**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

**MONDAY, November 9, 2020**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

Academic Senate Chairperson Senator Kalter called the meeting to order.

Senator Kalter: Hello, everyone. I hope you all had a great weekend as I did. There were two wonderful things that happened over the weekend. One of them was on Saturday, and actually, one of them was this morning. We were just talking about how Pfizer had their trials and may have a 90% effective vaccine fairly soon. So, that's really exciting.

***10.13.20.01a1 From Faculty Affairs Committee: Integrity Policy Section I Current Copy (Information Item 11/18/20)***

***11.05.20.01a2 From Faculty Affairs Committee: Integrity Policy Section I Mark Up (Information Item 11/18/20)***

***11.05.20.01a3 From Faculty Affairs Committee: Integrity policy section I clean copy*** ***(Information Item 11/18/20)***

***10.13.20.01b1 From Faculty Affairs Committee: Integrity Policy Section II Current copy (Information Item 11/18/20)***

***11.05.20.01b2 From Faculty Affairs Committee: Integrity policy Section II Mark Up (Information Item 11/18/20)***

***11.05.20.01b3 From Faculty Affairs Committee: Integrity policy section II clean copy (Information Item 11/18/20)***

***10.13.20.01c1 From Faculty Affairs Committee: Integrity Policy Section III Current copy (Information Item 11/18/20)***
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Senator Kalter: I'd like to start with the Integrity policy changes and the approval of the proposed Senate agenda and then go back to the Academic Progress Alert System, and the letters from Dr. Catanzaro about the chairs and deans evaluations, and then go back even further to the Oral Communications, because those are sort of the least important. So, let me let me go down in my notes here towards the Integrity stuff. So, upon my advice to the committee chair, who is Mary Hollywood, the committee (I think it was unanimously) decided to complete the review of the Integrity policy in two different stages, which you kind of heard on the Senate floor the other day. The first is the first three sections that basically form the policy part of the policy, and then Section IV is a very long final section that forms the transparently posted procedures part of the policy. And it's kind of a little bit similar in form to our Academic Freedom, Ethics, and Grievance policy. But the difference here, the big difference, is that this one actually does cover students as well as faculty and staff. So, it does not go through the Caucus. It goes through the Senate. And so, in order to keep making progress on it, because this has been four years or more in the making, the committee is going to start working on Section IV while the Senate is giving Information Item feedback to them for Sections I, II, and III.

And then there are also three other things that I wanted to note before we start talking about them section by section, (which is also what I'm going to do, by the way, on the Senate floor) is sort of have us give feedback section by section. The Executive Committee, first of all, already saw an earlier version of these revisions, and we incorporated your feedback. So, those were mainly from Senators Horst and Senator Nikolaou. Second, I already said it, this has been four years in the making, so I would really like it to go to the Senate floor at this point, rather than back to committee to move it towards finalization because Kathy Spence, who is in Research Compliance, and is our—we call it right now the Academic Integrity Officer, but it's going to be changed to Research Integrity Officer. She's been basically having to manage active cases with a policy that she doesn't consider to be very clarifying for certain parts of the process for her. And that means it's not clarifying for the committees and that kind of thing. And we as a committee here are going to likely need to be judicious about which ones of the marginal comments need to be kept on the stuff that goes to the Senate floor, because it is super confusing. So, I ended up creating a consolidated copy of every single section of this policy, because we had literally like five different places where were trying to work from, and so, we consolidated that. But now they're even, just because of the last week of conversation, there are accretions that may still confuse the Senate body. So, I'm going to ask for your help about what do they need to really see and what do they really just not need to see as we go forward. So, let's start with Section I. Does anybody have any comments about that one?

Senator Horst: You know, just in general, Susan, I appreciate your explanation, and I understand the parallel to the AFEGC, but I was, you know, very confused because policies usually don't go up in piecemeal. And so, maybe the entire policy can go up as an old, and then the markups can go up as new, just so the Senate understands what's going on.

Senator Kalter: Oh, okay. So, in other words, have one current copy that just goes up… It's the whole thing, and then have the markups, and the clean copies going.

Senator Horst: You know, because I actually had to look up, I remembered that there was a later part, and I saw it referring to the later part. And so, I actually had to go look up the current policy, just to see what was going on. So, if everybody has the current policy, I think they'll more likely be able to see what's going on.

Senator Kalter: Gotcha. Okay.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah, I was thinking the same thing or even just the part of the current policy that's been talked about, and then one… like is there a reason why we have to have three different markups? Can all three sections be in one markup? So, can everything be one document each, like it usually is. I think that's what I was really trying to grapple with this as I was going through the documents.

Senator Kalter: That's a really good question, Tracy. The reason we did that had a lot to do with what the committee felt it could bite off at one time, right. So, it's like we didn't want to… We wanted to make sure as we were talking that we were only talking about Section I, and then getting that done, and feeling a sense of accomplishment and moving on. I'm trying to think about that with respect to the Senate floor, because as a chair I'm going to try to go through and only get comments on Section I. And then only get comments on Section II. And, you know, in order for it to be efficient and not all over the place. But then that doesn't necessarily mean that the copy can't be consolidated. I don't know. I'm not sure what's best there. But in terms of my process when we have it out on the floor, especially because in the agenda that it's going on there are already going to be a whole bunch of things that we're dealing with. And so, by the time we get to the Information Items (we don't have a hard stop time again so we could just keep going and going) but there might be a point where we get in the night where we're like, okay, we just got through Section I, and that's all we can deal with right now. We gotta end the meeting and, you know, keep it going. So, what do other people think? One copy of the markup for the one Sections I, II, and II, III, or you know, three different copies?

Senator Horst: It's sort of analogous to the bylaws, like we didn't have the bylaws all sectioned out, but we stopped when we thought we had to stop. But just the way it looks on the agenda is just kind of like what is this… nine documents. So, it's more of a psychological thing, they go, oh, there's this one document. I think it'll just be clearer what's going on.

Senator Toth: I think if you put it all in one document, and then, like, you could say everyone take a look at the first page or the, you know, take a look at the next three pages, whatever. I think people will be able to follow that closely, so that we can have that discussion in different segments like you had suggested, I think that's a good idea. But yes, I do agree that it will be a little less intimidating or a little less tedious if we had it all in one document.

Senator Kalter: Okay, so that's three votes for one document. It looks like Dimitrios just nodded his head also, that's four. Everybody agreed?

