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**(Approved)**

***Call to Order***

Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

Senator Kalter: Good afternoon. Welcome back. Everybody have a good spring break? I have some potential oral communications, but I don't want us to get derailed from the distributed ones, so we're going to start with those. The other thing I was going to say, so Dr. Dietz will not be here today. Kyle emailed me, and he said he can't be here because he's in Springfield doing something important. And Jan has to leave at what time?

Provost Murphy: I'm going to leave at about 25 after 4. I'm going to be the president at 4:30.

Senator Kalter: You're going to be the president at 4:30.

Provost Murphy: Very exciting.

Senator Hoelscher: Going to be the president.

(Everyone talking and laughing at once.)

Senator Kalter: And who gets to meet you as the president?

Provost Murphy: A whole bunch of people who apparently donate a lot of money to the University.

Senator Hoelscher: You're going to be the president.

Senator Kalter: Good luck with that.

Provost Murphy: I know.

Senator Haugo: Smile wide and shake heartily.

Provost Murphy: Ask for a lot of money?

***Distributed Communications:***

***02.23.17.01 – from Martha Horst: Policy 9.1 Policy on Review, Approval, and Compliance with Information Technology Policies, Procedures, and Guidelines - Current Copy (Dist. Exec. Committee)***

Senator Kalter: Fabulous. All right. So let's see. The first distributed communication is from Martha, and it's policy 9.1. Why don't you go first, and then I'll give some background.

Senator Horst: Okay. So a couple of, it's a policy 9, it's intellectual…

Senator Kalter: Information technology.

Senator Horst: Information technology area of the policies. And the Rules Committee has been assigned a couple of number 9 policies. And so when I first started working on them, I came upon policy 9.1, which is like a policy on policies, which says how we should go about reviewing these technology policies, and it does mention this review board that no longer exists, but it does say that all the policies should go through that. So I briefly corresponded with Mark Walbert, and I said did this panel still exist? No. And so our committee is thinking that it's appropriate to work with them to figure out how this whole area of policies should be reviewed. Whether or not we want to review policy 9.1 and say the Academic Senate is in charge of this, otherwise we should work with these people, or we want to encourage them to delete 9.1 entirely, but right now there's this standing policy on policies for area 9 that says the entity that should review this area of policies is a panel that no longer exists. Yeah. So that's where we wanted to start when we start conversations with Mark Walbert.

Senator Kalter: And then a couple of other things to know. Last year or the year before, this committee put 9.1 on the non-Senate policy list. So in order to take it off that list, somebody has to make a good argument for why the Senate should spend its time looking at this particular policy. We look at some of the 9-point policies, but not all of them, and, for whatever reason, we put this one on the non-Senate list. Then Martha and I ran into Mark in person on our way to the Vice President for Finance and Planning meeting, and he seemed to think that we should just get rid of this policy, which, again, begs the question of whether we want to spend any time on it. Reading through it, it's a really interestingly-worded policy, because it keeps repeating the same thing with little variations over and over. It's like you guys needed a technical writer whoever it was who wrote this, because you could have said it in two words. So those are the questions. Do we want to take it off the list, do we want to look at it, do we want to delete it, etc.

Senator Horst: So we wanted to review it just because it says, you know, this Information Technology Policy and Planning Council should be consulted with changes and additions to the policy. And so we wanted to work with them to develop a strategy behind revising area 9 policies, and this seemed a good place to start. That's why we wanted to do it.

Senator Laudner: But IT wants it gone.

Senator Kalter: At least one person in IT… So one person in IT, the head of OAT, says we don't really need it anymore. We haven't talked to Charley Edamala or Rob Bailey. I think those are the only other two who would sort of…

Senator Horst: We invited him for our coming meeting, Mark and Charley. And we wanted to start the conversation with how should we start the conversation.

Senator Kalter: As it is now, because it's a non-Senate policy, Mark and Charley could get together and say let's get rid of this policy, ask the president to get rid of it, and it would go. It wouldn't have to go through the Senate. That doesn't mean, you know, it can't or it shouldn't. And I don't think the policy as worded prevents the Senate from looking at it just because the IT Policy and Planning Council, which no longer exists, is responsible. It doesn't mean that the Senate doesn't have to review it. It just means that they're responsible for making sure that everything goes all right. My sense is that if Mark and Charley agree that this policy needs to go, then just let them ditch it, and then you can spend your time on the other policies that you're reviewing. Right? But if they disagree, then probably the Senate ought to help them.

Senator Horst: We're just trying to get them to talk about it. We're trying to start the conversation, which nobody thought of. It makes sense to ditch the policy, but all we're trying to do is start the conversation, because before we even started the 9 policies, we wanted to start with the policy on Policy 9s. So that's all we wanted to do.

Senator Lonbom: It seems like a really reasonable place to start.

Senator Kalter: Just having them come to the…

Senator Horst: But we don't want a yearly review of it.

Senator Kalter: Yes. Good, that’s what I’d like to avoid. It still seems to me that this one doesn't need to be seen by the Senate even if it continues to exist. Right? Because it's sort of obvious. So as long as we don't put it back on a review cycle for us.

