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***Call to Order***

Academic Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

Senator Kalter: We have a quorum, but we don’t have quite everybody here. Taylor Phillips emailed me and said she had something come up at the very last minute, so she won’t be here. Do you happen to know where Alex and… Well, we know about Kiana, right?

Senator Solebo: Yeah. Her replacement is coming from her appointment, so she will be late, and I don’t know if Alex is coming.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Well, we’ll just listen for the knock.

Senator Kalter: So, we’ve got all the faculty. The President also is out of town, out of the state. So, it is us. So, I’m going to just mention the Oral Communications just briefly, but we should return to them, and do the stuff that has to do with the proposed Senate agenda first. The first one has to do with an email I received over the summer about some differences in how we’re going to get our consent agenda items for the curriculum stuff that we do.

And then the Emergency Response training for students was partly a follow-up to conversations that we had last year about Emergency Response Training and partly about the faculty part of those. And what I wanted to ask was about per semester training for the faculty, in particular.

***Distributed Communications:***

***Discussion or Approval of the New Engineering Program Concept***

 ***Curricular Plans***

 ***Financial Implications***

 ***Potential for Organizational Change (New Department or School at or beyond maturity)***

***Approval of the Operating and Capital Funding Request to the State of Illinois (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

Senator Kalter: But let’s start with the Distributed Communications. And these are related to what’s on the proposed agenda, but we need to talk through what we really want on there, in terms of both the Engineering program discussion, and then the approval of the Operating and Capital Funding Requests to the State. So, we might as well take those together. A couple of things, Dave sent around just this afternoon, was it, or this morning, an order of events thing, thank you so much, that’s very helpful. And then I sent around a thing, some suggested updates to the chronology that got passed out, so that it goes back to when the Senate started talking about Engineering. And then the other thing that Dave sent us was the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee approving both the Operating and Capital Finding Request.

So you see there that I originally had asked Cera to put this on as approval of the concept, then I started thinking twice about that after the Caucus meeting and thought, well, it’s kind of premature, partly because the Senate has already approved in a certain way the concept of planning the Engineering stuff…not in a certain way, but has done so. And it’s more the curriculum, the financial implications, and the organizational change potential that’s sort of lying out there, because this is going to be a non-traditional type of process, and that’s why David’s order of events is helpful, right, to sort of explain to people why there’s kind of a not, first curriculum, and then, the usual order of events.

Yes.

Provost Murphy: Two things. One, nobody from my office was consulted, nobody called. You didn’t call Ani Yazedjian. You didn’t call Bruce Stoffel.

Senator Marx: Right.

Provost Murphy: Because we develop, I mean, the new program process, I mean, that’s what we do…

Senator Marx: Right.

Provost Murphy: …and so, because of that, there are a number of errors in that. So I would suggest that…

Senator Marx: We would be happy to correct any of that.

Provost Murphy: …before you distribute this to the Senate, please involve the Office of the Provost.

Senator Marx: Of course. Of course.

Provost Murphy: Well, you contacted deans and chairs, but you didn’t contact the Provost’s office, and we can help with this, but we can correct errors of this. So I would encourage you not to distribute this with errors.

Senator Kalter: Okay.

Senator Marx: Right.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. We would be happy to do...

Senator Marx: That’s fine. We’d be glad to fix anything that needs fixing.

Senator Kalter: Let’s see. So, is there anything else about that, Jan?

Provost Murphy: Not about this one. But the other is the document that… it’s a document that I used… through Larry… this is the Summary of Progress to date. Through Larry, you asked for one change, and I made that change, but then you made all sorts of changes and I didn’t know anything about that until today. So, that’s…the changes you made, I mean, that’s not the document that was distributed.

Senator Kalter: Mm-hmm.

Provost Murphy: So, this document was not what was distributed to the Senate.

Senator Kalter: Correct.

Provost Murphy: This document is what was distributed to the Senate…

Senator Kalter: That document was distributed to the Caucus.

Provost Murphy: So, at the very least, to ask me, I mean, I could have made some changes to my document if you would have asked.

Senator Kalter: So, I sent it to Larry…

Provost Murphy: You… I……

Senator Kalter: … and asked him whether…

Provost Murphy: This one?

Senator Kalter: I sent that to Larry…

Provost Murphy: But he’s out of town today…

Senator Kalter: I sent that to Larry…I sent that to Larry, and I asked whether or not he would like it to, first of all, be distributed, second, whether it should be to Exec, whether it should be distributed by me, by him, or by you, and he said go ahead and distribute it.

Provost Murphy: I have an email from Larry… I have an email from Larry saying there’s no reason that they would make changes to a document that’s your document. So, I mean, I have it here. He was very surprised by that. So, he had apparently not yet read…

Senator Kalter: Well, I can certainly forward my conversation with him to you.

Provost Murphy: Well. It says “From Provost Murphy,” so I can’t understand why you wouldn’t ask me.

Senator Kalter: Hmm.

Provost Murphy: I mean, it says “From Provost Murphy,” you have that in there, so why would you make changes and not ask me about… I probably would have said that’s fine.

Senator Kalter: So, I’m distributing it to Exec… I’m distributing it to Exec to have a conversation about whether the updates there are accurate. Do you have any inaccuracies that you see there?

Provost Murphy: I just got it, and I’ve been in meetings all day.

Senator Kalter: Okay.

Provost Murphy: So, I just got this today. But to make changes to a document that is obviously my document and not ask me. At least have the consideration to send it to me first, before you send it to a group of people.

Senator Kalter: Hmm. Well, I did ask the President. So, I mean, if you see, you know, if you see things that are inaccurate there, we would be happy to change them, but it only got distributed to Exec for this discussion.

Provost Murphy: Well. Just a…

Senator Kalter: If you see any inaccuracies, we’d be happy to talk about them. Does anybody else see any inaccuracies?

Provost Murphy: But can I understand a process where you’re making changes to a document and saying “Distributed to Faculty Caucus” when this isn’t now the document that was distributed to Faculty Caucus. I mean that seems to be inaccurate to me.

Senator Kalter: Well, we can certainly correct that.