Senator Nahm: I think the only concern that I have would be if we don't get to the end of Section III next week and we have to continue the conversation later what the next round of documents looks like. Maybe for that one we might just decide to include the sections that still need to be discussed, so that people aren't, you know, it's going to be two weeks in between so people might start reading from the beginning of, then realize halfway through that we've already discussed this. So, for next week's Senate meeting, having it all in one document and then picking up where we left off and just including that for the following Senate meeting, I think that would be a good idea.

Senator Kalter: And yeah, for sure. I don't think that there's any chance that the committee will get through Section IV while we're doing Sections I, II, and III. It is just too long. But if that were for some reason to happen, I think that section should come in a separate document. Okay. So, and we can talk about that again, Kee-Yoon, after next week, like, at the next Exec, so that we kind of get a sense of where the room is. Yeah, that's a good point, though.

Senator Mainieri: I wonder, Susan, I liked the context that you provided talking about policy and procedure pieces of this one policy. And for me, as a Senator who was preparing for the meeting that context would be helpful to help me prepare, so I didn't go looking and trying to understand what was going on. So, I wonder if there is something that we can attach just to explain that so that people aren't confused as to why we're only looking at half.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, we need to have some short way of saying, do not look for Section IV, it's not ready yet, is kind of what you're saying. So, I think that Cera can do that just inside the email that she sends the agendas out with this. Will that work? Yeah, okay. Okay, let's remember to do that then, great. So, I'm going to go back. So, any comments on the substance, first of all, of Section I? And then, if nothing there, is there any advice about marginal comments that could be taken off?

Senator Mainieri: I just noticed that in the very first paragraph here it says, the first sentence, “…trust in the public and all research, scholarly, and creative activity here and referred to as research.” And then as we continue, it’s sometimes research and scholarly endeavors, research and scholarly activity, sometimes just research. And so that was one thing that I did notice throughout all three sections was kind of inconsistency with that first sentence. But that's, again, more of an editorial thing. I didn't see any major content things. I’ll send my other little editorial stuff along.

Senator Kalter: Thank you for calling that to my attention. Because I'm on the committee, I didn't look closely at the stuff that came to Exec. And the committee talked about that, and was supposed to standardize it, because we also needed to include the word “creative,” right. I don't remember if that's still in the margin notes, but we need to have it defined once—research, scholarship, or creative activities—and then just say research from then on, basically. So, Cera, if you can just make a note to let Mary know or just to change that copy. But that was definitely the intent of the committee. Anything else on that one before we go to Section II.

Senator Nikolaou: And then, just a small thing in the second to the last paragraph just capitalize “some” and “it is nevertheless.” And then is the reason why it says, “upon a university” and not “upon the university?” Aren’t we talking about our university?

Senator Kalter: Oh, that's an interesting question. I think it's supposed to be a general statement of philosophy, Dimitrios. So, I think it is supposed to be “a university.”

Senator Nikolaou: But the last part of it says, “…other university processes…” which refer specifically to our university because it is capitalized, and that's why I didn't know if it was on purpose, like general university.

Senator Kalter: I believe that we may have carried over… which paragraph are you in again?

Senator Nikolaou: The second to last. The one that starts, “A variety of practices.”

Senator Kalter: I’m pretty sure that that is in… I think that's in the current copy and that it was just carried over.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah, it was in the previous one. Yeah. And it was moved.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. So, but you can always bring it up on the floor and see if people want to change it.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay, yeah. And I don't know if we want a hyperlink to policy 1.15 in the last paragraph.

Senator Kalter: Yes, that's a very good idea. The Whistleblower Policy. Yeah.

Senator Horst: You know, Susan, just thinking more about what Tracy brought up, I know the ASPT documents always say research/creativity and I totally get melding those two together. I'm not quite sure why scholarly, like research versus scholarly, and then I see that's the title of the policy, and I'm not quite sure what's the difference between research and scholarly, you know. So, you might, you know, did the committee think about how everything is expressed in the ASPT document?

Senator Kalter: Tried to. That was where the creative thing came in, in part because of that, and in part because you don't want to leave out a whole group of people in the university and let them plagiarize each other at will. Right. So, but, yeah, I think that's another one that you should bring up on the Senate floor to standardize that language and make it conformed to ASPT.

Senator Horst: Yeah. Right.

Senator Kalter: All right, anything for Section II, either substantive or margin comments?

Senator Nikolaou: One is under B, shouldn’t it be, “and Graduate Studies,” when we refer to the AVP (AVP for Research and Graduate Studies)? Because that's the official title of the position.

Senator Kalter: Indeed, it should. I believe somebody brought this up at some point and it was just sort of dropped, but I think it should say that throughout.

Senator Nikolaou: I understand the rationale because it focuses on the research part and not on the graduate studies. But it's not that we have… because that gives the impression that there is no one who works on graduate studies, if it appears in the policy.

Senator Kalter: Agreed. And now there was talk, has been talk of separating the AVP for that area, but I think that until that happens, it should say what it is, not what it might be. It's going to be a big… there’s going to be about 50 substitutions in there, Cera, for that.

Senator Mainieri: Susan. I've been thinking about your question regarding like the margins. And I actually, on the second one, I didn't find the margins too difficult to follow. It was the first one, where there was lots of movement of things and changing so that it appeared as deleted instead of moved. And so, I wonder if instead of having those track changes if there could just be like a comment that says, from original moved and adapted or something like that, because there's just whole parts, right, that have been moved and the track changes don't really capture that movement because there's been changes to those parts as well.

Senator Kalter: My sense and I'll ask Cera if she agrees with this. The committee after they got the consolidated copy did a bunch of rearranging. And I think what you're seeing is because of that, and that if we just make that into a clean copy and then redo the markup, rather than taking what the committee sent us the mark up, that's going to take care of that just by making the track changes once, you know, a change once rather than moving it all over the place. I think that's going to take care of that.

Ms. Hazelrigg: That's what this is. She only sent me the clean copy. So, this is how Word translated it into a markup. So, if that is what you want, I would have to manually go in and do all of that.

Senator Horst: And usually that committee chair says that kind of stuff on the floor.

Senator Kalter: It's a big mess. Let's just put it that way. I'm not sure what's going to be more confusing. Not to have a real markup copy or not, or to have a real markup copy so to speak.

Senator Horst: Markup

Senator Kalter: You want the real markup. Well, in other words what Cera gave you guys?

Senator Horst: Yeah.