Senator Horst: Okay, so you encourage us to have a conversation with them to ditch it. Sorry, hold on we’re recording.

Senator Kalter: I don't think that was…

Senator Horst: You encourage us to have a discussion with them about this policy and then perhaps not approach it again.

Senator Kalter: There you go.

Senator Horst: Okay.

Senator Kalter: Very delicate way of wording it. All right. All right. Anything else on that one? That's enough on that one. All right.

***02.23.17.04 – from Jim Pancrazio: Policy 2.1.1 Student Records - Mark Up Copy (Information Item 3/29/17)***

Senator Kalter: This is the famous 4-page policy that's actually an 11-page policy, policy on Student Records, 2.1.1. So you may remember that we saw this before, but we only saw the first four pages, because apparently that was all that was sent to the committee. They've now gone back through and I assume -- although I don't remember if I read the minutes from this meeting -- that you still made only clarifying and typo types of changes. So no real content changes. So anybody have anything they found on that, other than let's put it on the agenda as an information item? All right. So that one's going on the agenda as an information item for next time.

***02.23.17.02 – from Mark Hoelscher: Policy 6.1.2 Lab Schools Policy – Mark Up (Information Item 3/29/17)***

Senator Kalter: Mark, you have the Lab School policies, which we have an interesting question about, but why don't you tell us all about…

Senator Hoelscher: So basically we took a long hard look at this and said we need to get Jeff Hill to review it, and he sent it back to us and said it looks really great, except you need to change the word Director to Superintendent, and frankly that's not even in the policy; it's down below under "Initiating Body.” “Please contact Superintendent of the Lab School.” So we took his advice and changed that to Superintendent. We didn't have any other changes that we thought needed to be made, so we passed it on out of committee. Now what's the interesting question?

Senator Kalter: So the interesting question, because this is an easy one, right? This is a no change. Just keep it as it is…

Senator Hoelscher: Pretty much.

Senator Kalter: Martha and I were just talking about it and reminding everybody that the 6 in 6.1.2 is Facilities policies, but when you read the policy, there's no reason to think that this is a facilities policy. Right? I'm trying to think of the other things that are on the facilities list.

Senator Grzanich: I would think it is in a facility.

Senator Kalter: That it is.

Senator Grzanich: It seems like they're talking about the buildings themselves.

Senator Kalter: Okay. When they say “Provide activities and experiences which contribute to the training of pre-student teachers”?

Senator Grzanich: Sure. So I'd say like the Rec provides activities and experiences which contribute to the training of athletic trainers.

Senator Laudner: But I think what they're saying is…

Senator Kalter: No. Not athletic trainers…

Senator Grzanich: I was just saying like the Rec as a reference.

Senator Kalter: Oh I'm sorry. I thought you meant this…

Senator Laudner: But like in that scenario, it's not the building that offers that, it's the program of recreation that offers, and I think that's what they're saying here.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. That's what I'm thinking. I'm wondering if we ought to advise a change of number. It wouldn't be a 6-point policy, it would be some other.

Senator Hoelscher: How would we do that?

Senator Kalter: I think we… I don't know. How do we do that? I'm trying to remember…

Senator Hoelscher: I'm thinking that we need to find out who is responsible for changing numbers, and you would send it back to Administrative Affairs and Budget and we would route it to that person or you can route it directly.

Senator Kalter: There might be a more efficient way, like now that it's come up through there is to just sort of on the floor of the Senate say, you know, we'd like to change the number and we've consulted with XYZ who is the one who changes numbers.

Senator Hoelscher: I didn't like it whenever I was giving you that option.

Provost Murphy: I don't even know who XY…Lisa?

Senator Kalter: It's probably… I was going to say Vickie, but it's obviously not Vickie herself, right, because she just changes the number on the site. My guess is that in a way it's the President and the cabinet who sort of decide…

Provost Murphy: On a number, yeah. You might suggest, and I would go as far as to suggest a number.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. Just…

Provost Murphy: You know one that's empty right now. We'd say could we use that one.

Senator Kalter: And figure out, like, because we have 1 I think is General, 2 is Students, 3 is Employees, 4 is Academic Activities, and it seems to fall in the 4 range. So maybe suggest a 4 point something type of policy.

Senator Horst: Defining the organization as opposed to defining the facility.

Senator Kalter: Yeah.

Senator Horst: Defining the unit, because it is a unique unit.

Senator Kalter: Yes. Yes. Absolutely. Lab Schools are an administrative unit in the college, so it's not really defining the building so much as defining, like Kevin said, like what the programs are. So okay. So we'll put this on the agenda as an information item, and in the meantime I'll do some research and figure out who you have to ask if it's anybody but us, because it could just be the Senate chair, because I've got a list of all the policies…

Senator Hoelscher: Yeah I, I mean, until you brought it up it never occurred to me, and I shouldn't, I should be paying attention to that, but the nomenclature would mean something, but I never thought to figure out what it would mean.

