**Academic Senate Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, March 28, 2018**

**APPROVED**

***Call to Order***

Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

***Roll Call***

Senate Secretary Martha Horst called the roll and declared a quorum.

***Chairperson's Remarks***

Senator Kalter: We have a quorum. Next thing is chairperson's remarks. I don't have many. Last two days' morning meetings were the budget meetings in Academic Affairs, so we found out what our budgeting requests and priorities might be and that's always an interesting thing. One of the deans remarked -- I think it was our dean, actually -- that he's been at a lot of institutions and has never seen an open budget meeting of the kind that we hold in Academic Affairs, so it's something ISU has to be proud of. The other thing I was going to say is that we're going to observe a hard stop time of 7:30; no, 8:30. That was solely to get to see if the Provost was paying attention. We're going to observe a hard stop time today of 8:30 and that's it for chairperson's remarks.

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

Senator Grzanich: All right. I hope everyone is having a great night. Quick report from me. So I'm actually very excited to announce that our previous meeting on March 21, 2018, we did indeed approve our Constitutional amendments for the proposed 2019-2020 school year. To touch on a couple of things that this particular body would see most would be changes in regards to the 20 senator roles that we currently bring to this table. As it currently stands, they're kind of broken up on an academic/non-academic level and then on a location-based, being off-campus and then on-campus representation. We're going to be axing that in favor of representation according to population of each college. So what that means is there would be five senators representing the College of Arts and Sciences, four for CAST, four for Business, three for Education, one for the College of Fine Arts, one for the Mennonite College of Nursing, and then two from the Graduate School. And then our legislative branch will be taking a split. As it currently stands, we have an executive branch headed by me, and then a legislative branch headed by Senator Stripeik. We would be splitting the legislative branch into Senator roles and then representative roles having the ex-officios from our current organization shifting over to a representative role for, again… This isn't official yet. It needs to be ratified by the student body of 10%, no less than that, and so we'll be moving into the processes of implementing that, but we're very excited that it passed with flying colors. I'm looking forward to the next steps with that.

Next week we'll be moving into our It's On Us week. Most important event that I'd like to publicize for you all is we'll be watching the movie No in the CVA, room 151, at 7 with a discussion immediately after. I strongly encourage you to attend that event.

Also going on next week is our voting for our Student Government election so, yes, you will be rid of me very soon; specifically on the 4th of April, so be looking out for that, but it's been a great time serving with you all.

Senator Noel-Elkins: People who know me will not be surprised that I'm asking this. It sounds like there's no representation for undeclared students or students in interdisciplinary majors.

Senator Grzanich: Yeah, and that was a discussion we did have. There was certainly a concern there, but the concern was also… We talked a lot about what would a Senator go through should they move from say the College of Business to College of Education. Do they give up their seat? Are we encouraging individuals to remain undeclared in their major by implementing seats for undeclared students? We're going to try and continue to represent them in different ways, but as the 20 senator roles stands, we felt that there wasn't any more room that we could push for that, but I'm more than happy to talk to you after about that as well if you see something else.

Senator Tyler Smith: This isn't a question, more just like a comment to add on to that last question. I voted against the Constitution for that exact reason, but there are still options to represent undeclared students. I have a couple of ideas of things that I'd like to propose for next year that will specifically help with that, so if you have any ideas or anything, come talk to me and I can motion for it next year.

Senator Kalter: Further questions. All right. My one question, it looked like CFA is only getting one senator, College of Education getting three. Is that population?

Senator Grzanich: Yeah. There are a couple of different roundings. The Mennonite College of Nursing from a population standpoint actually represented like 0.4% of a senate seat. The College of Fine Arts was more like a 0.58%, something like that, and so it was more of a round up to make sure that they had representation at the table, but population wise that was only what they were afforded.

Senator Kalter: Got you. Thank you. Further questions. All right. Seeing none, we'll move on to administrator remarks with Dr. Dietz, President Dietz.

***Administrators' Remarks***

* ***President Larry Dietz***

President Dietz: Thank you very much, Senator Kalter. Just a few brief announcements. Within the last couple of weeks, we did sign a formal agreement with the INTO organization relative to the international initiative that's been presented here before this group. We're very excited about that. We will have a visit from a number of the folks that represent that organization. We'll have a more formalized role out of that agreement, but I want to say thank you to everyone that was involved with that. There was a lot of time and energy and deliberation, and we're delighted about the agreement, so thanks to everybody that was involved with that. More to come.

I hope everyone had a nice break and is back with renewed energy. I also wanted to report on a meeting that I had on Monday with the Crain's organization out of Chicago, the magazine. We've been delighted that they have been writing about higher education. I think, though, that Illinois State University has gotten a little short shrift from the Crain's organization in some of their recent stories in that they've really begun to lump us in with other institutions within the state, and I think that we have a stronger story to tell, and so I was up there really trying to tell that story about our strong and stable theme that we've had for a long period of time, and hopefully made some inroads with that. We were talking about the importance of a reliable budget from the state and one that was a realistic budget that we could depend on for this next year, and I also talked to them a little bit about some activities that were going on at the campus. I think the main thing that we were trying to do was to put names and faces together and offered to serve as a resource for them as they develop other new stories, so we'll see how that works. You never know. I don't know if it helped or not, but it certainly couldn't hurt, and so we were delighted to be able to do that. Our Board chair, Rocky Donahue, went with me on that call.

While we were there also had a lot of meetings recently. I've been on the road with a lot of donor activity and prospective donor activity. I'm pleased to report that we're now over $115,500,000 in our campaign toward our $150 million goal, and to think that just last fall in September when we announced publicly the goal, we had $103, and it being over $115 now is really terrific, so kudos to Vice President Vickerman and his team and everybody else that's helping us get toward that goal.

The last thing I'll mention is that the Board of Trustees generally votes on tuition and fees and room and board and other activities at their meeting that occurs on the Friday of commencement weekend, and that date this year will be May 11, 2018. They had wanted a meeting before that to be better prepared to make that vote on May 11, 2018, and so there will be a special Board meeting on May 5, 2018, to try to educate the Board on various scenarios that we're considering relative to tuition and fees and room and board. There will be other items that will be on that agenda as well, but that's the time that we would really like to have a vote on that so we can tell our prospective students how much the cost of the education is going to be here at ISU, so that's our tentative date right now and we're developing scenarios to be prepared to talk with them about that on that date.

