

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

3-24-2021

Senate Meeting, March 24, 2021

Academic Senate, Illinois State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>

Recommended Citation

Academic Senate, Illinois State University, "Senate Meeting, March 24, 2021" (2021). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 1276.

<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/1276>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISUReD@ilstu.edu.

Academic Senate Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, March 24, 2021
Approved

Call to Order

Academic Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

Roll Call

Academic Senate Secretary Martha Horst called the roll and declared a quorum.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. We have a quorum. So, good evening.

This meeting is being held electronically due to the issued disaster declaration and because the President has determined that at this time in-person Senate meetings and Senate committee meetings are not prudent, practical or feasible.

Just a reminder that if you would like to be recognized to speak, you should raise your hand through the participant function in Zoom or click on either the Yes or the No button if the raised hand is not available to you.

Live transcription is enabled. You can use your live transcription controls along the bottom of the screen to enlarge the font, hide the transcription if it is distracting to you, or display the full transcription along the right-hand side of your screen.

Public Comment

Senator Kalter: We start tonight with public comment. The Academic Senate of Illinois State University welcomes constructive communications from the members of the University community and citizens of Illinois. Students, faculty and staff are encouraged to provide information relevant to the academic mission of the University.

The Academic Senate allows up to ten minutes in total for public comment and questions during a public meeting. An individual speaker will be permitted two minutes for their presentation. When a large number of persons wishes to speak on a single item, it is recommended they choose one or more persons to speak for them. The Senate accepts copies of the speaker's presentation, questions, and other relevant written or visual materials. When appropriate, the Senate may provide a response to a speaker's questions within a reasonable amount of time, usually 24 hours or more, following the speaker's presentation.

Further comments, according to our bylaws, will be carried over to the next Senate meeting. People may also submit written comment tonight, and we will distribute it by tomorrow. Just a reminder to our public commenters to please keep their presentations to two minutes.

And we begin first with Carrie Anna Courtad, a professor in the Department of Special Education.

Dr. Carrie Anna Courtad: Thank you. The first item I'd like to speak about might be of particular interest to our Senators who are currently students. On August 6, two RAs were forced to resign. The infraction was that they were in the same room together for four minutes over the permissible 15 minutes, and then they did the ethical thing and reported the infraction to their supervisors. The University took two first-generation University students of color and forced them out of room, board, and stipend for a minor infraction. No one officially from ISU ever contacted either of the RAs. The father of one told me his e-mails were never returned from Mr. Johnson.

Students should also be made aware of temporary code of conduct sanctions that were in place during the pandemic. Students were being suspended for a semester if they were found to be on a lease of a dwelling that hosted a party. This was in an effort to make those kids accountable for a decision that the administration had made.

Tonight you will hear a proposal prepared by out-of-state consultants on a financial analysis of a new College of Engineering. To assume that a College of Engineering will be the savior of our enrollment is absurd at worst and unproven at the least. It makes more sense to expand programs without a huge investment. Programs that already exist, that already have faculty and a building in a place would be a better investment. For example, Nursing or EAF in the College of Ed. Did you know that more than 50% of our doctoral students come through EAF? Yet right now our administration will not support them by even providing more tenure-line faculty. EAF has a ratio of one faculty member for every 21 doctoral students, which if you do not have experience chairing a doc committee, this is an obscene amount of students. These are the few...

Senate Chair Kalter: Senator Horst, was her time up?

Senator Horst: No, it was not. She was muted prematurely.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Let me... Carrie Anna, go ahead.

Dr. Carrie Anna Courtad: Okay, sorry. Where was I?

Senator Horst: You've got 30 seconds. 30 seconds.

Dr. Carrie Anna Courtad: These... Did you get the EAF ratio?

Senate Chair Kalter: Yes.

Dr. Carrie Anna Courtad: Okay. These are a few examples of how administration cannot or will not support current faculty, students, and graduate student workers who are just looking for a living wage. Academic Senate, please do not be a rubber stamp yes for the administration's desire. I've also included numbers that were debated last time about our peer institution. I have these numbers, and I believe that I will be running out of time, so I will just include them in a written document. Thank you.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Thank you, Dr. Courtad. We move to Natalie Jipson, a master's student in the Department of English, a graduate teaching assistant, and a member of the Graduate Workers Union.

Ms. Natalie Jipson: Hello, senators. I'm writing today because of a need to discuss the bargaining situation with ISU. This University continues to mischaracterize their bargaining attempts and claim that they are waiting on counteroffers. ISU's lead negotiator gave our bargaining committee ISU's counterproposals five minutes before our last bargaining session. Where was this commitment to timeliness then? What about the fact that we gave an offer with a time limit and ISU waited until two hours after the deadline had passed to even respond to us, and when they did, they continued to push a deal that does virtually nothing for most of our membership? ISU also continues to ignore that we are waiting on vital information from them on issues like healthcare. This process has been obstructed for over 17 months by ISU administrators and negotiators. The longer we go without a contract that guarantees living wages for all graduate workers at ISU, the longer our workers continue to struggle to survive. Currently, because of how long ISU's negotiating team has taken to initiate anything resembling meaningful counters, we have multiple graduate teaching assistants who are not coming back to ISU next year, and this is just within the English Department. These are people who the Writing Program has invested significant time and energy training, who love teaching and being educators but simply can't afford to continue as employees at Illinois State University. These are valuable and experienced educators who are taking positions at other universities where they can make a living wage or even leaving graduate study entirely due to the inability to afford to study and work at ISU. The lack of competitive wages is something that even ISU's lead negotiator has mentioned as a valid concern. If the University acknowledges that they aren't offering competitive stipends, why are they not coming to the bargaining table with meaningful offers? Why, when we have spoken time and time again about the dire need for graduate workers to earn enough to survive, are we continually told that there is shock and disappointment in our decision to move towards strike readiness? ISU's continued lack of empathy or appreciation for the labor of graduate workers on this campus is the reason we feel we need to become strike ready as a bargaining unit. We don't have time to continue waiting on ISU's non-offers and deserve a quality contract now.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Thank you very much, Ms. Jipson. And we're going to move now to Steven Lazaroff, a doctoral student in the Department of English, a graduate teaching assistant, and a member of the Graduate Workers Union.

Steven Lazaroff: Good evening. President Dietz says he doesn't need to talk with our union about bargaining. That's why he has a team. Well, let's judge President Dietz by his team, by the people he chose to represent him at the bargaining table, specifically his lead negotiator, Mike Kruger, Director of Labor Relations. My mother always told me, Steven, listen to people when they tell you who they are. Actions speak louder than words. For instance, President Dietz shows us something by acting to place Mr. Kruger in such a pivotal position. Just last Thursday in mediation, Mr. Kruger bullied and taunted one of our members by asking, "If it's so bad at ISU, if you don't like it here, why don't you leave? I don't need you to answer that. I know the answer." And this isn't the first time Mr. Kruger and his \$150,000 annual salary has used those words, "If you don't like it, why don't you leave." He used them also in negotiations with other

unions on campus. So, this is not aberration, but a formal tactic of Mr. Kruger's labor relations. ISU stalls negotiations using a variety of tactics, often dropping proposals five minutes before the start of sessions like they did last Thursday. ISU doesn't care about confronting TA poverty. They have their eyes set on the College of Engineering. Last meeting, Provost Tarhule and others asked us to imagine the praise folks 100 years from now would heap upon the founders of ISU's College of Engineering. I wonder, though, what praise the people of the 22nd century might direct to the people of ISU who came together to help win a contract for graduate teaching assistants and bring hundreds of folks out of everyday suffering, poverty that they encounter by working at ISU. To build a College of Engineering at this time with the negotiations with struggling TAs nearing two years now, this is a moral disaster. ISU should assert a commitment to solving existing problems. So I come to the Academic Senate and ask for relief from the principal deliberative and governing body at ISU. Please vote no on the engineering school tonight. ISU has existing problems it must urgently confront. Thank you.

Senator Horst: That's your time. Thank you.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Thank you, Mr. Lazaroff. I don't see Brian Rejack here. Brian, are you here? Okay, he was next on my list. So we'll go instead to Trevor Rickerd, a doctoral student in the School of Biological Sciences and a graduate teaching assistant and member of the Graduate Workers Union.

Trevor Rickerd: During negotiations with ISU's bargaining team, I mentioned to the University's lead negotiator, Mike Kruger, that we are forced to pay \$2,400+ in student mandatory fees as a condition of our employment as a TA, even if we are not taking classes. He seemed to either not understand this or play dumb with us, as we had mentioned this to him multiple times before. But he responded by saying that if I did not like the way things were at ISU, that I should leave. It's behavior like this that makes me believe that the intention of the University is not to make improvements for graduate teaching assistants. Rather, they'd like to keep TAs as cheap labor with a poor quality of life while they maximize revenue from our labor. Even when we started bargaining in October of 2019, seventeen months ago, a university commission study recognized that conditions and pay for TAs are non-competitive, even when held up to other comparable universities that ISU's team selected by the Carnegie classification system. Since the State of Illinois just raised its minimum wage, suddenly the University believes that this new minimum wage was a negotiated raise and that we are now more competitive in pay comparable to these other universities. This isn't a negotiated raise; nor is it a living wage. The structural economic problems at ISU didn't get solved when the State raised its minimum wage. One-third to one-half of our pay being taken up by mandatory fees makes our take-home pay significantly below a living wage, let alone a minimum wage. Without the Graduate Workers Union, we TAs have no voice in our conditions at all. The Graduate School doesn't even have the status of a college, which internal reports from ISU say should exist. Instead, the Dietz administration is shelling out over \$100,000,000 on a new Engineering School, creating a whole new college, hiring dozens of administrative staff with six-figure salaries but refuses to address its existing conditions nor even say that it's able to raise wages for TAs on operating fees.