Senator Nikolaou: And then I have another. So, for F, it talks about the inquiry team and the investigation panel, but we haven't seen these before. So, I have no idea what this is about. And so that's out of the blue. So, they would either need to be, you know, some sentences before that saying what they are, and then you know explain… it might be in part IV, you know, when they talk about them, but somehow we would need to know how do this appear.

Senator Kalter: Right. Last meeting, Craig McLauchlan came up with a very good way to do that because we had to say Research Integrity Officer before we had actually told people who that was, or what that was. So, what he suggested was “see IV B” or whatever it was. So, I think we can just do that, sort of have a parenthesis that says “see Section IV B” or whatever it might be for each of those and that should take care of that. Just to be consistent with how we're doing it in the rest of the policy.

Senator Nikolaou: And another one, which probably is for the floor, it's under A, it is the, I guess it is the end of the third to the last sentence where it talks about what it includes, and it ends with is related to the grant work or employment. Also, the grant work appears, again, it seems that it is not… we're not talking about grant work we were talking about research. So, it appears that, well, why are we putting that much emphasis on grants when that's not what the policy itself is mainly about. And that's something that was actually added, it was not in the policy before.

Senator Kalter: And I'm not sure I completely understand what you're getting at, But I can say that…

Senator Nikolaou: It's also because it talks about graduate and undergraduate students. So, if it was about faculty explicitly, I would see why we might have the grant there. But then, because it talks about undergraduate students too, well, it's unlikely that you're going to have an undergraduate student with grant work or, you know… and that's why I don't know… And also, it is grant work or employment. So, the grant work is more important than the employment part at the University. So, I didn't know, you know, is there something else that we don't know, but has to do with the RSP and we're trying to hint there?

Senator Kalter: I think the idea there is that they needed to make a division between what would happen if a student plagiarized their dissertation or thesis versus whether they were working on a grant for somebody and cloned a sheep, right, without permission or something like that. In other words, I believe, and I think you're right that this is for the floor, more than for this discussion, but I think the reason that's in there is because they need to call out that if you're working on a grant, you're more likely to be under this policy than under the student conduct and con… whatever it's called, community relations stuff, the student judicial process, right. In other words, I'm not sure whether those people working on the grants are still considered employees of the university, I think they are. But I think that's probably why they called that out to just make it more explicit. And also, because there are certain agencies (Kathy Spence would have to answer this one) but there are certain agencies that require certain things to be in our policy, the public health agency or something like that, there are certain requirements. So, it may be in there because of that. But I would ask that on the floor.

I'm now seeing why you guys are confused about the marginal comment comment because the stuff that's in Teams has no marginal comments in it at all. So, that's actually kind of good because in a certain way we got rid of a bunch of the conversation that was going on. Sorry, Kee-Yoon, what were you going to say?

Senate Nahm: I had a question about E. Academic Freedom. So, in the second line, it says that we should all work “to protect the policies of academic freedom and tenure that are fundamental the academic enterprise.” And I wondered what policies are the specific policies and what policy document? And I was also wondering if actually what it wants to say is “principles of academic freedom and tenure.” That phrase does come up in the ASPT policy document. But if there are specific policies that this is referring to, then maybe listing what policy in which document.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, that is a great comment. There are specific policies and there are principles. So, in some ways they ought to both be mentioned. But yeah, I think that one also can be mentioned on the floor and we can see if that's a friendly amendment according to the committee. But I think you're right. There is an AFEGC policy and there's an Academic Freedom policy and a Tenure policy, all of those. Alright, any comments then, any further comments on Section II and any comments on Section III?

Senator Horst: I had one comment on Section III, and I couldn't see the dialogue, so maybe this was an answer to the dialogue but part g, it said “misrepresentation regarding conflicts of interest, financial or otherwise.” And I sort of was wondering if that's more a Code of Ethics issue.

Senator Kalter: That is a great question for the floor.

Senator Horst: Okay.

Senator Kalter: Because there was also the question of whether it's… we have a financial conflict of interest policy (I can't remember what it's called, 7.1.11 or something like that), and we asked that question and it was answered, but nobody brought up the Code of Ethics. And the way that it was answered, it seemed as though it needed to be in multiple places. But you're right, those are the kinds of things where, should this go to the Integrity process, or should it go to the Academic Freedom, Ethics, and Grievance process.

Senator Horst: It would be different committees and different processes. Right. Or should be going on in both.

Senator Kalter: Or simultaneously. Right, so we have to ask that question, I think, on the floor. How do they make those decisions?

Senator Horst: Who would make the decision?

Senator Kalter: Yeah, who makes the decisions. Yeah. All right. Anything else for section…

Senator Nikolaou: One small thing is that for A to I, probably we should choose if it's like… paragraph is going to end up with a semi colon or with a full stop. Because right now, it seems that it, you know, sometimes it's the semi colon, sometimes it a full stop.

Senator Kalter: Cera, go with the majority.

Senator Nikolaou: And the other ones are for the floor. So, I'm not going to even mention them.

Senator Kalter: It looked to me, like there were more semi colons than periods, so we'll go with the semi colons. All right, any other comments before we put it on the floor. (Pause) All right.

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

**Wednesday, November 18, 2020**

**7:00 P.M.**

**VIRTUAL MEETING per state law and Governor Pritzker’s Executive Order**

**Zoom Link:**

*Request to make public comment at the meeting should be sent via email to* *acsenate@ilstu.edu* *no later than 6:55 p.m. on the day of the meeting.*

***Call to Order***

***Roll Call***

***Chairperson's Remarks***

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

***Administrators' Remarks***

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

***Action Items:***

***11.17.15.02 Policy6.1.13\_Amplification\_current\_policy (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***10.27.20.01 Proposed Policy 6.1.13 Sound Amplification Mark Up (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***10.27.20.02 Policy6.1.13\_Sound Amplification Clean Copy (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***09.24.20.01 Library Committee Bluebook page Current Copy (Rules Committee)***