Provost Murphy: That would be nice.

Senator Mainieri: Can I ask, Susan, for like this document that the Provost is referring to right now and David’s document that he generated and just sent out, what is the intention for these documents?

Senator Kalter: So, the reason that they got distributed at all here is because we need to plan on what we’re going to give to the Senate. And so, you know, if I or David made rapid changes, it was because we had only between the Wednesday night Senate meeting and this weekend, and of course I was grading all weekend. So sending things out so that Exec could say, okay we want to have either an updated chronology that goes to the Senate, and/or we want to have an order of events so that the rest of the Senate beyond the faculty understand, sort of, what the future order of events might be, right, so that when we are talking about the Operating and Capital Budget, and then when we have a wider conversation about the Engineering concept and where it is and all of that, in the Senate as opposed to the Caucus, we can have as much information to them as possible, and also to help them, for the chronology, see that the concept started in the Senate. Right? Because it’s going to be important as this goes out to focus groups around campus in the spring, or whenever that might be, that people understand that this was not, like, the President’s saying we’re going to do this, but a group of faculty in the Senate who had a brainstorm, and then started working with the Provost and the President about that.

Senator Horst: So are we… We’re now talking about the agenda item, right?

Senator Kalter: Yes, I’m sorry, yes. We’re talking about the first two Distributed Communications, which really first the discussion and/or approval of the Engineering program concept and all of that, and then the approval of the request, the funding request.

Senator Horst: Yeah. I mean, I think I said this last time, and it might relate to what you’re saying, but the presentation is in one way very specific, but in another way, it’s a little bit hard to figure out what we’re approving.

Senator Kalter: Right. Right. Right.

Senator Horst: It seems like what we’re approving is that we’re going to continue to commit to working with the administration in executing this complex idea. And I would rather have some sort of general statement and say this is where the project is now, and we can all endorse it with some sort of general statement. Because otherwise, I’m not quite sure what we’re endorsing, where there’s no curriculum, I’m not sure what we’re… Are we endorsing? You know, we don’t necessarily spend the money. We wouldn’t be in charge of the tuition. I would rather we just craft some sort of general statement saying we’re going to work with the administration to execute this idea which came through the Senate and now the administration’s been working on it, as opposed to, you know, some of these documents go into a lot of detail that I’m personally not ready to…

Senator Kalter: Right. That’s what I was saying. I think probably taking the words “or approval” off of the one that is in the proposed agenda, right, or I guess it says “ /Approval” and just have a discussion of it, so that it’s an information session like it was in the Caucus, but with student input, staff input, more administrators there, and maybe not talk about approval of the concept at this stage, but just discuss the concept and where it is, and then move on to the approval of the Operating and Capital Request. Does that make more sense?

Senator Horst: But is there a desire on the administration to have an approval before the building is put forward to the IBHE?

Provost Murphy: No. This seems preliminary to me, because we really don’t have a final budget model yet, and won’t until we have a building plan.

Senator Kalter: Right. And I just saw Brent in the hallway, he said they just hired the architectural firm for that cost site analysis, you know, the QBC. It hadn’t occurred to me to ask before, but I said, how long do you think that would take, and he said six months. And so, I said, if it takes six months, that probably means that the forums may not be able to happen in the spring, right. Because, I think, the plan was to have the QBC stuff back, the site study and the cost study, back before the forums. So that might end up delaying that until the fall or whatever, we’d have to talk more about that. But if that’s going to happen, if it’s going to be six months and so the study would come back like in March or so, it sort of again doesn’t make a lot of sense to do approvals of this part, and since Administrative Affairs and Budget has approved the Capital Request, then I think it can sort of sit out there waiting for those fora, right? But with the Senate discussing it. As we said at the end of the meeting last time, it seemed like we were an hour, or an hour and a half away from the end of that discussion when we ended, right?

Senator Mainieri: Um-hum. And I think that’s why I just wanted to understand what was intended to be happening at the Senate meeting. And so, I almost wonder instead of making these edits to the Provost’s document, that when you’re maybe introducing the discussion you could give that background orally on the origination from the Senate. I mean, is there a need for it to be documented somewhere?

Senator Kalter: We could. We could also just approve it by email. Right? We could say, okay, I’ve looked at this. This looks accurate. Or here are some changes to it, and get it into the packets. You know, it doesn’t have to be today, but sort of say, because it seems like it’s nice to have a handout, like if we have a handout, I’d rather not have one that starts in spring 2017, but that goes back to the beginning of the concept, right, and takes it forward.

Senator Ferrence: So, I’m a little further removed from all this, so I’m trying to kind of objectively put things together, where we are, where we’re going. I’m wondering, I mean, part of the issue, just like when I talk with colleagues is sometimes faculty, for many good reasons (we’re busy, whatever) even if another body is trying to communicate with us, we may not be particularly listening. And so, I’m wondering if partly the goal here (and I don’t want to put words in anybody’s mouth but I’m just trying to figure out where we’re headed) is the point is to have the discussions. I don’t see that we’re approving anything per se, I’m not even sure if you want to go as far as say endorse. But it sounds to me like what we really would like for all involved is to have something in the formal record that acknowledges that we’re looped into the process, so that if six months, a year down the road somebody goes, where is all of this coming from, the response can be, well, actually, if you check the Senate minutes, it was brought before the Senate floor…

Senator Kalter: Right.

Senator Ferrence: It was proposed, and it was discussed, so that somebody who for whatever reason at the moment that it was being discussed wasn’t being aware of it can’t argue later that the general population wasn’t being informed because I think they are. I mean I was very impressed with what happened at Caucus the other night, and I found myself walking away going, wow, there’s a lot of people who’ve spent a lot of time thinking about this stuff, and I actually was pretty impressed at where we are. Now, granted, I was a little confused because I’d brought with me this proposal for engineering programs, Illinois State University, which is evidently an older version or a different thing because that was in my Senate packet, and so it took me a while to figure out what was going on, and I think when I first heard it, this was about a year and a half ago, I was much more disturbed, because it seemed like we were walking into it kind of going, oh, you know, it’s not going to hardly cost us anything, and I think we’ve come a long way to realize, wow. So, I was really impressed and thought, okay, that’s the kind of communication I want to see. Now I also get that, if I wasn’t on Senate or on Caucus, I’d probably be too buried in all the other things that I’m doing to notice what was going on. But at least if I said to my Senator, my Senator could say, well actually, it’s been vetted and so. Is that kind of what we’re looking for? And then what is the mechanism within Senate to do that, if we don’t have to say approval or endorse? Is it just a statement that says somebody actually takes the mic and says, you know, let the record reflect that we thank Provost Murphy for presenting the current state of the engineering proposal and we’re looking forward to seeing how if develops?