Senator Horst: That's your time.

Trevor Rickerd: I urge the Senate to vote no on the College of Engineering...

Senator Horst: Time, please. That's your time.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Rickerd. Because we had a speaker that did not appear tonight, I just want to first ask Dr. Shelden if she is here to make public comment, because she did contact us a couple of weeks ago to sign up. Dr. Shelden, are you here to make public comment? And, if not...

Unknown person: Debbie Shelden is here.

Senate Chair Kalter: I just wanted to find out if she wanted to make public comment. And, if not, if there is one more person who wants to make public comment, we do have room for one more because we had one person that did not show up tonight.

All right. In that case, we'll move to the next part of our agenda. Thank you very much, all of those who gave public comment. We're glad that you're here, and you are welcome to stay to observe the meeting.

Please just remember that in all cases under Robert's Rules of Order, only sitting senators and expert witnesses whom the Chair recognizes have speaking privileges. The Chair of the meeting must recognize you from the floor before you're permitted to speak, even if another senator has invited you to speak. Non-senators who raise their hand or the equivalent during the meeting will be warned. During the presentation and administrator remarks, I do generally allow our ex-officio administrative senators to be a Chair's proxy, but the Chair always does reserve the right to take back the floor, and to mute microphones on Zoom in order to do so, in the absence of a physical gavel.

Information/ Action Items:

Approval of the creation of a College of Engineering

XX.XX.XX.XX Proposal to create a College of Engineering (Provost Tarhule)

03.16.21.01 Engineering Organizational Structure Academic Senate Presentation 2-3-2021

Approval of the space needs, building, and site plans presented on February 17 (with allowance for changes recommended by Cabinet and/or to conform the proposal to the Campus Master Plan)

03.16.21.02 Space needs and Financial Engineering Presentation to Senate 2-17-21

03.19.21.01 Unanswered Engineering Program Questions

So we're now going to move to our main business of the evening. First, we're going to address the proposed organizational change associated with the engineering program. Then we will address the space needs, building and site plan and the overall capital plan proposal. So we will start an information session on those tonight to address any questions, comments, and suggestions that senators might have on behalf of themselves or their constituents. Some of

those are already embedded in our distributed communication 03.19.21.01. And then we'll see if we're ready to move each item to action.

So this time I'm going to do the two information sessions first and then go to the action session, but one after the other for each of those instead of together. So I'm going to ask, first of all, if there are any questions, comments, concerns or suggestions on the organizational change only. Just that one.

All right. I don't see any hands raised or yes or no buttons pushed, so let me ask if there are any comments, questions, concerns, or suggestions on the space needs, building and site plan proposal or the overall capital plan. And, let's see, Senator Otto. Ms. Samuel, if you raise your hand again, it's going to be seen as a disruption, please.

Senator Samuel: I'm a senator. I just got elected.

Senate Chair Kalter: Oh, I'm sorry. I forgot about that. Go ahead. You were first then, Senator Samuel.

Senator Samuel: I wanted to ask if there were any plans on how we were going to get students to the new site, because I know that I've gone over to the lab before to pick up keys, and I've had to drive fellow students that don't have a car, and it's pretty inaccessible from the rest of campus. So I wanted to know if there were any plans on how we were going to transport students to the new location.

Vice President Stephens: I'll attempt to address. Our proposal currently to today is to use the Connect Transit system that does circle throughout the Redbird Express. If there is additional studies that are viewed where we would need to supplement that with some additional transportation vehicles, we could certainly do that, but right now we feel that students can come back and forth, because there's a stop right there in front of Cardinal Court, which is right next to the John Green building. But it's a very good point, and I appreciate you bringing that up, and that's something that we will always look at making sure that our students have adequate transportation around our main campus sites.

Senate Chair Kalter: Does that address your question? Oh, sorry. Go ahead, Senator Tarhule.

Senator Tarhule: If I may add that if you recall, the layout of the engineering curriculum in the first two years of the program, most of the students will take essentially general classes on campus. So it's not until they start getting into their third year that they're taking... The John Green building is really engineering, specifically. So by the time they start taking mostly engineering-specific courses, they'll spend a lot more time there, but in the first two years they'll spend a lot more time on campus taking STEM courses, which are mathematics, physics, gen ed courses and so on. It's also possible to have a time schedule that is slightly offset for courses that happen there in comparison to courses that happen, if you will, on main campus. This is actually a common occurrence at many campuses that have what they call science campuses where you offset the classes you offer in one section to allow students the time to get over to the next campus. One of my institutions had exactly the same situation where we were two miles apart

from the main campus in the science park, and so we had a 15-minute offset that allowed the students to work through, so it's a good point. It's an important point, but I think it's one that we can address and one that has been addressed at many other campuses.

Senate Chair Kalter: Senator Samuel, does that address your question?

Senator Samuel: Yes, it does.

Senate Chair Kalter: Terrific. All right, now we'll go to Senator Otto.

Senator Otto: Thanks very much. These are kind of general questions, a general comment and then a couple of questions. The first comment is from our esteemed colleague, professor emeritus James Palmer, who is a historian of higher education. And he brought up the point that engineering, many of the roles in engineering, specific roles, are notoriously vulnerable to boom-bust cycles in employment, in particular, and I'm wondering how you're taking that into account. And then, you know, in the presentations that we've heard so far, which has been very thorough and a lot of different ways at looking at this, we've been told that the main group that we would be targeting for enrollment are folks who have applied to U of I Engineering School but who have not gotten in. So, you know, the U of I being a top five school, I wondered... And this may be more of a question for the consulting firm... Where is the data that shows that people who would apply and have the goods to get into a top five engineering school would apply to a school that's new and unranked? Is there a school that gives a precedent for that, that you're using as an example since that is a basic foundational part of the plan it seems?

Senate Chair Kalter: Senator Tarhule?

Senator Tarhule: Yes, thank you so much, Senator Otto. I'll begin with the second part with a small correction. I don't think the consultants or any person on the design team, on the steering team, says that we will target students who have been rejected at U of I. The point we were making was to use the number of applications to U of I to show evidence of need. There were two data points that we used – well, actually three data points that we used as evidence of need. One is that the state legislature has known for a long time and made several comments to the fact that the public universities in Illinois are simply not producing enough engineers. So there's a workforce need. The other part is there are not enough places for Illinois students who want to study engineering. That's part of where the data from U of I comes in. And the third point is the number of Illinois students who are starting engineering out of state because they couldn't find a place in state to study engineering. So what we're trying to do is for ISU to provide, to meet a need that the State of Illinois needs both in terms of students who want to study engineering as well as on the workforce side, because there are a lot of companies, engineering companies, who want to hire engineers, and every year we see that the number of places that are open far exceed the number of engineers we're producing. So Illinois State is in a position to solve both problems on the upfront end by training the workforce and also in the back end by providing quality engineers to the workforce, to the employers. So that's the response to that question.

The one about boom and bust is much harder to answer, and I can't claim that I have the answer for you. I would say that the type of engineering that we're talking about, electrical engineering

and mechanical engineering and most any other business area that you would think about, we're going in cycles. There will be recessions. There will be... But we have businesses, we have accountants, we have other disciplines that will produce that kind of the same thing. So I'm not sure that there is a specific answer or that we would know how to address that other than to produce the best kind of students that we can train so that they are competitive as possible, they are agile as possible. So I'm sorry I don't have a good answer to that question.

Senator Otto: No, I appreciate that. So the school will focus on technical and electrical. Is that what I'm hearing, because I'm not clear on what specialization areas will be and if those are different from U of I's.

Senator Tarhule: Mechanical engineering and electrical engineering. There was a study, a market analysis that was conducted back in 2018. It reviewed all of the possible types of engineering courses that we could start, and the consultants concluded back then that these were the courses that would have the most need in terms of students and employers. So we hired the consultants who did that. Associated with that, one of the key things we want to do is to produce, as we've said, work-ready engineers. So if you look at the type of companies we have around here who will hire engineers, it's Rivian, which produces electrical cars. It's Caterpillar. It's John Deere, which are really big in mechanical field. So if you look at both the type of industries that will hire our engineers, the type of industries that students will do projects and internships with, we fit right in with the industry need, and, again, the conclusion after reviewing all of the engineering fields, also looking at our strength as an institution and the type of expertise that we already have, the conclusion was those two areas will be the most feasible for ISU.

Senator Otto: Thank you.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Thank you. Are there any other questions, comments, concerns, or suggestions about the space needs, building and site plan proposal or overall capital plan? All right. I'm going to go to mine, which were the ones that I referred to before in the distributed communication, and these are for Senator Stephens. I'm wondering if you would be able to go over briefly, just briefly, the reasons why the other six possible sites for the building were thrown out. So just briefly what they were and why they were rejected. And I'll help you out, because I actually wrote them all down. And we'll just sort of go one by one. The first one was possibility of putting it next to Milner, which would be to the east of it, on the other side of it from the Bone. And that one would have been five minutes to the Quad.

Senator Stephens: As we, if you recall from the presentation about our goal is to have a facility that at the end of the day is just not landlocked with a small space but actually having an ability to grow. Even though John Green is targeted with capacity with two floors to be about 500 students, our goal is to have this college to be certainly in the 1,500 to 2,000 student range if not larger, given the demand for engineers. So when we were looking for a site and also looking for growth expansions over time, we wanted to make sure we didn't lock ourselves in and have to potentially acquire property or make additional renovations near other facilities. And so the John Green complex, in general, has a lot more space there. And because it has space, even though we would have to relocate some of the facilities team. The facilities team is designed to always

move away from high-profile academic spaces, and so the John Green site just seemed much more appealing than trying to match a very kind of a tall facility next to a library. There's just only a certain amount of land there.

