**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes**
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**Approved**

***Call to Order***

Academic Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

***Oral Communications:***

***Engineering Programs proposal, February 3rd Planning and Finance Committee time & logistics of their schedule***

Senator Kalter: We have two Oral Communications. The first one is actually on the agenda. It’s just a little question I have to Dr. Dietz based on something that you said in the Senate meeting about the Engineering Programs. I was a little bit confused about the sequencing, because you mentioned about the February 3 presentation that it would be to the Planning and Finance Committee. I was wondering if you meant that or if you meant it was to the full Senate, but I think that we need it to be to the full Senate.

President Dietz: Yeah, I think it’s to the full Senate. If I said that, and I guess I did, I misspoke. The plan is to have that meeting dealing mainly with the academic program, curriculum, and so forth. But both of these would be to the full Academic Senate. Both on the 3rd, and then the following week as well [17th].

Senator Kalter: Terrific. I asked about it because I thought, well, that will take a night out of Planning and Finance’s stuff, and we need it to the full Senate anyway.

President Dietz: Right. Right.

Senator Kalter: That’s terrific. Awesome. The second Oral Communication is from Lauren.

Senator Harris: Yeah, this was from us students. We were inquiring because we’ve been getting the inquiries about the library, the status of the library, and if there’s any intention on opening it this semester. And kind of what’s the progress is looking like for that, if so.

Provost Tarhule: Yes. The library will reopen on February 1st. So, yes, there’s an intention to reopen it and that’s the date that we’d like to reopen it by.

Senator Harris: Capacity limits? Anything of that nature, or…

Provost Tarhule: Some of those details will come from the dean of the college working with the steering committee, but he’s had some consultations with the leadership of the library, and taken that communication to the planning group, and that’s the decision that we’ve made. So, the specifics about capacity and opening hours… I know that I’ve got information on that somewhere, I just don’t have it right here with me. But those have been worked out and those will be shared out hopefully sometime, I want to say this week, but don’t hold me to that.

President Dietz: I was going to say, maybe that’s part of the Thursday communication…

Provost Tarhule: Yeah.

President Dietz: …that we normally send out and there’ll be more detail in there about… concerns about, you know, how many people can gather and distancing, and safety and security and monitoring that. What I’ve heard is that they’re going to use students to monitor all of this pretty much the way they’ve done in the Bone Student Center, as to if you find somebody that, you know, isn’t complying with the expectations is that we have students talk to students, you know, about that and that’s worked really well in the Bone Student Center, which I think people… I don’t think really intentionally were walking through the Bone without a mask, but sometimes people just forget, I think. But I haven’t seen, I’m not in the Bone every day, but the times that I’ve been there, I really haven’t seen anybody in the Bone without a mask. And they monitor those folks pretty closely there, and I think the same will probably be extended to the library.

Senator Murphy (invited guest, Milner Library Senator): I can’t speak to what has been done in the Bone. I can tell you that when the library was open previously there was a decent percentage of students who were taking their masks off as soon as they cleared the lobby. You know, they would walk in, they would get through the lobby, head up to a subject floor, take the mask off on the stairway on their way up, or they would settle at a table and then take their mask off. Our staff were not really set up at the time for dealing with that issue properly, and they tried their best to approach those students and tell them that they needed to wear a mask. But it was basically turning into a full-time job for a number of people, just trying to enforce the masks…

President Dietz: Sure.

Senator Murphy: And they already had jobs they needed to be doing.

President Dietz: Right. And I think that’s why they, I think the thought around the student monitors, you know, takes the expectation away from the staff and puts it with students. So.

Provost Tarhule: And stronger compliance. One of the things we’ve talked about is if somebody is a repeat offender, you know, they should be booted from the library. We didn’t say that before, but now we’re saying that if you have to be told two, three times put your mask back on then you really should leave the library. So, there’s a whole number of reasons why this is a good thing to do at this time. You know, the public library is reopening on the same day. We’re now in a different phase. We are also very hopeful that… mask compliance has gotten really good compared to when we first started. I think a lot more people are comfortable with masks, and you know… So, hopefully that will continue to be the case. And right now, the Bone is actually facing pressure because since the library is not open, that’s where all the students go. So, in some ways it’s unfair to the people who work in the Bone. So, opening up additional study places… I think this is the number one complaint students gave for living on-campus are saying we’re not going to stay here if the library’s not open. So, there’s a whole variety of reasons why we think this makes sense. There will continue to be challenges, no question about that, as with anything in this pandemic, and we just have to try and manage it and give the people concerned a little bit more tools for dealing with it.

President Dietz: Lauren, does that help?

Senator Harris: Yes, it does. Thank you. The only other thing is that people were asking about the café. The little café that was there. And I know like, for the Bone for instance, we have the designated eating areas. I don’t know if the café was going to be open too, and were we going to have more designated areas but then that might cause an issue with the masks again.

Provost Tarhule: The last time I remember, and I may not be up to date, but the last time I talked to Dallas about this he said the café would not be open. But that’s been a while, so it may have changed. I’ll make a note here to check on that, but I’m sure all of this will be included in the communication that comes out.

Senator Murphy: My understanding is that the café will not be open.

Senator Harris: Thank you.

Senator Kalter: So, Lauren, when Cera emailed me to let me know that you had an Oral for today, she said that you had written we would like to know the rationale why it had remained closed, so I think you kind of heard a little bit about that, and that’s why Julie Murphy is here, is because she’s our Library Senator. But I continue to consider it a worker safety issue, part of the health, safety, and equity concerns that a lot of people have expressed. And so, you’ve heard a little bit about that. I also consider it a matter of shared governance, and I do hope, Senator Murphy, that it has been a shared governance decision to open up the library.

Senator Murphy: As far as we’re concerned at the library, we have always been told that we don’t have a say as to whether or not the building is open, that that is the university administration that decided whether or not the library is open. Even prior to COVID, if there was a mechanical issue in the building, it was never really up to the Milner Dean whether or not the library was open or closed. That was always something that was decided at the university level.

Senator Kalter: Do you have a sense of, I think Dr. Tarhule said that the public libraries (it must be the local public libraries here) are opening on the same day. Do you have a sense of the university libraries around the state or around the country? Do they tend to be open or closed right now?

Senator Murphy: I can’t speak to the country. If we’re talking about the other public university libraries in Illinois, many of them are starting to open this semester. Some of them are still closed. U of I, I believe, is still only open to appointments and not to walk-ins. My understanding is that many of the publics are starting to open this semester at some point.

