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**By Zoom; HOV 419 as OMA compliance room**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

Academic Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

***Oral Communications:***

***Update: Search for Director of International Pathways/Panel of Ten question***

Senator Kalter: Welcome, everybody. The Director of International Pathways Panel of Ten search, apparently there have been some changes to the INTO contract. And also, obviously the university is dealing, well, with all of the ramifications of the ICE announcement the other day. So, the Provost office is going to need more time to formulate that job description. And so, we will either discuss that at the next Exec on August 3, or during one of the fall meetings. And so, we'll get right into the Distributed Communications. I'm going to skip over the first one in Check in regarding Coronavirus planning. We can come back to it if anybody's interested.

***07.10.20.05 From Sam Catanzaro: Policy 2.1.30 Student Excused Absence draft (Information/Action item July 2020)***

***07.10.20.06 From Dean Diane Zosky: Support letter for Student Excused Absence (Information/Action item July 2020)***

***06.30.20.02 Yamskulna Email regarding Student Absence***

***06.30.20.03 SECOND Yamskulna email regarding student absence***

Senator Kalter: But let's go right to the Student Excused Absence policy proposal. And does anybody have anything that they need to say about that? Before we just sort of agree that it should go on an agenda

Senator Mainieri: This is Tracy, I did have a couple comments about the policy, but I think they can wait until we talk about them on the floor. I don't need to say them now.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah, so same. Do you need the comments now? Or should we just leave them for the floor?

Senator Kalter: No, I think for the most part, we can leave them for the floor. Okay. The only comments that I have, and maybe the ones that you guys have are, we should probably add a provision for how to extend the anticipated period of time, so that it's not just open ended. And then we might want to say that it's not just a faculty member, but another, any Instructor of Record, just so that that's really clear. Um, one of the things that I just wanted to say about that is it in general, I think this semester going forward, we're going to need to have really excellent communication to the students and parents about how to resolve issues with instructors, you know, first you should discuss it with your instructor. If that is, either that person doesn't respond or that's not working, contact the chair or director. And we need to have a list of those chairs and directors and their contact information really readily available to all of the students publicly on MY and elsewhere. And then also remind people about PRPA, that if a parent, you know, is trying to help one of their, you know, trying to help their child, or a guardian is trying to help their child, that the faculty member may not be able to answer all the questions that they have.

***Changes to admissions criteria  
06.24.20.01 Kalter email ACT SAT legislation (Dist. to Academic Affairs Committee)***

Senator Kalter: Okay, so let's move to the admissions criteria. This actually is an item that is for the longer-term discussion and for the fall, regarding whether we want to permanently alter the admission criteria that requires an ACT/SAT score. Apparently, there is legislation being batted around about this, but as you saw with Jonathan Lackland's email to me, it may not be complete, you know, very readily in the offing.

And so, it's you know, it's been my view for quite a while that legislators should not be making those decisions that faculty should be leading and weighing in. And what I'm going to ask is that in the fall, department curriculum committees, and departments both give us recommendations about whether to continue that criteria, or to make it ACT/SAT optional, or ACT/SAT blind. And then it would go to college curriculum committees, and then to the UCC, and then to the Senate, to try to sort of make a university level decision on that, rather than any other kind of decision. So, if the Provost office and the Academic Affairs Committee will initiate those discussions on the department level in the fall as soon as possible, then we can get that ball rolling.

There also, though, is the temporary logistical decision about the pandemic interruptions of ACT/SAT testing. And as you see, I put that on the summer Senate agenda also to essentially approve the decision that has already been announced on public television stations, partly, because that decision was announced inaccurately on the one that I saw, they thought that we had lifted it permanently as opposed to being an emergency, a pandemic type of lift. And one of the reasons that I think it's really important for the Senate to weigh in on that is that it's the Senate first power and responsibility to recommend policy for the admission of students to the university. So, and I would assume that the decisions that they made back in the spring about the GRE for graduate students went through the Graduate Council. If they did not, they probably should go through there as an endorsement of that. Does anybody want to say anything else about that?

Senator Horst: Is there any problem with the TOEFL scores?

Senator Kalter: That's a great question. I don't know. Aondover, do you know whether there are issues with TOEFL? And welcome, by the way.

Provost Tarhule: I don't have an update on the TOEFL score here that is for ISU. What I do know is that, like the GRE, the testing center that administers TOEFL couldn't do it, obviously, for around the world. So, many institutions were using a substitute test. I know that had been a thing, we voted to use a substitute test. It's not nearly as good. It's not as rigorous as the TOEFL. But there were no TOEFL scores at all. And so, we opted to use that totality when other institutions are doing it. So, I haven't had any briefing on this situation here, but I'll make a note to look into it.

Senator Nahm: If I could ask a question. And that's a substitute test that can be taken at home, is that correct?

Provost Tarhule: Correct. It's really like something that testifies that it's, it's not quite like (audio interruption) but not very different. Basically, it's something that you do on your own and then it gives you some kind of a score. And for graduate students, Binghamton, we were keeping those scores and there was some recommendation about what's an acceptable score. And all the students who had applied, I think, all the other students, but one, were scoring above that threshold. So that's… that's what we were using.

Senator Kalter: It will be able to accommodate any change to that, I think, in fact, I'm not even sure, Martha, what the Senate's role was in the TOEFL setting, you know, if that's on our level or somewhere else, but as soon as they have more information about that we can send that through as well.

***Other policy proposals for debate and approval by Senate committee of the whole (e.g. endorsement of change in admissions criteria during pandemic; face coverings messaging/policy, if Senate jurisdiction determined; other)***

Senator Kalter: The next thing that we have on that part of our agenda is whether there are any other policy proposals that need to be debated and approved or, you know, potentially rejected by the Senate committee of the whole. I think when we had our informal meeting on Friday, the only thing that we didn't really get to the bottom of was whether the face coverings policy is in the academic area broadly conceived. How we would prevent face to face and hybrid classrooms from being sites of conflict over face covering enforcement. And then also ensure maximum safety and a sense of security for all the students and instructors in those settings. Right. So, there are arguments on both sides. I'm not sure that we're ready today to say, yes, that's definitely a Senate policy type of thing, jurisdiction, or that's definitely something that's more administrative, like we were saying with the trying to find space for classrooms. Does anybody want to weigh in on that now, or do we have any other policy proposals that ought to go on the agenda?