And, also, when you're dealing with engineering equipment, you're going to be having your major labs, especially in your mechanical side, very loud, very large equipment, and that type of equipment has to be placed in spaces to protect the noise and also protect the vibrations, so we also have to be careful placing our lab equipment on first floors. And so, if you recall, the John Green building has loading docks, the facility to have those types of large spaces and complex spaces that do produce lots of materials and items and, in some cases, noise so that it isn't being mixed in with classrooms that certainly have to be quieter. So that would be, at least compared to that particular spot.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Thank you for that one. That may answer several of these, and I did notice that that particular one was a ten-story building and that it was also in the space where our library (I think it was called a) master plan actually suggested that we might want to expand the library into that space. That might be in 50 years, but it still would get rid of that space for that.

Senator Stephens: Right.

Senate Chair Kalter: The second one was next to Hewett, which would have been to the west of it where the basketball court is. I have a feeling that's the same ability to expand issue.

Senator Stephens: Right. Same thing. Yeah, it's exactly. If the engineering facility was conducive to a tall type of facility where we could build straight up and be able to accommodate not only the classroom needs but the movement in and out of equipment, the type of equipment, then you can place those types of facilities in smaller parcels of land. But giving the growth of the program and especially as we begin to add student space for projects... If you recall, in engineering, some of the greatest training that the school will provide will be in those lab spaces where students are actually building examples of go-carts and concrete canoes and things like that. You've got to have a lot of space in order for that. And so an engineering complex is definitely going to be needing a lot more space at lower levels of the facility necessarily. Traditional academic buildings. It may go six or seven stories.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Terrific. Let me just name in the list the other ones so that people can hear them, and if you hear anything that has an added component to it, you can let us know. There was a suggestion for the intersection of College and Main to the west of the Student Services Building. There was a suggestion of next to Turner on the south end of Turner on College Avenue. A Williams Hall renovation, which would have required, you know, relocation of the current occupants of that building. And then the final one was the north campus existing parking lot. This is the very large parking lot that's across from the church that is right next to Milner and just north of those apartment buildings. So I'm not sure. It sounds like those questions are pretty well answering those three or four sites as well.

Senator Stephens: Yeah, and like you said, as you can imagine, if we try to think through our present plans around any of our campus-wide needs, it's not just simply the need the engineering program, it's the potential need of any future expansion efforts. For example, you mentioned the library. The library, you know, has been approved by the State for capital funding, and when those funds get released, one of the questions we want to be dealing with is making sure that we've got space next to it in the event that capital appropriation allows us to make any additions or renovations that are outside of the current footprint. So any of our parking lots that we have, certainly for those that some of the other ones that you mentioned, we're looking at the current space, and we're looking at how we're going to decide to not only serve the current academic needs over near Turner but potentially down the road. I can see at the end of the day, now that you've mentioned Turner, that if we get a capital appropriation for engineering that I spoke to in my presentation, I can see us, especially if we get a large amount, that if we build a second facility funded by the State, we would actually be looking at maybe combining some of the inter-disciplines that are sitting over in Turner that may fit very well into a new engineering complex partnering with engineering, like construction management and things like that. So in that particular case, we would ultimately look for new occupants of Turner if we moved them out of there. So it's not a perfect plan. We can't certainly predict the future, but we certainly see the John Green complex as something that gives us an ability to move forward with a phase one and then the potential to move forward with a phase two when the State provides some additional capital.

Senate Chair Kalter: I'm glad I asked that question about Turner, because that's an interesting new angle that I don't think any of us had thought of before.

My second question is also for you, Senator Stephens, and it piggybacks onto Senator Samuel's question. She had asked about the transportation. I'm wondering, because students do walk, they're going to choose to walk, maybe because they don't have a second class after their class up there or what have you. So I'm wondering if the plans are going to tell us to change our cross-campus transportation and pedestrian mall infrastructures – you know, whether we think that we might need to build either bridges or tunnels over and under Main Street.

And we sort of had an answer to the question about needing to change our course scheduling model, which is actually for Dr. Tarhule, to add time between classes because it is a 16-minute walk between buildings. So we would have to time the buses correctly. So my main focus there, though, is about the pedestrian zones and the safety of those pedestrian zones.

Senator Stephens: And that's an excellent point. That's something that as we move forward with this proposal, that has certainly been on our list of addressing that particular need. We certainly today feel that our transit contract and the bus systems that they provide today, given the academic facilities and the footprint that the students walk today, serves that well, but that doesn't mean in the future that we wouldn't introduce, either by working with them or actually introducing some of our own complements to their bus transit system... That's very common on a number of campuses for universities to have some of their own vehicles. And given the fact that you're correct that we've got a large population of students, and we're seeing that need to have some other type of complement to Connect Transit. We would certainly do that, and we would also look to, you know, pedestrian traffic from a safety point of view as you get closer to

John Green, and we would bring forth those types of studies back to the campus community to make those types of wise investments if we see that they're definitely needed for those types of safety and security of our students crossing that particular street. So we would definitely... That's very much a high priority. For now, we would simply use our regular bus system or complement it with something else, but I can us down the road... Especially if it gets very large, we would potentially put some type of median across that way with working with the city to be enabled to make sure that the students as they walk across that particular street that everything is safe. So we would definitely keep that on our radar as this project starts to move forward.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Terrific. Let's see. Let me do a last call for questions, comments, suggestions, concerns.

Senator Tarhule: Thank you so much, Chairperson Kalter. Vice President Stephens did answer this question about cost, but I just wanted to complement a bit of the information that he provided. When we started thinking about the engineering program, the idea was we would get some money from the State. And if we got some money from the State, some of the... So the estimate of the cost of the buildings that will be needed for the program is about \$130,000,000. So if we were getting money from the State, some of those undeveloped plots that you mentioned probably would have factored higher into the construction. Because we didn't get money from the State, because we're trying to start this on our own but with the hope of eventually getting money from the State, we had to reduce that cost. And so reducing the cost means we find a building that already exists that wouldn't require \$100,000,000 to build. That is why we see the current John Green facility would cost \$38,000,000. So that's a big difference between \$38,000,000 and \$130,000,000. We think that with remodeling you have seen, ISU can definitely afford the John Green site to start the engineering at \$38,000,000 on the construction site as opposed to \$100,000,000+ if we used any of those new sites that you mentioned.

The other point I want to mention is the idea of the Quad. I know that there are many people on this call who have either trained at Harvard or visited Harvard, and one of the things that Associate Vice President Mike Gebeke kept bringing up when we were discussing this was the idea that when you go to Harvard, they have several quads, and it wasn't always like that. First they built around one quad, but there's only so much space that you can do that on the quad. As it fills up, you start up another quad, and you develop it, and so over time we could have an institution that has many centers. So ISU has pretty much used up everything we can build around the Quad now, and so it's actually, I think, forward-looking planning to think about could this be another quad that will develop going forward. Even if we were able to put engineering on the Quad, hopefully this is not the end of ISU's growth. What would we do with the next one? So the idea of starting another quad of something that could potentially become another quad, growth forward for Illinois State is essentially not a bad idea. So I just wanted to add those two comments to Vice President Stephens' already excellent response.

Senate Chair Kalter: Thank you for that. I think there are some people who feel that they are so far off the Quad that they're off the campus, so that kind of thinking would help that, right, to have sort of multiple quads and multiple centers of action, so to speak.

Senator Hogue: Hi. Yeah, I do really love the idea of adding additional quads over time, but in that current location I also know that there is a lot of other infrastructure there that really could deter that becoming another center of congregation, so to say. So I don't know that that's necessarily the most valid argument in that line of thinking.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Anybody else have any questions, comments, concerns about either of these things: the creation of a new college or the site planning? All right. In that case, we will move. Do we have a motion to move the proposal to create a new College of Engineering from information to action as our first step?

Motion by Senator Marx, seconded by Senator Rottinghaus, to move the proposal to create a new College of Engineering from information to action.

All right. And do we have any debate, remembering that debate, of course, is stating your position, if you so choose, and not asking further questions, whether you're going to vote yea or nay or what have you and why. And remember that this one is only about whether we move this from information to action. It is not about the approval. Any debate about that?

All right. So, two things before we move to that first magic of the evening. Just remember that an abstention does not change the number of votes to approve a motion. For example, in a 30-person body, if 10 persons abstain, the number of votes needed to pass something still remains at 16. It doesn't go down to 11. Also, once a roll call vote begins, because we do not have Cera here tonight, we will not be admitting people from the waiting room until the roll call has concluded. But if there were senators with voting privileges in the waiting room, we would not close the actual vote until any of those senators had been admitted and had voted. We just can't have, you know, octopus hands here. So Senator Horst, could you go ahead and proceed with the first procedural magic?

Senator Horst: And just to clarify, we are randomizing where we start, correct?

Senate Chair Kalter: Sure. Yes. I think that would be fine.

Senator Horst: Okay. Very good. So this is for info to action on the college.

The motion was approved unanimously with one abstention.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Now we move to the next part. Do we have a motion to approve the creation of a new College of Engineering?

Motion by Senator Marx, seconded by Senator Rottinghaus, to create a new College of Engineering.

All right. And do we have debate over that motion?

Senator Spranger: Hi. Often in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for those of us with power to speak out on behalf of those in minoritized and abused groups. Members of the

Graduate Workers Union have been taking respectful and traditional routes to obtaining a livable wage, and while I may never understand intricacies of capital funding, it seems simply unacceptable that so much money can be expended so easily when people of the backbone of this university are starving. I'm urging the administration to make negotiations in good faith with the Union, and while I think the College of Engineering would be a productive and meaningful addition to the Illinois State community, I will be voting no today in solidarity with the Graduate Workers Union.

Senate Chair Kalter: Thank you, Senator Spranger.

