**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

**MONDAY, October 14, 2019**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

Academic Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

***Oral Communications:***

***Emergency Response Training for students and faculty***Senator Kalter: We’ve got a short agenda but we have… Senator Ferrence is here so he can make long.

Senator Ferrence: Ouch.

Senator Kalter: If he wishes, as he did last time.

Senator Ferrence: I don’t want to get too much of a reputation.

Senator Kalter: So we’ll start with the Oral Communication. This is a carryover from two weeks ago. The Emergency Response Training, there are two parts of this. And I put this on here because my department had their annual Emergency Response Training as a department and I realized that, you know, last year we did a whole bunch, like Aaron Woodruff and Eric Hodges did a whole bunch of faculty emergency training stuff. Fabulous. I don’t know how many of you went to those but they were just great. When I asked the woman who came from EHS at our department meeting about when the next ones where scheduled for she said there’s one in April, and I’m just wondering…

[Senator Phillips and Senator Woody enter]

Senator Kalter: I’m just wondering and this sort of is a question for you, Larry. If… I don’t think it’s necessary to have the multiple ones every fall semester, but I wonder if we can have at least one early in fall semester every year? Of the type that they were giving, because I think that the EHS person was talking more about those really big ones where they stage a real incident, and all of that kind of stuff. But I think it would be helpful for faculty to have refreshers. And I certainly would go to one every year, if they offered one, if my schedule permitted.

So that was the first part of that. Hello and welcome. So we have it on the record, we have Senator Woody…

Senator Woody: Yes.

Senator Kalter: Is substituting for Kiana McClellan. Terrific. So that was one part of it and then we also talked in Exec, I think, a year ago or so, about students feeling like they did not have enough training for Emergency Response, and I wanted to ask the SGA members if you know where that is? Has there been change in that? This is Emergency Response Training that we’re talking about. And I think, Senator Campbell and Senator Phillips, you guys might have been in on that conversation.

Senator Phillips: Emergency response. This is going to sound dumb, and I’m just kind of muddy in the brain right now, but emergency response as in like if a disaster were to happen?

Senator Kalter: Disaster.

Senator Marx: Active shooter.

Senator Kalter: I was going to say hurricane but tornado, active shooter. You know, things like that.

Senator Phillips: I don’t know, in terms of like additional training came across us or anything like that.

Senator Campbell: Not that I … I don’t think that was last year’s Exec. It might have been two years ago.

Senator Kalter: Maybe it was the year before. Maybe what happened was that the year before we had that, and then you guys were on last year and we went to the Emergency Operations Center…

Senator Campbell: We did do that last year.

Senator Phillips: Yeah. I remember that.

Senator Kalter: Because of that conversation. So maybe what you guys could do is go back into SGA and talk about, like, where are we. How do people feel about Active Shooter Response Training and other types of emergency response? And do the students in general on the campus feel like they’re getting enough of it, and that kind of thing? And then bring that back to us to let us know where that is. Does that sound good?

Senator Campbell: Definitely.

President Dietz: Would it be helpful as kind of a memory jogger if Eric provided a listing of things that he’s done, maybe for the last year or so? In various audiences?

Senator Kalter: Yeah. That might be helpful actually, especially as regards to students. Because I think… I think that the faculty part is…I think we kind of have a better understanding of that, right, than about how the students… especially because the student population is so large. That would be great. Thank you, Larry.

President Dietz: But on the faculty thing, let me clarify what you want me to do on that?

Senator Kalter: What we were talking about in the department was early fall, the kinds of sessions that Eric and Aaron were doing in fall semester last year, but only a couple of them, because we don’t need the whole panoply of it, I don’t think. But having it early enough in fall so that when people are just getting into their classrooms, they have it on their awareness screens, and that kind of thing. I’m trying to get those as an annual early fall kind of event.

Senator Horst: Or a new faculty training.

Senator Kalter: And a new faculty training. I think they might already do a new faculty training but that would be helpful too.

President Dietz: All right.

Senator Kalter: But as they will know, as they will tell us, the having it repeated is not a problem because you forget.

President Dietz: Okay.

***Distributed Communications:***

***10.03.19.02 From Academic Affairs Committee: Student Leave Of Absence policy Mark Up (Action Item 11/6/19)***

***10.03.19.03 From Academic Affairs Committee: Student Leave Of Absence policy CLEAN COPY (Action Item 11/6/19)***

Senator Kalter: Awesome. All right. We move to Distributed Communications. And the first two are obviously related to the approval of the proposed Senate agenda. So as of noon on Thursday when our deadline is, I think we only had the Student Leave of Absence policy and we still have a question out there about whether or not Academic Affairs Committee needed more time to… We actually had almost a half an hours’ worth of conversation on the Senate floor about this. So we wanted to not put it on the proposed agenda until we talked to Senator Nikolaou about whether you are ready to put it on a Senate agenda. And then since we have an opportunity to cancel both Senate and Caucus, and given that we went until quarter to 10 last time, maybe it would be a good idea to cancel Senate and Caucus and give the committees some more time to work. So do you… are you ready and do you feel like it needs to go through next week, or can we wait two weeks?

Senator Nikolaou: Well, it seems that one of the main questions was for the plan of study. If this means that they are out of the program. So I… and because we said we were going to talk about in the Exec, I added a sentence to see if that’s going to capture what some of the students were concerned about. So I put, well… [Passing out new document]. So I added a sentence which says, “Students who are granted a leave of absence will not lose their spot or position in the program within the Department/School they were admitted to upon completion of the approved leave of absence term.” So… and obviously feel free to make any accommodations for changes in the wording. But this, I was just trying to clarify that there may be changes in courses that students might take if they do the leave of absence, but they’re not going to be denied staying in their program once they are back. Then for this… if a student’s going to be allowed to be part of the committee, we said that it might… it’s probably a FERPA problem. But then someone also asked what if the student gives permission to another student to attend. So maybe I thought that the last bullet point could allow for this possibility, if we just remove the expertise, and we say, “up to five other representatives as needed per case, which may include but not limited to…” and we list the main ones that we thought that they are going to be always the case, but then if we have a student who wants to have a student with them and they give permission, they would not be excluded based on the last bullet point, because we say these are the ones we suggest but there may be other representatives. And I also looked for the link that you ask for the leave of absence form. So I emailed John and said there is no such form because there’s no policy. So they said we’re waiting for the policy and then we’re going to create the form.

Senator Ferrence: So the one thing that confuses me about this is it certainly looks like the committee is an annual committee. So if you have this student, how can we be assured that any student in the same year is going to have the same student they want as their representative, because it’s not saying that the committee is convened for each individual case, the committee looks like it’s a committee that’s convened for the year. So it seems awkward then that one individual student who’s coming before the committee gets a member on the committee.

Senator Horst: Yeah. I was just thinking you could just say a student advocate may be brought to them.

Senator Ferrence: I mean I can see they have a representative, but to be a member of the committee suggests that student would serve for the whole term of the year.

Senator Nikolaou: And based on the last bullet point, it’s not that everyone’s going to be needed for all cases. Because, for example, Noelle, the Director of the Grad School, is going to be present only when there are grad students.

Senator Ferrence: Oh. I see.

Senator Nikolaou: The student… a representative from the Student Access and Accommodation is going to be present only if we have a student with specific accommodations. So it might be that no one from the five is present. There are going to be the four core people and then if there is a specific case that calls for the advisor because the student may fall really behind, then they have the flexibility to invite the advisor. That’s what Sandy and John said when we met with them, that they wanted some flexibility with people that may provide more expertise.

Senator Horst: But you know we can work this out in Senate, that our committee, the wording. I do think though the committee does need time to just shape the policy based on the feedback from the Senate.

Senator Mainieri: Um-hum.

Senator Horst: So I do think it is a good idea to have Academic Affairs…

Senator Mainieri: Talk about it.

Senator Horst: Talk about it a little bit more.

Senator Nikolaou: Sure.

Senator Horst: And I don’t think it will take that long.

