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***Call to Order***

Academic Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

Senator Kalter: I just wanted to first of all say thank you to everybody for your really excellent advice about the last meeting. I thought that it went well. The disruptions were kept under control and we didn’t have to use the YouTube room, but we still have it if we need it.

***Oral Communications:***

***Discussion of the proposed action items associated with the Engineering programs proposal***

Senator Kalter: So, we’re going to start with Oral Communications. The one that we have relates to the items on the proposed agenda. I had mentioned this at the Senate meeting. I will be meeting with Dan Stephens this week, and David Marx and Winfred Avogo are going to join us, to sort of get a more detailed understand of the financial implications of this self-funding model for the Engineering programs. And this morning I sent Dan some questions, a fairly large number of questions actually for the FAQ sheet or at least some of them will probably go on the FAQ and for our discussion, because I re-watched the financial presentation over the weekend and took some detailed notes from the slides and all that. I do want us all to be very aware that basically this proposal is adding about $44 million to the capital plan. Because you might remember that last year, we had just been thinking about the $100 million building and it also at the same time is reducing the initial number of students. So, there’s a potential for it to be essentially in the red for up to 30 years, but they’re being more optimistically modeling it to come out of the red around year 15, and I think that that is connected to the addition of the other students once the second building is built. And Aondover and Larry can help me with that. So, thinking about there’s going to be race for governor during those years. Pritzker could be embattled. We don’t really know where that money… whether that’s going to keep coming as quickly as it has been. And I’m saying we’re in the red, only because we’re covering somewhere between $900,000 and about $1.5 million with the reserves that we usually would keep for emergencies and that kind of thing. So, I’m wondering, we have on the proposed agenda several Action Items and I’m wondering if everybody thinks we’re ready for the Action Items to go on to the agenda. I’m wondering if you think we should have them all on the same night? I’m wondering if we need to do them in a different order than the way that they’re listed, or if the order is fine? And then also if we want to list them as Information/Action Items or just Action Items? (Pause) So, I guess the first question there is are we ready to go forward on the March meeting with these items?

Senator Mainieri: I think we need to. I think having them on the agenda allows us to have the discussions about them. I worry that if we don’t have the specific items and use them as the catalyst, then the discussion could go everywhere. Right? And so, to me it makes sense, particularly if you are still gathering data that you’re looking for the financial stuff, just start with the first two. I don’t know if we’ll get farther than that honestly in one meeting, but others might have different opinions on this though.

Senator Kalter: So, let me do quickly I hope, does everybody agree, yes, we need to put at least some of them on the agenda? Okay. I see a lot of nodding, so I’m going to go with that. Let’s see. So, the next questions… Well, let me do the easier question first. Should we list them as Information/Action or as Action? Whichever ones we end up putting on, what’s better?

Senator Toth: Clarification. In Information is when you can ask questions and things like that. And then Action would be debating?

Senator Kalter: Yes. So, I’m kind of leaning towards Information/Action, Dylan, just because it helps us do a slow start, have a slight discussion and then if there’s not a lot of questions we can move it to Action quickly.

Senator Toth: Right. Okay. That is something I would support as well.

Senator Kalter: Okay. I’m seeing Tracy nod her head. I saw Todd nod his head. I think I saw Kee-Yoon nodding his head. People are good with that? Okay. So, then the bigger question is, should we put all four on at the same time or should we stagger them? And there’s going to be, when we get down to the agenda, I’m going to talk about some rearranging of the agenda anyway. But we’ll get to that when we get to it. So, should we put all four of them on for the same night or should we do two and two, or what? Dimitrios is saying two and two.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. I saw Martha nodding for two and two. So, I agree with Martha. Because if we see all four of them, it might be that we try to rush so as to cover all of them, unless… Do we have like a limit by when we need to have them approved?

Senator Kalter: We’re trying for the Board meeting in May.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. So, not before that?

Senator Kalter: Right.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. And I’m actually wondering if we might want to have the financial implications one go first, because we’re going to be meeting about it this Friday. I think that... I don’t know, I can’t speak for David or Winfred, but my questions will probably be sewed up by then because I got a much better understanding being able to go slowly through the slides and listening to what Dan was saying. But I would hate to have us approve the curriculum and then say no to the financials. It seems like it might be a good idea to approve the financials, then do the curriculum on the same night and then go to the organizational change and the building plan on the second March meeting. Does that seem… I saw, Martha, I think you were nodding your head to that?

Senator Horst: I’m just wondering could the idea go forward but with a lot less money? Probably no.

President Dietz: No.

Senator Horst: Yeah. So, I guess then the financial does go first.

Senator Mainieri: Is there, and forgive my lack of knowledge here, but is there a reason why they need to be separated? Because to me we can’t not approve the financial model and approve the idea because then it can’t happen. So, I guess I’m wondering why they’re split. I understand why making a new college might be a separate idea, but do we have to split the finances from the actual move forward with the program?

Senator Kalter: So, that was kind of my point, Tracy, was that it seems like we should approve the financials first and then approve the program. The reason that I have them split out like that is, you know, normally when we have things on the Consent Agenda it’s all in one package, right? It’s whatever the curricular change is and then the financials go along with that. And usually there’s not much scrutiny about the financials because the Provost’s office has done that way before the program even starts going through the chain, right, the curricular chain. But this is massive. And so that’s why they’re split. Right? But what I’m saying is I think that we shouldn’t split them across two different nights. We should have them on the same night. Right? The program, the curricular model together with the financials, and we should put the financials first, so that if people do say no to the financials we know where we are.