Senator Horst: We could do a Sense of the Senate saying we continue to support the administration’s development of this complex engineering endeavor, and we appreciate that there’s a collaborative process going on. I’m just not comfortable endorsing something…

Senator Ferrence: Is the Sense of the Senate something that useful to you, or not particularly, or you’re ambivalent?

Provost Murphy: I think when it will really be helpful to us will be when we really have that full business model and we’re able to say, yeah, financially we believe we can move forward. I think that’s a point which I think the Senate would be well, I mean it would be very helpful to make sure that, because I feel like we have the full picture and then that’s that leap off point, you know. Right now, we’re still at a point where if the consultants come back and say, you know, it’s going to cost $200,000 for a building, Dan Stephens may run those numbers and say there is just no way we could ever do this and stay financially viable. Right? So then, I think then that’s the point at which we need to present that to the Senate. So I think the final business model where the President and Dan Stephens are looking at this, and the auditors and saying, yeah, you guys can do that, I think that’s the point at which we ought to then come with a final business model to the Senate and say, this is what… we think we can do it, now let’s walk through it and make sure that the Senate feels that we should move forward with this. And I think we’re a good six months away from that.

Senator Horst: Okay.

Senator Kalter: And I totally agree with that. I think, like I said, before the Caucus meeting, I had asked Cera to put it on as approval, and then I changed that a little bit, but I wanted to still have the discussion in case anybody here felt that we needed to move more quickly towards some sort of approval of where we are. But I think that the Caucus discussion, as you very nicely articulated, Greg, basically said exactly what Provost Murphy just said, right. We’ve already got two years of Senate endorsement of exploring. And we’re not at the point where we know whether we can afford it or not, and so once we do, that’s when the Senate gets looped back into the approval process. Right now, it’s just to kind of let’s have the discussion so that the students are understanding where we are. I think probably the AP and civil service already kind of know but some of them, I mean, it’s a big AP/civil service, so the ones in Facilities know, for example, or the ones in the Budget Office may know, but not everybody. So I’m not sure that we even need to have a Sense of the Senate, frankly, it’s more like just having the discussion and having the minutes and then eventually, as is on the chronology, having the forums, which I think are going to be really useful, because as you said, if sitting on the Senate and you’re hearing it and you’re like, wow, this is impressive, my guess is that the forums are going to have similar effect, right. That it’s going to be sort of a revelation how much has been thought through, and there are going to be some tough questions, certainly, but by that time Dr. Dietz and Vice President Stephens, and Provost Murphy are going to be working through some of those tough questions and running the models in various ways. And they’re not just going to be coming from us, they’re going to be coming from what the study shows, and so just talking about it next time at full Senate, I think, will probably suffice.

Senator Ferrence: So just getting rid of this word “approval” here will fix it.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. Yeah. And we can probably, let me know if I’m wrong about this, the reason curricular plans, financial implications, and potential for organizational change are all on there are that those are the things that the Senate usually looks at, right. The curriculum, which… embedded in it usually is the financial implications form, but of course it’s more complicated in this type of a scale of thing, and then the organizational change stuff. We can keep that on the agenda, we can keep those three things on to keep them in mind, we can take them off and just say Discussion of New Engineering Program Concept and have them all come up in the discussion. What are people’s preferences?

Senator Mainieri: I think just putting discussion. I think that letting the discussion go where it needs to for the people in that room would probably be the best approach, rather than prompting with particular things to be thinking about.

Senator Kalter: And, Martha, you’re nodding at that.

Senator Horst: Yes.

Senator Kalter: How do other people feel?

Senator Ferrence: I’m also wondering to what extent it’s useful for you to prompt the group, to remind the faculty who are present that we did have an opportunity to discuss this at our last Faculty Caucus and that the students haven’t really seen this in the formal setting. Because I think what it sounds like what we’re really after right now is to get a bit of a capture of what the student Senators and the non-Faculty Caucus Senators have to say. And it would be easy for us as Faculty Caucus to sort of forget that we already talked about this and we’re not picking up where that conversation left off, we’re looping in another body of people.

Senator Kalter: So I think I framed it that way in the Senate last time, then at the Caucus, and I can do it again at the start of Senate, right, at the start of the discussion. Like, last time, Caucus talked, we had a very robust hour and a half long conversation about it, we’re going to continue that, we’re going to open this up to the rest of the Senate and just go from there. Yeah. Definitely.

Provost Murphy: How do you envision…What do you need from Larry, and Dan, and I? You don’t want us to do that full presentation again, I’m assuming.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. That’s why I asked the question in the beginning whether we could get a transcript, and Cera miraculously, she was wonderful over the two days since the Caucus, has typed up a transcript, which we will eventually turn into our approved minutes. But I had asked everybody, do you have any objections to this going out as a transcript of what occurred, so that we would put that transcript in the materials, that way people can read beforehand, and maybe have a brief version of that from you, and Larry, and Dan rather than the extended one. I think it went for like 30 to 40 minutes, right. So, something more brief that refers to that, but is more like 15 to 20 minutes or so.

Senator Mainieri: CliffsNotes version.

Senator Kalter: The CliffsNotes version, yeah.

Senator Ferrence: That’s old. The Chegg version.

Senator Mainieri: Oh, I’m so sorry.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. The highlights. And I believe that a lot of that was because Dan Stephens is a Texan and he likes to elaborate, and was doing a lot of elaboration, so part of it was that he just had a lot to say. But yeah.

