**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes**
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***Call to Order***

Academic Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

Senator Kalter: Welcome, everybody. And welcome back. Hope you all had a good Thanksgiving. I just want to start by making note of Larry's announcement that he made on November 20 that he's going to be stepping down as President in June. He and I have worked together since spring of 2014—look at that big smile on his face—and I think that we have both enjoyed every minute of working together, except for the pandemic, which both of us can throw out the window and say we're done with it. So, may Pfizer and Moderna bring it to an end so that we can have a nice in-person send off in May or June of this year. That would be real nice. Did you want to want to say anything, Larry?

President Dietz: I’d just like to say that it was a very difficult decision and part of the difficulty with the decision, frankly, are all the good folks on this call and in other places that I've worked with over the course of the nearly 10 years, and my seventh year as President. It really has been terrific. I appreciate all the encouragement and support, but January 4th it'll be 50 years from my having served some institution somewhere in higher education, and that's a heck of a long time. And so, I was asked a question, late in the summer on a conference call, a virtual Open House actually, with about 1,000 students and prospective students and their families, and the question was, what have you learned as a result of the pandemic. And honestly, I've not been able to get that question out of my head. And so, I don't think we go through these things just to go through them. And so, my antenna has been up a little bit. And I've been doing a lot of reflection, and part of that reflection obviously with Marlene, and we came to the conclusion that maybe it's time to spend more time together, more time with our family and friends. But, you know, the tough part is I’ll be missing all of the good folks I've had the privilege to work with. But we’ve got seven more months of good work to do, and a lot of challenges ahead of us, but I know we're all up to the task. So, I feel very blessed to have served in this role, and just with the University when I started here in 2011. It's been the highlight of my career professionally and personally. So, thanks for letting me say a few words. And thanks to all of you for your continued support and encouragement. I appreciate it very much.

Senator Kalter: Thank you for helping to get us to a great place, and to keep us in a great place, and we hope for the best going forward. I think you're not the only person in the country who had a kind of wondering about where your priorities are, and whether you want to spend more time with family. So, you're in good company there.

President Dietz: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: For anybody here who has any questions about the search process, I can't help you very much. I can just kind of tell you what the past practice has been, and I know that Dr. Dietz told me two Fridays ago that we have Jay Groves on the case, in terms of working with the search process, and that's being in really good hands. So, in the past, you know, there have been Board members, the Senate Chair, a faculty member from each college, non-tenure track faculty member, I think two people from AP Council, two people from Civil Service Council, undergrad and grad students, and then other people are on this search as well. Usually the… of course, the Board runs the search, it's not a University-run search, so to speak. It's run by the Board of Trustees. And so, usually there's somebody from the Foundation, from Athletics, from the Alumni Association, maybe even two people from Alumni Association… and I’m trying to remember who else. But that's the past history, but that doesn't necessarily mean, you know, that there is going to be exact past precedent in all of that.

President Dietz: But I would add that there's going to be, and this was just decided over the holiday, there's going to be a Board meeting on December 12th in the morning, and I think 9:00 a.m. is the start date for all that. And Jay is going up to see Julie Jones, the Chair of the Board, on the 8th to talk about processes and so forth. I don't know this, but I recommended that they do a national search, and they use a search firm to do that. And we are somewhat limited in the firms that we can choose. The top of the list is WittKieffer, and they brought us our colleague Provost Tarhule, and I think did a great job of that. And so, they’re working on the Athletic Director search now. And so, I would hope that they would select them. They don't have to, but there's a whole nother rigmarole through procurement that you have to go through if you don't do that. And so, that's been my suggestion is that they do that. I also haven't talked about this in the press, but I have offered to the Board privately that if they, you know, come July 1, if they have a person that's made it through the process that they want but can't be here July 1, that I would be willing to continue on for a little bit. If they would have a failed search, that I would be willing to carry on, again, for a little bit. The thing I'm most sincerely interested in for the institution is that there be a smooth transition between my tenure in this role and the next person. So, whether they would take me up on that, it’s up to them. But anyway, I think a smooth transition, we would all hope for that.

Senator Kalter: For sure. Does anybody else want to say anything before we move into our agenda?

Provost Tarhule: Just to say that, Larry, I discussed with the senior staff in the Provost Office and I mentioned what you just described, that if we’re not able to… they wanted to know if there would be an interim, and I said unlikely because you are willing to stay on a little bit if we couldn’t fill the role. And somebody said, could that little bit be three years?

(Laughter)

Provost Tarhule: I thought that was pretty smart. They say, could you make that little bit three years? I said I don’t know but I’ll mention it to him. So, there you have it.

Larry Dietz: That's very kind. There is, you know, I don't want to take anything away from the Board. Obviously, it's their choice. And, you know, I've worked for a number of interims throughout my career, and, you know, it can work. I think it creates an adjustment for the organization, both to adjust to whoever's the interim and can create another adjustment then, you know, for the permanent. But that's all within the Board's sphere of authority. And I just want to do what I can to try to help, continue to help the organization as long as I'm in the role. And Marlene and I plan to retire in the community, and we want to, you know, help beyond the chair that I'm sitting in now. So, you know, we don't plan to go anywhere. So.

Senator Kalter: All right. Looks like we can start into our agenda. Let's start late in the agenda and go to the Administrative Affairs and Budget proposed changes to the Presidential Survey, then the approval of the proposed Senate agenda, and then come back up to the Engineering Programs proposal, and then we'll skip around even a little bit more. This is the last Exec for the fall semester, so I'd like to try to get all the business done and not carry stuff over into January. We’ll see how that goes.

