.

Senator Kalter: Here it is. The promotional increase sentence is on the bottom of page 2, and it says, "The permanent monies in the AIF were also used to fund a mid-year salary increase that was an increase in the promotional increment for all faculty that had received a promotion." So I think that you may have changed that because I suggested it. That it had to have been out of the permanent funds.

Senator Marx: We did.

Senator Kalter: I would call it, rather than an expenditure, an allocation, for that reason, because it's not a one-time expenditure. It's an actual allocation of money into the faculty. It's just a wording thing, but it's a significant one, I think, just because it's not a one-time expenditure. It's a one-time allocation.

Senator Marx: Understand the difference between the words, yes.

Senator Kalter: So I would just suggest that as a friendly edit there that I didn't catch the first time that it went around.

Senator Marx: It makes sense.

Senator Kalter: The second thing that I wondered, for the recommendation that you're making about the search funds, did the committee talk about why you would choose SBC versus the temporary funding? Just out of curiosity, did that come up?

Senator Marx: We did not. I've been thinking about that since we submitted this to the Senate as to really does it need to be part of the SBC or could it be permanent funds. So I think that still has yet to be determined.

Senator Kalter: I think this one ought to be brought up on the floor rather than here because it's not like an expenditure allocation kind of thing. But I'm wondering if we should amend it on the floor to say either/or so that if there is money in the SBC… Or actually vice-versa, right? If there is money in the temp, it might be a good idea to take it out of the temporary funds. If there is money in the SBC, sort of leaving it to their discretion in a sense.

Senator Marx: Yes, and that's what I was going to suggest as well.

Senator Kalter: Okay, great.

Senator Marx: That makes total sense. The point is that I think we're recommending that the Provost's office find a way to do this. That's basically it.

Senator Kalter: It's very interesting to read how much we do spend, how much we want to spend, and the gap between those.

Senator Marx: We had an excellent response to the survey compared to our commentary on the Vice Presidents and President. We get much better return on something like this.

Senator Kalter: That's very fascinating. Anything else on that one? Did you have anything on AIF while you were looking up the other thing?

Senator Horst: No. Great job.

Senator Kalter: Okay, great. All right. Well it's ready to go to the floor with that one tiny little change.

Senator Marx: We tried to keep it simple.

Senator Kalter: It was very nice and simple. All right, let's go back to the UCC thing.

***Executive Session: 04.12.19.03 From Rules Committee: Request for exception to seat UCC member***

The Executive Committee rejected the exception to seat the UCC member.

***Planning and Finance: Priority Brief- Increasing Student Financial aid***

***Planning and Finance: Priority Brief- Enabling students to get into their desired majors***

Senator Kalter: We'll do these together. One of them is going to the Senate floor; the other one is not. One is about increasing student financial aid. The other one is about enabling students to get into their desired majors. And it's the one about increasing student financial aid that is going to the Senate floor. Did you already pass those out?

Ms. Christensen: Yes.

Senator Kalter: Okay, great.

Senator Horst: Are we doing both of them now or just the financial aid one?

Senator Kalter: Why don't we do first the financial aid one since that's the one that needs to go to the floor? Anybody see anything that we need to tell Tracy about before it goes to the Senate floor?

Senator Horst: I think it got tied into the housing discussion. I'm not sure if it's a good thing or a bad thing, but as they tried to segment these problems, that was one byproduct that I noticed about this committee report, that it started expanding the question.

Senator Kalter: Oh, I see. You mean it went a little bit beyond its scope? Is that what you mean?

Senator Horst: Yes. It had a discussion at some point about housing, all-campus housing, which isn't necessarily a bad thing, but as they try to do these specific problems, it might be difficult to look at just one targeted problem in a long-range way.

Senator Kalter: Particularly when we all know that the administration is doing all its best effort to increase the number and value of student scholarships and financial aid. It's not like the committee knew anything that the President and his people don't already know. So it's about our perspective on those things.

President Dietz: I guess I don't have any major issues with any of this. The bigger concern I have is that there's a lot of this well beyond our control, and there's wording in here that says that.

Senator Kalter: That does say that?

President Dietz: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: That it's beyond your control?

