**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

**Monday, February 24, 2020**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

Senate Secretary Martha Horst called the meeting to order***.***

***Oral Communications:***

Senator Horst: I hear there’s a communication from Susan Kalter that she won’t be able to come to the meeting, and so, regrettably, we won’t have the chair here at this meeting. I also might get a call about my daughter, so at that point, you’re on your own. All right. I have no Oral Communications other than that. But Dimitrios, I believe received some communication from Susan before this meeting so he can convey those communications as we go through the agenda?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah.

Senator Horst: All right. We have from the Academic Affairs Committee the Religious Observances policy.

***Distributed Communications:***

***01.23.20.05 - Policy 1.6 Religious Observances CURRENT Copy***

***02.20.20.01 - Policy 1.6 Religious Accommodations AAC MARK UP***

***02.20.20.02- Policy 1.6 Religious Accommodations CLEAN Copy***

Senator Nikolaou: Yes. So, we made some changes based on comments we had during our last Exec meeting. And it was more about the time period that we would allow for the accommodations. So, now we’ve changed it to 10 business days. Before it was 7 days for the students and 30 days for the employees. And we said that it was too much of a gap for the two groups, and also we thought that it was too long of a period for the employees to give notification. So, Legal said that in order to find replacements for the employees, 10 business days would be sufficient, and then they made it consistent with the students. The other change, well, there was a question about the sentence where it said that if a religious accommodation can be made. So, when I asked Legal about that, because Susan wanted some examples from other universities, so Legal said they can come to our meeting and they are going to give some examples from case studies of when this might happen. Then another question was under employee religious accommodations, if we want to specify whether a task is going to be completed and when a task is going to be completed. And then, Legal said that they didn’t think it was necessary to specify it because it is captured by the part where it says, “…is a change in the work environment.” So, the change in the work environment can incorporate what kind of a task we may complete and whether we’re going to complete a specific task. So, if I am asking, for example, and I don’t handle work at all. So, whether I’m going to accomplish that task. But it is part of the change in the work environment. So, these were the main changes and things that we checked with Legal.

President Dietz: Just seeking clarification, under the first paragraph on the first page, is it 140 or 40 business days?

Senator Nikolaou: It is actually 10. 10 business days.

Senator Mainieri: On the mark up copy, it looks…

President Dietz: I’m sorry I’m on the wrong one.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. It appears weird.

Senator Horst: I think we had 14 days and then we changed it to 10 business days.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. Initially they proposed 14 days, and then we changed it to 10 business days.

Senator Ferrence: This sure does look like it says 140.

President Dietz: Then on page two, is it four? It looks like 140 there too.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. It’s also 10 business days in the clean copy.

President Dietz: Okay. We’ll scratch the four and mark 10. Okay.

Senator Nikolaou: I think it’s because it is the four, and then when you erase it, it goes exactly on the straight line of the four, and that’s why it still appears as 140.

President Dietz: 140 days was a lot to give why you request it.

(Laughter)

Senator Horst: Okay. And so we can see that potentially when we move onto the agenda, and we’ll probably want Wendy Smith to come?

Senator Nikolaou: Yes, we will ask Wendy Smith to come for both the Religious Accommodations and the next one the Withdrawal policy.

***01.08.19.02 Policy 2.1.14 Withdrawal Current Copy***

***02.20.20.03 Policy 2.1.14 Withdrawal policy MARK UP***

***02.20.20.04 Policy 2.1.14 Withdrawal policy CLEAN Copy***

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. So, we made some small changes based on the comments we got from the floor. So, for example, on the first paragraph, we changed the “should speak,” because the students, they were not clear if they need to go and see the Dean of Students all the time. So, we replaced that with, they “are encouraged to” go and talk with the Dean of Students. Then on the second to the last paragraph on the first page, where it says, “A student may make a written request,” we just added “to the Office of the University Registrar,” because they asked for clarification. So, the main change comes in the paragraph following. Before it was academic integrity violation or classroom distraction violations, and that’s where most of the questions came from the students. So, I talked with the Dean of Students, first of all to check that in the Code of Student Conduct there is something that talks explicitly about classroom violations, or classroom disruption violations. So, the Code, in the second section, it talks about disruptions in general and then, 2.a, it talks about violations that may distract research, or scholarship, or teaching, or university sponsored activities. So, I asked John if they have any information about how many cases of this kind of violation do we have. So, he gave me a table, and he said it would show that in the last three years, we had three violations that fell under that specific subcategory, but also he said that these three violations, it doesn’t mean that they are actually classroom violations. It might be disruptions when we had a talk in the Bone Student Center. Or it could be a disruption when we had a research presentation. So, it doesn’t mean that it is a big portion of the cases that they are handling. So, based on this, we thought that we should remove it from the policy. So, we focus on the academic integrity violation and because Senator Wall mentioned also the Classroom Disruption policy, which is a separate policy, we thought that it would be better to revise the Classroom Violation policy and add a section there where we discuss what are the potential sanctions.

