**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

**MONDAY, September 28, 2020**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

Academic Senate Chairperson Senator Kalter called the meeting to order.

***Oral Communications:***

***Follow up: Spring Academic Affairs retreat working groups***

Senator Kalter: All right. And I just have a brief Oral Communication. It is that this has the potential to be quite a long meeting. So, if we can make an effort to be succinct. But I say that, knowing that I am one of the least succinct people in this meeting, so apologies if I make it less.

Senator Kalter: We start with a follow up on the Spring Academic Affairs Retreat Working Groups. I just wanted to make sure it's okay with everybody that we send out from the Senate office a general call for volunteers. This would be both a faculty call and a student call, sending it through the FAC-L listserv and the student listserv tomorrow morning, and basically asking for volunteers from the faculty and student body to be placed on the various Academic Affairs Retreat Working Groups. That's what we discussed in the Senate meeting, and so then we would have to place the faculty vote for that on the Caucus agenda for October 7. Is that okay with everybody? (Pause) Looks like yes. Awesome. All right. I see a bunch of thumbs up. It's not a vote. So, we'll just go ahead and go past the magic that Martha usually does.

***Senate Calendar Change***Senator Kalter: And we've got Distributed Communications. First up is the Academic Calendar Change. Oh, I'm sorry. Gosh, I have two different things here. Actually, I put a note to myself. That's actually about the Senate Calendar change.Let me say one thing about that. So, that's on the proposed agenda still.It seems that we only have one hitch, as far as I can tell, because Winfred Avogo said that the Planning and Finance Committee is finding their groove in terms of, you know, finding a time for them to be able to meet so that we can move the time of the Senate meetings. Therefore, the only hitch that I could identify was that Sam Catanzaro for the rest of this semester is unable to make it to the time when Rules Committee meets, but everybody else in Rules is able to meet. I'm just curious. I'm going to ask, Aondover, is there a waythat we could send a substitute in for Sam to that committee. Maybe either Cooper or Yojanna so thatif Planning and Finance were able to find a time, we would be able to move the Senate meeting a little bit earlier in the evening. Would that be something that could happen or no?

Provost Tarhule: I could look into it. I hadn't heard about this issue before, but now that I have, I’ll find out why Sam can’t meet and if we can find a substitute. So, what time is the meeting?

Senator Kalter: So apparently (and Martha can say more about this) but what they had found was that 5:00-6:00 p.m. on Wednesdays, it was either on Senate Wednesdays or off Senate Wednesdays was workable for everybody but Sam.

Senator Horst: It was, but we have a new member.

Senator Kalter: Okay, so we would have to find out whether that member would also be able to meet at that time.

Senator Horst: It was the alternate Wednesday from Senate.

Senator Kalter: Okay, okay.

Provost Tarhule: So, do you still need me to talk to Sam or wait?

Senator Kalter: Martha, what do you think?

Senator Horst: Give me one day to talk to this new person. I just got his name an hour ago.

***Distributed Communications:***

***Academic Calendar Change***

Senator Kalter: Sounds good. Okay. All right. Now we go to the actual agenda item, which is the Academic Calendar Change. Do we have questions about that? We sent around some stuff on Friday about all of this. I haven't seen the survey go out yet, but I'm assuming it's coming out today or tomorrow.

Provost Tarhule: Ani, can you speak to this?

Dr. Yazedjian: Yeah, so the planning team met one more time just now to review the survey and it'll go out tomorrow before then.

Senator Kalter: Terrific.

Dr. Yazedjian: And then folks will have one week until Tuesday noon.

Senator Kalter: Terrific. Do you think that you'll be able to get the feedback to us before the Senate meeting, so that people can just see, like, read it through before they get to the Senate meeting?

Dr. Yazedjian: So, on Tuesday, Ryan Smith is going to put it in a Power BI dashboard and people will be able to see the results. So, they can just look at the snapshots of the results.

Senator Kalter: Okay, awesome. So next Tuesday, it'll be ready. Okay. Terrific. Wonderful. Any other questions or comments about that particular agenda item?

Senator Mainieri: I had a question in terms of what at the Senate meeting, what the aim is at the Senate meeting, to do with that information? And if there’s going to be an item associated with that. Just was curious.

Provost Tarhule: Susan. I think you have the answer. This is the explanation that you provided to me. And the reason we reached out was that if something involves a change to an Academic Calendar, it’s one of your committees, I think I got the name wrong the last time, that needs to vote on it, and then the rest of the full Senate is informed. I mean, the way Susan wrote it and that email to me was correct. So, now we are bypassing that first step, but your question is, it's appropriate, Tracy, what do we need to decide, what happens once we get that information at the Senate meeting.

Senator Kalter: So, Tracy, I think, from what I could read of the memo that I sent around, I think, Friday afternoon from the Provost Office. There are only two things that the Senate would vote on, and it also obviously would depend a little bit on the results of the survey. So, if the survey comes back with a lot of people saying no to one of these things, there might not be even a vote, but one thing would be to essentially waive the part of, I think it's policy 1.11, that says that there has to be a 30 day waiting period while the deans and all of the other people on campus, look at the change, because that obviously… that was put into place with the assumption that this Academic Calendar doesn't just change on the fly, right. That policy was written for the sort of the usual regular Academic Calendar, you know, sort of setting it in the first place, not changing it because of a pandemic. So, we would first vote to waive that part so that essentially all of the deans, all of the chairs, all of the other people on that list would be able to sort of simultaneously make their recommendations up through the system. And then the second thing would be about whether or not to cancel Spring Break, and I believe that the recommendation is if we cancelled Spring Break to move the semester up. So, essentially, we'd have 15 weeks straight shot from January to April of continuous classes, no Spring Break. Right. So, it would be essentially, the second thing would be, you know, the motion would be to cancel Spring Break and move classes up one week. Right.

Senator Mainieri: Okay. I just needed some clarification because I couldn't quite figure out from the agenda, the proposed agenda and also from our email exchange, exactly what the action, what the items would be if there were a vote.

Senator Kalter: That's my understanding, because starting online is not an Academic Calendar change. That is exactly the same thing as what we're doing with Thanksgiving, that was just, we were able to make that as sort of an administrative change, right. But those things that actually move the dates of when things happen are Academic Calendar changes. And I would be reluctant, Tracy, to put that out in anything but the form of that memo itself because, again, if for some reason the survey comes back with a large number of people against it, we may not even hold a vote. Right. I would assume that we're going to take that into some consideration, or we may hold a vote and it may turn out that we're voting against it. Right. So, I would be reluctant to do anything, you know, to actually write out a motion like we've been doing for the Faculty Caucus. Just putting that memo (that I sent here on Friday) out to the Senate itself, I think would be sufficient. Okay.

Senator Mainieri: That's helpful for me. I have the unique position that I'm on this committee and I just started serving with the calendar committee and so I know what's kind of going on in both. But if I were a Senator that didn't, right, I would wonder what it is I'm supposed to be kind of contemplating and preparing for, for the discussion on October 7. So, that's just why I wanted some clarification. And I'm sure that the materials that go out with the meeting will provide that as well.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Terrific. So, anybody else have anything on the Academic Calendar?

President Dietz: The only thing that I would add is that I think the survey is a great idea. I think it gives people an opportunity to express their ideas and concern and express that collectively, but I do think that it's important to understand that this is information, and that decisions will be made with that in mind, but we don't make decisions, necessarily, based upon all the data that we get in a given survey. So, I think it's advisory and I think, you know, there will be a decision made out of this, with entertaining the information that we gather on the survey, but it's not the do all end all, in terms of decision making.