* ***Provost Jan Murphy***

Provost Murphy: Just a couple of quick things. One, the last time I talked I told you a little bit about winter session and had a great question on the option or the possibility of counting winter session as part of fall term instead of spring term. I decided to do a little homework on that. The main issue with that and the reason that would be difficult for us to do is a financial aid issue. Financial aid is distributed based on the number of hours a student is registered for the fall semester on fall census day, and I know certainly the students you all know that. If we made winter term part of the fall semester instead of part of the spring semester, the problem would be if the student's plans for winter changed, they'd have an obligation to reimburse ISU for any financial aid that they were given over the number of hours they had on fall census day. There are also some financial aid processes. By that, I mean like system and technology processes that would not run well. And when systems processes and financial aid don't run well, we worry about the federal government and running afoul of the federal government. So for winter to be combined with fall, we'd also have to have registration for winter session open back as soon as the spring, and so most students are not ready to register for winter session as early as the early spring semester, and we don't always know what winter session courses will have. So we'll keep looking at that. I appreciated the question and it helped me understand winter session a little bit more and the timing of that, but for this year we will still group that in with our spring semester and make that part of spring semester, but please know that that's a good question and we always continue to look at those processes. We want to do the right thing for students and this really is trying to make sure that we're doing the right thing, but I did appreciate the question.

Do a quick update on INTO, and we have approximately 10 students, and so remember INTO is our pathways program for international student recruitment, so we have approximately 10 students who are going to be our first INTO pathway students. They'll be beginning this summer in academic English courses, so they're not admitted into the major yet. They're in those academic English courses and that, we think, is a really good soft beginning for us to start with 10 students. It allows us to begin working on any of the kinks in our systems and our processes. It also allows us to begin to make sure we're addressing both our academic and the student support services that we want to make sure that we're providing for our international students who are coming into us through that pathways program. The joint venture, that's what we call it, our INTO joint venture is beginning to develop position descriptions and hire some INTO and ISU employees, again, thinking about student support services, both academic and student support services. The first cohort, those first 10, and then the students that we bring in the fall, we think we'll be bringing about 100 in this fall. You know for us it's really important that those first students have a very good and very positive experience, because that will set the tone for our ability to continue with that INTO pathways program. The President mentioned a visit in late April. We call it a familiarization visit or a fam visit, and we'll have about 150 recruiters from all over the world coming to the ISU campus for two to three days to learn more about the campus. So that's kind of an exciting time for us to showcase this campus and who we are and who our students are so that they have a good experience here, and then when they go back, they want to recruit students back to Illinois State University. So that's an update on INTO program.

Just a couple upcoming events: Tomorrow's kind of a big day. We have Sinclair Bell coming in at noon to speak in the University Galleries. He's a classical archaeologist and art historian who will discuss race and representation in the Roman Empire. Tomorrow night, African American Studies and the School of Social Work are sponsoring a book launch and signing by Dr. Menah Pratt-Clarke, who chronicles the life and legacy of her mother, Dr. Mildred Pratt. Dr. Pratt was a longstanding and much admired Professor of Social Work at Illinois State University, so there's a reception in this room beginning at 5:30 pm, followed by a book talk and signing at 6:30 pm in this room, and that event is open to the public. Also, tomorrow night, we have a University Speaker, part of the University Speaker Series is sponsoring Nyle DiMarco in the Brown Ballroom at 6 pm. Mr. DiMarco is an ambassador for the deaf community and is a winner of Dancing With the Stars and America's Top Model, two shows I have never seen, but I am intrigued at the combination, let me tell you. And then there will be two campus open forums to provide input on the potential Inclusion, Diversity, Equity and Access in US society graduation requirements, and those two open forums are April 3 and 4, 2018, from 3-4 pm in Stevenson 401. I would be glad to answer any questions, except about Dancing with the Stars, because I have really never seen that show.

Senator Grzanich: Just a quick question. Do you know where the INTO students, are they living on campus or off campus housing?

Provost Murphy: Most of them will live in on-campus housing. That's right. And so part of the housing plan really also takes into consideration that slow increase of international students through INTO. Good question.

* ***Vice President of Student Affairs Levester Johnson***

Senator Johnson: Good evening, everyone, and I am excited to circle back around to you all. You have in front of you a document that outlines some of the recommendations coming from the Greek Life Task Force. Some of you who were seated at this table about a year ago, I remember we actually initiated this task force, which was comprised of faculty, staff, administration, students, alumni, and community members. In order to come up with recommendations in order to take the Greek system fraternity and sorority life system to the next level; both as it relates to safety and security for those students, as it relates to facilities, as it relates to leadership development, all right, and as it relates to inclusion as well and Greek unity, and we are very proud of the outcomes from that group. Right there you see in front of you the buckets by which the task force decided it wanted to come up with some more specific recommendations and programs in order to address each one of these areas. The areas include education and leadership development, strengthening the Greek system. Really the Greeks don't have any type of programming where they all come together and support each other, so establishing some campus traditions that actually do that. How do we bring alumni back to the fold, so alumni outreach and engagement and providing that type of support and individual chapter support that our organizations need. The age-old problem and challenge of the misuse of alcohol and other substances. How can we address issues of Title IX and bystander education for our students. Then finally, again, facilities. How can we partner with the City of Bloomington and Town of Normal as it relates to the facilities that our students are actually living in.

One area that we're extremely and particularly proud of and excited about, and you may have seen the announcement that came out I believe on Monday, where we have two dedicated alumni of the institution who were very involved in the undergraduate days, as well as they are very engaged and involved as alumni with the Greek system, but the Burwells, Eric and Karin Burwell, actually they believe so much in the Greek system and wanted to hear a lot more about these recommendations and have a particular interest in the area of education and leadership development for our students. They have generously donated funds towards the $500,000 that we actually need in order to put on and take our leadership program to that next level. So Monday that announcement came out about their generous gift. There's a fund that's been established called Arete, and it means excellence, actually, in Greek. So we are very excited about others being able to contribute to that, especially our alumni, in order to make sure we continue these programs over a five-year period and beyond. Those programs within the education area will be both home-grown type of programs that we put on for our students, as well as sending them to some signature-type of national programs that take place throughout the country. Right now we're able to on an annual basis address about maybe 20% of our Greek students as relates to leadership development. We believe with these additional funds we're going to be able to hit more of a critical mass of our students, get to the point of 70-80% of our students that will have a chance and an opportunity to go through more in-depth and intense leadership development. We believe if we have a chance to do that, that our students are going to be then able to make great decisions, good decisions, as relates to their behavior both on and off campus, as well as in these areas as relates to unity development and the other areas that are identified. So we're very excited about this. We're very appreciative of the gift that the Burwells have given the institution and hopefully more to come as relates to more on these initiatives.

The other area I want to bring you up to speed on is the update on the Bone Revitalization Project. I want to make sure that you are aware of two pieces here: upcoming work will affect both a portion of the sidewalk outside of the Brown Ballroom between the building and University Street beginning on Monday, March 26, 2018. That is going to take place and that area will be affected for probably three to four weeks until it is complete. In preparation for that project, they're actually moving the bus stop to the north end of the block near the corner of University and Locust, so be on the lookout for that change. You're probably seeing all of the work taking place on the east side as well. The big steel has gone up. All right. So it's really neat seeing the Welcome Center take shape, but, as a result of that, be on the lookout for every now and then we're going to have to close off that entrance on that side of the facility. It will be intermediate. All right. So not permanently, but from time to time you're going to see some closures on that side of the building. All right. And those are the updates that I have, and I'll be open for any questions that you might have.

