**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes**
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**(Approved)**

***Call to Order***

Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

***Oral Communications:***

Senator Kalter: Just a couple things. I'm pretty sure that Dr. Dietz will not be here because I have a note in my calendar that he was going to be absent today. Mike Gizzi is at a Campus Climate meeting. Actually, Dr. Krejci is also at that meeting but said that she would just be late rather than not here. And I don't know where Senator Haugo is. My guess is that she's talking to grad students. But we have a quorum, so why don't we call the meeting to order and we'll get started. We've got a bunch of stuff, so we ought to use our time wisely.

***Inquiry Regarding EAB Follow Ups from Provost Office***

Senator Kalter: Martha Horst contacted me to ask (after that letter came out in the Vidette and then the stuff in the Pantagraph and then the stuff in the Inside Higher Ed), she wanted to know if we had gotten yet the two questions that were asked on the floor of the Senate. So we don't have those minutes out yet, but I listened to the tape and the two questions were: Her question was, “Could the Senate find out exactly how much money we are spending each year for consulting services like this, not just EAB, but altogether?” And then I had asked Jonathan, “Can you give us some examples to help the faculty narrow in on what are the most useful EAB resources, especially during this planning year?” So we didn't get those last Wednesday, so I'm just putting on the record that we'll ask, and I'll send an e-mail to Dr. Krejci and Dr. Rosenthal since they're not here for that part of the meeting. Okay, so that's the oral communication.

***Distributed Communications:***

***10.27.16.01 From Planning and Finance Committee: Fundraising Policy (Clean) (Information Item 11/9/16)***

***10.27.16.02 From Planning and Finance Committee: Fundraising Policy (Mark Up) (Information Item 11/9/16)***

Senator Kalter: So we've got from Planning and Finance the Fundraising Policy. Anybody have anything they wanted to say about that one? We’ve got it on the proposed agenda as an information item right now, but we can always take it off if anybody sees anything as an issue. I saw two minor things, like put a “the” there and put a parenthesis there, not there. And I think that can be done on the floor of the Senate basically. So it sounds like nothing on that one. All right.

***10.27.16.03 From Rules Committee: Student Government Blue Book Page – Membership Revisions (Information Item 11/9/16)***

Senator Kalter: Rules Committee. This one I'm going to suggest we, actually, because we have so much stuff on the agenda, I'm looking to sort of pare it down and put stuff off and I think this one is a good one for a couple reasons. I mentioned this to you guys this morning, that somehow the Rules Committee was working from an old Blue Book page, and so we need, first of all, for them to actually do this edit on a different document. But then the other thing that we had noticed was that when we did the Student Code, that Student Code Enforcement Review stuff got taken off and all of that. I just want to make sure that when we look at the actual Blue Book page we've got the right one and that we remember what the rationale was for removing the Student Code stuff. Because what we were talking about this morning was that somebody needs to have oversight of the Student Code, and we had actually inserted that into Student Government Association's charge, so we might want to make sure that we understand whether we're just saying, "Yeah, we have oversight but you don't have to give an actual annual report," or what have you. So I thought, that's a good one to take off the agenda. Did anybody else see anything on that one?

Senator Heylin: I just had a question. The chair reached out to us about if we supported it or not, and it was through the grapevine so I wasn't able to talk to her directly. But would you be able to give a little… And she said that you recommended this change, I believe?

Senator Kalter: Way back, like maybe three years ago. What the rationale was?

Senator Heylin: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: So, what we had noticed… For some strange reason, we have 29, well actually, it's really more like 30 faculty and the faculty associate and 30 slots for them. In other words, with our full committee, the internal committee structure of the five committees minus Faculty Caucus and SGA, we have more slots than we have faculty to fill them. And we also noticed that for many, many years, no faculty member has been acting as the faculty liaison. Mark, actually, is the last person to have taken that role. I think Dan did it one year before that when he was chair, if I remember correctly.

Senator Hoelscher: With the Student Senate? Yeah. A little personal insight there. So, when I acted as faculty liaison for the Student Senate, my whole role was coming to their meetings and sitting in a chair in the back of the booth in the corner in the dark, because if you're old enough to remember that you'll be laughing (that was a Flip Wilson comment). So, I did nothing basically, and I would like a little more…

Provost Krejci: Oh, trust me, I'm old enough.

Senator Kalter: A blast from the past.

Senator Hoelscher: You have to imagine Flip Wilson dressed as a woman going, "In the back in the booth in the corner in the dark!"

Senator Haugo: This was before Tyler Perry.

Senator Hoelscher: Anyway, he was great. Is he still alive? Anyway, this is why it takes me too long. I would like to see that role a little better defined because I don't see any point in sitting in a chair. I don't.

Senator Kalter: Sort of my assessment of the whole thing was that, first of all, if we're going to fill the position let's fill the position. If we're not, let's not. And that it was giving somebody double work because I think you were also on a committee at that…

Senator Hoelscher: No, I was not. That's why I sat there because I couldn't serve on the committee because I had a class or something, I can't remember. So it worked out well for me to teach my class and be at the Academic Senate and then go to the Student Senate on the alternate weeks, but still, I didn't see any benefit. I didn't see any value added, and so if we're going to do it, then I guess you all can help us redefine the role and say either we need the role, we don't need the role, and if we do need the role, what exactly is the role? What do I do? Do I sit at the table and answer questions from a Faculty Senate perspective or what? But it needs to be either eliminated or more of a role. I felt like a complete fool sitting back there in a chair politely reading this stuff.

Senator Grzanich: For me, I know John Davenport currently serves in that role for us and he's almost as a point of reference for perhaps things in the past, things that other associations have done that have kind of been lost within the ranks.

Senator Hoelscher: Is he the mentor, though?