Senator Kalter: There are a couple things I’m also… Like I wrote down, I think the students on the Senate were imagining that they are going before a committee and arguing their case. And in reading this over again, I’m not sure that that’s what’s intended. It seems as though the papers towards the leave of absence are being reviewed by a committee, not an interview with the student. So maybe that’s part of the issue that needs to be worked out, is what is the committee actually doing, and are students actually being expected when they’re in their worse time of their whole lives, as somebody said, are they expected to go in front of up to nine people? I don’t think that we would ask that. And then I’m also a little, I think that Lisa may need to let us know whether, even if a student voluntarily sat on the committee with the permission of the student in question, would we be able to protect that person legally if, for example, something went badly, and the student who gets the leave of absence decides that they’re going to sue the student on the committee. Would they be indemnified or not, since they’re working for the university or not, in that example? And what would happen, also, if you had some committees needing all nine of the representatives, and so there’s no room for a student, and then others where you have students could sit, right. So just some questions Academic Affairs may need to pan through.

Senator Mainieri: It did seem to me, in the discussion of the students, that having someone outside of the committee as a support resource was something that I think I was hearing from the comments. And I don’t know if you’ve been following the case at Stanford about their leave of absence policy, but there is a lawsuit that just happened and was settled. And one thing that they added to theirs was having… The university having the ability to provide a resource person outside of the proceedings that the student could use to help them navigate this process, so it’s something that stood out to me. I was just reading in The Chronicle thing about it last week. That’s one of the things that stood out to me from that particular case. The other two things that stood out, that I just want to mention, and this is probably for the next policy review, is they included two business days for the student to change their mind about the leave once it was decided.

Senator Horst: I’m sorry, can you repeat that?

Senator Mainieri: They included something that the student had two business days to change their mind about the leave; just to make sure that it was really voluntary. And then one other thing that came up was housing. And students, if they decided to do their leave in the middle of the semester, whether or not they’d have access to housing, to protect students who have housing insecurity. And so those were the two other items that stood out to me that, again, probably for the next policy review, that I just wanted to mention.

Senator Kalter: Two business days seems pretty small, actually.

Senator Mainieri: The lawsuit was about students feeling like even though they were put on voluntary leave, that it felt more like involuntary leave. And so that was one of the terms that the university agreed to.

Provost Murphy: Yeah. And that case was it students… in this case it’s students requesting the leave of absence, but would that have been true there, but students felt coerced into requesting that? I understand. I understand.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. They would like go to… to just get advice and then it was suggested…

Provost Murphy: Kind of snowballed. Yep. I hear you.

Senator Mainieri: And snowballed, and that sort of thing.

Senator Kalter: I don’t really know how these things work, but it seems like we could give them a week. Like five days.

Senator Mainieri: Sure. Sure. It was just that kind of period for the student to choose not to do the leave seemed like something that was important. I just wanted to mention those two things.

Senator Kalter: Did anyone else have anything on any of that? The stuff I wrote down, so Cera sent you John Baur’s email where he had asked Noelle Selkow about the grad thing, that I think Senator Ferrence brought up. And then I think that when Senator Solebo brought up do we need an appeal process, I think that got answered on the floor that it was not really thought of as a process that would have needed an appeal, because it would be almost always said yes to, it’s just a matter of, like, do you have documentation. Are people in agreement that that one was kind of taken care of?

Senator Mainieri: But perhaps her even bringing it up means that something in here should reflect that this process is really just a process for the student to take the leave, not the student to decide whether or not they’re eligible for a leave. Just something more clear that that’s the intent of this policy. That was a question that came up.

Senator Horst: The student may request. The student may request a leave.

Senator Mainieri: And I understand. But the fact that the question even came up, and this idea about the committee, and is the committee reviewing and determining you’re eligible and you’re not eligible, it seemed to be that several questions were hovering around that idea. And this policy isn’t designed to adjudicate, it’s more designed just to allow the student to take a leave if that’s what they need to do.

Senator Phillips: Because the best thing I had when I like read this… to like initially understand it was like, both my first two years here I requested a housing exemption, so like something obviously that can go like yes or no. So for me, when I thought of like requesting something, the chance that you’re not going to get it is a very like real one. So I think that’s maybe why that got brought up.

Senator Kalter: So, it sounds, Senator Phillips, like you’re saying that maybe that needs to be discussed in Academic Affairs a little bit. In other words, if the policy is giving the perception that an appeal would even be necessary.

Senator Phillips: Or added to it.

Senator Campbell: I agree. I think there could just be language that clarifies that. I just think the existence of a committee in general probably signifies to someone reading this casually, that doesn’t have the insight that we do. Like if a student is trying to find out what the process is like, the existence of a committee in general without it being stated that it’s not like a yes or no appeals process might make it feel like it is. If that makes sense to folks.

Senator Kalter: Okay. So it sounds like we’re not going to put that on the agenda for next time. Perfect.

***04.02.16.01 From Faculty Affairs Committee: Policy 3.2.8 Sabbatical Leave policy Current Copy (Information Item 11/6/19)***

***10.11.19.06 From Faculty Affairs Committee: Policy 3.2.8 Sabbatical Leave policy Mark Up (Information Item 11/6/19)***

***10.11.19.05 From Faculty Affairs Committee: Policy 3.2.8 Sabbatical Leave policy Clean Copy (Information Item 11/6/19)***

Senator Kalter: The Sabbatical Leave policy, I think, came in later than the deadline, and so if we… I’m not sure which, maybe we should talk about them all at the same time. Do we want to put Sabbatical Leave on the November 6 agenda? Do we want to put it…? Do we want to have a Senate meeting just to talk about sabbaticals? I would sort of say no to that one, personally, because our sabbatical requests were due September 15th, I think it was. And so anything we do from here to May is going to be in place for the next round. Does anybody want to say anything about the Sabbatical Leave policy?

Senator Horst: I had some questions about… You sent us a new draft, right?

David Marx: Um-hum.

Senator Horst: And so that’s just more questions for the floor of what made them change some of the wording. But I don’t have any other questions now.

Senator Kalter: You’re going to save it for the floor?

Senator Horst: But I agree with you that the opportunity for the committees to do their work in a longer timeframe sounds like it would be very helpful.

Senator Nikolaou: I had… The main question was between the two drafts. Because it seems like in the new draft, they have totally removed the option where it was saying that you can get two sabbaticals within 14 years, even if they’re not seven years apart.

Senator Kalter: Um-hum.

Senator Nikolaou: So it seems that this one is totally scratched out. So I was wondering, since we didn’t talk about it on the floor, how it moved from that possibility, to being totally out of the question right now. Because there was a big change.

Senator Horst: Yeah. That’s my question too for the floor.

Senator Mainieri: Um-hum.

Senator Marx: Right. We were saying it wasn’t clear before, but I think they clarified it.

Senator Kalter: They changed it, I think.

Senator Marx: Yes.

Senator Kalter: Right? Or did they just clarify it?

Senator Nikolaou: I think they… I think it’s back to how it was that seven years, and then you wait another seven years. So it doesn’t allow, let’s say I got it in my ninth year, I cannot take it in my 14th year, so that I can have my two sabbaticals in the 14-year period.

Provost Murphy: Right. I think the intent is that you wouldn’t have one more often than seven years. I think the exception we were looking at is if you didn’t take a sabbatical, I know that’s a bit of a different… but I think the idea is that you wouldn’t get… it’s not two every 14 years, it’s one every seven years.

Senator Marx: Right.

Provost Murphy: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. So what their change two weeks ago had read was that if you had gotten what we were calling off schedule, right. If you had had, for example, to take your first sabbatical in year eight instead of year seven, that you could squeeze that timeline just a little bit in order to get back on track, but you couldn’t go more than… You couldn’t have any sabbatical closer than five years to the last one, and if you were already on track, you couldn’t squeeze that…

Senator Marx: Right.

Senator Kalter: It would still have to be seven years. It’s just in that case where people get off track.

Senator Ferrence: So…. Because the packet I received in my mail this morning was 10.11.19.02 clean copy. Is that older than what we’re talking about right now?

