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***Call to Order***

Senator Kalter: So hi everyone. Welcome back. Let's start by going around the… I'll call the meeting to order first officially. Let's start by going around the table. Since we have a lot of new people on Exec, we always do introductions anyway, so let's start there. And I'm actually going to ask the person to start who's been in the news lately in the Pantagraph, and thank you for not saying we really support the liberal arts as long as they're focused, quote unquote. Thank you for not being that President.

President Dietz: It seems to me to be antithetical.

Senator Kalter: So I wanted to put that out there.

President Dietz: Liberal arts and vocational education just seem to… I'm Larry Dietz, President. Welcome to everybody and happy new year.

Senator Blum: I'll go. Craig Blum. I'm from Special Education. It's my first time on Exec, so yeah.

Senator Mainieri: My name's Tracy Mainieri. I'm from Kinesiology and Recreation in the Recreation Park Administration Program. Also my first time on Exec.

Provost Murphy: Jan Murphy, and I work in the Provost office.

Senator Horst: Yes you do. I'm Martha Horst. I'm in the School of Music.

Ms. Christensen: I'm Cera Christensen. I'm the Senate clerk.

Senator Kalter: I'm Senator Kalter. I work in the English Department, chair of the Senate.

Senator Phillips: I'm Taylor Phillips, and I'm Secretary of the Assembly for Student Government.

Senator Breland: I’m Khayla Breland. I'm Vice President of the Assembly.

Senator Rubio: I'm Mike Rubio. I'm the Student Body President.

Senator Nikolaou : I'm Dimitrios Nikolaou from the Economics department, also first time in the Exec.

Senator Marx: Okay, and I'm David Marx from the Physics Department.

President Dietz: I should have said and I also work in the President's office.

Provost Murphy: When things get ugly, I just duck out like I don't, you know.

Senator Kalter: We were hoping with all those piles that they, in the picture, that you actually do, you know, like work and stuff.

President Dietz: And stuff.

***Oral Communications:***

***Academic Senate Bylaws***

***Student Code of Conduct ad hoc committee will need to meet again in the fall.***

Senator Kalter: All right. Cera’s passing some stuff around, so our first things… A couple of oral communications. One is on here, one is not. We now have bylaws. Our President who works in the President's office has just signed our bylaws. We have a new consent agenda, hooray, so we can start putting that in use. The second one is already on the agenda that the Student Code of Conduct ad hoc committee is going to need to meet again this fall, because they did not finish their work completely, so just letting you know that, and I'm also going to announce that at the full Senate meeting, because technically those committees really are constituted only for a year at a time, and so we kind of have to get like, you know, informal, I guess, permission; formal, if need be, if there's a debate or whatever, but it will probably be, you know… Let's see. So…

Senator Horst: I have a question about that. Do we need to replace anybody?

Senator Kalter: I don't know. I don't think so. What do you think?

Senator Rubio: Yeah, I'll have to replace people.

Senator Horst: Are there any faculty senators or anything?

Senator Horst: No? Okay.

Senator Rubio: Just because Beau and someone else sat on it and they both graduated. So just students, yeah

Senator Kalter: I’m trying to remember if we had the senators on it or if it was just faculty.

Senator Rubio: It was students, faculty, and then staff from SCCR

Senator Kalter: And I feel like the faculty were non-senate faculty, right? Yeah.

Senator Rubio: What I remember, yeah.

Senator Kalter: So I don't think we'll have to replace anyone.

***Distributed Communications:***

***Approval of Dean’s Evaluation Instruments for CAS, CAST, CFA, COB, MCN, MIL per the Administrator Evaluation policy (Action Item 8/29/18)***

Senator Kalter: Okay, so the first thing has a story behind it. This is approval of dean's evaluation instruments for six of the seven colleges. About four years ago, I thought it might be an interesting idea if we actually followed one of our policies, which is the Administrator Evaluation policy, and do what it says and approve these instruments that we use to assess how well deans and chairs do, and these instruments have been sort of in use for many years before, you know, we realized that we weren't following the policy about how they need to be approved, and it turned into instead of like a half a year-long thing, a four year-long thing. So the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee took this on and at one point the instruments for evaluating deans came up as an information item. This was on August 31, 2016, so about two years ago. At that time, we asked the deans and the chairs who in the policy are also supposed to approve these instruments to take a look at and give us feedback if they had any objections. The deans cleared them. They said they look good to us. The chairs took a little bit of time, a little bit more time, and they had some what I would consider comments for improvement. You can see in what Cera just passed out that some of them are comments for improvement and that there's one that's a little bit needing debate. I'm going to pause here for a minute to let Alex…

Senator Campbell: I apologize for my tardiness.

Senator Kalter: That's all right. So we started the meeting by going around and introducing ourselves, so if you would just…

Senator Campbell: Hi. I'm Alex Campbell, and I'm the President of the Assembly for SGA.

Senator Kalter: Welcome.

Senator Campbell: Thank you.