Senator Horst: And I think that policy is in an Academic Affairs task list, is that correct?

Senator Nikolaou: It falls under us, but, so, we would need to ask to put it on our task list, for next year, for example.

Senator Horst: Right.

Senator Nikolaou: Then, other changes, we just changed the title of the second section to be Withdrawal from the University, because there was some confusion about dropping a course, or dropping all courses. And then, the last question we had was about removing the reference to OEOA from the policy, and if it’s going to create any problems. So, that’s when we asked Legal and they recommended to actually leave it out from this policy, because it was Senator Wall who… one concern, for example, if there is a case of sexual harassment, and you have the victim and the perpetrator being in the same classroom, what would happen? But then, Wendy said that, well, this would fall under the other part of the policy, where it says situations that are beyond the control of the student, you can ask for a withdrawal without any repercussions. So, we don’t need to involve the OEOA in the policy. So, that’s a summary of the changes.

Senator Mainieri: My only comment would be, I hear very clearly what Wendy’s response was, and it makes sense. Is there harm though? Having the information about OEOA there.

Senator Nikolaou: And the reason we removed it is because, in the first place, it was not referring to students. It was under for applicant or for employee requests.

Senator Mainieri: Okay.

Senator Nikolaou: And that’s why we removed it in the first place.

Senator Mainieri: Okay. Thank you.

Senator Nikolaou: So, for this one, we’ll probably want Wendy, and then maybe John, yeah, in case there are questions about the student disruptions and how it came at the beginning. Why wasn’t it included in the policy in the first place?

Senator Horst: Are all of the changes you made in response to what was said on the floor?

Senator Nikolaou: I guess, what do you mean?

Senator Host: All of the changes that you made since it was an Information Item, are they all in response to comments you had on the floor?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah.

Senator Horst: We can talk about how to list it later, but it would seem to me that it should be an Action Item, but we can talk about that later.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay.

Senator Horst: Okay. Next on our agenda is the proposed Senate Agenda.

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

***Proposed* Academic Senate Meeting Agenda**

**Wednesday, March 4, 2020**

**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 Item:***

***Action Items:***

***10.12.18.02 Policy 4.1.8 Program Priorities CURRENT COPY (Planning and Finance Committee)***

***XX Policy 4.1.8 Institutional Program Priorities MARK UP (Planning and Finance Committee)***

***XX Policy 4.1.8 Institutional Program Priorities Clean Copy (Planning and Finance Committee)***

***03.02.16.03 Policy 6.1.37 Facilities Naming Current Copy (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***XX Policy 6.1.37 Naming of University Facilities and Entities Markup (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***XX Policy 6.1.37 Naming of University Facilities and Entities Clean Copy (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***02.01.18.19 Policy 7.4.1 Grants and Contracts CURRENT (Faculty Affairs Committee)***

***01.28.20.01 Policy 7.4.1 Grants and Contracts Markup (Faculty Affairs Committee)***

***01.28.20.02 Policy 7.4.1 Grants and Contracts Clean (Faculty Affairs Committee)***

***Information Items:***

***01.23.20.05 - Policy 1.6 Religious Observances CURRENT Copy***

***02.20.20.01 - Policy 1.6 Religious Accommodations AAC MARK UP***

***02.20.20.02- Policy 1.6 Religious Accommodations CLEAN Copy***

***01.08.19.02 Policy 2.1.14 Withdrawal Current Copy (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***02.20.20.03 Policy 2.1.14 Withdrawal policy MARK UP (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***02.20.20.04 Policy 2.1.14 Withdrawal policy CLEAN Copy (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***Consent Agenda Items: None***

***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 Marx, seconded by Senator Nikolaou, to approve the proposed agenda.