***11.19.20.01 From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: AABC email Requested changes to the Surveys on the president***

***11.19.20.02 From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Presidential Survey Students***

***11.19.20.03 From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Presidential Survey Faculty Staff***

Senator Kalter: So, I'm going to skip down to that agenda item. So, according to the Issues Pending list for the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee… Last year, as you remember, the survey goes out on the first day of the January classes (spring semester classes) and then basically gets completed by about March or so. And it is then delivered confidentially to the Executive Committee for us to review it, and it says in their Issues Pending list that, at the time of delivery, the AABC should submit any revisions to the survey instrument for the following year’s campus commentary period. So, it kind of leaves it ambiguous when it says, “submit” whether we're actually, as Exec, okaying the changes, but it does seem wise to do so. And following a little bit of precedent, you may remember if you were on Exec last year, that we actually went to the Legal department with some proposed changes, and eventually the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee withdrew the request for those changes because they were deemed inadvisable by Legal. This year, I thought that the changes that are being requested seemed fine. It does seem to me that it's going to be important to give the survey, even in a year when a President is leaving, because people will likely want to leave comments about their hopes and concerns for the next President, and that kind of thing. So, do we have any discussion/conversation about the changes that are being proposed there?

Senator Horst: Just to say that we might want to change the Blue Book charge of the Executive Committee to say that we approve of the survey language.

Senator Kalter: Do you want to take that up in Rules Committee, by any chance?

Senator Horst: I would like to put it on the Issues Pending list.

Senator Kalter: Excellent. Make sure it gets done right. All in favor, you know, just go like this or something.

Senator Nahm: Sounds good.

Senator Kalter: Terrific. Good. Anything else on this one?

Senator Mainieri: You know, I like the addition of the “responsive to,” but I do feel like open and responsive to are two separate items and should probably be separate survey items. I feel like someone can be open, but not responsive. And so, I kind of view that as a double-barreled question that I would want to split into two survey items.

Senator Kalter: That's interesting. I know that in the Vice-Presidential, one or more of the Vice-Presidential Surveys it does say open and responsive, so we may also want to look at those at some point. What do people think about splitting those questions? Or, you know, we don’t actually have time to send it back to committee to ask them if that's okay with them because this goes out in January. Do we want to split the question now, or just do what Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee asked for, and then maybe talk about splitting the question for the following year? Anybody have any opinions about that?

Senator Horst: I mean they are words that get paired together quite frequently. I understand what Tracy's saying though, that you could be open to the idea but then do nothing about it. Right. You're nonresponsive, but you say ‘oh, that's a great idea.’ Something like that. But those two words do get paired together in all kinds of different contexts, and if they're already on another survey, I personally didn't have a problem with it, but I'm really neutral about it.

Senator Kalter: I feel only a little bit uncomfortable with making that change, given what Martha said before, right, that we don't have, in our bylaws, the sort of obvious approval authority. So, it seems like we probably ought to go with what the committee asked for, and then send back that question to committee for the next year. Is that okay with you, Tracy?

Senator Mainieri: Sure. And I think it underlines the need to kind of make this process a little clearer, right. Like, I feel a little stranger approving something, and we don't really… it's not written out that we approve, and then we don't have actual time to provide feedback, right. So, yes, I'm fine with that. And highlight the need to formalize this process a little bit.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, it's usually…we are supposed… as it's written, we're supposed to get these changes in the spring so that we have time, and we never do. So that's part of the issue there. Anybody else have anything that they want to say before we make those changes and then send them back that question? (Pause) All right.

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

***Proposed* Academic Senate Meeting Agenda**

**Wednesday, December 9, 2020**

**7:00 P.M.**

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

**Zoom Link:**

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

***Call to Order***

***Roll Call***

***Chairperson's Remarks***

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

***Administrators' Remarks***

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

***Action Items:***

***11.17.15.02 Policy6.1.13\_Amplification\_current\_policy (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***10.27.20.01 Proposed Policy 6.1.13 Sound Amplification Mark Up (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

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

***11.12.20.03 Policy 1.8 Integrity in Research and Scholarly Activities Current Copy (Faculty Affairs Committee)***

***11.13.20.01 Integrity Policy Section I Mark Up (Faculty Affairs Committee)***

***11.13.20.02 Integrity policy Section II Mark Up (Faculty Affairs Committee)***

***11.13.20.03 Integrity policy Section III Mark Up (Faculty Affairs Committee)***

***11.12.20.04 Policy 1.8 Integrity in Research and Scholarly Activities Clean Copy (Faculty Affairs Committee)***

***Information Items:***

***Consent Agenda Item: None***

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

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

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

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

***Rules Committee: Senator Horst***

***Communications***

***Adjournment***

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

Senator Kalter: Excellent. So, it's actually looking to me like we actually we may not have much business or any business for the Senate. We’ll talk that through. It may be that this is mostly, because we do have to meet in December according to our Constitution, mostly about hearing Administrator Remarks and committee reports. Let me go down to the agenda. I had a couple of notes about why that would be. So, I’m not sure, you may remember that last time we tabled the Amplification policy. And I'm a little bit uncertain about putting it on the written agenda without knowing it has gone completely through committee. And given where Administrative Affairs and Budget is in their year, I think that we ought to take it off of this agenda and if they finish it, you know, in December, that's great. If they don't, there's no pressure on them, and there's no sort of awkward, ‘oh, we have to take it off the agenda’ or not do that agenda item. Does that seem right to people? So, that we would not have the Amplification policy in Action, or even on the agenda at all?

Senator Horst: Yeah. I sent a list of suggestions to David. And he said, ‘oh, we'll get right on that.’ And so, it does seem like they have, from various people, some direction on what to talk about. And so, it seems premature to put it on as an Action Item. I'd also say though that I think we, because the body voted on it to table it, I think the body has to vote to take it off the table.

Senator Kalter: Yes, I think, though, Martha, because of Open Meetings Act, it is advisable for Exec to put it on the agenda, and if the vote to take it off the table were to fail, that's fine. But to not have it on the agenda is not advisable, I think.