Senator Kalter: Okay, so it really just occurred to us as we were talking back and forth about it that it might be a (inaudible) policy, so we're going to put a little note, but we'll just route it to the Senate and do that in the background and say it on the floor if we can, since it's such a simple, it's no changes and all that.

***02.23.17.03 – from Mark Hoelscher: Policy 3.3.1 Tenure Track Position Authorization - Mark Up (Information Item 3/29/17)***

Senator Kalter: Let's see. Mark, you also have the Tenure Track Positions Authorization policy.

Senator Hoelscher: Yeah, I found that… Again, we, I do not have the marked up copy in front of me. I did not realize until just now that, thank you so much, that I don't know how to do it, or iPad does not provide me with the markups. Don't know which. So, at any rate, if you have the marked up copy in front of you, we sent this out to Alan Lacy because, again, that would be where the expertise would lie, and Alan suggested some changes, fairly substantial changes considering how short the policy was. We deferred to him and his expertise. He hasn't let us down yet, and we pushed it forward. We accepted those changes and pushed it forward.

Senator Kalter: Anybody see anything that…

Senator Hoelscher: My favorite comment was “This is not something that either Jan Murphy or I recall ever happening.”

Senator Kalter: That's a significant statement given the collective memory of those two.

Provost Murphy: Planted those trees with Jesse Fell.

Senator Hoelscher: So that's the short of it. We accepted his expertise and accepted the changes. They looked good to us and we moved forward with it.

Senator Kalter: Terrific. All right. Anybody else have anything?

Senator Hoelscher: And I promise I will make copies from my PC before the meeting. It never occurred to me, but it doesn't offer the markups whenever you look at it on an iPad.

Senator Kalter: I can't remember if I've told everybody here, but Adam Raboin, who's our Senate clerk, has gotten a job as a Peoria police officer, which was his dream, not necessarily in Peoria, but just to be a police officer, and so I've been training a woman named Cera Christensen, who's going to take over for the rest of the year, and when we started talking about the iPad thing, I was telling them, you know, you have to be aware that different audiences are going to see the policies differently, but we realize there's nothing we can do about the fact that iPad technology is just bad when it comes to markup, right?

Senator Hoelscher: It does not support markups. I'll go back to manual, especially when I'm dealing with it, but it also has an effect on me when I'm listening to someone else describe a policy, because I cannot see the markups. And it's so simple when you see the markups, and it's not when you don't. So I'll do that.

Senator Kalter: I don't know if there's a PC/Mac problem with markups or not, but we definitely have an iPad problem with markups. All right.

Senator Hoelscher: It could be I didn't find the right button, because I was dealing with iPeople trying to approve some time and iPads are a little funky when it comes to that too, and Human Resources is just wonderful around here, by the way, for whoever needs to hear that brag, because I get a hold of this young man and he's talking to a guy who doesn't really know technology. Anyway, he's trying to help me through it, and all of a sudden I get it. I hit the right button and I go to screaming, and we get it all approved and he said your childish joy was quite fun. He said, for future reference, can you tell me how you did it? I said no, it's a little bit like the first time I drove a Prius. It finally took off and I was so excited, but I tried so many different things I couldn't tell you exactly what I did to make it work. So we might be in for that again, but yeah, I didn't have to come in. That's the exciting conclusion to that.

Senator Kalter: Fabulous.

Senator Hoelscher: And I was able to do it from home.

Senator Kalter: We're going to move on. We're going to put that one on the agenda. Move on to consent agenda items, conscious that the Provost has to leave in about 15 minutes.

Senator Hoelscher: Sorry.

***Consent Agenda Items:***

***09.09.15.05 – from Planning and Finance Committee: Policy 4.1.7 Organizational Change (Information Item 3/29/17)***

***09.09.15.04 – form Academic Affairs: Policy 4.1.19 CreditHourPolicy2015-09-09 (Information Item 3/29/17)***

***09.09.15.02 – from Academic Affairs: Policy 3.2.18 OralEnglishProficiency2015-09-09 (Information Item 3/29/17)***

***03.09.17.01 – from Lisa Huson: Policy 1.1 Equal Opportunity Mark Up (Information Item 3/29/17)***

***11.17.16.02 – from Jeff Hill: Policy 3.5.1 Faculty Associate Hiring Policy (Information Item 3/29/17)***

***11.17.16.03 – from Jeff Hill: Policy 3.5.3 Faculty Associate Non Accumulative Personal Leave (Information Item 3/29/17)***

Senator Kalter: So… Five, five minutes. Okay, so these are all policies that we've already seen on this committee this year. We had put them tentatively on the policy consent agenda that now has been tabled. Please let's get this off the Senate's desk this year. So what I'm suggesting is we just put all of these on the agenda so they're on the proposed agenda. And I'm not even going to ask if anybody has anything about those. Those should be speak now or forever hold your peace back in October types of policies. So we're going to put those on there. So now let's move to the approval.

Senator Hoelscher: Second one and right quick.

Provost Murphy: So they're going to be info items.

Senator Kalter: What's that?

Senator Hoelscher: There's a typo second one in.