Senator Kalter: So, the chairs eventually gave feedback to the committee and you might remember that Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee was really busy last year, so it never, this one never got back to be an action item. So towards the end of the year I sent Cera this email that you’ve got in front of you that just got passed out saying okay, we need to simplify this process. It's taking a lot more time than we ever anticipated. Right? Let's do a little bit of splitting off. So my recommendation was essentially take these… Let me also go back just for a minute. The College of Education's instrument for their dean was always considered by the Budget Committee as needing some negotiation with the college. So that's why that one is not in this mix. And most of the feedback that the chairs gave, it's sort of like well the instrument that's in use right now is fine, these are just suggestions for improvement, and those need to go back to the respective college councils to see if they want to accept those. Right? Because they're part of that shared governance system. So what I'm suggesting is that we actually approve the current documents and say the ones that have been in use can continue to be in use and then send all of the feedback to those respective councils and ask them hey, can you talk about this in your councils and then send them back up. And what that will help do is to split them up so that they come back to us sort of a little bit at a time and trickle back and we can get them through instead of having this big block. But there was the… I wouldn't have considered myself the suggestions that were made about the College of Fine Arts instrument to have been completely friendly suggestions, and so I think that is going to need to go back to Administrative Affairs and Budget and have another type of conference, but that the current instrument still can go forward and sort of say we approve this, we just want to have more of a bigger conversation around that. So how does that plan sound after three or four years of good intentions?

Senator Blum: It sounds efficient to me. I mean like that the college councils are the appropriate, I think, body to have the most, you know, they're going to be sensitive to what the needs of each college is, certainly more than the Senate, right, as a whole is.

Provost Murphy: And the college councils are the ones conducting those evaluations. Can you tell me again the College of Ed, what was going on there?

Senator Kalter: You know, I'm not sure I remember or even ever knew the detail of what was going on there.

Provost Murphy: Okay.

Senator Kalter: And I don't remember the instrument itself actually. The only thing I remember is that when they compared all of the instruments all to each other, that one stood out to them as not, it was like one of these things is not like the others, and so they wanted it to conform more to the way the other colleges, or at least have a conversation about why it didn't conform and whether... Is that right?

Senator Marx: That’s correct. Yeah. I was on the AABC when we first looked at it, and that one really did stand out as being very weak compared to the others.

Provost Murphy: Got you.

Senator Kalter: So Alan Lessoff did a lot of yeoman's work on these when they first came to the committee, and then because of the year that Mark had last year with the other policy, and one of the things that happens on AABC, Administrative Affairs and Budget, is that they always get interrupted right in January or February to do the Presidential Commentary, and so any momentum that they have on something like this all of a sudden gets halted, and then it's really hard to restart it, you know, after that's done, so that can create kind of a difficult… You know, it's the appropriate committee to do it, but they often don't have the time, and so then things, you know, get hung up a little bit. But, anyway, so good.

Now the next question, the next one is the Integrity Policy, and I have a question, which is it's 13 pages. How many people were able to review it really thoroughly?

Senator Blum: Well I read it. I did read it, all right. So real quick, is there some way we're going to go back to the College of Education at some point?

Senator Kalter: Yes.

Senator Blum: Okay.

Senator Kalter: Let's see, what do I say in the email that… I think I say something like that will basically be, David, it's on the Administrative Affairs and Budget this year, it will be their job to do that one and also to take up the CFA suggestions and work with CFA.

Senator Blum: Okay.

Senator Marx: Right.

Provost Murphy: And I think Phyllis McCluskey-Titus is the chair of the College of Education council again. So that gives you a contact there and she's been the chair a couple of years, so she'll be a good contact for you.

Senator Kalter: Martha, do you know who the chair of the CFA council is?

Senator Horst: It was Tom Marko.

Senator Kalter: Okay.

Senator Horst: I don't know who it's going to be.

Senator Kalter: Okay, so it will be elected this year.

Senator Horst: Right.

Senator Kalter: Okay. All right, so that one will go on as an action item so we can clear those out.

***04.24.18.01 From Faculty Affairs Committee: Policy 1.8 Integrity MARK UP (Information Item 9/12/18)
04.24.18.02 From Faculty Affairs Committee: Policy 1.8 Integrity CLEAN COPY (Information Item 9/12/18)***

Senator Kalter: The Integrity Policy, the reason I ask is so this one and a number of others on the agenda are slated not to go on for the first Senate, because we don't like to overload the first Senate. It's slated to go on September 12, and I just wondered how many people had a chance to review it in case you want us to either talk about it today and then talk about it again at the next Exec, or wait until the next Exec to discuss it just because it's such a long policy and all of that. So currently what has happened, and one other thing that I want to just mention, the last time I saw this one, Dan Liechty, who was head of Faculty Affairs Committee, was asking myself and Jan a question about the very last step of the integrity process, and that was should the President of the University have the ability to basically consider an appeal on anything other than procedural grounds alone, because right now the policy is written that once it reaches the President's desk, he can only overturn it based on procedural grounds, so I wanted to sort of let you know where that conversation went and then what Faculty Affairs did with it. Both myself and Jan replied that we thought the President should have greater power than just procedural, but when Jan sent it to the university counsel, she said…

Provost Murphy: Is it me?

Senator Kalter: What's that?

Provost Murphy: Is it me? I don't remember any of this. I'm not disagreeing, I'm just…

Senator Kalter: No, yeah, so, so I wrote a long email, as I often do, and you and Lisa wrote short ones…

Provost Murphy: As I generally do.

