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***Call to Order***

Academic Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

***Oral Communications:***

***Discussion of February 3, 2021 Senate meeting***

Senator Kalter: First is an Oral Communication to discuss last Wednesday’s meeting, right. So, basically given the violations of the Code of Ethics that we were witnessing last Wednesday, Cera and I have basically been discussing together and with the Legal office whether to make changes about how we have been conducting the electronic meetings in an Open Meetings Act environment since last March. And I thought that process was working fairly well prior to last Wednesday. So, before I make a decision about this all going forward, I wanted to get all of your advice.

We basically have three options that I’m considering. One, of course is to just leave things as is, and to allow that kind of behavior to proceed. Another is to leave things as is with the possibility that I would interrupt the proceedings if Cera and I were experiencing a disruption that was making it difficult to conduct the meeting, and then booting the disrupters out. And this option would basically mean that Legal and probably Aaron Woodruff or one of his people would have to be at the meeting to advise me on the line between free speech and disruption level speech and activity in a Zoom context. As I understand it from our meeting with Legal, I acted correctly in not ejecting people from the meeting on Wednesday, because the free speech bar is pretty high, and apparently, it’s even higher on Zoom than in a face-to-face room. So, the third option is to conduct the meetings as the Board of Trustees conducts their meetings, which is only the Senators and the administrators’ support staff that would be likely to be called on would be given the Zoom link and admitted into the room. And then in this option the public commenters would also be give the Zoom link and admitted into the room at the start of the meeting, but then they would be removed from the room after their comments. And so, all of them and all of the other people would basically be watching by YouTube live stream. And I guess the one thing that this would hinder is the ability for a guest to sort of spontaneously volunteer for public comment.

You guys might remember that, I think for the first time that I’ve ever known, we had somebody from outside the university public-commenting. I found, actually, Dr. Khusro’s email to acsenate in my junk folder over this weekend, so Cera and I would have to set a reminder to check our junk folders just before the meetings in case we have more people from outside ISU. But the other thing is that it would be possible for people, you know, for us to have people who enter without realizing that they have to sign up or who want to enter with realizing they have to sign up, and I really wouldn’t want to shut that down. So, I would probably need to add a comment at the top of the meeting that if you’re watching on YouTube and you want to make public comment that you have to contact us pretty much immediately. So, Legal is recommending the YouTube option. So, I’m going to let Wendy speak to why. And then I’d like to hear your thoughts so that Cera and I can kind of confer and decide what we’re going to do.

Ms. Smith: I think the reason that we suggest that as the best option is because you are meeting the requirements of the Open Meetings Act. Remember the purpose of the Senate meeting is to conduct your Senate business. And as a part of that being an Open Meeting, you do have to provide for the public comment, and then in a public forum, so that means people who are in the room, maybe protesting, silently holding up signs, but they’re not permitted to disrupt the meeting. And so, the two reasons we suggest that is it meets the requirements of the Open Meetings Act, it allows the Senate to get their business done, allows the public comment, which is permitted, but it doesn’t have this additional commenting or people trying to speak when they wouldn’t normally be allowed to speak on the floor, which is difficult to manage over Zoom, especially the way you do your roll calls. Because when you do the… so it’s permitted that you have everyone muted, that’s permitted, and then someone’s called on to talked, you know, the video being on or the people having backgrounds is completely permitted, but it makes it difficult if people are trying to talk when they’re not permitted to. And when you do all roll calls and you’re turning everyone’s mic on for the roll call, that makes that difficult. So, it meets all the requirements that we need and then you’re not on the spot making a call about what’s on the line and what’s not on the line, which is difficult to do in a public meeting. When you’re in person, it’s a little bit easier to manage. I watched the video of the Senate meeting and I could see very little because it only shows the first screen. So, it’s very difficult to make that call in the moment if you’re not in person, especially when you have… you don’t know exactly what’s going on behind the scenes. So, you don’t know if people are trying to speak and being muted because everyone’s muted, which is a disruption itself, or if they’re, you know, just being silent. It’s difficult to tell that. So, those are the reasons that we would recommend that as the option for moving forward with the Senate meetings to deal with that… making sure that the meeting can go on without disruption.

Senator Kalter: All right. So, let’s talk about that.

Senator Toth: Yeah. Well, that option sounds great, so I don’t know if my input is necessarily needed, but have we considered doing like a Zoom webinar format? Which means like everyone would be in the Zoom call, but you could only see and hear the, like, hosts, if you will, which would be, you know, everyone on Academic Senate. And then that way people could also like… who are just watching, who are just viewing from the outside they could message in and say, like, I have a comment, or something, and then whoever’s the host could, you know, make them able to speak to the group. I don’t know, what’s the feasibility of that?

Senator Kalter: So, apparently, Cera sent me something earlier today, a Zoom webinar is an option. I will say that I don’t think it’s appropriate ever for the audience of the Senate to be sending in questions, right? We don’t do that on the Senate floor. When we had the #AntiBlackISU protest back last October, the student Senators were prepared to basically extend the public comment and ask questions during Q&A of the President, and that’s what’s appropriate on the Senate floor, right, for the Senators to represent the sentiment. Lauren did that a little bit when she came to the meeting and asked about the SEIU—is it SEIU? I get it mixed up with SIEU which is the… or SIUE which is Edwardsville—but the, you know, doing that kind of thing. So, in an ordinary meeting, we would not be letting the audience interrupt any of us. We’re supposed to be focused on what our business is so that we can get the business done, right? But, yeah, a Zoom webinar is a possibility for sure. And, Dylan, I think personally that may be a better option because one of the things that I don’t like about the YouTube is the feel of distancing that audience. It’s too bad that this has occurred because, like I said, I think it had been working quite well, and people feel like they’re part of the community when they can all be on the Zoom. Yeah.