Ms. Hazelrigg: Yes. Because I got changes on Friday morning. I sent them out in the packets, and then the chair had said, Oh no, I sent you the wrong copy. And so that was the second email that you guys got on Friday. So the one towards the end of the day on Friday was the newest copy of this.

Senator Ferrence: I just naively took the stuff out of my mailbox this morning and assumed it was newest.

Ms. Hazelrigg: Sorry.

Senator Kalter: I kind of agree with Senator Horst. So back in 2015-2016 or so Faculty Affairs Committee, which was totally different members, agreed with the original thing that we got two weeks ago, and now we’ve got a change. So I think that the whole Senate needs to debate the difference between what we have in front of us today, which took out that change, and the several Senators that wanted it in. And so, you know, I think at the Information Stage if somebody, you know… I don’t think it’s… I think we should talk about it at the Information stage, and then, if somebody wants to offer it as an amendment, we can then debate it at the Action stage, and somebody could bring wording that says… that brings back the other language from two weeks ago, and have us debate that as a Senate. So does everybody feel comfortable with that?

Senator Mainieri: Um-Hum.

Senator Marx: Sure.

Senator Kalter: Just having it batted out on the floor.

Senator Nikolaou: So we will distribute both the two weeks and the current one?

Senator Kalter: It would have to be brought up verbally at the Information stage, and then preferably if somebody, because we have a lot of time, preferably if there were a motion to amend even after hearing Faculty Affairs Committee’s reasoning this year. Preferably, it would be in writing in some way, right, so that people could read the suggested amendment, and then have something, come in ready to debate it, essentially. Yeah. All right. Sound good?

Senator Kalter: All right. Actually, I’m going to skip over the debriefing to go to the approval of the Senate agenda and then come back.

***\*\*Approval of Proposed Senate Agenda for 10/23/19 – See pages below\*\****

***~~Proposed~~* ~~Academic Senate Meeting Agenda~~**

**~~Wednesday, October 23, 2019~~**

**~~7:00 P.M.~~**

**~~OLD MAIN ROOM, BONE STUDENT CENTER~~**

***~~Call to Order~~***

***~~Roll Call~~***

***~~Chairperson's Remarks~~***

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

***~~Administrators' Remarks~~***

* ***~~President Larry Dietz~~***
* ***~~Provost Jan Murphy~~***
* ***~~Vice President of Student Affairs Levester Johnson~~***
* ***~~Vice President of Finance and Planning Dan Stephens~~***

***~~Advisory Items:~~***

***~~Action Items:~~***

***~~Information Items:~~***

***~~Consent Agenda Items:~~***

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

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

***~~Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Crowley~~***

***~~Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Mainieri~~***

***~~Rules Committee: Senator Seeman~~***

***~~Communications~~***

***~~Adjournment~~***

Motion by Senator Horst, seconded by Senator Mainieri, to approve the proposed Senate agenda. The motion was unanimously approved.

***Debriefing Senate meeting of 10/9/19:***

***10.10.19.01 Email from Senator Isaac Hollis***

***From Senator Kalter:*** <https://www.aclu.org/other/speech-campus>  
***From Senator Kalter:*** <https://diverseeducation.com/article/133611/>  
***From Senator Kalter:*** <https://deanofstudents.illinoisstate.edu/conflict/conduct/code/>  
Senator Kalter: So let’s go back to debriefing. You have Senator Hollis’ email, and then I sent some things that have to do with the speech debate, just for everyone’s information. Just wondered if people wanted to talk about it. It seemed like an appropriate thing to do after a two and a half, two and three quarters meeting. Tough meeting.

Senator Mainieri: I wonder if we could just be updated on what’s happening right now, in terms of meetings happening with students and things like that.

President Dietz: I met with Samiat on Thursday morning, and we talked for quite a long period of time, and agreed to meet this week. A meeting has been scheduled, and we thought it would be better to have a small group, and she was determining what group of students would be in that small group, and I made suggestions of staff that would be in that group. Provost Murphy would be one of those. Vice President Johnson will be one of those. Doris Houston who chaired the Campus Climate Task Force, I forget all those...

Provost Murphy: John.

President Dietz: John Davenport, Dean of Students and Christa Platt in Diversity Advocacy, I think, was the group that I talked with her about, she seemed to be agreeable to that. Spoke to Sarah Aguilar last night, and she was going to be a part of that too, but I have not heard from Samiat as to who the rest of the folks might be. But that’s tentatively scheduled for this Wednesday.

Senator Mainieri: Thank you.

Senator Campbell: So just a question on that, so are you kind of leaving the students that are invited solely up to Sami?

President Dietz: Yeah.

Senator Campbell: Okay.

President Dietz: And what I wanted to do was to try to get back into the shared governance process, but that was going to be part of the Wednesday meeting (inaudible) talk more about.

Senator Kalter: So I listened to the recording over the weekend. Very difficult. I was crying the entire time listening to it, and then I went and I took notes, and went back through, and I found about… There is a lot of stuff that is outside of the Senate, right, Housing and stuff like that. But the things that I wrote down that have anything to do with Senate or things that faculty need to pay attention to in particular. A couple times the decline in graduation rates was mentioned. Senator Phillips had actually asked for some data about that like a couple days before the meeting, and so I’ve asked PRPA if they could just take the Factbooks and give us that longitudinally over several years, because I started to go back and do that myself and then realized that I didn’t want to make mistakes about comparing apples and oranges on the… because the old Factbooks look different from the new Factbooks and stuff like that. And told them that the deadline was flexible, they always ask you what your deadline is, and I was like, well, here’s when we’d like it, but you know, whenever.

So that was the first thing, the second thing was, can the public verbally target and harass specific students, and that came out of the mention of brother Jeb or Jed or whatever his name is. And it sort of has to do with spaces on campus. The third one had to do with classroom microaggressions. The fourth one had to do with the Student Code, hate speech, free speech, and the timeline for making changes to the Student Code. So last year when Senator Breland was on this committee, we had talked about sending the Student Code committee a request to look into putting hate crimes into the Student Code, but not a prohibition against hate speech, which is a different level of discussion. The fifth thing was, I think it was Senator McClellan asked, how do hiring processes assess implicit bias of administrators and educators that we hire; and I would say also, even though it wasn’t mentioned, that pertains to graduate admissions, and people who are graduate students who are in our classrooms, and then undergraduate teaching assistants as well. The 2020 election. And the IDEAS course, which I think we might want to talk a little bit about here. And then, even though it was only briefly brought up, but the whole thing that was underlying… or that was the catalyst, I should say, not underlying, but the catalyst to the protest has to do basically with the facilities use issues that Administrative Affairs and Budget is looking at.

So, last year, the President convened a task force to look at our policies on facilities use, and met all year--Senator Marx and Senator Horst were on that for a while, and I was on it, and Senator Haugo—and it’s going right now through the Senate processes to sort of consolidate and update various things. And that was actually driven by free speech concerns around the nation, but obviously is related to Black Homecoming Committee and that kind of thing. So just wanted to put those out there. I don’t know if anyone else heard anything else that pertains to Senate. And some of these are marginally pertaining to Senate, in the sense that we don’t, in terms of hiring, as the President said, that’s very decentralized, and so the Senate can talk about it, but it’s more a thing in the departments.

Senator Mainieri: Search committee training, though is centralized.

Senator Kalter: Yeah.

(Um-hum all around)

Senator Mainieri: I’d say, to the retention point, I think the retention of our minority students, but also faculty, I think, could be added to that too. I think that came up a couple times in the discussion.

Senator Horst: But I do want to commend you, Susan, for just—I said this to you in person but—balancing the needs of the Senate, and the agenda that we had, the very important agenda that we had in front of us, with also accommodating the public. That was great work.

Senator Kalter: Thanks.

Senator Horst: And I… it was a very difficult meeting, but ultimately there are a couple of things that the Senate in particular can work on that do fall in our purview. You certainly mentioned them. We had a discussion about the facilities task force, and looking at how they make their decisions.