Senator Walsh: He's the advisor.

Senator Hoelscher: See, this isn't an advisor role. This is a faculty liaison. So the whole time I was there, there was a mentor, or an advisor, and he's the one you all interacted with.

Senator Kalter: That was part of my reasoning was that if John is serving in that role and if the communication to the Senate is adequate, is there a reason to duplicate, essentially, this role?

Senator Walsh: Most of the things that are - I speak about my reports at Academic Senate - is just basically what we (inaudible).

Senator Kalter: I think that this was put in at a time when the Senate was reorganizing and there was some concern that student government would kind of get out of control and the faculty wouldn't have any say in it.

Senator Hoelscher: They are rebel rousers.

Senator Kalter: Because they really are. It's shameful what we had to put up with over this couple of decades.

Senator Hoelscher: What no one knew is I was probably more inclined to join them than to oppose them.

Senator Kalter: Exactly. That's right. That's actually mostly the way it is.

Senator Gizzi: I like the idea of the faculty liaison. I think it would be very valuable. In fact, I put my name down on it several times and was ignored every time.

Senator Kalter: Well, you see what's happening now. I mean, right now we couldn't afford it because we've got a bunch of vacancies and CFA is now running their second re-election and CAST is like beating the bushes for theirs, and they're not, I don't know what's going on with that. So, that's probably partly why Mike asked. I mean, we could have a liaison who doesn't go, right? Who doesn't attend the meeting but is sort of the faculty resource person for the SGA. There are many models.

Senator Gizzi: The downside is it really means every single Wednesday night.

Senator Walsh: Whenever it is that we need a reference to a faculty member for something, usually we just come here.

Senator Kalter: Yeah.

Senator Heylin: It's almost never at our general assembly meetings that we have. Usually they're directly before our meeting or after our meeting and we don't have that kind of urgency to answer a question on the spot in regards to Academic Senate.

Senator Kalter: That was what I gleaned when I went to my one meeting two years ago. I was like, wow this really is just very efficiently run. Like I said the other day, you guys actually taught me Robert's Rules of Order, not the other way around. And it's sort of like, do they need us? Is there a problem that we're trying to solve?

Senator Walsh: You're always welcome.

Senator Heylin: My question is, I remember when we were talking about the Review Committee we talked about having excessive fatigue when it comes to people filling positions. I think if anything this is an example of that fatigue where you wouldn't necessarily need it.

Senator Kalter: Definitely this structure makes it more efficient because the staff liaison is being added. Right now the structure is faculty liaison, President of the Student Body, 20 Senators, and the Student Trustee. John is not actually officially a member of the committee, but this would make him one or allow him to designate.

Senator Heylin: Okay. Oh, so this isn't in addition?

Senator Kalter: Right. This is a flipping from faculty liaison to staff liaison.

Senator Heylin: Okay, I was assuming that it was in addition to John.

Senator Grzanich: So the staff liaison would serve as the advisor, then, and the advisor role would be eliminated?

Senator Kalter: It’s basically acknowledging what we're doing right now and instituting it. You know, I really think that it's about communication and I think we've got really good communication. What were you going to say, Kyle?

Senator Walsh: Just if there's something that you think that we need this for, I say we move forward with it, but I think the general consensus is that this is unnecessary.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, and just to officially put John on as the, or whoever's in the Dean of Students Office.

Senator Hoelscher: Now, to make matters worse, though, it was my very first appointment as a Faculty Senator, or an Academic Senator, so I couldn't help those folks if I wanted to. So it was sort of ceremonial and I didn't mind doing it, but I didn't see a lot of value in it.

Senator Heylin: Do you know if we're going to need to change our bylaws because of this at all?

Senator Kalter: That's a great question. I cannot remember whether there's anything there.

Senator Walsh: Come on, Dan, you're supposed to remember all those things.

Senator Heylin: I haven't looked at our advisor bylaws in a very long time.

Senator Kalter: We wouldn't want to have to put you through all of that all over again.

Senator Haugo: Don't you guys just have a chip you can install?

Senator Heylin: I wish. It would come in handy.

Senator Kalter: By the way, just as an aside, these guys gave a really great presentation to the Board of Trustees on Friday. It was astonishing how much more they do than what we do. As usual, right?

Provost Krejci: I was really impressed and I just wrote myself a note. I didn't know if you had talked about that before I got there, but it was so impressive to see this. I said, you should present this nationally because I can't imagine there's another SGA that does the kind of comprehensive work you do. It was very impressive and the trustees were very impressed. Several of them commented to me to say, oh my!

Senator Kalter: We need to just say here, it provoked J.D. Bergman getting up and confessing that the first year that he was on the trustees that he did not believe in shared governance, and within a year he…

Senator Hoelscher: Oh, that is cool.

Senator Kalter: It was a wonderful statement, especially coming from him as a businessman given what's going on in Wisconsin and all of that. It was marvelous, marvelous. And it was all because of you.

Provost Krejci: It was. I wish… Well, we will have it recorded for posterity and it will be in the minutes forever, but it was polished. It was well prepared. It was professional, and then just mind boggling to see everything they do. I don't know how you have time to do it.

Senator Walsh: Well, thank you very much. Because we have a whole team of…

Provost Krejci: When you said you spend 30 or 40 hours a week, I'm like, I think we might be breaking some rule.

Senator Kalter: Ryan Powers said it's all about delegation? Isn't that what he said?

Senator Walsh: Yeah, it's all about delegation. The four of us here don't do it all on our own.

Senator Heylin: It's kind of a second apartment sometimes where you're in the office a little bit more than your apartment.

Senator Kalter: You've got a swank set of digs over there. I'm jealous.

Provost Krejci: I've never been there.