Senator Horst: I tried to do a webinar in Music, and I was told that our license didn’t support it, but maybe that was just a Fine Arts thing. But I would just add to this discussion that I had a lot of duties to do that evening, and Cera and I were both manning letting people in, and I feel like there were certain people that were, you know, constantly going in and out of the meeting as almost a way to disrupt the meeting. We let people in, I don’t know, 10 times. There were certain individuals that… I feel like it was part of their strategy. And I had a lot of things that I was doing, not as many things as you, but it was throwing me off a little bit to be manning this, doing this, doing the roll call, doing this and that. And so, for that reason I support what the Legal is proposing.

Senator Nahm: I’ll just say one thing about Zoom webinar. Because in the School of Theatre and Dance, we do use the webinar platform for the Zoom productions that we do. So, you do have to request a license, but we were able to get one for the production, so I think that can be worked out. So, from someone who’s joining in, you don’t know who else is in the same call and I think that… it just feels different, right, than this call. You know, whether or not people have their cameras on, whether or not they’re muted, you do have a sense of who’s here, which is something you would know if you’re in an actual Senate meeting. And I think that something needs to be done to address potential disruptions in the future, but also I am a little worried about the sense of just the community that the Senate is supposed to provide as well, and the webinar format can feel very isolating, you know. From the host’s perspective, you’re able to see everyone, but for participants, unless you’re granted the ability to turn your camera on and to speak, it does feel like you are just there watching, and that sense of disconnect, I think, is palpable. So, I just wanted to throw that in there.

Senator Harris: I don’t have a preference or problem with the Zoom webinar or the YouTube. I guess my only concern would be I guess like the demonstration aspect that some people were using, the appropriate demonstrations, where they just had like the GW (I forget what it’s called) but like the whatever backgrounds that they made, the appropriate ones that they had, you know, that was like their form of demonstration. So, I don’t know, I feel like that may be missed with whatever format we do, but I know that we can’t determine what would be appropriate that they use, because I know that there were some things that they used that were not okay. But just like the general backgrounds that they had. I think that would be the thing that I think we would miss, which is probably what they want to show.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. I agree, Lauren. That’s one of my concerns too, because, you know, if we were in the Bone Student Center—which hopefully we’ll be back there soon, right, but not too soon that, you know, people who are there would feel uncomfortable being there—but we would always tolerate protests and having signs. We often welcome it, right, to stand around the table and have people be able to hold up signs that they’ve already done, whether or not they had, you know, profanity on them. We don’t really like that, but we wouldn’t disallow it. I’ve actually never seen that in a physical sign. But you’re right, that that kind of… just the, you know, this is a college campus and people should feel like they have the right to come in and demonstrate at their Senate or wherever. So, that is…you’re right, that’s a concern.

Senator Nikolaou: If we were to go with the second option, which was like keep it as is, but then we have someone from Legal or Aaron Woodruff present during the meeting, would this person from Legal or Aaron be responsible for in essence booting someone from the meeting? Or would it still fall to Susan, and Martha, and Cera to say this is inappropriate behavior we need to boot you. Or is it that the person from Legal or Aaron would contact the co-host and say, you know, that person is beyond that level that is acceptable, you need to boot them. So, how would that work?

Senator Kalter: Go for it, Wendy.

Ms. Smith: I mean, I’m not positive that Aaron would be appropriate because the police don’t typically make that call until there’s a disruption that reaches a level of threatening. And our office, you know, after watching the video and being on the Senate call the whole time, it would be almost impossible for any of us, even if all of us were on there, to see all of the behavior that was happening. So, what it would more likely be, and I couldn’t even see all of it watching the video, even though I saw some of it firsthand, would be the people being disrupted would have to contact the chair and then that person would have to make a call if it was disrupting the meeting, and I recommend doing that after a warning. So, a specific warning to the person, this is what you’re doing that is being disruptive, if you don’t discontinue that, we appreciate your right to protest and your right to have your free speech, but if you don’t stop being disruptive, we’re going to have to take this action. It could be turn off your video. It could be kick you out of the meeting. It’s the least restrictive action that you can take and stop the disruption, which in the moment is hard to tell. So, it wouldn’t even be us making that call, it would be the person who was experiencing the disruption describing it to us and saying do we think this is the limit, or just making the call at the time with their best judgment, right. Because if someone’s making that call elsewhere, they’re not necessarily going to have access to us, and it really isn’t the police that should be involved unless the disruption is getting threatening, and then you would definitely want to, you know, call the police in. But that’s not really their role, kind of on a day to day. And I had a hard time seeing, I probably say 20% of what was going on when the speaker view is up, or when the screen is up, I could see only the six people, right. Even on the video you couldn’t see any people. So, it’s very difficult. It would be very difficult to see what happened, from what I reviewed everything was probably in the line of first amendment when you’re talking about a protester, right, which is different than when you’re talking about a Senator speaking, or, you know, that’s when the Code of Ethics might apply. But if you’re speaking as a protester, as someone who’s coming to the public comment, the bar is higher. And so, I think it would really be making the call at the time, with, I always recommend a warning. Because then you are telling people what the consequence is and instead of doing something because of what they were doing initially, you’re doing it because they didn’t follow the directive to stop disrupting, so.

Senator Kalter: The reason, by the way, that the police got mentioned is because some of the aggression towards Dr. Dietz, I was wondering whether it was going to become literally threatening. And so, at that point, even though we’re on Zoom, that would be a concern. But so, what Wendy is saying is that I would be able to talk to Wendy or Lisa, or whoever might come from Legal to confer with them about what would be appropriate and inappropriate during that, and that’s why they would be there.

Senator Horst: What about this behavior of going in and coming out and going in and coming out? I mean, if we were in a physical space and somebody was constantly knocking on the door, and we’d have to go get them, would that somehow be viewed as inappropriate behavior?