Senator Horst: Like the differential tuition idea. If that went down, that would probably drastically change a lot of aspects of the plan.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. I mean, we don’t have ultimate control over that. Right? That’s the Board’s decision. But, so, what we’re doing is saying we’re basically endorsing the plan. And if voted up it would give the administration, you know, yes this has been voted up by the Senate.

Provost Tarhule: Susan, is it appropriate to make a comment here?

Senator Kalter: Absolutely.

Provost Tarhule: I know this is not the place to continue selling the program, but this has come up in some of my one-on-one discussions with people when they say the program is expensive. I think the best way to look at the program is like buying a house. If you make $75,000 you could probably get approved to buy a house that cost $250,000. That’s a lot of money, you know, but it’s not the total cost that matters, it’s how much we spend from a year-to-year basis. So, if you buy a house that cost $250,000 and you’ve got to pay that over 30 years and your payment is $1,000, for example, the financial house looks at how much you take home a month and says can you afford to pay $1,000 a month. And if you can do that, you’ll get approved for a house that cost that much. That’s the same concept here. By the time you finish this program, it’s $44 million, but you’re not writing a check for $44 million in any one given year. You’re spreading that out over 30 years. And that’s exactly why you spread it out over 30 years because if you spread it out over about 10 years your annual payments would be about $6-7 million dollars a year. If you spread it out over 30 years, now your annual payment is about $3 million or something like that. And then you could look at how much am I getting from this program. Even if I don’t totally have $3 million from this program, in any one year I’m taking about $1 million or maybe $2 million from my reserves to pay for this. So, yes, you’re committing $44 million in theory, but you’re actually taking only a very little in any one given year towards the program. That was the rationale for spreading it out over the 30-year period. So, if people focus only on the total amount, they’ll say my goodness that a lot of money. At no time are we going to take out $44 million. And the whole point of going to the loan is that you’re actually not taking the money from your reserves, you’re taking the loan from the bank and using you’re reserves as collateral. So, by doing all of those things you’re really minimizing the risk financially to the University. So, you’re reserves become collateral for the loan, and the amount that you’re actually taking to pay in any one given year is small. So, we have, what, about $100 million in reserves on the academic side and you’re taking about $1 million or $2 million in any one given year to support the program. So, like I said, maybe this is not the place to make a presentation, but I think it’s important to clarify for some folks.

Senator Kalter: I do think that that very last part that you said about how much we do have in reserves needs to be brought up during the conversation on the floor, so that people can see that the percentage coming out of reserves each year, what it is, compared to the amount of reserves. But, Tracy, I think the danger of tying the two together is that there could be some people, like you heard Dr. Otto’s concerns about the program. You could have some people who are skeptical about the finances who vote against those but who want to vote in favor of the continued development of the program and the curriculum and have perhaps, you know, the administration go back to the drawing board on the financing. Right? So, if you put them together, you’re more likely to get a less robust vote in favor of the program, which I would expect. Right? I’m expecting that people will vote yes on the curriculum itself. But there may be votes no on the financials, and we don’t want the one to sink the other. Right? So, that’s the other reason to split them. But to do them on the same night, so that we’re talking about these two things that are closely tied together. Because the organizational change and the building site are not as closely tied to those two things. Okay. So, I think. Yep. I think we have answered our questions. So, when we get down to the agenda, we’ll have the financial implication and the curriculum things, and then for the second March meeting it will be the organizational change and the capital plan. Does anybody else have anything they need to say about the Engineering stuff, before we go to the Distributed Communications?

Senator Nahm: Do we want to have a note or an announcement about, you know, when the next set of discussions, the Information and Action Items will be coming up? Just so that people are aware of how we’re splitting up the discussion.

Senator Kalter: Other than just putting them on the agenda?

Senator Nahm: So, are you going to have a note on the agenda that says, at next Wednesday meeting we’ll talk about these two items and the following meeting we’ll talk about the other two items?

Senator Kalter: Yeah. And I think we should also, when we distribute the agenda we should attach Distributed Communications in the form of the presentation that Dr. Tarhule gave on the curriculum and the budget presentation that Dr. Stephens gave on the financial implications so that people have those in front of them with the agenda. Does that sound good?

Senator Nahm: Yes.

***Distributed Communications:***
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Senator Kalter: All right. Let’s see. The next thing on the agenda is the Course Material Fees from Academic Affairs Committee. Dimitrios, did you want to talk about those?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. So, these came from an audit the University had and they asked us to clarify what are the steps students need to take in order to request a reimbursement of the course material fees if they decide to buy it from another source, and that’s all the changes that you see in item 5. It comes just because of this audit. So, I met with Christy West from Student Accounts to talk about the steps and then we talked about it in the committee, and that’s pretty much it.

Senator Kalter: All right. Anybody have any questions, comments, concerns before we say yes that one is ready for the agenda.

Senator Stewart: I guess very briefly it may just be impossible to do this, but it does seem strange that there’s no way to obtain a pre-waiver or something. That this has to be a reimbursement model, where you pay first and then have to come make a case to be reimbursed rather than having a plan in advance that avoids the fee. But my guess is that the university just couldn’t handle the other model, just adds complexity.