Senator Horst: I'm saying, we would have to have it on the agenda that we're voting to take it off the table.

Senator Kalter: Okay, yes. Okay. So, when we do get it back on, we'll try to make note of that. Great. And, Dylan, you had something you're…

Senator Toth: Yeah, I was just going to say, are you suggesting we postpone it because they do have a lot of other business that they're working on right now.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, and also because it, you know, they could start talking about this at the December meeting and not finish, and then we wouldn't know where it's going or what have you. So, I’d kind of feel more comfortable just taking it off the December agenda, not putting pressure on them to get it all done, and then if it's ready in January… because this is not, I mean, it's an Amplification policy during a pandemic. And so, there are not a lot of people on campus that are going to be disturbed by noise right now, so it doesn't seem like a rush.

Senator Horst: No, but there were some Music ensembles that actually in the fall were practicing outside and there were complaints, so they had to stop.

Senator Kalter: But we're under the old policy, so that should make you happier, right?

Senator Horst: I'm just saying, you know, that could happen in the spring too. The radical drum, the drumming group. So yes, yeah.

Senator Nahm: As a member of the AABC, I appreciate the extra time to take another look at this.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Terrific. Alright, so we will take that one off. I also think we need to remove the Integrity policy one. Faculty Affairs is probably not going to get to that or finish it by the December meeting. So, that one can go off.

The one question that I did have, and this sort of goes to the Oral Communication that I sent right before the meeting. The concern about RERIP that was forwarded to me, I'm trying to figure out whether that is something that we should send out to one of our committees first, or whether we should have a discussion on the floor of the Senate about it. Especially since we don't have a lot of other business, you know, whether that would be advisable.

Basically, this is coming, you know, in terms of… a chairperson in my college sent the document (that I sent) out to the faculty in his department, and you can kind of see reading it, that there is concern that there has not been consultation with the faculty or with the Senate about the specific kinds of things that would lead to a budgetary incentive. This is basically, RERIP is Recruitment and Enrollment Incentive money, essentially. I don't remember, Dr. Tarhule may know the entire acronym and what it stands for. But in any case, having the Senate sort of look at how those budgetary incentives are working. And one of the questions that came up is exactly how much money is involved here in this program, and whether or not it is influencing, you know, base budgets and that kind of stuff. But there's also sort of a concern about how, essentially, budgetary incentives may be used to change academic practices, standards, etc, to sort of put it in a nutshell. So, I'm wondering if we want to have this go to the Senate floor for a discussion, or whether we want to, you know, send that out to one of our committees?

Provost Tarhule: So, Susan, this is new to me, of course. So, when I got the email, I sent it to Dan Elkins and to Sam, and I said, you know, what’s the response here. What should we do? Dan sent an email. He says no, Academic Senate does not have oversight over this program. This is a purely operational matter. Academic Senate was not involved in the ERIP program, which is the former version of the program that was run from 2014 to 2017, and there's a lot… there's more to this than that. So, I would say maybe before you go to the Senate, this is one of those things that you should, maybe it’s advisable to have a conversation with Dan Elkins and with Sam to hear their perspectives.

One of the big, just so you know, it may not be directly related to this, but I'm actually having a bunch of meetings with some departments that are really upset that their funding levels have become out of whack. They have grown their numbers, they have grown their credit hour production, but in the current model they’re unable to get any additional funding. And so, they feel very marginalized that despite those growths, and despite all the good things that they have done consistent with the university strategic plan, they are now underfunded. There are instances of where, because we have a funding model, that goes back really to 2009, we have departments that have more than 100 students with one TA, as an example. Other departments with less than a third of that have six or seven TAs. That’s just the funding model the way it has been. RERIP is a small means by which those anomalies are corrected, where they allow those departments that are responding to the strategic priorities of the university some ways of getting this funding. So, like I said, I don't know the entire history, but I would strongly encourage that you talk to Dan Elkins and Sam a little bit more before you go to the Senate.

Senator Kalter: I'm glad that you mentioned that you talked to Sam as well. I was thinking of setting up a meeting with you and Dan and our chairs of Academic Affairs and Administrative Affairs to talk about this, because I think the question that's being raised by this faculty member is whether the Senate should have oversight about something, a program like this, because of the way that, depending on the money involved, it could impact the way, you know, academics are delivered. And so, I'd be happy to do that, to set up a meeting with those five people. You know, because it's obviously an Academic Affairs issue, it's also potentially an Administrative Affairs and Budget issue, and then with Sam, and Dan, and yourself, and myself. So, I guess that's six people, and sort of talk through how the program is meant to work, and who devised the metrics that are on it, and then sort of see where it goes from there.

But I think the issue that's being brought up is similar to the issue that was brought up many years back about the Academic Impact Fund, and the idea that it should not in those days have been implemented without Senate review and approval, because of the way it impacts the delivery of academic programs. So, does that sound good to people to… you know, one of the things that I was considering today is that this is the last, again, the last Exec of fall semester, and so, you know, it would have had to wait until the spring semester to sort of put it on one of the Issues Pending lists, or to put it on a Senate agenda, if that was the will of the committee. Anybody have any thoughts about that?