Ms. Smith: I mean, I think the line on disruption is case by case, and it’s a little bit different on Zoom because what’s disruptive is a different level, right. So, if someone kept coming in and out of the room in the Senate meeting, first of all, the door’s not locked, right. I feel like the reason they were doing that is that, and just from watching the video, as soon as you would do a roll call or call on someone, everyone would get unmuted and they would come back in and not be muted. So, as soon as they got shut off, they would go out and come back in and they’d have a second to do something before they got muted, right. So, that’s what they were doing. So, if someone got kicked out of a Senate meeting and then kept coming back in, of course that would be disruptive. But it just depends on, you know, it’s a little bit difficult with Zoom, everyone’s muted on your Zoom, so not unmuting someone, you’re not doing anything different than everyone. You’re only unmuting when people are doing the roll call. Lauren’s right. The signs are okay. I didn’t really see anything on the signs that we would kick someone out for, but then sometimes the miming, you don’t know if they were doing that because they were muted or if they would have been saying that… obviously, if they would have been saying that out loud that would have been disruptive to the meeting and it would have warranted a warning.

So, it’s very difficult to tell every situation that would reach that line, and some of it is technological with Zoom. Some of it is how you’re running your meeting. If you run your meeting where everyone’s muted and everyone has to have their video off, then you can do that for everything. You don’t have to make a line. You know, you’re not going to do that. You’re going to make your meetings where everyone has to be muted. You could consider doing roll call differently which would take so long, right, where people are unmuted. You could just say at the beginning of the meeting, if you get kicked out, we’re going to let you in x amount of times but then you’re not allowing for, you know, any kind of technical difficulties where there’s not any malintent. So, it really… that’s why I think the webinar or the YouTube avoids any of that, right, but it does have a different feel for sure, but it meets the requirements of the Open Meetings Act, and so that’s where it comes down to a decision, you know, by whoever’s going to make that decision. But both meet the requirements for an Open Meeting, it’s just difficult to manage that, right. You can also set some guidelines for, you know, you don’t typically have to do this but you could set some guidelines for who can speak on the floor, who’s an invited guest, who’s a Senator versus anyone in public comment, or anybody who is not an invited guest or a Senator. You could say some of that upfront as well. But it’s not an easy answer because you’ve got the technological side of it as well as the, you know, what’s being viewed by the audience and by the members.

Senator Mainieri: What happened on Wednesday was certainly serious and something we need to address, but I think also we’re all kind of leaning as we go, right, including our guests and everything. And so, I’m wondering if there is, for this next meeting, we could take an intermediary step. Like maybe come up with some guidelines, announce them at the beginning, and keep everything as is to see how it goes if we come up with some guidelines as a result of what happened, right. And if it’s still an issue, then I think we move to YouTube or webinar. I just, I do worry in a pandemic when we all feel disconnected as an institution, and personally, and as colleagues, I worry about jumping all the way to something that is going to just feel different than I think what we have typically wanted as our Senate atmosphere. So, I just wonder if there is that intermediary like Wendy just talked about, about maybe coming up with some guidelines and talking about, you know, things that we haven’t had to expressly say in the past, right. But we’re also in such a different space that maybe we just actually need to say them out loud.

Senator Kalter: I’m actually going to ask Larry and Aondover to weigh in here since you were targets of this.

President Dietz: I have mixed emotions on this as well. As the target of some of the comments and so forth the other day, I found it minimally unprofessional, but also, we have this value of respect. And in my estimation the values of the institution are very important. And people can have different ideas about what all that means and so forth, but I think, number one, I appreciated your comments, Susan, at the end of the meeting and also in an email to me later that expressed your concern about all that, and that was much appreciated. I don’t think neither Aondover or I could really… we didn’t know what was going on because we were in the presentation or making comments or, you know, whatever. I really didn’t learn the full scope of this until the next morning, frankly, and kind of what had happened during all this. But I do think we’re in just a tough environment right now. I don’t think anybody wants to limit speech, but I also think that you have every right to have the expectation that the meeting that you’re chairing is conducted in a way that we can do our business and do it as expeditiously as possible, and as respectfully as possible. None of that probably helps on, you know, getting after an answer to technology. And I don’t know what would happen… if we all would know what would happen at the next Wednesday, we’d be better informed today. But I wouldn’t be surprised there may be more public comments from the same individuals. So, I do think that talking upfront about, you know, if you are going to change the way of doing business and stating those expectations would be very important.

Senator Kalter: And, Aondover, I didn’t mean to say that you were targeted specifically, but apparently unbeknownst to me, because I was focused on your presentation, a lot of this was going on during your presentation, which I consider a form of absolute disrespect as well. So, I wondered if you have thoughts about it.

Provost Tarhule: Understood. Kee-Yoon made a really… Kee-Yoon’s point really resonated with me. We are already very disconnected. If we go into a medium where you don’t see people at all I think that adds that sense of disconnection. The other point, which is a little bit nuanced, but can be important, is you almost never want people who are disrupting things to force you to change your way of life. I mean, it’s wise to take precautions, but sometimes they win simply by forcing you to be not who you are, by doing the things that you don’t want to do. So, I wonder if it were possible to have somebody who’s less busy, maybe one of the Senators who is Senator-on-duty or something like that, who is watching what is going on in the background and can bring it to your attention, and you see if you need to do something? In other words, keep your format, but have somebody who is responsible for watching what’s going on in the background and can bring it to your attention, or Martha’s attention, or Cera, to see do you need to act on it. That way you don’t need to start a whole new platform because then, to my way of thinking, you know, the disrupters already would have won because they would have pushed you away from something that is working well and something that we seem to like to adapt something that we don’t like. That’s a way of winning in my books. So, I don’t know whether your laws allow you to do that, but you keep the same format and just have somebody just monitoring and ready to step in if the need arises.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. I’m trying to think if we’ve heard from everyone so far. I think Todd and Taylor may not have spoken, is that right?