Provost Murphy: It may make sense just to have Larry do that, instead of doing the three part, and I bet he could give a 15 minute, at the most, overview.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. That would be really helpful. That would help us to sort of move it along but not take too much time in the Senate. Because one of the things I am concerned about is how much time we have for all of the stuff that is currently on the proposed Senate agenda. Okay, so good. So we will…

Senator Mainieri: So, what are the documents, then, that everyone is getting?

Senator Kalter: So the stuff that we got, do we want to include David’s order of events once the Provost has looked at it?

Senator Marx: No. If I could address that. I wrote that up because we didn’t have time to talk.

Senator Kalter: Exactly.

Senator Marx: You wanted to know what it was, and so I wrote it out, and then it became, oh, we can discuss that at Exec. And so. Then, at that point, I contacted some of the people that were on the committee to see if they agreed with what I had there.

Senator Kalter: Right.

Senator Marx: So, it was just a quick thing, but that was on Saturday. It wasn’t even since Friday.

Senator Ferrence: We should write internal to Exec on the top of this.

Senator Marx: That was just meant to be for our discussion here. If we wanted to be distributed, then we have to work with the Provost’s office to turn it into a real document.

Senator Mainieri: There are just so many documents, in particular, if we’re wanting the student input. It’s confusing, there’s a lot of documents to look through, and so I’m just wondering if there is a way for us to consolidate, and be a bit more choosy on what’s being distributed.

Senator Horst: Maybe just the transcript?

Senator Kalter: I don’t know if just the transcript would work. It seems to me that perhaps one thing we could take away is the BoT slides, because those are almost exactly like what Dan handed out in his handout.

Senator Mainieri: I also think that even though having the EAB is helpful, the highlights are in this, right, so taking that out could bring it down.

Senator Kalter: That’s a good idea.

Senator Horst: Part of the confusing thing, though, is I feel like the project is here but the documents are older versions of it. So it’s confusing to see these older versions of where the project could go, as compared to what the President said at the Caucus.

Senator Kalter: Right.

Senator Horst: It can help to see older documents when you’re seeing what revisions are being made, but this is a whole concept. So the most important thing is what’s happening right now. The chronology is important, that this is an old idea from the Finance and Planning but that’s just… I think right now, it’s a little unwieldy.

Senator Kalter: Right. so okay. So we’re taking out the EAB because as you’re nicely saying it’s summarized. The important parts are summarized.

Senator Mainieri: What if we were just focused on what we wanted to include?

Senator Kalter: Right.

Senator Mainieri: Instead of what’s taking out. Because there’s so many things that I think could be taken out.

Senator Kalter: Okay.

Senator Mainieri: So, I mean, we want the proposal, right, the updated one that the Provost shared with us. Right.

Provost Murphy: Sure.

Senator Kalter: Right. The chronology.

Senator Mainieri: I think the chronology is helpful as long as it’s actually a collaboration…

Senator Kalter: Right.

Senator Mainieri: And if it isn’t a collaboration, then I think if we want to put the Senate stuff in, it needs to be separated from the Provost’s original one. And the transcript. I mean do we need anything else other than that?

Senator Kalter: Dan’s financial stuff.

Senator Mainieri: Are people going to… Wasn’t the last page of the updated proposal have the summary sheet?

Provost Murphy: Does the financial model make or break the information, given that it’s incomplete at this point in time?

Senator Mainieri: Right.

Senator Ferrence: As far as I’m concerned that’s really up to your department. If we decide to have it, you’ve got to find the money.

Provost Murphy: Well. Yeah. And the concept of not drawing only from the rest of the university to fund it, but I feel like that financial model is still, until we have a building, the big piece of it is incomplete. So, I mean, I think, certainly you’re able to distribute it, but if you’re looking for things that might not be quite as useful at the discussion Wednesday night, that might be one.

Senator Kalter: And so, perhaps, more important for the faculty to have seen than for the whole Senate to have seen?

Senator Mainieri: And we could certainly have a folder that says, if you’re curious, here’s a whole bunch of other stuff. Like here are the things to focus on and then…

Senator Kalter: That’s not a bad idea. That’s a great idea, actually. I don’t know how David feels, but I think it was important to see the progression from the proposal that went to Jan, to the proposal that Dan and Jan altered, right, so in other words, the task force had it at a certain enrollment. After the Provost and the Vice President of Finance and Planning looked at it, those numbers went up, fairly significantly. And so that was really helpful for me to see, right, to see those two things, but perhaps not as useful for this discussion, but if we had it in a place where people could look at it, if they’re interested, then we could sort of hone down what’s being distributed. What were you going to say, David?

Senator Marx: I was going to say that the committee’s approach was to see how we could get it started, not necessarily what the full program would look like.

Senator Kalter: Right.

Senator Marx: And so it was more of a go slow approach. But, as I said, there are issues with the lack of facilities and so forth that really made it necessary to seek out having a new building. And at that point, it becomes a much bigger program.

Provost Murphy: Right. And I think the funding estimates in that proposal, like the $36 million for John Green, or even the estimates for cost, I think were done without consulting Finance and Planning. So, for me, that was the main, when Associate Provost Jawahar gave that to me, he really…I guess I really got the sense that it was very much in draft form because they had not worked with Finance and Planning to get actual numbers yet.

Senator Marx. Right.

Provost Murphy: So that’s, for me, the biggest difference between the two is that the financial numbers are much more complete in the June.

Senator Marx: That’s correct. We expected it to take a few more months, a few more months to get actual numbers, so it was generated at that particular moment in time as to what we needed.

Provost Murphy: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: Okay. So what do we have? First of all, we have a site where we have all of the documents if people want to look at them. But to go to Wednesday’s meeting, we’ve got the chronology, and the transcript, and is that it, or was there a third thing?

Senator Mainieri: And the most updated proposal.

Senator Horst: Does the proposal have the budget, the color budget?

Senator Mainieri: It does not have that color budget.

Senator Horst: See, I also think, given the size of the numbers, it’s important for people to see how much money we’re talking about.

Senator Mainieri: Maybe just that data?

Senator Kalter: So, why just that, and not the whole thing that Dan created? Is it hard to read?