***05.29.20.01 From Destini Fincham: Policy 7.7.3 Course Material Fees Current Copy (Dist. to Academic Affairs Committee)***

***05.29.20.02 From Destini Fincham: Policy 7.7.3 Course Material Fees-Mark UP (Dist. to Academic Affairs Committee)***

***05.29.20.03 From Destini Fincham: Policy 7.7.3 Course Material Fees-Clean Copy (Dist. to Academic Affairs Committee)***

Senator Kalter: Alright, let's see, we're going to the next item, which is the Course Materials Fees. Thanks, both of you, Ani and Amy, please take back your time. It’s a good thing it was at the top of the agenda. Right.

Alright, so let's see the Course Material Fees has been on our agenda for a couple of weeks. We're simply sending this one out to the Issues Pending list for Academic Affairs Committee. Anybody have any comments about it before it goes there?

Senator Horst: This was decided to be an Academic Senate policy at some point?

Senator Kalter: Yes, I believe so. I think that we have made it all the way through our policy review and determined with every policy, whether it's a Senate-reviewable or non-Senate review. I think this one is obviously an Academic Affairs one, right. Course Material Fees.

Also, by the way for Dimitrios, it appears to me that it would be easily sent back as a Consent Agenda Item, since there's such a small change to it. Unless, obviously, the committee makes more changes. But if, after you're done with the priority items for your committee, that seems like it's an easy one to bat down quickly, and then send it back for Consent.

***08.20.20.15 From COE College Council: Overview of the Changes to the College of Education Bylaws (Dist. to Rules)***

***08.23.17.01 From COE College Council: College of Education Bylaws Current Copy (Dist. to Rules)***

***08.28.20.01 From COE College Council: College of Education Bylaws Mark Up (Dist. to Rules)***

***08.20.20.16 From COE College Council: College of Education Bylaws Clean Copy (Dist. to Rules)***

Senator Kalter: Alright, going to the next one. It's simply distributing out to Rules, some changes to the College of Education Bylaws. So, any comments on that one before it goes to the Rules Committee?

Senator Nikolaou: Martha, do you want us to email you our comments?

Senator Horst: That would be great.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah, so I'm not going to say anything.

Senator Horst: Is it sort of editorial kind of thing?

Senator Nikolaou: Some of them, they are editorial. Some of them, they are, I mean, a couple of them, they were more about clarification. So, that they need to clarify, is it calendar or is it business days? Then somewhere later on, in one of the selections that it was not clear if they were following totally the Administrator Selection policy that we have for the university. That was for the assistant and associate deans.

Senator Horst: I'm not sure, Susan. Can you clarify, are the… I thought I looked this up, that the assistant and associate deans aren't under that policy?

Senator Kalter: Yeah, that's actually why we're having the college councils, add them to their own bylaws, because they're not covered in the university wide one. But I actually also had a note about that. Just so that you know, Martha, it's not actually because the assistant or associate dean is an AP that they serve at the pleasure of the dean. They would serve at the pleasure of the dean, whether they were faculty or AP or CS, right, just because they're an associate or assistant dean. So, that's on page 25. I think that wording needs to be tweaked a little bit so it doesn't seem as though somehow faculty in that position would serve in something other than at the pleasure of the dean, or that APs somehow only serve at the pleasure of, you know, their supervisors or what have you. And, by the way, I also did let the College Council chair know that Rules is working on a backlog of items, right, that you're still clearing out things from previous years, like completing the Senate Bylaws revision through the Blue Book changes, and the other colleges’ bylaws. But they said they're not in a rush, so it can kind of go in the back of this year's or, you know, hopefully this year's stuff. But, Dimitrios, was that in line with what you were noticing about that one?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah, and I didn't know if it would fall under the last item on the policy where it was saying Academic Affairs selection because they are APs, but it's not necessary… I mean, they are part of the Academic Affairs, but they are not in the Provost Office, so I didn't know if they were covered from that last part of the policy, the assistant and the associate deans. Yeah.

Senator Kalter: My sense is that we have always… basically that the Administrator Selection policy has always been for vice presidents and AVPs and Deans, right, Nobody at the chairs level or below the deans level, because those are seen as the jurisdiction of the colleges, instead of the university wide jurisdiction. That's how I tended to understand that.

Senator Nikolaou: And it had one clarification. It's not necessarily for this policy in general. So, the acting chairs, are they appointed by the dean or are they appointed by the Provost after the recommendation from the dean?

Senator Kalter: My understanding, so I'll say, since we have a new Provost, he may never have done this, appointing acting chairs right?

Provost Tarhule: I haven't appointed anybody. So, you’re right. I don't know.

Senator Kalter: Yes, I think people would have been in place by July 1, right. So, my understanding is basically that if you're being selected as an acting chair, your dean is making the main decision but consulting with the Provost to make sure that the Provost doesn't have any other information that says, you know, that's inadvisable or, oh, we were about to hire that person to be the acting, you know, XYZ over here or whatever, right. So, in the chairs policy, it says that chairs serve at the pleasure of the dean and the Provost. And so that means that they’re appointed by the dean and the Provost essentially. So, I think that's how that works. Larry, do you have any further information for us about that?

President Dietz: I don't, I guess, things have worked pretty well, otherwise we would have examples just jumping off of our tongue right now. So, I think that the, you know, it's a reflection of good communication that's happened at the department head level, the dean level, and the Provost level that we haven’t wandered into this and had to define it more clearly.

Senator Kalter: Excellent. All right. So, that one's going off, therefore, to Rules Committee for their Issues Pending list.

***09.11.20.01 300/400 level course questions, GCC questions, other related issues (Dist. Academic Affairs)
09.10.20.01 Email- UCC operating procedure changes (Dist. to Academic Affairs)***

Senator Kalter: The next one is just simply being distributed out to Academic Affairs Committee. Questions that came up about 300/400 level course designations, Grad Curriculum Committee, and other sort of related issues. So that's being put on that Issues Pending list. Does anybody have any comments before it goes there?

Senator Nikolaou: I do. For the one where it says from Susan Kalter to the Exec, the third paragraph, where it says, what is the history about the GCC and if we should… if there should be a relationship with the Graduate Council. So, my question is, does this need to go to Rules because of what we were discussing last year when we were planning to make it University Curriculum Committee, which is going to have the undergraduate and the graduate, but then we said that one of the duties and responsibilities, it was not as easy to fix. And that's why we said, well, we are going to keep it as undergraduate curriculum committee for now. So, I didn't know if, you know, for that specific part for, you know, can they be integrated with the Senate. If we need to make that change in the UCC first, and then move with that aspect.

Senator Kalter: That's a really interesting question, especially because my understanding is that the GCC is elected by the graduate faculty only. And so, in some ways, there is an academic question there, like whether or not the GCC should at all be reporting to the Senate itself, which is a much larger set of people, or whether it should stay the way it is. And in some ways, I would think that if Academic Affairs thinks probably, yes, they should be integrated into the Senate system, then it would go to Rules. But not before then, right. If Academic Affairs Committee were to discuss it and say, yeah, it really is. The system was set up in a way that most of the time works really well. This may have been an exception. But in general, it works. Then we probably wouldn't want to go to Rules with it. And Martha's nodding her head about that. Does anybody else have any thoughts about that?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah, because I didn't know if we were planning to still move with the changes to the University Curriculum Committee or we just left it behind, for now.

Senator Kalter: Actually, what I would do, Dimitrios, is ask Amy that question, because Amy Hurd is the one that was interested in that.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay.

Senator Kalter: I think when we sent out the request for external Senate committees to look at their own charges and send us their changes. That was around the time that Jonathan was leaving and Amy was coming in and she had been the Grad School director and had identified that particular thing about the UCC, and then we ran into that hitch at the very end of last year and that's still kind of needs to get worked out. So, it would actually be good to have that conversation with Amy there to sort of work, bat that out, and maybe with Noelle there also.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay.

Senator Kalter: Any other thoughts about that one. I see all kinds of people thinking about that one, but not necessarily.

Senator Harris: I just had a question for, like, what's the timeline for when something ends up on a committee’s Issues Pending for them to complete it or talk about it?