Senator Hoelscher: So speaking as the guy who is currently using a handicap sticker, the Brown Ballroom is where they have the handicap entrance. Will there still be a way to get in there, or will we have to go around the long way?

Senator Johnson: No. There still should be a place for you to come in on the Brown Ballroom side.

Senator Hoelscher: Okay, and then we usually park across the street in the handicap spots? Those won't be affected?

Senator Johnson: I can't answer that real quickly, but I will find out and get you an answer.

Senator Hoelscher: Wonderful.

Senator Johnson: Okay?

Senator Hoelscher: Thank you.

Senator Johnson: All right.

Senator Horst: First off, thank you for this task force recommendation, and I'm especially pleased to see under the misuse of alcohol and other substances this discussion of expanding bystander education. You know, we all heard about the cases at Penn State -- it was really a horrible thing -- and I'm reminded of the policy that this body passed a couple of years ago, the Good Samaritan policy; one, you might consider just mentioning it, but two would be interesting to, you know, pass the education about that policy in particular to this body, and maybe even they could have something to say about that policy how it could be more effective.

Senator Johnson: That's a great suggestion, as well as some of the other laws that are on the books as relates to student sharing information and not having repercussions then in that sense. Absolutely. Definitely look into that.

Senator Grzanich: As it pertains to the Good Samaritan policy too I know the Student Code of Conduct Review Committee just looked on that as well and expanded that a little bit to more include organizations into that to prioritize student health and safety versus disciplinary sanctions.

Senator Kalter: Other questions. Senator Johnson, when you were talking about the east side closure, you're talking about that walkway that is between the library and the Bone.

Senator Johnson: Yeah, and that entrance that people could come in from the east side into that tunnel area. So from time to time, because of the construction that's taking place, it may be closed but, again, there will be an announcement that would come out to the campus community.

Senator Kalter: And they could climb the stairs if they're mobile in that way and go to the south side entrance.

Senator Johnson: Yes, or to the south side where there's the ramp as well.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Terrific. Great.

* ***Vice President of Finance and Planning Dan Stephens***

Senator Stephens: Good evening. Thank you, Senator Kalter. I also have a couple of brief topics to bring up. In conjunction with Senator Johnson's comments on the Bone Center, we've also just completed the parking lot design work on the Bone Center parking lot, so that contract has been awarded, or the design has been awarded, and so we'll be coordinating that project over the lifecycle of the Bone Center renovation with the main objective at the end to have as best of a coordinated reopening of the Bone Center parking lot, new parking lot, along with the Bone Center renovation. It will be probably pretty tight to do that, given the construction work, but that is the objective in that particular phase. In that, we're going to be looking and talking with Chuck and Nick in Parking, we will be looking at taking out the gates, you know, the entrance gates coming in there and potentially looking at using pay devices a little bit more efficiently in that parking lot. So, anyway, that will be a nice initiative and we hope to minimize any disruption with any events as best we can over the next couple of years.

From a closure perspective, after the commencement we'll be closing Watterson Dining Commons for the summertime because of the construction work that's going to begin this summer on the expansion of Watterson Dining. Certainly it will be open, obviously, in the fall, but I just wanted to make sure people realize that.

From a student financial services perspective, we've got a combination of a sustainability initiative, as well as an attempt to improve customer service. As many of you students are aware, we historically have been sending out paper, student billing statements, every term, and we've got an online site, and so one of the things, the initiatives we're trying to do is trying to continue to move both existing students and new students onto the site not only to, you know, save a lot of paper, save a tree, but save a lot of paper, save a lot of unnecessary costs, postage costs, and probably more importantly when you're printing out statements you have to stop it at a point in time, typically at the beginning of a month, and by the time it gets in the mail of students who are changing their classes and potentially adding or dropping, by the time you get the statement it's usually incorrect, and so then people may accidentally pay based on the statement, so we're trying to push more students and parents toward the online operation. So it will help us from a number of different angles, but, more importantly, we're trying to improve the customer service perspective there. So we're going to pilot some of this process change in the summer term, and then we'll try to work through as much of those kinks and the objective is to have the new communication and a new process for the fall. So be watching out for communications on that if you're an existing student, so you'll see some of that. The new students coming this fall will actually really see letters in the mail to help communicate to show them how to navigate the online website. We're hoping to move as much of our process to as much online as we can. That's all I've got for this evening. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Senator Kalter: I think you may have partly answered the question I had at the end there with the suggestion in your voice. So for the move to paperless billing, there will still be an option for people to opt back in to paper if they so choose, but you're going to try to move most people to paperless.

Senator Stephens: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: So it won't be an either/or.

Senator Stephens: Right, and we'll be communicating as much media, obviously, as you know students are aware of continuing telling them about the process on the website, emails, texts, a number of ways. I've been at other institutions that really have adopted this holistically and it actually is much more effective at communicating when there are balances. The last thing we want to happen, as anybody knows, somebody pays a balance and it actually changed at the time they were sending it in, now they got a refund, now they've got to wait on that refund. So moving people more to the online portal is also safer. It's very safe from a confidentiality and data perspective so, like I said, we're trying to be as efficient and as effective as we can, but also be mindful of the student experience and the parent experience in this particular process.

Senator Kalter: Terrific.

Senator Rubio: With the closing of the Watterson Dining Center over the summer, will there still be availability or options for students to get a summer meal plan?

Senator Johnson: Yes. I believe we're going to have that operation out of Tri-Towers. There you go. But what's the dining…

Senator Grzanich: Linkins.

Senator Johnson: Linkins. Thank you. So that should be running out of Linkins, as well as of course the options within the Bone Student Center. Okay.

Senator Kalter: We'll move to our action items. We have first the Administrator Selection and Search policies coming out of Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee.

***Action Items:***

***02.27.18.01- Policy 3.2.13 Administrator Selection and Search Policies (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

Senator Hoelscher: The Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee has passed this a while back and I think it's through the information phase. Since that time it got a little more complicated and I think that there are some concerns that have been expressed and the committee actually will remain neutral, as a whole will remain neutral, concerning those concerns, and so we would invite those concerns to be addressed on the floor. Right now, as discussed in the information phase, we would like to move that this bill -- I'm sorry -- that this policy be passed. I've been watching too much political news.

Motion by Senator Hoelscher on behalf of the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee to approve Policy 3.2.13 Administrator Selection and Search Policies.

Senator Kalter: If only we had those powers. So coming from a committee it does not need a second, so we're in the motion, and I'm going to move immediately to the first motion to amend, and Senator Horst.

***02.27.18.02 - Motion to amend policy 3.2.13 (Martha Horst)***

Senator Horst: My apologies to the committee that I didn't notice this before, but in the past in my experience when there's been a search committee formed under this policy, there has been some debate as to who exactly falls under the tenured/tenure-track faculty member lines -- is it chairs, is it an associate dean, is it even a dean, so it can be quite confusing -- and my opinion is that the spots that are designated “an administrator” is an appropriate spot for somebody of that stature and that the dean's perspective and the associate dean's perspective is represented by that slot. That's why I feel that the tenure-track faculty line should be reserved for people who are in the classroom, and I would like to make a motion to adopt a definition of who may occupy those slots. To craft this motion, I turn to the AFEGC language which defines tenured and tenure-track faculty, and I will wait for a second before I read the motion.