Senator Kalter: My first paragraph, I said I don't know how Provost Murphy will feel, but I'm not generally a fan of clauses that limit the powers and judgment of the President of the University in such matters, particularly in limiting that officer to a procedural policeman or policewoman. Not generally a fan of clauses that limit the power of any person on any committee to appeal in a procedural matter, and then I mentioned that I feel like our non-reappointment policy in ASPT is like that right now and I don't really like that fact. So then Jan replied and said to Dan Liechty, I like the idea of having the opportunity of an appeal to the President and I see no reason why that should only be an appeal for procedural reasons, but then she said I will go ahead and check in with General Counsel to see if there is some legal reason. And what Lisa said was it's actually preferable to only have the President review the appeal on procedure only. It correctly makes you, meaning the Provost, the final decision regarding the merits and then lets the person appeal to the President on procedural grounds only, so the President could overturn the decision and send it back down only if the process was not followed correctly. So that's her legal advice about that, and so what the committee did was they took that advice and had left the policy as is, but that was sort of the big question that got left, but there may be other questions that as you review this policy you may say, well this is ready to go to the floor for information in four weeks, or we really need to send it back to committee to reconsider certain things. So does anybody have any thoughts about which way we should go?

Senator Horst: I was even wondering if it should go to Faculty Caucus first? Because it seems to really be targeting to faculty.

Senator Kalter: I knew somebody would bring that up. It is actually not targeted to faculty. The students, particularly grad students, but even some undergrads, can fall under this policy and have fallen under the policy, partly because sometimes… There are pretty stringent compliance requirements that have to do with things like the Department of Health and Human Services or, you know, I don't know what all of them are, and so if somebody, for example, was working as a grad student on a grant and they falsify information, the university is…

(All talking at once.)

Senator Kalter: …and so the entire Senate needs to see. And I was going to say that when it goes to information, I'm probably going to have more than one information item section, and probably go section by section so that people can sort of slowly take the policy in, because it's really long and the whole Senate has to do this one. In my opinion, it's one of the best written policies we've got already, but it still takes a little while to sort of grasp what's going on, what are these processes, and all of that kind of stuff. But, yeah, so that's why it can't go just…

President Dietz: I like the idea of taking more time with this. The question that I had as I reviewed this a little bit is there is a university ethics officer and I don't know if Rob has seen any of this, but I think it probably would be worthwhile to have him take a look at this.

Provost Murphy: I will double check. I believe he has only because I think Kathy Spence and Rob a lot of times they're having to figure out which way something goes, but that's a good question and, I mean, I think it will be good to double check.

Senator Kalter: Actually, I don't think anybody has brought that question up yet.

President Dietz: And in terms of protocol versus, you know, and procedural versus substantive kinds of things, I'm willing to do whatever, the will of the body. It is frankly easier if I just have the procedural side, and I understand why Lisa's advising that, but I also frankly can imagine that for the time an issue would go through all of this process that I would then at the end of all of that say well, but have you thought about all of this other, so I trust in the process, but if the group wants to open it up.

Senator Kalter: It's a very tight process and it's hard to imagine that if a procedural problem is starting that it wouldn't be called attention to as it's beginning and it would be corrected as it's going on, but then we don't write policies for the good day, you know, the days when we actually follow the process right. Craig, what were you going to say?

Senator Blum: No, I was just going to say that I agree with looking at this more carefully, and I had some questions, when I read it that, so some things might, I thought, for example, some universities have pretty elaborate definitions of plagiarism, right, and I don't know whether that's necessary or not, but it's rather succinct here. So anyway, so there's probably I think a need to go over this.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. Talking about it today and then talking about it again at next Exec where we decide what to do with it.

Senator Blum: And I just want to say, Susan, that I, that the issue of really anytime that you limit something to procedures, it is extremely limiting, and so that, it just, it's almost like you've taken the, there's really not much of a decision you can probably make.

Senator Kalter: I wanted to make sure to bring up, because I thought it was interesting that my instinct and Jan's instinct were similar, that coming from the academic point of view, we were sort of seeing the President should have full power beyond procedural, because procedural can be very limiting, and that it was a legal point of view that was sort of saying well that's better. Now there have been some instances where we had policies where the academic side and the legal side disagreed and the President has said I'm going with the academic side, or the President has said, you know, I understand the academic side, but I really think that we need to go with the legal side, right? And so I think it will be a discussion in Senate itself what we're recommending for this Presidency, not just this President, but this Presidency and our university.

Senator Horst: I'll dig into the constitution to see what it says, but when you start thinking about all of the times that something’s appealed to the President, I don't think it's ever procedural, but there's just if you start thinking about the different policies that appeal to the President, this would be unique, but I'll look into the constitution to see if there's anything.

Senator Kalter: I definitely think you're right, because if you think about AFEGC and the ASPT, all of those give power to the President to overturn based on anything.

Senator Horst: And there's something about the health that I found in the constitution, somebody who's sick or something, if they're relieved because they're sick it goes to the President and he can overturn it.

Senator Kalter: Oh yeah, that's right. I think that's in a dismissal case or something like that.