Senator Kalter: That’s a great question, Lauren. That's the elephant in the room question actually. It really depends a lot. So, there are some things that because we were doing… at a certain point in the last several years, we have been trying to divide the policies that need to have Senate attention from the ones that don't. And in the process of doing that, we put a whole bunch of things on people's Issues Pending list that really have no urgency. Right. They’re just kind of… this is the committee that reviews them and so they're there. But there are other things that have greater urgency and tend to rise to the top. So, every year, each committee decides amongst itself what's our priority. They look at their Issues Pending list, and they can actually add stuff to it at the beginning of the year, or anytime throughout the year, and they basically prioritize those and then it's about the efficiency of the committee going forward after that. Right. So, and also sometimes about the difficulty of the issue being discussed, because sometimes there are, you know, there are pretty complex policies, sometimes like Faculty Affairs Committee right now is dealing with two that are over 12 pages long, and that are fairly complex. And then sometimes what happens is that in the middle of a year something urgent will come up that knocks everything else out. So, it really depends a lot from year to year. We were, by the way, I’ll mentioned this, about a year ago or so, I think, Martha and I got together because she had an idea about creating a sixth internal committee because we had so much work getting backed up, particularly in the Rules Committee, where they have to deal with bylaws. And then there are other things that they deal with. And then we also have one committee that doesn't really do policy review at all, the Planning and Finance Committee, and so things can get really, kind of, bottleneck at a certain point, and so maybe making smaller, more efficient committees is kind of something that's in the works. But that has also gotten bottlenecked by higher priority items, maybe not higher priority, but seemingly more… perceived more urgent ones, let's put it that way.

***09.24.20.01 From Rules Committee: Library Committee Bluebook page Current Copy (Information Item 10/07/20)***

***09.24.20.02 From Rules Committee: Proposed Library Committee Bluebook page - MARK UP (Information Item 10/07/20)***

***09.24.20.03 From Rules Committee: Proposed Library Committee Bluebook page - CLEAN COPY (Information Item 10/07/20)***

Senator Kalter: All right. Next thing, we're going to our Information Items. So, we have coming up from the Rules Committee the Library Committee Blue Book changes. Are there any comments on that that either Martha or anybody else would like to make before we say yes, let's put this as an Information Item at our next meeting?

Senator Nikolaou: I'm going to say… well, I don't have that many comments, I guess. So, I had one question under the students, in the last sentence, where it says, “If organization is not an RSO, this graduate student representative will be named by the dean of the college chosen on a rotating basis by the Graduate School.” So, my question was, why is it from the dean of the college and it is not from the Graduate School itself, since it is a graduate student.

Senator Horst: This is a policy that Noelle Selkow gave us. And it's a policy that's used in other selection processes. So, she recommended this policy.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. And then the other one, is there a reason why there may be multiple secretaries? Under the officers.

Senator Horst: Yeah, that was given to us by the Library Committee, I think maybe because there's two Associate Deans so they might both serve as secretaries.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay, and I may bring it up on the floor because that was actually one of the first things in the first paragraph, where it says, “3 or more ex-official non-voting members.” But then why isn't it specified if it is three ex-officio members, it is three ex-officio members.

Senator Horst: Because I think there might be more associate deans. There could be two associate deans, I think.

Senator Nikolaou: Because I was thinking, I mean, let's say, let's go to the extreme, where they have like ten associate deans, and then they end up with more ex-officio members, more non-voting than voting members. So, if they have all their, let's say all the bosses in the committee, how free are they going to express their views in the committee.

Senator Horst: This is a standard language and it's the way the committee works and it's working. I mean, it's the way the language stands now.

Senator Kalter: I don't think it's the way the language stands now, Martha. These came up on Rules last year too, that that they were… We had the same exact questions about having no upper end to that and having multiple secretaries. So, I think that those are changes, actually.

Senator Horst: The secretaries is. But I don't recall that the ex-officio non-voting members, there's a change. I know that the Director of Communications and Outreach, I changed that title, that I was given that.

Senator Nikolaou: I'm looking at the markup and it seems that these are added.

Senator Horst: I, yeah, let me get to the markup, but I'm, you know, I'm perfectly happy to take a recommendation on the floor.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, that’s what I would suggest.

Senator Horst: Because this has been passed out of the committee.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, that's what I would suggest, Dimitrios, because I think what you're bringing up is really very legitimate and important.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah and you know it might be that it was something specific to the Library Committee that, you know, that we have no idea about. And then one last thing, in the reporting is the reason why it's just a brief written report. Because that was one of the comments we had, at least in the previous three years when I have been in the Academic Affairs, that the Library Committee’s report is actually really brief with no justification altogether. So, if now it says a brief report. It's going to be more about who participated and when were the meetings. So, I didn't know, again, why it was brief, you know, brief overview.

Senator Horst: That language and I don't have the mark up in front of me, I apologize, but I believe that language is all coming from the Thomas Burr, who was the chair of the committee and we approve those changes. The significant change is that the faculty members are now… they have to be one from each college, that's a very important change. Before it was suggested.

Senator Kalter: So, will you bring these three or four things up again?

Senator Nikolaou: Sure.

Senator Kalter: Because they all do sound important, especially the ones about overloading the committee with the bosses of the committee, so to speak, as you put it, right. In other words, if it is advisory to the dean's office, why would there be more people from the dean's office on it than faculty and student members. Okay, so that one's okay to go to the floor as an Information Item, it looks like.

***09.18.20.02 From Lisa Huson, Susan Kalter and Dimitrios Nikolaou: Policy 4.1.4 Student Dress Code Current Copy (Consent Agenda 10/07/20)***

***09.18.20.03 From Lisa Huson, Susan Kalter and Dimitrios Nikolaou: Proposed Policy 4.1.4 Student Dress Code Mark Up (Consent Agenda 10/07/20)***

***09.18.20.01 From Lisa Huson, Susan Kalter and Dimitrios Nikolaou: Policy 4.1.4 Student Dress Codes Clean Copy (Consent Agenda 10/07/20)***

Senator Kalter: We now enter our Consent Agenda items for the floor. So, you may remember the Dress Code. I was going to talk to Lisa Huson. So, I spoke to Lisa and she agreed that the words “departments/schools” can be taken back out of the mark up, given the intended scope of the policy. And then I went back and confirmed with Dimitrios, that the policy as you see it in the markup is sort of what was intended, right, by the Academic Affairs Committee and the Senate, as they voted on it last year. So, you have the memo, the original memo from Lisa about why this got sent back to us for a tweak. So, hopefully we're good to go on that one. Does anybody have anything to say before we put it on our Consent Agenda?

President Dietz: I just observe that on the second bullet, I think the wording is very appropriate “Dress codes must be specifically tailored…” I think that’s just wonderful, so.

Senator Kalter: We aim to please, Larry.

President Dietz: It fits the spirit and intent of the policy.

Senator Kalter: I agree. Now, we want to have things in the budget to make sure that we're well tailored. Is that good to go? Excellent. Alright. So, that was going on the Consent Agenda.

***09.24.20.05 From Faculty Affairs Committee: Policy 3.3.4 Non-Tenure Track Faculty Classifications And Performance Evaluation Mark Up (Consent Agenda 10/07/20)***

Senator Kalter: We got now the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Classifications and Performance Evaluation. This is one we've not seen in a long time. Basically, we identify one issue that can be easily fixed. It's kind of an editorial change because the… whatever it's called, the non-tenure track faculty union changed its name at some point. And so, we're going to change that. But Faculty Affairs Committee has asked to retain this policy in its Issues Pending list, because it needs to work on two future issues. One of them is the definition of and the automatic awarding of the emeritus title. And then the second one is a question that was raised by John Baur, who now, as you know, Craig McLauchlan is in that AVP role. It has to do with whether we have sufficient classifications for visiting professors and research professors. So, those two things are going to stay in the Issues Pending list for Faculty Affairs for a future year, and hopefully we'll just put this little snippet from these minutes into the Issues Pending folder as well so that there's a record in case we don't get to it by the end of this year. Any questions or comments before that one goes on to the Consent Agenda?