Senator Stewart: Yeah. I mean, I suppose that I’m broadly in favor of what Senator Mainieri said that we’ve been very successful so far on Zoom for the last year that this is the first real hitch that we’ve had, other than just technical difficulties. And so, maybe having a clear set of guidelines would help. That might also help with the legal ramifications, right, because as Wendy was sort of pointing out, it’s easier to kick somebody out for a violation of a clear rule than for crossing a line over, you know, freedom of speech. So, I think that’s what I currently think.

Senator Kalter: Thanks. And, Taylor, do you have a thought?

Senator Spranger: I’ll weigh in while Taylor thinks. I just think that it’s fine the way that we’ve been doing it. Like there wasn’t any clear, like, out of all the rules that you lay out at the beginning, like nobody was really breaking any of those. And while there definitely was some disrespect, I don’t think that most of it was that disruptive. Like, I only knew that some of that stuff was going on because of our SGA chat. Like, I didn’t even see. All of their little pictures were at, like, the very back, you had to scroll through the whole gallery. So, like, while it may not have been, like, respectful, I don’t think it was disruptive enough that they needed to be removed or anything. Like, I feel like the way that we’ve been doing meetings, just maybe set a few more clear parameters at the beginning.

Senator Kalter: And, Wendy, did you want to say anything else?

Ms. Smith: I think the only thing to take into account is that disruptive behind the scenes or to the chair, the person trying to run the meeting, can be taken into account as well. So, you know, I think if you’re just watching the meeting, it may not have been disruptive, but if you’re running it, there’s kind of a little bit of a different feel there, and that doesn’t mean that we’re, you know, going to squelch people’s speech, obviously any backgrounds are okay, but I think that meeting went a little beyond just respect because of the management that it needed, right. And how it was taking away from the presenter or the person who was running the presentation. And ultimately the meeting is to get your work done, you know, other than the public comment time, which was not, you know, squelched in any way, within the time limit. So, I think that, you know, you just have to look at all those different factors when you’re deciding if it’s disruptive, and it’s hard to tell in Zoom. It’s very hard to tell when you’re not the one running it, I think. So, I would be counting on the people running it to give me information about, how is it disruptive, why is it disruptive, and it would need to be completely content neutral, you know, which I think would be an easy bar, but it would also… it’s just more difficult to decide in Zoom, you know, where that level is.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. One of the concerns I have since I considered it something of a Zoom-bombing type of incident, if we were to have people with racial slurs or other types of personal attacks that would make me feel extremely uncomfortable, and I don’t know how to leave it open without opening it up to the possibility of that. So, that’s something I’m also taking into consideration. But what the Provost said is very important as well, right, sort of a very post 911 kind of thing, right, that if you let somebody scare you and change who you are then they’ve won.

Senator Harris: I have a suggestion, maybe. To still leave it, because I agree with what Provost Tarhule said, maybe you can open up the chat function only for people to message the host so if members in Senate see something that you all are aware of fairly quickly if they send a quick message through to you all, without having to change to much structure.

Senator Kalter: I will say thank God the chat was not open. Thank God the chat was not open. But I’d actually prefer people text me or Cera, or to use the acsenate email, than to have the chat because the chat is extremely small on our screens and I can’t really run the meetings and pay attention to the chat at the same time. And I actually don’t think that either Martha or Cera can do, you know, all of the stuff that they’re doing behind the scenes and also be monitoring the chat as well. So, in order to get our attention, it’s probably other mechanisms than the Zoom chat. I wish that there was a way to get the Zoom chat to go into like 14-point type or something like that so that you can actually see it on your screen. But even when I’m doing a class, I have a student monitoring that because it’s like 8-point type or 6-point type and it’s just, you know, you sort of have to peer at it. And sometimes if it’s too voluminous it goes really really fast and it starts moving to the top. But that might be, you know, some other mechanism besides that would maybe be helpful.

Ms. Smith: I feel like I’m not doing my job if I don’t tell you all that any text that you do in a public meeting are FOIAable. There’s a case on that from a Champaign public meeting where someone requested all texts by the meeting members, and they were required to give them. So, I just want to let you know that. Obviously, if it was personal and not business related, you know, we could maybe restrict that, like if you’re texting someone else, but any text between members of the Senate are FOIAable during a public meeting.

Senator Kalter: Thank you, Wendy. I forgot to mention that. At the top of the meeting I was going to, and I should have. I think we should get to our business and wrap this up. So, I’m going to take all this into consideration and maybe confer again with Legal. Anybody have any last word on it, or should we go to the next thing?

Senator Horst: I just wanted to say it would be helpful if we could have a rule that any non-Senator and person who’s not considered an expert witness, if they start coming in and leaving the meeting, at some point Cera and I have the right not to let them in. That would be helpful.

Senator Kalter: Well, I think Wendy might advise us about the Open Meetings Act implications of that. We have to leave the meeting open to the public in some way.

Ms. Smith: Right. So, if you don’t have the YouTube channel and you do that, then it has to be that they’ve met that disruption standard, and I think that would be really high, and what if it was a technical difficulty, right. So, you wouldn’t necessarily be able to tell if they were coming in and out for disruption. And so, that would be… you’d have to have the YouTube channel in addition if you were going to do that, right. Because then the meeting is still open but they’re not disrupting. So, you know, having the webinar in addition to Zoom might be the best of both worlds because then the meeting is still open for that person to view and they’re not losing anything that they would have in a public meeting.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. I was just thinking that that is an option, right, to try to continue to do it the way that we’ve been doing it, and then also have the YouTube channel open so that we have some, like a… it’s like kicking somebody in church into the place where the kids all cry, right. Like, you get to go back there and not be bothering us, or whatever. Okay. I think that’s the last word. Tracy also had… thank you, Wendy. Tracy also had an Oral Communication for us.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. I just saw Kee-Yoon’s hand. I didn’t want to talk over him.

Senator Nahm: Oh. Is it okay if I say one more thing in response to Martha?

Senator Kalter: Oh, absolutely. Yeah.

