**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

**MONDAY, March 20, 2021**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

Academic Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

***Oral Communications:***

***Senate office administrator and operations through the next few days/weeks***

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. I think we're all here, so we're going to call the meeting to order, and we're going to start with the first oral communication. So I wanted to let everybody know. Cera is out unexpectedly since last week. We're not sure exactly when her return date is going to be, and obviously I can't answer any specific questions about the details of that in order to protect her privacy.

I am in… I think everybody is in the busiest season of the semester. Right? April is always the cruelest month. There's also the added work for me of the presidential search. The application files just got released to the committee Friday, and so I'm only having so many additional hours of her role that I can take on in a week and still have everything functioning, both in the Senate and in my classroom and in my research publishing obligations.

So I just wanted to remind everybody, for the moment, everything should still keep coming to acsenate so that when she returns, you know, she will be able to catch up and know what's going on, and that way I can also do what needs to be done, you know, what's most urgent, basically. And I also just wanted to just acknowledge that Charlie's team in Office Technology Solutions, Craig Jackson and Carla Birkelbaw helped us a lot last week. There were a couple of access issues that we needed to solve to keep the business of the Senate running smoothly on track. Also, Destini Fincham and Jean Ann Dargatz in the Provost's Office, they're assisting with the minutes, and it's a really busy time for them, especially Destini because it's budget season in the Provost's Office.

That is also something I wanted to mention. So apparently we're not going to have any open hearings on the budget again this year because of the Zoom format and just the continuing pandemic. So those would usually take place tomorrow and Wednesday, and I just wanted to sort of make a note that when they pick back up again next year, it's important for at least one member of the Senate, usually Administrative Affairs and Budget and/or the Planning and Financing Committee to attend those, because it helps us, you know, educate ourselves and other people about how the academic budgeting works. And then, when possible, it's nice when senators actually go to their own budget hearing.

***Deferral of a few Exec items of a non-urgent nature***

And then, also, on the agenda under Oral Communications, because Cera is out and because the Senate business is backing up pretty badly because of the large amount of time we're spending on the Senate floor, either with the Engineering discussions or with the protests and public comment, I made a judgment call to defer a bunch of items that would have occurred today on the agenda, and they're going to go either to the next agenda or to the last agenda of the year. I checked in with Martha about one of those because it came in from Rules Committee with our Thursday noon deadline, just to make sure that that was not urgent.

So, if I remember correctly, the first item I deferred was from Senator Lucey about academic freedom. There were a couple of things from me about sort of minor changes/suggestions about the Blue Book regarding the internal committee membership. There was one about changes to the charge (that was the Martha one) the changes to the charge of the Textbook Affordability Committee, and then Fine Arts has sent in their bylaws. We received those a couple of days ago, so there's no way that would be discussed until next year anyway.

And then so if you're a committee chair, one of the things I wanted to ask is if you need to invite anyone to the Senate next time for an item to do those invitations yourselves and then copy me, and I'll let Mary Hollywood know. And, Kee-Yoon, if you could let David know about that, because I think you guys have a couple of things on the agenda. Any questions about any of that stuff?

Senator Horst: You'll be sending out the Zoom link to them?

Senate Chair Kalter: Which Zoom link?

Senator Horst: If we invite somebody to the Senate meeting, should we also then forward the Zoom link to them?

Senate Chair Kalter: Yeah, so it will be on the agenda, and usually what Cera does is when she sends out the materials for the meeting, she includes the people who are invitees, and so they'll get it on the top of the agenda. Does that make sense?

Senator Horst: (inaudible).

Senate Chair Kalter: What's that?

Senator Horst: You'll be including them in the e-mail?

Senate Chair Kalter: In the distribution, and then if you could do the thing with the calendar invitation again, that would be helpful to get it into the Outlook calendar.

Senator Horst: For the whole Senate.

Senate Chair Kalter: Yeah.

Senator Horst: Okay. I'll figure that one out.

Senate Chair Kalter: That one's a hard one. Let me think about that one more. Actually, let me think about that one more. (Laughter).

Senator Horst: Good.

Senate Chair Kalter: That might not be the best way to do it, so we might just need to have people, you know, wing it. (Laughter). Anything else about those things? All right. Let's see.

***Distributed Communications:***

***XX.XX.XX.XX Proposal to extend the suspension of ACT/SAT scores as an admissions criterion through [fill in the blank] (Information/Action Item April 7, 2021)***

So the first distributed communication is, technically speaking, from the Provost, but I was the one who put it on the agenda sort of as a reminder/placeholder. So I was wondering, Aondover, would Jeff Mavros or Jana be able to type up sort of a short rationale for that extension of the ACT/SAT score suspension and be able to do that by like Thursday morning of this week?

Provost Tarhule: Yeah. Actually they sent me something. I don't know if it's exactly in the format you want, but I'm happy to forward that to you, or I can… So they’ve already typed up a paragraph, so I can run it by Sam tomorrow to make sure it's in a proper legalese or legislative format, or I could just send it to you. I could even send it today or tomorrow.

Senate Chair Kalter: Okay.

Provost Tarhule: Let me have Sam look at it since you're already so busy. I hate to send you something that you need to work on, but I already have it. So Sam will look at it tomorrow, and I'll send it before the end of the day tomorrow.

Senate Chair Kalter: Yeah. So this one, you're kind of right. It is in a way easy, right? It's like we're either going to do it or we're not going to do it, and it's because of the pandemic. And so it's kind of (inaudible) for everybody to take a lot of time on it.