Senator Horst: Something like that, but that one was singled out that it went to the President, so I'll look at the constitution and see if there's anything about this, but it seems like it would be unique. If this is the only one that had a procedural clause. I also had some concerns about the definition of self-plagiarism itself. Self-plagiarism, when you think about music, it would be different.

Senator Kalter: I actually just put that, I put that question both to Kathy Spence and John Baur when we were doing it in a working group and just put it back to John Baur again to sort of say, could you remind me what self-plagiarism is, because in different fields it is different things, and there are many sort of arts and humanities things where actually using your own stuff over again and recycling it or redoing it is actually not only accepted, but it’s applauded. So that is something that I think we also need to figure out.

Senator Marx: We need to clarify what the issue is with that. I mean, imagine you took a short story and turned it into a novel. I mean, something like that.

Provost Murphy: I think that, I do think the instance of self-plagiarism is someone who took an article and it was exactly the same article published in a different journal, which is so but now that I believe that, but I think it needs to be clarified that's different, you know.

Senator Kalter: Right.

Senator Horst: Clarified by the disciplines.

Provost Murphy: Absolutely. Absolutely. So I would agree with the need for clarification.

President Dietz: Just one more comment under this appeal. All due respect to my colleague here, the language about the Provost as the final adjudicator, on and on and on, I think that whenever anybody at the institution is named in a lawsuit, my name is pretty much at the top of the list. So the final adjudicator, I wish.

Provost Murphy: No, that's why I voted you.

President Dietz: That's not the way it generally works. I may have a teammate to be…

Provost Murphy: I'll be 10 feet behind you, but I'll be right there with you.

President Dietz: Which I really kind of think speaks for broadening it out a little bit, because it does really do that most other policies that we have.

Senator Kalter: We could insert language that basically said, ordinarily a President will only overturn, or we could just leave it. I mean, I would prefer to just leave it open, but, you know.

President Dietz: Well if you ended that sentence with, subject only to an appeal to the President of the University, period, that takes care of it.

Senator Kalter: One thing that you should all know as you go back to sort of reread it and think about it, Kathy Spence and Susan Kalter have two very similar names, KS SK, and so the comments on the side are from both of us and I cannot determine yet which one was which exactly. Sometimes I can and sometimes I can't. We also have very similar personalities, so as you're reading the side comments, first of all, if you can send us recommendations of which ones can be now eliminated before it goes to the Senate floor and which ones are really useful and need to stay there, but just know that two people, the Academic Integrity Officer is Kathy Spence. She's in Research, Ethics, and Compliance, and so she's one of the SKs and I'm the other one.

Provost Murphy: She is KS and you are SK.

Senator Kalter: Well you've got it…

Provost Murphy: I only know that because on KS on page 3, KS says moved from 4J as agreed by Kalter. Oh no, (inaudible). I don't know. Never mind. Yeah, you're right. I thought I had that.

Senator Kalter: I think SK 2R1 is her…

Provost Murphy: I had that. I thought, nope, because some of them are SK and some are KS.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, because we were, she and John and I had several meetings about this and so we passed back and forth a number of drafts and I think sometimes it reversed the letters and sometimes it didn't.

Provost Murphy: Okay, never mind.

Senator Kalter: So don't hold it against either one of us.

Senator Horst: When we just send it to the Senate, though, it might be nice to have a sort of less annotated, just a markup copy.

Senator Kalter: Right.

Senator Horst: So the annotated copy, the markup copy, and a clean copy.

Senator Kalter: And only have questions on the side if they really need to be debated by the Senate, rather than they've already been.

Senator Horst: Just the inline, you know, sort of things…

Senator Kalter: Well, unless it's a neutral question. Right. It can't like, where was it… There is one question that might get resolved before that, but I had asked, and I remember asking this one, isn't it odd that you go through this whole process, you have an inquiry committee, you have an investigation committee, but then when it gets to the appeal of the investigation, it goes back down in the university structure for somebody at the dean's level to put that committee together, and there may be good reason for that, there may be not good reason, but we should, those are the kinds of things that, but on the other hand, Martha, I could just have that in my notes to point out as we go through, and then have a cleaner, more readable, larger type copy. So, yeah. All right. Anything else on this one today before we put it aside for next week?

***03.29.18.03- From Academic Affairs Committee: Email from Academic Affairs Chair Jim Pancrazio***

***03.30.18.01- From Academic Affairs Committee: Policy 2.1.20 Equitable Treatment of Students Mark UP (Information Item 9/12/18)***

Senator Kalter: Next thing is a bunch of policies that are all somewhat together, came together. They have all been pending just because we had a busy spring schedule, poor Jim Pancrazio had to wait a little bit, so you have his email, but let's take each of these separately, because I have a couple of different, there are a couple that I wanted to say something special on. For the Equitable Treatment Of Students Policy, that one is currently, we're thinking of putting on for, again, not next Senate, but the second Senate, and I have a note to myself about, and I may just bring this up on the floor of the Senate, but it seems to me that a professor should be able to appeal to the Executive Committee and they have in the past appealed to Exec that we might want to put that in the policy. In other words, if the Dean of Students' Office makes a determination that something is a reasonable reason for a student to be absent, but the Senate says, you know, that was never really intended, when we debated this policy we never intended for XYZ to be that, you know, so I don't think it needs to go back to committee, I think we just raise that on the floor of the Senate. But that was my only thing about, you know, about that one is that I think some type, in other words, we're trying to preserve the academic mission while at the same time making sure that students can step out of class for, you know, reasonably high important things, but sometimes that determination of what's important and what's not important is in dispute and it's helpful for the Senate to review that. So we're going to put that one on as an information item and I'll just bring up that question there.