Senator Grzanich: We'll have you come visit. We have a Keurig! The Keurig is very helpful. It keeps us going.

Senator Kalter: So you guys like this, then? You're good to go with it. I still think we ought to pull it from the agenda so that we can get the real one, the actual updated one, and it also gives us an excuse to shorten the agenda.

***10.27.16.04 From Rules Committee: Graduate School Bylaws Revised 10/17/16 (Information Item 11/9/16)***

Senator Kalter: I'm going to actually suggest the same thing for the grad school bylaws simply because when I went through them (and I have to apologize for this because I've seen these in the summer and I think when they first came through), but, man, did I find a lot of stuff that kind of needs cleaning up in one way or another. Most of it is almost entirely non-substantive, but there was just a whole bunch of stuff that I wanted to sit down with Amy Hurd and Martha to ask about. And a lot of it has to do with why do we keep saying approved here and here when we also say it here? And then on the second page where it has the appointments for the associate member, for some reason C is the appointment as a full member, so all that formatting is wrong. And there were just little things like that all over the place. And given that I was also searching for things to take off the agenda, I thought this might be one of them. The other thing that I noticed that was the substantive piece was that I was appointed as a full member of the grad faculty as soon as I came on board, and I don't remember what Amy's rationale was for not saying in G, not just evidence but promise of effective teaching at the grad level, but I think that we might want to just ask her about that one more time before it goes anywhere.

Senator Haugo: There was the whole round of revisions in 2009 to graduate faculty status, and I would guess that that dates to those changes.

Senator Kalter: So that maybe they've changed it since we were hired? Okay. Did anybody else see anything?

Senator Gizzi: So you want to remove this graduate school bylaws?

Senator Kalter: I'm thinking of removing it from the agenda for now so that we can work out the kinks and get a really, really nice clean copy. For example, you might notice that they seem to be working from June 2005 version on the bottom, but it was last revised in 2009.

Senator Gizzi: All right. So they need a clean version.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. I'm just worried that we have all that worked out before… This was, by the way, the one that we went back and forth with how do we do this process. My sense is that what we ought to do is once it's back to us, put it out as an information item and in between the information and action item have that graduate faculty vote. In other words, if a senator is going to speak up about a change, let's give them the information item and then all the senators will have seen it. It will then go to a grad faculty vote, and that way once it comes back for an action item none of the senators can sort of say, "Oh, but, last minute change." Does that make sense to people to do in that order? We were trying to make sure it was streamlined. What do we call it? Not doing a loop?

Senator Haugo: Right. Because if we did the graduate faculty vote first and then to Senate, it would have to go back to the graduate faculty if the Senate made changes.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. So I think this is the most efficient way is to do the information, then do the grad faculty vote (assuming that there are no changes or send it back to committee if there are) and then after that do the action item.

Provost Krejci: Susan, was this really updated last April 2014? I thought they've been working on this recently.

Senator Kalter: That's one of my confusions.

Provost Krejci: Because I thought, did we get the recent copy?

Senator Kalter: Right. And I know that that actually happened with CTE bylaws where they worked on it around that time, but I thought that this one was last year.

Provost Krejci: That's what I thought. So then I started thinking…

Senator Kalter: Like, is that a typo? Could somebody have hit the 4 instead of the 5?

Provost Krejci: Or is there another document that might have cleaned up some of these things? I don't know.

Senator Haugo: I was on the Council at that time and I can't remember if they looked at the bylaws or not.

Senator Kalter: In 14? 13-14?

Senator Haugo: Yeah. Because the other thing that's possible is that the re-write could have begun at that time and that it was just never ratified. Right? But I can't remember. I was on the Council at that time.

Senator Kalter: Let me circle that one, too. I had that whole thing circled, but I want to put in 2015 perhaps. I definitely don't think that in the end version we ought to have these things that say, "oh, this was edited in" you know, and just these specific sections. Once is enough, just to say in the back, here's what we edited. Okay, so that one will come off the agenda when we get to that.

***04.15.16.01From Leanna Bordner/Athletics Council/ Rules Committee: Athletics Council Blue Book Page – Revision to III. B (Information Item 11/9/16)***

Senator Kalter: Let's see. The next one is Rules Committee. This is from the Athletics Council, went through Rules Committee and is just a relatively minor change, I believe, is what Martha said too, based on the NCAA stuff that is changing. Anybody see anything to question there? We are moving rapidly. This is great. All right. So that one we'll probably keep on the agenda.

***10.27.16.05 From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Administrator Selection and Search Policies (Information Item 11/9/16)***

Senator Kalter: The next one is from Mark's Committee. Why don't you say a little bit about this, Mark?

Senator Hoelscher: Yeah. Oh, and the lapse of attention actually didn't come from the Cubbies game last time. The policy that was forwarded I could not find and so I was frantically searching for it, but I didn't think that would get near as much of a laugh as the other did, so my apologies for not paying attention. This is the second one that we got now, and it came to us with some suggested changes and we reviewed those and we accepted them pretty much as-is, except as you go nearly to the bottom we got some advice from our student group and we changed that one line to, let's see. So if you look at Panel of Ten Chair and appointed committee secretary comma, colon, and then it says CAST and CAS and all of that, we changed a line, and I can't remember what it said at the beginning, but I think it said a master's student and we changed it… Say it again?

Senator Laudner: One master's and one doctoral.

Senator Hoelscher: One master's and one doctoral. And we changed that to two students, at least one of whom must be at the graduate level. And the reason we worded it that way, sometimes we have difficulty finding undergrads to serve, but the student representation recommended that we leave that open in case someone was very interested so we felt like that was an appropriate way to do that. So, other than that it's pretty minor changes, but that's what we did.

Senator Haugo: So it's changing from essentially two graduate students to a minimum of one graduate student?