Senator Kalter: And do you know whether there’s a plan to have scheduled space as opposed to just walk-in, and any capacity? Can you tell us anything about that?

Senator Murphy: I can tell you that several of them are scheduling. They’re making students reserve appointments in order to come into the building. But others are just allowing students to walk-in.

Senator Kalter: And do you know what our plan is?

Senator Murphy: Our plan is to allow students to just walk in starting February 1st.

Senator Kalter: I’ll go on record to say I think that’s quite inadvisable. I think it should be scheduled space so that students know before they come that the capacity has been reached, at the very least. And also, to know where to go in the building, so that they know where their study space is. Because we know that finals week and midterm week can be quite crowded in the library, and that’s not going to be a safe thing for students or librarians if that occurs. So, that concerns me a little bit.

President Dietz: I think some of that will be covered in the information that comes out on Thursday as part of the regular communication on this, some of the detail with all of that will be covered is my understanding.

Senator Kalter: I very much appreciated what the Provost just said about, you know, you don’t get an unlimited number of strikes. You’re going to be out if you don’t follow the rules.

President Dietz: Right.

Senator Kalter: And it seems like that should be both masking and distancing, right. So, thanks very much for that. Martha, I saw you with a hand up.

Senator Horst: Yeah. I was just going to say that some of these issues, maybe even right now, but in the future could be worked with the Library Committee. The administration could go to the Library Committee which has representatives, and I think this is a good thing to bring to a committee like that.

Provost Tarhule: This was discussed in the Library Committee.

Senator Horst: Oh, good.

Provost Tarhule: The Library Council discussed with the dean. As far as I understand, they discussed the issues and the recommendations that went to the planning committee is what came from that council or committee discussions. I don’t know what the right word is. But what the dean reported to me was that there had been a meeting and they discussed all of the options, and the recommendations he was taking to the planning committee was what was the consensus coming out of his college.

President Dietz: And the basis I think for this is obviously we moved into phase four of mitigations, which is a good thing. You know, thankfully that’s happened. So, I think that’s the basis, and we’ll monitor this and hopefully we’ll stay in phase four a long time and we’ll advance to phase five, I hope. But, you know, all of this is informed by what phase we’re in.

Senator Kalter: I should make the clarification since Provost Tarhule may not be familiar with our structure yet. There are probably two different committees that are being talked about here. The Library Council is I think what Provost Tarhule is referring to, which is made of faculty and staff in the library, just librarians, right. So, it has faculty, I think both tenure line and non-tenure line faculty, AP, and civil service librarians that make up the Library Council. They would be the ones, for example, that would write their bylaws and that kind of thing. I believe that Martha may have been referring to the Senate’s external committee which is called the Library Committee. So, there’s the Library Council which is the internal, and the Library Committee which is the Senate’s. And what that is, because probably most of you actually are not that familiar with it, it is made up of I think now nine faculty and a couple of students… Oh no wait. We just saw that in the Senate a couple months ago, so you may be more familiar with it than I remember. But it’s something like five to nine faculty, several students, the dean, and associate deans of the library, and we had revamped that several years back. It used to be sort of a “friends of the library” type of committee. Now, it’s a much more substantive sort of collections and recommendations about facilities and things like that.

Provost Tarhule: Thanks for that clarification.

Senator Kalter: Sure. And I also wanted to clarify it just because, Martha, I don’t think, I might be wrong, but I don’t think that the Library Committee has actually weighed in on this. I think it’s been the Library Council, which is just fine with me, because it seems to me that the people who work in the library should have some control over their own safety.

Senator Murphy: Just to be clear, what was brought to Library Council was that we needed to develop plans for reopening. So, we were allowed to plan for ourselves what a reopening would look like. We have no say in whether the library was open or closed.

Senator Kalter: Yes. And I will again go on record, I strongly disagree with that manner of being of our university that that has been the case. I think that it should be the librarians’ decision and that the librarians should be looking at what’s going on in other libraries, and not have to open if they don’t think that it’s advisable.

Senator Harris: I just want to add, to go along with that, but at the same time think about the students and their needs and what they’ve asked for for quite some time as well. So, it’s a hard balance.

Senator Kalter: It is a hard balance. And definitely, I agree with you, Lauren, that students need to have study spaces and they need to have access to the resources that the library offers in some fashion whether it’s in the library building or not.

***Distributed Communications:***

***01.21.21.04 From Alice Maginnis: Rationale of Changes from Legal (Action Item 02/03/21)***

***11.12.20.03 From Faculty Affairs Committee: Policy 1.8 Integrity in Research and Scholarly Activities Current Copy (Action Item 02/03/21)***

***01.21.21.01 From Faculty Affairs Committee: Integrity Policy Section I Mark Up (Action Item 02/03/21)***

***01.21.21.03 From Faculty Affairs Committee: Integrity policy Section II Mark Up (Action Item 02/03/21)***

***01.21.21.02 From Faculty Affairs Committee: Integrity policy Section III Mark Up(Action Item 02/03/21)***

***01.07.21.01 From Faculty Affairs Committee: Integrity policy Section IV Mark UP EDITORIAL CHANGES ONLY (Action Item 02/03/21)***

***01.21.21.08 From Faculty Affairs Committee: Policy 1.8 Integrity in Research and Scholarly Activities Clean Copy (Action Item 02/03/21)***

Senator Kalter: Okay. So, we’re going to move on to Distributed Communications. So, you may remember seeing the Integrity policy stuff. We saw these a few months ago, I think it was in November. The committee took the feedback—and I’m on this committee so I can kind of give you a rundown of what we did—they took the feedback in and discussed it. Mary Hollywood (who is the chair of the committee), myself, Alice Maginnis, and Lisa Huson met and talked through some of the points from the feedback because Alice was kind of recommending slightly different approaches from what were suggested on the Senate floor. I’m actually not entirely sure that one of the changes at least, and I think it was Dimitrios that asked for this change, whether it’s correctly captured in the new mark up. There was some confusion as it was going from the committee discussion in December to the next one. So, we’re going to want to look at that today. But I may need to ask Dimitrios or others about that, to make sure that you’re actually seeing those changes. Because they definitely were accepted in spirit or verbatim by both the committee and the Legal office. So, if they’re not incorporated into the thing it’s probably a mistake. I’ll say that I noticed in Section I.2 a change that was accepted by the committee is not reflected in the draft that we have here, so we need to change that. And, Cera, you have access to the recordings from our December and January meetings so you might need to be the one unfortunately to go back and see what we talked about and what we did and didn’t do, so that it’s not just me and trying to, you know, remember. There was some confusion in the Teams site about which draft we were on.