Senator Nikolaou: We don’t know about that. When I was talking with Christy, she just said that they need to pay it because they’re listed in Course Finder. So, courses that have the required material fees, in order to enroll in the class, you need to pay the fee. And the other reason is because she said it’s usually less expensive. Because if I’m in Biology and I need to use a microscope, there may be an associated materials fees and I may have to pay like $10.00. Obviously, I have the option of going and buying my own microscope, but I would have to pay $500.00 to get the microscope. But then Lea Cline, for example, mentioned that there are cases where if you’re doing, let’s say basket weaving you might be able to get the material in a much lower price, and that’s when you would request the refund.

Senator Kalter: Okay. And, Todd, I think it would be good to bring that one up on the floor also, so that people are aware of that. And, Kee-Yoon, I saw you also had had your hand up.

Senator Nahm: I just have a very minor editorial suggestion. On the second sentence of number 5, “Students who purchase needed material from other sources…” I would say either must submit or should submit, just so that it’s clear that this is an action that students need to initiate.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. Do we want like “must?” Because if they want the materials fees reimbursement, they do need to submit the form. So, must.

Senator Nahm: Yeah. Must sounds right.

Senator Kalter: All right. Anything else on that one before we say yes? (Pause) All right.
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Senator Kalter: Okay. So, for the next one there was a bit of a mix up, so I apologize to Martha for this. The Rules Committee had done changes to the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee charge, but because they weren’t the same changes as why the charge was on the Rules pending list it was confusing, and we weren’t understanding why it was going forward without addressing those changes. So, let’s see. So, Rules Committee’s intention apparently was to keep Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee’s charge on its issues pending list but to make a proposed change to it at the same time, you now, or like an incremental change, so to speak, that relates to the Academic Planning Committee charge. So, I’m wondering, and it’s basically the AFAC report, the facilities report. It’s related to that change. I’m wondering, even though you all haven’t seen that change to the charge, if anyone would object to us placing it on the agenda and we can send it around after this meeting, so you can kind of see what’s going on. But we can put it on the proposed agenda for the Senate to see. Would there be any objections to that? It’s a very very minor change. And I can actually read it out loud if anybody wants me to.

Senator Horst: And I’ll just add that it went through AABC, the change, and they approved it.

Senator Nahm: Yeah. Nobody had any issues with the suggested change.

Senator Horst: We were focused on the Academic Planning Committee. That’s what we were focused on.

Senator Kalter: So, it basically changes a line that says that the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee “Reviews with representatives from Facilities Services how the annual facilities improvement projects implement the comprehensive physical development plan, or the Campus Master Plan.” It changes that to say that they “Request, receive, and review the academic Facilities Priority Report and then discuss those things.” So, it’s very very minor. (Pause) Okay. Looks good. Now the only other question I have about that before I hand things over to Martha for anything else, there is actually a necessary change that we have to make to the Planning and Finance Committee charge to match up the fact that the Senate chair as a member of that committee is a member of the Academic Planning Committee, on the Academic Planning Committee’s charge. And I’m wondering if we should be doing all of this all at once on the same night?

Senator Horst: I’m not following you, Susan.

Senator Kalter: You and I had talked about this. That in the Planning and Finance Committee’s Blue Book charge it just says like a member of the Planning and Finance Committee should be on the Academic Planning Committee, but on the Academic Planning committees charge it specifies that that person has to be the Senate chair. And I think that we need to get those two things to match up so that there’s not confusion going forward. One of the big reasons for that is because APC is such a workload heavy committee it makes sense for the Senate chair to do it because of the course release that that person gets. And it’s also helpful for continuity, in terms of what’s going on in the Senate, right, understanding the programs and that kind of thing.

Senator Horst: Okay. So, the Planning and Finance charge should say the chair shall be the representative.

Senator Kalter: Right. That the Senate chair…

Senator Horst: I mean, we can get that… I think that’s sort of standalone, is my initial thought that we can get that done. But the Academic Planning charge doesn’t… I guess there is that thing that it says it has to be the chair. It’s just logically inconsistent at this point.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. So, my thought was that as we’re going the Academic Planning Committee changes and you had wanted, Rules had wanted, you know, the concomitant changes with Administrative Affairs and Budget, we might as well make the ones with Planning and Finance. And by the way, I think that the AFAC change also needs to go into the Planning and Finance charge as well, because I think we decided to send that report to both committees a couple of years ago.

Senator Horst: I actually spoke with Tracy and I think I emailed Senator Avogo, and they both indicated that they… Tracy, do you remember this? I emailed you in the fall, and you said you didn’t work on that report. And then I believe David Marx thought it really belonged in his committee.

Senator Kalter: Okay.

Senator Horst: And so, that was kind of where that discussion went. I mean it could go to their committee too. But that was the initial discussion that I had with Tracy as a former chair, and then Avogo, and then David.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. I had told Martha that even when I was just a member before I became chair, I don’t remember looking at that as part of Planning and Finances duties. So, I would say either it stays, and we just need to like refresh that that is part of Planning and Finances duties, or it hasn’t been being done. So, I think it just needs to be clarified.

Senator Kalter: I’m not sure about this, Tracy, but I think it may not be part of your duties because we still had to put it on the charge. Right. Like we’re doing with Administrative Affairs and Budget. And that it may not be in the Planning and Finance process because it was never put on the charge, but that Exec Committee several years back wanted it to be put on the charge. Whatever works is fine with me. I’m not sure if we have a different opinion about that as a committee that only one of these committees needs to see it?