President Dietz: I just would observe that this has been around in some way, shape, or form even before I became President, but just in that timeframe, we've had three Provosts, including now Provost Tarhule, who have put a handprint on this in some way, shape, or form with their respective staff. So, I think Aondover is doing the right thing by having some conversations internally so he can get up to speed as a relatively new Provost and find a little bit of history around this. I think the rationale is sound. I think providing some incentives, people understand that. Looking at the criteria, again, I think probably each Provost and their staff probably added a little to it, so then the list gets longer, oftentimes about criteria. But I think, you know, having a smaller conversation about this is probably the better way to go to gain some insight and information.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, my sense, Larry, is that it's the “R” that got added to the ERIP that may be the issue…

President Dietz: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: Because the enrollment incentive program has been along for quite a long time, as you said. And it's the Tier three, or whatever it's called, the number three that I think has perhaps been added, although I've never seen the metrics at all. And I think that may be to the credit of Dr. Tarhule that we are seeing these metrics for the first time, because I know that, Dr. Tarhule, you've been trying to, you know, make that transparent and open, in terms of the budgeting processes and that kind of thing. But that's my sense. And so, Larry, I think you're right, sort of seeing when those accretions began, and when they started happening, and how this has evolved, and whether it means that we need to have faculty input at this point is an important conversation to have.

President Dietz: I would also, you know, I know that you're looking at how much time each of these things take in the Senate. There is another issue that I don't know if you want to add to this agenda for next week or not, but the Spring Break issue is something that needs to be dealt with in some way, shape, or form in that, I think I mentioned this, I believe at the last Academic Senate that we have received word from the Governor's office to IBHE that all the survey work that we did, etc, that the Governor and IBHE does not want any institution to have a Spring Break this spring. So, we're really talking about starting at the same time and finishing a week early, and that's a calendar issue that Senate probably should weigh in on. Though, frankly, if Senate doesn't want to weigh in on that, that's something that I'm getting some pretty strong messaging from the elected officials on.

Senator Kalter: I will say that at this point I'm fairly uncomfortable with weighing in on it as Senate…

President Dietz: That’s fine.

Senator Kalter: And that's just me. Here's why. In the spring, the decision to basically close much of campus, you know, to population was driven by a state edict essentially, right? That Governor Pritzker put on a stay-at-home order and etc. So far, we have no order from the state about Spring Break. And we know that there are people on the Senate who are against eliminating Spring Break. We know that there are people in favor of it. It seems to me that, at this point, it's a state issue. Now, there is obviously a planning issue there, right, for the faculty, but I feel, you know, I will just say, I'm going to vote against it. And I don't really want the people who are like me to be put in that position, or you to be put in the position of having to say, well, the Senate voted against it and we're going to do it anyway.

President Dietz: Yeah. I appreciate that.

Senator Kalter: But I don't know how other people feel about that. But I don't really feel as the Senate Chair like I want to put it on the table for a Senate vote, when it's not really us deciding. It’s the Governor who is making that decision.

President Dietz: Yeah. And I appreciate that. The only reason I wanted to bring it up is to have this discussion, and if folks don't want it on there that's fine. We'll go ahead and move on this.

Senator Horst: I'd like to go back to the previous issue, and just say that there was some concern about the treatment of faculty, so the Faculty Affairs chair might also be involved. And, you know, things that are part of the problem, I think, or part of the issue is that we never saw all the metrics for how this money was allocated, and now that we see it, it clearly seems to be a curricular implications, which puts it in the Senate area. But also, that just because if it’s solely budget, we still should have some sort of consultation with that. Maybe it's not as deep as a purely academic area, but I still think the Senate should be at least, you know, get some sort of statement as to what's going on, and have some questions and comments. Whether or not… I do like the idea though of a smaller group talking about it first. But it is being implemented right now, and the Senate just found out about it, basically.

Provost Tarhule: Let me, so, as a general operating principle, what I'd like to do from the Provost Office is more transparency to make people understand how decisions are being made. I have talked to chairs that say, we have lost this many faculty lines, and here are the things we have done. We don't know the basis by which faculty lines are allocated. Other people have said the same, with respect to summer funding. They say, we don't know the basis on which summer funding is allocated. My goal is to develop metrics on all of those, so that upfront people know this is the basis on which you'll get RERIP, this is the basis on which you're going to get more faculty lines, this is the basis on which you're going to get summer funding. So, if you have a process where without those metrics, nobody knows what's going on and we just sort of decide that, and that’s somehow okay. But if you put up some metrics, then you have to go through these additional steps. And so, if you try to make it clearer for people to understand, then we need to go through additional steps and additional analysis. Those are considerations to take into account, right. Because I fully intend to, unless you tell me, no, that's not a good idea, I would like all departments to know up front what are the metrics, what are the measures, what are the basis upon which decisions related to resources are made, so that they can work towards that. So, I guess what I'm saying is, if this goes through Academic Senate review, then you're saying all of the other things that I'm thinking about doing needs to go through Academic Senate review as well. It's an interesting consideration. I guess, I would say I want to put metrics out so that people know what to expect, and how to make decisions, and how to plan. Maybe the larger conversation should be, what's the best way of doing that.

Senator Kalter: I guess, I mean, I think that we should really have this conversation in the small group, and that Martha's suggestion to include Mary Hollywood, who is the current Faculty Affairs Committee chair is a good idea.

I'll just say, like I'm just looking at the Tier 2 stuff in number 3, and there are issues in there—like raising time to degree to 1% above the university average—that make it so that half of the departments are going to lose out. Reducing admission criteria into your major in a way that may be either impossible or inadvisable for some of the programs. Or we were talking about Academic Progress Alert and having 100% submission be the criteria, even when we have faculty who are saying that, you know, there are good reasons why there aren't grades reportable at a certain period, and the Senate never approved that [having no option to decline to report a letter grade].

So, I do think that it's not just everything that your office does would be Senate-reviewable, but that these are particular issues that need faculty and student voice in order to make sure that these metrics are… first of all, we're not trying to do a one-size-fits-all type of metric that inadvertently punishes some departments for being who they are, and rewards other departments just because of who they are, right? So, there are things that I have, I actually decided to print this thing out and use, you know, old-style circling, and penciling, and, you know, margin, and there's a lot of comment on it, once I get past the second tier. But even in the second tier of student success data, I see some potential issues, like, for example, in some departments where you have degrees awarded, you know, a two-year average is, sometimes the degrees awarded go up and down and up and down, and the Academic Planning Committee tries to work with programs and departments to, you know, help them have their students succeed, help them get better at everything that they do, and so a lot of this seems detached from that process. So, I think, in many ways, some of this is already in the Senate system. It's just this particular sort of set of guidelines has not really been talked about enough, either at the department levels or at the Senate level. Okay, so, it looks like, without further comment on that, we’re going to set up a meeting with about seven people in it and see where that goes.