Provost Tarhule: Correct, and this is not a permanent change. It's a temporary change because of the pandemic. So you'll have it tomorrow. I'll make a note here.

***XX.XX.XX.XX IDEAS Graduation Requirement Recommendation***

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Let's see. So I'm going to… For just a minute I'm going to skip over the IDEAS item and then come back to it. I just wanted to point out in a list of annual reports from Academic Affairs that we keep trying to get to, I moved the Reinstatement Committee item up to the top and indicated after that one that we wanted to have that one come to the Senate on April 21, because Jana Albrecht is going to be doing her annual presentation on recruitment and retention of underrepresented students on that date. Then we were going to talk about those two things sort of on the same day if we could. And if we have time today, we'll at least start through that list of the annual reports. I don't know how far we'll get. Wanted to also call your attention to the fact that the Academic Senate calendar for next year is in your materials and on this agenda. So if you can sort of review that prior to final April Exec meeting, which I think is like the 29th or 23rd or something. I can't remember. It's one of those days. Just let us know if you see anything that's sort of accidental or anything substantive that we need to fix, and we can talk about that either of the next two Execs. Let's see.

Anything else before I go back to the IDEAS? Okay. So I think I'm the only one here who was on the original task force for the IDEAS graduation requirement. I got invited onto that one because of being a program director of two programs, so not in my Senate Chair role. So I'm going to ask Dimitrios to forgive me because I know he's poured a lot of time into this as the Academic Affairs Committee chair, but I wanted to say a couple of things before I turn to him. So one of the things I'm going to do here is sort of lay out some of my concerns about the proposal, because some of these were raised by members of the task force, or they were raised in the open forums by people who are friendly to the idea of the proposal. Right? And I personally also… I'm going to say here and on the Senate floor that I'm friendly to the idea of the proposal but that I do have some concerns about it that we kind of need to address and that there may be more. We actually received a couple of pieces of feedback last week, and we've got, you know, some that are concerned and some that are in favor. So I would say that this is going to take more than one Information Item and probably should take more than one Information Item. It's a proposal to add a graduation requirement, and that's a pretty big deal when it comes in the form of a class, so it seems like those are occasions to try to build consensus rather than just do sort of quick up and down votes. We might have seen that with the Engineering vote a little bit last time, so, you know, when we have a proposal that's controversial or that may have some suspicion behind it, even if that suspicion is unfounded or the resistance, you know… In other words, we had resistance and suspicion collected through the UCC survey about this one. It seems like the conversation and dialogue is really important, and we made a lot of room for that with the Engineering one. So it seems to me that it's often, you know, best to go for like more buy in and try to refine the proposal as well as possible. It could also… You know, doing that can also build irrational opposition to a proposal that pretty evidently sound and well investigated, but probably better to talk more than to talk less. So, before I go to my concerns, I also just wanted to sort of… I know that a lot of you are on Academic Affairs, and so this might not be new to you, but some of you aren't.

It's not quite as easy to do an index search for what the graduation requirements currently are in the undergrad catalog. The current ones are that you have to have a total of 120 hours to degree. And, by the way, there are 12 of them right now, 12 different requirements. So 120 hours to degree. If you take a BA or a BS, one of those you have to complete the LAN 115 course and all of the courses up to that. The other one you have to complete 3 hours of math, science, technology beyond the gen ed minimum. And then there are other types of undergraduate degrees, and those have different things attached to them. You have to complete the gen ed stuff. You have to take a major, declare a major. You have to do a certain number of senior hours. You have to have a minimum GPA, complete or remove any Incomplete, remove all of your disciplinary holds, have 30 hours of residency in the junior-senior years, have up-to-date pre-reqs. So like if you're in Nursing and your pre-reqs expire like, you know, in three years instead of ten, you have to actually update them. The AMALI is a graduation requirement, and then the last one is that you have a limitation on the number of hours that you can take of either professional practice internship or as an independent study. So some of those, but not all of them, involve having required courses.

I do want to make a note here for the record, and I'm going to say this because I want to say it for the record, because it disturbs me. We were falsely and slanderously accused of delaying the process about this one, IDEAS, for an entire year. We did not. As a member of the original task force, and I'm also the co-director or director of two programs that are pretty essential to this proposal, right, Ethnic Studies and Native American Studies, I really strongly resent hearing those rumors and innuendos and accusations and felt like we were being rushed to get through this as though there was racism at work when, in fact, all there has been basically is the pandemic delay that everybody else was experiencing and also due diligence by the members of Academic Affairs, which I really appreciate. So I really deeply understand the impatience, right, that a number of people feel: Faculty, students, staff, how long things like this related to improving the campus climate take. But part of that taking a long time is that we're doing it to avoid massive backlash, which things like this can get, and so I just wanted to make that statement, because I think it's important in the record that we have it. And I really appreciated that Dimitrios put the timeline into the proposal so that it would be clear to everybody what the delay was about.

Okay. So here are the things that I'm going to raise on the floor and that we might want to talk about today, but they're really just to preview for the floor some of the things that I'm going to bring up and that might come up from other people. So one of the things that I'm a little bit concerned about is that it seems like what we as a task force proposed is not necessarily what the students are asking for, so that’s the first concern.