Senator Toth: Great. Thank you. I rise today not in opposition to an ISU College of Engineering but in support of the students, workers, and ISU community members that are routinely denied fair wages, reasonable benefits, and basic recognition. I'm not opposed to a College of Engineering, but I will be voting no on this motion until our University pays our graduate workers the living wage that they not only deserve but are entitled to simply by being human beings. I'd like to add on behalf of all the students and faculty members that will speak. We understand that you cannot simply take the money for engineering and just give it to the graduate workers. However, we routinely discuss in this body that this proposal is good for university longevity. It's good for long-term fiscal health, etc. What we are doing is underestimating the impact that paying graduate workers poverty wages has on the university's long-term health. How dare we spend so much time planning this endeavor while graduate members of this Academic Senate and thousands of other students around the campus remain thousands and thousands of dollars in debt at the fault of our institution. How dare we profess our core values and integrity and respect when students, non-tenure-track faculty, and other bargaining units are told by those in power that they're replaceable or a dime a dozen. And someday soon we'll wonder why the number of graduate workers has declined when, in reality, it's because we never showed them any value in the first place. Many opponents of this will say rejecting this motion just won't work. The University administration won't care. The motion will get renewed. It will pass next time. What I have to say is how can we not try. If this doesn't light a fire under our administrators to finally act on this, can't we say it was worth the try? Are we supposed to throw our hands in the air and concede? I'm inviting you to vote no or abstain on this College of Engineering proposal and join me in saying you'll get your College of Engineering when every Redbird can afford to put food on their table and a roof over their head.

Senator Swiech: I just want to continue the sentiments expressed by my peers and express my disappointment at the actions of this University. As a student, I used to be able to say that I'm proud to be a student at ISU, and I still want to have that pride; however, watching this institution ignore their graduate workers, many of which who live in poverty and have to rely on welfare and the generosity of others to survive while simultaneously demanding that they give their all makes me sick. We need to take care of those whose work allows for this institution to exist before we spend millions of dollars creating a new college. We need to live up to our stated core values of integrity and respect, and right now the actions of this University don't align with our fundamental values. I'm voting no, and I urge my fellow senators to vote no, because this University shouldn't be looking to expand if we can't even take care of our own as it is.

Senator Miller: Hello. Thank you. I'd like to point out the idea of shared governance as it pertains to this Academic Senate. We as a Senate have a duty to this school and a duty to the students to govern together to benefit the entire campus body. It is my personal duty as one of the student life senators to intervene faced with injustice. I am the voice of my constituents, the entire student body. With that being said, I'm here to state that we should be just as concerned with the people who run this university as we are with positions, programs, and profits. So I cannot vote yes today, because that puts the needs of the University and its profits over the needs of students in poverty. I stand with the Graduate Workers Union as they continue to fight for livable wages. I stand with the student body when I vote no tonight. Thank you.

Senator Lewis: Thank you. I'd first like to start off with again voicing my displeasure with what I see to be institutional issues at this institution once again. I think I said in the Academic Senate meeting to start the year that if these issues are not rectified, they're going to keep happening. And since I've got on campus, we've seen issues that are kind of lining up institutionally that keep happening, which is why I ran for this position. So I would like to first ask the team questions about what we're really doing when we're here, because how I see ISU is a house in order. Right now it's a house out of order. What are our priorities?

Senate Chair Kalter: Sorry. This is my fault. I accidentally was trying to admit somebody and muted Senator Lewis. Are you back?

Senator Lewis: Am I back?

Senate Chair Kalter: Great. You're back. Sorry.

Senator Lewis: Okay, so the questions I've been meaning to ask like do we want to prioritize literal buildings over students that are starving right now? You know, we see a lot of the issues that ISU faces are being reflected by our realities. The students are suffering, right? But if we build a new school, the students are going to have to go there, and they're going to have graduate students eventually. So who's going to shoulder much of that burden? It's going to again be the students and the graduate workers. And so I urge a no vote, my fellow senators, and I think we should start thinking about the community and the house in order when we think about these issues instead of just moving on and funding the next big project, because that project is going to come. Things will get better. Buildings will get built, but students, can't replace those, meals, students can't replace those. So, neither can workers, especially with myself being a student worker on campus right now at work. I think we need to take this into account when we all, you know, certain senators vote no. So, with that I close.

Senate Chair Kalter: Thank you, Senator Lewis. And my apologies again.

Senator Hogue: Let me be frank. Right now I'm incredibly ashamed to be a Redbird. I look at this governing body, and I see a bunch of people who want the same thing, success for every single Illinois State student. Voting yes on the creation and renovation of a building for an engineering program is completely irresponsible at this point. These graduate workers are often taking the brunt of teaching. I have nothing against my tenured professors, but quite frankly shout out to Ann Johnson in my Math 120 class, because without her I would have failed that

class. These teachers are the ones who are making the impact on us, and the fact that we can't even pay them a living wage is completely irresponsible. I will be voting no on vote.

Senator Small: I want to echo the sentiments of my peers in saying that I do not believe that we can vote to approve this new college in good faith at an institution who proclaims such core values as collaboration and integrity. We must stand behind those in our actions and not just in our words. And it is my belief that voting yes on this contradict those beliefs. We must first handle the issues currently happening on campus, such as the ongoing conflict of the Graduate Workers Union before we invest massive amounts of funding into a new program, as the longevity and success of ISU does not fall on engineering but rather on the individuals who keep it running. Because of these reasons, I will be voting no on this item, and I urge my fellow senators to consider doing the same.

Senator Horst: I'd like to give some perspective on the motion to create a college, because I have been Chair of the Rules Committee and I've been on the Senate for a while, and so I just wanted to state some downsides and say why and how I'm going to vote. Because we're creating a college and not a department, there are going to be a lot of repercussions for shared governance. The first is that the Constitution states that each college gets a representative on the Senate. The Constitution also fixes the number of faculty senators at 29. So if we pass this, that means either we'll have to change the Constitution or one of the Senate positions from some other college will have to be taken away. Because we're creating a college, there are going to be a lot of university committees that will have to be expanded and include representatives from the College of Engineering, Academic Planning, Library Committee, University Service Awards Committee. Council for Teacher Education will most likely get a representative. Council for General Education, Faculty Review Committee, Reinstatement Committee, University Curriculum Committee, and Review Committee, and this is a small college, so that really could be problematic. It is true that those seats could go unfilled, but that could put a burden on the committees to make quorum if the quorum is based on the number of seats. Then there's going to be a DFSC structure and a CFSC structure, and anybody who's been on ASPT discussions knows that it can be quite problematic when you're dealing with a small college and you have to consider how you can have a small college seat both of those and we have to do a lot of work to rewrite the ASPT document to deal with small colleges like Mennonite.

Then there's the administrative cost, and I know they're getting a dean and chairs right off the bat. I just want to point out that the creative technology faculty – there are eight faculty. They just had a 250% increase in FTIC deposits, and they were denied department status; the reason stated was that they didn't want to pay the administrative cost for having a department. So there's some illogic there, because the Creative Technology department (sic) is booming, and they have a video game major, and they're doing all kinds of exciting things. But at the end of the day, I'm just going to say that I really reflected on what the Provost said about dreaming big, about taking a chance, and I really thought about what it means to build something from the ground up. I thought about, you know, building a house and not picking the house that you want now but the house that you might want when you're, you know, five years down the road. So I'm going to support the Provost's vision. I think it's problematic because it's a small college, but I'm going to vote yes.

Senator Samuel: I wanted to share some concerns that graduate students have that not only will the college increase. Like there will be people teaching at the Engineering College, but we have more people taking gen eds. And that has been covered. We're saying that there would be money given towards professor positions, but I asked the English Department, and the majority of English 101 is taught by TAs. And right now we're fighting to even get a living wage, and unless we're going to hire tenure-track that are just teaching 101, which right now is taught either by TAs or adjuncts or non-tenure track, I can only personally see a world in which class size increases, and right now the class size is bigger than recommended or which would be detrimental to the students and the instructors. And these are just some concerns I have that I haven't had voiced. I'm also against it for all the reasons that many, many people have said tonight, and I don't want to waste time by repeating it. I will be voting no because every one of my constituents I've talked to does not agree that a College of Engineering is going to improve life on ISU. Thank you.

Senator Mangruem: Hello, everyone. Can you all hear me? I've been having some issues.

Senate Chair Kalter: Yes.

Senator Mangruem: All right. I'd just like to say that, as somebody elected by the students to advocate on behalf of students, it is part of my responsibility to create positive change for current and future Redbirds. With that being said, I think the current Redbirds kind of take priority when it comes to their wants and needs. I cannot in good faith vote yes on a project in the name of University longevity when we have our graduate student workers who have been relentlessly organizing, advocating, and spreading awareness to their concerns, and those concerns are not being answered to, so with that being said, I will be voting no in solidarity with the Graduate Workers Union.

Senator Zoltek: Hi there, everyone. I'm here simply to repeat the hesitancy for creating the College of Engineering at this time. We feel that it is insensitive and completely blindsides the issues and demands of graduate workers. I say again, we should not be allocating assets to an entirely new school when the ones we already have can be improved and refined. For example, improvements can be made starting with the underappreciated and underrepresented group of graduate students. ISU needs to support its graduate students by meeting the Graduate Workers Union simple demands. Graduate students deserve a living wage, healthcare, and overall compensation for their dedication to this wonderful University. I urge you to vote no today in order to give graduate students their basic needs, and frankly they deserve even more than that. By respecting and fulfilling the GWU's requests, the university would empower its pre-existing students and TAs instead of irrationally delegating funds to a whole new sector. Thank you.