Senator Mainieri: It's not necessarily a possible proposal, but it relates to the discussion we had on Friday with the two pinch points that we were given: the compliance issue—and it's completely disappearing—compliance and student absences, right. So, obviously, we're moving forward on student absences with a suggested policy. With the compliance, you know, I think one of the things that we talked about on Friday was leveraging as many brains as possible, to brainstorm ideas and solutions to that. And so even though we may not be ready for a policy in the upcoming meeting, could it be part of the discussion to ask the Senators to contact their constituents and solicit ideas for how that might work? So, that we can maybe compile and then send them on to the appropriate working group? Would that be a role for us now, even though we're not ready for a policy draft or something?

Senator Kalter: That seems like a really great idea. In other words, right now we have an agenda that is pretty much Information/Action Items. And you're wanting to have more of a Discussion Item on the agenda.

Senator Mainieri: A Discussion Item, but also a charge to the Senators, right, to go out and talk to their constituents, and to get ideas to then send to us to compile to send on. Because I think we could have a discussion, but it might not be very, might be a bit all over the place. Right. So, it could be at the place where we describe why we're asking the Senators to get input to try to leverage brains so that it's a really clear charge for them to move forward on in the week following, or a couple days following the meeting.

Senator Kalter: Given that we have to call the meeting fairly quickly, would you want people to try to be talking to their constituents prior to this upcoming meeting? So that we would send something, like today or tomorrow (hopefully today), just saying, please talk to your constituents so that when we get to your summer Senate meeting, you have their feedback.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah, I think that makes sense. And then we can also reiterate if they haven't done that yet at the meeting to do it within the next 24 hours, to add in any additional ideas after the meeting, perhaps. Just an idea.

Senator Kalter: Awesome. Yeah, when we get to the approval of the agenda, we'll come back to that. Do other people have anything else that ought to be talked about in terms of other policy proposals that would need to be on the on the agenda that aren't there?

***07.10.20.04 From Sam Catanzaro: Memo\_Academic\_Calendar\_ElectionDay\_2020-07-09 (Information/Action item July 2020)***

Senator Kalter: All right. I'm going to skip out of the planning for fall for a moment and go to the Academic Calendar one because I'm trying to… This is an, Aondover, this is a very unusual rapid meeting, because we're trying to make sure that we have time for the engineering consultants. So, I'm going lickety split. So, as for the Academic Calendar, one, I think all that we need to say about this is that the laws, we just have to somehow find the time to fold it into the Academic Calendar. But one of the issues is that the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee, which usually would be the approval body for the Academic Calendar, under our policy, 1.11. is it's not fully seated, and it doesn't have a chairperson yet. So, I don't think anybody should really feel comfortable about sending it through that committee. But if we send it to the full Senate, it'll essentially be a committee of the whole, kind of decision. We also, by our bylaws, can't really do it by consent agenda, but that doesn't matter if we call a Senate meeting, right. It'll be just as expeditious, and obviously exempt can't vote on it either. So, do we have any comments about the calendar part?

Senator Horst: This is it says only November 3, 2020. What's going to happen in two years? Is it always going to be… do we know if it's every other year or every four years? Does anybody know?

Senator Kalter: Larry, do you know?

President Dietz: No, I don't know. The legislation has not been that specific. But I think there is a compliance issue here. And so, it's the law. And I have an obligation to enforce the law. So this will be a part of… I think it's important that, you know, the Senate address this, but the University has to be in compliance with this, but I haven't really heard anything as to whether or not this is a 2020 anomaly. It may depend on who gets elected in 2020. I don't know.

Senator Horst: I'm just wondering if AABC needs to revisit this. Like we did a chart of 10 years or something, we approved calendars for 10 years going forward, so we might need to revise those.

President Dietz: Yeah, I wish I knew more. But don't.

Senator Kalter: As far as we know, now, it's only for 2020. So, we’ll just keep apprised of it. Right.

President Dietz: Right.

Senator Kalter: Yeah.

***Activation of a faculty/staff ad hoc committee to examine ISU’s financial situation going into fall semester and during 2020-21  
05.27.20.02 AAUP COVID update***

***6-15-20 Excerpts regarding faculty staff ad hoc committee***

Senator Kalter: Okay, so let's see. The only other thing that I want to bring up, before we go to the approval of the agenda, I want to suggest that we also place an Information/Action Item on here that says that we would have a faculty staff ad hoc committee to monitor with the administration ISU’s financial situation during 2020 and 2021, and make recommendations in case there are unexpected drops in revenue.

So, let me… Larry and I talked about this at some length on Friday. And let me sort of try to summarize a little bit about what we talked about. We had talked about sort of how much time people are spending on everything, right. That administrators and staff are scrambling, faculty are scrambling for teaching and to try to maintain research agendas, students are scrambling. Some of us are overwhelmed by all of that, maybe all of us are overwhelmed.

And so, then we were talking about, well, what about using either the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee, or the Planning and Finance Committee for the purpose of regular updates? I had expressed some concern, though, about that because as being not optimal, exactly, because many of the people who are seated this year on those two committees are not the ones on the Senate who are best informed about how budgets work on the university level. And we really don't have time for the, what I consider the years of education that it really takes to understand that piece. I think it would be better to have people who are very well already, sort of, up to speed on that. And there are other issues in terms of the Issues Pending that both of those committees also have to get through. The other thing is that I want to make sure that if we do an ad hoc committee that we have CS representation, AP representation, and Student Government in on those regular updates and discussions.

And Larry and I were talking about how this coming semester and actually in both semesters, the 10th day census is going to be a critical milestone essentially.

So, given all of that, what I would suggest is that we (I hope you see this in your materials) that I'm suggesting an ad hoc committee. They would meet, not frequently, not a sort of a regular weekly or even bi-weekly kind of meeting but would meet on an as needed basis. And I'm actually going to suggest five specific Senators and five specific alternate Senators. And you can tell me what you think about this, as the people who on the Senate currently have the most experience on the Senate itself, and also are best informed about the sort of the ins and outs of the budget, and also the ins and outs of curricular issues, on issues of access, and stuff like that.

So, what I would suggest is that the Senate chair and Secretary as a kind of, you know, that's sort of a de rote type of issue. Senator Mainieri, because she is the most recent Planning and Finance Committee Chair, Senator Marx, because he's the previous one and also is, you know, was the previous Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee Chair, and Senator Nikolaou as having been on the AIF ad hoc committee, and also being the most recent Academic Affairs Committee chair so has the line into the curricular issues.