Senator Kalter: On the credit hour policy?

Senator Hoelscher: From Academic Affairs. Just a typo, just a typo.

Senator Kalter: That won't impact, I don't think. Thank you, Mark. Yes, you're right.

***\*\*Approval of Proposed Senate Agenda for 3/29/17 – See pages below\*\****

Senator Kalter: All right, so we'll move to the approval of the proposed agenda for the 29th. Do we have a motion to approve?

Motion, by Senator Hoelscher, seconded by Senator Grzanich, to approve the proposed agenda.

Senator Grzanich: You got it.

Senator Kalter: I'm getting better.

Senator Horst: Grzanich.

Senator Grzanich: Grzanich, yeah.

Senator Horst: Grzanich.

Senator Kalter: Just remember a growling lion. Grzanich. Yes.

Senator Hoelscher: You're going to resign about the time they get it, aren't you?

Senator Grzanich: Yeah. It will be close.

Senator Kalter: All right. So let's see, we got a proposed agenda. Anybody see anything needing changing. We've got the action item from, this was like a month ago, proposed edits to the Senate bylaws, and then those several information items that we just mentioned and the committee reports and all that. Sounds good? All right. No discussion?

The motion to approve the proposed agenda for March 29, 2017 passed unanimously.

***03.08.17.02 – from Noha Shawki: Civic Action Plan - Outcomes table 3-16 (Dist. Exec. Committee)***

***03.08.17.03 - from Noha Shawki: ISU Civic Action Plan 3-16 (Dist. Exec. Committee)***

Senator Kalter: All right. So we got an agenda. Excellent. So let's see. We've got… The other things on our agenda: Noha Shawki has sent us a Civic Action Plan update. I was a little bit disappointed to still see the Faculty Productivity Report in there, but…

Provost Murphy: Truly, because I thought you were pretty clear.

Senator Kalter: I thought I was… Thank you for saying that.

Provost Murphy: I'm with you, so I… And I talked to Jan about that, and I thought you were clear in your writing on that, and a good, I mean your rationale was very obvious.

Senator Kalter: Yes. I thought so too. I am so happy to hear you say that, Jan. I will send her a quick note about that. Did anybody else see anything where our feedback… I mean, I know we just sent out the minutes on this meeting. Did anybody else see anything that I should call to their attention that we asked them to revise that they did not revise?

Senator Horst: Could you send her the minutes?

Senator Kalter: We could, yes. We will. I sent her a pretty… I did my own minutes to send her the stuff, you know, sort of not verbatim, but almost verbatim, so I would have thought that it would have…

Provost Murphy: It was in there. Yeah. It was there with a clear rush. You copied me on that, and you did it like the next day.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. My sense is that this is not ready for us to go to endorsement yet, because they're going to have, I think she said, this Wednesday, I believe, this Wednesday or next Wednesday they're going to have an open forum, and then I think we are talking here about how they were going to do that also in the fall. So I'm just giving this to everybody as an FYI that they did make some changes. For the Faculty Productivity thing, it's not quite adequate, but, you know, if you saw anything else, if you do see anything else just let me know like hey they, you know, they forgot to change this, or we asked them to change that. All right.

***03.08.17.04 – from Council for Teacher Education/Deborah Garrahy: CTE Bylaws (Revised and Formatted 03.8.17 (Dist. Rules Committee)***

***03.08.17.05 – from Council for Teacher Education/Deborah Garrahy: CTE Bylaws (Revised and Formatted track changes accepted 03.8.17 (Dist. Rules Committee)***

Senator Kalter: All right. The next thing is we've got Council for Teacher Education Bylaws. We have been waiting for these for a long time, like two or three years, so thanks to Stacey Jones-Bock. She was the chair of their whatever-it's-called committee, maybe the rules committee or something. She is the chair of the Special Education Department.

Senator Hoelscher: I have connections with her through my Coleman Fellows.

Senator Kalter: Oh, okay.

Senator Hoelscher: One of the people under her is a Coleman Fellow of mine.

Senator Kalter: Oh, okay. Who's that?

Senator Hoelscher: Christi Borders. I think she's going to resign and become an interim…

Senator Kalter: She's just become the interim assistant or associate dean. Yeah.

Senator Hoelscher: So you all are taking a good one from me. I expect something in return.

Senator Kalter: Well we assumed it was because of you that she was…

Senator Hoelscher: She's, yeah, I'll take all the credit. No problem.

Senator Kalter: So these have actually already gone to Martha for Rules Committee. They're just being distributed out. So, did anybody see anything that they would like to advise Rules about as they're reviewing these? And, Martha, you said you didn't think you were going to get to these by the end of the year, right? Yeah, because you're doing the IT stuff.

Senator Horst: We'll have a conversation about the IT stuff, and then we're going to do our external committee slate.

Senator Kalter: Right, right. So by that time. Because there are only two more meetings left, essentially. There's, yeah, so…

Senator Horst: Maybe I'll have a meeting with her before…

Senator Kalter: Yeah.

Senator Horst: I'll have a nice meeting with her before that.