Let’s see. The other thing that I notice is that in Section II.3 just wanted to point this out, Alice Maginnis actually echoed something that Martha had brought up quite a long time ago when we saw this like last year, which led to a significant change in the Malicious Charge section. And I think she thought that it was a good idea not to have any Provost, basically, just be told that somebody did something malicious, and then the Provost on his or her own just decide to punish that person, right. That is has to be… we have to figure out a process for that. All right. Let me ask, any comments on the Integrity stuff that’s come forward? And one more thing, before I forget, you notice that there is a Section IV. It only has editorial changes. That’s because Craig McLauchlan who is the Provost rep on the committee was concerned that if we change the first three sections with respect to some things but not Section IV editorially that the legalistic policy changes would be potentially up on the website for a couple of months and would not fit together. So, that’s all that is being changed in Section IV is sort of cleanup of the editorial language.

Senator Horst: Susan, could you clarify where… we’re going to pass with an Action Item the part we worked on, and then we’re going to continue working on the different parts. And is it all going to be changed on the website simultaneously or is it going to be changed in batches?

Senator Kalter: I’m anticipating, unfortunately, that we’re going to have to change it in batches. We, the committee, is done with Section IV.A. We worked on IV. B in the January meeting and it was… we barely got through that section. In fact, I don’t think we did get through that section. As I left the meeting to get on Faculty Caucus a little bit early, we were only part way down. There are I think six to eight sections, A-B-C-D-E-F-G-H-I-J-K and I think there’s an L-M-N-O-P, literally. So, and L-M-N-O-P might be one section, right, because when it gets to the bottom it’s quite short, like little short sections. But there are a lot of sections. So, I’m not anticipating… I don’t want us to feel like it’s accomplishable by the end of the year if it’s not. But this has been six years in the making and it’s probably advisable to change the first three sections.

Senator Horst: But the policy will make sense if the first three sections are changed but the last section…?

Senator Kalter: Yeah. So, Section I is basically just the preamble, right. Sort of what are the principles of this policy. Section II is definitions of, I think it’s Section II is the definitions, or no, maybe Section III is the definitions of what could be an academic integrity violation. And Section II, remind me somebody what’s that one?

Senator Horst: General Provisions.

Senator Kalter: General Provisions, yeah. It’s marginally possible that as we go through Section IV that we’ll find things that need to be changed in the earlier section, but we don’t think that there’s anything that’s being changed here where it impacts the Procedures section in any way that would be problematic, except for, you know, changing Academic Integrity Officer to Research Integrity Officer and things like that.

Senator Nikolaou: So, what’s the purpose of the editorial changes? Because when I was looking at the proposed agenda it appeared as an Action Item. So, the idea is that we’re just going to approve the editorial changes? Or is it that we’re actually going to talk about it and then decide if we’re going to approve it?

Senator Kalter: So, Sections I, II, and III are in Action.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: Or they’re going into Action. I think they were in Information last time. They’re going into Action. So, those are not an issue. I hadn’t really thought about that, but generally speaking, I don’t think that if it’s only an editorial change it needs to have an information item and then an action item two weeks later. So, I think that we could do the editorial changes for Section IV all at the same time. What do all of you think?

Senator Nikolaou: So, we wouldn’t be talking about the content at all.

Senator Kalter: Correct. Yeah. We’re not ready…

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. That’s what I was not clear… if we are, so for example, are we emailing Mary or Cera like our editorial changes for Section IV, and not our substantive changes?

Senator Kalter: Correct.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay.

Senator Kalter: Yes. If you caught editorial changes, please, please send them on. But for substantive changes wait until we get the substantive changes from the committee, which could be, you know, this year or it could be in the fall.

Senator Nikolaou: For the other sections, I had a question. Do we need to have the actual markup we saw last time with any changes that happened? Because, for example, the item you mentioned about the Provost in that paragraph above the Malicious Charge… because in the Senate we saw a different wording and now in that version we don’t see it at all. We don’t even see that it has been deleted. It’s as if it never existed.

Senator Kalter: Cera, can you take care of that? What we always should see, I think, on the floor when it goes into action is the current copy, and what it’s going to (what the changes would look like when it’s completed) and then the mark up should reflect that, rather than the change between stages. Is that not what people got?

Senator Nikolaou: So, the wording that you mentioned Alice… was not in favor, we shouldn’t be seeing it in the mark up? Because in the previous version it was saying, you know, the Provost may enter a finding of malicious conduct etc., etc. that they’re going to contact the dean and the chair, but now it is reduced to only one sentence. So, we shouldn’t be seeing, like two or three or four sentences that we saw last time when it was in informational stage.

Senator Kalter: It depends on whether you’re talking… I’m not sure whether you’re talking about sentences that are in the current copy that’s already posted. But I think that those sentences that you’re talking about are in the current copy, right? So, this has been a long standing… it’s been in the policy for a really long time. And maybe that the reason you’re not seeing it is because we also moved it up from Section IV into Section II. And so, you’d have to look at the current copy way, way down in Section IV to find the Malicious Charges section, but I don’t recall a whole bunch of rewording of that, it was just a move. And then Alice was fairly confident that that was a bad process. In other words that it doesn’t give people as it’s written right now enough due process through the system. Like, let’s say a graduate student sees something… or you know a graduate student has a beef against a professor, that would be a malicious charges scenario, and they tell, you know, Kathy Spence, hey, that professor is doing something wrong. And the inquiry committee says, that was malicious, there is nothing going wrong with that professor’s research. This grad student was acting in a malicious way. Just telling the Provost, and letting the Provost (whoever it may be) decide the fate of that graduate student or of a fellow professor, or a lab research technician who’s an AP or whatever, that she did not think it was advisable to put that in one person’s decision making power, and instead that it should then go to another process. I don’t know if that’s helping at all.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. So, we shouldn’t be showing the intermediate changes? That was the main point.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. We should not be watching the intermediate, I mean, you know, we should not be showing the intermediate changes…

Senator Nikolaou: Okay.

Senator Kalter: …to the Senate floor is my sense. I mean, you can tell me different, but I think it would just be confusing.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. Yeah. Because that was the main big thing, that before it was there, and now it disappeared, and that’s why it was not…if, you know, people would want to see it or not. But, yeah, that’s fine.