Senator Nahm: So, maybe the one thing that we could do, if Wendy’s guess that people were possibly abusing the fact that when we were doing roll calls, people were unmuted, if that was one of the reasons why people were going in and out, maybe we could say that if you leave the meeting or get kicked out of the meeting and there’s a roll call, you’ll be let in after that roll call is complete, just because technically there’s just a lot to juggle at once. Maybe that’s a rule that we can establish.

Senator Kalter: Thank you, Kee-Yoon. That’s an interesting possibility. And we can also go back to muting and unmuting everybody, you know, and having the votes take longer, but that’s not exactly desirable. And when people are coming in and out of the meeting, sometimes what happened to me just now where I got muted at the start of the meeting can happen and so that can be kind of confusing, so.

Senator Harris: I’m sorry, I just have one quick question, now that we’re talking about letting people into the room. So, if everyone has to be let into the room anyway, do we still need to have it be where you can only get in once you’re let in? If regardless, everyone has to be accepted. Is what I’m saying making sense?

Senator Kalter: Yeah. I think you’re asking, Lauren, whether we need to have a waiting room?

Senator Harris: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.

Senator Kalter: We don’t need to…you know, it’s pretty… when people are coming into the meeting, sort of at the beginning, there’s an admit all function that allows us to admit lots of people at a time. I don’t know. Cera and I can talk about that. I think there are good reasons to have that as a security mechanism, you know, for various reasons, to just kind of keep that. And a lot of us, like I have that on my classroom ones. We just kind of have it as a Zoom setting that we just keep as, yes, we have a waiting room, you know. So, but we can talk about that. Do you find that to be an issue?

Senator Harris: I was just thinking if that will make it easier for Martha to just not have to worry about a waiting room.

Senator Kalter: Gotcha. Gotcha.

Senator Nahm: If there’s actual Zoom bombing from outside the University, that is one way to kick them out once and not have them come back. Otherwise, they can just keep coming back without the waiting room.

Senator Kalter: That’s exactly what I was thinking, Kee-Yoon, because people can either type in, you know, like random Zoom numbers and invade other people’s meetings, or whatever, right? So, we probably don’t want to have that. Okay. Tracy.

Senator Mainieri: I wanted to… I think it was two Senate meetings ago in your Chairperson’s Remarks you spoke about RERIP, Susan (Senator Kalter), and, you know, after hearing your comments, I checked in with a couple of my colleagues, just to see what they’ve heard about RERIP and what their thoughts are about REIRP, and received a variety of responses, many of which were different than some of the ones that you presented in your comments. So, I’m just wondering if it would be possible or appropriate to, I think it would be Dan Elkins who would come, and could he just do a presentation to Senate on RERIP, so that everyone could get the same information and ask questions, or address any concerns? Because I feel like because of the pandemic and when RERIP rolled out, I think typically a presentation like that probably would have happened, but it just aligned weirdly. So, I was just wondering if this group thought that that would be beneficial?

Senator Kalter: So, I can tell you that I, actually this morning, emailed the committee chairs to ask for coordinating the Senate collection of feedback from faculty. And so, I’m just beginning to collect that.

Senator Mainieri: I just find it difficult to collect feedback when we haven’t heard from the people in charge of the RERIP program, the details about RERIP as a body. But if those in the room don’t feel like that would be helpful then I will move on, but I wanted to bring it up.

Senator Harris: I think it could be helpful, just because like even based off of what you shared, Dr. Kalter, I’m still not completely sure what RERIP is. So, that’s just my opinion.

Senator Kalter: Thanks, Lauren. (Pause) All right. It looks like other people don’t have views, so we’re going to the next thing, and maybe we’ll bring this back at some point.

***Distributed Communications:  
01.03.19.02 From Rules Committee: Milner Bylaw Current Copy (Information item 02/17/21)***

***02.04.21.02 From Rules Committee: Milner Bylaws Mark Up (Information item 02/17/21)***

***02.04.21.01 From Rules Committee: Milner Library Bylaws CLEAN (Information item 02/17/21)***

Senator Kalter: So, we start with a Distributed Communication. Going to go to Martha for this one to tell us about the changes to the Milner Bylaws.

Senator Horst: The Milner Bylaws were reviewed by the Rules Committee. We suggested some changes and then they went back to the Milner Council and they approved them. So, we would like to move to the discussion on the full Senate.

Senator Kalter: All right. Does anybody see anything in them that would suggest they shouldn’t go on the Senate agenda? Which by the way, I should mention, we are having two presentations. One of them is about Engineering. I'm going to assume, because this is partly a Dan Stephens presentation that that one’s going to take an hour also. And that, because Dan loves to talk, and I love to hear his information, right, he’s got lots of good in-depth information. And we’ve also got him presenting, if you remember, because we’re in the pandemic, we’re getting after 10th day Census information about our budget. We had one in September, I think, and we’re going to have one, we had to delay it a little bit because of his schedule, so we’re having that also. We may have public comment and, for all we know, we’ll have administrator question and answer. So, I actually don’t think that anything that’s going to go into regular business on the Senate agenda is going to get done. But if we have time, we’ll try to get to the Milner Bylaws, right. But it sounds like we’re good with that. We don’t have any comments on that one.

Senator Nikolaou: Question. Martha, do you want us to send you comments ahead of time? There are not as many as the CAS.

Senator Horst: I would just say that Milner is a particularly difficult college, and I’m going to really rely on Dallas Long and the chair Joan (I can’t remember her name).

Senator Nikolaou: I mean for the smaller things. Not the substantive. Because even, for example, keeping consistent if it is the Library Council Elections Committee or if it is the Library Elections Committee, because it changes throughout the document.

Senator Horst: Certainly, if you have editorial things it could be, as opposed to discussing them on the floor, if they’re not really substantive.

Senator Nikolaou: Do you want us to send you like the more editorial, and then like the more substantive to keep them for the floor?

Senator Horst: Yeah. And then I’ll forward them to… I mean the document has been passed by the Library. But I will certainly gather any information and pass the information to them.