The alternatives that I'm thinking of would be Senator Midha because he is in Accounting and so would have, you know, a sharp mind for these kinds of things. Senator Murphy from the library because of having sat last year and I think the year before on Administrative Affairs and Budget, Senator Seeman, because of having been an acting Department Chair, Senator Stewart (Todd Stewart) because of the curricular things. He's apparently been the College of Arts and Sciences College Curriculum Committee Chair for 10 years, I think it is, and so really knows that well. And then Senator Torry because he has sat, I think on Planning and Finance for at least three years and seems very interested in budgets.

And then for the students, what I would recommend is either the Student Body President Lauren Harris, or a student who has sat on one of those committees, has dealt with budgets, and is interested and experienced in dealing with budgets. As a civil service representative, either the Civil Service Council chair or the Senator. An AP representative, same thing either the AP Council chair or a Senator. And then the Provost, and Dan Stevens, or their designee. So, let's talk a little bit about that. What we're talking about here, I think is more should we have this in the proposed Senate agenda for the summer meeting or not?

Senator Horst: If a critical date is the 10th day census, then we would want the committee ready to go before that, so that it could assess how the ramifications of the numbers we get. We have never put forward a committee that's, that's fully formed like that. So that would be something new. And we would be doing it on a meeting that hopefully would be off calendar. So that's kind of tricky. But I think that the situation calls for forming the committee now.

Senator Mainieri: So, Susan, in terms of what would happen at the meeting, if we were to put this on the agenda, would it first be asked to form an ad hoc committee and then how to populate it. There would be a motion how to populate it or… ?

Senator Kalter: Yes, exactly, Tracy, I think that at a meeting, I would probably not lead with who I'm thinking of. I would lead with, let's talk about whether we should form an ad hoc committee. And then if there is agreement that one should be formed, then lead into who should be on it. Of course, there's also, by the way, a possibility that it doesn't have to all be Senators. Right? That because there are other faculty, staff, and students who have good knowledge of university budgets. So that could come up. So, I wouldn't want to sort of load it first with the who that I'm thinking of, but to sort of say, do we need to have a faculty, staff, and student ad hoc committee.

Senator Mainieri: I just… I share some of the concerns Martha raised. I see the need for a group that's focused on helping and understanding what's going on with our finances in the fall. I will say that Planning and Finance already has the representation that you asked for. I mean, maybe not all of them having the budget, but they… I mean, we have a CS, AP, Provost, the VP designees all sitting on that committee already and student representation. So, I would, if it is going to go on an agenda, I would want to start with, should we use an already existing committee, and for the purposes of this short-term emergency thing, repurpose its purpose for a semester or two? Or consider an ad hoc committee. I would want to start there with that initial question, as opposed to jumping directly to, should we have an ad hoc committee or not? That would be my preference.

Provost Tarhule: Susan, may I ask a question too? Suppose this ad hoc committee… ideally, what do you see? What would be its mandate? What would you seek to accomplish and what would it produce?

Senator Kalter: So, what I have in mind is, as I wrote down a kind of tentative agenda item, that would be faculty, staff, student ad hoc committee, to monitor with the administration ISUs financial situation during the coming year. And then to make recommendations, budgetary recommendations, in case of unexpected drops in revenue. So, you know, right now we're spinning scenarios of the 5-10% potential holdbacks, or potential budget cuts, and that kind of thing. But if we had a drop in revenue at 10th day census or at the spring 10th day census that is unexpected… that so, for example, Senator Stephens (Vice President Stephens) had said in his recent letter to the directors and deans that we're not currently thinking of furloughs, things like that. There needs to be some faculty, student, and staff input on those kinds of decisions if we were to have to cross that bridge. Hopefully, it wouldn't be a bridge that we’ll cross, but that's the kind of thing that I'm thinking of is that…

[Senator Kalter’s Zoom connection failed. She was absent from the meeting for a time.]

Senator Horst: I believe she's gone. I think she's thinking of something parallel to a Financial Exigency Committee, but not that dire.

Provost Tarhule: Yeah. I'm wondering, again, I'm asking from a position of ignorance, the monitoring. So, I had two words monitoring and make recommendations. Recommendations to the administration in terms of how to deal with that, because if there's a budget cut, I imagined the university might say, well, we have to cut the budget by 10%. And academic schools, and department chairs, and different units will be trying to figure out how to absorb that. So, who is the recommendation going to? Is a recommendation going to those different units about how they are going to accommodate… how they should cut the 10%? Who is it going to? And I would also ask that when we discuss the monitoring, what does that consist of? So, I'm trying to pass those two words and to make sure I have a clear understanding of what they mean.

President Dietz: I'd also like to weigh in on this a little bit, just for clarification, that at one time when the deposit numbers were down much more dramatically than they are right now, and when the state had not come up with their budget amount for this new fiscal year, we were looking at 10-20%, you know, potential reductions in funding. Thankfully, the state has come up with a flat budget for the current year, compared to last year, and that's just terrific news for us. The governor still retains the right to have a mid-year rescission. Our actions with the governor's office is that he clearly does not want to do that. And so, right now we're operating with the idea that we have a flat budget for the current fiscal year. That takes a good deal of the pressure off even though that appropriation only represents about 14% of the total budget of the University. But nevertheless, that's a big deal.

The other part that has occurred is that the deposit gap, if you will, has been narrowed considerably. And so right now, for the fall for first time in college, we're only seeing a reduction of a little over 300 students at one time, it looked like a reduction was going to be closer to I think a thousand students. And so, things have continued to, you know, to get better on both fronts. So now, we were at one point, reducing that initial thought from the 10-20% down, and we had had discussions of 5-10%, and now we're really only talking about a 5% as a holdback, and on a one year basis. And so, we're in a very different situation now than we were even just a month ago. And so, you know, a lot of expenses that we haven't had previously. And so, this is not… 2021 is not going to be a good year in any way, shape, or form. It's certainly going to be a very different year for all of us, but on the fiscal side, compared to what's going on in a lot of other states, and what's going on in on the enrollment side, to me, it really has changed pretty dramatically, and for the better. So, in a comment, I guess about some of the existing groups that Dan Stephens and Aondover have to… you know, and I interact with fairly regularly, having another group to me is, frankly, another preparation that this group has to make. So, I guess I'm somewhat concerned about the amount of time that yet a third group from Senate would take of staff time and preparing information.

Susan and I did talk about… and I think this is important, particularly for new Senators, Dan and his predecessors have done a presentation on the Color of Money, which is basically, you know, how general revenue differs from the bonded areas of difference from contracts and grants, etc. So, I think you know that that is a good primer of sorts for everybody to be reminded of, and for new people on the Senate to realize that the total budget can't be spent, you know, that it has parameters around a lot of those different accounts. And they can't just be spent for things that some people would say, well, you've got X amount of dollars, why don't you just spend it on this? That there are parameters around those different sources of funds? So, I'll stop there.