My second concern is that if so many people, according to the data analysis, have already taken one of these IDEAS courses or are taking them just as a matter of course, I'm not sure how that's going to change the campus climate. So I had asked for those statistics during the task force meetings and was never provided them. They didn't come out until like this fall or this spring. So, you know, at the time I asked, because as a task force we were kind of concerned about the resistance that we might get from departments and programs, but I think it's also interesting because it speaks as to whether the cure, right, towards the campus climate and the educating of people is going to be efficacious in addressing the disease because so many people are already taking the courses. On the other hand, you know, the third concern is that if we were to create a different course that no one has ever taken and require that, it would add credit hours and then would we ever get support for that. Right? So there's kind of a conundrum there.

Another concern that I have, as one of the faculty who teaches these courses… I've been teaching these courses for 21 years, and I'm a little concerned about how making both of my courses required rather than basically voluntary is going to change the nature of the audience that I might be addressing and sort of add an element of increased hostility to the class or add an element of hostility to the class if it's not there, right, and change the tone of the course. So one of the things that I notice is that almost all of the students that I get come in pretty much completely ignorant of Native American lives and history and literature and issues. Right? Except for those students for whom being Native American is a lived experience and then that can cause a clash within the dynamics of the course, and that can be pretty difficulty to manage. So the second kind of student, right, then the professor has to work real hard because that student might be suffering from micro-aggressions and macro-aggressions within the class from the rest of the students. And I see that sometimes when I teach like African-American, Latinx, Asian-American texts, AMALI texts.

So, you know, I can say a little more about that, but let me bring up three more things. The task force and a number of people in the public forums raised workload issues about IDEAS about adding a graduation requirement and concern that we don't put the work on the back of non-tenure-track faculty or hire more non-tenure tracks to accommodate capacity. So basically saying if we're serious about this commitment, we should be hiring people who have solid research agendas and healthy and equitable salaries to teach and support the agendas.

There's a minor thing that I wanted to bring up. Because I am on the task force, I got some e-mails about some things that Toure Reed, who's one of the members of the task force and teaches African-American history, had brought up that I don't think got incorporated.

And then the other thing was on page five. It talks about how there's a parallel to the AMALI curriculum committee. But the way it was described, it was parallel but not parallel, and in my opinion, AMALI) faculty and IDEAS faculty ought to be electing their own people who are screening which courses are appropriate. Right now, Amy Hurd does… and, you know, she's told me, well, I feel really uncomfortable with approving AMALI courses on my own because it's not in her area of expertise, so she appoints people, but it seems like those ought to be elected and we ought to formalize that. The Senate ought to formalize an AMALI curriculum committee and an IDEAS curriculum committee to be subcommittees or panels of the UCC.

So that's a big mouthful, but the reason I said all of that before Dimitrios even got a chance to introduce himself is because so many of you are on Academic Affairs. Right? I think one, two, three, four, five, six of you out of this group and then, Todd, you're on a curriculum committee. So just wanted to kind of say all of that and then hand it over to Dimitrios. Have fun with introducing it. (Laughter)

Senator Nikolaou: Well, this is the IDEAS graduation requirement, as Susan mentioned. So we started… So pretty much the whole year we have been talking about the IDEAS graduation requirement. We looked at some of the issues that Susan brought up. We talked about them. I think we didn't know about… which one was it…the one you mentioned about introducing a new course. We talked a little bit about it, but then we said that this might be a bit more toward down the road, that we may, toward the beginning, we may seek candidates and see which courses that we currently have would be willing to serve towards the IDEAS graduation requirement. So in the proposal toward the end, you see there is a list of courses, and I think that came from the ad hoc committee, because Amy provided us the list. That they identified that these courses could potentially satisfy the IDEAS graduation requirement, but we would not automatically change them into IDEAS graduation required courses. It would be up which ones want to participate in the graduation requirement, and partly that they may want to restructure a little bit the course, to better match what the IDEAS is trying to do, because it might be that they have a greater emphasis on diversity and inclusion, but they do not have any discussion about access. So they may incorporate more learning objectives or reallocate part of the teaching component.

We also talked about the workload and the NTTs and who is going to teach it. Partially that was not something that we could directly address, because that would have to come with more discussion with the Provost. It would have down-the-road lines that would be specifically designed for covering these types of courses. And that was related more towards doing the more voluntary and then moving to, okay, do want to create new courses that are explicitly designed for this graduation requirement. And if that's the case, it makes perfect sense that we want people whose research is totally on diversity, inclusion, and equity.

Well, if you look at the recommendation… So we looked at some of the other universities to see what other universities are doing. As you will see, most of the universities are talking about a cultural component, but they do not necessarily discuss that it has to be within the U.S., and the only university that was the closest was University of Illinois Chicago, with pretty much the same graduation requirement as the one that are proposing.

The timeline, part of the reason was to clarify that we tried to address IDEAS as quickly as we could, given that a whole semester went off last spring when we had set up to work on IDEAS.

I'm going to talk more about the learning outcomes in the meeting, too, because there was a specific outcome that was proposed by the ad hoc committee. It was changed by the UCC, but then when we talked as a committee and then we also had Rocio, who was the chair of the ad hoc committee, and then we also had Doris join us. We decided that what the ad hoc committee had proposed better captured the issue of diversity. And that's why we diverted to the initial proposal even though the UCC voted to change the language.