Senator Horst: You know, I’m moot on this. I would turn to David Marx as really sort of the specialist in this area. And you know, maybe Avogo, Marx and you can… I have no opinion. I mean it might be something we want to talk about on the floor.

Senator Kalter: I was just going to say that. We could raise it on the floor, you know, while we’re changing the Planning and Finance charge with respect to the membership to clarify that one thing, to ask about that when it goes to the floor.

Senator Horst: Okay.

Senator Kalter: Does that sound good to everybody? To have basically all of these three things go together. That one and the two charges?

Senator Mainieri: So, I’m going back to the Planning and Finance representative on Academic Planning. And I know that it has traditionally been the chair when the chair is serving on that committee, right, the last two years you’ve served on a different committee. Am I correct?

Senator Kalter: Yeah.

Senator Mainieri: So, I’m looking at the Planning Committee composition, and so are you proposing… Because it’s not in there. Right. The Planning and Finance Committee member is not in there, in the Academic Planning Committee description.

Senator Kalter: It’s in the Planning and Finance Committee description but not specified as the Senate chair.

Senator Mainieri: But it’s also not in the Academic Planning Committee list of members that there’s a Planning and Finance Committee member.

Senator Kalter: Right. It’s listed as the Senate chair.

Senator Mainieri: So, should we just take out in the Planning and Finance Committee a representative and just the Academic Planning Committee says the chair of the Senate. And that also takes care of if there are weird exceptions like this year and last year where you were serving on a different committee or the chair was serving on a different committee, than Planning and Finance isn’t missing something and needing to send a representative when they typically don’t.

Senator Kalter: Does that sound good to everybody?

Senator Horst: Yeah. So, we’re going to delete in the Planning and Finance charge the business about Academic Planning. And then we’ll put them all together. And then we’ll have this discussion with David Marx about this report.

Senator Kalter: Awesome. Awesome.

Senator Horst: And we’ll try to get the NTT AIF thing done too. We just didn’t realize. We were just focused on this thing.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. I can understand that. It’s hard to remember to look back at the actual pending list. Okay. So, Martha, do you have anything else that we need to know about the Academic Planning Committee charge changes?

Senator Horst: We’re pulling them, right? So, that we can get it all done.

Senator Kalter: Oh, are we pulling them? I was wondering if we could just do this behind the scenes and get them to the floor anyway.

Senator Horst: Oh. Okay. Okay. Then I will talk about the Academic Planning charge changes. There were proposals and discussions in 2017. Those discussions and then Susan Kalter’s background on that information came to us. We met with Amy Hurd. We met with Cooper Cutting. We met with CGE and the chair, and he brought it to his committee. And some of those proposals made sense to the people that I just listed and some they did not agree with. And this is the list that we came up with that incorporates some of the changes from 2017 but not all.

Senator Kalter: Awesome. Any comments, questions about that one?

Senator Horst: Also, Dallas Long. We worked with Dallas Long for the library part.

Senator Nikolaou: Just one small thing. I’m assuming one is not going to Functions, right? So, it is Functions and then we have “1)” goes to “In order to…” or is the “In order to…” like a general description and then we have Function “1) Assist…” Function “2) Review…”, Function “3) Review…” and then “4) Complete…?”

Senator Horst: Can you just hold on, I’m not on the right… On Functions, are you saying they’re not parallel, is that what you’re saying?

Senator Nikolaou: No. Because right now it says “1) Functions.” So, it should be, I’m assuming just “Functions” and then we list 1,2,3,4.

Senator Horst: Yes. 1,2,3, and then 4, and then 5, and then 6.

Senator Nikolaou: So, it should be like five, right? Because it’s not 1. Functions.

Senator Horst: Oh, I see. The 1) should be moved down. That just looks like something that happened when we did the mark up.

Senator Nikolaou: And then is the part where it says, “In order to…” and actual function, or is it more of the description of how it works? And then the functions actually start at “Assist in the development and review…”

Senator Horst: This is a wording… Maybe Susan can bring this up, but this was wording to clarify…

Senator Nikolaou: What they do.

Senator Horst: Yeah. How the whole process works.

Senator Nikolaou: But is it a real function then? Or is it more like, Functions, and then like an introductory paragraph where it talks about IBHE, the Senate, the President, and everyone. And then it has “1) Assist…,” “2) Review…”

Senator Horst: So, the Academic Planning Committee shall review them. That’s the function?

Senator Kalter: I’m pretty sure, Dimitrios, I can also… I’m not looking at it right now, I looked at it over the weekend. I’m pretty sure that’s a function not just an umbrella description. I think that’s what you’re getting at. Right?

Senator Nikolaou: Okay.

Senator Horst: Yeah. “The committee shall review the academic program and centers of the university to ensure that they remain viable.”

Senator Kalter: In other words, that’s the biggest charge of that committee. It’s the thing that they spend an enormous, like 90-95% of their time is spent with function 1.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. So, should it stop at shall and then “1. Review them on a regular cycle established by Illinois Board…” Because then the shall refers to all other functions.

Senator Horst: But that’s not an umbrella language that would apply, for instance to number 6 as assigned by the Executive Committee.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. Then it’s just that the 1 needs to go to the “In order to…”

Senator Horst: But the 1 needs to go down.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. That was my…Okay.