Provost Murphy: For each of those areas, those are things that we’ll talk with the group about on Wednesday. But we’re glad to, you know, folks from my office are glad to meet at any time with groups from the Senate, the Faculty Caucus, to talk about kind of what we’ve done. How we’re going to try to reframe some of what we’re doing based on what we heard Wednesday night. I think we… you know when we think about things like retention and graduation rates, Amy Hurd, Katy Killian from Student Affairs, Jana Albrecht work consistently on that, and we’re planning, we have a position description for somebody to hire to come in, and continue their work, and have that be their job. You know the classroom issue, that’s kind of what we’ve hired Yojanna to do and we have a pretty thorough plan looking at a lot of diversity and inclusion, but what I heard Wednesday night is that we need to reframe that a bit and think about anti-racism training and microaggression. So she’s going to start working on layering another level of professional development for our faculty and our administrators in those areas. So each of the things we heard Wednesday night will allow us to continue the work we’re doing, but certainly refocus it. You know, we heard what the students were saying, and know that we have a lot of work to do. But at any time we’re glad… we’d like to be a part of these conversations, and make sure that, you know, kind of what we’ve done so far, and welcome any thoughts, and any ideas, on things that we can do differently or do better.

President Dietz: I would echo a lot of what Provost Murphy has said. One of the things that I think to me became very clear is that the diversity and inclusion value, there are a lot of activities that have happened around that, but the racism piece really came through loud and clear. And so I hope that on Wednesday that we can sit down and talk about that very specifically. And the units that were identified as students having trouble in, develop some very specific responses to that. I continue to believe that all of us think, and I hope we do, that this is our university. It’s ours. It’s the faculty, staff, the students. The community has a role. The board has a role. Alums have a role. Etc. But it’s an important time for us, in my estimation, to work together to help redefine what our institution should be. And I’m committed to that. I hope everybody can move in that direction. I’m optimistic, I guess.

Senator Mainieri: One of the things that struck me about the discussion, and one of the things that I find myself doing, and I feel like we do it a lot on campus is say diversity and inclusion, together in one breath. And I think that we heard from the students that separating those two ideas out could be a useful exercise for us. And so I wonder, moving forward and obviously we have a new Strategic Plan, but I wonder if we should stop lumping those two things together.

President Dietz: Okay.

Senator Mainieri: Diversity is one type of initiative on this campus, but inclusion deserves its own focus as opposed to…

President Dietz: And that racism just flat won’t be tolerated.

Senator Mainieri: Right.

President Dietz: If we find that, we’ll do our best to root it out.

Senator Mainieri: Right.

President Dietz: There’s no place in society, but there’s certainly no place on a university campus. To the extent that we know about that, we all work hard to eliminate that. But it’s an interesting point, because I think that the thought process and as you look at the, kind of the evolution of that, diversity was the first thing that happened, and then people wanted to be included in it, so they just automatically put them together. But they ‘re… it bears discussion about whether or not that was a good idea.

Senator Horst: One item I think that was brought up that’s not under the Senate purview is I think there was a difficulty with how the police were engaging people, and I think there was a call to look into that.

President Dietz: Yep.

Provost Murphy: Um-hum. Agreed.

Senator Marx: Um-hum. Yeah.

President Dietz: I heard police issues, housing issues, mental health issues, mentoring support staff kinds of issues, OEOA, and those are ones that just come to the top of my mind. And so all of those could be addressed.

Senator Ferrence: I heard, the toughest one that was really resonating with me, because I didn’t get it until late into the conversation and our… there’s the things that OEOA would address, right, but then it’s the insidious stuff that leads to the mental health. It’s that walking across campus, and thinking that the person you’re walking by may be thinking a certain way or not thinking a certain way, because you had just enough incidences where you’re darn sure that somebody was insinuating something to you, but you have nothing that’s provable. And that to me is the really, really hard one to crack…

Provost Murphy: It could be.

Senator Ferrence: Because no amount of policies…

Provost Murphy: No, that’s culture.

Senator Ferrence: Can stop other human…, it’s culture, right. And I was saying to one of my colleagues, you know, the American Chemical Society has gone through a big process over the last, really, decade, a little bit more now, because of an incident where somebody who had recently graduated, but then was hired as a laboratory technician at UCLA was killed in the laboratory. And the PI basically said, well, you’re supposed to train yourself, and got charged with murder, involuntary manslaughter because it was, like, no, the PI is responsible for a certain level of training. And it really changed the culture, so the term we’ve been using is safety culture within Chemistry of saying, you know, you have to… It’s not so much the rules weren’t there, it was that the culture was, well duh, everybody knows better than that. If you kill yourself in the lab that’s on you not on me, kind of thing, and that’s really changed. And it’s that culture, and it’s a hard process because it’s… you know, and I was thinking, does it mean a special colored ribbon around campus, you know, just to be calling it out. Because it’s the insidious stuff that at the end of the day I heard them saying, you know, they kind of, aside from some of the policing issues, like some of the things in Watterson, like we don’t want to be putting 24/7 security cameras, and even there, if somebody gives you an eyebrow even caught on a video camera, that’s not provable as a racist act, but it certainly can make somebody feel miserable. And so it’s that culture part that’s such a hard one to crack, that was really the part I found myself as the white male resonating with, I’m going, wow, I had no idea. I don’t see it normally.

Senator Mainieri: Another thing that I was thinking about, and Susan, you brought it up toward the end actually, because it came across our table, what, two meetings ago, not the inclusion (what is it called)…

Senator Kalter: The Inclusive Community Response Team.

Senator Mainieri: The Inclusive Community Response Team? Because that seems to be one of the places that students are able to go to if they experience microaggressions and things in classroom. Am I correct in understanding the role of that? And you brought up almost at the very end of the discussion, and it made me wonder how much students know that that team exists, and then it came across our table because it was then folded under Redbird Care Team, and so it just made me think about the discussions that we had in here about that, and it seemed like such a logical thing, and then it seems like that team needs to be more visible.

Senator Kalter: I was actually surprised that Larry and LJ did not bring it up, but I think it was part of the pressure of the whole situation. Right. It’s like how do you respond, how do you remain on your feet when the whole room is so very difficult.

Senator Mainieri: Absolutely. Absolutely.

Senator Horst: But you know Wellness has so much marketing and advertising as to all their different programs. Every time I go to the restroom I’m completely aware of all these initiatives, and wouldn’t it be great if we saw that kind of marketing for this team. That it really became known that this is a resource.

Senator Marx: Right.

Senator Kalter: I think also we have SafeZone for LGBT students, and so we have cards on some people’s offices that they’ve been through that training. We have nothing like that for racial incidents. And so I think one of the things that we know happens across the nation is that, when you hire faculty and staff of color, they get burdened with the mentorship and the sort of emotional care of the students who are going through this. And the students don’t know by looking at some of the other people in their classrooms whether that person is a friendly face, or somebody who’s about to microaggress against them, or some combination thereof, right. So it would be maybe a good idea to try to start decentralizing ICRT, especially if it’s not easy to publicize, and to sort of say we’re going to start some intentional voluntary training of faculty/ staff to give students more points of access to a person to just listen to them. Because unfortunately I wasn’t surprised at anything that was said that night at all, but that’s because this is my field.

So I mean, one of the things that I heard was how we can’t separate the Senate issues from the other issues, because it’s all an interlocking web, right. If somebody is not feeling safe to go to sleep at night, they’re not going to do as well in their classes as another student who has a feeling of security. And then that feeds into perceptions about various types of students that other students have of them. That, you know, the stuff that’s been going on with Affirmative Action since it was first instituted. Well, that person must be here because they’re not really… they didn’t really compete against me to get in. Right? Well, that’s nonsense. I mean when I see students in classrooms and their performance, academic performance, it doesn’t play out at all along racial lines or any other obvious lines. So, you know, that sort of how all of these questions are integrated with each other and integrated with the retention issue, you can’t, we can’t completely separate them all.