***03.30.18.02- From Academic Affairs Committee: Policy 2.1.26 Student Absences Due To Service As A Volunteer Emergency Worker Mark up (Information Item 9/12/18)***

Senator Kalter: The second one was, if nobody had anything about that one, the second one was Student Absences Due to Service as a Volunteer Worker, and all they did was correct a typo. Did anyone see anything on that one before we…

Senator Horst: Do we have the power now to send it to a consent agenda, given that this is a typo?

Senator Kalter: Well we could send it back, technically, to Academic Affairs and say would you like to put this on the consent agenda? Hint hint.

Senator Horst: It has to come from the committee.

Senator Kalter: Right.

Senator Horst: Yeah, but…

Senator Kalter: As my, as, you know, the Secretary of the Senate often reminds me…

Senator Horst: This is a great example. I mean, it's a typo.

Senator Kalter: Is that good for everybody that we should technically send it back and say would you like to do this, and then have them send it back. Okay.

***03.30.18.03 From Academic Affairs Committee: Policy 2.1.27 Student Bereavement Policy Mark Up (Information Item 9/12/18)***

Senator Kalter: Student Bereavement Policy. This one I actually am going to recommend sending back to Academic Affairs substantively. They removed the word consecutive, but when Senate first passed policy, there was a long conversation about that word, and if we don't have that word in, it means that when somebody's mother, for example, passes away… Let's say it happens on a Wednesday, and the person has a Tuesday/Thursday class, it essentially allows them, if they have non-consecutive days, to miss two and a half weeks of class. If it's consecutive, it means that they can miss Thursday and Tuesday, and then of course if the person, if the mother were in California they would get extra days added on. So I'm pretty concerned about that, because I actually don't think that it serves the student to be able to miss. Right? I mean in some ways it's good that I thought of the example as a mother, because that's a particularly difficult death to deal with, but on the other hand it actually serves the student very badly if suddenly they've missed literally a quarter of the semester. Because let's say it happens on a Tuesday, right, and they maybe missed class that day or something, so I think we need to have them think that through a little bit more and maybe give us a written rationale if Academic Affairs still feels like they want to recommend that, what was the rationale for it.

Senator Marinieri: Yeah, I'd be interested in the rationale, because I have had students who the death happens and they need to go immediately, but for whatever reason the funeral is separated quite a bit, and so students have asked me for clarification, what does that mean, do I get that time for both of the incidents or not, and so I wonder if that also comes into it; if allowing them to split it up allows them to use it for both incidences.

Senator Blum: No, I mean that's, I don't know, but that sounds like something that why you would want to eliminate, but it also could get really out of hand in a hurry. If someone, you know, that, I think… I don't know how to count it, but it seems like, I mean to me it seems like common sense, right? But I realize there has to be a policy, right, that, you know, a student would miss five days and then they had to go, what did I say, two weeks later to a wake, for the same bereavement, but…

Senator Phillips: I just, my only thought, like I understand so if a student had like a passing and then days later they had a service, I guess I would just want to think about if it's more likely that those are the type of situations that students would be trying to use those days for versus like trying to get out of a class or not go to a class, and then decide if we want to have the policy be serving as like a preventive measure or something to benefit students who have suffered a loss, because I mean both sides are definitely valid for like worrying about a student.

Senator Mainieri: That's what I'd like to know, the rationale for the change that led to taking it out.

Senator Kalter: And actually from what you said, I wonder if the issue is that the taking of the word out implies more than they intended to imply, and there might be a way to reword it so that it may change a little bit, but not have the sort of scenario that I thought that it might mean. So let's send it back to them and ask them for re-deliberation and sort of clarification.

Senator Marx: Those special cases are covered by the student's ability to go through Dean of Students and they can say we have a special circumstance where I need a few more days. That's covered on the next paragraph, or in the next paragraph.

Senator Kalter: Which would imply to keep the wording.

Senator Marx: You could keep the wording as five consecutive days and if students need more days then they can ask for them via that process that's there already.

Senator Kalter: You can imagine like if somebody gets killed overseas, right, and it takes a while for the funeral to take place that you would want to have that… But if that's already built into the policy…

Senator Marx: Yeah, it's already built in.

Senator Kalter: Yeah.

Senator Horst: Couldn't we have the Academic Affairs Committee Chair discuss why they did this on the floor of the Senate and give their rationale to the entire Senate.

Senator Kalter: We could, I mean we have the power to do either, right. Exec can either send back or send it forward.

Senator Horst: I mean I also was envisioning five random days. If you take, and I remember the conversation we had with Student Government when this first went through and we asked for the consecutive, but I'm just thinking that this is coming from a committee and this is the wording choice they chose, so can they answer it on the floor of the Senate?

Senator Kalter: So what would be the benefit of doing it that way versus sending it back?

Senator Horst: That the entire Senate could hear the rationale and then the entire Senate could decide.