Senator Horst: Yeah. The 1 does need to go down.

Senator Nikolaou: And then the other thing that might be, because you mentioned the library, under 4 the last sentence, and it might be a question for the floor. Do we need to specify like a minimum period for when they need to have a self-study instead of leaving it open ended?

Senator Horst: This is negotiated by our committee with the dean of the library and that’s the wording they came up with.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. I’ll bring it up on the floor. Because I was thinking…

Senator Horst: I mean that’s the wording we came up with. We had other wording and it was not… not this wording.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. Yeah. Because it might be that in ten years, they could just do it but then it might be too long for a self-study.

Senator Horst: You know, I’d rather the dean of the library answer his concerns.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. I’m going to ask then.

Senator Horst: Because he had specific concerns about initiating…

Senator Kalter: It was actually his idea.

Senator Horst: Yeah. But he had specific concerns about initiating language that would pin him down. So, this is something that we worked out with Dallas Long. This is Wade Nichols wording that they liked.

Senator Kalter: Awesome. Anybody else with anything about that one? (Pause) I just have a couple of things that I caught. I’m actually wondering whether we still have somebody called a “Coordinating of Academic Programs and Policies.” Because it used to be that the Provost rep was the Associate Provost. That the Coordinator was the Bruce Stoffel/Cooper Cutting. Now the Associate Provost no longer attends those committee meetings and therefore doesn’t facilitate them. Now the Bruce Stoffel/Cooper Cutting is the AVP for Academic Planning, and that person chairs the meeting. So, I’m thinking that we need to change that language.

Senator Horst: I recall I emailed Cooper Cutting about that and I recall him wanting to keep it in, but I don’t remember the reasoning why. But exactly that, that it used to be Bruce Stoffel and then it was the administrative assistant, maybe Jean Ann Dargatz.

Senator Kalter: Jean Ann Dargatz.

Senator Horst: Yeah. Right. And so, I have some email from Cooper Cutting explaining why he wanted to keep that in, but I’ll look for it for you.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Awesome. Because it does… I wanted to say this while the Provost was here, right, that it does seem to me that that person, the Cooper, needs to have a non-voting AP from the Provost office to assist with the recording secretary duties. Jean Ann, I think, is a CS. But whichever one, that person needs help. So, its important to keep that non-voting person, but I think that the term is wrong. Right? The Coordinator of Academic Programs title is no longer… it doesn’t exist anymore. So, we need to change that. One other small thing. I’m wondering for number 2 if we can have a line between the first and the second paragraphs there just so it’s clearer. And then, I’ll bring this up on the floor, this third point, but I’m wondering since the interdisciplinary programs or academic programs that are approved by the IBHE, I’m wondering if the IDS minors are included in number 1 or if that was one of the things that the Rules Committee decided not to incorporate?

Senator Horst: Yeah. The Rules Committee worked with Amy Hurd and we looked at the list of the IDS minors that are actually reviewed by the UCC, and we decided that review was adequate with…

Senator Kalter: Okay. So, I’ll say here what I’m going to say on the floor. I would say there’s a great deal of burden that is placed on the program directors of the IDS minors for reporting as compared to the minors that we review through the APCs departmental review, which is basically they just say it’s going well and that’s all they have to do. Whereas with the IDS minors, program directors have to do basically the equivalent of a full self-study, and yet they have fewer resources of salary and time for doing this. So, I would ask the Provost at some point to review whether that burden is actually justifiable and necessary for the IDS programs, given that if you have a minor that’s a departmental minor you basically don’t even review it. If you have a minor that’s an IDS minor, you have to go through a huge process that’s equivalent to our majors and masters and doctoral programs. And so, like I said, I’m going to bring that up on the floor. But I do think that it’s an extraordinary burden and more than is needed to make sure that the IDS minors are doing well. All right.
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***02.18.21.04 From Rules Committee: Policy 9.7 Mass-Electronic-Mail-Policy Clean Copy (Information Item 02/22/21)***

***09.30.20.01 From Rules Committee: Policy 9.7.1 Procedures for use of Mass Electronic Communication Current Copy (Information Item 02/22/21)***

***02.18.21.05 From Rules Committee: Policy 9.7.1 Mass Electronic Mail Procedures Mark Up (Information Item 02/22/21)***

***02.18.21.06 From Rules Committee: Policy 9.7.1 Mass Electronic Mail Procedures Clean Copy (Information Item 02/22/21)***

Senator Kalter: The next thing is the Mass Electronic Email policy. So, thank you Dr. Dietz for running these policies by the cabinet and by our Chief Information Officer Charley Edamala. Making sure all the relevant parties, they’ve either already been contacted or would be contacted before we placed it on the floor. That’s awesome to know. Apparently, the changes that Carla Birckelbaw and Craig Jackson brought to Rules had been started under Mark Walbert several years back, and they then verified with us (Martha and I) that new policies had been created after 9.7 that were filling the gap between electronic communication and electronic mail. Those were the two things I was concerned about, so we have sewn this up before this goes to the attention of 50 or more people. Martha, did you want to say anything about these?

Senator Horst: Well, just that there were slight wording changes that Craig then, again, brought to us that were as a result of conversations with Legal that may have happened in the cabinet—I’m not sure where the Legal review went—so there was a little more fine tuning of the language after that.