Senator Horst: All right. So, the one item that we need to think about right now is the Withdrawal policy is listed as an Information Item, but it’s already been on the floor, and all the changes are in response to discussion on the floor. So, wouldn’t it make more sense to list this as an Action Item?

Senator Mainieri: Sure.

Senator Nikolaou: Or put it as Information/Action.

Senator Marx: I’m fine with that.

Senator Ferrence: Because we’ve had Information, we can make it Action, and if somebody really objected.

Senator Nikolaou: Then we could make amendments.

Senator Horst: I think so. I would say it should be an Action Item because nothing’s new.

Senator Ferrence: I agree.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah, no.

Senator Horst: So, I’m proposing that change. Any other discussion about the… I guess we need to discuss the Senator Lucey comment. Would that at all go on this agenda? Did you hear from Susan about that? Whether or not she conceived of this item potentially going on the Senate agenda.

Ms. Hazelrigg: She did not say for this agenda.

Senator Horst: Should we hold off on the agenda and wait to see what we decide about the Senator Lucey discussion?

Senator Ferrence: I guess my only question would be is how are we on timeline with that, in terms if there’s something hoping to be approved. And so, is time of the essence on that one, or does it not matter if it puts off another couple of weeks.

Provost Murphy: I do think time will make a difference on whether it can be ready, whether we could start admitting students this fall or not. So, but if you ask me a specific timeline, I couldn’t tell you.

Senator Horst: So, could I perhaps backtrack a little bit and not put the agenda on there. Sorry about that. I guess we should discuss this curricular issue and then go back to the agenda.

***02.11.20.03 From Tom Lucey: Email from Senator Tom Lucey Game Design minor***

***02.20.20.05 From Creative Technology: CTK Response to Academic Senate Concerns Regarding Game Design Proposal***

***02.11.20.01 From Tom Lucey: Game Design Curriculum Forms***

***02.11.20.02 From Tom Lucey: Game Design FIF***

Senator Horst: And so, we have a Consent Agenda for the curricular items, and in our bylaws, it says that a Senator can asked for an item to be pulled. And you see Senator Lucey’s argument as to why it should be pulled. Just my own personal life, I talked to my husband, and he said they used to regularly ask for curricular items to be pulled and go in front of the Senate. I haven’t seen one ever go in front of the Senate, but I guess it used to happen more frequently. But it’s just, we haven’t done it ever. There was one item that was requested to be pulled off the consent agenda, and then there was a discussion with that Senator and he withdrew.

Ms. Hazelrigg: In Exec. Yeah, because he was a member of Exec.

Senator Marx: Oh.

Senator Horst: Right.

Senator Mainieri: So, if it were to go to Senate what… is that then Senate voting on, or what is that?

Senator Horst: The Senate always de facto votes on things by deciding not to vote.

Senator Mainieri: Sure. It would be like a… it would be a straight Action Item or? I’m just kind of wondering what the process is and I don’t know if Susan mentioned.

Ms. Hazelrigg: I think you guys would decide if it needs to go to a committee and if they need to review.

Senator Horst: Well, but it went through the Curriculum Committee. And so isn’t it coming through them, and we already have it, we’re already approving it through the consent agenda. I don’t have the bylaws in front of me, but wouldn’t it go to the full Senate?

Ms. Hazelrigg: It would need to be…The matters that he brought up would need to be discussed in a committee, like in Academic Affairs or something; to see if any changes need to be made to, I believe.

Senator Nikolaou: But should we send the response they gave us to Senator Lucey and then see if the response addresses his concerns, because it might be that he says no, that’s perfectly fine.

Provost Murphy: I did send him that, so he’s had that too.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay.

Provost Murphy: And I obviously haven’t talked to him about it, I just, when I forwarded it to the Senate, I forwarded it to Senator Lucey also.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay.

Provost Murphy: I haven’t followed up with him, of course.

Ms. Hazelrigg: I can.

Senator Horst: Could you pull up the Bylaws and see what it says about…

Senator Campbell: Yeah. I’m looking at that now.

Senator Ferrence: Because fortunately, all he says in his letter is it be forwarded to Exec. He didn’t ask for it to be vetted on the Senate floor necessarily.

Senator Horst: But that’s what you do when you ask for something to be pulled off the Consent Agenda, you’re asking for it to be considered by the full Senate. Which technically every single curricular item is being considered by the full Senate, right.