Senator Kalter: But it wouldn't give them time to then write out the rationale, right, and sort of say here's… or to even potentially sort of re-hear what is implied and maybe rethink that. Right? In other words, more is implied than what was intended. It would give them an opportunity to be prepared for that. In other words, we may send it back and they send it forward and say we want to keep it as is, here is why, and we're now prepared to articulate that really well on the floor. Whereas if we, you know…

Senator Horst: That's the only change to the policy.

Senator Kalter: It's a pretty significant change.

Senator Horst: Yeah, so if I were the chair of this committee I would be prepared to describe why we wanted to take that word out, because it's the only change.

Senator Marx: I think they would know.

Senator Horst: And if they're not prepared, they shouldn't be bringing it to the floor, but he should be able to represent the discussion about why this should be coming out. I'm just thinking that the Senate at some point needs to be involved in the debate.

Senator Kalter: Absolutely, absolutely.

Senator Marx: I think we should move it forward and since it's being presented as information item, then we have the discussion about it and then that can be discussed, and then the following time we vote on it. It's time to have friendly amendments and so forth.

Senator Horst: We could tell them we have concerns.

Senator Blum: Or we could tell them in advance, right. I mean tell him that we have these questions, but we want to talk about it on the floor. Right?

Senator Kalter: Right. So we will not send it back, we will send it forward. Is that what we're agreeing to? Should we take a vote? Do we want to vote or are people…

Senator Horst: Let's vote.

Senator Marx: Does anyone want to…Yes yes.

Senator Blum: Yes. I think it's good.

Senator Kalter: How many people want to send it forward to information? Okay, so that's what we'll do. Great.

***02.01.18.10 From Academic Affairs Committee: Policy 4.1.4 Dress Codes CURRENT (Information Item 9/12/18)***

Senator Kalter:Let's see. The next one, Dress Codes. Only one thing to note on this one. I noticed that Jim Pancrazio recommended a title change, but then didn't give us any wording for one. If you can think of one, let us know, I guess.

Provost Murphy: Did he give a justification why he didn't like the word dress codes?

Senator Kalter: Yeah, he said… where is that?

Provost Murphy: It will help us think about a better title.

Senator Kalter: He said, “He recommends changing the name of this policy to reflect more accurately what it really is, a list of issues that the department must consider if and when they would like to create a dress code.”

Senator Blum: Considerations for dress codes? I don't know that that really helps, okay, but that would reflect, that would point to information that's there. Actually, I didn't even know that you could have dress codes for some of these things, so I'm just kind of surprised.

President Dietz: It makes me very nervous.

Senator Kalter: What's that?

President Dietz: This whole thing makes me very nervous.

Senator Kalter: Does it?

President Dietz: Oh yeah. There are all kinds of legal issues with dress codes.

Provost Murphy: Nursing. Oh I think of like Nursing and that's where I go is like Nursing, yeah, in certain events or dietetics, or Reggie Redbird.

Senator Horst: The School of Music wears tuxes.

Senator Marx: Yeah, that’s for events.

President Dietz: Do they call that a dress code?

Senator Horst: I believe so, yeah.

Senator Marx: I would think so.

Senator Horst: There are expectations for what you look like on stage and you have to wear all black and the men have to wear tuxes.

President Dietz: I was going to say, though, I think the expectations may be there out of practice. I'm not, most case law is not around all that, and most case law would say don't do dress codes. You can have an expectation for the practice, but that varies by discipline, and oftentimes it's really around health-related areas and performance, you know, expectations, so forth. Everybody is wearing a tuxedo in a performance, you don't want somebody showing up in jeans and a t-shirt kind of thing, and I get all that but... And then the other thing that's in here, it says and/or grooming.

Senator Kalter: Was anyone else, other than Martha, here when this first came through Senate? Anybody want the history? So at some point I think it was the entire College of Business voted to instituting a dress code for their students. The rest of, well maybe not the rest of the university, but several faculty in the rest of the university were up in arms over it, maybe some inside the College of Business for all I know, I don't know. So the Senate did a lot of investigation, a lot of negotiation with the various deans, chairs at the time. I think since that time it went from all the College of Business down to just one department, which was the Marketing Department, and we ended up with what I thought was a compromise position because we sort of said well, the way that Jim puts it in his letter, it's not completely accurate, the way he says it is that “the dress code in the Marketing Department came before this policy was created,” which is true, “and is independent of it,” which is not quite accurate. We were trying to sort of push them, push back on them, because you'll notice that there's a Grading Practices policy that we're about to look at, and it says that you cannot grade a student on things that are irrelevant to their academic performance. So this brings up a very important question, is dress in Marketing or in Business academic or non-academic. Is it relevant or irrelevant to a student's performance in the classroom? I have family who are in sales and marketing in the music business, and wearing a suit and tie is probably not what's going to get you the job if you're trying to figure out how to go to a Phish concert, right, and like market there. So the assumptions about what constitutes proper business dress are really interesting, and hopefully were debated at the local level. But I think one of the things that happened was that the Senate didn't want to impose on a local, you know, department or college, and on the other hand felt that it needed to do some of that imposition. I never liked this policy in the first place, because it ended up with such a compromise position and there didn't seem to be an adequate justification that makes it so that the Grading Practices policy is not being violated by it.