Senator Kalter: Anybody else see anything on these that’s for us?

Senator Nikolaou: I have a couple minor things. In 9.7.1, in the first paragraph under Introduction where it says “…to send permitted mass electronic mail…” we should add mass email to keep it consistent with the 9.7.

Senator Horst: I’m sorry. I’m just now opening the file.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay.

Senator Horst: 9.7.1, the procedures document.

Senator Nikolaou: Yes.

Senator Horst: And hold on. I’m in the clean copy.

Senator Nikolaou: So, in the very first paragraph under Introduction in the parentheses where it says “(email)” to say mass email, because that’s how we defined it in 9.7.

Senator Horst: Mass electronic, in the definitions in the introduction. “These procedures establish the appropriate us of…” I’m not seeing where you’re seeing this. Mass electronic communication, or mass electronic email you’d like it to say?

Senator Nikolaou: “…mass electronic mail”, the way that it is saying it parenthesis, instead of only “(email)” to say “(mass email)”.

Senator Horst: In 9.7.1?

Senator Nikolaou: I’m just not seeing it right now, Dimitrios. Maybe you could send me an email. I’m just not seeing what you’re seeing.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. Yeah. I can send you that one.

Senator Horst: Communication. I don’t see the word email here.

Senator Kalter: Why don’t you go ahead and send that.

Senator Horst: I’m sorry.

Senator Nikolaou: I can just go ahead and send you that one. Yeah. Yeah. That’s fine.

Senator Horst: Oh, in procedures? That’s what it is. Sorry.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. In Procedures for Use of Mass Electronic Mail. Yeah. That’s the document.

Senator Horst: It’s in the procedures one.

Senator Nikolaou: I’m going to send you that one. That’s not a big deal. Then at the end, Complaints should…

Senator Horst: Oh, I see. And you want it to say email? As oppose to mail.

Senator Nikolaou: Mass.

Senator Horst: It says mass electronic mail.

Senator Nikolaou: Parentheses.

Senator Horst: Policy 9.7.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. Let me… So, you’re looking at the clean copy, right?

Senator Horst: Maybe you can just send me the… I don’t want to waste people’s time.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. I’m going to send it. And then the other one is just if you go all the way to the end of the procedures. Instead of seven complaints it should be eight complaints, because we have seven…

Senator Horst: Yeah. It looks like one of those things that didn’t get…yep.

Senator Nikolaou: And then the other, it was more like a question, the paragraph just before Complaints where it says, “Detailed instructions on how to send a mass electronic mail message,…” should it be further up, like in the Introduction? Because it applies to all sections, right? Because it says all the instructions on how to do that. It is on that website. So, my question is, should it go in the Introduction like a second paragraph so that they know where to refer to?

Senator Horst: Yeah.

Senator Nikolaou: Because they could interpret it that it is specific only to sending surveys to on campus recipients.

Senator Horst: Yeah. Why don’t you send me that one and I’ll just loop in Craig Jackson as well.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay.

Senator Kalter: All right. Anybody else? Dimitrios, you said there were only two?

Senator Nikolaou: And the other one, I can ask it on the floor.

Senator Kalter: Okay. And anybody else have stuff for that one? I did sort of want to read to you, Martha, the things that I am going to ask on the floor. And in the first one I’m actually channeling you. I’m going to ask… even though I sort of know this, I think we should know a little bit more about who the Mass Email Guidance Council is and who appoints them. If it’s clear to everybody how and when to contact them. And whether we could shift some of that passive voice to active voice in that section that describes that. The second thing that I’m going to bring up is asking what types of exceptions they’re envisioning in the second paragraph under number III which is at the top of the second page of the mark up. And then the third one, there is a stray “however” in the first paragraph under number IV which doesn’t seem to need to be there because it’s not changing what the sentence before it is saying. Let’s see.

Senator Horst: It’s extra? It shouldn’t be there.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. You know how you have a sentence and then you have another sentence that says, however.

Senator Horst: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: And the reason to have that however in the second sentence is because you’re contradicting the first sentence. But in this case, the two sentences are totally consistent with each other.

Senator Horst: Okay. And that’s in IV?

Senator Kalter: In that same place, in IV in the regular policy, not in the procedures, I do wonder why the most drastic remedy of potentially getting terminated from the University is the first thing listed. Right? That we could reorder that. Like it goes from least drastic to most drastic. And then, I do have a question, that’s kind of a complicated question that I’m going to ask on the floor. Over the years, I’ve been asked by activist family, not activist family—I don’t have any activist family—but activist faculty from various departments whether our policy effectively prevents faculty employees from communicating with one another across departmental and college lines, right, regarding various work issues. I’m pretty sure this first came up when President Flannagan got the payout. What was it a $400,000 payout or whatever when he left. So, I’m going to ask, you know, what is the Administrations response to that questions? Do we have, for example, an option for like a type of FAC-L list but one that’s optout or whatever, that people can use to, you know, talk to each other? So, since this is coming forward it seems like an occasion to bring that up on the floor. So, I wanted to let people know that I’m going to do that so that you’re sort of prepared for that question. Does that make sense to everybody what that question is?

Senator Horst: I like that idea. I’m not sure it’s… I’m not sure it’s what this policy envisions.

Senator Kalter: Right. The faculty member who first brought this up is a fairly activist faculty members and was concerned that there is no way for faculty to communicate with faculty.