So for the catalog copy/implementation, I think what Susan mentioned, that could be something that we can incorporate. If we decide that we want to create specific committees, one for AMALI, one for IDEAS, I think that's something that could be done, and that's where we asked mainly Amy about the implementation, because she had in mind how the AMALI graduation requirement was going to go through the process. And I think she would be open because she also mentioned the same thing to us that she doesn't feel comfortable approving herself courses on IDEAS because that's not her area of expertise. That's why she wants to have people who totally work on these areas.

And then the last part that you see in the proposal, when we talk about the numbers, the second part when we said that there are some departments that have potential courses, but they are not listed in the table that the ad hoc committee created, was because we were discussing that it might be better for some departments if the IDEAS graduation requirement is satisfied by a course that can also serve as an elective in their program, and that's why Amy sent a quick survey to advisors. And I think it was to advisors in departments that didn't have a course in the table to see if there were any courses that could be redesigned to meet this requirement, and that's where you see the “add Biology Communication, Econ,” and all the Teacher Ed courses. That's why they are listed in there.

Oh, so the question that Susan said about Toure’s comment… We also had the same question when we were talking about it in the Academic Affairs, because we had incorporated comments from Toure, comments that all members from the AAC made. So we had two options. Either include definitions that we had adjusted based on the feedback that we had received from the ad hoc committee and from the AAC or incorporate the definitions that DIAC created and then when Doris sends the e-mail, she informed us that the President had signed off on these definitions, so we thought that if we include different definitions from the ones that the University has approved, it might create questions why they are not matching with each other. And that's why it didn't make it to our proposal, Toure’s comments. And then I asked Rocio, because she's also in the DIAC, and she actually said that by the time Toure brought the comments to DIAC, the definitions had already gone through the process to be approved by Legal and then sent to the President, and that's why they were not reflected in the Appendix A that you see in there. But we do have the alternative definitions that we created, so if, you know, that would be helpful to see what they were… I mean, they are not that different from the approved ones, but that could be material that we could attach as supporting document.

And, also, obviously we voted, and we unanimously approved for everyone who was present in that meeting.

Senate Chair Kalter: Great. Anybody else have any comments. We're basically here to talk about whether it's ready to put on the agenda, and I would say it is, right. Martha?

Senator Horst: I'm just wondering about the financial implications. I mean, are we going to have to add extra lines, or are you saying that's just a future plan? And if we do think that there's going to be some financial cost to this, does that have to be presented?

Senator Nikolaou: So for the financial implications, we were not thinking that we are going to start with creating new courses that are going to be expressly designed for IDEAS. We thought that because we already have courses which the majority of the students take, it would satisfy this component. And then the survey that I mentioned earlier that other departments may have courses that, you know, they don't really think they match the IDEAS requirement, but with a small tweak they would meet the requirement, that we would be able to meet the demand from the remaining approximately 2,900 students. And these 2,900 students, the numbers do not include summer semesters. The numbers are from fall and spring semesters. There are some of these courses that are offered during the summer, but I didn't have access to that information. And that's why we say at most it would be 2,900. It might be less. But ideally we would want to think that in a few years, if we are in a financial situation that would allow us to make hiring specifically meeting these IDEAS graduation needs, to also address the concerns that also Susan mentioned that we don't want to introduce the graduation requirement and then have NTTs or graduate students being burdened with teaching that graduation requirement. It should be offered by experts in the field.

Senate Chair Kalter: So I’ve heard two things that really need longer term working out. I think it should still go to the floor, right, but what Martha just brought up is kind of important, and it's all sort of in a knot. Maybe it's really one big complex thing. But if we don’t know what the financial implications are yet, and we haven't studied that… Like we didn't study which courses until three years after the task force… And if we're, instead of opting all of those courses that the task force had originally suggested in, they're going to opt in themselves, we can easily get, first of all… Well, there are two things. We could get to a situation where we've got too many students needing to take it without enough financial resources to accommodate them, and then there's a capacity issue for the students. So you make something a graduation requirement but then let's say only half of those people opted in and none of the other ones get approved, right. Maybe Agr or Bio, I think you mentioned, maybe they apply but those are rejected, and so then you've got a very tight pipeline of courses and not enough capacity. So that then brings up a third thing that I noticed, which is these can get pretty controversial. So AMALI’s curriculum committee a couple years ago had a big debate about admitting a certain set of courses, and so it kind of comes down to how do we determine as a University who are the experts in this area, right? So it's a little bit of a catch 22. You either figure out who the experts are and then, you know, they're the gatekeepers, which we do in every other discipline. This is more of an inter-discipline. Or you let everybody apply sort of indiscriminately to be a course because… for a reason that’s not a valid academic reason, right. It’s, oh, we need to have students getting through their majors, and so we're going to include an AGR course even if the people who have been teaching this for 50 years… because like Ethnic Studies has been here for 50 years… don't consider that course to actually fulfill, you know, not be solidly grounded in theory, you know, in critical race theory or whatever it may be. You know, whether it's disability studies or what have you. So that's interesting. It's just sort of interesting, I think that it's important that we're putting these on the floor to sort of point them out.

The thing about Toure’s thing… I think, actually, Toure’s argument about why we should make the minor change was more important than the minor change, but I wanted to bring it up, right, because the entire task force agreed with Toure, and then it didn't get incorporated. So that was pretty confusing.