I do think that when Academic Affairs talks about the IDEAS initiative--and I started seeing this during the year that they had the open forums--it became very clear that the faculty and staff that was on the task force had a very different view of what that course, or courses, might consist of, than the students who were in the room, and that was also clear in Wednesday night’s meeting. That really needs to be talked through before we move forward with IDEAS, because what many of the students are envisioning is a single course that is very much about this campus, and about the student experience on this campus, and what the faculty created was essentially marshalling existing courses in academic areas that are about the history of either racism, or the history of LGBTQ, or gender relations, or disability, or what have you, and was intentionally actually, among, in that task force spreading out the issues, so that a student could conceivably go through ISU and never have anything about race. And so I think that that’s a very serious discrepancy between what the faculty are thinking is going to be that course, and what the students wanted from that course, and what they’re sort of begging for from us. And whether or not what they’re asking for is something that should be in our academic curriculum, or whether it should be in co-curriculars, or should it be in both, right. Should it be both an academic requirement, and in Housing programming? I would say, you know, that’s probably preferable, because I can’t imagine not having it in Housing programming, and it seems to me that it’s really important on the academic level. That there are things that faculty can bring to that, that can’t be brought into the Housing environment.

Senator Mainieri: Taylor, did you have something… I thought I heard you start saying something.

Senator Philips: It was about the ICRT, just like, because the idea of it is good, and this could be glossing over some of the like nuts and bolts of it, because I’d just had a conversation with JD [John Davenport] about it, and it seemed like if a student had an experience they could come into the ICRT and pretty much like talk about it, but like nothing’s necessarily done. And I know that that’s like the hard thing to solve, but the concern is like things like that task force are good, but also at the same time they can’t be a solution, because at the end of the day like if a student comes in and is like I was called a slur, and you talk with them about it, and how it made them feel, like they still have to like go back to that class, or go see that person again, and like nothing changes about the culture that they were in, or like the situation they were forced to be in and how that experience…

Senator Horst: Certainly, that response team could say, put this in the teaching evaluation. And if that’s in the teaching evaluation, that’s part of the faculty’s… that goes in front of their chair, that goes in front of the committee that write their annual letter. So something can be done.

Senator Ferrence: That’s asking that person to weather the whole semester in that environment.

Senator Horst: Well, that’s true but I’m…

Senator Ferrence: That’s a lot of psychological stress there.

Senator Mainieri: It puts the burden on the student.

Senator Horst: But nonetheless, there is that ultimate…something can be done. You could go to the chair right away.

Senator Marx: That’s not enough.

Senator Mainieri: That puts the burden on the student again.

Senator Kalter: But, we can then have 25 years of documentation with nothing happening. Right.

Senator Phillips: And that was kind of my other concern is like, I’ve not had the experience but I’ve heard on more than one occasion of like faculty who are white using racial slurs in their classrooms. And I understand like academic freedom and in one case they’d even, again like I just heard they said like my chair knows. And so like that’s… I don’t know if there’s a potential balance to be had, or any sort of like recommendations could be made, but like I know in high school my English teacher when we read *To Kill a Mockingbird* she used a slur because she though it would be beneficial for like pretty much the white students in the class to get that like shock or like understand the gravity of it. And like truthfully, maybe that does help some people, but like the hurt that it also can inflict on the people that that was actually directed at, I think, should weigh more than whatever potential like learning experience is trying to be garnered. But I don’t know if that’s like… I don’t know how much you can do with a faculty’s like class.

Senator Kalter: That’s the hardest issue. I mean, I teach 19th century American Literature, and there are African American authors who are using racial slurs for certain reasons, within the novels that they are writing, for some of the same reasons as it might be in, you know, contemporary music. And so, you know, that debate about whether you then, as a professor, use that word in class or refer to it as the n-word or the c-word or what have you, is a raging, raging debate, and very, very difficult.

Senator Phillips: Or again, I know it’s hard to constrain faculty, but like for me if like a certain professor thinks that that’s going to beneficial then like okay. But like if it’s a class that like you’ve got to take, and they teach the only section, I don’t know if it’s possible, but if you like know that that’s going on or that a certain professor insists on like using that language or using that experience, if there could also be like a section offered… I don’t know. It’s really… That’s really like getting super small but just like…

Senator Kalter: I think that, you know the things that I put on the Exec agenda are related to that, because I think that that can also be used to shut down important conversations. So I teach every other year the Introduction to Native American Studies and sometimes teach the Introduction to Ethnic Studies. Some of the material… there is sometimes a backlash against what’s being taught in that class and there are non-minority students who might object to some of the things that get said in that class, and so then that becomes a very difficult site of, when you put in place a prohibition to say certain things, can that then be used against the very same movement, right. And I think in general that’s something that we have to debate about the Student Code, about classroom, you know, classroom atmospheres, I guess you would call…

Senator Phillips: Or maybe not prohibiting, but like removing punishment. Like if you know that there’s going to be a day that you think is going to like hurt your mental health, or like is going to be really hard for you, I have classes that you’re allowed one absence and then the rest like take off your grade. So like if we could maybe do something to where a student if they like meet with their professor about the subject matter, or like do notes by themselves, but they don’t maybe necessarily have to be in class for that. I mean that’s really idiosyncratic for each like student, so I know that it’s hard for the university to mandate or like legislate stuff.

Senator Mainieri: Well, I think, yes, the Student Code will be helpful, but I think it’s also on faculty to set up an environment where those discussions are not harmful, right. Like there are ways to have those discussions in a constructive learning environment where people feel safe, or feel safe to opt out if they need to and then there are places where it just becomes more of a shock and awe thing, which it sounds like your high school experience was. And the second thing I was going to say off that, to kind of to Martha’s point, is if we’re thinking about faculty, and this is more Faculty Caucus purview, obviously, but I mean the second that this becomes part of ASPT is the second faculty will, I mean, the second that not being inclusive as a faculty member is part of the way that faculty are evaluated, that’s when faculty will start to pay attention. And I hate to say that, but I mean that’s one place that the faculty who are resistant to these ideas, that’s one place that is consequential to them. And I think that if it’s a value of our campus, I think right now teaching, yes, is one place that you can get dinged, but diversity would be a small part of that. And so that’s one thing that I… when I was listening to the students, I also took lots and lots of notes, and shared it with my faculty in KNR, and we talked about it, and when it becomes tied to our evaluation, that’s where we get the faculty who would roll their eyes on what happened on Wednesday night.

Provost Murphy: Sam and Yojanna are looking at some examples of different languages at different institutions. And my guess is that they would start with the University Review Committee. Is that correct?

Senator Kalter: University Review Committee.

Provost Murphy: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: Is that what you said? I’m sorry.

Provost Murphy: I said University Review, no, that’s alright. But am I right in thinking that that’s the group that would start to… the faculty group that would start to think about opportunities to look at our ASPT documents and so.

Senator Woody: I think that it’s a small change for faculty if that’s in their curriculum and that’s something that they’re addressing in their topic. I think it’s a small change for them to make to refer to it as like the n-word instead of saying the actual word. That’s a small change you can make, but the impact that that has on the student to say the actual word is something larger. So I think that it’s on the faculty, like you said, create a welcoming environment, because that’s something small that they can do that is going to have a ripple effect, and I think it’s important.

Senator Campbell: I agree. And I’d also say like while it’s great to have those conversations, right, that we need to have that are tough and to like engage into those, there’s also something to be said for the opposite. So it can have a really bad mental effect, right, on students of color. But think about the effect that it can have as like you all as faculty have such a high importance and power in our lives, and for like a white professor to say like the n-word, or something like that or use like a slur in class, what do you think that that shows like other white students, you know what I mean. Like that can be really impressionable, so.

Senator Phillips: Like because academic freedom is important, and it’s always a fine line, but the idea of people that sort of like are not involved in higher ed, or don’t plan to be then like, well I can say these things that in any other setting I would get dinged for, would not be socially acceptable, but if I can sort of like make it part of an academic endeavor then I’m fine to say it. And like I’ve seen kids get embolden with like really problematic things in my class because they’re learning, when whether or not that’s actually their intent is… So yeah I would say that the faculty and like their culture within their classroom is really important to students too.