Motion by Senator Horst, seconded by Senator Grzanich, to amend policy 3.2.13.

Senator Kalter: And may I ask, before we start debate, precisely where within the policy this would be inserted.

Senator Horst: Yeah, so it says search committee composition, and then right after that heading, this is on page four…

Senator Kalter: Thank you.

Senator Horst: …it would say all committees, and then it would read college deans, department chairpersons, school directors, civil service personnel, etc., are not eligible for election or appointment to a tenured/tenure-track faculty seat.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Wonderful. So it's right underneath the big title Search Committee Composition, but before the first vice president, which is in this case the Vice President for Student Affairs.

Senator Horst: Yes, so it would say all committees.

Senator Kalter: Okay. All right. Do we have debate on that motion? All right. So this is simply a motion to amend. We're not voting yet on the full policy. All in favor of that motion to amend.

The motion to amend policy 3.2.13 to define the faculty seats was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: All right. Terrific. We will now move on to the motion from the AP and Civil Service Council also to amend. Should I go to Senator Noel-Elkins?

***03.23.18.01 AP and CS Council Motions to Amend 3.2.13 (Administrative Professional Council and Civil Service Council)***

Senator Noel-Elkins: Would you like to handle these three separately?

Senator Kalter: Yes. I think that would be wise. Yes.

Senator Noel-Elkins: Okay. So the first motion that we will put forward on behalf of AP and Civil Service Council is to remove in the last portion of the policy the portion regarding Academic Affairs Administrators other than Department/school chair/director to remove the language “including, but not limited to,” that is in the first section of that section of the policy.

Senator Kalter: Okay, and I think that because it's coming from AP and Civil Service Council, that's technically seconded already by Senator Roberts.

Senator Roberts: Correct.

Motion by Senator Noel-Elkins, seconded by Senator Roberts, to remove the language “including but not limited to” in the first section of the last portion of the policy.

Senator Kalter: Okay. I just want to make a comment on that particular one. I don't think that the committee or anybody on the Executive Committee thought that this policy would ever reach down in any way into searching for academic advisors. This is an Administrative Selection and Search committee, and since academic advisors are not administrators, I don't think that the intent of changing that language from “such as” to “including, but not limited to,” was ever to do an enormous power grab of that sort, nor do I think that people who volunteer to serve on the Panel of Ten generally would think of themselves as looking for somebody, you know, in a department, or what have you, so I just wanted to put that out there. That being said, the English professor in the room will also say that “including, but not limited to,” is almost exactly the same thing as “such as,” so it was an attempt to clarify rather than to power grab, but I just wanted to put those two comments out there. Do we have debate?

Senator Grzanich: Just a question. Are you removing both “such as” and “including, but not limited to,” or leaving “such as”?

Senator Noel-Elkins: We would recommend leaving “such as,” but removing “including, but not limited to.”

Senator Grzanich: Okay. Thank you.

Senator Horst: I would just say that as I was looking at this addition, at this correction, the language does point towards specific positions, and I didn't really, when it said “including, but not limited to,” it did still point to those positions, but the “such as” conveys that you're giving examples of what would be appropriate for this kind of search, and so it does seem a bit clearer to me to say “such as,” because it's pointing to specific examples, such as these things, as opposed to making a more an all-inclusive statement, it could be this, but it could be a lot of other things.

Senator Noel-Elkins: Right. The academic advising positions are the examples given in the amendments, but you can look also at coordinator level positions, which could be considered administrative, and some of those deal with policy, deal with curriculum, those are both Civil Service and AP positions, depending on how they're classified by Human Resources, and so it does, using the language “including, but not limited,” broaden the scope of the policy quite a bit.

The motion to amend by reverting to the original “such as” language in the current policy was approved, with the Senate chair opposed.

Senator Kalter: All right. Let's move to the second motion to amend.

Senator Noel-Elkins: The second motion is to remove the language from, again, the same section of the policy, remove the language indicating that AP and Civil Service members of the committee will only be included when the Provost and the Academic Affairs Committee agree that these groups are an appropriate constituency. We would move to remove that language.

Motion by Senator Noel-Elkins, seconded by Senator Roberts, to remove the language indicating that AP and Civil Service members of the committee will only be included when the Provost and the Academic Affairs Committee agree that these groups are an appropriate constituency, in the first section of the last portion of the policy.

Senator Kalter: All right. Thank you. Do we have debate on that motion? I want to observe that similar language to that exists in the one or more students line. I just want to make that observation.

Senator Horst: Right below that it says for all committees the structure must maintain a minimum of four tenure-track faculty, two staff… that's including these… and one student and then the percentage part. So doesn't that take care of that that they would be included, because it says…

Senator Noel-Elkins: I think it does, which then makes it more important to remove the language, because it's contradictory then. If the ad hoc committee always has to include the two staff, Civil Service/AP, then the language about including them only when deemed appropriate should not be included in the committee makeup.

Senator Horst: Senator Hoelscher, for all committees, that applies to all committees listed in this policy?

Senator Hoelscher: I would think that's what it implies.

Senator Kalter: Has your question been addressed?

Senator Hoelscher: So, just very quickly, I want to thank Senator Horst from the committee, Senator Horst and Senator Noel-Elkins for laying out the rationale in such a way that it made it much easier for us to have conversations about it as a committee -- that's the first thing -- and we chose to remain neutral on it -- that is the second.

Senator Horst: In terms of the students, it says one or more students in the bullet point, and then it says one student minimum, but this implies that there could be more, that bullet point, and it implies that there could be more than one student when it is deemed necessary, so that seems appropriate.

Senator Kalter: And you are, Senator Horst, arguing under the assumption that the next motion to amend that will come to the floor will not pass or that it has no bearing on this, because that part of this will remain the same. The structure part of that sentence will remain the same.

Senator Horst: Yeah. It seems as if they're saying the same thing. This says the search committee is formed in consultation with appropriate shared governance body and points, and then it lists this, and then this says the minimum requirements, and this seems to list the minimum requirements as well. Am I reading that correctly? So they seem to say the same thing.

Senator Kalter: So you're arguing against removing the language, against the amendment.

Senator Horst: Yes. I am.

Senator Kalter: Is there further debate?

Provost Murphy: Just a question. I see the last sentence as saying two staff members and not delineating one AP and one Civil Service. Is that fair to say? I think that's the amendment that Senator Noel-Elkins proposes ensures there's an AP and Civil Service, not just two staff.

Senator Kalter: Thank you, Provost Murphy. Further debate.

Senator Horst: So are we proposing to eliminate this clause specifically on this Civil Service line or also on the student line?