The only other thing I was going to say sort of snidely is whether somebody else can write learning outcomes for a course that I've been teaching for 20 years. Right? So and that's not just me. It's also Toure course. It's also Maura's course. Right? There are a whole… It's all the Women and Gender Studies courses. They have their own learning outcomes, and so this kind of goes back to that first point that I made that we're trying to… Do all of the individuals who are teaching the IDEAS course have to hit every single one of the IDEA topics in some substantive and well-grounded intellectual way? Right? So, but I think we're still… I think we should still go forward with it as an Information Item and see where these things… You know, what the Senate has to say about all of these concerns.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah, that's what I was going to say. I'm eager to hear the discussion on the floor and think this is ready to go to the floor, and I think that’s the main question today, right, is whether it's ready. So I just wanted to put in that I think it's ready to go to the floor.

Provost Tarhule: Susan, may I add one perspective?

Senate Chair Kalter: Mmm-hmm.

Provost Tarhule: And I haven't, I’m not as in tune with this discussion as the rest of you. But as I think about the tenure track, and we want these courses taught by tenure track faculty, think about how tenure track faculty are approved. It actually starts from the department. That means the department would make a request that would go to the dean. Then the dean will have to prioritize that before it comes to my office. That means some department will have to decide that they want tenure track faculty specifically for IDEAS courses. I think more than likely they will be thinking of their faculty in terms of their curricular needs or their research needs. And because we have so many IDEAS courses, the likelihood that we'll have a lot of departments independently deciding to put up and advocate for faculty to teach these classes may be low.

Alternatively, what could happen is the departments that want to do that are the ones that teach critical race theory. So then you might end up with a limited pool of courses coming from a small area, because those are the departments for whom tenure track hires makes sense. So it's what's, I’m not arguing against it and just putting that out as something to think about as we say we want tenure track faculty to teach this.

The other alternative is to say is an NTT synonymous with lack of expertise. There are cases where NTTs may not have necessarily the most current research, but, you know, a lot of them are, you know, Ph.D. trained at reputable institutions, and so when you think on the one hand the complexity of how tenure track lines that move to the top, this is the…, and also the risk of maybe limiting the pool of classes we offer to only those that support this in their curriculum versus the option of potentially having NTTs teaching some of this. I think that could be an important balance to weigh in as you think about what we might do going forward.

Senate Chair Kalter: Let me clarify that last point just so that everybody understands. When this was brought up at the task force and open forum level, it wasn't brought up by me, actually. I can't remember who first brought it up, but I think it was brought up by somebody from the Women and Gender Studies program. It wasn't about lack of qualification at all. That was not anything that ever came up, because we know that, you know, many, especially in these areas, there is a deficit of jobs and a surplus of faculty to teach those jobs, right? So we have a lot of very well qualified non-tenure track faculty who are, you know, who have the same basic credentials when they come in as the tenure line faculty. Todd's department, you know, sort of know that very well, because there are a lot of philosophers out there without jobs. The concern was sort of what I had mentioned before about there are stresses within these roles that are unique. You know, we know, for example, that when professors and other instructors get student feedback, if they're teaching a course about race or gender or what have you, they're much more likely to have negative student feedback, which is one of the reasons why, you know, student responses to teaching are, you know, being put into question in areas around the country because they also tend to skew against faculty of color and women. So it was more about whether the University values it enough to fund it, whether the University values the area in a way that allows the people who are teaching it to have the time to do the research that you need to keep up in the field in order to continue to teach an excellent course throughout a long period of time, right? And so because we do not pay our… There are a lot of non-tenure tracks in my area and other areas who do research and publication, but they're not paid by the University to do it. And so it's much harder for them, especially with four course load each semester and usually more students than the average other professor because they're not teaching at the graduate level, they're not teaching as many upper divisions or any upper division, they tend to have a very high grading load, etc. Right? So those are the concerns that were attached to that one. It had nothing to do with the credentials of the non-tenure tracks. It had to do with whether the University is going to value, to put their money where their mouth is kind of the way I would succinctly put it. Which is rare for me to do that succinctly. (Laughter) Let's see. It seemed like there was one other thing that came up there, but I can't remember what it was. So I'll follow up, perhaps, at some point on the floor.

Provost Tarhule: It's how to get tenure track lines, because that will have to start from the department, and if you look at the long list of courses and imagining the mechanism by which all those departments will actually put up, use their tenure track lines for this. Yeah, so anyway, that's…

Senate Chair Kalter: That might have been it, actually. I was thinking when you were talking about that that I have a listserv in Ethnic Studies of about 140 people, including faculty and staff. I'm thinking that maybe 60 to 70 of those are people who teach frequently in the field. So we actually already have quite a few faculty. Some of those are non-tenure tracks. Some of them are tenure tracks, right? So it's not for lack of faculty. What I find often is when students finally find me and realize that there's a minor on campus for Ethnic Studies, they have no idea how many courses there were. Because of the way our curriculum is structured, a lot of those courses are at the 100 level and fulfill the same gen eds, and we don't allow students to take multiple ones of the same gen ed, in general. So we have tons and tons of courses in the areas, like AMALI, for example. But students can only take a couple of them because we're trying to keep the class sizes low. So that's another issue. All right. So, let's see. I think… Sounds like we're ready to put that on with just the advisory that it might take a little more than one information item, given all of those things that just came up.

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

So, do we have a motion to approve the agenda?