Senator Horst: Yeah, there's a period missing after adjunct, in the adjunct faculty sentence.

Senator Kalter: Thank you.

Senator Mainieri: And then there's a comma instead of a period under Emeriti Faculty.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Cera, so you see where both of those are?

Ms. Hazelrigg: Yes.

Senator Kalter: Awesome.

Senator Toth: And then just for clarification, you said that they changed the name to ISUEA from NTTFA.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, a long, long time ago actually, probably 20 years ago, and it's just never been looked at.

Senator Toth: Gotcha.

Senator Kalter: Never, never been noticed

***09.24.20.06 From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Policy 6.1.16 Display Flags On Campus Markup (Consent Agenda 10/07/20)***

Senator Kalter: All right, let's see, we go then to the next one. Apparently coming up from Administrative Affairs and Budget. The Display of Flags is being offered for the Consent Agenda because they are only changing one word. Any questions or comments before we place it on the Consent Agenda?

Senator Horst: Yeah, I've been thinking about flags, because I've been seeing a lot of flags in my neighborhood. Like there's Trump flags and Biden flags and all kinds of different flags. And I also know all about the flag policy problems 10 years ago. And I'm not sure if “official flag” is enough, because like a political party could have an official flag. So, I have the wording, “nations, states, or internationally recognized organizations,” because I think that's the kind of flags that we're talking about, as opposed to official flags. All kinds of organizations could have official flags.

Senator Kalter: That sounds like… I'm trying to think whether we should have that… I’m thinking that for the sake of efficiency, given the current Zoom environment, we should send that back to David and the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee to consider your suggested language, before we move it to the Consent Agenda. Does that sound like the right plan for everybody?

Senator Nahm: I'm on the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee. So, one thing that's not reflected in the language, but is a part of this policy, is that there are specific flagpoles designated on campus for the purpose of raising official flag. So, this policy pertains to those areas, and not necessarily all flags that are on campus. I'm not sure if there's a different policy that might cover that. So, we had at one point discussed whether we want to include official flags on, you know, like official flagpoles or some language like that. But we can definitely go back and consider the concerns that you raised about that.

Senator Nikolaou: I actually had the same question as Martha, because I was trying to figure out what official flag means. And I actually went online to see that there is not even a consensus about what flag is.

Senator Horst: Don't go there.

Senator Nikolaou: And then I had, do we need to remove the first sentence of the policy all together, where it says, “The following policy is recommended for adoption by the Academic Senate.” I mean, if it is a policy, it has been adopted by the Academic Senate so that the policy should start from, “The University will display the U.S., state, and other official flags as follows:” ABC.

Senator Kalter: That Kee-Yoon seems logical, right, as a member of the committee, I'm thinking of the efficiency of having like nine people debate this rather than 60. So, I'm thinking we should send this one back to committee, briefly, to iron those two things out. I do think that this came up also in the Facilities Use stuff that went through last year. And so that's where the stuff about random flags got discussed as opposed to, you know, the U.S. flag, the State of Illinois flag, the ISU (do, if we have an official flag of the university). But anyway, there are two different policies, and this one is more for the stuff that deals with what Martha and Dimitrios were talking about, as far as I understood it. Okay, not on the Consent Agenda, goes back to committee. And what were you saying?

Senator Nikolaou: For C, is it only upon the recommendation of the President? Or is it the approval of the President. So, is it that the President only recommends or is that the President actually approves which flags are going to be displayed?

President Dietz: Yeah. I don't approve the flag. Half-mast flags, for example, that's mandated by the state. Many times, I don't even know the person. I’m not notified as to why the flag is at half-mast, that comes through as a mandate from the state. Typically, it's someone has lost their life in a war, or conflict, or something of that nature or a dignitary has passed away. But I don't approve that. Those are automatically at the direction of the states that those are lowered to half-mast. And, Susan, I would echo the issue about last year. There was a lot of discussion around the one flagpole that's out here on the quad. That really is not viewed as the official pole of the U.S. flag and the state flag and so forth. It's more… that one flagpole’s more expressions of, you know, different groups and so forth that want to fly a flag for a period of time. So, your limitations about how long a flag could be flown on that one pole and so forth. So, I think it'd be wise for this group to look at what we did last year.

Senator Kalter: Alright, so we're going to send that one back to Administrative Affairs and Budget to work that out.

***09.16.20.01 From Teri Hammer: Email Policy 1.6 Religious Accommodations (Dist. to Academic Affairs or Consent Agenda)***

***09.16.20. 03 From Teri Hammer: Policy 1.6 Religious Accommodations Current Copy (Dist. to Academic Affairs or Consent Agenda)***

***09.16.20.04 From Teri Hammer: Policy 1.6 Religious Accommodations Mark Up (Dist. to Academic Affairs or Consent Agenda)***

***09.16.20.05 From Teri Hammer: Policy 1.6 Religious Accommodations Clean Copy (Dist. to Academic Affairs or Consent Agenda)***

Senator Kalter: Let's see. The next one is also a Consent Agenda one, and, Cera, has this also as “or distribute to Academic Affairs.” Basically, every year, the university has an audit that’s done, I believe it’s by the state, and they caught, even though this is another one like the Dress Code that had just gotten passed by the Senate. Last year's Academic Affairs Committee went through a lot of work to bring it up to a really good state and we passed it, but they caught that we hadn't included stuff like admissions, and so Legal is sending it back to us to say, you know, with just the suggested additions. And one of my questions was to Martha about… I'm trying to remember if it's allowable by our bylaws to simply place this on the Consent Agenda, or if it has to first go to Academic Affairs, and then come back to us to say, yes, we're good with those changes, and can you place it on the Consent Agenda. I'm trying to remember what the two things are that we need for the Consent Agenda.

Senator Horst: Because, well, I actually have an item that might just automatically send it back to the committee. I was thinking about auditions, because auditions aren't necessarily admissions. You get admitted to the University, but you still have to go through the audition process, for instance, of the School of Music. And so that could be… if they're thinking about admissions, that's sort of that kind of thing. If somebody couldn't make an audition because of a religious accommodation problem, would that fall under this policy? Or is that what they're thinking about? Because we admit people to the School of Music in the same… you know, it's like an admission, but it's not the admissions in general to the university. So, they might want to think about auditions, and they might want to talk to, like, the School of Music and the School of Theater and Dance.

Senator Nikolaou: So, would this fall under the other programmatic issues? Because I remember when we were talking about the policy last year, Wendy was the one from Legal that, you know, she was advising about everything. And she actually told us, do not give specifics. So even in the third paragraph, when we say, “…missed exams, quizzes, or other works,” she said try to keep it minimum, because then you might make it sound that it is, like, a disability accommodation, which is more permanent based, instead of religious accommodation, which is more of like a one-time thing.

Senator Horst: But that we admit people to the School of Music. So, if you're going to say admissions.

Senator Kalter: So, Martha, why wouldn't that be covered by the word admissions?

Senator Horst: Well, because we have the audition. And that…. I don't know. I was just thinking… audition to me means something different. They go to the audition. Then we admit. So, the event is called the audition. And if they miss the audition, they would not be admitted. So, is that all tied into the word admission? Or can they get a religious accommodation for the audition? Does that make sense? And that's just a question I had. Because we have a whole series of audition dates, and I'm not sure if students are actually exempt from attending. If they have the last audition date, would they get an exemption? I don't know.

Senator Kalter: And, I mean, you've been our sort of unofficial gatekeeper about the Consent Agenda itself, and I didn't look it up right before the meeting, but I'm remembering that you often say, well, we can't put it on the Consent Agenda unless the committee has asked for it to be on the Consent Agenda. Wasn't there one other way that we can put it on the Consent Agenda.