***09.24.20.02 Proposed Library Committee Bluebook page - MARK UP (Rules Committee)***

***09.24.20.03 Proposed Library Committee Bluebook page - CLEAN COPY (Rules Committee)***

***11.17.15.03 Policy6.6.16\_FlagsOnCampus\_current\_policy (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***10.22.20.05 Proposed Policy 6.1.16DisplayofOfficialFlagsonCampus\_MarkUp (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***10.22.20.04 Policy6.1.16\_DisplayFlagsOnCampus\_clean\_copy (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***10.27.20.03 Policy 7.2. Parking (clean copy) (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***10.22.20.07 PROPOSED DELETION Policy 7.2.1Parking Lots and Spaces (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***10.22.20.08 PROPOSED DELETION Policy7.2.2 Permits for Parking (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***10.22.20.09 PROPOSED DELETION Policy7.2.3 Parking Permit Types (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***10.22.20.10 PROPOSED DELETION Policy 7.2.4 Parking Citations (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***10.22.20.11 PROPOSED DELETION Policy 7.2.5 Motor Assistance Program (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***Information Items:***

***10.13.20.01a1 Integrity Policy Section I Current Copy (Faculty Affairs Committee)***

***11.05.20.01a2 Integrity Policy Section I Mark Up (Faculty Affairs Committee)***

***11.05.20.01a3 Integrity policy section I clean copy (Faculty Affairs Committee)***

***10.13.20.01b1 Integrity Policy Section II Current copy (Faculty Affairs Committee)***

***11.05.20.01b2 Integrity policy Section II Mark Up (Faculty Affairs Committee)***

***11.05.20.01b3 Integrity policy section II clean copy (Faculty Affairs Committee)***

***10.13.20.01c1 Integrity Policy Section III Current copy (Faculty Affairs Committee)***

***11.05.20.01c2 Integrity policy Section III Mark Up (Faculty Affairs Committee)***

***11.05.20.01c3 Integrity policy section III clean copy (Faculty Affairs Committee)***

***Consent Agenda Item: None***

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

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

***Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Hollywood***

***Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Avogo***

***Rules Committee: Senator Horst***

***Communications***

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Horst, seconded by Senator Nahm, to approve the proposed Senate agenda.

Senator Kalter: Let's talk about that agenda. Kee-Yoon, do you know if your committee is making changes to the Amplification stuff, based on what was said on the floor?

Senator Nahm: I haven't heard from David if that's on the agenda. Yeah, I'm not sure.

Senator Kalter: And same question for Martha about the Library Committee. You're probably in a little better place to answer that, since you're the chair.

Senator Horst: Yeah, you know, I'm looking into what you said, and whatever it is, it'll be a small change. We could delete the line. We could change the line. But it'll be something we can clearly deal with the night of.

Senator Kalter: The night of, okay.

Senator Horst: Yeah. You know, if the Sound Amplification Policy isn't ready, it can always be deleted. I mean Cera can just choose not to have it go forward.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, or even if it's on the agenda, we can skip over it. Like, if it's not there yet.

Senator Horst: Right.

President Dietz: I have one other item here that was not on the agenda today but is kind of a leftover from the meeting on the 26th related to the Mass Electronic Communications series of questions. I've talked to Katy Killian, and we've had conversations with Jill Benson, and while this isn't earth shattering, it really wouldn't need to be dealt with, and the sooner the better, because the issue right now with all that is that we have mechanisms to communicate through Mass Electronic Communications with faculty, with staff, with students, and with AP, and the Civil Service, and faculty, both in combination and separately, but we don't have a Mass Electronic Communication System with students and families, and there is certainly a need there that we've discovered through this whole pandemic process that we would like to have that piece added to this existing policy. So, it's not a huge change but at some point, we'd like to have that dealt with again, and back on the agenda. So, I don't know if that's next Wednesday, you know, I don't know exactly when to insert that, but that's a little leftover business that we had that I wanted to follow up on.

Senator Kalter: So, we routed that to Rules Committee. And so, Martha is probably just writing down what you said about its priority level, but it would need to go through the Rules Committee first, and then come up to us here before we put it on an agenda.

President Dietz: Sure.

Senator Horst: Larry, could you send me the names of the two contacts you mentioned, Katy Killian and Jill Benson.

President Dietz: Sure.

Senator Horst: And then I can certainly prioritize it.

President Dietz: Yeah. Just email? Is that good? Okay. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Awesome. All right, anything else. Does anybody else have anything else for the agenda? (Pause) Alright, we're about to do a roll call vote. All in favor of the proposed Senate agenda as it looks. Let me do the roll call. Oh, Dylan. Go ahead.

Senator Toth: So sorry I'm late. This includes the amendments with that Integrity policy, did we decide to narrow that down, or are we going to leave that as is?

Senator Kalter: I think we decided that we're going to put it as Integrity policy Sections I through III, right, but with the markups being I, II, and III. Is that what everybody thought they heard? Current copy would be one, and the mark ups would be three. And what did you say, Martha?

Senator Horst: And forwarding the entire old policy, so people understand that they're looking at a half of a policy.

Senator Kalter: And then do we want the clean copy just to be the new clean copy, and do we want it to be unified? Basically, one clean copy with just the policy part. Yeah. Okay. Thank you, Dylan. So, we'll do that change. Awesome.

The motion was unanimously approved.

***Streamlining the Academic Progress Alert system to maximize student success while minimizing workload burdens on faculty (Dist. to Academic Affairs)***

***10.20.20.04 August 26, 2015 Senate meeting excerpts (Dist. to Academic Affairs)***

***10.20.20.03 Kalter email APA submission (Dist. to Academic Affairs)***

***10.20.20.01 Academic Program Alert System AAC memo (Dist. to Academic Affairs)***

***10.20.20.02 Academic Program Alert System Proposal 95(Dist. to Academic Affairs)***

***2019\_Factbook-retention (Dist. to Academic Affairs)***

Senator Kalter: So, let's see, let's go back up to first Distributed Communication. So, the reason this is on here, the Academic Progress Alert System was put in place around 1996 and in our Blue Book, basically, it's under the joint jurisdiction of Academic Affairs Committee and the Student Government to monitor it. So, a few things, including my own submissions of APA grades over the last several years has been sort of bothering me in light of our newest push toward student success. So, here's an example. One semester, I had in my class nine students for whom I was asked to enter grades. Only two of those students were actually at risk. But I had two more for whom I had no automated place to enter their information in order to alert them that they were at risk, right.

Also, the other thing that I've been thinking about is that over the years, most of the students (at least in my own classes) that have ever been at risk are at risk because they get into trouble very, very early on. So, the system seems to come out very late in the semester in order to get support and encouragement underneath them. And so my question here is whether the APA system that we have is actually effectively doing what we need it to do, or needs to be rethought? For example, should notifications go to all at risk students, which they don't right now. Should it be much earlier in the semester?