And let me go back up to… Oh, we’re in the middle of the motion to approve the agenda. Do we have any further changes to the agenda?

Senator Horst: Have we resolved the discussion on Spring Break?

Senator Kalter: Good question. So, do you want to say something about that, Martha?

Senator Horst: I advise that we not put it on the agenda. And it sounds like it’s going to be a decision that’s going to be made by Larry, with the Governor’s advice.

President Dietz: I’m in the kind of awkward situation that if you put it on the agenda that the Senate would be in, in that I don’t have an edict but if I act like we’re going to have Spring Break, I will get an edict, I’m pretty sure about that. And so, I don’t know if I want to… I wouldn’t want to put the institution in that situation. But we would be the only public university in the state that would be having a Spring Break if we went ahead and did this. And I just, that’s just not a good thing to do. So.

Senator Kalter: The other wild card of course is where the vaccinations will be by March.

President Dietz: Sure.

Senator Kalter: That will be interesting to see.

President Dietz: Sure. And that was my response to the Governor’s office, is that I think it’s really early, you know. And I’m not really optimistic or pessimistic, it’s just that this darn thing, you know, we’re in the middle of a spike, and so… and if you read all the information that we have, there may be other surges as a result of Thanksgiving and some at the end of December, and who knows. But that wasn’t listened to, so. And I’m happy not having it on the agenda. I just wanted to bring it up and have this conversation.

Senator Kalter: All right. It looks like we may be in agreement on that one. And I think we would all also advise, because people are planning their spring courses, you know, that as soon as you know to let us know so that we can plan and all of that.

The motion was approved.

***Engineering Programs proposal (Provost Tarhule/President Dietz)***

Senator Kalter: Awesome. We’re going to go back up now to the Oral Communications, and you probably noticed one that is about the Engineering Programs, so let me get down to that and just do a little bit of an introduction. Provost Tarhule and I basically, right before Thanksgiving break, we discussed what might need to happen on the Senate level, so that the Engineering Program proposal could move forward to the Board of Trustees by their May meeting. So, they have a meeting in February and then another one in May. And I followed up on our conversation with an email to him, sort of outlining a little bit of what had happened last year, and what I was recommending. So, last year, I had indicated that the programs, the program concept, and the financial implications would need to be approved by the Senate.

With respect to the financial implications, I went into a lot of detail about that, sort of recommending in that email that we would want to see a detailed hiring plan (you know, specifically things about like when are the program directors being hired, and all of that), a recruitment and enrollment plan, and a plan about the capital funding and logistics. And then also, sort of a discussion about why the curricular approvals, which would normally come first, would be coming last, just to have that sort of clarified for the Senate.

And then, we also heard, if any of you went to the open forums, you also heard that basically there’s an organizational change that’s going to be in the works. And organizational changes are governed by something called the Organizational Change policy at this campus, and also probably by the past precedent of adding colleges, right. So, the organization change here would be to create a College of Engineering, and we did that most recently with the Mennonite College of Nursing, but that was a little bit different because it wasn’t being grown from scratch. So, what that policy says, essentially, is that (or I’ll just quote it), it says, “All pending significant organizational changes at the university will be communicated to the Academic Senate Executive Committee which will determine if Senate participation is appropriate.” And so, I’m going to sort of, you know… that’s not necessarily a very full sort of introduction to what Drs Tarhule and Dietz want to talk to us about, in terms of the Engineering programs, so I’m going to ask them to sort of fill us in on where the consultants are, where we are in the process, and where we would like to be by the start of the summer, if possible.

President Dietz: I’m going to let Provost Tarhule go first, and then I’ll try to fill in whatever gaps that might be there. But he’s much more on the ground with this than I, so.

Provost Tarhule: I’ll take some responsibility for not studying the agenda more closely until it was too late. So, where we are is we had some discussions, I believe Tracy’s in some of those committees with the consultants, but we’ve decided that… Dan Stephens and I and a whole bunch of other people have been working on the funding piece, about how this would be funded. And we have a proposal which we haven’t taken to the President. So, I believe that we are making that proposal to the President tomorrow about how we theoretically think this can get paid for without compromising other components of the University. Sorry. If I had studied this agenda more closely, I would have known from the perspective you wanted us to address it, I would have suggested you wait until we talked to the President tomorrow, because he might say, ‘oh, that’s stupid’ (Laughter) and that’s where it will end. But we do have a plan for how we think that the University will be able to pay for this. But as I said, we haven’t discussed that with the President. That will happen tomorrow.

Beyond that, the consultants are continuing to work at a good clip. They had originally proposed to finish their work sometime in November, that is now being pushed to January. And I personally, I’m very pleased with the scope of work that they are doing, and the degree to which they are thinking through every issue. And all of the different committees have been bringing input and suggestions and they have been very responsive to those suggestions.

President Dietz: I would also say that I’ve had individual conversations with Aondover and Dan Stephens, our VP for Finance and Planning. So, tomorrow’s meeting will be more informative, but I doubt that I’m going to say that this is stupid. (Laughter). So, I think that the consultants are also right on track with their recommendations.