Senator Horst: Well, if like somebody objects, a Senator objects, if I'm recalling, and then we explain it to them, and then they go, oh, I understand, and it could go back. Something like that. But I would just say that these, the spirit of the Consent Agenda was to accommodate, for instance, that change in the flag policy, although we talked about that one, but just changing one word, or the date, or the phone number. If you recall, like eight years ago, we had some policies going through that just had the phone number change, and that was the spirit of the Consent Agenda, and anything where there's a wording that needs explanation, like this I think it's a point that needs to be discussed in my opinion, so.

Senator Kalter: And also, that the Consent Agenda was supposed to be driven by the internal committee, not by the Executive Committee. Right?

Senator Horst: Right. We were supposed to okay it, basically.

Senator Kalter: Okay. So, let’s then… should we agree that it just goes to Academic Affairs Committees Issues Pending list. Is that all right with everybody?

Senator Nikolaou: Did Teri mentioned anything about if there is a timeline? Because she mentioned in the email compliance. Because, for example, if we need to comply by the end of the semester, and because it's not going to be a big thing, we can have like a short break from IDEAS, deal with it, and then continue with IDEAS. I just want, but if they say that, you know, we need to comply by, you know, the end of the academic year, then we may do a different allocation.

Ms. Hazelrigg: She didn't specify. I can ask. I can give you an answer tomorrow.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay.

Senator Kalter: Awesome. And it is, by the way, in the spirit of IDEAS, anyway, and hopefully would go quickly, because it's just adding things that are in the spirit of what we already passed, as far as I can tell.
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Senator Kalter: Alright, so approval of the proposed Senate agenda for October 7. Let me take a look in the larger screen about whether I have anything written down here. Well, first of all, let me ask for a motion to approve the proposed senate agenda.

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

Senator Kalter: So, we are looking at the proposed Senate agenda, and the text right now we need to remove a couple of things. We're going to have the final, hopefully for this semester, presentation from Dan Stephens, although he's been fabulous to be giving us these presentations. But we do need to get to our other, like our Action and Information Items, so hopefully we'll have a little bit of a break from presentations after this one. But they're going to do the Operating and Capital Funding Request, because that's on its way to the Board. Then the Action Items and the Information Item from the Library Committee. But for the Consent Agenda stuff, we're going to take off the Display of Flags, and we're not going to put on the Religious Accommodations one. That one's going to go to committee. And does anybody see anything else? Do we have the Academic Calendar one? Let me see.

Senator Mainieri: That’s what I was wondering, is I don't see that. And I'm wondering where it's going to go, particularly, because I anticipate there being robust discussion about the item.

Senator Kalter: Yes, I do too. And so, then the question is, probably do we put it before the Senate Calendar changes or after the Senate Calendar changes? I'm guessing we don't want it to go lower than that, right, because it is, it's fairly urgent, if we were to make any changes.

Senator Horst: I'm sorry. I'm not following you, Susan, you want to put the Senate Calendar change up higher?

Senator Kalter: No. The Academic Calendar. I'm suggesting that the Academic Calendar change is slightly more urgent than the Senate Calendar change.

Senator Mainieri: I agree.

Senator Kalter: Only slightly. You agree, Tracy?

Senator Mainieri: Yes.

Senator Nikolaou: Isn’t the Senate Calendar going to be faster, though? Because the only thing that we're going to make is, if all the internal committees have found times to meet, then we vote. That's the only thing, right? It's not that we're going to have any debate about it.

Senator Horst: There will be debate.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay.

Senator Horst: There’s people who don't want this change. So, I would recommend moving it down.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah, I agree. I think… Yeah, I'm interested to see the Academic Calendar discussion.

Senator Kalter: I'm wondering if we should put it absolute first even before the Student Code of Conduct ad hoc committee extension issue.

Senator Mainieri: Probably. I was just wondering what the wording is going to be about the Academic Calendar items, how it's going to appear here on the agenda, and then what materials will be provided as well? Just to help Senators prepare for the discussion.

Senator Kalter: So, we talked about that at the top of the hour, right. So, we'll have it say Academic Calendar proposed changes, and then the letter from the Provost Office that I sent to everybody on Friday.

Senator Mainieri: And then the link to the dashboard with the survey info?

Senator Kalter: Yeah. Okay. So, does that sound good? So, it sounds like we're making two changes to the way it's currently written. We're inserting the Academic Calendar changes and its materials right under Action Items, and then we're taking off the Display of Flags, because we're sending that back to committee. Did I miss anything else?

President Dietz: I was just wondering in your description of this whether or not Spring Break needs to appear in the heading on this.

Senator Kalter: I'm going to leave that up to you and Aondover, because it's coming from you guys. Right. So, do you want it to say that?

President Dietz: I think it would be helpful if it did, because that's the bulk of the issue is the Spring Break piece.

Senator Kalter: Okay. So, Spring Break changes. Yeah, okay.

Senator Horst: Can I clarify, Susan, if we get information on Tuesday that says, oh, I hate this idea, are we at all going to address other proposals, or is it just a thumbs up or thumbs down on this one proposal?

Senator Kalter: My understanding is that it's about this one proposal, because the committee, you know, this has been going on since at least July, if not earlier. I was in an Academic Continuity Classroom Logistics Group on the 20th of July, where they brought fairly thorough research about this already at that early date. And they said that starting the semester late is not a possibility because of financial aid issues, that it's simply too difficult to make that change. Like I said, starting online is also not an issue because that's not a calendar change. And I think that's the only, other than moving the end date of the semester as a result of either canceling or not canceling the spring break, I think that's the only other issue that was being debated. Am I misremembering that, or are those the main things that were being discussed?

Provost Tarhule: I was going to say, certainly the most difficult one to try and get right in… I haven't seen the survey that's going out, though, Ani had been working on it, but I hope it captures the essence of the concern about Spring Break is really a health issue. When people are moving back and forth, then the probability of continuing to increase their infections is… So, it's really the health issues around Spring Break, and the traveling, and how we might mitigate that so that we're not in the same situation as we were at the beginning of the fall semester. Now, when people come back, you know, we're already going to have that at the beginning of a spring semester. So, we know that's going to be an issue and to create another possibility, where there may yet be another upswing in infection, those are the types of things that we're trying to avoid. And so, I just don't know how much information people already have about the thinking behind that proposal, but this is the most difficult one to resolve.

Senator Kalter: That's, I think, what is going to be needed most at the Senate meeting is very, very clear, explicit rationale for why the recommendation is coming to us as it is. So, in other words, I think the answer to your question is that people right now do not have very good understanding of the rationale for why to cancel it, even though it's been talked about all over the country and people have already started doing this. My guess is that the Senate is going to need Ani and Amy or other or maybe Chris Horvath and Sally Parry, whoever's been in charge of this most recently, and has sort of all of the rationale, to give that rationale to the Senate before the Senate debate begins.

Senator Mainieri: So, the survey that is going out has a link to the working document from the group that goes through the options and pros and cons, that the working group worked through to get to the final recommendation, so I know that's part of the survey. The other thing I was going to say, and I don't know… on the survey the two calendar items that we're getting feedback on is, of course, Spring Break cancellation, but the possibility of if Spring Break is cancelled doing a Friday off, like a long weekend in the middle of the semester. And I didn't know if that warranted a calendar change discussion in the Senate, and I just wanted to bring that up.

Senator Kalter: Thank you, Tracy, I was trying to, you know, figure out if there was something I was misremembering. But you're right. There was that possibility. So, that could be another vote or another, you know… I would think, though, that the administration would want us to vote on all of that as a package, right. That, in other words, cancel Spring Break, move the end of the semester up, and add Fridays wherever, right. That it sort of all goes as one package, rather than as separate votes.