And then as you noticed on the handouts, the Senate had never agreed to having the grades collected twice in a semester, and we don't have any evidence that doing that statistically is more effective than not. So, one problem there is that the Senate's actual approvals have not been being followed. But the other is whether it's worthwhile to do it.

The other thing is that the Senate had explicitly reserved for professors the right not to report a grade (an actual letter grade) mid semester if that grade was not meaningful. That's has nothing to do with the attendance or the comments that you might make or what have you. But that part of what the Senate has approved has really had mission creep over the years as well.

So, I'm not really interested in getting into a debate about how we even despite all of that we have a ton of compliance with this, right. To me, that's sort of a logical so what, and it's kind of irrelevant to the question, which is, do we have a truly effective Academic Progress Alert System? If not, how do we better or best promote student success without hindering faculty success, because there are some professors for whom the Reggienet gradebook does not deliver accurate grades at mid semester, and so, you can't just push a button and upload them even, you know, that's the case sometimes even when the grades are predictive at the time that they enter, you know, they're entered into the APA system, but sometimes we have also heard from professors who say often I don't have a predictive grade because not all of the students grades are in in a way that makes the letter grade predictive or legitimate, right.

The other thing I just wanted to note before we start talking about this is that at the time the system was put in place, we had about a 75% fall to fall retention rate, and we've only increased that to 79%. That’s not very much, and certainly has not worked for all categories of students. So, to me, that means that this system is not as effective as it ought to be to promote student success. And so, the reason this is on here is because I think that Academic Affairs at some point should start looking at this question and sort of start to tackle it about whether our APA system works well. So, do we have discussion about that?

Senator Horst: Could that be a topic for the Provost Retreat as well?

Senator Kalter: Quite possibly. That's an interesting one because it is part of the student success, which is the big portion of that. Yeah. The first one.

Senator Mainieri: Susan, I wonder, you shared your communications about it, but I wonder, are you receiving a great deal of comment for the Senate to take this up as an issue that has led to this being put on the agenda?

Senator Kalter: I know that there have been discussions in my own department about the timing of it, about the over burdensomeness of it, and I get scattered comments from faculty from other departments. But I guess I would say, more importantly, Tracy, is can we wait? I mean, if the system is not working effectively, as effectively as it could, is there a reason to wait to put this on an agenda to get looked at?

Senator Mainieri: I guess I would caution using overall retention rates as a measure of the effectiveness of the program. And I wonder, and obviously if this were sent to a committee, I would hope that we look beyond the Factbook retention rates, because there's other targets that I know these are intended to serve. So, I just want to be careful in terms of when we send something to a committee, right, to send relevant information, right. I'm not sure overall retention is a good measure of these progress reports.

Senator Kalter: Anybody else have any other comments before we…

Provost Tarhule: Susan, I'm not sure how the processes work here, or what happens first, but I have a full page of comments here from Amy Hurd about this once she saw it on the agenda. I think this is one of those that it's really worth talking to some of the people in the office about before you decide how to proceed. Because there are implications about how they do this or how some of these are us, not to say that it shouldn't be done, but that is important for everyone discussing it to understand before we proceed. So, for example, she writes here that a midterm grade is the strongest indicator of retention into second year college for FTICs. Even stronger than high school GPA. So, as we try to calculate what the retention rate is, maybe it's not predictive for everybody, just as Tracy was saying, but in terms of knowing how students go from year one to year two, and this is the strongest indicator in the models that they use. If you drop the midterm GPA, the predictive accuracy of the model drops also. So, then we end up with a situation where we have some difficulties. Once these grades go out, and I think I talked about this last time, we identify the students, especially those students that are between 0.0 to 1.0 GPA. And those are the students that advisors then focus on and trying to reach and trying to figure out what's going on. This year, partly because of COVID and partly because of all the disruptions, we are very worried in the Provost Office about what's going to happen to retention going forward. So, that may be a reason to maybe not mess too much with the alert system at this time because we don't know what's going to happen. We think that some of the students coming in and with all the struggles that they may have had, that we're going to be struggling with retention numbers going forward.

The other thing that would be worth paying attention to is this will be the first year that we go pass optional. That's something that people in my office are also worrying about in terms of what’s that going to do for retention, and so we need to have some means that allows us to compare year over year, and some consistent formats to see how students are doing. None of this is a reason to say, don't do this, it’s just to say those are just a few of the points that I’ve picked out from Amy about how they use this, and while they do some of these things. So, maybe talking to Amy to just understand some of these will help frame questions and also enter exactly what it is that we would like to fix. From there we could decide some of this could be maybe there are things that can be fixed by a management decision as opposed to a policy. You know, sometimes it's possible to say well if that's not working, well, can you fix this. So, in my mind policy should be fixed once it becomes clear that the present system is broken. Some type of policies themselves don't fix things. People still needs to manage those things. So, just a lot to go on, but I think that may be a lot that we can do with this.

Senator Kalter: So, I agree wholeheartedly that the Academic Affairs Committee should talk to Amy and Amelia and the other people who are integrally using this system, the advisors and etc. You're very optimistic about how fast the Senate process works because I can't imagine that they'd even be able to look at it until late in the year if not next year. So, this is a longer-term thing.

But I also would say that the midterm grades as predictive does not address the first point that I brought up, which is that if we're not catching people early enough in the semester, then those midterm grades indeed will be predictive of failure. And so, we really need to think about whether or not… not whether to mess with the system during a pandemic, but to improve the system for the future so that we have better retention overall, you know, and if that turns out to be a management process in full or in part, that's a great outcome. If it's a policy process or if it's combination of both, but I really think that it's important that we start thinking about how many students we’re losing and how many we could retain if we were able to get those midterm grades up between the first week of classes and the time the current first Academic Progress Alert System comes out.

I've also heard from advisors, and especially depending on the advisor’s load, that it may not be operating quite as effectively as a, you know, the alert. In other words, sort of getting an email in your box. I've had students where I've tried to alert, and alert, and alert, three or four times, and so has the advisor, and for some reason, there's no response. So, trying to figure out whether the system that we're using to reach students is effective, but I think all of that could be dealt with in Academic Affairs Committee.

Senator Mainieri: I guess, if we are moving this forward, I think the way that it's framed to the committee matters. So, I think instead of saying something like Streamlining the Academic Progress Alert, which I feel like is already determining the outcome of an investigation. I think maybe just, you know, an evaluation of Academic Progress Alert System in relation to the original Senate charge or something like that. That empowers the committee to take a holistic look at it, as opposed to saying how can it be fixed, right. Because I feel like that's jumping questions before really knowing a lot about how it might actually be working as well.