[Senator Kalter had been able to reconnect to the meeting during Senator Dietz’s comments.]

Senator Kalter: Thank you for vamping for me, Larry. I think because it's 10:30 we should pause this discussion and move on to our engineering discussion. Because our consultants are all here now. And then we'll move back, finish up the discussion about the ad hoc committee and the budget and that kind of thing after we hear from them and then approve that agenda, and then we'll move on after the Senate Exec meeting into the Faculty Caucus Exec meeting. So, I'm not sure where to go to take it, Rick?

Mr. Kentzler: Thank you, Susan. Appreciate it. Yes, we have two members of our planning team for the engineering master plan project. We have Jennifer Stanovich from Canon Design. She's an architect and our project management leader. And we have Dr. Vincent Manno, who is the education consultant, and he's a former dean of the College of Engineering out there on the East Coast someplace. So, anyway, Jennifer, if you'd like to take it over?

Ms. Stanovich: Sure. Would it be possible for me to share my screen?

Senator Kalter: I'm not sure if Cera has it set up that way.

Ms. Hazelrigg: I do not.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. Sorry, Jennifer, we would have been able to do that with just a tiny bit of this notice, sorry.

Ms. Stanovich: Okay. I'll just talk through what we were going to talk about in the slides. So as Rick mentioned, I'm Jennifer Stanovich from Canon Design. I'm the project manager leading the project. Also, as a part of our design team, I have Vincent Manno with me who is education planning on the project, and has been leading the initial efforts to define the program detail as the basis for our master plan. Our team also includes CCJM Engineers and Vantage Technology Consulting as the other two aspects of this project. And I could share the slides that I had with the… or with you guys so you could see them after this meeting.

So, our processes happening sort of in the middle of this larger ISU process that's happening for creating this new engineering program. And, you know, there's been several years of work prior to us starting on this project in April, and then there's gonna be several years of work after we complete our project, which is scheduled to complete our sort of portion of this project at the end of this year. So, our work is focused on building on the initial feasibility study to provide more definition to the education program so that we can create a master plan for the physical spaces to support this new program. We'll be working with and have started working with four groups at ISU, we're loosely calling them the education planning group, the technology planning group, architecture planning group, and then an executive committee group, but an equally important part of this process is stakeholder engagement. So, those people are getting into the details with us helping us understand. Right now, we're in what we call the explore/discover phase, just sort of finding out all the things that we don't know. So, those groups have been helping us do that. And we'll continue working with them. But we also want to get stakeholder engagement from the larger ISU community, including you guys (Academic Senate). So, it's great that we were able to jump in on this meeting that you have this month. We also want to meet with faculty at ISU. In a lot of our meetings, we have heard about all the amazing things happening at ISU, and a lot of the existing expertise that exists here that can contribute to this new program, and help feed and support some of the things that we've been talking about. So, we think trying to pull in all these stakeholders is going to be a very important part of our process so that we can define the details of education planning and programming.

So, focusing on the education planning group, because that's who we've had about six meetings with them… five meetings with them now. And that's where we've been focusing because that's sort of the basis for everything that will come after. So, Todd McLoda is also on this call. He's one of the primary members of that group, as well as Aondover Tarhule, who's just joined our group as he's joined the University, given some great feedback. We also have Diane who's on the call as a part of that group. We have Dan Holland, Craig McLauchlan, Tracy Carte, and Ted Branoff, Cooper Cutting, Rosie Hauck, and Rick as a part of that group.

So, we've been meeting with them a lot, almost every three weeks, and we've developed seven rough project goals. And the project goals were based on the information that was already done for the engineering program. We know that back in 2017-18 ISU did a feasibility study about this program and a market study with EAB so based on all that information, we came up with seven goals. And I'll just read through them very quickly. The first one is to increase student population and enrollment. Second is to attract a diverse group of students and faculty. Third is to provide flexibility and curricular pathways. Fourth is to prepare graduates for the workforce. Fifth is aligned and engaged with local industry. Sixth is to retain the student-centered culture that already exists at ISU. And the seventh is to create an accredited program with Electrical and Mechanical Engineering as a foundation. So, those we saw really as the basis for the beginnings of Vincent’s education planning work, and then is there any anything you want to build upon those goals that we've defined.

Mr. Manno: Um, well, it's nice to meet everybody, at least virtually and that's what I wanted to first mention is how much I appreciate everybody at ISU. Participating in, sort of, diving in in a fairly detailed project in this virtual format. So, to go take a look at the goals again, as Jennifer pointed out, I guess what first these are not in any order, the way she read them. It was not an ordered list. These are all goals that really play together. It keeps us grounded in our exercises. It gives us something to develop a framework around. And I'd say in addition to the seven, the seven project goals, the one important aspect of them is that they're all interrelated. Like they're not independent goals. So, as you think about designing a program or a process to develop a program, you can't treat them as a separate independent entities you have to see what plays off each other and to some degree, what reinforces each other. When you wrap them all together, the overall goal is to initiate an engineering program that is distinctive at ISU that has a reason for existence, and a reason that is going, and something that's going to make a difference both to the institution and into the larger community. And of course, we didn't list feasibility in this project goals, but that's implicit. I mean, we want to come up with something that is, in effect, doable. Jennifer, you want me to take it from there to the next slide?

Yeah, so I'd say the education planning group in a nutshell (over this discover or exploration phase) has gone through a number of different types of exercises. On the first exercise, I'd say was in a purely an exploration exercise of coming to develop an understanding of what the engineering education landscape looks like, from a fairly broad perspective. So, we had this exercise where we put on the table 30 or 40 different subtopics that would be considered, and actually there was a subset of that might be considered in an engineering program, and use that exercise so that the education planning group could do a couple of things. One, it could help us trigger questions. Oh, I didn't know about that, oh, we should understand more about that. It was useful to uncover things that were already happening at ISU, or things that were on the list that were about to happen, that could be leveraged as you started a new program. And it also started to identify specific areas that might have an impact not only how you design the what you pick for the curriculum, but how you would design it and how that would impact the types of students that you might attract and the pathways that the students would take through and then after the program, so postgraduate outcomes, were very important.