Senator Kalter: I’m hoping it didn’t just disappear though on the copy, right? It should somehow be showing on the current copy. So, it may be because it got moved that you’re not seeing that particular mark up as a cross out. I have a feeling that that’s what’s happening. So, Cera, you might need to have a special mark up of just the malicious charges current copy and the new copy that’s a little bit separate so that people can see that change, since it was moved up from Section IV. I think that’s the only one that got moved up from Section IV.

Ms. Hazelrigg: Okay.

Senator Kalter: Is there anything else? I said I would ask Dimitrios if he saw all of the changes that he had requested on the floor because I know you were one of the people that did it… did the request. And, Todd, actually, first of all, welcome. I forgot to say to everyone to welcome Todd. Todd, you were another one, but I think yours was simple and got incorporated.

Senator Stewart: I think that’s right.

Senator Kalter: Dimitrios, did you see anything wrong with the way the copy showed your requested changes?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah, no. I mean there are a couple of, you know, typo kind of things but I can email Cera.

Senator Kalter: Awesome.

Senator Nikolaou: But then the main changes, the wording that was introduced it makes sense.

Senator Kalter: Awesome. Okay. And, Martha, I think I saw your hand up.

Senator Horst: Yeah, I was just going to say that this is unusual to pass three fourths of a policy. It makes me feel a little bit nervous. And so, if somebody, Alice Maginnis, or Mary Hollywood, or you, or all of you could just address how you’re confident… what you just said. Because, you know, it really is unusual not to pass an entire policy.

Senator Kalter: It is unusual. I agree. But I think in this case it’s warranted.

Senator Horst: Yeah. So, if you could just talk that through with the Senate, I think that would be good.

Senator Kalter: And we’ll need to have Kathy Spence and Alice there, obviously, so we should invite them. Anybody else have any comments?

Senator Mainieri: I had one very minor thing in Section IV on the top of page six of the mark up. There’s some binary gender language that needs to be replaced.

Senator Kalter: In Section IV? Okay. We may take that… I’m trying to think whether that’s editorial in the way that we mean, so I’ll ask Mary to ask the committee about that. It would be better to have that done sooner rather than later but it may be something that they want to do when the Section IV comes through. Because I know we cleaned up gender non-neutral language in the I, II, and III. And by the way, when it comes to the floor, I will make sure to go through… Alice gave sort of a… Cera wrote down all of the comments from the floor, Alice gave some advisories on that, so we’re going to send that part out to the Senate floor. And I will specifically ask on the floor, you know, anybody who made comments on section I, II, or III, did your changes get incorporated in a way that you thought was okay. So. Great.

***01.21.21.06 From Rules Committee: CAS Council By-Laws Current Copy (Action Item 02/03/21)***

***01.21.21.07 From Rules Committee: CAS Council By-Laws Mark Up (Action Item 02/03/21)***

***01.21.21.05 From Rules Committee: CAS By-Laws Clean Copy (Action Item 02/03/21)***

Senator Kalter: Looks like we can move now to the College of Arts and Sciences Bylaws. They’re coming to us from Rules. Martha, did you want to talk about what you discussed and what CAS asked to change and what Rules accepted and all that?

Senator Horst: If I remember. Well, first off, it’s not the College of Arts and Sciences Council Bylaws, now it’s the College of Arts and Sciences Bylaws. I did some digging with the Constitution and this is actually the official… it varied from college to college. Some of them have the council bylaws, like the library, and some of them have the college bylaws, so they switched that. I just noted quickly some things, the dean is now non-voting. There’re three groups in CAS, they group the departments into three groups, and they shuffled those around. There’s various gender-neutral language that we incorporated and we’re still finding some of that, so if anybody finds any of that let me know. And I would add that I got an email (maybe today) from Diane Zosky that they’ve found a couple more editorial changes, so they will be sending another copy to Cera. They incorporated an associate/assistant dean search process; that’s a big one. The curriculum committee now has a secretary that’s elected, and Senator Stewart is the one who alerted us to that. So, those are the changes that were coming to the forefront for me. There were many others, but I don’t have a total list at this point.

Senator Kalter: All right. Terrific. Do we have discussion about this one?

Senator Mainieri: I just have a general question. And first of all, the clean version is so beautifully formatted, Cera, making all the changes and everything, and committee. I do find with this document (the markup) and the mark up for CGE that the number of formatting changes that are there is overwhelming being able to see the actual changes. So, I’m wondering if there can be a markup copy that doesn’t involve the formatted changes when it does go to Senate, because it’s hard to, on some pages, you can’t even see the actual changes.

Senator Nahm: You can actually turn that off on Microsoft Word.

Senator Kalter: And you can also go in, Cera, and accept the formatting changes without accepting the other changes. In the margin.

Senator Mainieri: And then I have a couple things that can probably be brought up on the floor, not here. But I did just want to bring up one item to this group to just kind of hear a couple of thoughts before I consider bringing it up on the floor. And it has to do with the asterisk in Article I under the name, that then says, you know, “From this point forward in the document the term faculty shall refer to tenure track faculty and NTT shall refer to non tenure track faculty.” I’m not sure why but that statement stood out to me as perhaps “othering” NTT faculty. And I wonder if it’s possible instead just to label tenure track and non tenure track faculty. It doesn’t seem like it would be too much more onerous throughout the document to do that. But I just wanted to bring up that. I had kind of an icky feeling as I read that, and just wanted to hear from others before I consider bringing it up or not.

Senator Horst: I mean, I can’t flush out exactly how they used that word faculty throughout the document, so you’d have to look at each one of them, right. And so, there’s that. That phrase was in… that’s been in from the last time so that wasn’t added. But, you know, as I work on all of these bylaws, what was it, CAST, CAST’s term of faculty was very different. Each college really kind of defines what they mean by faculty in different ways, so it can be quite tricky. And the other thing I would say is this has been passed by the CAS Council. So, it’s a document that they’re in a way putting forward. I mean, certainly you can bring that up. But I think to make that change they’d really have to check to see how the term faculty was used throughout, and that’s language that’s coming from before, so they’d have to… Maybe it could be something to consider for the next time they revise the bylaws, maybe is what I’m saying, potentially.

Senator Mainieri: Thank you. And then I did have one other question and that, Martha, I was hoping you could just… since you were part of the discussion, I did see for the associate and assistant dean searches (let me get to the right page, sorry), let’s see, associate deans it says that the notice of position will be sent to all tenure track faculty and assistant deans will be sent to all faculty and staff, and I’m wondering if that difference was purposeful or should be the same?