Senator Kalter: That's why I was making that comment, that observation, so that we would see that if we approve this motion to amend, the only constituency that would be if the Provost and Academic Affairs Committee agreed would be the students. There would be an assumption. In other words, there would be faculty, there would be Civil Service, there would be AP, but there would still be question about whether there were students.

Senator Ferrence: So I've looked at this several times. My concern here is that once we invoke the “or more,” we don't know what that “or more” means, and so I think if you want to strike the Provost, Academic Affairs, we should also strike the “or mores” from those statements. That way we are limited at one, because otherwise you could have a situation where 12 Civil Servants, 12 administrators, and it could greatly change the dynamic of the committee if you don't have any upper limit. If you have some oversight where the Provost can input and say well it's not appropriate to have that many Civil Service, so I guess I would only be in favor of striking that language if we also struck the “or mores” that appear in the various bullets in that section.

Senator Kalter: In other words, essentially reverting to the way the policy originally was written, right, so that you would be proposing to take out the “or more” after four or more tenure-track faculty, the “or more” after Civil Service, the “or more” for the AP, and the “or more” for the students and simply revert them back?

Senator Ferrence: If we were going to also strike the Provost's input section.

Senator Kalter: The condition that the Provost and the Academic Affairs Committee have to agree.

Senator Ferrence: Correct.

Senator Kalter: Let me ask the proposers, would you consider Senator Ferrence's contribution a friendly amendment. In other words, that if we take out that language that we would take out the “or mores”?

Senator Noel-Elkins: Yes. That's fine with us.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Further debate.

Provost Murphy: Mine might be a question, rather than a debate. As I'm reading this and, Senator Kalter, you and I talked a bit about this, so would you consider, for example, the University Registrar or the Director of Financial Aid, would you consider them covered under this section of the policy. They don't report directly to the Provost. When I'm looking at that and saying no probably not, they don't necessarily. Well the Registrar might involve curriculum. And the reason I ask that is that I could see those as examples of administrative positions where we probably would want more than one Administrative Professional or more than one Civil Service on their search committee. If you think of something like the University Registrar just having the knowledge of all those different areas that that position covers, we may want more than one AP person who understands the catalog. Or, you know, I could go on or understands articulation or whatever that is, that might be a committee where it would make sense to have a more balanced representation of AP and faculty. So I think my question is would you see that as a position covered by this section, and then would we need more flexibility than saying no, just one Civil Service and just one AP.

Senator Kalter: And we had a very rich discussion about this, because I think that both of us look at this section of the policy as indeterminate until the Senate Chair, whoever that may be, and the Provost, whoever that may be, get together and think through, is this the kind of position that should come under this clause in this policy. So that's what happened, for example, when the Director of the Graduate School was searched for, and we actually ended up not following this policy at that time, because this was an inappropriate mix of faculty and students, etc. But, as you see, we are proposing to add what we came up with to the policy so that it would be in there. So what you're talking about is…

Well first of all let me reiterate that I think one of the dangers of this policy is that it does depend on who the Senate Chair is and who the Provost is, and I don't really particularly like this section of the policy, yet I would not like it to be completely removed either. I think there are some indirect reports to the Provost that could fall under this policy and that have in the past, and I just mentioned one of them. I think Honors Council or, I'm sorry, Honors Director would be one of those. Possibly a CTLT search. Possibly an OISP search.

The Registrar was a very interesting part of our conversation, because our Provost actually was able to inform me of some things where faculty are affected more than I had realized, partly because I'm not in a department that gets accredited and so hadn't thought through, for example, how a Registrar might be involved in articulation types of agreements or what have you. So I don't know that I can say yes or no that the Registrar would be somebody I would consider would fall under it. I would still want to keep talking about that one. I would say I can't imagine a reason why Financial Aid needs to have a Panel of Ten search. I can imagine why the Director of Enrollment Management would need that, and that is a direct report to the Provost. Financial Aid is a lot harder, because it really does not impact... It impacts faculty in indirect ways, but certainly not in direct ways. But then I'm not going to always be in that role, so I think that that's what's hard about this policy is that other than… You know, Academic Affairs Administrator other than, it's not always invoked. It's always a matter of judgment call and that's what I was saying at the top that I don't think that there was ever in any way a power grab going on here, because who would want to do that and put everybody through the pain of getting a Panel of Ten search together when it can be worked out much more informally for many searches, and certainly in terms of academic advisors should never be on a university-wide level. Hopefully that answered that question. I'm trying to remember where we are. We are in the middle of debate. I think we're in the middle of debate, and we have just accepted the friendly amendment from Senator Ferrence.

Senator Grzanich: Using one of your examples, Susan, that the, what was it, the Financial Aid, I feel that it would be more appropriate to have more students in a search on that level, because like you were saying, it is more of a… students have more stake in the game for a search like that, and so I would say in instances if we were to use this policy for searches of that sort then I think we would need the “or more” line to better include students.

Senator Kalter: Let me just reiterate that I was saying I can't imagine why we would use this policy for that kind of a search. I'm just going to make that really clear that I did not see that one as falling under this at all.

Senator Grzanich: Okay.

Senator Noel- Elkins: I think that the standard search committee makeup is set out through the bullet points, but the next section, the ad hoc, gives the ability to put the “or more” back in there, and so I think Senator Ferrence's amendment is, the “or more” is still protected by the ability to create an ad hoc committee. In certain cases where more student representation might be appropriate where more AP and Civil Service representation might be appropriate. I think by striking the “or more” from the bullet points and striking the statement about when they're considered appropriate constituencies simply sets out the minimum qualifications for a standard committee, and then there's always the ad hoc option.

The motion always to include AP and CS employees in any Panel of Ten search for Academic Administrator – Other was unanimously approved, with the friendly amendment to remove the “or more” clauses from this section of the policy.

Senator Kalter: All right. We then move on to the third motion to amend, and Senator Noel-Elkins, or should I give Senator Roberts a chance.

Senator Noel-Elkins: You give him a chance. He deserves a chance.

Senator Kalter: All right.

Senator Noel-Elkins: I'll second it.

Senator Roberts: So putting forth a motion to remove the language “percentage of tenure-track faculty to other members not including the chair and secretary on either side must be at least 55%.”

Motion by Senator Roberts, seconded by Senator Noel-Elkins, to remove the language “percentage of tenure-track faculty to other members not including the chair and secretary on either side must be at least 55%.”

Senator Kalter: Do we have debate?

Senator Tyler Smith: I’d like to state that I am in support, but if you follow the bare minimums of the requirements laid out by this, you don't have 55%, so the policy completely contradicts itself on that line.

Senator Kalter: All right. Thank you. Further debate. Did anybody hear that? She said are we putting a period after student, and I don't know exactly which student you're talking about.

Senator Horst: So are you striking “and the percentage”?

Senator Noel- Elkins: Yes.

Senator Horst: Yeah. So you're putting a period at one student period.

Senator Noel-Elkins: Correct.

Senator Mainieri: This part of the policy refers to all committees, not just this last committee?