Senator Hoelscher: That's correct.

Senator Laudner: It still requires two students.

Senator Snyder: When we were looking at it, we felt that a lot of undergrads end up going to grad school here so it would be, I mean, if they want to be involved in the college and they're looking at down the road, then it would be something that they would have interest in.

Senator Kalter: I'm pretty concerned about it for a couple reasons. I think grad students are already disenfranchised out of shared governance at this university and to not guarantee them both a doctoral and a master's student on the committee that is basically directly affecting their lives seems problematic to me. By the way, this suggested language was worked out between me and John Baur when we did the search that ended up with Amy Hurd's hire. So I had a feeling that that was the rationale, Morgen. I'm wondering if there's any reason not to simply say three students, at least one at the master's, one at the doctoral, and one open, right? One at-large. Because it does seem to me that master's students have very different interests from doctoral students and there are many different kinds of doctoral programs just even there. I feel like… I know that the grad students in my department felt very disenfranchised with the Senate vote last year. Apparently there was not, in this case, communication between John Davenport, the SGA, and the GSA (which is the Grad Student Association) about the fact that a Senate election was going on. And so it ended up that an undergraduate, who was also about to be a graduate student, got elected. But they felt like we would have put somebody up if we had known that the election had already started, right? And I'm not going to take a side on that because perhaps some of that was them not paying attention to the election cycle also, but it just seems they already have very minimal participation in the university-wide shared governance in many ways.

Senator Gizzi: What election was this?

Senator Heylin: This was the recent….

Senator Kalter: For Senator.

Senator Gizzi: Your election?

Senator Walsh: SGA election.

Senator Gizzi: Grad students felt that…

Senator Heylin: They didn't have ample information.

Senator Walsh: So this was a specific graduate senator position. Granted, graduate senators are not prohibited from running for other positions, but that one is specifically for graduate student representation, and the filing period went by and only one person was currently an undergrad but was becoming a graduate student had filled out his forms to become a candidate and so…

Senator Gizzi: Got it.

Senator Kalter: And Amy was really concerned about that, right? Because she was sort of expecting more communication from John, and I don't remember what John's reply was to that. I can't remember. The other thing about that is that realistically speaking they deserve two seats as senators because that's their proportionate population, right? And they've only got one and then that one… But that's just an example of where they already often feel like where do we shape the policies? Where do we shape our future here?

Senator Walsh: They have one designated position within student government, but as far as I'm concerned they're eligible to run for other positions as well.

Senator Hoelscher: So the bigger concern for the committee was not two or three. The bigger concern was can we get an undergrad to serve? So I think our student contingent said we'd like the opportunity but we don't mind putting that at least one of which must be a master's - I'm speaking for the committee a little, but we have two more members of the committee on here so please speak up - I don't think it would be a big concern of ours if we put three in there, at least one must be a doctoral student and one a master's student and then the third one's open. I don't think that would be a concern, would it?

Senator Snyder: Our biggest concern was just having the opportunity to serve as undergraduates.

Senator Hoelscher: Now, do we water the committee down too much? That would be the only other question.

Senator Kalter: I think that it might be helpful to run it by John and Amy about that because that's a good question. But from my perspective, no, because the Panel of Ten chair is a tenured/tenure-track professor, the department chairperson or school director is essentially that. You've then got six tenured/tenure-track professors. So essentially you've got eight faculty. In the current structure that would be two students and a civil service or AP employee from within the grad school or who supports a grad program. So that's an eight to three ratio. I don't know that an eight to four ratio is that terrible.

Senator Haugo: Except that it results in an even number, and an odd number may be better.

Senator Laudner: But there's no vote.

Senator Haugo: No. It's a recommendation, but we typically try to stick to odd numbers so that there's not a…

Senator Kalter: That's an interesting question, Senator Haugo. Do we stick to odd numbers throughout the rest of the policy?

Senator Haugo: Well, in the policy, I don't know. I guess the other issue just in terms of, and it's one person here or there, but it is a large committee and the more people who sit on the committee, the more difficult it is to find a time to meet, having served on the last committee. So the more bodies that we assign to a committee, the more difficult it is to find a meeting time.

Senator Hoelscher: The other thing we could do – I'm just going to throw this out there very quickly – so John Baur and Amy Hurd, and they're both in RSP.

Senator Kalter: Yes. So, John works for Janet. He is one of her direct reports and is the Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies.

Senator Hoelscher: Yeah. I deal with John all the time on completely different issues.

Senator Kalter: Yes. And then Amy works for him as the Graduate School Director.

Senator Hoelscher: So you could put two students, at least one of whom must be a PhD student. So the question is…

Senator Gizzi: Whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa. Because that narrows it down to just a few departments.

Senators Kalter and Haugo: Yeah.

Senator Hoelscher: Oh, wrong word. Well, the point is, do we increase the number and leave the wording as it is or do we keep the number at two and re-do the wording?

Senator Kalter: Yeah. That is the question. I think that working with John and Amy would help. I think there are good arguments like what Morgen gave about why an undergrad might be very helpful, but what the graduate students will tell you is first of all that doctoral and master's students have often very different perspectives on what the Graduate School needs to do for them and how well they're served by it. And the reason to have people who are already grad students is because they have experience understanding what the problems have been or what the good stuff has been and how the processes work and all of that kind of stuff so that I would be reluctant to have less than two graduate students. I don't personally, except for Senator Haugo's even/odd thing, I don't see anything wrong, personally, with having three students altogether, an undergrad, a master's, and a doctoral student.

Senator Hoelscher: Is it okay to leave it three students and leave everything else alone, at least one of whom must be at the graduate level or at least two of whom…

Senator Kalter: I think we would have to say at least one of whom must be a master's student and one must be a doctoral.