Senator Kalter: I think either way is fine. I mean, if it's not going to get… It's not going to get done by the end of this year, so if you don't have time, I would just wait, you know. All right. Great. So no comments on that one? Two copies of that.

***03.16.17.01 - From Thomas Burr/University Library Committee: Annual Report University Library Committee for 2015-2016 (Dist. Academic Affairs Committee)***

Senator Kalter: Let's see. The only other thing, I think, is Thomas Burr, or two other things. Okay, so Thomas Burr sent us the annual report. Actually this is from last year's activity on the University Library Committee. So that just gets distributed to Academic Affairs Committee and will eventually come back to us as an advisory item for the Senate. Boy, this is a long agenda, and yet it's going rapidly.

Senator Hoelscher: I mean, I don't think we've ever had a 30-minute meeting.

Senator Horst: So you're going to advise them to forward it to the Senate potentially.

Senator Kalter: Yes. For the most part, when we get an external committee report -- which actually I've been trying to get on top of that, because we've been pretty lax about asking for those -- we have the committee who they report to look at the report and then, you know, send it up through the Senate just so that everybody can see it.

Senator Horst: I think this would be a good one for everybody in the Senate to see.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, why?

Senator Horst: Because I understand there are substantial changes going on in the Library, and the Library Committee is addressing that, and they might be happy to receive the input from a broader constituency than the committee.

Senator Kalter: I couldn't agree more. I've actually been sitting in on their meetings this year because there are such changes going on and because the State is doing us no favors by not having money for the capital project that they need, and they've been having really interesting discussions about, you know, how do you transform a library into a 21st century library when it goes against everything that librarians are used to, it goes against everything that campuses are used to, you know.

Senator Hoelscher: What does it even mean?

Senator Kalter: What's that?

Senator Hoelscher: What does it even mean? That's not a question I'm asking an answer for. What do we even mean by that? I mean just in our lifetimes, and when I say our lifetimes I started 15 years ago, it has changed so much.

Senator Lonbom: It's a moving target.

Senator Hoelscher: Yeah. It just, it's astonishing how much it's changed. I don't know that there's a need to have a physical presence in the library anymore, and I think very shortly, in terms of the way I viewed a library 20 years ago, there's not going to be a need for a library. They're going to have to redefine themselves and reinvent themselves.

Senator Lonbom: You know, just remember, Mark, and it's probably different for you, but it varies wildly between disciplines, people's needs and use for a physical library. From my perspective, it's still very much there. That's a long time coming before that goes away. That said, with everything we offer 24/7, you don't have to be anywhere near the building. There's that piece of it too.

Senator Hoelscher: And the research component is... I mean there's so much to, yeah, it's, we're at Napster time now, you know. It's like what's going to happen, and we don't know.

Senator Grzanich: Speaking purely from like a physical standpoint, the facility itself for students to utilize it is, in my opinion, essential. I know that, you know, when I was living in the dormitories and when I was in the fraternity house, it's impossible to find somewhere to study besides the library, and so I think it's important for the sheer fact of just having somewhere to go. The library serves as a great…

Senator Snyder: And I've definitely had like classes on like research and stuff, especially like my Model United Nations class right now, it's very beneficial to have lab and those resources, librarians and things to go to.

Senator Hoelscher: Yeah, I mean it's, there's certainly a need, a critical need, but it's not the need that I remember.

Senator Grzanich: I do see where you're coming from the integration of technology and all that is going to be, you know, ever the more important as time goes on.

Senator Haugo: Which also increases the costs of maintaining the library too. It's not just simple acquisition of texts, right? As we add technology and databases, the costs go up.

Senator Hoelscher: I just watch it with wide-eyed wonder. I didn't mean to slow us down. I watch it with wide-eyed wonder, because I think we're on a frontier here.

Senator Grzanich: It is absolutely. Interactive technology.

Senator Lonbom: Yeah, I just had a question about this report. So do you anticipate getting one for this year from them also?

Senator Kalter: Yes. He's a little late with… I think what happened… He said we should do it at this time of year, I think it was January, but let me ask my committee, and then he forgot, and, you know, then he saw me and he's like oh, I still owe you a report, you know. And he was on sabbatical last year, but still doing the committee, which was really… Or, actually, it was this fall he was still doing the committee.

Senator Lonbom: He's very dedicated.

Senator Kalter: He's very dedicated.

Senator Lonbom: He lives in the library.

Senator Kalter: He lives in the library. He literally lives in the library. But what Kathleen just said is so true. Like, that's what I'm observing. Even, we expanded that committee like last year. He helped us to expand the committee to six to nine members. It was something like five faculty members. We don't have any students on it right now, which is really a pity, but even with the nine members, there are still voices that are missing, right? There are perspectives. Like what Kathleen is saying, it's widely different depending on even within the department how much you use the library as a physical space, how much you use it for print resources, how much you use it for journals, all of that. It's very difficult to figure out how to make a plan going forward when everybody has such different opinions and such different perspectives on what it does. So, you know, what a library used to do for them and what it's supposed to do, you know, 50 years from now or even 10 years from now. So I couldn't agree more that more voices are better, right, to have… Yes, it will go on it as an advisory item, but that doesn't mean we can't have a rich discussion about it and give that feedback.