We move from that activity exercise to what we called “I'm taking a look at programmatic archetypes.” In other words, some basic features that a program that might have that you really were positioning it, for instance, did you want a program that was that you might call sort of evolutionary or a focused program, where it was a relatively narrow focus and basically, how you would implement it and what you would connect to as you built a program within the institution were relatively straightforward. On the other extreme, was the institution interested in a program that had all those goal characteristics, but what basically paradigm shifting that this is going to be a different type of entity, this is going to be, sort of, ISUs, if you will, academic, you know, almost sandbox, where you can do things that you wouldn't do in one of the existing schools or colleges. And then, something you might call hybrid, something that lived in that space between that, and that was really useful, both for us as sort of the third party to listen and understand, and also what helped the ISU planning folks (ISU education planning group) on understand what the possibilities might be. In other words, to sort of build upon the good work that was done in pre 2018 with the internal feasibility study and outside consultant report that was done by EAB group that was more to take a look at the employment lay of the land, but also to build upon those things, and actually also connect it with ISUs overall, you know, strategic planning that had gone on a few years ago.

We moved from then, from the archetype phase to developing what we call program prototypes. So, that's sort of the next level of detail, if you will, where you start to look at things like the programs of study, the curriculum, the student pathways, faculty, recruitment, the interconnections that exist or would exist within existing ISU programs. And it's fair to say that the prototypes we employed in, this and what's on the… we use this nomenclature, sort of an almost semi military nomenclature of alpha bravo, charlie, and delta (which we will soon abandon), but it gave us a chance to identify different prototypes that we were talking about. It's fair to say that the discussions sort of zeroed in on prototypes that live somewhere in the space. You remember I talked about archetypes going from focus, to hybrid, to new paradigm, to things that sort of lived between the focus and the hybrid spectrum, if you will. And, you know, we're just giving you a glimpse, and appreciate your patience, especially with a lack of visuals. But where we are now is actually, we had our fifth meeting, as Jennifer pointed out last Friday. And I think we are at the point where I think we're all comfortable that we're moving out of this exploration or discovery phase into a develop phase where we are now digging in on, you know, what might be a good framework to develop a more complete prototype and actually to define the program. So in very general terms, that's about where we are, and I'm glad that both obviously, Jennifer is on this call and Rick, but also Todd and Diane are on the call and I'd welcome them to, you know, to add anything that you know that I missed or that I should elaborate upon further.

Senator Kalter: And before you go, either of you, I just want to let you know that Jennifer was able to send Cera and I the slides, and I think Cera has now sent them around. So, you can kind of see some of the visuals that they were planning on.

Mr. Manno: Oh, Great.

Ms. Stanovich: Thank you.

Senator Harris: Oh, yeah. I just got the email. I just wanted to see where we were in the PowerPoint so I could follow along.

Ms. Stanovich: Oh, I think we've pretty much gone through to slide nine is where Vince sort of ended off and that's where he was describing the sort of range from focus to new paradigm.

Senator Harris: Thank you.

Ms. Stanovich: Todd or Diane, anything else we should touch on?

Dean Zosky: I would simply say it's just been an excellent process up to this point. You folks have a method and a model that really provoke us to really dig in and think about what we want. So, it's been a joy to participate, and I really look forward to continuing conversations.

Dean McLoda: I agree. I'll echo Diane, on that. It has been a great process, kind of lead the way right up front, we jumped right in, got our hands dirty, looked at all these different iterations that Vin and Jennifer provided for us to consider, while they were also asking dozens and dozens of questions to understand who ISU is, what we're about, understand our culture, understand how shared governance permeates who we are, understands our curricular disposition. And it's been, it's been great to help us zero in or focus on particular, I guess, as Vin put it, a prototype, if you will, of how this is taking shape. And, you know, we talked just within the last couple of weeks about, okay, now let's take this to Senate Exec and beyond. And we'll be working to identify additional internal groups that can help us, you know, take it from here. So, we're by no means done. There's a long ways to go. And a lot of meetings yet to take place to bring this package, if you will, to everyone who's interested in seeing it.

Ms. Stanovich: And if you're looking at the slides, slide four shows our schedule for the project. So, we started in April, and we're scheduled to finish in November. So, we're right at the end. We're at the end of explore, beginning of develop, which I think is a great time to start engaging this larger ISU audience, in terms of faculty, as well as students, to get feedback on what we have been talking about with education group, as well as where we need to move on from here.

Senator Kalter: So, Jennifer, and Vin, and Diane, and Todd, will you be needing to have faculty representatives very, very soon, you know, so when will those be being brought on and when will the student input be gathered?

Ms. Stanovich: We'd like to engage faculty at as soon as possible. I think we're at a point where we have enough to present to those groups to get meaningful feedback from them and further expanded ideas on the things that we should be thinking about. One thing that we've gotten into is we have the mechanical and electrical programs, but there is this opportunity for concentrations, or minors, and things like that. And I think that's where the larger ISU community can really, oh, we're already doing this thing here that could fit in with engineering and dial in. So that's why those groups are really important now.

Dean McLoda: And Susan, we were kind of trying to time that with, you know, sometime in August to really hit so that we're not taking a person’s summer. So for the rest of this summer, I think one of the things that Jennifer and Vin are working on is to reach out to external stakeholders. So they will be talking to potential employers of our graduates. So, you think of Caterpillar, Toyota, ADM, John Deere, and countless others. There are many, many others on that list. And so we're getting them contacts with those too so that they can do some triangulation. Start to really hear from what other types of skills and things beyond what you would expect in a traditional Mechanical or Electrical Engineering Program that these employers expect our graduates to have. And that I think will help us set ourselves apart from the other Mechanical and Electrical Engineering Programs in the state, because we want to really make sure that those stakeholders understand. And then should coincide well with mid-August when there'll be a larger population of students and faculty back on campus and available for these virtual meetings. So.

Senator Kalter: Great. I think, you know, we had talked in the spring about… well, first of all, I'll say I think you all know already who the expert faculty are on the campus around engineering, right? You don't need our help to help you identify them. We had talked about how we had been hoping to have the forums with the larger faculty and student groups back in the spring. So that sounds like a great timeline, you know, now. Unfortunately, it's getting, it's gotten delayed, but and it sounds like the curricular phases will not start going through the University Curriculum Committee, or college curriculum committee processes until November or so. Is that… am I getting that right? That's the other sort of Senate-relevant piece here.