President Dietz: I guess the concern, back to the health/safety issue, that really started all this, is that in fact Spring Break was eliminated, and you're adding back in days off that encourages travel, which is exactly what we're trying to discourage. Is that a wise move, even though the survey might suggest that that's a preference and preferred point? And that was my issue earlier when we were talking about the survey. I’m all for the survey, I think you gain information but with the same token, there's got to be a decision made on this at some point in time, and looking at the health/safety issue, you know, the concern about adding additional time off, really encourages travel, which we’re not wanting to do. The other thing that I would, and I'm happy to bring this up in discussion versus anything formal here is that I've been asking this same question to the presidents and chancellors of the other public universities, and about half have already cancelled their Spring Breaks for the spring. And the other half that haven’t, typically are commuter institutions, and they didn't really feel the need to do that, and they tend to be, you know, in Chicago. And so, clearly, the ones that are more like us, in terms of residential institutions, they’ve already cancelled their Spring Break, and make that decision.

Provost Tarhule: We had people do a survey… Ani did a survey of the schools and systems that have canceled Spring Break, and it's a lot. A lot of systems, a lot of schools have already canceled their Spring Break for exactly the same reason. This is one of the challenging things about this topic. It's really useful to have feedback from people. But in one sense it's almost like now, Dylan and the students that are here, but it's almost like asking a kid if they want ice cream. I mean, they're going to vote yes for it and how do we take that into account? Because most kids, I think, will probably want Spring Break. Some might say, yeah, we want Spring Break, but then how do we reconcile those desires with some of the concerns, you know, the health consideration. So, even though… the surveys a good idea, and we should do it, it’s not absolutely clear to me how we integrate all of this with some of the bigger wishes about health concerns.

Senator Toth: That's something we've talked about too, and as students, Lauren and I, we did like a mini survey, just to get ideas to bring to that Academic Continuity work group, and most students did say that they would be, you know, find canceling Spring Break, as long as there were some way to incorporate like a better mental health thing. But it's kind of a… like a lot of people would say that, Dr. Tarhule, but like a lot of students really do understand the risks here, like these are the same students who have lost their proms, and their graduation and there, you know, winter, and like we've lost a whole bunch of stuff. And so, we totally understand that like when students are losing their Spring Break they're not going to like, come on, like, give us their Spring Breaks can go on a road trip to Florida. It's kind of like we do see it coming, and a lot of students are already expecting this change. So, as long as there's some way to incorporate a, you know, a way to better your mental health and incorporate that. And if we were to do a long weekend, like, that is a thing. Yes, of course, like Labor Day, a lot of students are going home, but they aren't going to Mexico, or going on a cruise, or, you know, flying across the country or anything like that. So, the risks are lower, but yes, that is a factor in our decision as well.

Provost Tarhule: I'm encouraged to hear that.

Senator Nahm: Um, I just, I'm a little concerned that there will be just a lot of different ideas of how best to have, you know, like, you know, the Friday off for a long weekend as an alternative to Spring Break. I'm just like speaking from the perspective of my school. We don't have classes on Friday, but we do have production meetings all throughout the day. So, you know, like not having that Friday for production meetings will have an impact on our production calendar for that semester and things like that. So, I'm concerned that, you know, different units and, you know, different people might have different ideas of how best to accommodate these needs for mental health, and to take a break in the middle of the semester. So, I wonder if it's better to focus on canceling Spring Break, and just having people understand the need for that first, and then maybe deal with the question of, well, then how do we, you know, like how do we give students and faculty a break after that, instead of trying to put that into a single package. That's how I feel about it.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, I mean, again, this is coming to us from the Provost Office. So, I'm going to leave that recommendation from you to the Provost, right, to shape the way it gets presented to the Senate.

Provost Tarhule: Okay.

Senator Kalter: It may be, I don't know how they've got the survey setup, but perhaps if there's any way to record the college that things are coming from, that might be helpful in terms of how the different questions get answered, so that there can be some analysis. That's very short period of time for Ani and Amy to be able to analyze that, you know, within one day, but if there are multiple questions beyond Spring Break about Fridays, or which Fridays, or whether it should be Fridays or Mondays, or whatever, you know, I don't know how that's…. That's all up to the Provost Office basically.

Senator Harris: Can you all see this survey now? Because like me and Dylan are both part of the group, so one of the questions is asking specifically would you rather just cancel it, or to cancel but have the Friday off. So, I don't know if that will impact discussions that we have at Senate if it's already on the survey as an option.

Senator Kalter: So, Lauren, I’m not sure if you're asking whether we're able to see it, I have not received it. Are you saying that you have?

Senator Harris: Yeah. The group has the survey. I don't know when, I wasn't a part of the meeting today. I had to miss it. So, I'm not sure when they intended on sending out the survey. But if those are questions that we're having about what would be on the survey, I don't know if that would affect conversations for Senate.

Senator Kalter: I'm not sure. I mean, again, I still feel like this is… the Provost Office is making a recommendation to the Senate. So, one of the things that's happening, I think, in this meeting is that some of us are sitting on that calendar group and so you guys have seen that. I'm on the Academic Continuity Group, but they had to schedule their meeting during my class, and I am doing synchronous classes. So, I won't be able to make the meeting this week, so I probably won't see the thing until it comes to the Senate unless they're able to give me the notes from that meeting, but I don't think I even saw it on the agenda of the meeting. So, I think that our messages right here are getting a little bit crossed because we're talking about two different issues, right. What you guys are doing on the Academic Continuity calendar committee is advisory to how the Provost Office is doing the survey, then the Senate will get the results of the survey. Right.

Senator Harris: Yeah, that's why I was kind of unsure if we're going to get the results of the survey, but we're kind of questioning what's on the survey. That's why I was confused. Because Dylan brought up that the survey does have an option for Friday. But if we're already wary about the Friday option. That's why I'm a little confused on what was happening.

Senator Kalter: I see. And so, I think Kee-Yoon was expressing wariness about the Friday option, but that will come out in the survey. And what I was wondering, was whether the Provost knew whether the survey has a way to record were that wariness is coming from. Right. So, that you would be able to interpret those results as, oh this is coming out of Theatre, which has already been hit hard by cancellations of productions, and so we'll take this into consideration when we're thinking about perhaps opening up days, you know, I think we're getting into the weeds, frankly. The question is, you know, does this go on the Academic Senate's proposed agenda, and the answer to that is obviously yes, and that it should be prioritized. And the rest of it is the Provost Office job to bring to us a clear recommendation, and people who can speak to the rationale behind those recommendations, and then we have a debate. Rather than having that debate here. Because we're not going to be able to resolve that issue here. Right.

Senator Horst: And, but just picking up on Kee-Yoon’s point, I do think it's important to separate, if you have different proposals, like, Spring Break, Friday off, just separate those out, so that we have clear things to vote on as a recommendation.

Senator Nahm: To clarify my point. I think it's great for the survey to try to collect as many opinions and ideas as possible. My concern was if the goal of putting this on the Senate agenda is to come to an agreement to what to recommend to the administration based on this feedback. I think that trying to talk about both, the issue of canceling Spring Break, and what an alternative would be to give students and faculty a break would be but trying to cover all of that I think might take too long.

Senator Kalter: But they're all, Kee-Yoon, they're all changes to the calendar so we can't avoid that.

Senator Nahm: But couldn’t we do it in steps? If the most important thing is, first of all, canceling Spring Break, making that recommendation to the administration first and then following up with another debate on another calendar change to have a Friday off or something like that.