Provost Tarhule: Again, I think, thanks, Tracy, for saying that. And I don't know when you meet with Amelia and Amy formally or not, one of the things I have charged them to try and find answers for us is to identify the top five reasons we're losing students. So, we’re losing between 720 and 750 students a year, if you look at… our retention, if you take a retention rate of 80%, and the number of students who come here, 20%, multiply by that, that gives you about how many we’re losing per year. That’s a lot of students. If you could think about an initiative that would get us 750 additional students a year, that will be huge. And yet we lose those on average a year. So, my question to them has been, how can we retain the students. So, there's a lot that goes in there. And I think that if you think about this as one and we put a lot of emphasis on it before they have finished that analysis, I don't know if we're using all the energies in the correct way. So, they are identifying 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 of the issues, based on historical data. Basically, they're doing a ranking, if we could figure out why we lose… and it's a bit hard to do because a lot of the students that you lose, they never give you information, right. And so, the data is not as comprehensive as we'd like to be. But our hope is, there are lots of reasons why we lose students. There's a limited amount of money, and time, and resources for dealing with this. My hope is can I identify the top 3, 4, 5 that if I could address, maybe I could bring this down to 50-60%, and that's what they're working on. And this has not, they haven't finished yet, they're working on this as part of the retreat. So, just again informational, maybe if you talk to them, you might get a sense of where this fits in the overall scheme of retention and success effort, but I want you to know that this is a big, big issue for us in the office that we would like to fix and taking one of them and saying, you know, we got to fix this, because it's more than retention. I would prefer to address it as part of that overall strategy or maybe when the report has come out, we see where this fits, and then we can determine how we want to tackle it at that point.

President Dietz: As a part of an old enrollment management person myself, oftentimes recruitment gets overplayed, retention is obviously an important part of the whole enrollment management strategies at any institution, and one of the things that, you know, there's some long standing research that talks a lot about retention, and what’s successful and what's not. And one of the issues that always comes up is that if students can be assessed about their knowledge within the first six weeks of the semester, some way, shape, or form that positively correlates with identifying students who are having some difficulty, which then connects with potential resources that, you know, can be afforded those students or more time or whatever. I would just add that in as another major factor. And I think Provost Tarhule is on his way to help figuring this out, what are the top few things that we can really target and potentially, you know, provide some assistance on. The system in itself is important but getting to the point where you're assessing why students are leaving during that time frame, and then at the end of the semester, I think, is probably more important. So, to me, I would support what he and the staff are trying to do on this, and then also evaluate the system, but I think, you know, other systems can potentially be put into place that might measure what we want to measure in a better way.

Senator Horst: Yeah, I was just thinking, at some point, either the Provost staff or the Academic Affairs, or Senate, or somebody could consider surveying the faculty to try to figure out, you know, when would be the best time to drop the metrics. Could it be earlier? I personally can tell within three weeks if a student is in trouble. And I'm sure a lot of faculty would have, you know, ideas of what would be the best solution.

Provost Tarhule: Good point. But at the present time, I think, not just me but a bunch of folks in the Provost Office are new, and in some ways, that's good and bad, you know. The good is we're really trying to get a handle on what's going on, and not just on this topic, but if you’re involved with the retreat, you'll see the range of questions that we’re asked. And I think when those reports are ready, I think we'll have a much better idea of the challenges, and maybe some of the priorities, in a way that we can be much more surgical with respect to limited resources. So, as you said, if things don't move very fast, and maybe you can start this and it doesn't disrupt that effort, you know, so be it. On the other hand, maybe if you start this, by the time that report comes out. Maybe this is not really as important in the raw scheme of things, and given all the work you're doing, would that have been the best use of your time. So, I don't have a strong opinion about it one way or the other. I just wanted to share with you what we're doing in the office, and how it might impact your decision making.

Senator Kalter: I'd like to get some student views about whether you'd like, especially because a lot of you sit on Academic Affairs, whether you think this is a good long term thing, taking Tracy's suggestion about changing the verb from streamline to evaluating, a good long term, you know, something to examine in Academic Affairs Committee. Or whether you think that that's a good thing to tackle there?

Senator Phillips: I was just gonna say like, I understand that it's obviously something that you would want to get done like as soon as possible because you don't want to miss anybody. And I think that that's sort of what you were alluding to, at one point in the conversation, Senator Kalter, but I also do think that it's something that would probably benefit too from being like a longer term thing, in case that there's like new information that comes up, or like new ideas to sort of like even if we change the verb from streamline to like evaluating or something like that. But just to make it a better and more well-rounded initiative, especially since it's something that's been really popular in Senate the past few years, at least in my experience, I feel like we talked about retention at length every year. Especially last year after everything happened. So, I think it could benefit from being something that's done in the short term, but also from something that gets or would be something that would benefit from like long term attention as well. I don't know if that helps. Or that's just another like ambiguous sort of answer, but that's what I was sort of thinking.

Senator Spranger: And I feel like I'm a way different student in my online classes. Like usually, I feel like I'm a good student, like I can self-describe as that, and I honestly can't say that, especially like in the past week. So, I feel like it wouldn't necessarily be the best to try to speed up that process because I feel like everybody's not performing at their usual at the moment.

Senator Kalter: I've heard that from a lot of my students too, Avery, that they're like, I'm usually a great student and not this semester. Right. But you're saying more for the long term than the short term. Like looking at it more over the long term than the short term, or no?

Senator Spranger: Yeah. No, like definitely try to make it a longer-term thing. Because if somebody was like judging me based off my performance this semester, I feel like it's not really accurate. So, like as long as we're in a pandemic, I feel like it's not going to be the most accurate that it could. Just like online is really affecting people in a negative way, I think.

Senator Harris: Yeah, kind of like the same things they were saying. I think it could be useful down the line, but also seeing what the Provost Office is already working on because, yeah, I think it's been pretty identified throughout campus that retention is an issue, particularly with black students. So, I would hope that the Provost Office is already doing that kind of work. So, I do think you can kind of sit back a little bit especially for Academic Affairs because we're quite busy this school year.