Senator Ferrence: Right.

Senator Marx: As a larger question, the things that he’s asking for seem to be in the realm of academic freedom. He’s asking for particular content in this program and courses. I don’t quite understand under what authority this is being made, this request is being made.

Senator Horst: I appreciated his comment because I had a similar major at Stanford. I was an Engineering major, but I had this Values, Technology, Science, Society, and everybody was required to take a class, but I personally believe if we’re going to ever require of a program like this, we would require it of many programs having to do with technology. Right. And so, I’m not sure it’s appropriate to single out one program. So what does it say?

Provost Murphy: I did like their response, I would say. In other words, I thought their response really took his questions seriously.

Senator Marx: It did.

Senator Ferrence: I agree.

Provost Murphy: I thought it was a good response, so.

Senator Mainieri: For sure.

Senator Campbell: So the process is that “A Senator may request that an item be removed from the Consent Agenda. Items removed from the Consent Agenda are given a filing number if needed, and forwarded to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee decides if the item should be routed to an internal committee, sent back to an internal committee for further review, or place on either the Senate or Faculty Caucus agenda. The Executive Committee may also decide to place item back on the Consent Agenda but if the Senator who had requested that the item be removed does not agree, the item may not go back on the Consent Agenda.”

Senator Horst: Right. I remember that.

Senator Marx: Okay.

Senator Ferrence: So, what would be the next move though is to ask him, and if he agrees put it back on Consent Agenda.

Senator Horst: Right. So, I think it’s appropriate at this stage to forward their response. Does everybody agree with that?

Senator Marx and Mainieri: Um-hum.

Senator Horst: And then, if he still would like the Senate to consider it, then the Executive Committee to discuss it. I would hate to…

Senator Ferrence: Provost Murray said he got a copy of the response. So somebody just needs to reach out to him and ask him if that’s sufficient.

Senator Marx: Okay, do you have an opinion on that, what I was just saying about requesting particular content in the sequence, right. I'm troubled by that.

Provost Murphy: Right. And normally, you know, we see curriculum committees have those conversations. So if it was sitting in front of the, you know, the curriculum committee in the College of Fine Arts or the CTK, they may have that conversation at that level, if that would not surprise me.

Senator Marx: This is cross college.

Provost Murphy: Yeah. So I don't know, although, that's part of what we do. So if it was in front of the UCC, and someone who wasn't in that major had a question of it, they'd get to ask, so. I don’t know, I think I wasn't, I wasn't bothered by Senator Lucey's request, because I thought, well, that's a good thing for us to think about it. Right. But I, again, I also like their responses. So I'm hedging a little bit in that, I think that's part of the curricular process though, is for people to ask questions about content and, you know, qualifications of faculty and all those things that we do through the curriculum process.

Senator Horst: All right, so we can forward it to Senator Lucey and see if he still feels that it should be pulled from the Consent Agenda. And then it will come back to us next time. So let's go back to the proposed Senate agenda. Okay, so we had the Withdraw policy as an Action Item.

Senator Nikolaou: Do we want to go to the agenda or do we want to do the Alcohol policy?

***02.11.20.04 From Legal: Alcohol Policy Current Copy (Rules Committee)***

***02.10.20.01 From Legal: Alcohol policy Mark Up (Rules Committee)***

***02.10.20.02 From Legal: Alcohol policy Clean Copy (Rules Committee)***

Senator Horst: The Alcohol, that's right, okay. I’m backtracking again, sorry. I just got thrown in. Okay, but you know what, I'm going to not do the agenda again. And we're going to go now to the Alcohol policy. I didn't see all of the moving pieces here. So, President Dietz, do you know about the background of this Alcohol policy?

President Dietz: I think it's simply an update of the old policy. There’s not a lot of changes. I think there has been a change in terms of tailgating, and I think there’s some language that talks about tailgating specifically. It also doesn't allow alcohol to be served in student organizations and any exceptions to the policy, I think, has to come through my office, so I didn’t see a lot of change in that.

Senator Horst: And it's coming from Legal. It's coming from Legal.

Senator Nikolaou: Yes. Yeah.

President Dietz: I think so, yeah.