We’ve done a lot of simulations on this (financial simulations) and the idea was, initially, that we would have between 400 and 600 students once fully enrolled in Mechanical and also in Electrical. That the program in itself, including a facility for this, would be stand alone based upon the tuition from the individuals that are enrolling in those programs. And that it would also be a source of stabilization for enrollments since enrollment has been… you know, demography, everyone knows that the demography of direct-from-high-school students and the migration out of state, I think we’re on a good path to helping curb that a little bit with increased MAP funding, but who knows where that’s going to be. So, I think, you know, the programing itself makes sense. And we’ve had literally several years of working on all this. So, the Board also understands the importance of this program for the institution. And the idea of college, I’ve also been involved with conversations about that. And I think, frankly, we’re going to be able to attract some private money into this as a college that we probably wouldn’t be able to attract if it wasn’t. And so, I think it is going to be a win-win for everybody. So, we just need to get a little more detail on the simulations, and the facility, and I think we don’t have to start out that way. We’re already teaching Engineering courses. And so, I think we can start, certainly more modestly, we’re not going to start out with an additional 1,000 to 1,200 students that just all of the sudden weren’t here and they’re going to be here. So, all this is going to be phased in, but I look forward to tomorrow’s meeting to further this discussion.

Senator Kalter: So, Larry, we had a one-on-one (Aondover and I) the Monday before the Monday before Thanksgiving, whatever that would have been (the 16th) and he raised this with me and was sort of ready to ask about how all of this would move through the Senate, as I said in the beginning, towards potential Board approvals of things by May. And so, when we discussed it, you know, I had mentioned to him that this was the last meeting before mid-January, so we agreed that it would be a good idea for Exec to start strategizing the pathway through the Senate because of the tight time frames that we have. That we have basically one January meeting, two February meetings, two March meetings, and really one April meeting. Because, even though we have another April and another May meeting, those are usually, we’ve got to get our business done before them. And the May meeting happens literally two days before the Board meeting, so that’s also an issue.

So, I apologize that if, between that time, Dr. Tarhule had not had a chance to talk to you about this. But that’s why it was on the agenda, was to sort of start thinking about, okay we’ve got a certain Senate schedule, and we know that the Senate… we don’t want to have it going to the Board without the Senate having seen and approved sort of the basics of, especially the financial implications, right. Because in an ordinary curricular process, what we get on the Consent Agenda is the curriculum and the financial implications form, and things can be pulled off of the Consent Agenda because of the financial implications, or because of the curriculum, or both. That hardly ever happens because usually the University Curriculum Committee has done such great work, and all of the committees before that. But because this is such a huge, you know, new thing, there’s no college attached to it, there’s no curriculum attached to it, so we’re sort of doing things in a different pattern than we ordinarily would. So, I guess one of the things that we kind of…

Let me go over again what I had recommended to be brought to the Senate eventually, and see what people think about that, if I have missed anything, and how we should stage those kinds of things or start thinking about staging the approvals. So, what I had suggested was that just the concept of the program itself be sort of re-endorsed, right? We’ve already done that twice because the issue came out of the Senate originally, and then again last year. And then I had said to Aondover that the Senate would probably want to see like a one… I think he said they want to see a one-page abstract, right. Like just sort of an encapsulation of the financial implications, but that there might need to be more detail behind that. And so, the detail that I had suggested was a hiring plan, so that we understand the leadership hiring and also the faculty hiring, both within that college and outside of it. And then any administrative support, like secretaries and that kind of thing, if we’re creating a new unit. So, that’s the hiring plan. A recruitment and enrollment plan for the students. And then the capital funding and logistics, which is going to be fairly complex as I understand it. And then of course added to this was what I said about the organizational change and whether that, sort of, creating a college, we as an Executive Committee get to decide whether that gets approved by the Senate or whether that doesn’t need to be approved by the Senate. I’m guessing that, I don’t know if Aondover has seen the stuff about Mennonite yet, but I’m thinking that that was probably approved through our Senate, and so it would be a similar process. So, do people have comments about how… first of all, whether that’s comprehensive enough in terms of what the Senate would see, and then, you know, what the timing would be of each stage of going through the Senate process?

Senator Horst: I like the idea of separating out the organizational change. I don’t recall that we were going to create a new college. So maybe, it’s been so long, maybe that was always part of the plan, but I’d also like to see the financial cost of creating a new college, and like the number of faculty that would be under that college. And so, I’m glad that that’s going to be a separate discussion. But I like what you laid out and, you know, we can’t necessarily devote two hours on a Senate meeting to this because we have all this other business to do. So, it would be nice if it was just spread out over three or four… maybe three meetings, four meetings and then a vote. Something like that.

Senator Kalter: And just so that you’re aware, Martha, the reason I’m bringing up the college is because it got brought up in the open forums. So, there were two open forums that took place earlier in that fall. It looked like that was the direction that things were going, and as far as I could tell that is still the direction that things are going, because of things like fundraising, and you know, the growth of the… you know, trying to figure out how you would grow programs in two other, you know, in two separate colleges, and all of that kind of stuff. So, that’s where that’s coming from. I don’t think that it was in the plan last year, but it has gotten into the plan.

Senator Horst: Okay.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Any other thoughts about going through the Senate stages?

President Dietz: I like what you’re talking about, and I like the clear definition of the staging of all that. My concern is always making sure the Board is as up to speed on the processes that we need to go through on the campus to get the right approvals, and to make sure that they’re supportive of those.

Generally, these are the kinds of things that we would have covered at the early November retreat that we have. That was a completely different retreat this year, literally none of the university leadership had any presentations to make. They brought in a consultant with the Association of Governing Boards, and they were really viewing it as a Board development experience, and they did that for two days. So, we didn’t have the time that we normally do to talk to the Board about, you know, current projects and future projects, and, you know, kind of where we are on all these things. And I’m not aware that they’re planning any other kind of retreat, because that typically has been the only one that they do. So, it brings into… not question but concern that as we move through these processes that retreat format was really good at having discussions about all of this. The actual meetings now are all public meetings, and so, frankly, you don’t want the public getting into a lot of the weeds of this and then having lots of discussions about things that are really internal to the University. It’s not that we’re trying to hide anything, it’s just that I would think that we would want to have our act together a little more closely (and we’re heading in that direction as a campus) before we would bring a lot of these things to the Board.