President Dietz: Yeah, and there are some other things that would be illegal for us to do to just categorically re-examine and adjust the Expected Family Contribution calculation. That's a federal calculation and we could do it on an individual basis based upon unique circumstances, but we couldn't come through and say we're going to up the EFCs by X percent because we don't have enough financial aid to fill the needs. The institution has never had enough financial aid to meet the needs, nor does any other institution typically. So overall I don't have a problem with any of it because I think it raises some really (inaudible) kinds of things, but some of the specific recommendations just need some context around them.

Senator Kalter: I think, Larry, if you're on page 3 with that one, the context to that is that we're recommending that Jonathan Lackland and that staff work with Jana and her staff to identify barriers with respect to financial aid and specifically, maybe this needs rewording, but what we meant there was to lobby for a re-examination and adjustment of the EFC, not to actually change it just on an institutional level. So it says, "to advocate on the federal level in concert with other colleges and universities for more sensible financial aid measures," not for ISU to do that.

President Dietz: Well, and there is talk about higher education being reauthorized this year, which scares the devil out of me.

Senator Kalter: Talk about whether it will be reauthorized? Whether funding for higher education will be reauthorized?

President Dietz: Well, frankly, I would hate to see the higher education laws being reauthorized under the current administration because you're going to have less programs and less money. It's just the stance that the Department of Education has taken on all of this. And the issue at the state level with MAP is the state of Illinois is leaving money on the table because we're not funding the MAP program. The state is not funding the MAP program the way it should be, and it's not necessarily because the students aren't filling out the applications. They're filling out the applications, but half of the students who fill out the applications and qualify for the MAP program don't get it because there's not enough money there. Now, the current administration of the state has a proposal to increase that. Whether or not that will pass the General Assembly, I don't know. So there's some good things going on there, but you have to look within the context of what's going on in Washington, which has not been favorable to higher education, period, and whether or not you really want all these programs reauthorized under an administration that's not been favorable to higher education.

Senator Kalter: I see. I wasn't sure until the very end whether you were talking about Washington. So you're saying the DOE level of stuff is not…? Okay.

President Dietz: But because the state's not funding MAP, for example, not as many people can get it that should. Therefore, many of them are maybe not choosing to go on to college because they can't get the MAP, so then they're also not going to get the Pell Grant money for that school. So the state of Illinois is leaving Pell Grant money on the table because of the decisions that the state is making, though, and not necessarily because the students are not wanting it, but it gets pretty complex. But overall, it's a good document, and so I would just think that it's incumbent upon us to respond to this with some of these things and put some context around it about, well, we can't do this because of that, but here are some other things that we're trying.

Senator Marx: I was going to mention also that the state is not funding the tuition for veterans that they originally were. Is that true?

Senator Kalter: I think have never or something like that.

Senator Marx: That they haven't funded it for years?

President Dietz: There's a proposal that they do that as well, but again, that's part of the governor's proposal and hasn't been approved by the General Assembly. That, to me, has been one of the biggest abominations about state funding. Another unfunded mandate has been the veterans. So, you know, it said everybody thinks that veterans ought to be getting money, us included, but there's no money for that. So they just turn around and say, well, institution, you should fund this. Well that's, you know… So frankly, and there's a lot of those unfunded mandates like that. It sends this message. Come on! You don't have… Oh, geez. You know.

Senator Marx: And we have way more veterans than ever before.

Senator Breland: I had two questions. I know you mentioned how it's not that people… Wait, let me read this sentence. Basically how it's not the application itself as to why people aren't applying; it's the money. So where are they getting that from? Because it mentions it two or three times in here that it's the application.

President Dietz: The application process is complex. I don't think there's any question about that. The federal application process is pretty complex, but that's up to the feds to change that, and that usually is a part of the reauthorization process.

Senator Kalter: And so what the committee is recommending is that our government relations staff and our financial aid staff, or EMAS staff (Enrollment Management staff) work together to sort of give the federal government some very concrete ideas about how it could be simplified and how things could be changed to be in the better interest of students.

Senator Breland: But can we do that? Can't ISU just do that so we don't have to wait for the federal to get their things together?

President Dietz: We could. The impact of that will be not much, to be honest. The largest lobby group for higher education in the United States is the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, and every state has a state organization of financial aid administrators and their representative at the regional level and then also at the national level, and they have their structures. So working through that lobby group is the most effective way to impact policy in Washington, D.C.