Senator Kalter: I don't want to leave Dylan and out. He didn't unmute, but do you want to say anything, Dylan

Senator Toth: No. I definitely would just echo what the other students are saying. I would also say that I would follow the Provost’s guidance on this, just because I would support anything that would enhance student success. And I think that I agree that this semester is, you know, quite difficult to evaluate student success based on things from the semester. But also, like, what more resources can we be giving students to help them during this time like this. So, we don't know if this will be the last semester where something's affecting student success and everything like that. So, I think it would definitely be valid to give at least that consideration to see what we can do to help students succeed, but I agree that it should be a long term thing just because it doesn't have to be a short term COVID related thing, it could be relative to a lot of different issues. So, yeah, I would echo what the other students have said in the past too.

Senator Kalter: Hopefully, everybody understood that there was never an idea of it being short term or pandemic related.

Senator Toth: Right.

Senator Kalter: So, I'm actually wondering if this can be folded into one of the two Oral Communications because we pulled these over from Exec a couple of weeks ago. One of the things that Dimitrios had asked was how the internal committees were going to be able to plan their fall and spring schedules and make room for guests regarding the retreat types of things. And that would be all, you know, not just does Academic Affairs Committee have an opportunity to talk to the retreat planning committees, but then once, you know, those reports start coming out from the retreat committees about student success, faculty success, and other things, are we building into our year the ability for Academic Affairs to hear those reports, right. So, if we were to put this Academic Progress Alert System on the Issues Pending list for the long term for Academic Affairs, that could sort of dovetail with an end of the year report from the retreat committees, right. Sort of showing us what work the retreat did with regard to student success and that kind of thing. Does that sound like those two things could be sort of folded together?

Senator Nikolaou: Well, and when I mentioned it back then, was when we were trying to figure out, are we going to have Senator representatives or general faculty. And then it was thinking that, you know, if we went with the general faculty and there were no Senators, then we would have no idea what's going on. But then when we're talking about you know what the Provost Office is doing about the APA submission. That's what I thought that, okay, it might be, because as Lauren said, it's unlikely that we are going to even touch it if it comes to our committee this year. So, if it goes on our issues pending list for next year or the year after, it might be that since Amy's already in our committee once they have an update on APA she just gives us an update. And at that point, we may say, okay, what Amy just presented addresses that topic that is on our Issue Pending list without necessarily doing the evaluating part of the APA submission. So, you know, since they're already going to have done the work for the Spring Retreat that at some point we can build it in our committee to have, okay and update about the APA, or if there was something else related to the Academic Affairs Committee, as an example.

Senator Mainieri: I guess when I'm thinking about your question, Susan, this may be actually a question for the Provost instead, I mean, I would imagine that as a result of the retreat that we will hear from the Provost outcomes and steps moving forward. And so, I guess I'm wondering why individual Senate committees would need to hear something different than probably what we might be hearing from the Provost as a campus community, or as presentation to the Senate. Again, I don't know what the plans are. So, I guess I just wanted some clarification there because I, I guess I didn't imagine that the committees would need individual reports.

Provost Tarhule: There’ll be a lot of follow up communication from the retreat. The retreat is really just the beginning of a process, not the end. So, my hope is that as the different working groups, by the way, in the next week or so, if I'm correct in saying that, but soon we're going to put up a website about that work. It’ll contain information about each working group, what they're working on and solicit input from the campus as a whole. So, even for those people who are not participating who are not in the working groups, they have an opportunity to provide information about things they would like the working groups to consider, ideas they would like those groups to deliberate on, and so on. I think it's going to be… well, we want this to be as open and as transparent as possible. So, there will be an opportunity for people to provide feedback before the retreat.

And then once the retreat is over the issues that the groups have identified as their top priorities, we will then be, you know, sharing that with, again, the whole campus, you know, for further input and then those are things that we can then take and discuss what specific stakeholders for whom that is relevant, about how we implement that going forward. So, I think there's going to be a lot. And if I may make one last comment, if the problem is with retention, I would almost suggest that we focus our retention holistically, rather than taking one issues that impacts retention on its own, because when they begin to look at these issues. Now, it's very hard something as complex as retention, it's very hard to identify a single thing that we could say, this is what is driving that. So, maybe if retention is the goal, maybe the whole conversation should be focused on how do we improve retention.

On the other hand, if there are some technical inadequacies with a current alert system, you know, we can have that as a separate discussion decoupled from retention, regardless of whether it's retention or not. We might say it's too onerous on the faculty, or we might say the timing of it, we’ll request new timing, and we can examine those issues separately.

So, I want us to be very clear, and it could be very helpful if we're very clear on what it is we're trying to accomplish, and that way we can be a lot more targeted, and maybe with much less effort achieve the same thing, accomplish the same goal.

Senator Nahm: I really want to second what Dr. Tarhule said there. I was thinking a lot about the different tools that I have to, you know, keep track of students who are struggling in my class, and to notify, you know, the academic advisor, or my director, that there's a student that we could all be helping out together. And I think the benefit of the progress reports that we do right now is that it produces data, right, that the university can look at as a whole. But it doesn't have the personal interaction that I would have with the student emailing them and saying like, hey, you know, like you're missing a couple of assignments. If you need any help, if you have questions, please reach out to me. So, I think there are just different things that we could be doing together and having a holistic look at all the different means that we have to improve retention is key.

Senator Kalter: All right. Well, I'm not sure where this leaves us. In my view, the Academic Affairs Committee should always have this on its Issues Pending list because it's one of their charges. So, it seems like where we are, in a sense, is that… and Martha had brought this up in the beginning, I think, that hopefully this retention discussion, and as part of it the Academic Progress Alert System is part of the Student Success part of the retreat. And that stuff would be coming to, some things may be coming to Academic Affairs, either for advice or, you know, to work on, or policy changes, or what have you. So, I guess where I am is wondering if people object to putting it on the long term Issues Pending list, with the understanding that it wouldn't be gotten to this, you know, certainly not before IDEAS.

Senator Horst: Put what on? Put the Provost report or put the Alert System?

Senator Kalter: The Alert System and other issues regarding retention, you know, improving retention and graduation rates and that kind of stuff.

Senator Nikolaou: If we put it on our Issue Pending list, we can always make a note because there is a note when we review the Issues Pending, saying that, you know, you don't have to go into this item before you receive the report from the Provost Office about this topic. So, that, you know, whoever is next year in the community they know that, okay, the report is completed from the Provost, if we have time, we can look at it. But if the report is not ready, we shouldn't even spend time on that issue.

Senator Horst: I mean, it's hard to say because we don't know what the Provost’s reports are going to look like. But, you know, I can just say from Rules, you know, we're just completely backlogged, and so, I think, you know, my experience with Dimitrios on AAC, it's also the same sort of thing, Academic Affairs, and I feel like the long range planning committee is the one committee that might be able to take a bird's eye view and consider what the Provost retreats come up with.