Senator Horst: Okay, and so Senator Nikolaou has a message from Chairperson Kalter.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. So, when she sent me the comments for the Academic Affairs policy, she also mentioned for the Alcohol policy, because usually it would go to the Rules Committee. She says she’s strongly recommending to send it directly to the Senate floor. Because that way, we will be able to approve it this semester, so that the President can sign it off and have it ready before the football season starts for the fall. That was her recommendation. So not to route it to the Rules, because it's also going to sidetrack them from the other items they're working on.

Senator Horst: And we do have the power to send something directly to the floor. So would people like to send it to the floor or send it to Rules?

Senator Mainieri: The floor seems logical.

Senator Ferrence: Do you need a motion? If you need it, record me. If not, don’t.

Senator Horst: Well. So I think everybody's in favor of that approach. Yes, it makes sense, makes sense. And so on. Now let's go back to the agenda. Very good. And so, we have an agenda and under Information Items, we now have an addition of the Alcohol policy. And does anybody know the contact in Legal? Is that Lisa Huson or is that Wendy Smith?

Ms. Hazelrigg: I want to say it was Wendy.

Senator Host: Okay.

Ms. Hazelrigg: But I'll ask Teri to make sure.

Senator Horst: And she will present it, since it's not coming from a, or no, actually, maybe Susan will present it because it's not coming from a committee.

Senator Mainieri: Should we put the Alcohol policy before the Religious Observances if we're wanting to… just in case for time purposes, or are we feeling okay on time?

Senator Horst: You're thinking the Alcohol policy will be faster.

Senator Mainieri: I'm thinking that there might be discussion that comes up with the Religious Observances that could be fairly lengthy, and then we may not get to the Alcohol policy if we are against a hard stop.

Senator Horst: Okay, sounds good.

Senator Ferrence: I find a certain irony in discussing Alcohol policy and Religious Observances, back to back.

Senator Horst: Okay, so our Information Items are the Alcohol policy, the Religious Observances policy. And under Action Items, we have the Withdrawal policy, any other additions or corrections? (Pause) Seeing none.

The proposed agenda, with friendly amendments, was unanimously approved.

***02.17.20.01 Email NCSS Statement on the President's FY21 Budget***

For discussion: Do we want to draft a Sense of the Senate resolution? If so, when?

Senator Horst: Okay, we have item 02.17.20.01 an email from NCSS statement on the President’s FY21 budget. That’s President Trump?

President Dietz: Yes. President of the United States.

(Laughter)

Senator Horst: And the question is, do we want to draft a Sense of the Senate Resolution?

Senator Ferrence: No.

Senator Horst: Senator Lucey is free to draft a Sense of the Senate Resolution? That way Senators…

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. That was my understanding since Senate, right, typically, it’s put forth by an individual, or group of individuals, not necessarily Exec. Is that correct? I mean Exec can but…

Senator Horst: Yes. I suppose we could, but I think we should not.

Senator Ferrence: I would be very worried about it, because you really get into some… that could be extensive discussion if you’re going to discuss whether our University agrees with the federal government or not.

Senator Horst: I concur. Although being from the arts, I’m simply shocked that they’re proposing to cut the NEA.

Senator Ferrence: Yeah.

Senator Horst: But a Senator is always free to draft a Sense of the Senate Resolution, and they have been political in nature. I don’t know. Do you have any other background on that item?

Ms. Hazelrigg: Hum-um.

Senator Ferrence: So, what happens with a Sense of the Senate? So, then is it a simple up down or is it a two thirds? Because, like, if we put it out there and we disagreed, does that mean we’re basically saying the opposite. Like, if you put out a Sense of the Senate, and then the Senate votes on it and it’s not the Sense of the Senate, is that effectively saying that the Senate is endorsing the opposite?

Senator Marx: It’s just we’re not making a comment then.

Senator Ferrence: You’re just not making a comment.

Senator Horst: I do remember one with a Senator but we had competing Sense of the Senate Resolutions, I can’t remember what it was about. And we had trouble coming to a Sense of the Senate Resolution, but they’re more of just a statement of the body, and typically they come up… I remember I did one when we had the Occupy Wall Street people out on the Quad, and I drafted a Sense of the Senate supporting them. So, they can be of that nature but typically they come from Senators.