Senator Kalter: It does not refer to all committees in the document. It refers to all committees under the title Academic Affairs Administrator other than Department/School Chair/Director.

Senator Horst: Can I hear from the committee chair the rationale behind this language.

Senator Hoelscher: I think that's going to be a little difficult to describe, but basically we were thinking in terms of most searches being mostly affected by faculty and we wanted to make sure the faculty was properly represented. However, I think Senator Noel-Elkins and Senator Roberts make a lot of sense. Therefore, we're very happy to remain neutral in that sense and remove that language. I think we're protected in many other ways.

Senator Horst: Just regarding your comment that the chair chosen from the Panel of Ten would be faculty and an administrator to serve as secretary.

Senator Tyler Smith: This says in the parentheses not included.

Senator Horst: Oh, they're not included.

Senator Tyler Smith: Yeah. I made that same mistake at first too.

Senator Horst: Ah, I see. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Further debate. I will say that until we passed that motion with the friendlies from Senator Ferrence, I was pretty nervous about this one, because I do think that the Panel of Ten searches are intended to be majority faculty searches. However, I think that now that we have taken out the “or mores,” it makes it a little bit more, it makes me a little bit more secure, because the way that this reads is if in the judgment of the Provost and/or the appropriate shared governance body the numbers need adjustment, an ad hoc committee structure may be arranged. I think the assumption there is that the Provost will work with that appropriate shared governance body to do that, so I think that, you know, that soothes my concern that faculty would be disenfranchised. I know that some of you around the table may be surprised that faculty feel disenfranchised sometimes on this campus, but they really do, and so I think that if we have a conversation about whether a Registrar's search should have a majority faculty or simply 50/50 or something less than a 50/50, that needs to be a very serious conversation, not an assumption that just because a Registrar doesn't have any supervisees who are faculty that somehow or another the Registrar doesn't impact faculty. Having said that, again, I feel a lot more secure about that having reverted back to the original language of the policy. Do we have further debate on this amendment?

The motion to remove the requirement for 55% faculty composition of Academic Administrator – Other search committees was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: All right. We are now back to the original motion, and I'm wondering if we have any further motions to amend or any further debate on the changes, remembering that there are many changes other than just in that section.

Senator Dawson: Thank you for the Non-tenure Track add on Department Chair.

Senator Kalter: You can thank them.

Senator Dawson: Thank you.

Senator Kalter: It had nothing to do with us here. The committee made that add, and thank you, Senator Dawson, for bringing it up. Long overdue.

Senator Dawson: Yes.

Senator Nichols: I didn't notice any provisions in place when it says from a list of three non-tenure track. What if an academic unit doesn't have three non-tenure track faculty members.

Senator Kalter: Excellent question. Senator Hoelscher, do you have a response to that? Remind us what page we're on here.

Senator Nichols: Sorry. I found it in the, with respect to one non-tenure track faculty member from a list of three names…elected by the non-tenure track faculty under… Sorry, was that under the academic affairs, under chair/director. Nope. I spliced that in. I'm sorry.

Senator Kalter: You spliced it in.

Senator Nichols: I spliced it in.

Senator Kalter: Oh, okay. So I was thinking, because under department/school chairperson/director, there is no mention of the list. Okay. All right.

Senator Hoelscher: I was grateful. I was lost.

Senator Kalter: Yes. I was lost too.

Senator Hoelscher: I was going to fall back to the old I was checking my email routine again. I didn't know.

Senator Kalter: I like that one. I think we should replay that all over again. I think the students were not here when that happened, so we'll have to redo it for them. Any further debate about the policy in general? I can't read your… Senator Smith. Sorry.

Senator Tyra Smith: The other one.

Senator Kalter: Yes. The other Senator Smith.

Senator Tyra Smith: Well, I had a couple of questions, so the first one being I was reading as you were saying, Senator Nichols, I was reading under Vice President for University Advancement, it says one non-tenure track faculty member from a list of three names selected by the non-tenure track faculty. Is that the person that you were talking about?

Senator Nichols: No. But that might very well be the part that I dragged out of that section of the document.

Senator Tyra Smith: Oh, okay. Okay. And then the other question I had was under College Deans. It says, “two students from a list of up to ten provided jointly by the appropriate College Council and Student Government Association,” but in other portions of the document it just says a list of ten members, a list of ten names. Should the other portions follow suit to that and then say up to ten names or was there a reason that that was added in there?

Senator Kalter: Senator Hoelscher, do you remember?

Senator Hoelscher: So this is going to be on my tombstone. I've had it so long. I don't think there was a reason that we weren't thorough on the other, so I don't think, and I'm speaking out of turn because I haven't talked to the committee about this, but to make that more detailed I don't think would be a concern to us. If you wanted to make it consistent, that's just an issue of consistency, so there was no reason it was inconsistent, if that's what you're asking me. One was just more thorough, so I have no objections to that if you want to do that in the form of an amendment.

Senator Kalter: Senator Grzanich remembered what the conversation was.

Senator Grzanich: Yeah. I think we had it on the floor maybe two months ago or so. I think you were gone, but the conversation was that the college deans, that Student Government might not necessarily have a list of ten students that we have actively available for colleges that aren't necessarily as actively involved within Student Government, so the Mennonite College of Nursing or College of Fine Arts, and so it would be better for Student Government to work in collaboration with those colleges to get students with a vested interest into that conversation, because apparently we in the past had a track record of putting students who weren't in that college before or at any point onto those search committees. So just more mutual collaboration so that students who have a stake in the game again would be a part of that conversation.

Senator Kalter: My recollection was that it involved the size of colleges, that it's a lot easier to find ten students in the College of Arts and Sciences than say in Mennonite or in Fine Arts or what have you. Still I think what Senator Hoelscher said is true, because in other parts of the policy, you know, when we're enacting the policy, we don't wait to give that list to the hiring authority just because we have eight names instead of ten. It's assumed we left them blank because we just couldn't find anybody. It's not as though the search is held up until we've got ten or what have you. So would you like to offer that as an amendment?

Senator Tyra Smith: Yes.

Senator Kalter: Yes, you would. I'm trying to think, should we do this as a friendly amendment or is the committee remaining neutral in general?

Senator Hoelscher: So the only reason that I would say we're remaining neutral is I have not had the opportunity to discuss it, but, unless my committee objects, I would have no objection as a friendly amendment.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Does anybody on the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee have any objection to seeing that as a friendly amendment.

Senator Ferrence: Well, I'm not sure that I object, but just a comment, because I think part of the idea, as we've talked about here and memory is jogged, is that on these other positions they're university-level positions where presumably it's likely to find ten, and so I would think from the student perspective they more want to see there needs to be a list of ten. Otherwise, it's too easy to just come up with a list of two and move on. Whereas in the specific case of the college deans because of the high probability that in small colleges, particularly like Milner, there may not be ten students, there is a real reasonable reason that there would be less than ten, and so I can see why they put that the students perhaps put that language into that one to say look, doing the right thing it's wise to have a smaller list potentially with the deans, but that they might want to kind of preserve that mandate for ten and the other things where they do have their full student body to draw on. So I'm ambivalent either way, but I can see a reason for why just in the dean's case it says up to and the others are trying to hold the ten.