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

***Proposed* Academic Senate Meeting Agenda**

**Wednesday, April 7, 2021**

**7:00 P.M.**

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

**Zoom Link:**

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

*YouTube currently inaccessible...OTS working to recover*

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

***Call to Order***

***Roll Call***

***Chairperson's Remarks***

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

***Administrators' Remarks***

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

***(Tabled)***

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

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

***Information/Action Item:***

***Proposal to extend the suspension of ACT/SAT scores as an admissions criterion through [fill in the blank]***

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

***XX.XX.XX.XX IDEAS Graduation Requirement Recommendation***

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

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

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

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

***Rules Committee: Senator Horst***

***Communications***

***Adjournment***

All right. And, let's see, do we have anything that we need to change about the agenda other than putting the links in?

Senator Mainieri: Is there any way for us to move up the IDEAS in the agenda, anticipating that it will probably take more than one information discussion? I just worry with the number of meetings we have left. I don't want to be in danger of running out time. But if that's not a concern with this agenda, then I'm fine where it is. But if we're worried about time, I would like to open a discussion about moving it up on the agenda.

Senate Chair Kalter: What do people think? Yes, no. How would it impact other things to move it up?

Senator Harris: Yeah, 'cause that was going to be my question. I just didn't know like what it would look like if all the discussions weren't had before the end of the school year that people want to have.

Senator Horst: I’m looking at the agenda, and I would advocate for the action items to stay where they are. I don't there will be too much discussion for those. You know, the Academic Planning Committee Blue Book page and all the related items could potentially go down. The CAS Council bylaws, however, you know, there are ramifications as to how the college will work. So I think that needs to be addressed. And it also has ramifications on how we seat the committees, although I don't think we'll get that far. But, you know, the Academic Planning Committee stuff could move down.

Senator Nikolaou: And we still need to do the Course Material Fees, because this is from an audit, and it has been since, I think, around January. Fees, and is it an option to move around the remarks?

Senator Harris: I like that idea. At least my remarks. (Laughter)

Senator Mainieri: Yeah, I would be in favor of that. And then could we rearrange the information items just a little bit and maybe do course materials? What did you say, Martha, CAS? And then IDEAS or something and move down the other, the other three below IDEAS?

Senate Chair Kalter: I think it might be important for the Chairperson's remarks to stay where it is, but if Lauren wants to move hers, and Larry and Aondover, what do you think about moving yours? I'm wondering, for example, if we're going to have other fall planning types of questions again or other, you know, things like that or if we kind of address those…

President Dietz: I don't mind moving Administrator Remarks down. I do think that it's difficult to predict fall planning and some other things that are kind of the continual conversation about all of that, but I don't mind moving those down. I don't think that Aondover would care about that, either, and I know the other vice presidents wouldn't.

Provost Tarhule: I definitely support that. And if people have questions… I don't have any burning issues that I need to report. If people have questions, I'm happy to answer them, but happy to move the remarks down.

President Dietz: I do think that moving the IDEAS discussion up while people are pretty fresh about all of this is important. The students have wanted progress on this for a long period of time, and I understand why it's taken as long as it has and probably will take more time, but I think to the extent that we can have as much discussion between now and the end of the academic year would be very helpful.

Senate Chair Kalter: Let's see. I'm trying to do this in some track changes on my own computer while I'm conducting this. So what I'm hearing is, first, from Martha that we take all of the stuff that's related to the APC and move it underneath the IDEAS grad requirement. Is that right, Martha? Okay. So then, also hearing to take Student Body President and Administrator Remarks and move those down to right before the committee reports. Is that where we want them? Yeah. Okay.

President Dietz: That would be good. Yeah.

Senator Nikolaou: After or before the committee reports? Because the committees, we can always send like a one or two sentence statement to be added to the minutes.

Senate Chair Kalter: Good question, although I think traditionally they've never been… The committee reports have never been above the Administrator Remarks, but I don't remember all of that.

President Dietz: I don't remember them being… I think we're always either… Historically, I think we've been first, certainly higher on the agenda with some exceptions, but I don't remember them ever being after committee reports.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay, so we're saying to be just before the committee reports, right?

President Dietz: Oh, yeah. Yeah.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. I thought we said to be after the committee reports. Oh, okay. Okay. Yeah.

Senate Chair Kalter: That's great. And I think that, by the way, one of the reasons we do that is if we're in a face-to-face environment, sometimes some of the administrators can come in… They're at Senate for like half an hour, and then they have to go to another event, so it makes, you know, that kind of thing a little easier. Okay, so then… Let's see. We would have… Oh, this is such a long agenda. So the action items are Milner Bylaws, the Mass Electronic Communication, which had Larry's thing in it that was sort of moved up, the Sound Amplification tabled, the proposal to extend the suspension of the ACT, SAT, the course materials fees, the CAS Council Bylaws, and then the IDEAS Requirement? Is that right? All right.

Senator Nikolaou: Question for the Sound Amplification. How… Because if it was just that we are voting, it would be fine, but it is tabled, which means that we need to do a vote for un-tabling it, and then we need to do a vote for actually voting.

Senate Chair Kalter: Actually I think it's in the midst of action. So technically when you table something in the midst of action and you un-table it, it goes back to where it was, so we're in the midst of debate, and… I believe this is how it works, right. It goes up to the point of tabling, got tabled, got taken off before, continues.

Senator Nikolaou: But we still need to do two votes, right? One to un-table it and then one to approve it, right?

Senate Chair Kalter: Yeah, although the motion for the second one doesn't need to be made because it has already been made.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay.

Senate Chair Kalter: So we can just go right back into that debate.

Senator Nahm: About the Sound Amplification policy. I think if I, you know, didn’t remember, right, that it was tabled, I might be confused by the parentheses-tabled. Could it be previously tabled just to make it clear that we need it back?