Senator Kalter: And, Lauren, it looks like you’ve got your hand up.

Senator Harris: Yeah. I was just wondering, because I know you said we probably won’t even get to our items on Wednesday. So, do we have a… we don’t have a hard stop time anymore? I know we did last semester. I don’t know since Faculty Caucus hasn’t been meeting.

Senator Kalter: That’s a really great question. So, Faculty Caucus, you know, tries…. I’m trying to remember our original deal. When Faculty Caucus wasn’t meeting, we were trying to end by 9:00 p.m. If Faculty Caucus did meet, we were trying to end Faculty Caucus by 9:30 p.m. I think that that was what we used to do.

I made a serious exception last time, Lauren, because the Engineering program is so important. And Dr. Tarhule had a little bit of technical difficulty right at the beginning, which also delayed it just a little bit. So, we can talk about that. Actually, when we talk about the agenda, we might want to talk about whether we want to have a hard stop time. But I would like… I think that it’s important enough, we do not have a Faculty Caucus again this coming week, and I do think that both of the presentations we’re getting are really important. So, we can talk about managing our time. Remind me when we get to the part where we’re approving the agenda to talk about that, if you would. Larry, go ahead.

President Dietz: I’d just like to say that Engineering presentation, Dan and I both are going to be doing parts of that, and it’s going to be about space and budgeting. So, I do think there’s going to be a good deal of time on that. And then I think folks are going to be very interested in how’s the budget look after 10th day, you know, for the current year. That one, I think, initially it didn’t look as well, obviously, but we had strong fall [spring] enrollment. But the other thing with the stimulus money coming in, it’s not going to be nearly as dire as what we’d hoped. So, that might be more brief than we’d originally thought.

Senator Kalter: I think you meant what you’d feared. Not as dire as what you’d feared, right?

President Dietz: Right. Right.

Senator Kalter: Okay. And I don’t remember, when did we end last time, by the way. Say it again, Martha, can you unmute.

Senator Horst: 9:30 p.m.

Senator Kalter: About 9:30 p.m.- 9:40 p.m.ish? Okay. Let’s go to the Mass Electronic Communication Policy. Martha, if you can give us a little bit of a rundown on this one.

***11.06.15.08 From Rules Committee: Policy 9.7 Mass Electronic Communications Current Copy (Information item 02/17/21)***

***02.04.21.06 From Rules Committee: Proposed Policy 9.7 Policy on Campus Mass Electronic Mail MARK UP (Information item 02/17/21)***

***02.04.21.05 From Rules Committee: Policy 9.7 Mass Electronic Mail Clean Copy (Information item 02/17/21)***

***09.30.20.01 From Rules Committee: Policy 9.7.1 Procedures for use of Mass Electronic Communication Current Copy (Information item 02/17/21)***

***02.04.21.07 From Rules Committee: Proposed Policy 9.7.1 Procedures on Campus Mass Electronic Mail Mark Up (Information item 02/17/21)***

***02.04.21.08 From Rules Committee: Policy 9.7.1 Procedures for use of Mass Electronic Mail Clean Copy (Information item 02/17/21)***

Senator Horst: Sure. We prioritized this per President Dietz’s request. The big change that they’re making is that they’re folding in, in the student category, they’re folding in the parents. This was work done… so the student email now includes the parent email addresses. And this was worked on by Carla Birckelbaw and Craig Jackson, in consultation with us.

Senator Kalter: So, I’m really confused about this policy because the changes look massive. Much more than what Jill Benson gave to us.

Senator Horst: Yeah. Those two people took it as an opportunity to do further edits. Like for instance, the term spam they thought was understood. They targeted it into mass communications as opposed to, I think it was mass communications via electronic mail, they modernized a lot of the terms. But I’d rather they address any concerns you might have.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. I actually contacted Charley about this one because I was surprised at how extensive the changes were. And it actually went the other way. It went from a Mass Communications policy to a Mass Email policy which concerned me, because I’m not sure… Let me just read over what I had written. I wasn’t sure that we could change the scope or the title of the policy because the President’s office and our other offices basically routinely engage in mass communications on other platforms, not just email. And I wasn’t sure whether we would be essentially creating a big gap in policy and not have anything to cover inappropriate sort of free-for-all type behavior on social media with like no rules and boundaries. So, that was my first thing.

And then the second thing was I saw that in the December meeting you had talked to Carla Birckelbaw and I think Craig Jackson, but I wonder if we (before we put this on the Senate floor) we also need to talk to all of the Vice President’s offices because this is a pretty extensive change, right? And sort of the Vice President for Student Affairs asked for a very small change and this became a very massive change. And my thought is that maybe what we should do is take the original change that Jill Benson had requested, and put that on the Senate floor, because that apparently was pandemic related, Larry had asked us to move that up. And then give some time for these other more extensive changes to go through sort of the other offices beyond the Chief Information Officer’s office so that we know that we’re not inadvertently creating a gap that we didn’t mean to have, right? (Pause) Does that make sense to people?

Senator Horst: You know, a lot of the changes that they did were more just updating the language, and the way that the communication happens now is different. But, you know, they’re more of the experts in this area than I. But, you know, the definitions, for instance, they thought everybody knows the term email. Things like that. The way that the students communicate with faculty, faculty communicate with students, they articulated that was Reggienet. They had language that articulated the emergency communications. So, my committee did not view it as a major change. But, certainly, maybe the other vice presidents might view it as a major change, but at this point it seems like something that should be debated at the Senate.

President Dietz: I guess in the original conception of all this, that I didn’t view it as a major change either. I think it was mainly to try to acknowledge that we’re trying to get to parents of students and in some instances, we didn’t have a way of doing that previously. And so, I think this is really to address all that. I do have a cabinet meeting tomorrow that I could bring this up to cabinet meeting where all the vice presidents—I’m sorry on Wednesday. I could bring it up to the vice presidents on Wednesday to see if they see that this…and Charley is also a part of that. So, I can see whether or not they think that this is a major issue or not. I do think that, you know, the gap that you’re talking about. We don’t control the social media piece, nor do we do official business over social media. We inform sometimes over social media, but in terms of policy and those kinds of things, we don’t use that typically. But I’m happy to bring this up on Wednesday with the VPs and with Charley in cabinet to see if there’s any concern about what’s being proposed.