President Dietz: The Occupy Wall Street is an interesting point on this. When we start taking positions on potentially national policy like this, it brings in to question the institution taking a political stance on a political issue, and it invites an investigation by the Office of the Inspector General, saying you’re not supposed to be taking University time to take political positions on other political positions. So, that worries me a little bit. The other part of this is that there’s a lot of umbrella organizations, like the American Council of Education, National Association of… well, APLU now. It’s used to be (inaudible), that are taking up these kinds of issues. The other part is that I don’t know that the Congress has ever paid attention to any President’s budget in the history of Presidents writing budgets. And so, the feedback that I get is that he had to put forth a budget, and he did. Whether or not people will take that seriously, I don’t think they probably will. The other part of that is that there’s a lot of… The environment that we’re in here, just the political environment in this community would probably not take kindly to us taking a position that’s an anti-administration position. So, I think you might bring more ire than need on this, and I think, frankly, it’ll fall under its own weight. I do have concerns about, you know, them coming out, always about the arts, and slashing Fulbright, and on and on and on. Those are… I don’t personally agree with that, but I think it’s a little slippery slope for the institution to take positions on this.

Senator Horst: Right. And the Occupy Wall Street was about a specific set of students at Illinois State.

President Dietz: Right. Right.

Senator Horst: And this is a national issue.

Senator Marx: Right.

Senator Ferrence: Your point is very interesting from the point of view of because we receive federal funding on this University for various things.

President Dietz: Right.

Senator Ferrence: It sounds like we could run the risk of putting that in jeopardy.

President Dietz: It would.

Senator Ferrence: Because if we took a position that could be to complete 100% cut off of federal funding for that institution.

President Dietz: Absolutely.

Senator Horst: So, we could forward these minutes to Senator Lucey and convey to him the discussion that we had? I don’t think we technically can stop somebody from saying they want to do a Sense of the Senate.

Senator Mainieri: Right.

Senator Horst: But we certainly don’t want to have to convey all of this on the floor either to him.

Senator Ferrence: Could we encourage him to use the comment time to encourage the individual members of the Senate—not as Senators but as individuals—to reach out to their congressman if they find this, you know, in other words he can convey the message without doing it through the formal channel of Sense of the Senate, which runs the risk of being a conflict of interest from the sounds of it.

Senator Horst: In Communications.

President Dietz: And I’m always reminded of a good chunk of my role is that I’m in a political environment all the time. I cannot be in a partisan environment, and that’s a major distinction. And so, in reference to President Trump’s budget, that’s a partisan response to that and so I do think it’s a bit of a… I completely agree with his concerns, there’s no question about that. But it’s a slippery slope.

Provost Murphy: If he really felt compelled to do something, you’d almost want a Senator to do something like write a statement in support of the arts versus against this particular budget.

President Dietz: Right.

Senator Horst: Okay. So would you like me to call him or…

Ms. Hazelrigg: I’d be happy to convey that.

Senator Horst: Okay, and then, I don’t know when we get the minutes from this.

Ms. Hazelrigg: I can type it up.

Senator Horst: Yeah. So, we can just convey to him, here’s the discussion in Exec, and here’s some avenues you could pursue, but I think we’re all against Exec making any sort of Sense of the Senate Resolution. Anything further on that one? (Pause) Moving On.

***From Dan Elkins: Academic Facilities Advisory Committee (AFAC) Report (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

Senator Horst: Right, okay. Now we have the Academic Facilities Priorities Report. And Senator Nikolaou has another... Do you want to convey, again, what Chairperson Kalter said about this?

Senator Nikolaou: There are not that many comments. The only comment was on page two. Forecasts what the SLB expansion plans are, and if this is a college cost sharing. And then on page five, at the end of the University Multicultural Center, where it talks about African American Studies, Latina/Latino Studies, Women's and Gender Studies, LGBTQ. A question about what are the plans for that specific sentence over there. But other than that, no other comments,

Senator Horst: Oh, I thought you said that Susan was hoping that this became an annual review of AABC.

Senator Marx: Yeah. She’s mentioned that.

Ms. Hazelrigg: Yeah. That’s what we talked about.

Senator Horst: But right now, did she want us to forward it to AABC or she wanted us to discuss it.

Ms. Hazelrigg: Yeah. I think she just wanted Exec to discuss it and then send it on to the Senate.

Senator Horst: On to Senate. Oh, my gosh, do we have to go back to the agenda? Maybe we'll have we can put that on next time. So, next. Yeah. Okay. Okay. Discussion? We, I mean, it's out of date. It's part of the problem.

Ms. Hazelrigg: If we're going to make it an annual report too, we could put it on AABCs Issues Pending, and then it would go straight to them instead of coming to Exec first.