Senator Kalter: There's another reason why you guys are backlog, Martha. But I'm wondering if Dimitrios feels that you’re backlogged or just working steadily?

Senator Nikolaou: The AAC.

Senator Kalter: Yes.

Senator Nikolaou: Well, I think that once we are done with IDEAS, our main topics are pretty much complete. I mean apart, you know, a couple here and there, but IDEAS is the main thing, and then we're tackling with, you know, the Textbook at the same time, and then we do the reports. But I don't think we have any other major issue right now. I mean there's no way we're going to look at it this year. That's pretty certain that even if it comes to us, we will not be able to look at it.

Senator Mainieri: I guess I have trouble right now adding a specific item about APA to an Issues Pending list when we're kind of in a transition phase, with the retreat happening, we have the new position for Student Success that would also tie in here. And so, I'm not sure I see the value adding a specific item in right now to an Issues Pending list. I do wonder if moving forward, if this is something, you know, if retention obviously is a topic important to Senate, and it touches on several committees, right, not just Academic Affairs. I wonder if it's one of those reports that we want to hear about each year as a Senate. Like what's going on in terms of new retention efforts and data across campus. And if we can put it that way, and then we hear the report, and then we of course if there's things that we hear flag that seem relevant to dish out to committees, I think that could be one way to approach it. I just feel like right now in this time of transition and change that putting a specific item for APA on an Issue Pending list, I'm not sure… I don't see a utility to that right now. Just because we don't know, and even by the end of the year, what that item might need to look like in order to be meaningful.

Senator Kalter: So, I have a question then about, and it goes back to something that Dr. Tarhule said, about what I should do about those students that I need to alert, but they are not in the Alert System. So, I have, you know, every semester I have probably 50% of my students that I alert, and 50% who I have no place to alert. So, it sounded like what Dr. Tarhule was saying is that might be able to be fixed with a computer issue. I'm wondering if Charley Edamala can take a look at that, or Rosie Hauck could take a look at that part of it.

Senator Mainieri: I've asked Amelia this question when she was in University College because I was wondering why certain students show up and certain students don't, and her recommendation was first of course faculty direct contact, then a Redbird Care Report, and then you can also now do a direct student referral for advisor center help. And so that there's all these different avenues to tap a student, not just through APA, right.

Senator Kalter: But that's part of the problem that I'm trying to bring out, Tracy, is that not every faculty member knows Amelia, and so they may not know to ask Amelia that question. And so then they may be wondering well, how do I alert about the, you know, I've got 10 students that are in trouble if you've got a class of whatever you know 88 or something like that. And the bigger your class gets, right, the harder it is to not have an automated system, and to have to go through seven different avenues of alerting.

Senator Harris: Yeah, that was going to be my recommendation to see is this just like a technology thing that can be fixed and not necessarily a whole, I mean, at this point, a whole policy revision or change. Like, for the most part, it seems like it could possibly be addressed, like the specific concern you have, maybe it’s just the tech, but I'm not for sure, that would obviously be Charley, but that can be the first thing we do.

Senator Nikolaou: Well, and I was also thinking along those lines that, you know, we should probably separate, as the Provost also said, the retention with the more technical issues. Because, for example, last year when the Academic Affairs Committee, look at the catalog, we didn't create any policy, we just looked, we had Amy, she told us what they were doing. But then we sent an email out to the advisors. We got feedback. And then based on this feedback, they adjusted the online catalog. So, it's not that whatever comes to us we're always sending it for a policy creation. So, it might be that we are just going to talk about, okay, one concern is that are, you know, we have like, what, 79% of people who respond to the APA, is it that the remaining 21% because they do not feel comfortable putting a letter grade and that's why they are not doing it. So, if we gave the option to give comments without posting an actual grade would this be beneficial? Or if it is, can we have an earlier email going out? So, all these are going to be more like technology focused. They are not going to be a policy, but you know if we don't talk about them, we will not be able to address them. Which is exactly, I mean, I'm using the catalog because that's the most recent example that we had that we talked about it but it was not an actual policy that… and I don't think it even came to the Senate floor. It only stayed with the Academic Affairs and then it was sorted out.

Provost Tarhule: Dimitrios, you raise a point, not to address that particular one, but the one thing I could offer to do since some of these I’m hearing for the first time. I could start (I made a note) I could talk to Charley and figure out why some students don't appear in the system, right. That's a technical problem. That's something he and I can work on and if there is a solution, one way or the other, I could come back to this body maybe at the next time and sort of report what I have found. So, at least on that one technical issue I could say, here's the solution or here's the challenge, and maybe what we could do going forward. But yeah, so that separation of technology versus the larger issues of principle or approach in general, I think, will help us to whittle down the problem too, so that what remains we sort of focus on what is the best way for tackling what remains. And again, and maybe this might support better what Dimitrios was saying, part of and the value of talking to people like Amy, she said here that one time they considered including qualitative assessment and the advisors really hated it, because faculty (some faculty) put very mean comments that would be very discouraging to students. I tell her if she has at list of actual comments (qualitative comments) that faculty have put on students’ assessment… So, there's no way that, the advisors would refuse to communicate that kind of information to students because you’re just beating them down when they are already down. Right or wrong, that could be another perspective that is worth hearing about as we think about how to discuss this.

Senator Kalter: It is after 5:15. I'm thinking that we should wrap here, pull anything that we didn't get to on the agenda over to the next meeting and lest any of you be concerned that Dr. Tarhule and I didn't talk about this for some, you know, bad reason, we don't have enough time in our days to get through all of this stuff that is on each of our agendas. So, even though I had it on my list for last time we talked, we never got to it. And also, I have talked many times to Amelia about these things. And so, it'll be interesting to see what Charley can do.

The other thing that I noticed this year, and I think it's new this year, is that you used to be able to pick multiple reasons out of a menu why a student was not succeeding in your class and now that's gone for some reason, you can only pick one. Which doesn't really help, you know, because sometimes it's they're not coming to class and they're not turning in assignments and they have personal issues, etc. And it seems like the system ought to want to hear that, I'm really disappointed to hear what you just said about people putting mean comments in, that's not okay. So, all right, so. Motion to adjourn the meeting.

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Harris, seconded by Senator Toth, to adjourn the meeting. The motion was unanimously approved.