Senator Breland: No, I mean if faculty and staff were here or advisors or something like that to help students with the application process.

President Dietz: Oh, on campus?

Senator Breland: Yeah, instead of waiting for the federal to actually change the application.

President Dietz: Sure, sure. And they do that. They put together all kinds of workshops for prospective students to help them fill out their financial aid applications.

Senator Kalter: We actually have that, Khalya, as a bullet point. "We recommend that the University increase its assistance to students and families toward completion of financial aid paperwork and increase skills training for students in budgeting and financial management." So one of the things that we talked about on the committee was once a student moves off campus, how difficult it is to figure out how to budget if you don't have family who have done that kind of financial advising before or who are bad at it themselves or something like that. So all of a sudden, you're taking on your own making food, doing everything, paying for utilities and stuff like that or however the leases work around here, and students on the committee were expressing that they needed more help with that.

Senator Breland: So my last question was kind of back to you again. I know how you said the MAP grants, we can't really get that, right? So then would there be a way to increase… So I now we have a section on our student fees that's like 33 cents for a certain kind of aid.

President Dietz: Student-to-Student Grant, yeah.

Senator Breland: Right. Is there a way to put another item on that or increase that specifically to help students?

President Dietz: Sure, absolutely.

Senator Kalter: Tell them the process. How does that go through the… What committees does that go through? Because there is a whole set of committees.

President Dietz: There's the Student Fee Committee, and we're pretty far down the line on that for this next year. Matter of fact, generally the Board will pass on that in May, we hope, depending on if we have a Board, how many we have and all that kind of stuff. It's the weirdest time in my history here, anyway, in terms of not knowing who's going to be our Trustees. But sure, that can be increased, and there's a process. You go to the Student Fee Committee and make recommendations about that and say we want to supplement the grant-to-grant offerings and that there would be a pool of money and we would use it for that.

Senator Kalter: And SGA seats people onto that Student Fee Committee, right? So if you have that idea, talk to the newly elected…

Senator Rubio: It's co-chaired by Wendy Bates and the Student Body President.

Senator Breland: I'm familiar with the committee that came in and spoke. But when they came in and spoke, we had these questions but it was about a different… It was about the Administrative Technology, something like that. But we had the concern of there's other places where we could use this money, which will be that part. So that's kind of where that question came from, like could that actually happen.

President Dietz: Well, it can happen with a Student-to-Student Grant. You can't take money from another fee and apply it to scholarships.

Senator Breland: Okay.

Senator Kalter: All right, anything else on that one, that particular brief? If not, the other brief is the committee telling us that they were doing stuff this year, and I don't think Tracy has anything else on those. So anybody have any feedback to the committee on the desired majors thing?

Senator Horst: Yes, they should talk to somebody from College of Fine Arts that has an audition process. They should bring in the chair of the School of Music.

Senator Kalter: So, Fine Arts is not one of the ones that has a desired major that people can't get into.

Senator Horst: But she talks a lot about… We have barriers for our majors that are different than other ones because we have an audition process. So you can't get into a School of Music class unless you have had a successful audition.

Senator Kalter: So, not to make you feel bad, but you and us, we're not even on this committee's radar screen.

Senator Horst: Okay.

Senator Kalter: Because we have more capacity in our major. Yes, you have to make a certain standard, but if you make that standard there's room to get in. We're welcoming the students in. This part of the committee work is talking about majors where there's more students wanting to get in than the programs are able to admit. And that's not Music; it's not English.

Senator Campbell: This is like Graphic Design.

Senator Horst: We have a limited number of people that we decide. So we don't have a problem with students because we already decide who our students are.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, and they don't get into ISU unless…

Senator Horst: They can get into ISU, but they don't get into the major.

Senator Kalter: But it's not like there's 400 of them standing outside your door knocking on it.

Senator Horst: There's a couple. Anyway, yeah. Certainly, we're not a very popular major.

Senator Kalter: Well it's not about popularity. It's about capacity, right? So that's what they're looking at is sort of the capacity. Whether it has to do with we don't have enough exercise equipment to do Exercise Science, we don’t have enough faculty, or we don't have enough clinical sites or what have you.