So, I just need to be thinking about how do I do that outside of the, you know, just regular Board meetings where we have tended not to give a lot of presentations, though this could be one. I mean, we’ve done that in some cases before. So, this could be a presentation to the Board, one about the processes that we’re going through, that might be the first one. And then, you know, give it a couple more meetings, and then going through another one. I fully expect that we’ll have another, you know, other meetings of the Board, more that just February and May, because we usually have a special meeting of the Board to talk about tuition and fees setting all that, sometime in early part of April. I don’t think that discussion’s going to be a long one this year because I don’t plan on recommending any increases or anything. So, you don’t have to take as much time in educating folks about that. But I do think we need to be conscious that the Board has, you know, they’re aware of all this, they really haven’t approved much of anything yet. And I think they will. I don’t think that’s an issue. But orchestrating that is just something that’s on my mind right now as you’re talking about it. But I applaud the processes that you have described.

Senator Kalter: Well, I can’t help you with the Open Meetings Act, Larry, because it is simply something that we have to abide by.

President Dietz: I get it.

Senator Kalter: There are two things that I was going to say. One is that Dr. Tarhule and I also talked about perhaps at some point having the Executive Committee members, and the cabinet, and perhaps some of his staff, getting a presentation, I think it was, from Cannon Design, so that we could sort of see where things were. I don’t know if that would be an opportunity also for the Board to be there, or if you’d want to have those two things be separate.

The other thing I was going to say, I think Martha’s kind of on target about having maybe three nights, splitting it up in the Senate, so that it’s not all at once, and etc. I don’t think that we have time to send this through a committee. Just given how much the committees are doing, and that that would just delay things. I think this is just one of those things where it, just like last year where the capital thing went straight onto the floor, right, do we want to put this at the top of our capital funding request list, or do we not, that this one would go straight to the Senate floor, maybe in January, maybe in early February, I think not past late February is probably advisable if we’re going to get it, you know, if we’re going to get attention to it and a vote on it by late March.

And so, as long as we’re all agreed that that’s good, right? That this is actually good to have the committee of the whole look at this, all at once, with as much information as we can have about it. The people who want to see the one-pager, we’ll give that to them. The people who want to see the fine details, not the fine details, but the finer details we can give that to them, and, you know, sort of have people asking questions. It’ll be a little bit like, probably, some of the open forums, but I know from attending… I attended one, and then watch the other one on Zoom because I was teaching during the second one. There weren’t a ton of Senators there. There were a couple, but a lot of the Senators were not able to attend or chose not to attend, and so this would be, essentially, like another set of open forums for them with questions to ask and perhaps refinement. But I think probably the plan has gone through enough stages that it’s going to be refined by the time it gets to the Senate floor the first time, and that there may be tweaks around the edges, but that it will be where it’s, pretty much where it’s supposed to be by that time. Tracy, I saw you unmute, did you want to add something?

Senator Mainieri: I just wanted to mention, in the last exec meeting with Cannon Design, one of the discussions was about (I don’t remember what we were calling it) but like a reveal event of the proposal, and all of the details. Because, I mean, I’ve just been so impressed with the amount of detail in the developing proposals. And so, I wonder, because we have another meeting, I think coming up next week, if I remember correctly, you know, if we can suggest that part of that event (which of course is going to be virtual) might include something specific for the Senate, right? As kind of a kickoff of the Senate discussions as Cannon Design hands off to us, right, after they’ve completed their work. So, that was the thought, I wanted to put it out there, and particularly to Provost Tarhule as we look toward that meeting next week.

Senator Kalter: I’m not sure if you’re suggesting that Senators should attend that meeting, but we need to be careful about that, because at a certain point, it becomes a Senate meeting. And so, you may instead be meaning that faculty who are working with them plan for how the presentation to the Senate would go. Is that what you meant? (Tracy nodding) Okay. Yeah. I was thinking it could be either/or, and I’m glad it’s the second one.

President Dietz: The Board has the same challenge. That’s the difficulty. We say ‘oh, the Board can get together and listen in,’ not more than three of them at any one time. So. And I get why that is, but it is confusing, and makes doing business difficult sometimes.

Senator Kalter: Everybody knows my views about that. I made them very public during the summer. I do think it’s a little bit odd to treat professors and students in the same way that you would treat City Council members, but that’s where we are. So, looks like Martha has another addition?

Senator Horst: Yeah. I just have a question. Does the Board need to approve the idea and then the Senate? Or the Senate and then the Board? Or do we need to do it simultaneously? I’m a little confused by that.

Senator Kalter: It would be very, very unusual for the Board to approve something before the Senate does, especially on an academic issue. So, I would strongly suggest that the Senate go first, even though the processes have to be simultaneous.

President Dietz: I completely agree with that. I think the Board may be more focused on the financial exposure. They’re not going to typically get into the curricular issues or the staffing or any of that nature. But they would look at the… we have several members of the Board that really look at the risk assessment and those kinds of things, as they should. And so, I think that’s really going to have the bulk of their attention. No, I think Senate ought to go first on all of this.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, hopefully they’re doing that, Larry, because that means they’re doing their job, right?

President Dietz: Right.

Senator Kalter: That’s what we have them for.

President Dietz: Yep.