Senator Kalter: That would be great, Larry. But I’m actually wondering if you’re looking at the same copy that I’m looking at. Because you’re right that the Jill Benson edit was very small.

President Dietz: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: Very, very small. But what was distributed to Exec today was a lot of cross out. A lot of substantive change, much beyond what Jill had requested.

President Dietz: Okay.

Senator Horst: Would it help if you had a summary of the changes from Craig and Carla?

President Dietz: That would help me if you want me to use the cabinet as a vehicle to kind of, you know, reflect on this and find out if there really are things that they’re unaware of, but that would be the biggest issue. But that would help, Martha.

Senator Horst: Okay. I’ll have to see if that can happen.

Senator Kalter: Maybe I’m an outlier. I don’t know if other people saw this as a big change or not, but I was quite surprised at the amount of strikethrough.

Senator Mainieri: I’m going to be honest; I don’t remember the original request from Jill Benson. So, it’s hard for me to compare that with this. There is clearly substantial changes. To me, it just looked like it was just modernizing the policy, right? I don’t think that, like, email is really only the way that mass communication is happening from the university. So, it just seemed to me that it was just modernizing the policy.

Senator Kalter: Let me screen share what Jill did, if I can, so this is the policy originally, and… there’s some stuff up here. But I think this here, the yellow, if I’m remembering correctly is something that was being suggested to be added. What I got in my packet was changing the title of the policy from Mass Communication to Mass Email which narrows it and striking through most of the policy as far as I could tell.

Senator Horst: I mean, they saw it as an opportunity to modernize the policy, and we met with them, and we discussed the changes. Todd, do you have any insight into the Rules deliberations on this policy?

Senator Stewart: Yeah.

Senator Horst: We worked on the policy and this is what we came up with. And we weren’t under any guidance to limit our discussion only to the changes proposed.

Senator Kalter: I wouldn’t suggest that you were, Martha. That’s not what I’m suggesting. I’m just wondering who will be impacted by the changes. Go ahead, Todd.

Senator Stewart: Yeah. Just a couple of comments. I mean, I guess I share Martha’s sense that a lot of this was very archaic and it devolves into lots of very strange definitions of things that maybe don’t even exist anymore. One change though, or one issue that I did bring up in Rules that does seem like a major shift, is the old policy governed communications with 100 or more people. The new policy only seems to apply to communications that go to everyone in a group. And at my urging we stuck in the word potentially all, at one point, in one of the documents. I notice the other document though still says “all faculty, all students,” and so there is a narrowing of the policy in that way. Where many emails to say half the students may not fall under it anymore. So, there is a shift that might be worth thinking about.

Senator Mainieri: Since we don’t anticipate moving beyond the presentations and the discussions and the administrator comments, unless President Dietz, unless there’s between now and our next Senate meeting (not this upcoming one, but our next Senate meeting) unless there’s an urgent need, right, to have that parent piece added in, I don’t see any issue with President Dietz checking in with the cabinet as he’s offered, right, because we probably won’t get to it anyways. But if there is a need to get that parent thing added in, then I think we should take the policy and just the place that adds the parent in, let’s just do that and then wait on everything else.

President Dietz: I don’t think another two weeks, or ten days, is really going to… We’ve been waiting on this for a little while, so I don’t think… I think it will be fine. I’ll take this to cabinet if you folks want me to do that, and if there’s major concerns there I’ll give you a jingle on that, Susan. Otherwise I think we can go the way it is and have discussion about these issues that have come up here. But I do think the spirit was to take something that had been around a long time and brush it up a bit, with the specifics though being the paragraph, Susan, you referred to. That’s the genesis of this whole point.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. Maybe one thing that we could do is leave it on the agenda, have as one document Jill’s original email to us with the proposed changes that she had, so that people can see originally this was the proposed change, this is what it turned into, right, after Carla and Craig came to the committee. And that way people could sort of follow that train and see the thing in its entirety. So, we could tentatively put it on the agenda, and we could have it, you know, have that in there included, and then if I get a jingle from you, Larry, you know, on Wednesday or Thursday and you say yeah, the vice presidents really think they need to circulate this more amongst the people who use, you know, Facebook or what have you, or other types of communication with people, we would know that and we would say we’re not quite ready for the Senate floor.

President Dietz: Okay.

Senator Kalter: Does that sound good to people?

Senator Horst: Larry, could you, again, tell me when your cabinet meeting is?

President Dietz: Wednesday morning.

Senator Horst: Okay. Thanks.

Senator Nikolaou: Question for, partly based on what Susan said, that the newly proposed policy seems to focus more on email, whereas the previous one was more about communication in general, and that it might be leaving a gap. Do we need to check with Legal if they also think that there is a gap left between the two policies? Because they may tell us that you are limiting, you know, a whole section, or they may say, no, there is no problem at all.

Senator Kalter: Legal will be in the cabinet meeting. I would assume that Lisa goes to that also.

President Dietz: Yes.