Senate Chair Kalter: That's genius! How come we didn't do that last time? (Laughter) Great, Kee-Yoon. Anything else that anybody sees? All right. Terrific. Let's see. So we already had the motion and the second. Do we have a vote?

The motion to approve the proposed Senate agenda passed unanimously.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. So we've got an agenda.

***From Academic Affairs Committee:***

***Memo from Reinstatement Committee, 2018-2019 (Advisory item April 21, 2021)***

***Annual Report, Reinstatement Committee, 2018-2019 (Advisory item April 21, 2021)***

***Memo from Reinstatement Committee, 2019-2020 (Advisory item April 21, 2021)***

***Annual Report, Reinstatement Committee, 2019-2020 (Advisory item April 21, 2021)***

***Annual Report, Honors Council, 2018-2019 (Advisory item?)***  
 ***Annual Report, Honors Council, 2019-2020 (Advisory item?)***

***Annual Report, Academic Planning Committee, 2018-2019 (Advisory item?)***

***Annual Report, Academic Planning Committee, 2019-2020 (Advisory item?)***

***Annual Report, Council for Teacher Education, 2018-2019 (Advisory item?)***

***Annual Report, Council for Teacher Education, 2019-2020 (Advisory item?)***

***Annual Report, Council on General Education, 2018-2019 (Advisory item?)***  
 ***Annual Report, Council on General Education, 2019-2020 (Advisory item?)***

***Annual Report, University Curriculum Committee, 2018-2019 (Advisory item?)***

***Annual Report, University Curriculum Committee, 2019-2020 (Advisory item?)***

***Annual Report, Library Committee, 2018-2019 (Advisory item?)***

***Annual Report, Library Committee, 2019-2020 (Advisory item?)***

***Annual Report, UAB and UHP (Student Conduct Conflict Resolution), 2018-2019 (Advisory item?)***

***Annual Report, UAB and UHP (Code of Student Conduct), 2019-2020 (Advisory item?)***

Senate Chair Kalter: So now… Oh! We have six minutes to go to the one annual committee report. (Laughter). And this time I'll hand it over to you, and you can actually start it.

Senator Nikolaou: For the committee report, the point we want to make is partly you mentioned it, that for the Reinstatement Committee, we have already asked Amy Roser and said that she would be willing to come to the Senate and make a short presentation. And then on this list you don't see the Textbook Affordability, because they actually have a graduate student making the actual data analysis of the student and the faculty survey, and they said they are hoping by the end of the year it's going to be done so that if we have like 10-15 minutes that they would be able to come and join us on Senate to tell us what they found from the surveys.

Senate Chair Kalter: So it's been so long since I've prepped this stuff that I'm a little confused about what you're talking about with the Textbook Affordability Committee part.

Senator Nikolaou: That was a heads up, because it is the only annual report that is not included there.

Senate Chair Kalter: Oh, oh.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah.

Senate Chair Kalter: Okay, that, that, I see…

Senator Nikolaou: But other than that, we didn't have any issues with any of the annual reports. The reason that you see two of them is because we didn't have the chance to vote to approve all of them last spring, so we approved all of them apart from the UAB and UHP in last AAC, but this year we did a full re-vote for both years for all the committees. The only one of the items we mentioned was for the UAB and UHP. If LJ would want to, at some point in his remarks, say something about how the cases of student conduct might have changed or if he wants John to be present, that would be something that we could do, but we didn't think that it was necessary to invite John Davenport just because we have the annual reports. So that's if LJ decides that there is something important, because we saw between the two years there was a drop in some of the cases of the student conduct, and we're thinking maybe they want to emphasize what they did differently, and it worked, and it led to the lower cases.

President Dietz: I'm happy to talk to him about that to see if he would give a brief report. My sense is that the numbers will be down because of a lot of folks were not on the campus. They were online, and I think there may been less of an opportunity to have some difficulties. But I'll talk to LJ about that to see if he couldn't do about a 30,000 foot flyover on some of that.

Senate Chair Kalter: And, Dimitrios, were you thinking of that for the 21st or later?

Senator Nikolaou: No, that's totally up to and if LJ thinks it is necessary. If he thinks that it is not necessary, AAC didn't think that we have to do it. And that's why we're leaving it totally up to LJ if he thinks he wants to emphasize something from the Dean of Students office. And for the Library Committee, we talked with the Chair, because they wanted to remove the students from their committee, and we told them pretty much no, that we need to figure out different ways to promote what the committee is doing, maybe consider changing the time when the committee meets so that there are no conflicts with classes. So she is also working with the Library Committee to try and address it. They said they are going to review their bylaws probably for next year. And then for the Honors APC, CTE, CGE, UCC, we didn't have any big comments.

Senate Chair Kalter: Does anybody else have any comments or observations on any of these?

Senator Horst: My one comment was really about what the Library Committee report talked about, like the trouble seating students. And I think it's come up in different contexts, like trouble finding grad students and that kind of stuff. So, I mean, I don't know necessarily how students are getting funneled into these committees, but I just noted that the Library Committee really noted they were having trouble. That's my only comment.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah, we told them to look into it and work on their… Think about strategies that they would try to address in lack of students. Because it was the second year, pretty much, where they had no student representation.