Senator Horst: And he has the situation because of the building.

Senator Kalter: He has a major situation.

Senator Horst: So it would be a good time for them to get input.

Senator Kalter: Oh they've gotten a lot of input. Yes. There's no doubt that they have gotten a lot of input. Yes. And we're trying to make a plan forward so that the input is less -- how would you put it -- convulsive, because what has happened over the last 20 years or so is that there are these external things that force decisions, convulsive decisions and major decisions, and they've happened at least, what, four times Kathleen? Five maybe?

Senator Lonbom: Something like that.

Senator Kalter: Something like that, where like a basement floods and you have to do something about it, or what have you, and trying to get a plan in place so that it's more of a constant looking at your collections and, you know, figuring out what you need, what you want. It's difficult for sure.

***03.08.17.01 – from Kathleen Wilson: Email from FIU Fac. Senate: Importance of Immigration to Higher Education (Dist. Exec. Committee)***

Senator Kalter: All right. Moving from that one, we as a Senate always say that you as a campus member can always bring at any time any issue to the Senate. We don’t necessarily say that to other universities, but every once in a while the Senate chair receives stuff from outside. So we received an email from Florida International University. Just so that you know, I also today got something from Mary Dyck in Nursing about whether we would like to sign something about Illiberal Education. It's something about the Trump budget, right, Donald Trump's budget proposal. I haven't read it thoroughly, but something about how they're worried that it's taking, you know, away from things that would impact education. So that's going to be probably at the next meeting, but that's also the Dean of Nursing wanted to know whether the Senate wanted to sign onto that pact. So we've got two sort of, you know, political items that are here. Whether we want to give our attention to them is something we should discuss and, you know, discuss whether we should make that decision or whether we should put that decision to the Senate. So the first one is this one from Florida International about resolutions about the impact of immigration restrictions and immigration in general, I guess, to higher ed.

Senator Lonbom: So is your question whether or not this should be decided here or on the Senate floor? Is that your question?

Senator Kalter: Kind of, yeah. Yeah, so they're obviously asking us to, you know, to endorse their own resolution or a similar resolution. I think it's in… We should decide whether that's something we want to decide or whether we should ask the Senate if they want to decide it, and part of that is do we want to spend the Senate's time doing that. Have we already made statements that cover what they're asking us to cover, or have we not? Is it bipartisan or nonpartisan? All of those questions and whether it's worthwhile to spend the time on the floor of the Senate debating this and potentially voting something like this up or down.

Senator Horst: I would say if it was November or December where there's a lull in the Senate calendar, we would be having a different conversation, but this is these two or three meetings coming up are most intense meetings. They're the longest meetings. And so I can just see that this sort of political statement would generate a lot of conversation. I'm also hesitant to take it away from the power of the Senate to make this decision, but just as a keeper of the agenda, I don't think it's a good idea to put this on the agenda at this time. Maybe even in two or three meetings it might be better, but these are the meetings where we get all of our stuff done. And then, on the other hand, the Faculty Caucus is saying statements that we never discuss faculty matters that pertain to ISU. We want to have meaningful conversations. Well if we have those meetings with conversations starting at 9 o'clock, it will be more difficult.

Senator Kalter: This is another one of my oral communications. So let me say something about that. Beau and I were emailing back and forth when I sent out the question about whether internal committees could meet sort of independently, and then we could move the Senate meetings to 6, etc., and thank you for your email to everybody. And then John Baur back-channeled me and said, you know, whenever I go to meetings on this campus during the day and students are supposed to be there, they end up not being there, because they have other stuff that they do. So I feel fairly strongly that if we want to have a Senate that has a student voice, a strong student voice, that it’s going to be pretty impossible for us to move most of our meetings outside of the nighttime. Then we have major faculty, some. It depends on who the faculty is. Some faculty are very, very angry that we meet at night just at all. Some of them just don't want us to meet late into the night, which we've tried to solve. So my sense is that there are maybe two or three solutions to the problem of meeting late at night, right, that what Beau and I were talking about, and I don't know, I think you never, you probably went on spring break before you…

Senator Grzanich: Yeah, I was in Texas.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, that moving the internal committee meetings to what we call non-Senate Wednesdays was one option, because that would allow all of the students to still do what they're already doing. They're just, their time would be allocated slightly differently so that you would have essentially on "Senate Wednesdays" Academic Senate at 6, Faculty Caucus would meet after that, and SGA internal committees would meet after that, so we would sort of break apart, but do those on those Wednesdays. And then on non-Senate Wednesdays, we'd have the internal committee meetings with the faculty and staff, but now that also brings up another problem, which is that faculty don't want to meet more than twice… They don't want to meet weekly. They want to meet only every other week. So that's one possibility. The other possibility would be, and I can send this around. The other possibility would be to have the Faculty Caucus meet during the day somewhere sometime. Those are the two that I find potentially most viable as solutions to the problem that Martha just brought up. This is kind of off the topic of the Florida International thing, but it relates to what you're bringing up about it.