Senator Horst: That sounds like a great question for Diane Zosky.

Senator Mainieri: Okay. I just wasn’t sure. And then I just caught a typo.

Senator Horst: Sure.

Senator Mainieri: Page eight, it’s really small. Page eight of the mark up at the bottom, VI “council” should be capitalized in that first sentence.

Senator Horst: Yeah. Could you just send that to me in an email, Tracy, and I’ll forward it to Diane? They’re catching a lot of things.

Senator Mainieri: Sure.

Senator Nikolaou: I had a question on if we know who is going to come on the Senate, because I have several points throughout the… and they are not small things.

Senator Kalter: We generally invite the college council chair.

Senator Horst: He cannot make it. So, he said he felt comfortable being represented by Diane Zosky. I invited… I told him this was happening and there was a good chance that the document would be up next time, and he said he had family commitments. I don’t know if that’s every Wednesday.

Senator Kalter: Gotcha.

Senator Nikolaou: Do you think it would be better for me to send all the comments then to Diane? Because, I mean, I have lots of them. And when I say it’s lots… So, instead of addressing all of them on the floor…

Senator Kalter: Dimitrios, are they things that Exec should be concerned about that might lead to us sending the bylaws back to Rules or are they things that…

Senator Nikolaou: Well, I’m not talking about, you know, small things because, I mean, the small things I can just send them to Martha. But then, for example, since we brought up the chairs and the deans, this should be totally consistent with the 3.2.13 policy that we have implemented. So, for example, it says that, you know, the new department chairperson should be selected, when the dean is going to announce it, it is the Provost, or the Provost designee, based on that one. I mean, the small thing there... I’m assuming the affirmative action office is the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access, right? So, we need to change that one. And then the policy was also… when it was for the selection of the department chairperson under 3.C it says, “if faculty member of the selection committee becomes a candidate for the chairpersonship, the department shall choose an eligible replacement.” But then the policy says that “any person that has agreed to serve as a member of a search committee may not become a candidate for the search position.” So, that is totally in conflict with the existing policy.

Senator Horst: So, it sounds like you have some list of some issues and I think the best thing probably would be to have you email me those issues and work a little bit more on the bylaws. And see… yeah, I think it’s best if I just communicate with Diane Zosky.

Senator Kalter: In other words, Martha, you’re sort of taking it… you’re asking us to not have it on the Senate floor quite yet until you can determine if these are sort of floor issues versus things that you really need to take back to Rules.

Senator Horst: Yeah. The chair’s search concerns me. Yeah. So, I think that’s the best thing, as opposed to waiting two weeks…

Senator Kalter: Yeah.

Senator Horst: Waiting a week, right, and then spring it on Diane Zosky, and then she has to go to her council and maybe they meet once a month. It sounds like… Todd, do you have an opinion on that?

Senator Stewart: That sounds right to me. That especially the chair stuff seems important to get right.

Senator Kalter: Dimitrios, when you send that, can you copy me just so I can also do a little assessment about whether Exec would, you know, …

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. Yeah. I can send you the, because I added some on the markup, well I had it all on the mark up but then I can also create a list so that it is more clear that, okay, it is that and that and that and that.

Senator Kalter: Awesome.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. Because, for example, I also had a question about the membership of the council, so who… because it says three fifths of current membership. Is it three fifths of the voting membership, of the non-voting membership? Because when we talk about the membership it says the members are the dean, the faculty, the students, and then in a separate sentence it says that associate deans may also be present. But then when we are talking about the three fifths, in that case that we are talking about, would Diane be counted towards the membership or not? So, is that voting or non-voting? And then the three fifths was also weird because it doesn’t result in a round person number. Because we would assume, you know, what is the total number of the membership and if you want to have a quorum it would end up being like 10, it wouldn’t be 10.4.

Senator Horst: Yeah. That sounds like a wordsmithing thing. But, again, the policy thing that you cited seems to be something that we really need to work out. You know, but sometimes… anyway. So, I’ll be happy to get the list.

Senator Nikolaou: And, for example, in the first page I mean that would be an easy thing, under B, where it says that the college council shall advise and assist dean of the College of Arts and Sciences particularly in such areas as conducting the annual evaluation of the dean. Well, how does the council assist the dean with their own evaluation? So, should this be part of C, where it says the college council establishes the procedures for conducting the annual evaluation?

Senator Horst: We brought that up and that’s one of the rationales we used for having her be non-voting. But I think that’s kind of standard, that evaluation of the dean is something you see in a lot of college bylaws, and the deans are members. The college councils evaluate the dean, and the college councils all contain the dean as a member, most, I think all of them, right? But that rationale that you just did is what I suggested to her why she should be non-voting.

Senator Kalter: That could be, by the way, an issue for our administrator evaluation policy. I’m not… I don’t remember what’s about deans in that policy, but it ought to be conformed there. So, Dimitrios, it sounds like, and everybody, it sounds like Dimitrios should send Martha and myself the list. We should not put it on the agenda for next Wednesday, and if possible, we’ll put it back on the Exec agenda for two weeks from now. If not possible, Martha will let us know that is wasn’t possible, that things need to be worked out. But before we end this one, let me ask other than Dimitrios, did anybody else see anything that needs to be attended to? (Pause)

Because I saw two things, Martha, that… one of them is quick. Either Tracy or Dimitrios mentioned 3.2.13 which is the Selection policy. I thought both of those should be mentioned on the first page, right. Only 3.2.15 is mentioned, and even though 13 doesn’t have a really significant section about, I think it was chairs that were being talked about, it probably ought to be referenced. The other thing was in Appendix C.1.A. Now this was something that I was going to bring up on the floor, but I’ll bring it up here since it might be going back to committee. Seems to me that it should say that acting appointments happen after an announcement and about a week’s time for interested parties to make themselves known. And I’ll tell you why I feel that way. As an institution I think we need to really start moving beyond kind of what I see as routine violations of the spirit of EEOC law. We do this all the time, right, where Tracy had mentioned rooting out systemic racism the other day at the Senate meeting and unfortunately we too often appoint temporary people into these types of positions and then that leads to permanent, you know, without much thought or notification of other people who might have been interested or skilled in the role. And it can also lead to just long-term permanent, you know, positions. It’s too often by word of mouth, who a person knows, you know. I would imagine that means it’s filled with implicit bias, and, you know, that often we know that people often fill roles of people underneath them because that person looks or sounds like them, right. So, this is one of the places in the university where I’ve been working for over 10 years trying to get this rooted out and it keeps coming back. And so, I really didn’t like the way that the acting appointments were different from the permanent appointments in Section C.1.A. The point is to let people know, hey, there’s a vacancy in the dean’s office, is anybody interested. And then, you know, I mean, unfortunately for acting appointments what will still happen is that the person will choose who ever they want to choose, who’ve they’ve already pre-selected but it does make it a little bit more difficult, you know, to just kind of pull up your friends or, you know, what have you, which happens all the time, and we need to have it stop. That’s my two cents on it.