Provost Murphy: Go there in the fall. What was the question about Multicultural Center, more specific about the center? I wasn't quite sure I followed that.

Senator Nikolaou: So, the question was, what are the plans relating to the last sentence in the Multicultural Center? I'm assuming if there are specific plans for LGBTQ or Women's and Gender Studies, something along those lines,

Senator Horst: So what are the plans for this specific subgroup?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah.

Senator Horst: Okay.

President Dietz: I think at one time we were hopeful that there would be space in this building for those academic programs and that’s not going to happen. It’s not big enough for that.

Provost Murphy: Yeah. I think LGBTQ is going in that building, but the institute… because they're in a pretty crummy space. But I don't think the others. I don't think African American or Latina/Latino Studies are going to move out of Williams.

Senator Mainieri: It was kind of a strange report to read just because it is so out of date. I think several of these items; we know a lot more now. So, I think having it on a regular rotation maybe would prevent some of that.

Provost Murphy: Yeah, in the fall.

Senator Horst: But there was a seismic shift in the Fine Arts funding. Right, right. So if you took away that Pritzker announcement, it would not read so out of date, I think.

Senator Mainieri: Well, I think also we know a lot more about Multicultural Center too, since June 2019.

President Dietz: Yeah.

Provost Murphy: Agreed.

Senator Horst: I don't know if the Cook Hall bathrooms were ever addressed, but Cook Hall, the first floor, is also something we might want to consider.

Senator Ferrence: Well, yeah. Some of the fund is… if it’s FY20 approved, that means these things should be almost done because they're approved for FY20, which means they only have to June 30 to finish them.

Provost Murphy: And is Cook Hall bathrooms, part of the, do you know, part of the Fine Arts Complex funding or not.

Senator Horst: I don't believe, I don't think Cook is part of that funding. But it's psychologically. But anyway, that's just my thought. But are there any other general comments about this report? It's gonna go to the Senate floor. And then, the plan is then annually in the fall, a new version is that… when does this report generally come out?

Senator Marx: In the summer?

Senator Horst: They do it in the summer.

Senator Marx: It says June.

Senator Horst: Okay, so then, in the fall.

Senator Marx: I think I have the June 18 one as well. I have that already.

Senator Host: So then, in the fall, AABC can get the June 2020 report. Okay. And I was hoping we could also put that in the bylaws and revise the committee description. It's always good to have it there too. Any other comments on this report?

President Dietz: I want to say hopefully by fall the Multicultural Center will be done and filled with people doing good things.

Provost Murphy: Okay, I have a dumb question. Why would it go in bylaws because it's a report from another committee, but what if that committee decided not to typically do that report? What if they were re-constituted? So it's a report from a non-Senate committee. So but, you see you can't really put it in the bylaws because the Senate doesn't have control over what this committee decides to do in terms of reporting.

Senator Horst: There's a description of the internal committees and their functions.

Provost Murphy: This is not an internal committee though.

Senator Horst: No, but the AABC part of the description of their function would be to review this report.

Senator Ferrence: Her point is what if it doesn’t exist.

Provost Murphy: So, yeah… I mean you’re not…

Senator Horst: Oh, it doesn’t typically exist?

Provost Murphy: Well, who knows, but what if it doesn't someday. Because this is not a Senate committee, so what if they decide to do something different? I think that's my question.

Senator Horst: Okay.

Provost Murphy: Do you know what I’m saying? I mean, I think it’s good for it to go to the committee. I'm not disagreeing with that.

Senator Horst: But you're saying it's not an annual thing that typically done.

Senator Ferrence: It doesn't have to be.

Provost Murphy: It changed a couple years.

Senator Horst: Okay. I didn't understand that.

Provost Murphy: So. It was called the Chatters report.

Senator Horst: Ah. This is the Chatters report. Okay, well then, just put it on the Issues Pending list.

Provost Murphy: But I do think it should… I think that's the right committee to send it to. I don't mean that, I just kept thinking, can you put in the bylaws of AABC, can you demand a committee make report? I don't think you can, because they’re not a Senate committee.

Senator Horst: I see.

Provost Murphy: Yeah, but it is a good… But I think it’s great information, yeah, I agree.

Senator Horst: All right. Any other comments on this? Let’s see, do we have anything…We did everything. Okay. We can adjourn.

***Adjournment***