Senator Campbell: I would agree with Senator Phillips. And like in addition to that, it’s like once you get those conversations rolling, and then you have students that might say like problematic things, and that’s part of the conversation, right, is like you getting those previous notions, or biases, or whatever it is out of those students to see like where they’re at, because everything is a journey, right. Like even us sitting in this room like working on this problem, like we aren’t done like learning different things, right. But like I see a lot, as like the classes I’ve taken specifically in Political Science minors, and I’ve talked to you a lot and folks in like Social Sciences that happens, where like people get to say things that like may be problematic, or might be like offensive towards like other students, whether it’s students of color, LGBTQ students or whatever it is that are in that classroom hearing that, they don’t necessarily get corrected on it, right. So like it is great that they say that, because like you have to get it out of them, and you have to find out where other people are so you can meet them there, but then once you meet them there are you helping them to sort of progress, if that makes sense. Which is something that I think could be, and I mean that’s not something that we can necessarily, again, can legislate, but that’s something we can work on, especially with like the power that you all have like within this room.

Senator Kalter: It seems to me that the best use of the ICRT is when things like that are coming up in classrooms, that they’re supposed to be having a dialogue with the person in question, right.

Senator Campbell: True.

Senator Kalter: Sometimes faculty may be aware of it, sometimes they may not. If they’re aware of it, it’s very likely that they’re going to be highly resistant to a kind of mandatory training, but they might be interested in having a continuing dialogue about the emotional impact, right. And so the question is, how do you find, not something that feels good in the moment to put in place as a policy necessarily, but something that actually works. Something that changes the way faculty approach their classrooms, and how sensitive they are to it, without putting any individual student who came to the ICRT at risk.

Senator Horst: Do we have an incident report from them? Could we see how many cases there are? Get some sort of ideas to the kind of work they do?

Senator Kalter: It’s not our committee so we don’t, we haven’t gotten incident reports from them.

President Dietz: I’d have to check with Dr. Davenport and the rest of the team. I don’t have those numbers.

Senator Horst: How many cases a year they have?

Provost Murphy: But I hear… I hear lots of need for faculty development and opportunities. And I think these will have to be opportunities that go out to the departments and schools. We can’t offer them at CTLT, and hope everybody comes. But it is training about the faculty behavior itself, and microaggressions, but also helping faculty handle conversations that start to occur in their classrooms, and how to manage that, and how to set the right expectations for students. So, you know, again, I think we do have a lot of work to do, and we’ve started some of that, but we’ve got… You know, I think, one of the many things I realized Wednesday night is how much work we have to do, and we’re committed to working, and again we’re open to all suggestions, so if the… Whether it’s fellow faculty or students, we need to get going on this.

Senator Mainieri: Are there faculty in Wednesday’s meeting? I think I heard you say Doris Houston.

President Dietz: Yes.

Senator Mainieri: Okay.

Senator Phillips: I don’t want to sound so attacking, because I recognize y’all are pretty much experts in your field, right, and I can’t speak to what you learn in a teaching major, but like one of my professors was talking about how he never learned how to teach, he just had started doing it and then been doing it ever since. And like in most cases I’m sure, I’m sure that doesn’t have any serious ramifications, right…

Senator Marx: It’s common.

Senator Kalter: It’s quite common, actually.

Senator Phillips: Yeah, but just being open to the idea that something you may think has been conducive to learning actually like may not have been.

Provost Murphy: Oh, absolutely.

President Dietz: Yep. Yep. Good point.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, that’s been a problem with higher ed for a long time. I was very fortunate to be a TA for five years, I think it was, and then a non-tenure line faculty member at three different institutions before I came here. But most people come here, they may have (in my field) have at most one year of being a TA anywhere, and in some cases zero, like they’ve literally never set foot in the classroom until after they’re out of their graduate program. Part of that we don’t have control over. Part of it, hopefully, has always been happening on the hiring end where, like my department very intentionally hires for people who are very into teaching and very into research, not just one, not just the other, but that’s not always helpful. I though what Senator McClellan asked was incredibly interesting, because she didn’t ask whether we were as search committees being trained about implicit biases in who to hire, she was asking whether the people being hired are screened for it by the search committees, and that’s a really important question, to flip that around, and say do you know who it is you’re hiring when it comes to how they feel about various issues.

Senators: Um-Hum.

Senator Campbell: I have a couple of really quick things. So one thing we’ve talked about a lot is the Student Code. So I’ve been talking with Dr. Davenport about that a lot, especially because there’s currently a committee for it right now, because we have to wait for all the Title IX changes and make those accordingly, but I’m sort of confused on how the Code works. So like Dr. Davenport keeps… we keep talking it and he’ll be like well that’s on SGA. SGA, if they want to do something, do something. So what is the process? Obviously, I know that we are a subcommittee of Academic Senate as SGA, what is the process of the Code like undergoing changes and getting approved?

Senator Kalter: Usually what has happened is one thing. What should happen is maybe a different thing, but. Usually, what has happened is that a group of people in the Vice President for Student Affairs. I think the last time was actually led by Dr. Dietz, because he was the Student Affairs Vice President at the time, are looking around the country and in their professional organizations at how are codes changing, and how should they change at various institutions, come up with sets of revisions based both on the conduct process over the last five to ten years and what those places are saying, come up with a set of revisions, and then usually they go through SGA. And SGA then sends them up through us, because of course the Code impacts not just students but faculty and staff, so that’s why it’s a Senate issue. The last time it came, there were a couple things that once it got to the Senate level got sent out to some of the committees (the other internal committees of the Senate), I think it was Rules Committee and Academic Affairs Committee each had a different one (I can’t quite remember), and then it goes to the floor. And then what happened though last time was that, I think it was a year after, or maybe it was the next year after we passed the new Code, there was a petition, or a resolution I guess it was, among Student Government that some of the changes that had happened weren’t enough, right. And so that’s how the ad hoc committee got formed, was part of that resolution was a request to the Senate to form that. Since then I’m really not happy with how it’s gone, and it has nothing to do with us. It has to do with the federal government and Title IX, meaning what’s going on there means that we haven’t been able to make quick progress in that, and just get it back to our normal pace, and who knows if it ever will, frankly. So that’s how it has happened. That’s how it has happened.

Senator Campbell: So if SGA did want to look into some changes, more on obviously on the student end, we wouldn’t have much insight into changing anything on the faculty end or anything like that. That would be, like we would just initiate that?

Senator Kalter: Yeah. As an internal committee, you always have the ability to initiate anything actually. One of the things that you should be aware of about the hate speech thing though, is that we also have an ethic of diversity in terms of political diversity, and we have people watching from the outside who are going to come down on this university on the national level if we go to something that seems to be restricting the First Amendment. So that, I hope, will be part of the debate. Because even if the Senate agreed to put something about hate speech in the Code, the President is sort of in a sense--that’s what the AAUP link was about. Because we’re at a public institution, government should not be excluding, you know, restricting free speech and it would put our President in a very interesting legal position, to know that if signing off on that it may very well bring a lawsuit that we would be likely to lose at the Supreme Court level. So that has to be part of the discussion before it goes, you know, up, all the way up to that level, I would hope that you know… But, yeah, you guys can initiate anything. Absolutely.

Senator Campbell: Awesome.

Senator Horst: And have Legal involved.

Senator Marx: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: That’s a good idea.

President Dietz: I would just simply add that what Senator Kalter talked about, it’s one of the toughest things to do in terms of policy is reviewing that Code. It’s just tough because of all the implications with all of that. But she’s exactly right, we generally try to look at best practices at other campuses, we look at case law and what’s happened with case law, and then more recently these executive orders and such from the federal government that just really change the way all of that works. So sometimes you can do the best job you know how to do logically, base it in logic, and then it can all change at the end, because you’ve got a directive, or you’re waiting on a directive, or something. So it’s a tough nut to crack.