Senator Solebo: It’s honestly just long.

Senator Kalter: Just long.

Senator Solebo: Yeah.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. I’m thinking about the probability of people reading it. Increasing probability of people looking at it.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Gotcha.

Senator Ferrence: And what do you want people reading. To me, this is the most important thing for people to have read, so the more things you give them the lower the probability that they’ll actually read the thing you want them to read.

Senator Kalter: Right. Okay. So that means we’ve got four things, right. The proposal, the chronology, the one page sheet, and the transcript.

Senator Horst: Yep.

Provost Murphy: And the proposal should be the June 2018 version.

Senator Kalter: Right. And then we can put the other version up on the webpage or a Teams site or something like that. Great.

Senator Horst: May I ask a quick question? You mentioned forums?

Senator Kalter: Yes.

Senator Horst: So there’s a plan to have faculty forums, or targeted faculty forums?

Senator Kalter: Yeah. It’s in the bottom of the chronology, and was talked about, I think, in the Provost’s comments in the Caucus.

Provost Murphy: Right. If we decide that it makes sense to move forward, then we’ll have campus forums, campus focus groups.

Senator Horst: Okay. Great.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, because you’ve been emphasizing, Martha, how important that is, right. You want to say about why it’s so important to have them, in your mind?

Senator Horst: Well, I think there needs to be a perception, it seems as we’re all working together, but there also needs to be a perception of, with the faculty, that this is a faculty driven idea with the administration also as a co-partner. And people are hearing about the engineering program, but they don’t know the details, and it’s like is this just coming from the administration. So I think it’s very important that the entire faculty have a perception that we all are deciding on this major course change. And it is a major change, in my opinion, it’s as equal as when we decided not to have the N. To have this whole other area of study in our program. It’s very exciting, but it’s a big course direction, and it’s something that the faculty have to embrace. Not all faculty have to vote, but just that people are informed, and they have a feeling like their opinions are consulted, and they’re part of the decision making process.

Provost Murphy: Just a reminder, we have since we lost the N, we’ve also added Mennonite College of Nursing. So we have gone through this process in a significant way.

Senator Ferrence: That was the one that I was going to ask about. That was before my time, but how did the faculty buy-in come about during that time?

Provost Murphy: You know I was an associate dean at the time, and so Betty Chapman was the Associate Provost, so. That’s a good question.

Senator Horst: This seems much larger, just given the number of faculty, and the amount of facilities, and the fact that the Mennonite College of Nursing was purchased, essentially, with a lot of pieces intact. But this, we are all creating, right.

Provost Murphy: True.

Senator Marx: That’s right.

Senator Horst: And so, it’s a much bigger endeavor, and I just… I think we’re on the right track, but we just have to make sure that the entire campus feels that the direction was decided by all parties involved.

Senator Kalter: At least that the people who are in decision-making roles heard feedback, right. Heard both positive feedback, suggestions, also heard concerns, maybe answered some of the concerns, maybe, in some cases maybe tweaked the model, you know, what we were talking about at the end with, is it going to be 4 years, or 8 years, or 10 years, or 20 years until when we reach maturity and stuff like that, or what is our attrition rate. Right. So, collecting that kind of campus wide feedback and having people feel like their concern, if it was a concern, got listened to, or their suggestion was heard. Like one of the things I didn’t have a chance to say was that I heard from some people in Communication wondering why there weren’t, at least one person wondering why there weren’t any communication courses in it, if there’s technical writing, why is there not technical communication in the, sort of, their department’s sense of it. And so that may not be part of accreditation, right, and the answer might just be, well, that’s not going to be the way it goes, but at least they will feel like you heard their argument for why it should be in there, and understand the answer of, well, this is why it is the way it is, right, that kind of thing. All right.

***University Appeals Board chairperson dual role***

Senator Kalter: So unfortunately, Alex is not here. What I was going to ask about the University Appeals Board Chairperson dual role. I had sent out an email about that, this was the Jessie Krienert question, and I heard back from all of the faculty, nobody had an issue, I was going to ask the students just to make sure that there wasn’t a perceived conflict of interest. Do you feel like it’s fine for her to take those two roles?

Senator Solebo: Um-hum.

Senator Kalter: So, we’ll just let John Davenport know that everybody that was here agreed.
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Senator Kalter: I’m going to skip a little but down. I’m going to skip the UCC thing for a minute and go to the Leave of Absence policy. So that’s one that’s come in and I’m just curious whether we want to have Transfer, Leave of Absence, and Sabbatical Leave all in this October 9th meeting? Do we feel like anything needs to push further? One argument for keeping it in is that even if we don’t get to it, even if we need to have a hard stop time, people would have read it. Right. And so, they will be prepared for the next time, even if it gets put off or whatever. We don’t necessarily want to feel like we’re crowding out the discussion about Engineering and that kind of thing. So which way do you prefer to go? To keep stuff in here or to leave it off.

Senator Nikolaou: It seems there are too many things.

Senator Kalter: It seems there are too many things?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. Especially because we have the Sabbatical Leave which is going to get questions for sure. And then we have the Engineering which we were not even close to finishing up in the Caucus.

Senator Kalter: Right. Okay.

Senator Horst: I would say that the Sabbatical Leave policies, which I think they’re needed, aren’t as urgent as the Leave of Absence policy. The people that came to the committee that Dimitrios is chairing pointed out that this is a real hole in our set of policies regarding students. And right now, they would have to withdrawal, and there’s a lot of hardship situations that this will fix. And this is a brand new policy, so I would advocate that this take priority over the Sabbatical.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. We were hoping, actually, to get it done last spring, and it got sent back for discussion, so I would agree with that. So, in other words, to at least try to leave it on even if we end up running out of time?

Senator Mainieri: I agree with that as well, in particular, we just know that the agendas going to get more and more crowded because things are going to start coming out of committees.

Senator Kalter: Right. So, the more we delay, the worse it will get.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. So, I think leaving it on, so if we have time to get to it, it’s at least there.

Senator Kalter: What about the Transfer policies? Leave those on because they were moving toward Action?