Senator Horst: So, if Susan, and Dimitrios, and Tracy could all send me an email so I have it all written I would appreciate it.

Senator Kalter: Sounds good. Anybody else on that one, before we go to the CGE? (Pause) Okay.

***01.21.21.11 From Rules Committee: COUNCIL ON GENERAL EDUCATION-current (Action Item 02/03/21)***

***01.21.21.12 From Rules Committee: CGE Charge Mark Up (Action Item 02/03/21)***

***01.21.21.05 From Rules Committee: CGE Charge-CLEAN Copy (Action Item 02/03/21)***

Senator Kalter: CGE is also coming to us from the Rules Committee. Martha, do you want to talk about that one?

Senator Horst: Sure. This is the Council for General Education charge in the Blue Book and the functions were edited by the committee. The title changes were made, Amy Hurd’s title changed. There was disagreement in the committee with just me disagreeing about how the chair… who should be eligible for the chair. And I sent a rather long note about that. Other than that, these are the changes that Rules is proposing. They’ve proposing that the current language stay, and I tried to advocate to have the chair position limited to the faculty because I think it’s a curriculum committee. People did not agree with me.

Senator Mainieri: Martha, I appreciate you sending that statement along. It gives us some context ahead of time. Some of the discussions maybe that happened. I guess maybe my question is, is Martha’s statement also going to be forwarded with the materials or not? And if so, I had a comment.

Senator Horst: I actually asked Todd to do this on the floor… or I asked somebody to volunteer to present it on the floor, and then I just will probably present questions regarding the chairship.

Senator Mainieri: Okay. Great. Thank you.

Senator Nikolaou: I had a question. So, even if let’s say… so, I tend to agree with Martha in terms of… because it is a curriculum committee we know it takes lots of time. So, a student on the one hand they wouldn’t have, you know, as much time available to devote towards the service. And it is the power differential over… So, would a student, let’s say try and argue with a faculty member? Or with, let’s say in that example, Amy? Because it is that power differential. But even if students were allowed to be chair of the committee, my question was should it if…because it says that it is advisory to the AVP for Undergraduate Education. So, then the AVP should not be able to be the chair of the committee because, you know, if the chair of the committee needs to meet with the AVP to advise them, well, am I meeting with myself to advise myself?

Senator Horst: Exactly.

Senator Nikolaou: And that’s why I was thinking that even if, you know, even if a student in a rare case wanted to become the chair, should it say that the chairperson will be elected from the voting faculty and student members of the committee, or something along those lines? Because then I was thinking, for example, that, you know, when you look at the ex-officio the Director of the Honors Program and the University College, they report to the AVP for Undergraduate Education, right? Like the AVP for Undergraduate Education is like their boss, right? Or not? Or am I mistaken?

Senator Horst: I don’t know.

Senator Kalter: Can you repeat that? Who reporting to who, Dimitrios?

Senator Nikolaou: So, the Director of the Honors Program.

Senator Kalter: Yes.

Senator Nikolaou: And the University College, they are like under the AVP for Undergraduate Education.

Senator Kalter: Right. Right. I believe you’re right that the Honors Program Director reports to the Amy Hurd, the AVP for Undergraduate Education. I think that’s correct.

Senator Nikolaou: That’s why I was thinking, you know, should it say that the ex-officio members, they cannot be chair for that reason? Because, again, they would need to advise the AVP for Undergraduate Education. So, if let’s say I’m the Director of the Honors Program and Tracy is the AVP for Undergraduate Education, so she’s pretty much my boss, so will I feel, you know, comfortable if, let’s say there’s a case where there is opposing views. How much power would I have to make the case of the committee to my “boss.” So, that was the main thing that I saw in terms of that.

Senator Horst: I mean, that’s a practical take on it. My attitude is it’s also a philosophical one, that you have the administration, and you have the faculty and the students. And the faculty should be the ones that are in charge of the curriculum. And I think the representation of the chair being a faculty is part of that. And so, if you had for instance Amy Hurd in charge of the curriculum committee and Amy Hurd in charge of the Council for General Education, you’re not representing the faculty being in charge of the curriculum. And the whole idea of shared governance and the Memorandum of Understanding is that the faculty are doing this part and the administration concurs. So, just philosophically, it’s not that, oh, students could or couldn’t do it, it’s that the faculty should be in charge of that aspect of shared governance. But I was voted down 13-0 by the CGE who thought that everybody should be able to be chair. And my committee voted me down 7-1.

Senator Nikolaou: And then one question for Function 5. Do we know why the Program Director changed to the AVP for Undergraduate Education? Because then, doesn’t that become now, isn’t it already satisfied by default? How are they consulting with the AVP for Undergraduate Education if the AVP is already on the committee? Is it really a function of the committee?

Senator Horst: And before it was the Provost?

Senator Nikolaou: Before it said the Program Director. And it changed from the Program Director to AVP for Undergraduate Education. So, that function it seems that now it’s tautological since that the AVPs in the committee.

Senator Horst: I can follow up with Amy Hurd to make sure that that’s what she wanted for that language.

Senator Kalter: Did Sally Parry get consulted on this one at all?

Senator Horst: I don’t know who… I mean I know who Sally Parry is but is she a member of the committee?

Senator Kalter: She’s the longest standing member of that committee and she’s the most knowledgeable person about general education in the university.

Senator Horst: If she is on the committee, the committee saw the charge and the committee specifically talked about the chair aspect, and the committee voted to not limit the chairship. So, that’s the 13-0 vote. So, Amy Hurd brought that to the CGE and the CGE voted 13-0 that they did not…

Senator Kalter: So, Dimitrios is talking about number five. What I was asking about that was does that… so, in other words, my guess is that this charge has not been rewritten since Eric Thomas was the undergrad studies Provost office person, which was long ago, before Jonathan Rosenthal and everything, and that number five language is an artifact of that. And so, what I’m asking… right now in the university, Sally Parry does an awful lot of basically what is a program directors’ job. As opposed to, I don’t know that that has been pulled into Amy Hurd’s area, but I don’t know that it hasn’t been. So, what I’m saying is that I think that if you consult with Amy you should also consult with Sally to make sure that we’re understanding what that number five is really supposed to be about, and if it’s the right person, right?