Senator Kalter: Any other comments about any of this? (Pause) So, it seems like what we need to plan for are two things. One is that Executive Committee, at some point, is going to be asked to come to a meeting where Cannon is presenting. And then hopefully by late January or early February, we will have the proposal from either the Provost’s office or the President’s office that will start moving through the Senate process, and just having us as Exec aware that that’s going to impact the time constraints of the Senate meetings in the spring, but I think for a great cause. So, hopefully we can get this show on the road, because it’s really exciting, both academically and in terms of the enrollment hopes that we have for it and all of that. All right.

***Do we want to have a Senate meeting on Inauguration Day?***

Senator Kalter: I’m not sure this is even an option for us not to have one, but I just wanted to find out if we anticipated any problems with that? You know, protests, people trying to watch nighttime events in Washington, D.C., or anything like that. Or it’s just a worry that I should not have? Are we good? Everybody who thinks we’re good, and I’m worrying too much about that just put your thumbs up. (Laughter) Excellent. That one was easy. We are going to have our January meeting on Inauguration Day. If you want to watch the President and his wife dance together, you know, that’s up to you. I won’t be able to monitor that anyway.

President Dietz: He’s in a boot now so he may not be dancing.

***Distributed Communications:***

***10.02.17.02 From Sam Catanzaro: Copy of Cumulative Evaluations FY18-FY22***

***10.27.20.04 From Sam Catanzaro: Cumulative Evaluations FY20-FY24\_retro***

***10.27.20.05 From Sam Catanzaro: Cumulative Evaluations FY21-FY25\_Final***

Senator Kalter: Yeah, I’ve heard that. Yeah. He broke his foot because of playing with his rescue dog, or something like that. So that’s good, or not good as the case may be.

Number six was just taking a look at the cumulative evaluation stuff from Sam Catanzaro. Any questions or comments about that schedule? I will note, we never received the letter that shows the evaluations between FY19-23, but you can pretty much discern kind of which cumulative evaluations would have occurred in FY19, and I have asked Sam, you know, to check about whether what was planned in FY18 for FY19 occurred, but I haven’t heard back from him. So, all of those evaluations are basically governed either by our chairs policy or our deans policy. They basically just say that all chairs and all deans if they stay in office every five years, they get a cumulative review that’s in addition, or sort of more significant than their annual review. So, just wanted to make sure nobody had any questions or comments about that before we move to something else.

Senator Horst: Yeah, he has to say Wonsook Kim College of Fine Arts. That’s my comment.

Senator Kalter: All right. Larry likes that one. (Pause) All right. it looks like no other comments.

***Compliance month: October versus earlier in the fall semester***

Senator Kalter: So, I think the last one was the issue about the timing of the state ethics training. I just had a quick question about that for Larry, I think this one is for Larry. October tends to be kind of the midterm time and a very stretched time for faculty. I just wondered if you know how that compliance month is chosen around the state, and whether September is an option, and whether other people think that it would be better to have it in September? This is obviously one that we would want to consult with AP and Civil Service Council about if we ever moved that month. But I did notice this year how difficult it was to fit in all of… and because the training keeps expanding and getting longer and longer, that it comes at a very difficult time of year for an academic semester, and I’m just wondering if there’s any leeway back and forth with regard to that. I know also that University of Illinois is the one that creates the module that we use, so it may be a constraint, you know, with when they do that or something. But just curious about that.

President Dietz: I’ll have to talk to Rob Blemler about that. I don’t know that there’s a legislative mandate on this, could very well be. But let me talk to Rob and I’ll express your concern about that and see if we have latitude and bring my answer back to this group.

Senator Kalter: And let me ask the faculty and staff who are here, are you seeing the same kind of an issue with October being kind of a difficult time to put that in, or is it a non-issue?

Senator Mainieri: Honestly, I feel like it’s one of those things that regardless of where it would fall on the calendar it would feel burdensome. Right. Like I understand the idea that October is a busy month, but it’s just that it’s not the most fun task, right? And I feel like it would feel that way regardless of where it falls. So, I haven’t heard any pressing need, and I don’t feel any pressing need for that to change, particularly because you can do it earlier, but you do have quite a long time to complete it. Several weeks to complete it.

Senator Evans-Winters: I agree. No matter where it’s placed on the calendar, it’s not going to ever be an ideal time, I think. I agree with Tracy.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. I don’t think that this is going to make a difference, but then on the other hand for new faculty or graduate assistants, if we want them to be aware of the ethics, for example, they should be done with the training earlier than almost at the end of the semester. So, what if we talk about the bribing part, and the graduate assistant accepted a gift that they shouldn’t have accepted, but they accepted it because they had no idea, because it happened in September, and that’s not when they had to take their ethics training. So, it would make sense if it is earlier, but in terms of when it’s going to be easier to do it, I don’t think there is an easier time to do it earlier or later.

Senator Kalter: There is a requirement, I think, that new employees have to take it right away, but I don’t remember what the window is there. It may be a month from the time of hire.

President Dietz: I think it’s a month after you begin employment.

Senator Nahm: Yeah. I remember taking the new employee training in early September. And I think, I’m in favor of maybe moving it a little earlier in the fall semester. And I think for me it’s more of a mindset thing, because I think you get oriented or re-oriented to, you know, the academic calendar at the beginning of the fall. And I think it’s just one of the things that it’s easier to take care of if you’re already in that mindset, than when you’ve kind of forgotten about that, and you’re really focusing on your courses.

Senator Kalter: One of the reasons, by the way, that this came up this year is that the changes to it caused a conversation on my department’s listserv about emotional trauma, because there’s a lot of stuff about child abuse that people were not expecting to see. And where people had triggering reactions to it that… you know, I was actually glad that I read my department’s listserv before I took it so that I was prepared for those triggers, because I did feel my emotions rising quite a bit during parts of the child abuse training part of it. So, that’s perhaps another consideration in terms of the stresses of the year and when they fall.

President Dietz: All right. I’ll talk to Rob about this and get back to the group.

Senator Kalter: Awesome. Thank you, Larry.

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