Senator Kalter: I guess I feel two ways about that. One is that I've seen the Board meeting from September 12 where I think our Provost and President already were getting pressure from outside to have a decision made lickety split. And I also would say… so, I don't think that extending that into two or three nights of Senate is going to be productive. And because it's going to simply delay their ability to make decisions and I'd also say that people could vote differently on Spring Break, depending on what they think about the Friday. So, I don't see how we can extricate those two from one another, they're inextricable, right. You have to be talking about the alternative… I mean, my biggest concern about this is mental health. Pure and simple. This is going to be extremely hard on people, right, to go for 15 straight weeks as students with absolutely no break at all. After a… we already know that fall semester is literally killing to our students and to a certain extent, to our faculty, with the way it goes for 13 to 14 weeks straight with no break, and then we finally get to spring and there's a respite in between, right, in the halfway point, and in a pandemic year, where everybody is already dealing with extreme mental health issues. This is going to be a big debate on the floor of the Senate about mental health versus physical health, essentially. So, I don't see how we can pull those things apart if, especially, because Larry is bringing up the fact that the Fridays are also physical health consideration weekends. So, I think we have to just deal with the fact that we're going to have a big debate on… and it may be the only thing that we get done, again, on October 7. Right. That's just the way this year is going unfortunately.

Provost Tarhule: What if giving some additional days off is not an option? Because with respect to what Kee-Yoon was saying, there are some lab classes that are expressing a lot of anxiety about this. Because if they had different sections of labs, if you cancel one day, then you'll cancel the whole week. Otherwise, some of those sections are ahead of others. So, if you give up Friday, for example, and it means we're going to lose the labs for the whole week, and they can't figure out how to deal with this. So, there is that issue that has not been resolved, we haven't figured out how to resolve. Kee-Yoon is talking about the lab. So, it may be that in the end, maybe just canceling Spring Break and there is no discussion about giving any time off. Is it a strain? Sure, it is. But then there are many other schools that are doing this too, they just cancel Spring Break and that’s it. There is no… there's nothing else given. And I think part of the reason is the complexity of what happens to the curriculum when you try to do that.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah, I think for this group, I think we're getting a little bit ahead of the data, as well as the final presentation that the Provost Office will provide the Senate. And I think that we could sit here for quite a while and debate these things. But I think we're getting ahead of what will actually happen during Senate.

Senator Kalter: Yeah.

Senator Mainieri: I would advocate moving on.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, I agree. Our only question here is whether we put it on the proposed agenda. So, everything else is up to the wisdom of the Provost Office to present it on the floor on October 7, and to try to make a convincing case. And just to know that we're going to have a replay of this mini debate on the floor.

Senator Harris: I have a question. Is this still a hard stop time 8:30 p.m.? I don't know, because we're talking about two things that I feel like may take some time.

Senator Kalter: There are some pretty serious things still being talked about in the Caucus. So, yeah, I'm going to say that, at least in the beginning. We’ll see how it goes. But I mean, you know, I'm going to say yes to that, but let's not have repetition in the debate is kind of where I need to be, right, when I'm chairing the meeting to try to emphasize to people if somebody has already made your point, especially if three people have made your point, okay, we can stop making the point over and over again. Right. So, I think, you know, we need to have enough debate to have all of the voices out there, but not have it be repetitive. We may need to put time limits on each person's debate or the number of times the person can speak or something. I don't know. But let me ask us to approve the agenda first, and then let's go into talking about that part of it. Okay.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: Awesome. Okay. Because I just wanted to sort of get our actual business done and then move into that, Lauren. So, I don't know, give me advice about that, because it's pretty difficult to weigh those two things. We can't have three-hour long Senate meetings. We just can't do that to ourselves, and the Faculty Caucus has stayed until like 10:00 p.m. two weeks ago, and until 9:30 p.m. last time. And I think until like 9:30 p.m. the previous time. So, I think we have to figure out a way to not have Senate go for hours and hours, but I need your advice about how to do that, because it's really been a struggle. My instinct is to give as many people as much voice as possible, right, like when I'm on the Senate floor in a face to face setting, I try to make as much room for debate as possible. This is just a super difficult year.

Senator Mainieri: So, can I… just in order to answer the question I want to wrap my head around the process a little bit. Is your intention to have this, and we have it listed under Action Items, right, and so, do we need to just straight off put a motion on the floor? Does the Senate recommend canceling Spring Break, and then debate it? Or are we going to have a whole discussion about the survey results first, and then move into a possible motion?

Senator Kalter: I would say my instinct, Tracy, would be to have the Provost Office present the rationale for the recommendation, and then immediately have a motion and a second. And then move straight into debate.

Senator Mainieri: Because I feel like that will help direct. Because if we were to start with a whole discussion of what we're seeing in the survey results, we're going to go here, right. As opposed to if there is a motion to cancel Spring Break, right, then part of it that helps focus the discussion and gives you the leeway to say, great, but that's not related to our motion or something like that. Right. I think it just provides some focus.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, I think what you're saying also is that people can bring up the survey during their debate, right, they can bring the survey in and say “I'm opposing this because,” “I'm in favor of this because,” and then refer to the survey results.

Senator Nikolaou: So, I think that's what Kee-Yoon had in mind earlier, when he was saying that, you know, to have it in two steps. The idea that currently the memo has two things. So, we cannot have a motion that says cancel Spring Break and an alternative is to have Fridays off. So, if the Provost Office wants to bring out the recommendation to cancel the Spring Break, I think that's what Kee-Yoon had in mind, that if that's their recommendation, that's the recommendation, that's a clear motion, we debate, and we vote. But if the memo says cancel and also in the same memo says let's do the Fridays. We debate, but what we vote on? If I vote yes, do I vote yes for canceling the Spring Break, or do a for yes for having the Fridays.

Senator Mainieri: I see those as two separate motion. Right. Like cancel yes or no. And if we say yes. Cancel. Our recommendation would be to cancel, then the survey has two options, either don't do anything and end a week early, or add one Friday long weekend, and end a week early. There’s not like 20 options.

Senator Nikolaou: So, then my question is, since it comes out from the Provost Office in theory, we should have like two or three potential memos where the first one is recommending to cancel the Spring Break and then if the Senator votes no, then the Provost says, okay, if we vote no for canceling Spring Break the alternative that the office thinks is this one, so, this is the second memo that we bring on the floor for you to vote on.

Senator Kalter: Do you really mean memos? I'm a little concerned about the language of memos. So, we're talking about motions. Right. So, what I would expect is that the Provost Office would bring us clear recommendations, and that if they see two recommendations as independent from one another, that they would offer us those two as two different recommendations, and that would say is, do we have a motion for the first recommendation and, you know, debate that. And then have a motion for the second rec…. But, I think we're also, again, mixing up motions, which we do not have, and will not have until Wednesday, with the memos and the materials that are going out, which are the thing that got sent out on Friday, plus the survey. Right. So, there's the memo that’s sort of giving people the background information. There's the survey, that's giving people the information from campus. But the motions are going to be coming out of either Dr. Tarhule’s presentation, or Ani's, or whoever's, right. They're going to say, we have two recommendations to make to the Senate, or we have a single recommendation to make to the Senate and they're going to be able to say to us, for example, they may want to recommend cancel Spring Break, and end the semester earlier. Even though that's two different things, they may want us to vote on that as a single motion because why would you do the moving the Spring Break up unless, you know, are moving the semester earlier, unless you cancel Spring Break. Otherwise, everybody's going to have to rewrite all of their syllabus that they've been teaching for the last 20 years. So, that I think can be one motion. But you're right, that like two motions might be, you know, they might recommend cancel Spring Break, and move the semester up, and then they might also recommend, you know, add some extra Fridays that are days off. And they would say to us very clearly on Wednesday, we have two recommendations, we have three recommendations, or we have one recommendation, and we go from there. But we're not going to be able to get them in written form prior to that, just because of the nature of how fast we're moving, right.

President Dietz: If I might make a suggestion, then I apologize, I’m going to have to get off and get on another Zoom call here. But just in terms of how we might think about this, and I'm really saying is more for Dr. Tarhule, and perhaps in the larger group, but when we're preparing for Board meetings and Board resolutions and so forth, we do a lot of background on that, and we do the formal part (which I'm not suggesting be a part of Wednesday), but the formal part is a whole litany of whereases. So, we give the rationale to build a case, if you will, and then be it resolved, and then that's essentially your motion. And then there's also a possibility of be it further resolved, if you want something else that follows the same rationale that the… just a different way of thinking about this, that I think clarifies a little bit. So, with that, I'm going to apologize for getting off, and thank you all.