Senator Kalter: All right. In that case, we will have Senator Smith make a tradition motion, which I think she already did. Do we have a second to that motion?

Motion by Senator Tyra Smith, seconded by Senator Rubio, to remove the “up to” from the line “two students from a list of up to ten provided…” in the College Deans section.

Senator Kalter: Excellent. So do we have debate? We've just heard debate from Senator Ferrence sort of, you know, before the fact. Do we have further debate? The other Senator Smith.

Senator Tyler Smith: Okay, so this is just a point of information, and I don't need like an exact number, but do we know approximately how many students the smallest college on campus has?

Senator Kalter: Oh hundreds. Right?

Provost Murphy: Seven hundred.

Senator Kalter: Yeah.

Senator Hoelscher: Bring the mic closer.

Senator Tyler Smith: Oh sorry. If 700 is the smallest, I feel like we should probably be able to find ten. So I guess that's just my rationale, and I feel like if we're not finding ten, we're not looking hard enough.

Senator Horst: What about Milner?

Senator Kalter: Milner, I believe, would usually draw on students who work at Milner. Senator Lonbom, do you have a guesstimate about how many students work at Milner?

Senator Lonbom: You know, I don't right now. Sorry.

Senator Kalter: Would you see it as problematic for Milner to come up with ten?

Senator Lonbom: It could be.

Senator Kalter: It could be problematic.

Senator Lonbom: It could be.

Provost Murphy: Could I add to that, though? My recommendation, though, with Milner would be to think about beyond just students that work there, because you might want to think about a variety of disciplines, graduate and undergraduate. Does that make sense?

Senator Lonbom: I agree. I agree completely.

Senator Kalter: Okay. I was iterating something that I think a dean once told me, but if we want to go beyond that, that's fine. That's very good.

Senator Grzanich: So I understand from the perspective of having 700 individuals within a college in theory it would be easy to find individuals to serve on those. Right? But I know Vice President Ashley Shannon has put the most effort out of anyone I've seen to find individuals to serve on search committees, putting in all of the different Facebook pages and any group chats that she's in, and it's consistently and systematically a very difficult thing for her to find these kinds of things, and that's on university-wide level, and so going at it from the college dean perspective, I think, one, having that “up to” allows for a little bit more wiggle room in regards to however many people Vice President Shannon or whoever takes in that role after her and proceeds so on and so forth, and then after that the collaboration with the college deans, I think, is imperative to allow for more communication in regards to what students do you think would be more actively involved in this. They might not be on the Facebook page or actively looking at what Student Government is about, because it might not be a direct desire of theirs for that given point, but the college deans approaching you about these kinds of things, then it gives you more of an understanding at the importance of the role of the search committee. So I would say that this language is good.

Senator Haugo: I'm going to argue a different position from the College of Fine Arts. The reason that we put the language of the College Council in here was for a case like the College of Fine Arts where recruiting the students for a committee like this is probably going to be done at the school and department level more effectively than a notice on a Facebook page or from a Vice President's office. For a college dean search we can, you know, distribute that out to the schools and easily find, you know, three students from each school and Arts Technology or, you know, however that might break down. I think that it's easier for people on the ground to be recruiting those students than someone in Hovey Hall recruiting them.

Senator Ohler: I just want some clarity on the amendment itself. Are we striking the words “up to” in the section on college deans or are we adding the words “up to” on all of the other sections?

Senator Kalter: I believe that the motion was to strike the “up to” in the college dean section. Yes. To say, in other words, in the college dean section to say from a list of ten rather than saying from a list of up to ten. That was your motion. Yes?

Senator Tyra Smith: Yes.

Senator Hoelscher: I'm a lot more queasy about that. I thought we were talking about taking the language two students from a list of up to ten provided jointly by the appropriate College Council and Student Government Association and making everything else consistent with that. I'm more comfortable with that than I am striking that and making it consistent by going the other way. So I would be in favor of leaving that language under the college deans and making everything else match it, not the other way. I think the other way is problematic.

Senator Kalter: And let me clarify the motion again. In that bullet point under college deans, it's only the two words, up to, that are being proposed to be stricken, not the jointly or the appropriately College Council or anything like that. That's my understanding of your motion that…

Senator Tyra Smith: Yes.

Senator Kalter: Yes. Okay. Super.

Senator Tyler Smith: Hi. Okay. So with the restructuring of Student Government, now we're going to have one… I mean, the way it works I would like the College of Nursing, for example, there's one Senator, but for others, you know, there's more based on population, but if that one Senator cannot find nine people within their major to be on that committee with them, I just don't, I'd feel like at that point we're failing as a Student Government Association, because we're failing to represent the students.

Senator Horst: I've seen difficulties seating, for instance, the College Council, this position of students on the College Council, so I support the inclusion of the words “up to,” because I think it gives the policy flexibility, particularly in smaller colleges with busy active College of Fine Arts students who it can be quite difficult to get them to volunteer for something like this.

Senator Hoelscher: I would argue that we need the words “up to,” because while we may be failing as a student body, we don't want to fail in the search, and if you don't leave those words in there and you can't get ten students for whatever reason, maybe it's who knows the fault or the reason, we need to continue with that search, and I think that gives us some wiggle room to continue with the search.

Provost Murphy: Just one clarification, I don't think there's any part of this policy that has Hovey Hall recruiting students or selecting the students. Yeah. I want to make sure. But I would tell you that we currently have a search that we're forming, a search committee for the Dean for the College of Education, and to let you think about how it's working -- and this will be the first time we're doing this way and I think it's going to work well -- we've received a list of names from the Student Government Association, all who are majors in the College of Education. Once we have the rest of the committee formed and we know where the faculty are coming from, which departments, and then we'll work with the College Council to say here are the list of ten names, are these names acceptable, can you help me pick two out of those ten that help round out making sure we have representation from all schools. So this will be the first time we're trying to do this with both the College Council and the Student Government Association and we'll see how it works and we'll get some good feedback from the college and see how the college feels about how it works. I don't know if that's helpful to think through what we're trying to, how we're trying to make this work.

Senator Kalter: I think that plus what Senator Haugo mentioned about also working through the departments directly and the College Councils directly.

Provost Murphy: Sure. Absolutely.

The motion to remove “up to” from the student composition line of the College Deans section failed. The vote was 12 in favor, 31 opposed.

Senator Kalter: So the motion does not pass, so we go back to the original motion on the policy itself. Do we have any further debate? Further debate, further amendments. This is so exciting! And we have only ten minutes to do the bylaws. All right. Seeing no further debate, all in favor of passing the changes as they have been articulated.

The motion to make changes to the Administrator Selection and Search policy was approved with four amendments.

Senator Kalter: Excellent. All right. Anybody who wants to overrule the hard stop time before we start on bylaws. So we have 8:20. Let's move to the bylaws.