Senator Haugo: I think so, so that there's representation.

Senator Kalter: I'm trying to remember. We've got nursing, audiology. KNR, I think, has a PhD…

Senator Laudner: No. CAST doesn't have one.

Senator Kalter: Oh, okay. English. Education has three, actually. I think there are eight total on campus.

Provost Krejci: Ten now.

Senator Hoelscher: I have no problems with running that by John and Amy, and if they don't think the committee is too big with the addition of one, I think it's a very equitable solution if that's okay. And I don't think the committee will have a problem with it.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. We should probably put it back through Administrative Affairs and Budget just to have that conversation.

Provost Krejci: Are we done with that piece of the policy? I just want to bring something up that may not be something you want to deal with right now, but under the selection for the deans, I believe it is… I struggled as provost when I had to have two faculty at large and I'll tell you why. I think it narrows who could get on that committee. We just had a meeting where we were talking about search committees and the problem with the lack of under-represented groups on search committees, so what I always did with that when I had an at-large was I tried really hard to focus on finding members who were under-represented, but it was a little arbitrary. Do you see what I mean? It's a little arbitrary for me. I thought about it. I would ask people, etc. But I'm just putting it on the table as I would love to have a list of faculty who are interested in serving on search committees that are beyond the Panel of Ten who may have some… be under-represented. Because we don't know who's willing to serve and who would like a phone call for that, and it would give people from under-represented groups potentially another venue to have a list. Another option is even to say that all the deans submit three names. Do you see? I feel like I always try to do my best to say, what are we looking at? And I would leave those to last to look at who's on committee so I could say, well, gee, it's all women or it's all men or we don't have any diversity or we don't have any of this. And maybe it's there so it can be that arbitrary, but I'm just putting it on the table. I struggled with it sometimes. And I did my best, but it was really me going, I would go to the provost's staff and I would go to the dean's staff, but it's a little open to arbitrariness. This is yours for the future. It won't be mine, but I just wondered, could there be a list? Could there be another pool of faculty that is elected or willing to serve on things that weren’t passed. Because you almost always want a little bit of diversity outside of the college as well.

Senator Kalter: I was just going to say, so Jay, whenever he puts together a Panel of Ten, holds out certain positions that he has control over to find out who actually gets elected and then if the committee is not very diverse, he will try to look for the diversity in that other pool. And that sometimes works and it sometimes doesn't work, but I guess the theory here is somewhat similar, that those two are the ones that you have in your… And you just select them. But if you don't have an actual pool to draw from…

Provost Krejci: For me, I do my best to go search, but it's so arbitrary that I could say, hey, Mark, you're my buddy. Come on in. And I hope no one would do that, but I just wondered if there was at least a pool available. We talked about how do you get more under-represented people? Because if you look at the Panel of Ten, it's not very diverse usually either. So, anyway, I don't think you need to discuss it today. I just think if the policy is on the table…

Senator Hoelscher: Do we want, as a committee to try to come up with some language? And if we do, do we want to call it something like a specialized Panel of Ten, a focused Panel of Ten, a Faculty Panel of Ten or something like that?

Provost Krejci: And I don't want to delay this, and maybe it's something you just put on the table to think about in the future, but I do struggle with getting under-represented groups on searches and I usually can find people to do that. And that's usually what I do is I wait until the whole committee is formed and then I use those, whether it's students or whatever.

Senator Kalter: I struggle equally with the final paragraph, the one about Academic Affairs Administrator other than department chair or school director. This is the very last, after the Director of the Graduate School. We actually should have given suggested language there because remember, I think it was when we were searching for the grad director you and I sat down, Janet, and you said what is this "such as" mean? Does this include the graduate school director, does it not, or maybe it was some other position. So we probably ought to change that to something like "including but not limited to" those positions.

Senator Hoelscher: You've got to get me there. I don't know where you are.

Senator Kalter: I'm sorry. It's the very last set of… It's on the very last page.

Senator Hoelscher: Under Academic Affairs Administrator other than department school chair?

Senator Kalter: Yeah. So, for example, that paragraph leaves open, do we form a Panel of Ten search committee for Troy Johnson's job or not? Do we form one for, what was another one, there aren't that many in the provost's office that are direct reports where you would have this question, but it might be something like international affairs, international studies, or something. And it's very, very vague.

Provost Krejci: Which wasn't a direct report but now is.

Senator Kalter: That’s a good point.

Provost Krejci: So when it wasn't it was even more of a local decision versus a systematic approach to it.

Senator Kalter: I think we might have had this conversation with the honors director also and with the Cross chair at some point.

Provost Krejci: And the reason this is even here is because when I first came in, this position was open so I read the policy and I asked everyone, is this a Panel of Ten? And they said no. And I'm like, well, how do you decide? Because it was this kind of open language. And I think that's when you and John said, let's do this for now and then let's do this. We're so decentralized here, which is wonderful, but then there are things that happen locally that you say, oh, should we do that locally or should we have had a different kind of approach to it?

(Senator Grzanich excused himself to go participate in Trick or Treat for Change.)

Provost Krejci: I don't want to delay it. It's just something to consider. I don't have a magical answer for it.

Senator Gizzi: This is going back to the committee, why can't we just suggest it go back to the committee and maybe, Mark, invite the provost to come to the committee member and talk about it.

Senator Haugo: That makes sense.