President Dietz: Another issue that I'm a little concerned about on this is we become more internationalized as a campus, where does the religion piece fit into all of this? If I'm a business major and I'm wearing a burka because of my religion, what trumps the burka? The expectation in the classroom or my own religion. So I think by doing this kind of thing I think we kind of set ourselves up. If you have an expectation within disciplines, I think people kind of get that, but that changes as well. It hasn't changed in music for the symphony in a long time, but it changes in the corporate culture. If I went out to State Farm today and met with some of their executives, I would be the only person in the room with a tie on. That's just changed.

Senator Horst: But I was just going to say, you know, there is a performative aspect to the dress, and so like if you are giving a senior recital, your presentation is not only the music, but it's the visuals, so there is an appropriate time for appropriate dress, and I think it's particular with the performing arts.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, I agree. I think that in the performing arts you can make a link to relevancy, right. You can make that link in Nursing and in a number of other professions.

Senator Marx: Safety, safety issues.

Senator Kalter: Right. Safety issues.

Senator Blum: In Education. We have our students, right, so we have, we talk to our students about professional dress before they go into schools that are consistent with what the school's expectations are. So, I mean, like, the other stuff, like I actually thought bullet three was the most sensible one. All right. The other stuff around this I was like I'm wondering if we should be engaging in it at all. Right? I mean there is a time, right, through professional activities that students do, where dress code is from Theatre to Nursing to whatever, but there are… I mean, you know, come in classes.

Senator Kalter: So I guess our question here is, is this ready to go on the Senate floor for debate, and one question that we'll just sort of leave in the air is whether the policy itself is being enforced. Right? Are we checking for departments that do have dress codes, hey, have you given us a relevant tie between your dress code and the performance in the classroom. Is your dress code in compliance with our grading practices policy?

Senator Breland: I kind of have a concern of like the access like to professional clothing, so if you are in certain situations like in Business, just because they're in that major don’t necessarily mean they can afford that, so it's kind of like we're putting pressure on the students to say you have to like this, you have to dress like that, because this is what you want to do in life. I think at this point in their life in being a college student, you don't have a lot of money, so to have the expectation of students continuously in certain classes, depending on what kind of classes they have this semester, I think that's kind of a lot of pressure that it puts on college students to have to represent themselves a certain way on low budget.

Provost Murphy: You know in professions like think about Nursing students, that's built into the cost. I mean students that go into Nursing know up ahead, just like textbooks, they're given a cost ahead of time so it's not a surprise cost; you have to have a lab coat, you have to have… but you're right. I can see where going into Business and all of a sudden you're a junior and, you know, all of a sudden you have to have professional dress clothes three days a week. That's huge. And then be an unexpected expense.

Senator Kalter: And gender issues have come up in the past as well. I remember when I first walked on the campus I found out that I think it was, not to say anything bad about the current Career Center, because it's fabulous, but apparently the Career Center was telling women that they had to wear pantyhose to interviews, and I was like you got to be kidding. You know, I just came from California, it was the year 2000, and I was like it's the year 2000. What are you talking about? What did you say?

Provost Murphy: I said but once you get the job…

Senator Kalter: You and I both go barefoot. I've noticed that. Anyway, so maybe we can separate is the policy being enforced from the debate on the Senate about where it should go and just move it forward? Does that seem right? And let's bring up all of these problems to the committee and see if there's anything that needs to change in the policy itself beyond hey, you know, should somebody call the Marketing Department and just say, can you give us the written explanation for why this is relevant to grading a student, and have you considered this, this, this, and this.

Senator Horst: So, Susan, what exact wording in here are you having a problem with? I'm not quite clear about that.

Senator Kalter: I don't know if I’d tie it to specific wording this time, Martha. I just don't like the idea that when we put this policy in place we essentially did not try very hard to push back against the College of Business at the time and say, you know, if this policy had been in place before you guys provoked the need for it, you wouldn't have been in compliance with it. So it's not really the specific wording, it's the fact that the policy, you know, as Jim thought, the policy, it was almost as though what the Marketing Department, they can do anything they want to, even though there's a university policy that kind of mitigates against what they're doing.

Senator Phillips: Like would they be open to like changing that to be in compliance with this? Because like a specific course like (inaudible) if you knew you had a senior seminar coming up and you're a business major, you would have time, I think to compare, like you would know that you might have to have the cost of buying a suit for that semester.

Senator Rubio: And what is a timely manner to inform students, because I personally have friends in the College of Business who found out last week they needed to show up in that attire, and they had to go out and buy stuff. So telling them what is the time and manner to inform those students, especially those as brought up don't have as quick of access to that type of clothing.

Senator Kalter: If I'm remembering correctly, when we redid the Student Code of Conduct, and I think you're on that committee, right, we took away this thing called the Student Grievance Committee, which I couldn't believe we were getting rid of. I kept asking, are you guys sure that you want to get rid of this committee, because that's the only place that was in the process for students to basically lodge those kinds of complaints. Right? Like most of the student process now is that the student did something wrong that the student doesn't have much of an appeal process if they think something in the university is going on. And, you know, so I had been hoping when this first came in that the students in Business and the students in Marketing would start lodging those kinds of complaints, like I just found out a week ago that I'm supposed to dress this way and I don't understand how this is relevant. Because the SGA was very involved in trying to do the pushback at the time, but then it just kind of quieted down and I was surprised that it quieted down, because I do think that students need to push back, but of course they're afraid to, right, because once you get in the class it's like I know that I'm being judged and what if my professor finds out. So in some ways SGA and the Senate need to sort of bring that pushback back to them again.