Senator Mainieri: We’re not anticipating a ton of discussion, right? I mean, there wasn’t a ton of discussion as an Information Item.

Senator Kalter: Right.

Senator Ferrence: So I’m curious. I mean we don’t really vet the things here, like, when I look at the Sabbatical, there are some things in the new language that just don’t make sense to me. Like, how can you apply five years after your previous sabbatical when in the same sentence you’re not allowed to have two within seven years? They seem to be mutually exclusive right in the language that’s proposed.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. I had that too.

Senator Kalter: I think what they were trying to do there was, like, let’s say that you take a sabbatical, instead of taking it in your seventh year you take it in your 12th year for the first time, I don’t know why that would happen, but let’s just say that that happened.

Provost Murphy: A lot of people don’t take sabbaticals.

Senator Ferrence: Yeah. Sure.

Senator Marx: I have yet to take one.

Provost Murphy: Yeah. I’m here 33 years, I’ve never had a sabbatical.

Senator Kalter: So let’s say that that’s the case, and then you want to try to start catching up, right. And so they were trying to move the clock forward so you don’t have to wait seven years since your…

Senator Ferrence: I understand but in the very same sentence then, it says you can’t have more than one in a seven year period. So how can you apply for one five years after the last, when it’s impossible to be approved for it until seven years later?

Senator Kalter: So if you have one in your 12th year, you could have one in your 17th or 18th year, right?

Senator Ferrence: Not according to that sentence. Because it says during no seven… Oh, I see, you’re saying that seven years is from when you’ve arrived as opposed to a seven year window. See I read these to be seven-year windows, and 14 year windows, as opposed to time of appointment.

Senator Kalter: Gotcha. So but that’s an important thing because it shows what Dimitrios was saying, that there may be a lot of discussion about that. So are we moving then…We’re not really on the approval of the proposed Senate agenda yet, but are we thinking of keeping the Transfer stuff and the Leave of Absence stuff on, and deferring the Sabbatical one to the (whatever that is) October twenty something? Okay. And so then my traditional question is, are there any comments on either the Leave of Absence policy that needs to be talked about here or on the Sabbatical policy?

Senator Horst: The other point I wanted to make about the agenda in general is that we would probably want to invite a guest for the Leave of Absence policy and if we did that, the guest might have to sit there for a while.

Senator Kalter: And if Amy is not going to be here next time…

Senator Nikolaou: Amy’s not there next time, she’s out. So for the Leave of Absence we had John Davenport, and Colbs…

Senator Kalter: That’s right and Sandy Colbs, okay.

Senator Horst: Yes, and she talked about the review process they did with the different policies. I’m just saying she might have to sit there and then not speak.

Senator Nikolaou: We also asked them for if they wanted to give us the JED report, which explains from where did these policies come from. But we haven’t received it yet. So, I don’t know if this is something we want to have for the Senate?

Senator Horst: Or she could explain it saying…

Senator Nikolaou: Or if she’s there, she can just talk about it instead of looking though the whole recommendation.

Senator Horst: This foundation evaluated.

Senator Kalter: I’m not sure I caught that.

Senator Nikolaou: J-E-D. It’s the JED Foundation that made the recommendation to include a Student Leave of Absence because we didn’t have it, and because we called and asked them to give us a background about the history of why do we need the policy, who recommended it, why…And so she said, based on these recommendations, based on which they based the actual policy and said I have it somewhere, so she just needs to figure out where she has the recommendation saved.

Senator Kalter: It’s analogues to the EAB report. In other words, this is the origin of why we’re going this.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah.

Senator Horst: Yeah

Senator Kalter: Okay.

Senator Horst: I mean, she could just state that. Or you could state that.

Senator Nikolaou: Yes, she can talk about it.

Senator Mainieri: Couldn’t you give like an intro to it?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah.

Senator Horst: It was interesting where it actually came from and she did a great job explaining how this is a deficiency.

Senator Kalter: Right. Now the other thing that we can do it rearrange the order of things on the agenda.

Senator Mainieri: I was just about to suggest that.

Senator Kalter: Were you about to say that, Tracy?

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. I’m even thinking do we just move the... Is the one that under the Action Item, all of those things are those as urgent as the Student Leave of Absence?

Senator Kalter: The reason that’s there on this agenda is because the Board of Trustee’s meeting is before the next Senate meeting.

Senator Mainieri: Gotcha.

Senator Kalter: So it seems important to have the Engineering discussion and the Funding Request…

Senator Mainieri: I’m sorry I meant the thing under the Action Item, the one where we’re deleting a whole bunch of policies and putting them together and stuff.

Senator Kalter: The Transfer policy. I personally don’t know if that’s as urgent. Jan, maybe you have a better sense of the Transfer stuff as being urgent or not urgent?

Provost Murphy: I don’t know. I don’t know it’s urgency.

Senator Kalter: But we had just said that we weren’t going to get a lot of debate about that.

Senator Mainieri: Sure. But, at the very least, if we maybe could move the Student Leave of Absence up a little bit.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. What I was thinking about potentially was taking the Action Item and putting it first, then the Leave of Absence, then the discussion, right? That way the people wouldn’t be waiting. We can ask the administrators for their traditional remarks, we can either ask them to be shorter or we can move that down, right. And that way we get that business done first with the guest and then have the discussion, right.

Senator Horst: I like that idea.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. That makes sense.

Senator Kalter: So should we keep the Administrator Remarks where they are or move them down more where the Committee Reports are?

Senator Ferrence: Is there any reason we don’t move the discussion item, the Engineering thing, until after the business has been approved? Because in many cases…

Senator Kalter: That’s what I’m saying.

Senator Ferrence: Oh, that’s what your saying, because that’s the only one that I would move. I think everything else will go fine, it’s just we want to leave as much time for that discussion but not back ourselves into a hard stop for the Action Items that we need.

Senator Kalter: Right. Because in the Caucus we’re going to have Noelle Selkow come, and I don’t want her to be waiting forever, so we are probably going to have to have a hard stop time, like 8:15 or 8:30 or something, I’m not sure which. What’d you say?

Senator Mainieri: Probably 8:30. I mean, just based on…

Senator Kalter: What we heard last time?