Senator Horst: Okay. I will send a note verifying that number five is the correct person, and I’ll speak with Sally Parry and Amy. I mean, Amy signed off on all of that, but I’ll run it by Sally Parry.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. Just remembering Amy’s been in her role for like a year or so, with a pandemic, and so she may not have had a chance to, you know, get all of the knowledge about the general ed program under her belt before March hit.

Senator Horst: Okay.

Senator Kalter: Other thoughts about this one?

Senator Nikolaou: I have a tiny typo. Or a missing “s.” “Three representatives from the College of Arts and Sciences” where is says 9 faculty in the very, very first page.

Senator Horst: Yeah.

Senator Nikolaou: And then under six, I was wondering, do we want to specify IDEAS courses, IDEAS majors, and IDEAS minors? Instead of saying IDEAS courses, majors, minors.

Senator Horst: Okay.

Senator Nikolaou: Just to make it clear that we’re talking about the IDEAS specific majors and minors, and not all majors and minors.

Senator Kalter: So, and sorry, Dimitrios, is that…

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. Yeah.

Senator Kalter: Tracy, I wanted to go back to you because I do think that as a committee, we should be making the decision about whether Martha’s statement goes on the Senate floor or not. And so, I’d actually be interested in hearing what your statement would be were it to go on or were we to suggest that it go on.

Senator Mainieri: My only request, because right now I think the memo with Martha’s statement says from the Rules Committee to Exec, and I think it’s from Martha, right? And so, I would just request that who it’s coming from is clarified if it were to be included in the Senate materials.

Senator Kalter: Okay.

Senator Mainieri: That was my only comment, if it was going to be included.

Senator Kalter: Okay, to clarify who it’s coming from basically.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. Yep. Just because of the vote on the committee. I’m not sure that it comes from the Rules Committee, right. It’s coming from Martha, sharing her thoughts on why she voted against it.

Senator Kalter: Gotcha. Okay. So, remind me everybody to go back to that. I did have myself a couple of comments about it. With regard to the chairs issue, I kind of think that we shouldn’t put this on the Senate floor quite yet. Because I’d like to know who the past chairs have been and, you know, what the record is in terms of who has been chairing this committee, and sort of look further also because I think you did this for a different charge, I think it was… oh yeah, you had a very good point about the 1969, you know, we’ve had students on the committee since 1969 for the Reinstatement Committee and you really want to change it now after 50 years, right.

I’d like us to sort of look into if there is a history of why CGE did not include a clarification when it was first created, right? Whether that was intentional or a mistake.

And for the University Curriculum Committee, and Sally, and the past chairs of this committee to weigh in about the workload and the needs for the chairship. So, I’ll just say, you know, I am sympathetic to Martha’s statement because of the nation-wide definition of what shared governance means. Basically, there are three entities: The Board, the President, and the faculty. And of course, here we always include faculty, students, and staff, but it is important to understand why it’s the faculty.

So, what, you know, one of the other principles here is this is an external committee of the Senate. Those are not supposed to be run by administrators because otherwise why are they Senate committees. We only have a couple of exceptions. One is the Academic Planning Committee, which is almost always chaired by the Associate Provost or more recently the AVP for Academic Planning. I actually can’t… I’ve sat on that committee for a while and I can’t imagine anyone but the Associate Provost or somebody like that doing it because of the kinds of work it does—and Dimitrios could weigh in about that too—it’s just such a heavy workload and there’s so many IBHE issues at stake, right. So, that’s a concern with that committee. For the CTE (the Council for Teacher Education) that one is very difficult because ISBE, you know, is an external body that we have to report to and there are huge compliance things there that it’s very hard to see a faculty member being able to take that on because it’s, you know, it’s a big job. But Senate committees are supposed to be basically, you know, faculty and faculty/student committees for the most part, not all of them are. And the general intention is to have them chaired by faculty because of the definition of shared governance.

But the other thing about this is that all other curricular committees on this campus, as far as I know, are chaired by faculty: the department curriculum committees, the college curriculum committees, the University Curriculum Committee, I believe the Graduate Curriculum Committee, the curriculum committee inside of CTE. And so, this is kind of an anomaly.

And I did ask Sally Parry about this because she is the longest standing member of the committee and because I know her through my department, and I can read to you what she said about it. She said, “We talked about this at CGE and I think there was some support for it being possibly a student to chair CGE, although it would be highly unlikely. I don’t think it is a good idea because students do not have the breadth of experience or knowledge for this responsibility and it would be rare student indeed who would be comfortable convening discussions about gen ed with faculty. In addition, and this applies to other committees as well, students are here for the short term and faculty are here for the long term, so it would be better to have a chair with a long term stake in the success of general education.”

And so, I feel like there is more research that we could do about this question before we bring it to the floor. And sort of more discussion, and wider discussion we could have. Maybe even getting some, I hadn’t thought about this before but, opinions from the college curriculum committees, maybe even the department curriculum committees because it is really important that we have this system working the way, you know, the way that the whole curriculum system feels that it should be working. And if we ended up having a bottleneck, for example, because a student took on the role and then wasn’t getting the agendas out, etc., etc., that stops, you know, everything. It would be the same thing if we have a faculty member that’s doing that, obviously, but I do think that, I feel like this one is not quite ready for the floor yet.

Senator Horst: The other thing I would say is beside the student part, this committee is unusual in that it has these five ex-officio members but they’re all voting, and that’s unusual. I tried to push a little bit on that one, but I didn’t push it too hard. But you know, you could potentially have the Director of the Honors Program or the CAS associate dean, or the AVP, there was no resistance to the committee of any one of those people taking the chairship, and that’s really just changing the way we do curriculum committees.

Senator Kalter: Um-hum. So, where are people on these questions?

Senator Horst: Todd?

Senator Stewart: Well, yeah.

Senator Horst: He’s on the committee.

Senator Stewart: Yeah. I mean, as I acknowledged, I was very conflicted when I voted in favor of this current version. Just to maybe say a little bit, I mean, I actually don’t remember whether we explicitly discussed the idea that there might be conflicts of interest, like, for example, with the chair of the UCC being also the head of general education. I could see potentially thinking that there’s some kind of conflict of interest, but I don’t remember discussing that. But just to address one of the points that Martha made. I can’t speak for the other members of the committee, but it does seem to me that faculty members are the largest voting body on this committee, and that does seem to me as though that’s faculty control, whether the chair is a faculty member or not. But I’m open to persuasion anyways. But again, I can only speak for myself.