President Dietz: Another concern I would have with this is the last bullet when it talks about an appeal, but it doesn't say to whom or how or anything of that nature, and that's not a ploy to say that they ought to appeal to me.

Provost Murphy: Only if it's procedural.

President Dietz: But I think, you know, that's another question back to the folks.

Senator Kalter: So consistent with our earlier decision, we're going to send this to the floor and get all of these points out there, and then we'll see whether it goes back to committee or which way it goes. Sound good?
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**OLD MAIN ROOM, BONE STUDENT CENTER**

***Call to Order***

***Roll Call***

***Presentation: Update on SUAA activities (SUAA President Larry Alferink)***

***Chairperson's Remarks***

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

***Administrators' Remarks***

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

***Advisory Items:***

***Surveillance Equipment Memo (President Dietz)***

***Action Items:***

***Approval of Dean’s Evaluation Instruments for CAS, CAST, CFA, COB, MCN, MIL per the Administrator Evaluation policy (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***02.01.18.02: Policy 1.16 Recruitment of Service Members CURRENT no changes (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***Information Items:***

***04.09.18.01 Cover Sheet Policy 2.1.23 Transcripts (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***05.17.18.01 MARK UP Policy 2.1.23 Transcripts (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***05.17.18.02 MARK UP Policy 2.1.24 Transcript Holds (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***Communications***

***Adjournment***

We never make the through our agenda, ever, but these are important things to talk about, so let's try to do just the last two, and then we'll stop and do the rest of this. We only have five minutes, really, let's actually go straight to the approval of the proposed Senate agenda and then we'll close the meeting.

Motion by Senator Rubio, seconded by Senator Blum, to approve the proposed Senate agenda.

Senator Kalter: Cera, is Larry Alferink confirmed?

Ms. Christensen: Mm hmm.

Senator Kalter: Okay, do we know when the IBHE- FAC Presentation is going to be…

Ms. Christensen: I have not received an answer back

Senator Kalter: Not have an answer. Okay. And then at some point during the meeting I will let people know about the Student Code ad hoc Committee. Just a reminder under action items, in addition to the Dean's Evaluation Instruments, we also have the Recruitment of Service Members policy. That was an information item on April 11, 2018, and then we had a turnover of the Senate or something happened, I'm not sure what, or maybe we just didn't make it to that part of the agenda. The information item, they are trying to merge these policies. Should we keep that on or should we put it on the September 12 agenda, so the action items are things that we're trying to clean up from the past. The information item is something new. Should it stay on this agenda or get pushed forward with the rest of the Academic Affairs Committee's stuff.

Senator Horst: Have we talked about it? The Transcript policy, we talked about it?

Senator Kalter: We talked about it sometime in April, I think it was, and then we decided hey, let's not put this on the late April agenda, because then the Senate will turn over.

Senator Horst: Okay.

Senator Kalter: But we did talk about it.

Senator Horst: Okay.

Senator Kalter: So the question is on the first night of Senate should we have an information item or not have an information item. Like should we have new business or just try to clear out old business. I don't care which way. I'm not loading the question in any way, but what do people think is best?

Senator Phillips: How much old business do we have?

Senator Kalter: The Dean's Evaluation Instruments and the Recruitment of Service Members policy is all we have, just those two.

Senator Horst: We're assuming that the Academic Affairs Committee chair would be the same, because they'll have to present what they talked about.

Senator Kalter: I think the old committee chair will present what they talked about and represent that. We usually don't do that, but we can have him do that. And by that time we will know after, because we'll have elections.

Senator Mainieri: I'd say go ahead and move forward with it.

Senator Kalter: And move forward, keep it on this.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: Do people agree with that.

Senator Marx: I would agree.

Senator Kalter: Sort of move it forward, get things through. Okay. All right, anything else on the agenda that we need to change?

Senator Marx: There comes a point where you ask who the chairs and the secretaries are.

Senator Kalter: When do I do that? I'm trying to remember if I do that at Communications or if I do it in Chairpersons… I think I do it at Communications.

Senator Horst: Committee Reports.

Senator Rubio: You did it at Chairperson's.

Senator Kalter: It is Committee Reports, actually. So we need to add a section for Committee Reports right underneath the information. What did you say, Mike?

Senator Rubio: Yeah, it's before Communications is what I remember.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, we'll have Committee Reports and that's all the report is. Who was the chair and the secretary.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: All right, and we'll move the Integrity Policy and everything else we didn’t get to the next agenda, which is, by the way, the next meeting is on a Wednesday, because there's Labor Day, so remember it's on Wednesday instead of Monday, and faculty can stay here, Provost can stay here. Everybody else, thanks very much, Larry, and we'll see you at your… Thank you for inviting us again to your reception.

President Dietz: You're welcome.

***Adjournment***