Senator Chassy: Thank you. I actually like the idea of an engineering college. There's no doubt in my mind that it would benefit us financially. It would bring new students here, but I think approving the massive price tag along with that at this point sends a message that is not in sync with how we actually feel. I'm certain that the financial experts here tonight would make a point of explaining capital funds and different state-approved money that make graduate working conditions and the college completely separate, and I don't doubt that. And I understand and acknowledge there's no formal connection, but it's hard to ignore how I feel that we are being

seemingly insincere that we have the money to invest in something that we like but we can't take care of what we've already obligated ourselves to. The fact is the people at ISU are choosing groceries or prescription medication. They are struggling to make the most basics ends meet, and we're a public university. I feel strongly that we should be taking the lead on this. I want everyone to reflect before they vote. Think about the message that's being sent to prospective students, investors maybe, struggling graduate workers, and more importantly what it says about each of us. What does it mean if we vote on this and that spending before we take care of our own, especially those who are struggling right now? I really wanted to vote in favor of this. I actually give the presentation a couple of weeks ago a lot of credit. I think it would be a great investment for us, but I just can't do that with a clear conscience at this point, so I'm going to be abstaining. Thank you.

Senator Phillips: So like my colleagues have said, on principle I'm not opposed to the addition of an engineering program at ISU. In fact, despite my reservations about some of the arguments presented to us, I think it has the ability to be a net positive for our campus. What I am opposed to is the mistreatment of members of the campus community who dedicate so much of their time and effort into making ISU what it is. Tonight I'm speaking about the graduate workers who, despite producing tens if not hundreds of thousands of dollars in value for this institution, are being paid wages that don't allow them to live and are still far from ISU in negotiations. For a student at ISU to be working 20 hours a week or more on top of their graduate course load and personal obligations to still be unable to make their bills or to be forced to seek additional employment is wrong, and not only is it wrong, it's incredibly unjust, and it has a corrosive effect on community relations. Beyond the issue of compensation, the University's effort to undermine the free speech of its graduate employees by demanding that they cede their right to express support for other union members on campus is illiberal and unbecoming of an institution that has supposedly dedicated itself to the pursuit of knowledge and higher thought. Beyond that, the conduct that is alleged to have come from ISU's bargaining team, not only by the graduate workers themselves but also by other groups of instructors and staff on campus, is abhorrent, and beyond that it's embarrassing. I don't want to be associated with an institution that finds it okay to refer to its workers as worthless, to belittle their contributions, or to make it appear that the institution finds them to be replaceable. The allowance of conduct of that nature is a problem, and inaction by those with the power to stop it is as much of an endorsement of those practices as engaging in them would be. I understand that future planning is important for ISU, but I urge you all to consider that more goes into making ISU viable in the long term than additional programs, campus enhancements, or profits. There will still be a need for instructors, staff, and graduate workers in a new program, and brushing existing campus issues to the side or moving slowly to rectify them does nothing but delay justice and delay a reckoning that is inevitable. The Academic Senate is the primary body for shared governance on this campus. We have an official charge, but I would argue that we also have a duty to uphold ISU's alleged values – things like respect, collaboration, integrity, and to act in a manner that is moral. ISU's argument against paying workers more is simple, and they want to save money; however, there is no lesson to be learned from poverty wages. There's no character trait that is gleaned from being hungry or virtue in being overworked, and withholding peoples' needs in order to cut costs is not an argument I'm convinced by. I would ask you all to consider acting in solidarity with the graduate workers and, like myself and others, vote no on the establishment of the College of Engineering and its base considerations, given the fact that there are urgent issues on campus that need to be

addressed if ISU is to be successful and if the engineering program is to be successful in the future. In the absence of popular support or action, it is clear that progress is not something that is inevitable. I would ask, and I'm almost done, that we take a moment to reflect to ask ourselves if we're dedicated to order, to the status quo, to the traditional path, or if we are dedicated to justice and working towards a more equitable world. It's easy to get caught up in our day to day, and ISU is only one campus, but we are humans first, and we have the ability to do what is right and to act on behalf of those that aren't always able to act for themselves. I'm sure there are reservations about what I'm proposing and the timing of it all, but to that I would ask you to consider how long we can keep telling vulnerable groups to wait for better treatment or offer platitudes in the absence of action. The graduate workers are in the spotlight tonight, but it could be anyone on this campus next. And if it were you who had to be in their shoes tomorrow, what would you ask those in our position to do tonight? Thank you.

Senator Blake: Thank you. I would like to just candidly speak on this matter by asking, "How can we focus on future issues when we have not yet solved or even acknowledged the current issues at hand?" Okay, within a four-year period it costs the average student \$100,000 to go here, yet we have graduate workers who are struggling to live. Imagine working at a successful grocery store desperately in need of a wage increase to support yourself and your employer says, "Oh, we can't pay you more. We need new water fountains." Okay. What would you do? You would leave! Okay. So why are we asking like the graduate workers are not a valued asset to ISU. While the College of Engineering would be an incredible addition to the campus, we should first consider those who are already on campus, servicing the campus to help you welcome more students and generate revenue while they can barely afford to eat themselves. Our job, being part of this Senate, is to speak up for these people and those alike, and for that reason I urge a no or abstain in today's vote.

Senator Lucey: Senator Kalter, I'd like to yield my space to the two students who would like to present, please.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right.

Senator Villalobos: Thank you very much, and thank you very much, Senator Lucey, for the courtesy of yielding your time. I echo much of what some of my colleagues and especially Senator Chassy have said tonight. Frankly, I'm not opposed whatsoever to the addition of an engineering college. In fact, I hope to one day come back as an alumni of ISU and see just how far the college has come. At the same time, I must say that our institution has put themselves in the position of large opposition to this measure tonight. Had the University made better efforts to move at a far more appropriate speed in negotiations with the Graduate Workers Union and performed better within those negotiations, this position we are in tonight would probably not even exist. I will always support the administration when they have done good, but I will also not hesitate to render criticism when necessary. I echo something that I said earlier this year on this same subject. Nobody is asking for a fiscally irresponsible agreement but one that satisfies the needs of our students. For that reason I will be abstaining in tonight's vote. Thank you.

Senator Ayers: When I applied to become a senator, I spoke of a vision of wanting to fix the problems that we already have at Illinois State. Transferring here when I was a sophomore, I've

seen so many different things from my former college. And I believe adding a School of Engineering would be a beautiful thing in the future, but I believe if you build the School of Engineering right now, it will have too much negative pressure. You have to think about that you aren't paying your graduate workers and then you're building a school that costs \$38,000,000. When that goes to the news, think about the optics. Think about what other people are saying. Are people going to actually want to come when they're going to see graduate workers might be working at this engineering school. Are the teachers and the people who are helping me getting eligible pay to even be there? You have to look at it from an average American or average student point of view, because most of the students here want to go to grad school after, and they're not going to go here because you're not paying the graduate workers. We want to keep people around. We want to keep our students here. We want to keep our alumni happy. We want to keep our current students happy. So we can fix the problems that we have now, but we can't move forward, because all you report brings negative pressure. And ultimately, it's going to hurt the school, because the enrollment is not going to be high. We're going to be losing money [inaudible] so I encourage all the senators to abstain from voting and wait until we can handle the problems that we have so that we can build a brighter future.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. And Senator Lucey, did you want to speak now?

Senator Lucey: Yeah. So thank you, Senator Kalter, for your recognition. Also, thank you for your gift of leadership in this Senate. Also, thank you to Senator Horst and to the students for your courageous comments. They are quite a marvel and needed. I would ask all of you to consider how many of you have engineers in your families. Okay. There are several engineers in mine. I have great appreciation for engineers, their knowledge of technology and resources and their efforts to improve our lives. I value engineers and am grateful for their contributions to society. And the preparation of engineers represents a laudable goal and pursuit for ISU. In his still relevant work, *Ethics in an Age of Technology*, Ian Barbour observed the [inaudible] class claim that their judgments are value free. The elite is supposedly non-political. But those with power seldom use it rationally and objectively when their own interests are at stake. When social planners think that they are deciding for the good of all, they assume innocence of moral intentions is likely to be corrupted in practice. The integrity of a college of engineering provides a foundation for its rooting and growth. The college's worth lies in principles that undergird its planning and development and the integrity of their implementation. We have heard presentations that describe the curricular and financial plans for this program, and I would invite members of the Senate to reconsider the claims and assumptions supporting this proposal and the values upon which they rest. To my knowledge we were told that the engineering represents the most frequent search term at the University's website, but we are not told from where these hits originate. We are not told the patterns or hits in regards to frequency and geographic origin. We do not know how many hits were recurring from prospective students, from scholars conducting research, or other institutions who were seeking pure data. To my knowledge we were told that the University would absorb all students who withdraw from engineering studies. Yet, according to the 2009 ISU Fact Book, for the past five years this institution has experienced a first-year attrition rate of 20%. And although the 2020 Fact Sheet presents a fall attrition rate of 16%, this figure, an anomaly or not, is still distant from complete retention. Engineering represents a very technical and challenging area of study. Given that the University retains, on average eight of ten first-year students, complete absorption of attrition from the engineering program does not