Senator Campbell: One last thing. So we… I know, and I’ve talked to the Students Trustee Sarah Aguilar about it afterwards is the… I have one positive and one negative. So the one negative I had from the last Academic Senate was I do think the flow was really good and we had a good mix, and it was going to be hard for you to predict as chair what that public comment, and what sort of, like the student feedback was going to be, but I think you handled that really well. I mean we did get down to some important business, but I would say that I wish we could have had a different Senate to talk about the Engineering program, and stuff like that. I think that could have been almost an entire Senate meeting on its own and I’ve understood now since talking to Sarah that they’re on a deadline, cause there are certain things they want to discuss at the…what is it next week I think right, they have a meeting for the Trustees. But I’m hoping that we can maybe have like further discussions, and I’m sure we will. So I guess that’s my question, is do we foresee that coming back, like, maybe this semester or next semester?

Senator Kalter: Believe me I would have pushed that off so that it would have its own night, had there not been a Board meeting this week, where we’re supposed to look at the capital requests and the operating requests and give them, give the President approval, so he can say the Senate has approved this and stuff. But yes, I absolutely agree, and if we want to, you know, we could put another discussion on the November 6 meeting, or some other time this year, because I do think that there are more things that both students and faculty want to ask about it. I still had, I mean, I think I put in four more things from what I had put in at Caucus and I still had at least four others that I didn’t say, that I’ve collected from various people. And, yeah, it was unfortunate that we couldn’t have a robust conversation about, as robust a conversation about that as we had originally planned, but we weren’t going to… it was important for the student Senators in particular to be able to voice their concerns directly to Dr. Dietz and to Dr. Johnson, and for that to go on longer than I would ordinarily allow a Q & A to go on.

Senator Campbell: Sure. And then my one positive is just like this, like Senator Mainieri taking down all the notes, and like I love that you went through and listened, and took out what Academic Senate can actually make changes to, because I appreciate that. And I appreciate everyone at the table, especially Dr. Dietz and Provost Murphy for like making sure that it wasn’t just one Senate meeting where a bunch of angry students were like grrrr. I appreciate that we’re actually taking the time to look into changes, and making the university better, and that it wasn’t just one Wednesday meeting that went crazy long, and crazy in depth in conversation, because it’s something we’ve got to talk about, whether students are like currently angry about it or not. It’s just something we always have to work on. So I appreciate everyone at the table for taking the time and the initiative to make sure that we have time to discuss, and time to make good changes and strides. So thank you all.

President Dietz: I’d just like to say how much those comments are appreciated. And things were hard to hear Wednesday night. I think everybody was disappointed. We thought we had a better university on this issue, and a lot of people have worked very hard for that. And clearly we’ve got a lot more work to do, so we’re pledged to do that. I would say that the other difficult part, I would agree with, Senator Kalter navigated the waters as well as I think anybody could, and going from a very raw topic into the Engineering agenda was tough to get people’s mind switched into that. But the timing on that is really dictated by the Illinois Board of Higher Education, because we’ve got to have ours in by the Governor’s office, frankly, because we got to have our Operating and Capital Request in by their timeline, so backing away from that this really needed to happen or we wouldn’t have had a… I would’ve still had to submit something, and I really liked to do that after we’ve had some discussion but we’re…. really good discussions, in my estimation, about Engineering have really come out, questions about the attrition rate, and where do those folks go, because we want to keep them here, and those are very important discussions to have. So more to come. But thanks very much for what you said, we appreciate that.

Senator Ferrence: I would add that you’ve got it… it was in the Senate packet, but having been one that was present, and others can confirm the previous (two weeks prior) the Faculty Caucus had it as an agenda item, and they hit it from a lot of different directions, and you can see it in those transcripts. And if you haven’t read through those I would, and then talk that with the students, because I suspect a lot of the things that the students would have likely brought up last week, not all of them, but a number of them, were brought up by the faculty. Because they hit it from a variety of perspectives so that, you know, if you look at that you might go, okay, so at least people are thinking about it. Because I think people have been thinking about it a lot of different aspects of it, and I thought Susan, you know, I’m like wow, particularly coming back, you know allowing us to do our mini Faculty Caucus to knock out the thing and then opening up the floor again, navigated things well. Because I really felt like people left, and I was a little worried when you said we only had the room until 10 that people were going to revolt, like, what do you mean we only have the room until 10. You’re like, nah, we’re good.

Senator Horst: One thing that I don’t think we talked about at all too much, and it really is a topic for the Board, but I still think we could have an information session on it is this idea of differential tuition because it is really a new idea for a university and I don’t think either Information Session really talked about that topic. So even if we had just a Q and A about how it would work.

Senator Kalter: And I think that even if the faculty brought up things that the student might also have brought up, the students will have a very different perspective on them that we need to hear about that. And differential tuition was definitely one of the things that was in my list of questions that I held back on, because it would have sent us into at least another half hour just on that topic alone, I think.

Senator Horst: But we could even just do that topic.

Senator Kalter: Um-hum.

Senator Mainieri: When I forget in the timeline that was drawn up when campus forums will be happening, is that next semester?

President Dietz: Yeah.

Provost Murphy: I think as soon as we can get the… I think what we need next is the report from the consultants to give us a better… make sure that our estimates on building cost, and kind of what might go in that building, and then we thought depending on when that recommendation comes back, that report comes back, and then Vice President Stephens can make sure the dollar, the numbers, are right. That might be a good time for forums. Because I think that information tells us whether or not, we think we could even financially move forward. And then I think we really do need campus forums and that.

Senator Mainieri: I just ask because I wonder if that would be an appropriate… Because I imagine Senate would get some presentation associated with that, right.

Provost Murphy: Oh yeah. Absolutely.

Senator Marx: Uh-hum. Yeah.

Senator Mainieri: And then just from the student perspective, do we need to have a discussion before, I don’t know, do we need to have a discussion before that? Another one?

Senator Kalter: Why don’t we talk about that next time actually, like at this Exec next time? Whether or not we want it in fall semester, early spring, after the forums, or during the forums, right, or what have you.

Senator Mainieri: Okay.

Provost Murphy: Whatever works.

Senator Horst: Spring is always very busy.

Senator Kalter: Because spring, yeah spring is always very busy so you… there are arguments for deferring, there are arguments for going it right away.

Senator Mainieri: Right.

Senator Kalter: But I think that since we’ve been talking for a while, and since we’re canceling this Senate meeting, we could put it on the agenda for next Exec, do we want a continuation of the Engineering discussion at the next Senate meeting, or do we want to have it at a different time of year.

Senator Ferrence: So it’s been gnawing at me through a fair amount of the meeting from the, when I saw the strikethroughs on the Senate meeting coming up, I just want to put it out there on this group’s floor, it’s an optics issue that I’m a little bit worried about. And I think we were clear within here, but because we had such an intense Senate meeting last week, and then this perception that, gee, it would have been nice if we hadn’t done Engineering, but we still did fit it in for obvious reasons. I worry about the optics of canceling Senate this week as though it almost looks like some sort of response to last week’s events. Even though it’s just purely coincidental, so it’s important that we’re communicating that on a clear front, you know, like if the students ask, why didn’t they just put Engineering off until this week since they could cancel the meeting, that what temporally that simply didn’t work. And obviously we weren’t going to put off the sudden issue of #AntiBlackISU, and say we’re not going to talk about it for two weeks. But this is one of those things I worry a little bit about, because we haven’t cancelled a Senate meeting yet this semester, and so the timing seems a little awkward to me. I just wanted to put it out there. I get it.

Senator Horst: But we just did cancel it.

Senator Ferrence: Well, we did. I know.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. We voted right?

Senator Ferrence: We voted.

In Unison: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: Just curious.

Senator Ferrence: We voted. But since we’re talking, I’m not saying that we shouldn’t, I’m just saying maybe we should just be aware.

Senator Horst: We frequently cancel at this moment a Senate meeting, just because the committees really haven’t generated policies to review, and we need work sessions, and I think in the Constitution it says we have to meet once a month…

Senator Marx: Right.

Senator Ferrence: I don’t disagree at all, I’m just saying from an outsider what they see and perceive may be a little different than what we do.