Provost Krejci: I'm certainly happy to do whatever, but I would like the input of the Exec Committee. This is my experience, and I guess in my head I always thought, wouldn't it be cool if there was a pool of people who were willing to serve on search committees who may not want to take the responsibility for the Panel of Ten. Because I've talked to some members of under-represented groups and the balance is they get asked to do all the stuff and we don't want to over-burden them, yet then how do you get diversity on search committees? And this is a way that I choose to do it, but it's only my choice, quite frankly, and it's Jay's choice, quite frankly, because we're committed to it. But it's not really…

Senator Kalter: And what we could do… We're going to send it back because of the John Baur-Amy Hurd thing anyway, so December will be the first opportunity to put it on as an info item. But there's no reason to hold up one part of the policy while we're thinking about another part, right? It seems like there are three parts that have little or large concerns – the college deans, the stuff that we just talked about with the director of the grad school, and then this last sort of catch-all. And we could work out the thing with the director of the grad school, put it on as an information item, and send that part through while still talking about the other two issues.

Senator Gizzi: Is that necessary to split it?

Senator Kalter: It's not necessary, but if we want to…

Senator Gizzi: Unless there's some compelling reason, I would say do it all at once.

Senator Hoelscher: Yeah, because this process is complicated enough and I think we're far better off approaching it all at once. The only problem we have is, as a committee, I don't know what our free slots are because we're about to go into the Academic Impact Fund.

Senator Kalter: And the Presidential Commentary.

Senator Hoelscher: Yeah, well the presidential commentary will be spring, so I'm not so pressured with that. But I have my first meeting with Alan Lacy coming up very soon, and so I may be covered up for a little bit until we get back to this, but that's not a problem. And Janet is going to be gone, so I'll have to hustle that up.

Provost Krejci: Well, and Jan can do it as well. And I'm happy to talk to anyone. My other piece on this is about students because students… You know, we'll get ten names, but like for my first dean's search, we just get names. We don't know where they're from. So I drill down to say, "What colleges are they from?" and none of them were from the college that we were looking to get from and that was a problem. And a lot of times it takes a while to get those SGA meetings just because it takes a while, but I don't know… So then I knew last year to call Ryan and say, "I need someone from Business. Can you help me?" That was easier because I need someone from Nursing and there wasn't as much so we got one Business and one Nursing, but we went and kind of got them. And that's the other piece is that if you're going to get students, it would be nice if they were from the college.

Senator Hoelscher: So, the big question is, as pressed as we all are for time, the top one will be easy. I'll call John Baur and Amy Hurd. If they say, no, three students there's no problem, we have the problem solved. If they say, well, we really don't want three, then we have as a committee maybe some tough decisions to make. That'll be easy. The second one, College Deans, we may have to work on that a little bit. And the third one is probably going to be the most difficult in terms of working our way through. Do we want to put these off until the next review cycle?

Senator Kalter: I don't think so. I think that we have momentum on it. What I just wrote down was four different things: The grad student issue with John and Amy, the diversity pool for the deans, are the students from SGA in the same college as the deans - so those are sort of both the dean's search - and then this weird catch-all category at the end and whether any sorts of refinements are possible there. My question over here was is this adequate? Is that the way we want it? And it seems like those four things, or at least three of the four things, could be batted out pretty… Sometime this year, so to speak.

Provost Krejci: And you're right because there's no clear direction whether Troy's position would fit under here. There's not a clear… Because it says such as those who report. And for me coming in as a brand new provost trying to read the policies and figure it out, you don't know. I mean, it is not clear. And I can give you probably half a dozen positions that are critical positions, even financial aid. You know, you'd say, well we don't want to do that. And it may not be that you have a Panel of Ten but it may be that you have some kind of Academic Senate membership on the search committee.

Senator Kalter: I have a couple of ideas there that I can share with you later, Mark, like I had written down something like four to six tenure-track faculty members and one to three students or something like that as that catch-all. Or you could say something like, it will have at least this composition and then the rest will be decided in conversation with the Executive Committee for that year because it kind of depends on what the position is and the provost's office doesn't stay the same over a decade, you know? We never had a Troy Johnson at one point. At one point we had a Rosenthal and then we didn't and then we did again.

Provost Krejci: And we had a Rita and then we didn't.

Senator Kalter: Exactly. So, that last catch-all one is really weird and might take a little bit more finessing. But the other two I think can be…

Senator Hoelscher: So, I will bring it back at the very next meeting, and we're going to make the simple changes. So I'll talk with John Baur and Amy Hurd and then bring it back at the next committee meeting. And then the more difficult changes we'll probably wait to get either Jan, or Janet, to our meeting and have that conversation, and we may even invite you to the meeting if you would like, and we'll work on those. It may behoove you and I to get together before that so we have some proposed language to try to…

Senator Kalter: It might be helpful to talk to Dan Holland, too, since he has a lot of institutional memory on that.

Senator Hoelscher: So, that sounds like a plan. I think Academic Impact Fund is going to take the next meeting. That would be my guess. It took two meetings last time and I want to try to efficiency it up to one, but I doubt I can efficiency it up more, but these are numbers and the numbers are difficult.

Senator Kalter: I was just thrilled to see this coming to us. I was thrilled to see this on the agenda, that you had already gotten to it. This is great.

Senator Hoelscher: Well, thank you. We expected it to be a little more difficult than we thought it was going to be. I've got to ask, is anybody as tired as I am from the Cubbies last night? Wore me out! It was way too much worry.

Senator Kalter: 5,4,3,2,1. Okay, I'm going to move on to the next agenda item.

***10.28.16.01 From Academic Affairs: Dual Degree Process Outline (Information Item 11/9/16)***

***05.16.16.01 From Amy Hurd, Grad. School: Dual Degree Program Proposal (Information Item 11/9/16)***

***10.28.16.02 From Academic Affairs: Committee Minutes with Dr. Hurd’s Comments (Information Item 11/9/16)***

Senator Kalter: Dual degree documents. Anybody have anything on those?