***03.22.18.01 Article V Section 1 F Consent Agenda (Rules Committee)***

Senator Horst: Yes. The Rules Committee sent forward our proposed draft of the bylaws plus an executive summary that gives you the revisions. We are updating the language. We are trying to create a document that merges various documents, governing documents, of the body together. During the information session we did have some discussion in particular on Article V, Section 1.F, the consent agenda, so I'd like to begin with that. The consent agenda now is something that the Academic Senate is practicing with regard to curriculum committee items and minutes. The Rules Committee is proposing to extend that to Senate items that have completed the review and circulation stage, have also been reviewed by an internal committee and the Executive Committee and deemed that they can go on the consent agenda. We made a slight change to the wording, yes, and we added the language “the Executive Committee may also decide to place the item back onto the consent agenda, but if one Senator had requested that the item be removed from the consent agenda, the item may not immediately go back on the consent agenda.” So that was in reference to our discussion we had regarding that item during the information stage. So I'd like to propose first that this language regarding the consent agenda be moved by the body.

Motion by Senator Horst on behalf of Rules Committee to revise significantly Senate bylaws after forty-plus years.

Senator Tyler Smith: Hi. Okay, a couple of things. So first the word “immediately” in the last sentence of the paragraph that starts with “the Senator may request,” I feel like if you keep that word “immediately” in there, that sentence does nothing to prevent the Executive Committee of having like dictatorial powers. So, you know, for example, a piece of legislation might go on the consent agenda, a Senator might disagree with it, so it would go back to the Executive Committee who would send it to the Internal Committee who doesn't like the Senator's changes, and so then it goes right back on the consent agenda. So that's a plausible situation where the consent agenda is failing. And then also the last sentence of the paragraph beginning with “curriculum proposals” about the Executive Committee may also reconsider, or may also consider an item for placement on the consent agenda, that's problematic to me, because I feel that the committee that is in charge of the policy is the experts, so I don't understand why the Executive Committee could…

Senator Horst: Could you repeat that? The Executive Committee may also… What are you talking about?

Senator Tyler Smith: It's the last sentence on the paragraph beginning with curriculum proposals where it says the Executive Committee may also consider an item for placement on the consent agenda independent of a request to do so from an internal committee. I feel like if an internal committee is not requesting something go on the consent agenda, there's probably a reason, and I feel like…

Senator Horst: Something could not come from an Internal Committee, though.

Senator Kalter: So let me give you an example. We've had cases where we get a policy from Legal or from some other office and they… I think Senator Horst had this example before where they changed the phone number or they took off somebody's name. Like a couple of years ago we had the OEOA director's name on the policy and I said to Legal, you know, it's probably a good idea just to say Director of OEOA, not who that person is, so that we don't have to keep changing the policy. Exec might feel like that is a waste of an internal committee's time to even look at that, that it's just better to put that on a consent agenda straight, so that's the kind of example that I think that particular line is trying to capture. It doesn't go to your “immediately” issue, it just goes to the second issue that you brought up.

Senator Tyler Smith: Okay.

Senator Horst: And just to respond to the “immediately,” that's the wording that the committee, the Rules Committee came up with. The Rules Committee thought it addressed your concern, so that's the wording we'd like to put forward. If you'd like to make a motion to strike something, you're welcome to.

Senator Tyler Smith: I would like to make that motion to strike the word “immediately.”

Senator Kalter: All right, so you are making the motion to strike the word “immediately” in the last sentence of the second to last paragraph. Correct?

Senator Tyler Smith: Yes.

Motion by Senator Tyler Smith, seconded by Senator Campbell, to strike the work “immediately” in the last sentence of the second to last paragraph of the consent agenda section of the Senate bylaws.

Senator Kalter: Do we have debate on that motion?

Senator Blum: Yeah. I do want to clarify that the Executive Committee doesn't have dictatorial powers. Okay? They're a democratically elected body. All right? And they vote and that would constitute in this situation too. So on the Rules Committee what we discussed is that this was a compromised way of allowing if somebody did request something to go off to allow some time to allow the Executive to reconsider, to allow that a Senator's concern to be raised, and they could in fact say well, okay, these are some really good concerns and put it on the floor. I mean, I think that it's reasonable to allow Exec to do their job and make some decision making around this. I think I'll just stop there.

Senator Kalter: It's nice to hear that we don't have dictatorial power, even though I was going to agree with Senator Smith, but reword the sentence in a way to say “if the Senator who had requested that the item be removed from the consent agenda does not consent, it may not go back on the consent agenda,” which is I think what you're after, but I'm not the one who made the motion. I don't know if, you know, you would consider that a friendly complete rewording.

(Laughter)

Senator Horst: I'm not considering anything. I'm just going with what we…

Senator Kalter: I'm sorry. I was asking Senator Smith. So you would consider that a friendly complete rewording.

Senator Tyler Smith: Yes.

Senator Kalter: And, Senator Campbell, would you also consider that a friendly complete rewording?

Senator Campbell: Yes.

Senator Kalter: All right. Let's debate that rewording. How did I put it? I'm just kidding. I'll reword it. “But if the Senator who had requested that the item be removed from the consent agenda does not agree, the item may not go back on the consent agenda.” So that's the motion we're debating.

Senator Horst: You're adding language?

Senator Kalter: Changing that language. Changing everything after the semicolon to say what I just said. Should I repeat that again?

Senator Horst: Where?

Senator Kalter: Right here. So the full sentence would read, “The Executive Committee may also decide to place the item back onto the consent agenda, but if the Senator who had requested that the item be removed from the consent agenda does not agree, the item may not go back on the consent agenda.”

Senator Tyler Smith: I'm sorry. What? I didn't understand. Oh. Okay. Yes.

Senator Kalter: Are we on the same page still? We're good. Okay. All right.

Senator Horst: Can you read it again, please?

Senator Kalter: So the full sentence there would read, “the Executive Committee may also decide to place the item back onto the consent agenda, but if the senator who had requested that the item be removed from the consent agenda does not agree, the item may not go back on the consent agenda.”

Senator Dyar: So then how would it go back on the consent, would it have to go through…

Senator Kalter: It would go through the full Senate.

Senator Dyar: Okay.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. In other words, the Senator is essentially saying at that point, you know, you didn't resolve my issue. Whereas it's possible in conversation with Exec, the Senator would say, oh, I understand, why don't you just put that back on the consent agenda, because my question has been resolved. All right. Any debate on that reworded motion?

The motion to amend Article V was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: All right. So we have an amended Article V. Do you want to keep going, Senator Horst? We're in the debate on that. Right?

Senator Horst: I don't believe we passed the consent agenda.

Senator Kalter: Right. We're in debate on passing the consent agenda.

Senator Horst: That's correct.

Senator Kalter: Okay. So is there any debate on the consent agenda? On the clarification and addition of new things to the consent agenda? All right.

The motion to adopt Article V, Section 1F was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: All right. We are going to carry the bylaws themselves over to the next time along with the information item and committee reports.

***Adjournment***

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