represent a sound premise. To my knowledge we were told that the budget sets aside money for efforts for diversity initiatives and that recruiting would consist of standard networking processes. Just as morality cannot be legislated, nor can morality be bought, indeed morality is a process that occurs freely without coercion. Attaining an equitable learning environment implies the deliberate and purposeful recruitment of underrepresented candidates. Initiatives such as the College of Education's collaboration with the Chicago city schools purposefully recruit underrepresented students to give them back to their communities through teaching. A similar program of engineering recruitment that encourages a reimbursed investment in underrepresented communities, rooted in compassion, would make a needed statement about Illinois State University representing a white institution with tokenistic nods to diversity. To summarize, the proposal for the college emphasizes positive presumptions and intentions, yet in my mind the administration has not proven the substance behind the claims. I would remind my fellow senators that during our March 3, 2021 meeting we passed a Sense of the Senate Resolution that expressed disappointment concerning the closed nature of the presidential search. The Resolution arose in the midst of activities that appear to undermine the spirit of shared governance at Illinois State University. In addition to the aforementioned dissatisfaction with the presidential search, these activities include the following items: Concerns about the integrity of negotiation with graduate students about their working conditions, and the failure of the College of Education technology support to communicate with faculty about computer restarts and the installation of remote surveillance software. I question the virtue of voting upon or for a college of engineering program in an environment that applies shared governance as a convenience. At the Academic Affairs Spring Virtual Curricular Retreat, a report on a breakout session promoted the humanities as representing an essential part of developing bridges among the areas of studies. I wonder what benefits we could realize, encouraging a vision of the humanities as course of this study that represent ends of themselves rather than as supports for those designated to fulfill jobs. This is not a process that derives from financial incentives but through deliberate policy vision. A stronger effort to invest in the preparation of students who think more critically about sociological and philosophical issues that undergird the values that guide our social decisions. I wonder what engineers could arise from a program that emphasizes integrity of values as well as designing and building efficiency. I would presume to anticipate a criticism from many of you that my criticism of this College of Engineering program represents an act of hypocrisy, and I would concur with that assessment. I am a hypocrite. I criticize a proposal rooted in love of money and status at the expense of a community founded in mutual respect based on trust, and I am too guilty of that failing. Several years ago, David Oxendine published an article in the journal *Issues in Social Science* that related to the issue of moral hypocrisy. He concluded self-interest in and of itself is not evil, but left without restraint may lead individuals and societies to a greater morally corrupt world. I perceive shared governance as a process of mutual restraint and accountability that guards against hypocrisy. It is human nature to be hypocritical. Our challenge is to acknowledge our individual and collective hypocrisies that we can build a committee founded on truth and mutual restraint. A question I would ask is whether we have the compassion to apply the restraint needed to practice shared governance that is genuine. I perceive a path for doing so as in our acknowledgement of hypocrisy in ourselves and working to self-improvement, both as individuals and as an institution. A former mentor of mine likes to say that we do things faster by doing things slower. And I would invite my fellow senators to consider the extent to which this pursuit of an engineering program represents a policy for the good of the institution at this time. Senator Dietz is very fond of saying that the biggest room in

the house is the room for improvement. And I believe that much in the area of shared governance needs to improve in this University before approving a new college. To adopt Robert F. Kennedy's speech after the killing of Martin Luther King, what we need at Illinois State is not division, but we need love and wisdom and compassion towards one another and a feeling of justice towards those who still suffer. Respecting principles of shared governance represents an essential element of such conditions. Our graduate students are not valued from disrespectful negotiation. A community feels appreciated when it's engaged in an open presidential search, faculty experience, academics, and scholarly freedom in the absence of technological monitoring. Sometime ago, President Dietz honored me by telling me the story of the courtship with his lovely wife. What struck me about his account was when he chuckled and told me that he made the decision "to grow up and propose." I perceive a loving relationship as rooted in sacrifice of one's self for the other. As I am certain those of you with spouses or partners realize, it may be giving up something significant so that the other party may flourish. Love is not a process of self-promotion. A lasting unity results from dialogue rooted in humility, not manipulation, intimidation, and conformance. I have great appreciation for engineers, their knowledge of technology processes, and their efforts to improve our lives. I value engineers and am grateful for their contributions to our society. The preparation of future engineers represents a laudable goal to pursue. Before we approve this program, however, I would suggest that we focus on improving the process of decision making that guides the University. Let us not be hurried into a major investment into a new college. There is no need to rush. By taking time to ensure the existence of a sound system of shared governance rooted in good faith, integrity and trust, we create a system of integrity that would attract a unique pool of engineering faculty and students to reinforce the social values that ISU promotes. Such an investment would offer lasting returns. Thank you very much.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Do we have further debate?

Senator Walsh: Thank you. Sorry, I was having a little issue right there. First of all, thank you for your time and the thoughts that were brought to the Senator floor tonight from everyone who spoke. I, myself, find the College of Engineering to be a sound initiative for the future, a work to be of benefit to the student, to the future students at ISU and ISU as a whole. However, I must reiterate what many of my colleagues have stated – that the current effort from the University has not been proven to be enough to make it seen that the genuine effort from the University has been made in order to aid the Graduate Workers Union who currently haven't had many of their current proposals to the University heard or understood. For these points, while I do hope to see the College of Engineering in the future and believe in the benefits it will most definitely provide, I must abstain in today's vote.

Senate Chair Kalter: Great. Any further debate? All right. I will just state I am going to vote yes on this proposal. I'm on record in January about our graduate teaching assistants. I don't think I need to restate what I've already stated very strongly in that meeting. We do already have a financial model and a curricular model that has been approved by this Senate. This vote regards whether we're going to build a college or have a college to house that curricular model, and the alternatives are a program or a department. The model, as presented, is going to bring additional revenue to ISU and also prevent revenue loss. So I want to first thank Senator Stephens and Senator Tarhule for the extra meeting they had with myself, Senator Marx, and

Senator Avogo, going through the numbers very conscientiously and the way that have done that for over a year. It's too bad, actually, that most of this debate has really not been on topic, and were I different Senate Chair in the past, who I happen to know, I probably would have been cutting everybody off because it was not on topic of the question of whether to build a college for the things that have already been approved. I think it is an incorrect statement to say that the claims that are being made in the proposals have not been supported by evidence. I would invite everybody to re-read those very carefully as I have done over the last probably two, maybe three, years. I've studied these proposals at great length, to the point where the administrators are pulling their hair out because I asked too many questions. I think I had 34 questions or something as we went into the Friday meeting a couple of weeks ago. Senator Crothers, who is the former Chair of the Senate, once said something that was echoed here: To support the administration when they do good, and when they don't, to speak out about it. In my opinion, the work of the administrators and the faculty on the many committees, the many task force work groups, that have built this proposal for engineering have done good. They have listened. They have taken the recommendations of the open forums that we asked for in the fall, that I attended, that I watched both of, even though I couldn't make the second one... They have done good, and for that reason I am going to vote in favor of building the College of Engineering that will make the already approved curriculum for this program, these two programs... It will make it recognizable and valid throughout the country and throughout the world, and it will give them room to grow, as Dr. Tarhule stated a couple of weeks ago, not having to disentangle the program from another college or set of colleges or a split kind of model. It will give them room to grow just as we would like, for example, for our College of Nursing to grow and for other programs to grow. I'll also put on record what Senator Horst said. I have been advocating for several years with our Provosts that we build some metrics that help us to understand when we should have a department or a school that is new that we should be creating anew or a college, and so I want to stand with Senator Horst on that point regarding the Creative Technologies program. It has booming enrollment. It is growing. It has a unique faculty that ought to be able to judge one another. And I think it's about time that we have metrics to that effect. So I will just stop there. And if we have no other debate, we will go to the vote. All right. Senator Horst, go for it.

Senator Horst: We're doing just the college and then the...

Senate Chair Kalter: Yes, the college one is first. Yes.

The motion to create a College of Engineering failed by a vote of 22-18 with 11 abstentions.

Senate Chair Kalter: Okay. Let's see. We will go then to the motion to approve the building and site plan and the overall capital plan. Do we have a motion to approve this? I'm sorry. I think... Have we moved those off...? I'm sorry. I skipped ahead. Do we have a motion to move the building and site plan and the overall capital plan from information to action?

Senator Horst: I thought we did those together, Susan. I thought we did that motion with both of them together?

Senate Chair Kalter: I think we did the information parts together, but we have not moved them off the... Right?

Motion by Senator Marx, seconded by Senator Jones, to move the proposed building and site plan and overall capital plan from information to action.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Do we have debate about whether to move it to action? All right. Seeing no debate, we will go back to the vote. This is about whether to move the site plan from information to action.

Senator Horst: This is just to move it to an action item?

Senate Chair Kalter: Yes, that's correct.

The motion was approved by a vote of 51-0 with no abstentions.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Now we will need a motion to approve the building and site plan and overall capital plan.

Motion by Senator Rottinghaus, seconded by Senator Marx, to approve the building and site plan and overall capital plan.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Do we have debate over whether to approve those?

Senator Miller: I just want to echo what we all said before in the previous vote. Vote no in solidarity with the GWU, short and sweet. Thank you, guys.

Senate Chair Kalter: Do we have further debate? Senator Blum, is that debate or an unwieldy microphone? Okay. All right. Seeing no debate, Senator Horst, if you can move us to that vote, also?

The motion to approve the building and site plan and overall capital plan failed by a vote of 22-17 with 12 abstentions.

Chairperson's Remarks

Senate Chair Kalter: So we move on to the next part of our agenda, which is Chairperson's Remarks. I'm going to defer my remarks until the discussion under Administrator Remarks. So we'll go to Senator Harris for Student Body President Remarks.

Student Body President's Remarks

Senator Harris: Thank you. I just want to applaud my fellow student senators for speaking so eloquently today in support of our graduate students in encouraging ISU to do the work that they need to do to support our students in the way they need to be supported. Like many others, I do look forward to one day seeing a College of Engineering on campus, but to not belabor the point, I will just say that there is so much work to be done before we can get there. Many of the students that you heard speak today, I'm very elated to see them continue to do their advocacy

work for the next school year through our elections, which will be happening April 13-14. Though our elections have not officially happened yet, I am confident that many of the people that you heard speak today will continue to do great things in the following school year to support all students. And the last thing that I have is that SGA has adopted a land acknowledgment, which will be announced by our President of the Assembly before we begin all of our general assemblies going forward, and this acknowledgment was adopted from the McLean County History Museum, and this was brought forward to us by our student representative who felt that this was a positive step for us to take to truly be progressing as an assembly and, you know, keeping with current times. And that is all for me.