Senator Kalter: All right. Terrific.
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***Call to Order***

***Roll Call***

***Presentation: Engineering Programs proposal (President Dietz/ Provost Tarhule)***

***Presentation: Pandemic Budget Update (Vice President for Finance and Planning Dan Stephens)***

***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 Item: None***

***Information Items:***

***01.03.19.02 Milner Bylaw Current Copy (Rules Committee)***

***02.04.21.02 Milner Bylaws Mark Up (Rules Committee)***

***02.04.21.01 Milner Library Bylaws CLEAN (Rules Committee)***

***11.06.15.08 Policy 9.7 Mass Electronic Communications Current Copy (Rules Committee)***

***02.04.21.06 Proposed Policy 9.7 Policy on Campus Mass Electronic Mail MARK UP (Rules Committee)***

***02.04.21.05 Policy 9.7 Mass Electronic Mail Clean Copy (Rules Committee)***

***09.30.20.01 Policy 9.7.1 Procedures for use of Mass Electronic Communication Current Copy (Rules Committee)***

***02.04.21.07 Proposed Policy 9.7.1 Procedures on Campus Mass Electronic Mail Mark Up (Rules Committee)***

***02.04.21.08 Policy 9.7.1 Procedures for use of Mass Electronic Mail 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 Harris, seconded by Senator Nahm, to approve the proposed Senate agenda.

Senator Kalter: All right. Let’s discuss that. I had already said the thing about the two presentations, Administrator Remarks, possible Public Comment, etc. I’m thinking that we may want to flip Milner Bylaws and the Mass Electronic Communications policy in their order, just in case we were to have time. So that because the President had asked Rules to sort of step up its consideration of this change. And if he and the cabinet are okay with sort of going forward, we would be able to get to that one even if not to the Milner Bylaws.

The other thing that I wanted to come back to was Lauren’s question about the hard stop time. Do people want me to put a hard stop time on this meeting, given that we’ve got those two important presentations etc.?

Senator Horst: I personally have difficulty functioning after 9:30 p.m., after having meetings from 6-9:30 p.m., so I would appreciate meetings that end at 9:30 p.m.

Senator Harris: Even earlier than that if possible.

President Dietz: I’ll try to do my part with Dan. He and I had some more time to rehearse. Matter of fact, we gotta write more of the presentation between now and them. But we’ll have a little more time to rehearse our timing. So, I’ll do what I can.

Provost Tarhule: Susan, on that note, I think the agenda should change the presentation Engineering Programs Proposal, you have the President and me. It’s actual the President and Dan Stephens presenting.

Senator Kalter: Oh. Thank you. We will change that. I will say, by the way, everybody, that I almost cut the meeting short before the Action Items last time. And then I was like, nope, let’s plow through, because otherwise they’re just going to start piling up and I knew that we were coming to this meeting, and that they would continue to pile up. So, it was a judgment call there. But yeah, so we’ll change that. So, it’s President Dietz and Vice President Stephens for the Engineering Programs Proposal. And Dr. Dietz, is it okay to do the Engineering one first, and the pandemic one second, or should we flip that?

President Dietz: No, I think that’s the way to go.

Senator Kalter: That’s a good order. Okay. And you’re having the consultants in again. Or are they…

President Dietz: They will be on the Zoom but playing a secondary role. We’ll call on them if we need them.

Susan Kalter: Sounds good. Okay. All right. Anything else about the agenda?

Senator Horst: I was just wondering if you could discuss what happened with the CAS Bylaws, because it was submitted to the Academic Senate. And it contains information on how we do the committees, because, you know, the CAS has the three different divisions, so it is, you know, it would be significant if it were passed before the committees were allocated.

Senator Kalter: So, I teach on Thursday afternoons. The deadline for Cera is Thursday at noon. I had a whole bunch of stuff to do on Friday and Dimitrios had entered a very large number of comments, so I could not tell whether it was even ready for this meeting. And so, I asked Cera about it, I have asked Diane to give us kind of an executive summary of what they rejected or modified as opposed to accepting from the comments that myself, Dimitrios, and Tracy entered so that we can make a better determination about whether Rules needs to see it again or whether it is ready to come to Exec and go to the Senate. (Pause) All right. Let’s see. So, we have an agenda, it looks like.

The motion was approved 9-1.

***From Academic Affairs Committee:***

***Annual Report, Honors Council, 2018-2019 (Advisory item?)  
Annual Report, Honors Council, 2019-2020 (Advisory item?)***

***Annual Report, Academic Planning Committee, 2018-2019 (Advisory item?)***

***Annual Report, Academic Planning Committee, 2019-2020 (Advisory item?)***

***Annual Report, Council for Teacher Education, 2018-2019 (Advisory item?)***

***Annual Report, Council for Teacher Education, 2019-2020 (Advisory item?)***

***Annual Report, Council on General Education, 2018-2019 (Advisory item?)  
Annual Report, Council on General Education, 2019-2020 (Advisory item?)***

***Annual Report, University Curriculum Committee, 2018-2019 (Advisory item?)***

***Annual Report, University Curriculum Committee, 2019-2020 (Advisory item?)***

***Memo from Reinstatement Committee, 2018-2019 (Advisory item?)***

***Annual Report, Reinstatement Committee, 2018-2019 (Advisory item?)***

***Memo from Reinstatement Committee, 2019-2020 (Advisory item?)***

***Annual Report, Reinstatement Committee, 2019-2020 (Advisory item?)***

***Annual Report, Library Committee, 2018-2019 (Advisory item?)***

***Annual Report, Library Committee, 2019-2020 (Advisory item?)***

***Annual Report, UAB and UHP (Student Conduct Conflict Resolution), 2018-2019 (Advisory item?)***

***Annual Report, UAB and UHP (Code of Student Conduct), 2019-2020 (Advisory item?)***

Senator Kalter: My other clock that I can actually see instead of the 6-point one on my computer is saying that it’s after 5:00 p.m. I think that we should actually push the annual reports from Academic Affairs Committee to the next Exec meeting, so that we are not going over our usual hard stop time of around five-ish. Anybody have any objections to that, and just adjourning and putting those off? (Pause) Everybody’s either putting a thumbs up or saying, “no, I don’t object.” Lauren is putting up a heart.

Senator Harris: I put up the wrong emoji, sorry.

Senator Kalter: What’d you say, Lauren?

Senator Harris: That was the wrong one.

(Laughter)

Senator Kalter: That’s awesome. Tracy wants to have a party, so she’s going to go into the ice fields and have a party. All right.

***Adjournment***

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