Senator Marx: Like Chemistry doesn't have enough lab space or that kind of thing. I wanted to ask if the committee had any time to reflect on their new process this year and recommend changes for next year's committee.

Senator Kalter: That reflection is in the process right now. Tracy is sending out a survey at some point and then asked us on the last day. And one of the things that was contributed by me was that I felt that the brainstorming got lost. So one of the great things about the Planning and Finance Committee is that every year it brainstorms new ideas, and sometimes generates some new initiatives, and that really didn't happen much this year. And it's partly because the kind of process that Dan Rich set up, and I think that you also were following, was to do fall semester with learning sessions (which are very broad learning sessions) and then have the committee brainstorm sort of where do we want the administration to go. So it was what I kind of predicted. We were only working on last year's list and we didn't come up with a new list. So that's something that got dropped. There are other things that got added, I suppose.

Senator Horst: I saw a very fixed process, that you would have this list that you would go through, it would take five years, and you couldn't necessarily respond to current situations and current trends like the Campus Climate report or the INTO or other initiatives.

Senator Kalter: In terms of the past way that it was being done, right? Is that what you mean? Or this year?

Senator Horst: No, I'm saying that if you have a fixed list it's inflexible and you can't necessarily brainstorm or you can't come up with initiatives given the climate that's happening right then. You're dealing with ideas that are somebody else's ideas from a couple years ago.

Senator Kalter: Somebody else's ideas from a different committee, yeah.

Senator Marx: But the point of that was that they would be focused on more long-term things, not shorter-term things because the campus plan (ECE) is meant to be the next five years, and the priorities should be longer term than the five years that are currently being addressed.

Senator Kalter: My question is, would winter session ever have happened? Because I think that it came out of Planning and Finance. So would that have ever happened if we were in the process that we're in now? I'm not sure that it would have; I'm not sure it wouldn't. But it seems harder for those kinds of creative ideas to come to the surface in the process that we're in this year.

Senator Marx: True.

Senator Kalter: But that's just my opinion.

Senator Marx: Right. I would suggest that they really revisit that work plan that was put into effect last year, adjust it accordingly, and then make those recommendations to the next committee.

Senator Kalter: All right. We're going to approve the proposed Senate agenda before we go into executive session. Tracy said, "I'm not sure if I'm confused, but the date for the bulleted and underlined elections note and the Senate meeting agenda seem like last year's date." So that's already been corrected? Awesome. Do we have a motion to approve the proposed agenda?

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

***Proposed* Academic Senate Orientation**

**Wednesday, April 24, 2019**

**5:30 P.M.**

**FOUNDERS SUITE, BONE STUDENT CENTER**

***5:30 p.m. Reception***

***5:45 p.m. Introduction to the Academic Senate for New Senate Members***

***6:30 p.m. Faculty Caucus for New and Returning***

***Faculty Senators***

***PLEASE PRINT YOUR BALLOTS FOR:***

***Nomination of Senate Chairperson***

***Nomination of Senate Secretary***

***Nomination of Executive Committee Faculty Representatives (4)***

***\*Elections will be held by Full Senate on 5/8/19\****

***Proposed* Academic Senate Meeting Agenda**

**Wednesday, April 24, 2019**

**7:00 P.M.**

**OLD MAIN ROOM, BONE STUDENT CENTER**

***Call to Order***

***Roll Call***

***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***

***Advisory Items:***

***Action Items:***

***03.19.19.03 Policy 3.1.44 Consensual Relations In The Instructional Context And Outside Of The Instructional Context- Current Copy (Rules Committee)***

***03.19.19.02 Policy 3.3.12 B Consensual Relations In Instructional Settings- Current Copy (Rules Committee)***

***04.11.19.01 Amorous Relations policy Mark Up(Rules Committee)***

***04.05.19.01 MCN College Council Bylaws Mark Up(Rules Committee)***

***04.05.19.02 Revised MCN Bylaws 3-27-19 clean copy (Rules Committee)***

***Information/Action item:***

***04.12.19.01 CTE Bylaws- II.A.3 revisions Mark Up (From Senate Chairperson)***

***04.12.19.02 CTE Bylaws- II.A.3 revisions Clean Copy (From Senate Chairperson)***

***Academic Impact Fund Report (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***Academic Impact Fund Statement of Priorities and Guiding Principles (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***Information Item:***