Senator Horst: Or you could have a Senate that didn't meet every other week, that met once a month, and then that next three-hour block you have the committee meetings.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. That's true too.

Senator Horst: So you wouldn't have… We could discuss that.

Senator Kalter: That's an interesting thing, because the question then would be if we go back into the archive, do we see years when we really need to respond rapidly to something and we can't do that if we only meet once a month as a full Senate. Right? So if we don't see that pattern, that would be more viable, but if we do see that, it would be advisable, you know, to keep the every-other-week meetings.

Senator Horst: Right, because then it would take at least a month to get an information to action item…

Senator Kalter: Right. Right.

Senator Horst: I take that idea back.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, that is a really long time.

Senator Hoelscher: So I don't want anybody to give… I'm going to say this, but I don't want anybody to think that I'm extremely conservative or anything else. When I talk to my family, they accuse me of being the liberal that doesn't know he’s a liberal, so I'm going to lay that on the table, but I think these waters run very, very deep, and I think people are irrationally in favor of some things, and I don't know where we as a community or we as a campus stand yet, so I think we need to be very careful if we step off into the political waters, and even if we don't mean to step off into the political waters. Now I am personally embarrassed by all that's going on, but I recognize that I have many treasured, valued loved ones and friends who take a different view of things, and it has tempered my view; not my opinion, just my view. And I'm a little hesitant to say this is a good thing to do. Now I think it makes all the sense in the world if you have International in your title. You're pretty confident that this is impacting you in a big way. I can't even talk about it without getting emotional when I think of all my colleagues that it impacts and all the people that it impacts, but I think we have to recognize that we are in some very interesting times and that this is a little bit… It carries a certain risk if we move into these waters, so we have to tread very lightly. So it's not just a question of time. It's a question of what's right, and then of course it brings to mind -- and I think we all have to ask ourselves this now, not later, not when we're called to it, but now -- what are our obligations, what are our moral obligations, so that when the time does come we know, we thought through it, we understand, we know when we should stand and be counted. So I don't want to encourage us not to, but I think we need to acknowledge that this is not as simple as just supporting another university. These waters can run really, really deep. I know, all I did was muddy the water. It just scares me where we are.

Senator Kalter: I mean, I'll just say, we could be getting these every two weeks, because there's enough controversy that impacts universities going on in the world right now that we could be getting these every two weeks, and then it… I think already the Sense of the Senate resolution that went through between November and January rattled a lot of our hope for bipartisanship, or the nonpartisanship. You know, we talked about that when it first came to us and said it's got to be this way. You know, it may be that the people who were trying to make it bipartisan didn't notice that it was still not quite there, because, you know, you can only come to it from what you're seeing, not from what everybody sees. So, but I think we got to a point with that one where we got to a vote and there was one objection, one no, and otherwise it was unanimous.

Senator Hoelscher: I thought it was an abstention actually.

Senator Kalter: Oh, was there an abstention? I think we voted no.

Senator Hoelscher: It was a no.

Senator Kalter: I'm pretty sure it was a no, and I really respected her for doing that. Right? That took a lot. It takes a lot of courage in a body of that size to say “no, this is against my principles.” Right? So I really respected the fact that that happened, but what I'm seeing with some of what we might be getting is that we're going to start moving into territory where it's going to become a close vote or a long contentious discussion. And while I kind of agree with the faculty saying we ought to be talking about things that are controversial and contentious, I'm not sure that we want to be talking about that with respect to these kinds of things. Right? I mean…

Senator Hoelscher: There will be obvious…

Senator Kalter: …that are political. In other words, where we're drawing lines not around what we think as professors, students, and staff, but we're drawing lines about whether we're leaning Republican or leaning Democrat or, you know, even Constitutional or non-Constitutional gets into some of those questions.

Senator Hoelscher: And the problem is that we don't even really know… It's muddying the waters as to what all that means anyway. So I think I hear caution in your voice and that's… I wanted to make sure that we approach this with extreme caution. It just really concerns me, because I'm on the leaning edge of a lot of this because I'm from the south, and so…

Senator Haugo: Wait, you are?

Senator Hoelscher: Yeah. I'm going to take that…

Senator Haugo: I had to lighten the moment.

Senator Hoelscher: I'm going to take that as an extreme compliment. And I know the tone is completely different, and maybe I shouldn't say from the south, but completely different in different arenas and in different areas, and there's a certain unreasonableness out there that doesn't allow itself to enter into conversation, and we have to recognize that we represent larger than ourselves here. I represent the College of Business. You represent the entire Senate really. We all have that responsibility, so unless it is something that's heinous, I have to think about the fact that we are a divided community right now.

Senator Haugo: My inclination too is to say that as a Senate we have issued one statement and we've approved it. Some of the issues addressed in this statement are still undecided. Right? We have federal judges who are blocking some of the legislation, for example, and I'm wondering if given the fact that our academic year is almost over if this is something that we revisit at the beginning of the next academic year after more time has passed.