Dean McLoda: Probably not that soon. I would, I would say we wouldn't even be ready by November. Because the work will continue after these consultants are done will have a lot more internal work to do in terms of structure and things like that. And also, Susan, to be clear, it won't… we won't just be talking to the engineering experts on campus, you know, those are easy to identify, but there are a lot of partner units on campus that will be effected,. So you think of Milner Library, CTLT, English and Technical Writing (your own home department), Chemistry, Biology, you know, there are so many, so many units that will be impacted. And then we're looking for interdisciplinary opportunities. So, we think of what can we do with Arts Technology and the Wonsook Kim College of Fine Arts, what can we do? You know, how would the School of Information Technology be impacted and on and on. So, it will be pretty wide reaching as we pull in internal stakeholders?

Senator Kalter: Excellent. That's what we like to hear. Does anybody else have any questions or comments? Before we move to our other parts of our agenda?

President Dietz: Just one comment. First of all, I very much appreciate all the good work that's gone on for literally several years on this, and delighted that Vin and Jennifer have joined us, and we're gonna continue to push this forward. I think it's a terrific opportunity for the University to branch out in new ways and offer curricula that perhaps not been offered before and through collaboration with faculty. I'd also really suggest in terms of potential employers out there that certainly Rivian and Brandt Corporations here in town. Rivian just received another $2.5 billion dollar investment, and I've talked to their CEO several times, and he's interested in potentially participating with us in some way, shape, or form. And Brandt’s new company out of Canada that's here as well. And they might be interested in helping in some way, shape, or form as well. So, thanks for being on board, helping us move this agenda.

And just as an aside, Vin, your last name is the same name as a former student body president here, who many of us remember, and so I don't know if you are related or not, I'm sure you're fine man. And Andy is as well. And so, he just finished law school. So we're very proud of him.

Mr. Manno: I'm not sure. I don't know. But I'm glad you told me that everyone liked him.

Senator Horst: Yes, Susan. I was just wondering, the thoughts of the group on the how to roll this out to… Are we going to have another meeting with the Senate and brief them again on this plan? What is the plan of how to integrate the Senate in the fall?

Senator Kalter: I'm gonna pitch that one to Larry actually, and to Aondover.

President Dietz: Well, again, I think we could, you know, do a potential update, but I think Todd’s right on the money in terms of any kind of curricular involvement here. There's a lot of work yet to do. So, I think that later in the fall, the better, we'll know more, but this may end up being a spring event. But I understand that there may be a need to say something about this in an official way for the faculty in the fall just to keep them up to speed. So, if you're going to have something, my suggestion is that we do it later versus earlier. But Todd and Diane and others, let you weigh in on that.

Dean McLoda: I would agree, but I think that while we have the expertise of Jennifer and Vin and the others that are on these design and technical planning groups, that might be a good time. So I would say maybe before November to brief the Senate in the larger Senate, and for them to maybe do a presentation to the Senate would be helpful. And they could see sort of the… I think the Senate needs to know the path that we've been down so far. You know, where are we that's gotten us to this point, and then how much heavy lifting is yet to do, which is plenty, so that they don't feel, I don't want anybody to feel left out. Which is why we thought this would be a good time to talk to Exec, and then if you want, if you'd like us to attend another Exec meeting, you told me that you have another one August 3, if there's if there's more questions that come up in the interim. But I think, you know, it'd be good to have our consultants’ part of that presentation before we're done with their services.

Mr. Manno: If I can make a quick comment on the curricular side, I think this timing sounds right. And in addition, you know, our goal is to provide a really strong foundation and an important set of directions, and if you will, evolutionary options. But then, you know, from an institutional standpoint, it's going to be really important that the faculty, not only the engineering faculty, but the broader faculty, and the broader community, really make the program real. It would be a mistake for, sort of, we're here to help you build a program that's right for your institution, not to finish in November with a blueprint, especially from the academic standpoint, and say, here, you must do this. I know as a faculty member, I wouldn't be terribly excited to be part of a program where I was basically be being given a blueprint saying, thou shalt do these things in this way. But we hope to give enough that this structure so that the intrinsic goals can be achieved, and that the plan, we think has a high probability of working and being successful, but with enough room for the faculty and staff and the students involved to really build the program.

Dean Zosky: I concur with Todd. And I think as we get a little farther down the road, we'll just have more input, we'll have the external stakeholder input, internal input, and we'll have much more information more mid to later fall.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, we've been talking recently about sort of the deep shared governance, right. And so the forums that might be starting in August, as early as August, September, I think are a really important part of that to get the whole campus, not just the Senators, but the whole campus in the conversation, giving ideas, giving concerns if they have any, having, you know, those concerns answered and all of that, that's really part of that shared governance process. So, let's keep in touch regarding whether August 3 is a good time, you know, to meet again, or whether it should be later or what have you. And we'll just sort of keep collaborating on this. Does that sound good to everyone?

Ms. Stanovich: Sounds great.

Senator Kalter: Excellent. Thank you so much for coming.

Ms. Stanovich: Thank you for having us.

Senator Kalter: And thank you for presenting and sending your slides.

Mr. Manno: Thank you for giving us a few moments of your time, appreciate it.

Senator Kalter: Sure. No problem, Vin. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Take care, everybody. Okay. Those of you who are Executive Committee members do not leave.
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***Proposed* Academic Senate Meeting Agenda**

**July , 2020**

**By Zoom; Hovey 102 as OMA compliance room**

***Call to Order***

***Roll Call***

***Information/ Action Items:***
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***07.10.20.05 Policy 2.1.30 Student Excused Absence draft (Sam Catanzaro)***
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***Endorsement of decision to waive the ACT/SAT requirement for undergraduate admissions during pandemic due to unavailability of testing centers and other pandemic related logistics***

***Consent Agenda Items: None***

***Communications***

***Adjournment***

Senator Kalter: And I think we can move to the approval of the proposed Senate agenda. And I think, Tracy, you had one thing that you wanted to add that was more of a Discussion Item, that thing we're going to send out… or actually let me, first of all, let me say please, Do I have a motion to approve the proposed Senate agenda? And we're going to have to figure out a date and all of that

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

Senator Kalter: So, Tracy, you had had something that you wanted to add where we asked Senators to collect their feelings about I think it was the face coverings issue. Right? So do you have a wording for that that we can put on? And we'll put it under Discussion Item, I think, right.

Senator Mainieri: I could type something up and send it, would that be easier? Do we want to draft it right now?

Senator Kalter: Is everybody okay with that to just, maybe be the placeholder when we approve the agenda?

Senator Mainieri: It's just gonna say something like talk to your constituents about ideas for how to deal with compliance regarding facemasks.