Senate Chair Kalter: Okay. So I have three things. One of them is related to stuff on the agenda. Just for the Honors Council stuff, AAC may be interested in the fact that… And actually Dimitrios and Dylan, you guys may have been in these discussions. I've noticed that this year in Academic Planning Committee there was a lot of discussion about whether honors is accessible to all of our eligible students, because we were seeing in some departments kind of lower numbers than we might expect. So at some point, I think the APC is trying to communicate directly to Honors, but it is kind of an Academic Affairs Committee issue, so just to kind of keep that on your radar screen. You know, because we restructured Honors a couple of years ago, and I'm not sure whether it expanded, contracted, or it did both in different departments. Right?

The second thing was… So a couple of years ago, students on the SGA were the ones who were really driving toward having CTE change the way that it seats students, and so at first when I saw this one, I had a question about where are they, and then I read the reports, and it was like, okay, so they're recommending against that. I think that we ought to talk about that, because ultimately CTE reports to the Senate, and if the senators and the SGA were saying we want you to change the way you're seating students and the CTE is saying, well, we don't want to change the way we're seating student, that loop needs to be closed somehow. Right? I'm trying to remember who the senators were who were really bringing that up, but there was quite a bit of passion about it, because it had to do with diversity issues. Right? And sort of fairness, partly because I think there's both the perception and reality that a lot of the students that get seated on CTE are kind of hand-picked, and so that obviously can bring in some implicit biases and that kind of thing.

So, let's see. I'm reading a little note of mine. Oh! Oh! I better mention this one, too. This is the fourth one. So at one point they had co-chairs somewhere in there. I think it was in their subcommittee structure. We don't allow that in our Senate bylaws. So just… We might want to send a note back to CTE to say you're not allowed to have co-chairs. You can have people who come on in the fall and then leave and then a spring chair, but you can't actually have co-chairs, according to the Senate's bylaws, which cover all of the committees of the Senate system.

And then the last thing was just Cera had marked all of these as question mark advisory item. Do we want to put any, all, none on future agendas. What do you want to do with these? Seems like maybe CTE at the least, right? CTE and the Reinstatement Committee so that we can have those two conversations at some point. Any others or should we put all of them on?

Senator Horst: I don't think we need all of them on. Sorry.

Senate Chair Kalter: Go for it, Tracy.

Senator Mainieri: I was actually going to say the opposite. I was thinking, could we like put them on in a batch, right? And I think Dimitrios just did a nice job. Maybe put the Reinstatement Committee and CTE at the top of the list on that agenda, right? And just outline… The other ones are really uncontroversial, but if you have anything to say, then let us know. But we'd like to focus on these two for these reasons. I think it never hurts to have them out there and distributed.

Senate Chair Kalter: Martha? What do you think about that idea?

Senator Horst: That could work, too, but as long as we don't have to go through every single one, especially this year, because we're running out of time.

Senate Chair Kalter: For sure.

Senator Horst: Are we going to try to bring up the CTE debate? I mean, we could forward the minutes from that meeting, and if I recall something was tabled, and that was quite confusing, actually, where we ended up. The proposal… They wanted to revise the language, and I think that was never quite fulfilled, but I can't remember.

Senate Chair Kalter: Yeah, and I remember a confusing meeting in Exec as well. So what we might want to do is, since we won't put it on for this time because we've already approved the agenda and we don't have any room anyway, maybe put it on for the 21st and put on that we want to have the minutes attached and sort of see which of those minutes are useful for the whole Senate to see, if any. That might work. And, Dimitrios, I think you might have unmuted to answer the question of whether to put them on or not.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah, I'm good either way, but what Tracy mentioned that we can have it pretty quick overview of everything. If people have questions, then they can ask, but then either way the Reinstatement is going to go hand in hand with Jana's presentation, and even if it is on a different meeting when we talk about the CTE, that's also perfectly fine. If we don't get into all of the other reports this year, I'm assuming that's also perfectly fine.

Senate Chair Kalter: And, let's see. Haven't heard from Avery, Dylan, Lauren, Taylor, Kee-Yoon or Todd. You don't have to say anything, but is there anything that you want to say? All right. So sounds like a plan.

Senator Toth: Nothing extra. I agree. I'm good with either plan.

Senate Chair Kalter: Terrific.

Senator Spranger: Yeah, I was just trying to take it all in. I think it sounded pretty good.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Good deal. Wow. We made it through those things finally. This is like meeting number three or four for the annual reports from AAC. They are the committee that has the most of those.

***Academic Senate Calendar for 2021-2022 (Advisory Item for May 5, 2021)***

And, oh, I think the other thing… So, the Academic Senate calendar, just briefly. We can keep this on the agenda for next time, like I said before. Just, you know, did anybody this time, since it's fresh in your mind, if you reviewed the materials, did you see anything that is problematic, that's a mistake, typo, anything like that?

Senator Nikolaou: No. I also checked the dates. I went through the calendar. I didn't see any problems for the Exec and the actual Senate meetings.

Senate Chair Kalter: So that one will go on the May meeting, it says, so I think there.

Senator Mainieri: Can we still do as you are suggesting keeping it on the next Exec meeting? Because I have some, just some ideas I don't think we have time. Right? There are just some questions and things like that. Nothing pressing. I didn't see any errors, though. So can we please keep it on the next Exec agenda?

Senate Chair Kalter: Yes, sure. Yeah. Okay. Wow. We need a motion to adjourn at 5:07 p.m.

Motion by Senator Mainieri, seconded by Senator Toth, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.

***Adjournment***