Senate Chair Kalter: Thank you, Senator Harris. As the Director of the Native American Studies Program and a member of a Native American Student Support Group, I am going to ask that that land acknowledgment, which we are very grateful for, be run through the Student Support Group. We are very concerned that land acknowledgements be looked at by people who are either Native American or experts in the field of Native American Studies so that they are consistent with the ethics that we are trying to promote on campus to keep this campus safe and welcoming for our Native American students. Yeah, if you can send that to me, I will send it to the group, and we can invite you, or whoever wrote, the statement to one of our meetings if we, you know, want to discuss the points in it and sort of have a dialogue about it. That would be wonderful. So thank you for that.

Administrators' Remarks

Senate Chair Kalter: So we're going to go with Administrator Remarks unless there are other questions for either one of us. Okay. So I'm going to first be asking all the administrators just to make their remarks, and then I'm going to be asking for questions regarding any issue except for things like vaccinations, fall planning, fall scheduling and space – the ones that most of you e-mailed to us before the meeting. And then we'll have our planned discussion regarding those things and any questions about those.

So we're going to begin with President Dietz for President's Remarks.

- ***President Larry Dietz***

President Dietz: Thank you very much, Senator Kalter. I have three topics. Two I'll discuss briefly and a third in a little bit more depth. The first one is on on-campus vaccination clinics. As many of you are probably aware, higher education faculty and staff among other groups became eligible for the COVID-19 vaccine beginning Monday, March 22nd. This announcement comes a day after the Governor announced that anyone 16 and older will become eligible for the COVID-19 vaccine on Monday, April 12th. I'm grateful for the hard work of the Public University Presidents and Chancellors Group and the Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges and Universities to make up the lobby group for private colleges and universities who have advocated for higher education workers to be included in the Illinois Department of Public Health Vaccine Distribution plan for the last several months and has finally come to fruition. Campus vaccination clinics will continue at this time, at this time scheduled once a week on Thursdays and staffed by the Illinois National Guard in collaboration with the McLean County Health Department. It's important to note that the registration length for the on-campus vaccination clinics can only be made available after the McLean County Health Department

provides the registration link to the University. The University community will be made aware of the link as soon as possible once it is provided to us. More information about on-campus vaccination clinics can be found at the coronavirus website at www.coronavirus.illinoisstate.edu in the weekly COVID update.

Second topic, ISU's commitment to good-faith negotiations with SEIU Local 73. The University respects that the graduate teaching assistants and elected SEIU Local 73 is their legal representative. As is typical in any relationship between the union and its employer, the formal communication channel to discuss topics during the collective bargaining process is through structured meetings between the designated negotiators of each party. The University believes such matters are most appropriately handled through that process at the negotiating table. The parties are currently meeting with the continued assistance of an independent mediator from the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service in an effort to reach a fiscally responsible agreement that balances the interests of the graduate teaching assistants with those of the University. In addition, prior to the negotiation session on March 18, the University formally documented the verbal counterproposals that ISU had offered at the conclusion of the March 3rd mediation session as well as further movement on two proposals that were discussed with SEIU in followup meetings since March 3rd. At this time, we are awaiting a response from the union on these counterproposals. As has been stated previously, due to the mediator's travel schedule and shared availability for all parties, the next negotiating session with the mediator has been scheduled for April 12th. I want to stress that the University remains committed to ongoing good-faith negotiations and continues to believe that there is progress to be made. Please visit the SEIU Negotiations website at www.seiunegotiations.ilstu.edu for the most up-to-date information about the status of our ongoing negotiations.

And the last general topic is response to questions about fall 2021 from Academic Senate. I'm going to handle a few of these, and then I think Provost Tarhule is also going to handle some of the questions that came up. Senator Kalter shared with me questions that she received from faculty and students about plans for the fall. In the interest of time, I've categorized the questions and will respond in general terms. I will begin by saying that the information on COVID-19 continues to change rapidly. We are constantly reassessing our planning decisions and making modifications as new data and information emerges. Within the last week, higher education employees were added to the group of persons eligible to receive the COVID-19 vaccination in Illinois, and Governor Pritzker announced a Bridge to Phase 5. These strides continue to show progression toward achieving a return to a more traditional fall semester at Illinois State University this fall. Our planning processes are focused on envisioning what the fall semester will look like, based upon information from public health and governmental agencies and what we know about operating the University under various conditions. We see the fall of 2021 as somewhat of a transition semester between what we have experienced the past year and a return to a semester that looks fall of '19. At this time, indications at the State of Illinois might move to Phase 5, an open phase, and Restore Illinois as early as sometime in May. As a University, we need to be prepared for a fall semester that reflects being in Phase 5. I understand it's difficult right now to think about living in Phase 5, but we cannot base our plans on where we are today or where we were last fall. If the predictions hold true for a fall semester that begins in Phase 5, we will be prepared to welcome our students to in-person classes and activities and provide the on-campus experience that has been the hallmark of the University. Meanwhile, we continue to

work on alternative plans should the situation change and Phase 5 not be reached by the fall. If there is one lesson we've learned over the last year is that we need to be prepared to pivot. We know how to operate under Phases 3 and 4, and we continue to plan should we find that Illinois remains on the Bridge to Phase 5 longer than expected. All of our plans prioritize the health and safety of the campus community and reflect the COVID-19 conditions at the time.

The questions that were submitted revolve around three key issues: health and safety, class modality, and a return to working on campus. Let me address health and safety first. The facial covering requirement... At this time we foresee that face coverings will be required for employees, students, and visitors in accordance with the Illinois Department of Public Health guidance, CDC guidance, and other requirements. Face coverings will be required in classrooms, all common indoor areas, hallways, restrooms, break rooms, dining facilities, retail establishments, elevators, etc., and outdoors when physical distancing cannot be maintained.

Second part: vaccination requirements. Vaccination requirements for K-12 schools and institutions of higher education are established by the Illinois Department of Public Health. Right along with my President and Chancellor colleagues across the State are calling on the IDPH to make COVID-19 vaccinations required for attendance at colleges and universities in the fall, but we've not heard back on that yet. I understand that some of you are concerned that COVID-19 vaccines may not be effective. I'm not a physician or a public health expert and rely on the information from those who are experts, but from what I understand, guidance from the CDC updated March 13, 2021 states "All COVID-19 vaccines available in the United State are effective at preventing COVID-19."

Issue about physical distancing. The study by researchers at Indiana University found no evidence of increased COVID-19 risk with classes taught in person. According to one of the researchers, "The more in-person credit hours a student had, the less likely they were to test positive for COVID-19." At this time we do not know what the physical distancing requirements may be in the fall. We anticipate that Illinois will be in Phase 5 by the fall, which does not require physical distancing. Recently, the Illinois Department of Public Health revised its requirement for physical distancing in K-12 schools from six feet to three feet. This change went into effect on March 9th. The Illinois Board of Higher Education is working with Illinois Department of Public Health on revised guidance for physical distancing in higher education settings. However, given recent changes and vaccine eligibility and projections regarding State vaccination rates by fall, physical distancing may no longer be required and is not currently required in Phase 5. The University is working on a plan should it be necessary to have three-foot physical distancing in classrooms in the fall.

Two other topics under this general heading: facility cleaning. Regardless of which plan is implemented in the fall, we anticipate that enhanced cleaning of high-traffic spaces and restrooms will continue and that hand sanitizer and antibacterial wipes will remain widely available, including in classrooms. And the last point under this general area is air circulation. The University will continue increased air flow in campus facilities and maintain hospital-grade air filters where possible.

The second general topic was return to on-campus work. As we look forward to a more traditional campus experience for the 2021 and 2022 academic year that includes face-to-face courses and in-person activities, the University is also planning a return to on-campus work beginning this summer. The working group made up of representatives from all four vice presidential areas and shared governance groups is developing an updated work-from-home policy for staff. We anticipate that policy will be finalized by the end of April, giving staff and supervisors sufficient time to address any concerns regarding a return to work. Temporary work-from-home agreements for staff that have been in place in various iterations since the start of the pandemic expire on before June 30th. The process, however, is being developed to review requests for special consideration to extend the work-from-home agreement. The process and reasons for consideration to extend the work-from-home agreement will be announced along with updated work-from-home policy when it's available. That ends my remarks, but I know that Provost Tarhule can also respond to some of these questions, so I would end there unless there are questions I may ask him to pick that up.

- ***Provost Aondover Tarhule***

Senator Tarhule: Thank you so much, Chairperson Kalter. I'll begin with traditional remarks, and I'll begin on a positive note. I'm delighted to report that Diane Zosky will continue as interim Dean of the College of Art and Sciences through June of 2022. Later this year in the fall, we will initiate the search process for a permanent Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. This second one... Chairperson Kalter, you may have to help me here. It's really, I think, a request for an endorsement from the Academic Senate to allow us to continue with the test optional policy for maybe one year or maybe two years. So Admission has done a really good job of moving for a holistic review process. We feel very good about the process that we have established moving forward. The admitted student high school GPA has increased from 3.5 to 3.6. Because of moving the test option, we believe that there are significant benefits to moving in this direction in the future, but we also believe we do not have enough data to make this decision just yet. We need to analyze the differences in retention for students with and without test scores. We will not have that kind of data for at least one to two years. In addition, the University of Illinois has already announced that they will extend test optional for another two years. Many of the other public four-year institutions in Illinois and in the Big 10 have also made this decision as well. Of top of this, we know that students are still having a hard time with accessing these exams, and the high school guidance counselors are in favor of test optional procedures now and moving into the future. So we would really like, unfortunately, for lack of time, we would like some kind of endorsement to continue the process and maybe at future time to select a more fully official vote on that problem.