Senator Mainieri: Could it be that when the notification is sent out to the Senators of the canceling to make sure to explain why and be sure to underline to share that with your constituents or something along those lines?

Senator Kalter: (Laughing) In the era of social media, I think that anything you say can be used against you

Senator Mainieri: But that shouldn’t stop us from saying it though.

Senator Kalter: It shouldn’t stop us from saying it, but I’m not sure… in other words I’m not sure whether it’s better to say it or to just cancel it, right. I literally don’t know whether it’s better to say something or not say something.

Senator Horst: We have no new business in front of the Senate, right.

Senator Marx: Yeah.

Senator Horst: Maybe we just need to say that.

Senator Campbell: I’d be more than happy, if you all are willing, and I don’t know what the precedent for this has been in the past but if we did some sort of like social media or marketing that lets students know that you know we did cancel, like the meeting for next week was canceled. If you have any like grievances or anything else you would like to discuss SGA meets this Wednesday. So we’re still listening, and we still have Senators, like all of our Senators sit on that body. So if you’re comfortable with that, using Academic Senate and saying we did cancel it, it’s purely out of coincidence, and they don’t have any policy, but SGA is still meeting this Wednesday. They’ll meet again in what a month, right.

Senator Kalter: That’s a very good idea actually. Because we have stuff out to the faculty about giving us feedback about the #AntiBlackISU demands and stuff like that—and by the way we haven’t talked about any of them in Senator Hollis’ email—but I think that would help. So they know that it’s not that the Senate is like closing down our ears, we’re just getting business done, and we’re continuing to collect issues that can come back to us.

Senator Campbell: Sure.

Senator Horst: As you were speaking, I was just reflecting on what happened with the Open Meetings Act, and the public speaking, and I’m wondering if your body has some sort of similar procedure?

Senator Campbell: So we operate on an even more loose version of Roberts Rule’s, because we don’t really don’t have formal training on it. But the way we’ve just done it in the past is if people show up with public comment, we let them speak. We probably… we don’t have a written rule, but we would probably cap that discussion at like 20-30 minutes. Obviously, we have a lot more length to that because we solely represent students. So students come to us with public comment, we’re not as harsh on time constraint, and we also don’t, we don’t have like business, we don’t have legislation for Wednesday. So we have that opportunity to field more discussions.

Senator Kalter: I think that’s why we… when we redid the Senate Bylaws a couple of years ago we restricted it to ten minutes because of the legislation.

Senator Campbell: Sure.

Senator Kalter: Because we couldn’t afford to give an already often long meeting over to more than, you know, a certain amount of public comment any particular day. Obviously, the Senate Bylaws can be looked at also, but I think that an important thing though that I was trying to emphasize to Senator Solebo is that the Student Government Senators are there to represent the voice of the students, and did a fabulous job doing it, but it was important for the Senators to be carrying the charge for all of the protestors in the room.

Senator Campbell: Agreed.

Senator Kalter: And not just have the public comment be from the outside, but from the inside of the Senate. So in that way I think that it kind of worked out really well, even though it seemed to both Senator Solebo and to Ashley Dumas as though it was very restrictive. You know it ended up being kind of important to get the Senators to be the ones who were voicing the concerns.

Senator Horst: But the public comment could be from anybody. So just think about that, if you have the public showing up, and saying we’re going to have 30 minutes of public comment at this moment, so when we worked on the bylaws Lisa Huson advised us to set out some procedures and rules ahead of time so that you’re maintaining and acknowledging the Open Meeting Act, but then having procedures and rules for how to handle the public comment section that are fair and decided beforehand.

Senator Ferrence: I’ll say, I found it coming off very strong the way it was put together… the way it ended up coming together and so quickly. I mean having the students Senators speak, they’d been there a long time seeing how Senate, and so it resonated a lot more than just having a bunch of people that hadn’t been to Senate before taking the mic. It’s not that I wouldn’t take their comments seriously, but when the Senators took the time to organize their thoughts, and send a clear message, that to me got a lot of traction, and did exactly what Senator Dietz said earlier of bringing it inside shared governance. And that’s really what that effectively did, and I think that was a really important thing, is to actually hear Senators sitting there saying we’re bring this issue. And I thought it was nicely done, because they don’t have limit, per se a limit, I mean, you can cut off if you want but.

Senator Kalter: Uh-hum.

Senator Mainieri: You know I appreciate, Alex, your suggestion of press for SGA to do it, but I’m going to reiterate that it doesn’t hurt that the Senate say something similar. That we’re canceling our meeting, but we’re still listening, or something like that. I feel like it’s important that the students say that, but I think the students are also asking us to be listening too. And so I think that… I think I would still suggest that when we do cancel the meeting and send it out to the Senators that we say something. And it can be something just as simple as just because we’re canceling the meeting doesn’t mean that we’re not listening, we just don’t have any business on that agenda, or something.

Senator Ferrence: We could just say there’s no actionable item so the meeting is canceled so we have more time to carry out committee business and talk with individuals in the ISU community.

Senator Kalter: Part of the reason I’m hesitating is because those messages always come from Cera. And so I don’t want… I don’t think it’s fair to put her in the position of receiving the comments back about that.

Senator Mainieri: Um-hum

Senator Campbell: Could we suggest putting Samiat’s email within that email if you have any questions you can direct them to us, also letting them know that SGA meets this Wednesday too. I don’t know if that helps at all.

Senator Horst: But who is this…Is this addressed to the student Senators? Who is this message being addressed to? Or who are we trying to convey this message to?

Senator Campbell: Fair point.

Senator Mainieri: I think that it’s important that the people who are not in this room who sit on the Senate know that to head off any… because I agree with Senator Ferrence. I think there could be some perception that even though it conveniently happens that we don’t have any action items that we’re stepping back a little bit from the discussion, and that’s not the case at all.

Senator Kalter: After an hour of…

Senator Mainieri: I’m sorry. I’m not saying that that what we’re doing.

Senator Ferrence: Optics.

Senator Mainieri: I’m saying that there could be some perception that that’s happening. And I think that we are instead leaning into this discussion, and so I’m just thinking, to use some of the words that the students, being proactive a little bit in saying that we heard… we’re still listening even though we’re not meeting or something.

Senator Phillips: And for what it’s worth, I would never wish anything awful on Cera.

Senator Campbell: Agreed.

Senator Phillips: And I don’t think any of our student Senators would like email back some nastiness about that. But I do think that like them reading it or seeing it, it would resonate within them.

Senator Mainieri: I’m putting it on the table as something that I would like to suggest but if others feel like just saying the meeting is cancelled is sufficient, then I’m fine to go with that. I just wanted to say that. I think that a message and even since our student Senators get that message too, I think that’s a strong message to them that we heard as well.

Ms. Hazelrigg: I just… for my two cents, I usually when you guys cancel the Executive meeting, that is what I put. The Executive Committee has decide to cancel Senate meeting. I can put in to give the committees time to get their business done. That Senate doesn’t have any business, I mean I’d be happy to do that.

Senator Horst: And that there’s no new business in front of the Senate.

Ms. Hazelrigg: Right.

Senator Horst: Because there’s no new business in front of the Senate, the Executive Committee has cancelled the meeting, and also this is an opportunity for committee to get their work done.

Senator Marx and Ferrence: Yeah.

Ms. Hazelrigg: But again if you have any questions or concerns you can contact acsenate.

Senator Ferrence: And my bringing up was less to say that we need something more that we’re all aware, so that if it should come up we all go, oh yeah, but we talked about this and… So that’s nice and concise.

Ms. Hazelrigg: Right, but on our website, like if you go on last year, if we cancel Senate meeting I just scratch it through and it says canceled. And so like there’s not going to be anything on the website that says a reason that it’s canceled.

Senator Marx: Right.

Senator Ferrence: And I wouldn’t change that, because that’s what we’ve been doing for years.

Senator Marx: Yeah.

Senator Campbell: Thanks, Cera.

Ms. Hazelrigg: You’re welcome.

Senator Kalter: Are we ready to break? All right a motion to adjourn?

***Adjournment***

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