Senator Nikolaou: Well, actually the comment that I had was about the opt out but not about that part. Because in the policy, the part where it says that you have the option to opt out, now it has been removed. So, it means that I cannot opt out from receiving on campus surveys. So, that was the question that I was going to ask on the floor. Why we do not have the option to opt out of surveys if someone wants to.

Senator Kalter: From surveys. Like research surveys and things like that? Okay. All right if there are no others. Now we’ve previewed what we’re going to ask on the floor. We’ll see how many people have things that they’re going to ask on the floor.
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***Roll Call***

***Presentation: Recruitment and Retention Report of Underrepresented Students to the Senate (Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management Jana Albrecht and <team>)***

***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:***

***Approval of the curricular model presented on February 3 (with allowance for flexibilities that may need to be incorporated during the Year Zero curriculum development and approvals stage)***

***Approval of the creation of a College of Engineering***

***Approval of the self-financed financial model presented on February 17***

***Approval of the space needs, building, and site plans presented on February 17 (with allowance for changes recommended by Cabinet and/or to conform the proposal to the Campus Master Plan)***

 ***Information Items:***

***01.03.19.02 Milner Bylaw Current Copy (Rules Committee)***

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

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

***02.17.21.01 Policy 7.7.3 Course Material Fees Current Copy (Academic Affairs Committee)***

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

***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: I’m going to suggest we do some rearranging here, but I don’t know how you feel about this. First of all, I’m a little bit concerned that we’ve had so many presentations in a row, and long presentations, and I’m thinking that maybe we should take our Information Items and our Action Items, so basically our regular business including the Committee Reports and the Communications and move them to the top of the agenda. And move the presentation by Jana Albrecht, and the Chair Remarks, Student Body President Remarks, Administrator Remarks to the bottom. One of the reasons I’m suggesting that also is because I was contacted by a Senator who does intend to bring forward a Sense of the Senate Resolution regarding the Presidential Search. So, that would potentially get totally lost if we put it very very last with Communications. But it’s also simply because we have business that’s piling up in a pretty, you know, it’s beginning to pile up as we kind of knew it would because of the Engineering presentations, and I’m feeling like the Senate needs to get some of its business cleared off of its books or at least started. And so, I’m wondering if you would agree that we need to do that rearranging?

Senator Nikolaou: Are we going to put Jana’s presentation before the Engineering discussion? Because if we put it after, I’m thinking it might take the whole time and then she will not be able to actually make the presentation.

Senator Kalter: Great question.

Senator Mainieri: And I also think I recall that Jana, and it says on the agenda, right, that there’s a team usually with her to help answer questions. So, I always hate to have folks who are there to help with a presentation to have to wait or try to guess when the right time is. So, I would actually prefer to just keep the presentation on the top. I don’t really have a thought one way or another about the rest of it. But that would be my preference.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. There is another issue there, Tracy, that is kind of together with that which is that we postponed this presentation indefinitely last year. So, if I’m remembering correctly, we haven’t had the presentation for two years. And so, I don’t want to move it because we struggle to find a time for Jana to come in. And it’s an important presentation about underrepresented students, right. So, I think it’s important that we have it. So, how do people feel about that? Like moving, in other words, Tracy’s suggesting keep the presentation where it is but move the Chairperson’s Remarks, the Student Body President, and the Administrator comments to the bottom, and move everything else up. Kee-Yoon, I see you nodding.

Senator Horst: I’m wondering if, I mean I don’t know her schedule, but there’s so much that we need to act on now. Could she go next time? Because I just… I think the Engineering Action Item is going to take some time. And then as you said, there’s all these other items too. Would it be possible, so that we could have some space for her presentation to have it next time? Or does she have to come this time?

President Dietz: I guess I would speak in support of Martha’s concern about that. There’s some momentum going with the information about Engineering and I would want it to get more fully vetted on this. And the topic is very important that Jana’s presenting on, but there’s nothing that will happen next Wednesday that will be impactful for what they’re doing right now for next year or is going to impact the current year. So, I think it’s important to have the presentation, but I think when it occurs, as long as it’s occurring within the next, even month to six weeks, I think would be appropriate.

Senator Kalter: How do people feel about that?

Senator Mainieri: I would be okay with that. Again, I think whatever meeting its on it needs to be at the top.

President Dietz: Yeah.

Senator Mainieri: I don’t like the symbolism of having a presentation about underrepresented students buried in an agenda. And then I was just thinking about the rest of the agenda in, I guess I would ask President Dietz and Provost Tarhule, I wonder if you anticipate any of your Administrator Remarks being pertinent for Senators to consider as they consider the Action Items for Engineering? Because then we would want the Administrator Remarks before the Action Items.

President Dietz: I think I’ll kick this to Provost Tarhule, particularly the Q&A piece.

Provost Tarhule: I don’t know that it’s in the Administrator Remarks that would be relevant for the Engineering. I think the questions that people will have, we’ll ask if people have questions for us at that point. I think that’s where the clarification will be. So, in that sense, it’ll be okay for the Remarks to go to the bottom.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. I would agree with that. I think what we’ve been doing is having questions after each of the Engineering presentations that are different from the Administrator Remark questions.

President Dietz: Right.

Senator Kalter: And we can continue with that. So, that then… That may beg my other question a little bit, because I was going to suggest also that we place the Information Items before the Engineering items, but it sounds like maybe we are wanting the Engineering debate first?