Provost Krejci: I just have to ask if the duel spelling was any problematic because there was…

Senator Kalter: I loved that. That was great. That was really great. I had to step out. Or, actually, no. I was at the University Research Council when I ran into Amy Hurd and realized that the dual degree had slipped through the cracks between Cynthia and Adam and so then I had spent the afternoon with Adam doing the agenda and stuff like that, and I'm like, "Oh, no! We've got to add something to it!" So we sent that one and then we started dueling swords. That was awesome. But no, I don't think there was any meaning to it.

Senator Haugo: We have faculty who can do tutorials for that now.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. He's no longer on the Senate, by the way. Anybody have anything about that one?

Senator Hoelscher: Why, again, do we have two copies of that?

Senator Kalter: Do we have two? Did you get sent two? So, one of the agendas said d-u-e-l rather than d-u-a-l and I think there might have been something else in that, but…

Senator Hoelscher: I have two copies of the dual degree document.

Senator Haugo: Isn't one set from Amy Hurd and one set from…

Senator Kalter: Oh, yeah, that. I am mystified, especially because they're in pdf and you can't figure out whether there were changes.

Senator Hoelscher: There is some difference.

Provost Krejci: Well, the dates are different. It originally came up last May and then in August.

Senator Kalter: I think I saw somewhere that Luis had gotten it and made changes, so it may be that those are the changes since Luis and somebody else looked at it and made changes to it.

Senator Hoelscher: So I'm looking at 10.28.16… One was distributed in August and this one is distributed…

Senator Haugo: In October.

Senator Hoelscher: I don't know. 11? 9?

Senator Kalter: This is partly why I asked, I had actually asked for an excerpt from the Academic Affairs Committee minutes so that we could have more of the understanding of what had happened. And he must not have remembered that part, to take the excerpt.

Senator Gizzi: That's why I e-mailed you. I was confused. I was like, we don't consider minutes.

Senator Kalter: Well, they are public documents.

Provost Krejci: Could they have just fallen off in between Cynthia and…

Senator Kalter: Yes, I think that's what happened. I think that she…

Senator Gizzi: We did this at the very beginning of the year.

Senator Kalter: I think Jim sent it to Cynthia and maybe even to me but within a set of minutes and so we didn't see that it was coming through. There's another issue here. I had two questions about the document itself, but what is the nature of the item? Is it going to be a policy, a guideline, a procedure, a philosophy? Is it on a university level? Is it on the grad school level? Janet, it sounds like you're thinking that we might want to not put this on right away for information?

Provost Krejci: I'm torn because, of course, we have these opportunities for these things and we want to move forward, but I'm sorry that it's not clear because this is… I mean, I think they've done a lot of work on this to look at it but I don't know if there are substantive issues that would be an obstacle to moving forward on it.

Senator Gizzi: I don't remember the conversation. I remember the foreign exchange student thing. I remember that, but I'm just trying to remember what we …

Senator Haugo: I think the key thing is that there's already two programs operating at the university, so they're operating without a policy governing them.

Senator Kalter: That was a summer whoops. Even the grad school didn't know about that.

Senator Haugo: So this would seem to have some urgency if we have two degree programs operating without a policy that's governing them.

Provost Krejci: Does anything have substantive changes or concerns?

Senator Kalter: Janet, I've already shared with Amy my one or two. One of them is I'm a little disconcerted by the idea that you could get a degree in the same subject. Same degree, same subject at two different universities. And then I think the dual degree review committee… I don't know if I've shared this one with her, but I'm not sure it's well defined.

Senator Hoelscher: I was thinking dual degrees here.

Senator Haugo: No, it's two institutions.

Provost Krejci: And this is new to me. This is apparently not new in terms of what's going on with international these days, and there are some reasons to it as you say here with different things because even though it's a different degree, it's a different cultural perspective that broadens their ability to go back to their own country or stay here in a different way. And there's lots of reasons for it. But this is new to us. This is not something that… But a lot of universities are moving forward with this as they expand internationally. So Amy has not shared with me your concerns, so I don't know those.

Senator Kalter: My recollection is that she answered them and I just don't remember the answers, so I was going to ask that one on the floor of the Senate when she came. It just seems to me that when one of our two administrators on Exec is wondering about this that we probably shouldn't put it forward as an information item, right? Janet, if you're still sort of scrutinizing it…

Provost Krejci: Well, I'm not scrutinizing the substance or the aim. I was just scrutinizing the difference to say, why do we have two? Because I was really looking at this and thought, oh this is a … But I don't see anything different. It's new for us, but I think they've done an enormous amount of work to try to figure it out and look at best practices and try to see it. I don't have any obstacles in it except that I was trying to see if there were differences and I couldn't see any.

Senator Kalter: Maybe what we could do is I could go and ask Amy which one of these is the one that got approved out of Academic Affairs Committee because my guess is it's the one that has the later date, and what was the substance of the change between those two so that we could keep it on the agenda and move it forward.

Senator Laudner: What's the later date?

Senator Haugo: October 28th. This first one, Susan, has a distributed date of August 22nd. That would have been prior to our ….

Senator Gizzi: Yeah, but it was distributed here and then it would have made it to the committee by the time… It was one of our first meetings.

Provost Krejci: So is it just coming back as to say they're done with it and now it's ready?

Senator Gizzi: We didn't really do much with the whole thing.

Senator Haugo: It was September 28th. We didn't change it.

Senator Gizzi: It felt more advisory than anything. It was more of a discussion. Maybe it needs to go back to the committee. I don't know.

Senator Lonbom: That’s what I’m wondering, actually.

Senator Haugo: It says recommendation that it's unanimously approved by the committee to send to the Senate.

Provost Krejci: But I think it may have been…

Senator Gizzi: Further edited?