Senator Horst: Yes, but it’s more like, you know, it’s the responsibility. My opinion is it’s the responsibility of the faculty to be chair. And I just… when we were working with the chair of CGE, they sort of mention a bunch of administrators that they thought had been chair, it was actually, Oh, Jonathan Rosenthal’s been chair, and actually Amy Hurd dug up on that and they weren’t. But you know, it’s just, it’s easy to say, oh, somebody else take over, I don’t have time for this. My attitude more is it’s the responsibility of the faculty. It’s our job to be in charge of this.

Senator Stewart: And you know, look, I guess I do think that’s reasonable. I think one of the other things though, and you know you’ve mentioned this but I think we were kind of surprised that it was a 13-0 vote at the lower level, that they wanted the possibility of students, you know, or maybe administrators. And so, I think we were also trying to be deferential to the council itself. But maybe that’s a mistake.

Senator Harris: I’m sorry, I know there’s no chat box, I normally would put this in the chat. But I have a meeting with my professor now that I have to go to.

Senator Kalter: All right. Thanks, Lauren. Have a good evening.

Senator Harris: You too.

Senator Horst: So, it sounds like this is not going to go forward, and the idea of more research, trying to figure out if there was some sort of rationale. I think I tried to, you know, I dug into this, Susan, a little bit and maybe Cera can help me. And I found the start of CTE in the 60s, but I couldn’t find the start of CGE, it was before that. And I was trying to Google Dean Bond, who was like some old name from back in the day. I just, you know, if you plug in general education into Google you get a lot. So, maybe Cera can…

Senator Kalter: What I’m saying is just advising more research, right. That level of research, a little bit more consultation with the other committees that are impacted by CGE, right? Because this is a pipeline that needs to operate smoothly. And the other thing… I can’t remember what the other thing I said but it’s in this recording, to just sort of look into the past chairs and their views about it.

Senator Mainieri: Susan, I guess my question then is, you know, if Martha’s able to dig up some of this information, are you saying that that information would then be brought to the floor or does it need to go back to the committee? Like, what would then be the next step if we have this information? Because it seems the committee has already considered and voted on it rather overwhelmingly. So, I’m wondering what you see is the next step then?

Senator Kalter: The committee has not voted overwhelmingly with that information in front of them. So, it would obviously be Martha’s call as the Rules Committee chair, but I would recommend bringing that research to the Rules Committee once it’s done, you know, once the consultations with the other curriculum committees are done. Once the past history has been dug up, and once some of the, you know, as many of the past chairs of the committee as we can find, so that they can testify about the workload and the kinds of skills you might need to be the chair. Then it seems like it should, you know, most likely go back to Rules. But there’s no reason not to put all of that on the floor eventually. And have an open debate about it.

Senator Mainieri: Would it also then go back to CGE for their consideration as well?

Senator Kalter: I don’t see why not.

Senator Mainieri: Because I think that was an important step. I think, for me, I hear… like I said, I appreciated Martha’s thorough statement, right. It gave me some things to think about. I’m going to echo something that Senator Stewart said too though in that, you know, CGE who is this body, right, voted unanimously for us to keep this in. So, I think for me when we see this again, I’d also like to know from CGE the reasons, right. Why they view it as such as important function so much that they voted unanimously to keep it functioning in this way.

Senator Kalter: Absolutely. I totally agree with that.

Senator Horst: They actually did shift chairs, so there’s a little bit of a complication with that.

Senator Kalter: Okay. All right. So, it’s 5:15p.m. or so. Let’s move on to the approval of the proposed Senate agenda.
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***Call to Order***

***Roll Call***
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***Administrators' Remarks***

* ***President Larry Dietz***
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***01.21.21.01 Integrity Policy Section I Mark Up (Faculty Affairs Committee)***

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

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

***01.07.21.01 Integrity policy Section IV Mark UP EDITORIAL CHANGES ONLY (Faculty Affairs Committee)***
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***01.12.21.02 REINSTATEMENT COMMITTEE CLEAN Copy (Rules Committee)***

***Information Items:***

***01.21.21.06 CAS Council By-Laws Current Copy (Rules Committee)***

***01.21.21.07 CAS Council By-Laws Mark Up (Rules Committee)***

***01.21.21.05 CAS By-Laws Clean Copy (Rules Committee)***

***01.21.21.11 COUNCIL ON GENERAL EDUCATION-current (Rules Committee)***

***01.21.21.12 CGE Charge Mark Up (Rules Committee)***

***01.21.21.05 CGE Charge-CLEAN Copy (Rules 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 Mainieri, seconded by Senator Nikolaou, to approve the agenda.

Senator Kalter: All right. So, we have call to order, roll call, etc. The Engineering Programs discussion. We’ll probably have some distributed communication at some point to put on there, is that right, Larry, or Aondover?

Provost Tarhule: With respect to the Engineering Programs?

Senator Kalter: Yeah. Since this is the February 3 meeting.

Provost Tarhule: Yeah. I’m going to have to work with you on the nature of that communication. What you want to see. Yeah. We’re more than happy to provide that, but I may have to touch base with you to get a sense of what it should look like, what you would like to see.

Senator Kalter: Sounds good. We’ll just know that, if we need to, we can add a distributed communication there underneath that part of the agenda.

Provost Tarhule: Yeah. Maybe I can work with Cera, or Jean Ann can work with Cera, to get you that information.

Senator Kalter: Wonderful.

President Dietz: We have a meeting on that tomorrow.

Senator Kalter: Terrific.

President Dietz: So, I hope to inform all of that.

Senator Kalter: Great. We just want to make sure that we get those (anything that you want the Senate to read) out to the Senate by Friday of this week, so that they have it to read over the weekend, if you have stuff. And then we’ve got the Integrity policy. We’ve got the Reinstatement Charge. Both of those are action items. I believe we’re sending both the information items back, or at least putting them both on hold temporarily. So, those will come off the agenda. Anybody have anything else about the agenda that needs to be changed?

Senator Mainieri: Really random but there’s a mysterious period in the date, February 3.,. So, he’s trying to get in there so let’s put him out.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. So, okay. We’ll get that individual period out. So, with the elimination of the information items and the possible inclusion of a distributed communication about Engineering.

The motion was unanimously approved.

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Spranger, seconded by Senator Mainieri, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.