Senator Kalter: Okay, so we'll put that I think at the bottom of the agenda so we can get through the Information/Action Items first, and then do that discussion last since it's really recommendations more than action. So, we have as our proposed agenda, the Call To Order, the Roll Call, and then the calendar, the excused absences and the ACT/SAT Endorsement of that temporary change to our admissions criteria.

One of the things that I need to tell you all about is that the law on Open Meetings Act changed again with our entry, I think, into Phase Four. And so, now we have to have a physical meeting space where at least one person is present. This creates sort of a kink in the process because I have to be in Hovey, in our usual meeting place, which is the President's conference, from Hovey 419. I don't think that… and sometimes Cera has to be there, but not always. Sometimes she can do stuff from home, but it's not going to be workable for me to be a police officer deciding how much social distancing could happen in that room, so that really can't be the designated meeting place, it doesn't make sense for us to have to spend all of the money in a time when we are having potential budget issues to rent out Old Main and have all of the recording equipment at Old Main, which is very expensive every year, right? Not to mention that we were talking about how Old Main and other places in the Bone may need to be being used for classes as classrooms. And so, we have to figure out where our designated Senate meeting rooms are going to be. For this particular meeting since it's a summer meeting I've suggested Hovey 102 which is that fishbowl down at the bottom of Hovey. And partly because I think it's possible that we may decide on a date that's in the middle of the day rather than at night because it is a summer meeting and not a regular session meeting. But I just wanted to sort of let you all know about that to help us brainstorm and Lisa Huson is attempting to help me brainstorm about how do you comply with the new OMA (Open Meetings Act) restrictions, while also having a normal Zoom environment, because given that we have 50 plus people, we cannot have a physical Senate meeting, probably for the rest of the, you know, at least for the rest of fall semester is likely, however long we're in Phase Four. And as I said to a Senator, that's probably going to last even a little bit into Phase Five, because at the beginning of Phase Five, not everybody will have been vaccinated or whatever it is the condition that will move us into Phase Five.

So, the next question about the agenda then is, when do we want to have the meeting, and I would suggest Monday the 20th. But then, what's a good time for a Senate meeting? Or the other possibility is that we leave this open and have Cera look at as many schedules as possible to see if we can get a quorum. So, what do people think about those logistics?

Senator Mainieri: To me, given our discussion on Friday with the Provost and Provost representatives, I think as soon as possible is necessary. And I think that would probably be best to accomplish by Cera, I'm sorry, or whoever looking at calendars to try to find a time that's open. Because, I just, I worry. Monday even seems a little far out to me.

Senator Horst: I mean, it could be Friday, but that is risky. Wednesday's too soon, right?

Senator Kalter: We have to under Open Meetings Act, we have to have 48 hours notice.

Senator Horst: Right. I would say the soonest it could be would be Friday.

Senator Kalter: Okay, let me do this quickly. So how many people think that Cera should look at calendars, and we should determine the date, you know, sort of make the date contingent upon what she finds out? Raise your hand if that's the good plan. 1234

Senator Horst: I'm just… the faculty aren't working right now. Right, the students aren't here right now. So, you know, the administration is going to have an active calendar but what would that accomplish?

Ms. Hazelrigg: And are we doing it during business hours, or are we doing it 6-7:00pm

Senator Kalter: That I think we should leave open

Ms. Hazelrigg: Because most people don't fill out their calendars past four.

Senator Mainieri: I have… my Outlook calendar is active. I still use it in the summer. I don't know about other faculty.

Senator Kalter: It looks like we had a majority of people saying that Cera should check the calendars. Maybe check schedules, not just the Outlook calendar, but actually send out a when can you meet, you know, email, a Doodle Poll or something like that. And so we can approve the agenda with a kind of a blank there. I do think is… what's that?

Senator Horst: A Doodle Poll, I think is a good strategy.

Senator Kalter: Isn't it? Like that might help.

Senator Nikolaou: But should we say not later that the 20th? So that people don't say that, oh, I can do it on the 23rd.

Ms. Hazelrigg: I can give them two options. If I do a Doodle Poll, I can do them on the 17th and the 20th. And I can put like10:00 am, like noon, or you know, and 4:00.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, I think what I would do is leave it completely open, Cera. Anytime between 8:00 a.m. and, you know, 8:00 p.m. and see what people answer?

Senator Mainieri: Well, I think, in my experience Doodle Polls are most efficient if there are specific time slots, so whether that be like 10:00, 11:00, 12:00, 1:00 or whatever. So we can really see where people are, but.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, that's what I mean, Tracy, is to have specific time slots, especially since we only have to two days worth of them, to have it through a whole calendar. Obviously, nobody's going to say yes, I want to meet on Friday evening. But to have, you know, a very full complete 14 hour day as options and then see where we get the most feedback, for yes, I can make it. And we'll have to do that, by the way, Cera, for not just the faculty, but the students, and staff as well just to make sure.

Okay, uh, we have already have the motion and the second to approve the agenda. We have the addition of Tracy's item that's coming to us. We'll put the date on once we know it. We'll leave the OMA compliance room as is for now. Anything else before we approve the agenda?

The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: So, it looks like the agenda has passed. Let me just move back and make sure that there's nothing else we need to talk about today. In this particular meeting. We do have a Faculty Caucus Executive Meeting. I think I had… let's see.

***07.02.20.01 Possible change to ReggieNet recording statement edits for FA 2020***

***07.02.20.02 Permission to record form***

***07.02.20.03 Videotaping Class statements***

Senator Horst: The recording statement for ReggieNet.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. I was looking through that one. Yeah, all I want to say about that one, is if Aondover if it's… or actually it would probably be Larry because I think that Legal is working on this. If we can just get an update from Legal in the next few weeks about whether there is going to be one of those recording statements for fall, has it been finalized, and how will it be delivered or displayed? And I can also just copy you and send that directly to Lisa. If it's easier.

President Dietz: That'd be easier.

Senator Kalter: Okay.

President Dietz: Thank you.

***07.07.20.01 International students' concerns about the fall semester***

***06.29.20.05 Email Preview-plus COVID education modules***

Senator Kalter: Yeah, you're welcome. And then I wondered if anybody wanted to, has any comments on either the international student issue that has come up or the question that I sent to Amy and Ani about, you know, preparing students for fall semester. The preview plus email. Any comments on any on either the ICE decision or the…

President Dietz: I've got a couple of comments and then Aondover, I'm sure, can fill in some things as well. Over the weekend. A number of General Counsel staff and a number of Aondover staff work together to issue declarations that were going to be then set on to the Illinois Attorney General, to potentially join the suit with MIT and Harvard. And to be supportive of, you know, the efforts at MIT and Harvard. In addition to that last Friday, there was an advocacy kind of reaching out from the American Public Land Grant University Organization and the American Council of Education, asking presidents to sign on to petitions in opposition to the President’s declaration related to international students. So last Friday, I signed that petition to join lots of other folks across the country in opposition to the President's decision on that. So those are two things that are going on.