Senator Mainieri: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. But yeah, that’s what I was thinking was to have it normal up until that, then do the Action Item first, then do the Leave of Absence, then do the Engineering, and approval, then go to the Committee Reports and those often get cut off. My only remaining question was whether the Administrator Remarks, given that the administrators are also making remarks down at the Engineering part, should they stay where they are or should we do business first and then have their reports? Just this one time, not as a common…

Senator Ferrence: They don’t generally take long unless there’s snow removal involved.

Senator Kalter: Well, that’s what I’m concerned about. We’ve had this discussion, Greg, in this body many times and I’ve always defended having the Administrator Remarks upfront because it’s one of the things that people are really interested in. They want to hear that. They want that chance to have the back and forth and stuff, so I wouldn’t want it to become a habit, but on a night like this one, it’s sort of like does everything get done that needs to get done? And if you have a jaywalking incident or if you have snow removal, it can go on and you don’t want to shut it down, right, because to that person or to that group of people, it’s important.

Senator Horst: And the administrators will be making lots of remarks through their presentation.

Senator Kalter: Right.

Senator Horst: Except for LJ.

Senator Kalter: Except for LJ. Yeah. Exactly. So, I mean, one thing that we could do is ask, Larry, Jan, and Dan to save their remarks and have LJ to have most of that time. In other words, we could leave it where they are, Larry, Jan, and Dan could say we’re going to talk about stuff later on and then have that go a little bit quicker.

Senator Mainieri: I think leave it where they are, and I think the President and Provost and Dan Stephens would all know that they also have other time, but they might have other things that are important to say.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. Exactly.

Senator Mainieri: So I think leave it where it is.

Senator Ferrence: I like leaving it where it is because it at least sets us on the standard rhythm, and then after that, all of the things after Administrator Remarks kind of you feel are somewhat fluid, but that first part of the meeting, sort of that, you know, break the ice, get things…

Senator Mainieri: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: Right. Right. And, Tracy, I didn’t mean to say it on the floor. Can you keep your remarks…

Senator Mainieri: Oh, no, no, no. Not at all. I didn’t think that you were suggesting that.
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Senator Kalter: Okay. All right. So let’s formally propose approval of the Senate agenda.

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

Senator Kalter: There’s only one other thing that I want to do about what we’ve just done is that I think we should put Information/Action Item about Approval of the Operating and Capital Funding Request but have Discussion, not be as an Information/Action Item, right, because it’s not. It’s not an information, or an action, it’s just a discussion.

Senator Horst: Yes.

Senator Kalter: And so maybe just put Discussion Item, or something like that there. Does that sound good to people?

Senator Horst: And put the Approval under the Action Items. The Approval of the Operating and Capital Funding Request or do you want to show that they’re linked?

Senator Kalter: That Information/Action Item is going to have to go after the discussion because in order for people to be informed about the Capital request in particular we’ll have the Engineering discussion and then have the Approval.

Senator Horst: Yeah. But he already did an Information Item, didn’t he?

Senator Kalter: Yeah. Oh, I see. So you mean making it an Action Item but separated from the Transfer one, so that it happens after the Engineering discussion, right?

Senator Horst: Right.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Gotcha.

The motion was unanimously approved.

***Proposal to change the name of the University Curriculum Committee***

Senator Kalter: All right. I’m going to go back to the proposed change of the naming of the University Curriculum Committee. I think this just gets routed out to Rules, which is this year looking at their other changes to their charge. Does that sound right to everybody? Yeah.

Senator Ferrence: I chaired that body and have wondered ever since I was on that body why it wasn’t called the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.

Senator Kalter: Why it wasn’t… yes. Right. Good question.

Senator Ferrence: It never made sense to me.

***UCC/ CCC communication with the Senate***

Senator Kalter: Okay. Let’s see. We don’t have much time left, but let me go back to UCC/CCC communication with the Senate. So, as you know, you kind of know the way that consent agenda items have worked in the past. Basically, we get them in our email (Cera and I) and then Cera puts basically the executive summary, the proposal, and the financial implication form all up on the Senate website. So Amy Hurd emailed me over the summer and said they’d like to change it to automate it more. And so we got together a week or two ago, was it, and sort of talked it through because there’s some things in her proposal that won’t quite work for us. Like, we need to have the consent agenda transparent to all of the campus, right. To sort of have that one final, you know, here’s the check. Or like there’s a curriculum proposal that comes through and you say, gosh, I think that somebody in Music Education needs to look at this because it may impact Music Ed but I don’t know anything about it, then you can sort of say to your colleague, can you look at that or something. Now during the curricular process up to this point, there’s been circulation of the proposals and all of that, but we’ve always had this kind of level of transparency. And it’s particularly important for the students because there are very few students who sit on the curriculum committees on the way up, right. So what she had originally proposed was that an email get spit out by the curricular system to every single Senator, and then people would be able to go directly on and propose. One of the concerns I had about that was that Cera needs to then, like we have student Senators coming on and off all the time, we have faculty Senators coming off all the time, so then she would have to be up on that and sort of repairing those misses and stuff. So what I think we’re going to do, we’ve still got to get some word back from Amy a little bit about what the system can and can’t do, but essentially, instead of having the actual PDFs, apparently there’s a concern also about ADA compliance and putting PDFs up on a website, and so the executive summary is essentially embedded into the proposal because it’s the thing that we call the rationale in the proposal, so we’ll point that out to people on the website, right, that if you’re looking for the summary it’s in number four. I think, over the summer, they figured out how to attach the financial implication form to the form, so we’ll be able to click on those and see those, and Cera will put up on the website a kind of boilerplate that says, you know, if you’re looking for that click there, or whatever. And we’ll just have the link to the curricular system up on the website, rather than the actual PDFs and then, after it’s approved, we will archive it, because the Senate also needs to have a stable archive copy of it, right. To sort of say, this has been what’s occurred over the last however many years, and if people need to go back to it, we’ll have that. So I just wanted to let you all know that, because at first it was going to be sort of a major change, right, to have everybody receiving that email that sort of got spit out of the system. We’re probably not going to go in that direction, but I wanted to let you know that there are going to be changes, just to ask, do you see anything wrong with those changes and do you have any other ideas about them?