Provost Krejci: Well, I don't see… And again, all I did was look at every last sentence, etc. I didn't go word by word, but I think it may have been just drop the ball between and so it showed up again. But I don't think there's any substantive changes. I think that's the question. If there's no substantive changes and it was approved unanimously out of committee, then I think it should be able to go forward unless there's anything here. I don't see any big obstacle. It's new for us. It's clearly new, you know?

Senator Gizzi: We didn't wordsmith the document. We had a discussion about it.

Senator Kalter: In between now and next Wednesday I can just talk through it with Amy. Like, are we putting this on as a university policy? Is it just sort of Senate endorsing this as a graduate-level policy? What form do you want this to take? Because we had left that open in the summer when we talked about it. She was asking that question and I'm still asking that question. The form of it is not like a university policy on that policy website, but it is kind of a policy, so where would it go?

Senator Haugo: And do we need catalog language for such a thing?

Senator Kalter: That's a great question.

Provost Krejci: And that we can get answered.

Senator Kalter: So it sounds like we're moving forward with it. I'll just talk to Amy about some of these questions and then put it on as an information. Because we can always go back.

Senator Gizzi: But we need to know by Wednesday if it's a university policy or a grad school policy. And if you don't know that, then I would pull it until you know it.

Senator Kalter: Good. Okay. Anything else on that one?

Provost Krejci: So you're going to take it but nothing you need me to do? Just so I know.

Senator Kalter: I don't think so. I've got the two tape recorders and I can play back this conversation and have a conversation with Amy about ironing out the details and making sure we've got only one copy going forward. Great.
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***Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Pancrazio***

***Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Senator Hoelscher***

***Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Dyck***

***Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Marx***

***Rules Committee: Senator Horst***

***Communications***

***Adjournment***

**Motion:** By Senator Hoelscher, seconded by Senator Walsh, to approve the Senate Agenda.

Senator Kalter: So, yes. Let's make the changes. So we're going to take off the Student Government Blue Book page, the Graduate School Bylaw revision, the Administrator Selection policy. I'm wondering, does anybody think we should take off the Anti-Harassment thing given the preponderance of evidence question that came up? Given that we don't have minutes from that night.

Senator Gizzi: I move to take it off.

Senator Hoelscher: I heard Anti-Harassment policy.

Senator Gizzi: Preponderance of evidence. The issue about evidence.

Senator Walsh: The burden of proof. The standard of proof.

Senator Hoelscher: Where is that? I'm sorry, folks. I'm losing it.

Senator Haugo: It's the first action item on the agenda.

Senator Hoelscher: I'm lost. Am I looking at the same thing?

Senator Heylin: It wouldn't be in the executive packet. It would be in your last Senate packet.

Provost Krejci: But it's the agenda, right?

Senator Haugo: It's the first action item on the agenda.

Senator Kalter: My feeling also, Mike, was to take it off. I'm not necessarily concerned about the answer that we got. I'm concerned about the fact that nobody on campus knows that answer. That only the people in the Senate heard it and it went by relatively quickly as to why they used preponderance of evidence and given that we're still trying to catch up with getting the minutes out…

Senator Gizzi: As opposed to clear and convincing.

Senator Heylin: Isn't it legally mandated?

Senator Kalter: She didn't say mandated. What she said was that the state uses that as their standard so if you're dealing with the State Office of Civil Rights, they're looking to campuses to be using the preponderance of evidence standard. So, of course, they're looking at it from that kind of… It's not exactly compliance but conformity with the rest of the state. But I think it would be nice to have that understood better by a wider group than just who was at Senate that night before we move forward. Because, remember, they've already made those changes so these changes are posted. We have some time to get the minutes out and then feel like, okay, campus has been informed.

Provost Krejci: We're compliant. We're not risking it. And I don't know if this will come up, Mike, but given the conversation at our previous meeting about this topic where they wanted to have more discussion on this…

Senator Gizzi: They want the university to consider a hate crime policy. But they don't know what that policy is. And I insisted that it go through our process and thus it would go to a committee and we'd have to… Yeah, that's not a quick process in that sense.

Senator Kalter: It would also need a previous committee, right? Now that we've hired Tony Walesby, probably he's going to be the director of OEOA, he and a number of people should probably get together and actually create any policy like that before it comes to the Senate.

Senator Gizzi: Right. Yeah. No, this was just sort of like their brainstorming. This is the Campus Climate Task Force and it's like, we need a hate crime policy because there's this public law about hate crimes. And I'm like, well, that's great. We have shared governance here. But, yeah. I was thinking the same thing. What's the policy that you want? You know?

Provost Krejci: And they talked about it with harassment and this, so that's why I'm thinking they're going to overlap or whatever it is, but that will come in due time.

Senator Gizzi: I agree. Hold this until.

Senator Kalter: All right. So we're holding four things. The 1.2.1, the Student Government Blue Book page, the Grad School Bylaws, and the Administrator Selection.

Senator Haugo: And we want to change the spelling on dual degree.

Senator Kalter: It is changed in the revised agenda that was sent out, actually. Thank you. I'm not sure I want to change it.

Senator Haugo: So the dual degree process outline, do we need to distribute the minutes or can we just pull out?

Senator Kalter: Of the dual degree conversation? No. The intention, I had asked Adam to only excerpt that one conversation, but by the time he got to it I was sitting in the Board of Trustees meeting and so he didn't have any guidance on that.

Senator Haugo: So my question is, I guess, for the Senate meeting can we just…

Senator Kalter: We can just excerpt. We will, for sure. Because nobody needs to see the entire set of minutes. All right. Do we have an agenda? All in favor?

The motion to approve the proposed Senate agenda as amended passed unanimously.

***Adjournment***

Motion: By Senator Hoelscher, seconded by Senator Heylin to adjourn.