Senator Mainieri: Can I propose something maybe completely different, in that I don’t know if there’s timing on any of the other Information Items. What if we just made this entire meeting about the Engineering items? Like take off the pressure of the other Information Items, unless there’s a timing reason. Right? We’ve heard the two presentations. So, what if we cleared the agenda, except for Administrator Remarks at the end, and just have the discussion?

Senator Kalter: What happens if there’s no discussion? And then we have a whole night where we don’t get anything done except for the Engineering.

Senator Horst: And the Mass Communications policy.

Senator Kalter: And the Mass Communications policy.

Senator Horst: (Laughter) We have to be able to talk to those parents. Right?

President Dietz: Right.

Senator Kalter: Which by the way, Martha, I was going to suggest moving that one up below Milner Bylaws but above the other things, because it was supposed to be there earlier anyway. But, Tracy, what I would be worried about there, you know, if the Engineering discussion goes for a long time I can cut off the meetings and say we’re going to push all of this other stuff to the next week, you know, for two weeks from now. But if we don’t put it on the agenda and we have literally five minutes and then a vote, and then we have…. you know, we wouldn’t be able to get anything else done and everything’s going to start bottling up even further down the line. Especially if we push Jana’s presentation off. Okay. So, let’s see. So, what we’re doing is we’re going to ask Jana to come on a different night. We’re going to put the Action Items first on the agenda. Oh, I’m sorry, Information/Action. Right? Because we decided earlier that the Engineering stuff would be Information/Action. There are only going to be two of those. It’ll be first the financial model and then the curricular model. And then we’re going to have as Information Items Milner Bylaws, Mass Electronic Communications, Course Materials Fees, and then that whole group that’s with the Academic Planning Committee stuff. That one. Administrative Affairs and Budget and the Planning and Finance charge. And then I think we’re going to need to do Committee Reports and Communications, and then go to Chair Remarks, Student Body President Remarks, and Administrator Remarks because of the Sense of the Senate Resolution that I’m expecting. Does that look good to everybody? (Pause) Okay.

President Dietz: I would say right now I’m not sensing a very long Administrator presentations from me. I think Provost Tarhule, in the interest of time, perhaps can shorten his a bit, and I will talk with the other two Vice Presidents and say, you know, this is really a time that we can focus on cleaning up any further discussions about Engineering. And I think everybody understands the priority that is.

Senator Kalter: Thank you, Larry. You know from past Exec meetings that we hardly ever like to move the Administrator Remarks down in the meeting, but I do think that this is one time when because the Administration is doing something really significant with the Engineering, we need to make sure that we do that and the rest of our business. That’s awesome.

President Dietz: Right.

Senator Kalter: Right. Thank you so much.

The motion was approved with amendments.

***02.18.21.16 From Susan Kalter: Question- percentages of each modality from Fall 2020 (Advisory Item 03/03/21?)***

Senator Kalter: So, we have an agenda. It is 5:00 p.m. Do we want to keep going or do we want to not keep…? I think we have to keep going for one very small thing and then we can decide whether we want to do the annual reports. Apologies to Senator Nikolaou. The question about the percentages of each modality from fall 2020. So, I received a request for this information on an off-cycle basis. Basically, it wasn’t like immediately associated with one of the Senate meetings. And I was just wondering if you all think that the full Senate would benefit from me sending that response out to the campus through our Senators or not? We were doing that with some of the questions about public comment and stuff like that. But I just wanted to find out if you think that we should that out on the Senators list?

Senator Mainieri: You forwarded us as part of that the original email from the constituent and it didn’t seem to request any further distribution. It seemed like the person just wanted the information. Am I correct?

Senator Kalter: Right. Yes.

Senator Mainieri: So, I would say no. I don’t… I think that just giving the information back to the person that requested it would be my preference.

Senator Kalter: Martha, you’re agreeing with that?

Senator Horst: Yes.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Other thoughts? (Pause) So, I’m going to try to go with a majority. So, I’ve only got two votes.

Senator Nahm: I agree with Tracy.

Senator Phillips: Me too.

Senator Kalter: Who is that? Taylor, you agree also?

Senator Phillips: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: Okay. I think I saw a nod from Dimitrios.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. I’ll agree too.

Senator Kalter: Okay. And Dylan. Okay. So, that’s six so we’ve got a majority. Alright. So, we’ll just keep it in house.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

***Memo from Reinstatement Committee, 2018-2019 (Advisory item?)***

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

***Memo from Reinstatement Committee, 2019-2020 (Advisory item?)***

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

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

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

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

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

Senator Kalter: And do we want to go forward and talk about the annual reports or do we want to move those off until two weeks from now?

Senator Mainieri: Two weeks from now because they have no hope of anytime soon. So, to me, I think there’s no rush to talk about them. Yeah.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. Especially if we are moving Jana’s presentation, one of the reports could be related with her presentation.

Senator Kalter: The Reinstatement Committee’s report?

Senator Nikolaou: So, we could have someone to join her for the Reinstatement.

Senator Kalter: Was it the Reinstatement Committee Report?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Yeah. I was going to bring that up. So, since we’re doing that next time we can talk about that next time. Awesome. That one I don’t need a majority on. Although, I have a feeling we’re all in agreement that we should end the meeting at about 5:00 p.m., which it is.

***Adjournment***

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