Senator Ferrence: So what I’m trying to understand is I thought (and maybe I was wrong) that when curricular matters went to consent agenda, anybody in the university community, not just the Senators, could respond and therefore there was a website where anybody, you didn’t even need a ULID to go.

Senator Kalter: Right. Exactly.

Senator Ferrence: In the new system, does that mean that anybody can get into the curricular system to look at this?

Senator Kalter: That is one of the things that Amy’s verifying.

Senator Ferrence: Right. I don’t know how many people do, but you know what I would be worried about is that you could have, I mean, I don’t know that we ever have anybody who doesn’t have a ULID, but you could have say a student who didn’t have authorization to get into the curricular database…

Senator Kalter: That’s a very good question actually, the student side of it.

Senator Ferrence: But we’re saying anybody with a ULID at a minimum should be able to look at these documents, at least that has been the practice as I understand it. Is that any curricular proposal that hit the consent agenda, anybody in the university community could look at it, and if we’re saying that we can’t show it anymore because of ADA then the question is how do you convey that to them.

Senator Kalter: I think if we find out that, for example, students can’t get into it if we put up the hyperlink, we would essentially, Cera would receive the link and download stuff, and put it up the way we’ve been, and then we’d have a line about ADA compliance asking anybody who needs access, where this access does not work for them to contact us. That’s what, the English department office does that, like, with our alumni letter or something like that. Like, if you need a different version of this for disability, you can ask us for it. And so that would still be compliant. I’d have to make sure that that would work, right. I’d have to ask OEOA just to be certain that that would work. So in other word, we would keep it even more the way it’s been.

Senator Ferrence: I’ve never done it. So what is the normal trigger if I were just a regular member of the community, looked at the consent agenda and went, wow, I can’t believe they’re doing this, I’d really like to see this discussed. What would I need to do to trigger that to be pulled from the consent agenda?

Senator Kalter: Contact a Senator.

Senator Ferrence: Any Senator could do it?

Senator Kalter: But we do not notify all faculty, staff, and students that the things are just sitting there, so you’d have to be someone who’s monitoring that. Right.

Senator Ferrence: Well, and I think some people do a little. Although, I think years ago more people did.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. And I mean, theoretically if you’re a Senator perhaps you’re sending it out to your constituency and saying, hey, there’s something on the consent agenda if you want to look at it.

Senator Ferrence: You say that, but like in my college, I’ve never been given a constituents list so I don’t really have any way to communicate with my constituents. The College of Arts and Sciences is large.

Senator Kalter: Right.

Senator Horst: On the flip side people who make those proposals are like where’s my proposal, where is it in the Senate process. And so getting… I say, oh, here you are, you’re on the consent agenda. So it is nice that they can see that final phase happening. And just so I understand, the PDFs can’t go through speak recognition software?

Senator Kalter: I’m not sure I completely understand it. Do you know, David?

Senator Marx: I just looked it up. There are accessibility converters for PDFs.

Senator Kalter: There are?

Senator Marx: There are. I saw at least three that are available.

Senator Kalter: That we can use or that the person on the other end uses?

Senator Marx: I don’t know. They exist. This is what I looked into.

Senator Mainieri: Yes. They do exist.

Senator Marx: To convert a PDF into an accessible document, they are available.

Senator Kalter: What you looked up does it say whether it’s the user that has to do it, or is it the people who posted it?

Senator Marx: Well, it is you can take a PDF and post it online as an accessible document. So that’s fundamentally what we want to do.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. That would be ideal.

Senator Ferrence: So long as we aren’t grabbing the information in the PDF as images and populating it with images instead of actual text.

Senator Marx: Right. I think that’s the main thing. If you have any image, it has to have a description with it. But it’s rare. It’s rare of us to have an image on anything.

Senator Mainieri: I do know that some of those are not super reliable. So I would encourage, if we are going down that route to reach out to Student Access and Accommodations and they will know which ever one is the best one to use.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. Absolutely. They came and did a whole session for the English department about how we as professors can make our stuff more accessible to our students.

Senator Mainieri: So is this new process sufficient enough to address whatever concern was brought up to necessitate a change?

Senator Kalter: I think so. I mean, my initial thing is that the Senators will have to be able to find the executive summary, the financial implication form, and obviously the proposal itself. And it seems like just a minor change to our website model, and Cera obviously sends out the email to everybody alerting them to the fact, and so she can embed something in there as well. I think that will help as a kind of road map, like, the executive summary is here. Right. The financial implication form is here, or what have you. And so that seems like it will suffice.

Senator Horst: And we’ll log into the system to get the documents?

Senator Kalter: Right. I’m trying to remember, Greg, do you have to do a ULID password entry into that? Because I know that I’ve looked at other people’s proposals online.

Senator Ferrence: I don’t know. I haven’t been on the curriculum…

Senator Marx: Yes. You need the ULID password.

Senator Horst: They set up an account for you. Like, you get an account with your ULID but you get an account on the system.

Senator Kalter: Right. So I guess the difference there for the Senate, and I don’t know whether this is important or not, but, like, Western Illinois University would then not be able to look at our curriculum, our consent agenda. Right. So if that is a significant loss that the general public can’t look at it then we need to talk about that.

Senator Horst: It is Senate business.

Senator Kalter: Open Meetings Act.

Senator Horst: So it should be an Open Meetings Act.

Senator Kalter: Right. Now, Open Meetings Act, I’m pretty sure, does not require you to post things on the website, it just requires you to make them accessible. Right. So in other words people can call up and say, I want a copy of that or what have you.

Senator Mainieri: Okay. So maybe that could be something on the website that if you’re someone who doesn’t have access to this system and you’re wanting it here’s who to contact.

Senator Horst: Contact the Senate office.

Senator Kalter: Right. Exactly. Okay. I think I’m going to skip the Emergency Response because Sami just left, and so I wanted to make sure that at least one student was here for that. So we are at the end of our agenda for now. We’ll push that one forward to next time.

***Adjournment***

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