***03.08.19.03 Policy 1.17 Code of Ethics Current Copy (Rules Committee)***

***03.21.19.02 Policy 1.17 Code of Ethics Mark Up (Rules Committee)***

***03.21.19.01 Policy 1.17 Code of Ethics Clean (Rules Committee)***

***02.27.19.01 Policy 4.1.18 AAC email (From Academic Affairs Committee)***

***02.27.19.02 Memo Deletion of Policies (From Academic Affairs Committee)***

***03.08.19.04 Policy 2.1.6 Undergraduate Proficiency Examination (From Academic Affairs Committee)***

***03.08.19.06 Policy 2.1.7 College Level Examination Program (From Academic Affairs Committee)***

***03.08.19.05 Policy 2.1.8 Community College And Other Transfer Students (From Academic Affairs Committee)***

***03.08.19.07 Policy 4.1.18 Transfer Of Credit Current (From Academic Affairs Committee)  
02.27.19.03 Policy 4.1.18 Transfer Of Credit MARK UP (From Academic Affairs Committee)***

***03.08.19.08 Policy 4.1.18 Transfer Of Credit Clean Copy (From Academic Affairs Committee)***

***Communications***

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Rubio, seconded by Senator Campbell, to approved the proposed Senate agenda.

Senator Kalter: And with that date correction stuff that I just read, do we have anything that we need to say about the proposed agenda? Is Consensual Relations ready to go?

Senator Horst: It will be. I'll send you something on Wednesday, and hopefully you can help me get it revised. We talked about doing the wording together.

Senator Kalter: We did? Okay. All right, well, I guess I volunteered something.

Senator Horst: We were going to do that with the options so you're going to have options.

Senator Kalter: Oh, yes. So what Martha is talking about, the thing about LGBT and whether you would be outed in the process that Rules came up with. So Martha said after the meeting, what if you could go either to your department chair or supervisor or to OEOA? So if you don't want to be outed, you could go through a confidential process with OEOA.

Senator Horst: I thought I said that on the floor.

Senator Kalter: Oh, maybe you did say it on the floor. Yeah. So we'll have to think that through because actually as I was saying that I'm thinking of how that would work. Like if you're being pulled out of grading somebody else, how would that remain confidential? And I hadn't thought about that on Wednesday night. So at some point if you're grading a student who you're dating, which shouldn't happen in the first place, and the Conflict Management Plan that OEOA comes up with says you can grade all of the other 120 students in the class but just not Joe, then suddenly Joe is already outed because the chair would have to know somehow or another.

Senator Horst: Bring in somebody else who has the expertise.

Senator Kalter: So we'll talk. Sorry, I just thought about that. I hadn't thought about that before. The only other thing is Alan Lacy for AIF will be there.

Senator Marx: Yes, we'd like to make sure he gets invited.

Senator Kalter: Yes, okay. Anyone else need any invites? I don't think so. All right, all in favor of this agenda?

Ms. Christensen: Planning and Finance, for the financial aid, does that need to be an Advisory Item?

Senator Kalter: I'm sorry. Yes. Actually it should be Information/Action Item. Just that one. Sorry about that.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: All right, terrific. We will now go into executive session to talk about the presidential commentary, but the President wants to make a comment first.

President Dietz: If you filled out the form, I appreciate the time that it took you to do that. I take those seriously. I read every comment, and I am always open to feedback and I just appreciate the amount of time that you put into that and the amount of time that you're putting into this today. So, thank you very much.

Senator Marx: Have you had a chance to read the whole thing?

President Dietz: I have.

Senator Marx: Okay, good.

Senator Kalter: Just out of curiosity, have there been actions in the past that derive from the commentary?

President Dietz: Yes.

Senator Kalter: Awesome.

President Dietz: That's about all I can say about that.

Senator Marx: That is good to know.

Senator Kalter: Some people are very skeptical of that.

Senator Marx: We don't need details.

Senator Kalter: They think that nobody reads it. So it's nice to know that. We have it on the record that people read it.

Senator Marx: Thank you very much.

***Executive Session: 2019 Report on the Performance of the President***

The committee went into Executive Session to discuss the Report on the Performance of the President.

***Adjournment***