Senator Kalter: Thanks for staying this long, Larry.

Provost Tarhule: But, Susan’s explanation is entirely correct. This decision about the calendar doesn't rest just on this survey. There are so many other points of data that are being considered. As I mentioned, if you give people a Friday off, what do you do with all those other lab classes. And if you did it on Wednesday, what do you do with syllabus that they have to shift back and forth? So, there's a lot that's going to go into this, and they have considered a lot of these decisions, the survey is just one part. And so, once we get the results and see maybe if 100% of the people came back and say, absolutely we should do Spring Break. Yeah, that might alter the direction, you know, but if it turns out to be a bit qualified, you know, they'll take it into account, along with all of those other considerations and then make a recommendation. They'll have to be working really late on Tuesday to make sure we have a recommendation to present to you guys as well. So, I would say, let's not overbeat the horse. The committee's really aware of all of these nuances and issues and they will take it into account. And what I like is the clear explanation about what to put on the floor in such a way that it's not going to put us in… it won’t be confusing. I've heard your concerns. I've heard the interpretations that Dimitrios is bringing. It makes a lot of sense. And I'm going to take this into account as I work with Ani to craft something in a way that you'd be able to vote on, hopefully, directly.

Senator Kalter: And I mean, going back to the Lauren’s question, Lauren, I just feel like I have to put a hard stop time on this. Part of the reason for that is the night that we stayed until 10 o'clock was because we literally had to spend 52 minutes voting because of the way the Governor changed the Open Meetings Act. It was the most ridiculous waste of time I've ever spent anywhere. But we had to do it because of Open Meetings Act. And we have another set of votes that are coming up in the Caucus because of the retreat stuff that could easily take an entire hour, and yet we've still got Caucus stuff to deal with, in terms of the way that faculty are getting judged. So, it's sort of like, you know, the pass/fail stuff for you guys last spring, we're talking about things on that level for faculty, and they deserve to have people who are actually awake when they're debating them, and not to make ourselves sort of second class citizens in our own university, right, as being the faculty who wait until 10:00 in the evening to make all of their decisions about themselves. So, it's a terrible thing to have to weigh, and I've been trying to, you know, make it so that we can begin Senate earlier so that we don't have this awful crunch of time. But that's unfortunately been several years trying to get some way to make our time more efficient, and it's just, unfortunately, it's gotten worse instead of better because the pandemic is putting so much pressure on us to do stuff that we wouldn't be ordinarily, you know, dealing with. So, I am afraid I'm going to say at the beginning of the meeting we're going to have a hard stop time between 8:15 p.m. and 8:30p.m. because of all of that consideration.

Provost Tarhule: Susan, here's something else to consider, it may not come out right, but the fact of the matter is, with a lot of these things, there isn’t a right solution. I mean, we could debate it for three days or four days, and we still wouldn't know what is right or wrong. What is important is we need to hear from people and maybe there's enough of a consensus one way that's helpful. But in many other cases when that doesn't happen, you could be talking about it, as you said, the committee's discussing this have been working on this for months. They’re still no closer. Just because there isn't a right solution. At some point, we as an institution, we just have to take a position that we can live with, but we will never get that right solution because it doesn't exist.

Senator Kalter: So, one more thing, everybody, Dimitrios, you had something about, oh, what was it, cameras on and off.

Senator Nikolaou: Question/clarification. So, it was either last or the second to last Exec meeting when we talk about if we can require students to have their cameras on or off. So, I had a question. Because we said that now, when we know the modality of this spring courses the instructors are going to have in the notes if it's going to be synchronous or asynchronous, if they're going to start online, and then move to face to face, and etc. So, since we're still getting the proctoring software, right?

Provost Tarhule: Yep.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. So, the proctoring software, doesn't it required cameras? So, if there is a course that's going to be using the proctoring software, which means the students for these courses they will be required to have cameras, should this be part of the notes for these specific courses? Because I may have, let's say, a desktop computer I can access Zoom and everything, but I don't have a camera. I should know ahead of time if I would be required to have a camera, either for attendance purposes or for, you know, because I need to take my exams through a camera. So, that was my question, if we know if this is something, we would need to disclose on Course Finder, or it doesn't matter.

Provost Tarhule: I'm sending in my message that would go out on Tuesday, this is one of the things I address. We have acquired the proctoring software. We're going to use it. And in the message, we’ll specifically states that if students have computers that don't have cameras, now they should contact technology, we will work with the students to make sure that they will have the cameras they need for their exams. So, I don't know if that answers your question or not. But just so you know, I'll be putting out a message in on Thursday, and part of that message addresses this this issue.

Senator Kalter: Dimitrios, does that… So, you're very specific question was about proctoring, but we also had that discussion about people who are just requiring cameras to be on and off. Did it extend to that, like where students should know, oh, I have a synchronous class and I'm going to require everybody to always have their cameras on. Like, is that also part of your question?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. I guess that would also be part of… if, for example, let's say I'm taking attendance for my class and my attendance depends on actual live participation, and for that one I need you to have the cameras on. Should the students know that ahead of time? So, should it be part of the Course Finder, you know, note description. So, for the note that is going to come out from the Provost Office, I don't know if, let's say I don't have a camera, will I be able to get the camera from the technology office for the whole semester, or is it only for the days when I'm going to have the exam in order to use the software.

Provost Tarhule: The messaging that I'm putting out is about the exam only. It doesn't address this other issue.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. Yeah. So, that would be the other part, if the students will need to know ahead of time that, okay, this is a synchronous course that requires you to have the camera on.

Senator Kalter: Dimitrios, I’m thinking that one way to address the second part, not the exam part, but the other larger issue might be to send an email to Ani and Amy simultaneously, and ask them that same question, like, should the chairpersons be asking professors about cameras on/off preferences. Right. So that they're working to collect like the synchronous/asynchronous, you know, whatever, there was some other question, Zoom/Not Zoom or whatever, that they would know they would have that on their radar screen and the chairs could start collecting that. I mean, again, I'll just say, I'm so against that it's not even funny. Right. I think there are too many technology issues, too many privacy issues for people to even be requiring that. But I'm also not, I see the academic freedom side of it too, right, that the faculty member has the right to do that. So, I'm thinking that they should be alerted at that level so that they can start filtering that question, they can process that question and filter it down if they need to pull that information out, and put it somewhere where the students can see it if they decide that they should. Does that make sense?

Provost Tarhule: I think this is already addressed on the COVID webpage guidance. When this came up before, exactly like Susan says, a lot of students taking classes in conditions that they'll be uncomfortable, and maybe it's not even fair to them to require them to turn on their cameras. On the other hand, there are classes where if you're doing language where you need to see the articulation. So, if there is a learning outcomes requirement that cannot be met unless the student’s camera is on, that's understandable. But other than that, my very strong preference would be, folks, this is not a normal year. Let's just let some things get by, you know, we are all just trying to get by this year. So, let's just let some things like attendance and participation, surely there are some ways we can find around things like that. This is not a normal year. Let's not try to treat it like a normal year. That would be my suggestion without imposing that on people. So, the learning outcomes is understandable, but outside of that, we should be able to find workarounds, but we don’t have to impose it on students.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah, and that's what I had mainly in mind. So, if it is a languages courses where you need to actually, you know, look at the mouth, shouldn’t the students know that this is a requirement for the course? So, I know it ahead of time so I don't have any surprises, or we start the class and then they tell me you need to have your cameras on and I don't want to do it, but now I cannot do anything else, because I have already set up my schedule already. So, I cannot, you know, switch it now.

 Provost Tarhule: That’s a good point. I’ll bring it up with Ani.

Senator Kalter: Awesome. Awesome. Okay, so thank you so much for that.

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