Senator Horst: President Dietz made a statement about this. So our university… The other Sense of the Senate was referencing our documents, was coming from our faculty. This statement I could say well, we said something along the lines when he made that statement, and I'm not sure we need to make another statement as a university, so I think we can… I feel comfortable not putting it on the agenda, just realizing that President Dietz has already made a formal statement, so I don't think we need to make another one, and I don't think we need to take up the Senate's time at this point.

Senator Grzanich: Is that a motion?

Senator Horst: I believe so.

Senator Kalter: To table the, document.

Senator Horst: I'm not even sure I want to table it.

Senator Hoelscher: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: Ah, so…

Senator Haugo: So just taking it off the…

Senator Horst: I mean it's not coming from one of our faculty, it's coming from an outside body. Our president already made a statement about immigration.

Senator Haugo: So it does not need to be revisited.

Senator Hoelscher: Basically, Susan is the Calendar's Committee, and if you listen to us, or we are the Calendar's Committee really basically, and if we choose not to put it on the agenda, it's not on the agenda.

Senator Haugo: Yeah, does that need a motion?

Senator Hoelscher: I don't think so.

Senator Horst: I move to strike it from the agenda.

Senator Hoelscher: Well it never was on the…

Senator Kalter: It's not on a proposed agenda anyway. It's for discussion here amongst ourselves as to whether we would ever want to put it on…

Senator Haugo: And I guess my question is procedural whether it requires a vote or not.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, um.

Senator Horst: If it came from a faculty member, I think it would be a different thing, but it's not coming from our faculty members. It's not coming from the student group. It's coming from an outside entity that has their viewpoint, and we've already given… Our president's already given a viewpoint on this.

Senator Kalter: And your Senate chair has already given a viewpoint on part of this, right? Like I said…

Senator Haugo: It's in the record.

Senator Kalter: …I want to be unequivocal. This is bad for universities, and said a lot of stuff about that, and one reason for doing that was not to move towards a Sense of the Senate about every single issue, like this is impacting our university negatively, period. And that's about a university issue, not about politics. And it's not different from what both Republicans and Democrats have said about that original January 27, 2017, Executive Order. Right? There was heat coming from both sides on that one. Whereas we're moving into territory where it's becoming a lot more gray as to whether, you know, where the court system's going to go and all that.

Senator Hoelscher: And we have such bigger fish to fry here. We don't have a budget, we have chaos in our state government. I think it's fair to say our plate is full. Did you all notice we were in the Wall Street Journal today? Yeah. It was very complimentary in very trying times, because the article was about no budget in the State of Illinois, and I did not realize it, but Chicago State has already declared financial exigency and done some things, and they're at half-staff right now. They basically have, I don't know about staff, but they have half the students. They've gone down that far. Then they talked about some others that were having difficulty, and then they mentioned ISU and U of I being fairly healthy still, but even they will soon run into some serious difficulty. So it's a very interesting article. Very good.

Senator Horst: But if this, you know, I am wary of the Executive Committee silencing voices that the Senate might want to hear. So, like I said, if this had actually come from somebody internal, it would be a different thing. Like…

Senator Kalter: Absolutely. I couldn't agree more with you about that. I think we have to have… We have entertained stuff from the outside in the past, like the athletics issue went through the Athletics Council and you heard about that, and we, you know, if it were from even a CIUS member, like a Council of Illinois University Senates, like if it came from NIU or, you know, U of I, we have done that before, like with the Civil Service issue a couple of years ago. The fact that it's from a very outside university, and it wasn't like this was taken up by a Brian Rejack, because he got his from Oregon or Oregon State, some colleague that he knew there and said I want to do something like this, but it was him, it was a professor who was saying, and students, who were saying we want to do… And I don't want to silence those voices either. Whether or not they cause controversy on the floor of the Senate, I think it still needs to be talked about, even when we vote it down. Right? It's like it doesn't mean it shouldn't be aired. It should be aired, and if we don't like it, if it's not bipartisan enough, if it's not, you know, if it doesn't represent all of us, then we should vote it down, but it shouldn't be not talked about, and it shouldn't be Exec that says we don't want to talk about it. It should be the Senate that says no, let's either table this or whatever. Yeah. But with this one, I don't know, what do people think about Martha's question about do we need to have a formal motion to not do anything with this or do we need to just discuss it like we do with most of the other stuff on the agenda by doing. Do we need to do anything formal?

Senator Hoelscher: I wouldn't think so. In a sense, our chair brought it forward and we had a conversation about it. It dies on the vine, unless you feel the need. You could, you could insist on something formal, but…

Senator Kalter: I don't think so. I mean, I don't think so.

Senator Hoelscher: I would rather not do anything formal and on the record, because I don't want them to feel we're against them. We just are using discretion here and saying today's not the time for our battle. And there's a little risk in that, but I would think there's more risk if we vote it down.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. All right. All right. We're pretty much agreed on that? Yes? Great. All right. We will move to a motion to adjourn.

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Hoelscher, seconded by Senator Sibley, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.