We also are planning, hopefully it'll be today, if not today, perhaps first thing tomorrow a letter going out to faculty/staff, letting them know the University's position on this issue. And then we are going to send a separate letter to all of our currently enrolled international students and incoming international students, which frankly, there's not very many in that latter category given all the pandemic issues and the various organizations related to enrollment being closed up now. So the international enrollment for the fall is going to be pretty small of new students. So we're planning to send out a letter to all those folks as well. So let me stop there and Aondover see if you've got other things that you want to chime in on there.

Provost Tarhule: There's gonna be a town hall with international students this Thursday. So I think it's this Thursday. So we're going to try and update them on the types of things we're doing and how we might support them.

Additionally, there's a number of people trying to see if there's a work around on the requirement that international students have to be enrolled in face to face class, otherwise they will be deported. So many institutions are trying to figure out what constitutes a face to face class. What if we could have an independent study class, does that constitute face to face. So Legal is trying to explore those types of things. They are reaching out to other institutions to see what they are doing. But our goal is to, if there is any kind of work around that we can introduce to keep the students here as much as possible. That that's what we're working on.

Senator Kalter: Anybody else wanted to say anything about either of those issues?

Senator Horst: You know, I'm concerned about what will happen if potentially, we go all online, like if we all set up these face to faces, can we create a loophole so students who (graduate students) that are in some sort of individual study face to face don't lose that status one, if potentially we go online?

Provost Tarhule: That's exactly what I said. It's a legal, it depends on the legal definition of whether first an independent study class with one professor constituted a face to face class. And that's a legal question. And Legal is looking into that. So if we could do that, then that definitely allows us… even if the entire university were to go online, as long as a student is registered in that course, they would be meeting that legal threshold that they have that course. So, but how much of it would be allowed or how to make it legally work? We're waiting for additional guidance from the Legal staff. But we all have the same goal. Now we're trying to find what can we do to keep our international students, keep as many of them as we can?

Senator Nahm: Has there been any discussion about honoring tuition waivers for graduate students who are unable to fulfill their assistantships because they're taking all their courses online from their home countries.

Provost Tarhule: I am not up to date on that information. I should know, but I’m not. Let me look into it.

Senator Nahm: Thank you.

Senator Kalter: One thing that I'll ask the group so Martha was one of the founding members of the National Council for what they call Faculty Senates, since most Senates are faculty rather than faculty/student, and we received a petition over the weekend or a couple of days ago. And I wondered if we should send that petition around on the Senate, either on FAC-L, or FAC-L, CS-L, AP-L listservs. Or just on the Senate listserv or not at all. Does anybody have an opinion about that?

President Dietz: Related to the international issue?

Senator Kalter: Yeah, it's basically a petition against… sort of like the petition that you just said that you signed, but it would be for faculty and staff to sign.

Senator Horst: And it's actually not coming from our organization. It was independent of our organization. It's already done by 20,000 faculty, I think.

Senator Kalter: Let me get a quick show of hands, if any, how many people would object to sending that around on one of those listservs. In other words, should the Senate be pushing a petition?

Senator Mainieri: I would not object to that.

Senator Nahm: I would not object.

Senator Kalter: Dimitrios would not object. Lauren would not object. Martha would not object. I do not object. So, we'll do it. And do we have a preference for whether to send it out to Senators or the whole faculty or the whole campus?

Senator Mainieri: Yes. I mean, my feeling is, I think, you know, garnering as much support for this as possible. I think that we've seen that across our campus we are outraged by these ICE decisions. However, if we are using the platform of Senate, I do wonder if we're sending it from Senate if it should only go to Senators and then ask Senators to pass it on.

President Dietz: But my concern is that we may have two communications, because I'm gonna be sending out something either later today or probably in the morning on this issue. So, I guess I don't know if it's wise to send two out on the same topic or not. Tracy's point about sending it to Senators might be a good thing. But I think the faculty and staff will know that we're in opposition to this. And the students will know that because we're sending a letter out to them, and then we've got a town hall meeting. So, I'm concerned oftentimes that we send so much out. We wonder who's going to read what. So, I don't know.

Senator Mainieri: President Dietz, will your communication involve like faculty or staff or students be able to sign on to something that's being sent out or is it just a communication to us?

President Dietz: It's a communication about us joining this, or at least the planning right now, it would not include any kind of petition. It would just be saying what we've done relative to this declaration of Attorney General's and then also my signing on with APLU and ACE as a group of presidents opposing this.

Senator Mainieri: I wonder if when Cera sends out the materials for our upcoming meeting, if at the bottom of the email, the petition could be included. I wonder if that's a way to ensure that it doesn't confuse the messaging.

Senator Kalter: At first, Tracy, I thought you were saying that we should send it to all faculty/staff through the major listservs. But it doesn’t…

Senator Mainieri: I would love that. But I feel like if we're using the Senate platform to distribute it, I feel like it needs to be directed toward Senators.

Senator Kalter: Okay. So, since I'm not seeing other opinions, let's figure out a way to do that through the Senators then, and we'll go ahead with that.

And I think we can now move to adjourn this meeting so we can get on to the Faculty Caucus agenda. Sorry that it’s such a long meeting. This is not usual for it to go for this long. Tracy, go ahead.

Senator Mainieri: Sorry, I am sorry to extend this, but I wanted to bring up something that came up on Friday in regards to the discussion regarding Senator representation on the different working groups, and Ani suggested that if we sent her names, that that would happen. And we were talking about election practices versus appointments. And I wonder if we want Senate representation on the working groups, can we simply ask for volunteers if we see a group that doesn't have one?

Senator Kalter: So that's what the Faculty Caucus Executive agenda is all about.

Senator Mainieri: Oh, I'm sorry. I wanted to make sure that the students were included on that discussion, because student Senators might be interested in that as well.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, I agree with that. I think that what we could do is adjourn this meeting, start the Faculty Caucus meeting, you know, Faculty Caucus Exec meeting and have that be, you know, a conversation where the students stay and, and contribute, right? Even though they won't have a vote. We can ask Ethan and Lauren their opinions about all of that. Does that sound good?

All right. Do we have a motion to adjourn this meeting?

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