The third announcement is one I made before, which is a workshop that we'll be having this Friday. It's organized by EAB, titled *Future Visioning*. This will take place, as I said, on March 26. That's a Friday from 9 a.m. to 12 p.m. Due to its structure and design, the workshop is by invitation. The goal is to help administrators and decision makers to focus on aspirations and future trends in their management, and it is an excellent complement to our retreat that we had.

I would like to make a quick comment about the engineering vote. I'm really... Even though it failed, I'm really encouraged by the many comments I had from many of the contributors. It seems to me that the vote was not really against the program per se but in response to the

situation with the graduate students. So I feel encouraged by the validation that support for the Steering Committee has put forward, mainly that the program would benefit the students of Illinois. It would bolster enrollment at ISU, potentially help us to avoid an enrollment crash, contribute to workforce development which we know is sorely needed, and contribute to the long-term financial viability of the University. So it's unfortunate that enough votes were not received tonight's Academic Senate meeting in regards to the creation of the College of Engineering and approval of space needs, building, and site plans, especially since the Senate previously voted in favor of both the financial and curriculum at the March 3rd meeting. As I said before, I think the creation of any college at a university is a once-in-a-generation opportunity. If we look at ISU over the last 50 years, we've created only two colleges: College of Business and the Mennonite College. So two colleges over 50 years. That's two generations. We have a great opportunity to be part of a historic moment by creating another college, so I look forward to the opportunity to continue to seek the support from the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees to move this program forward, perhaps after the case of the graduate students has been resolved.

I'll now briefly address some of the questions that were sent to us by Chairperson Susan Kalter. I'd like to offer the following as clarification in some cases. The first has to do with the mode of instruction. As President Dietz said, we expect the percentage of in-person class offerings for fall of 2021 to be much closer to that of fall of 2019. Classroom requirements... President Dietz mentioned this as well, but I will just add a few comments to it. We anticipate that physical distancing requirements will be lifted by fall; that's our planning assumption. Therefore, class enrollment should be set at pre-COVID class enrollment maximums. Contingency plans, in the event that three-foot distancing will be required in classrooms, have been developed by the departments here since school directives. Therefore, the same guidelines from IDPH to continue to maintain the six-foot social distancing in the fall, and most classes will resort to online instruction or hybrid instruction. On the question of large classes, we believe that large classes... I'm stating that large classes of more than 100 students can be offered in person. In a previous communication, I originally indicated the possibility that classes with 100 or more students would be done online in the fall. This has been revised. So I'd like to repeat that this has been revised, as we received positive information and vaccine availability in a Bridge to Phase 5 in the past few weeks. We will continue to work with our floor planning team, which includes faculty and staff from our shared governance groups to prepare for the fall. So I believe that captures most of the other comments, the questions that we asked to submit. If there are any that I have omitted, I'm happy to address those further. Thank you.

Senate Chair Kalter: Thank you. And before I move to Senator Johnson, I just want to follow up on your request for help regarding the ACT/SAT issue. First of all, before I forget, over the weekend, I heard a very interesting segment on NPR, sort of an in-depth reporting about this issue around the country that we might want to sort of study. Secondly, so in the summer we had a retroactive vote regarding the same issue after finding out that the administration had moved forward on it during the summer or maybe during the spring, so we actually have on the agenda for next Executive Committee meeting to put that on the agenda for the following Senate meeting on April 7 to have an approval vote up and down regarding extending that. And then the only other thing I'll say about that is that we are trying to get advice from our departments and programs. So currently I have heard back from 16 departments or more with

recommendations that are going to go to their college curriculum committees about the permanent arrangement, eleven departments that are nearing recommendation, and six so far haven't responded. I'm not going to be previewing what those responses are, because there does need to be a lot of dialogue back and forth always about an issue like this that's very complex, and the College Curriculum Committees are going to also weigh in and the UCC, and then the Senate, and usually those consultations with people like Jana Albrecht, Jeff Mavros, who is our Admissions Director, would happen at that University level stage, although some of the departments have contacted Mr. Mavros for data, and so that's sort of a continuing conversation there.

- ***Vice President of Student Affairs Levester Johnson***

Senator Johnson: Great. Okay. First announcement that I have is in regards to the ISU PD assessment that's taking place. Our goal is, Healy, a nationally recognized campus safety and security consultant firm of leading a comprehensive external assessment of our Illinois State University Police Department. Through this assessment, we hope to identify ways to enhance campus safety, further our commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion, and improve upon the Department's strategy and practices. We have been conducting sessions with faculty, staff, and students, and I want to make you aware of two remaining student focus groups. They will be on March 25 and March 31, both at 4 p.m. You can access the sessions and those focus group opportunities via links, either by going to the ISU PD website and/or we've been partnering with entities like SGA. They put out some wonderful social media, and they've been helping promote the session. And if you go to their Insta account, they've got the link posted at their site and their bio. So I encourage you all to try to get students out to attend those sessions. We've, I believe, had about maybe four or five other student sessions already, so they have student input in these last couple of sessions.

The second item that I would like to talk about, just quickly, is, yes, we are still having Homecoming. So I want to make sure people have that from their book. We're still going to celebrate this, even though it's going to be mostly virtual. But mark the calendar for April 5-11 for us to celebrate Homecoming and our alumni and our students and our campus community. All right? So I encourage you all to go to the University website to find about all the wonderful opportunities we have for celebrating homecoming. And that's about all I have.

- ***Vice President of Finance and Planning Dan Stephens***

Senator Stephens: The only thing I want to bring up this evening is a brief announcement about the possibility of some much-needed capital funding by the State for certain deferred maintenance repairs to our academic facilities on campus. In a State-wide CFO conference call with IBHE today, there was some positive news mentioned by IBHE staff that the governor's office was getting ready to release some capital funds to all of the public universities across the State. The final amount to each school is not available yet, but we should be hearing something very soon. These funds are part of the governor's Six-Year Rebuild Illinois capital plan that was announced just after Governor Pritzker took office. ISU's capital renewal funds are listed at approximately \$40,000,000 in that six-year plan. This funding release to ISU will be a portion of that capital renewal. Please watch the news over the next several days for a public announcement from the governor's office. We're very thankful to Governor Pritzker for his

continued commitment to fund higher education. That's all I have for this evening, and I'll be happy to answer any questions.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Sounds good. So if you remember, I said first everybody that we're going to go to questions that have anything to do with anything else but the pandemic and sort of fall planning issues. I just want to mark that I did see Senator Otto raise her hand, and I do have you on the agenda for those issues. Do you have a question for something other than those?

Senator Otto: Yes, I do. I have a question for President Dietz. In a public comment tonight, we heard some, what I thought was really disturbing stories of some of the language that's being used by ISU mediators against graduate student workers with the Graduate Workers Union during bargaining. And I would like for you to talk to us about how you're going to address that.

President Dietz: I'm obviously not in any of those meetings, so I really can't address that. I've talked with our negotiator on occasion, and I really can't address what's happening in those meetings because I'm not in the meetings.

Senator Otto: Well, if these stories are true, the language that is being used is completely unacceptable, and it needs to be remedied. It needs to be addressed and remedied.

(Pause)

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. So I'm just going to mark that, Senator Dietz. I don't know if you are able to answer that, but it seems that what Senator Otto is asking is a question about personnel and the Code of Ethics among our negotiating teams with our employees. So I'll just mark that, and we'll go to Senator Samuel.

Senator Samuel: I have a question for President Dietz. You mentioned the vaccine eligibility expanding to higher education staff, and my question is why wasn't all higher education staff notified of this. I work for the University. I work 28 hours a week, and I was not notified by the University of this change.

President Dietz: My understanding is that that is our website. It's a relatively recent announcement. But my understanding is that that is on the website that I mentioned earlier.

Senator Samuel: It wasn't in Friday's e-mail. I know that professors got an e-mail about it, but there hasn't been a separate e-mail sent to students who are also higher education staff, and I think that's something that was overlooked that should be remedied in the future. We are also workers for the school. We're also eligible, and we should be told at the same time as professors.

Senator Dietz: I think the inclusion was for faculty and staff.

Senator Samuel: But I am staff.

Senator Dietz: Well, I misunderstood that. I thought you said it's only about students.

Senator Samuel: I am staff, and I am a student. I am both.

Senator Dietz: Okay.

Senator Samuel: I attend full time, and I work 28 hours for the University.

Senator Dietz: Yeah, I'm sorry. My understanding is that that was on the website, but I'm hearing from you that it wasn't, and so I'll follow up on that.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Thank you, and I'll mark that one, also, because we also have on the agenda, by the way, the Mass Communication, going into a Mass Email, policy. This may be an issue where we need to improve our communication. Because we do have quite a large number of graduate student workers who are instructors and also other types of student workers, we may want to develop listservs that allow us to communicate those types of employment issues to everybody and not assume that going just to the faculty and staff listservs that are currently set up is adequate, especially during this kind of a pandemic. All right. So thank you, Senator Samuel.

I have one question for Senator Stephens. I'm not sure whether you have had a chance, but a couple of meetings ago I think I asked if there is any point in our material reality at which a deficit in the non-academic side of the house would ever lead to threatening the vitality of the academic mission itself, and I'm wondering if you've had a chance to think about that one. We gave you some time to think about it. If you haven't, you can just say so, and we'll give you more, and I'll ask you again at the next meeting.

Senator Stephens: Actually I appreciate that. I appreciate moving that conversation to the next meeting. It's rather complex, and so I think I could do a much more thorough explanation at the next meeting.

- ***Discussion on scheduling and space for fall***
 - 03.09.21.05 From Brian Rejack: Provost policy on MW vs. MWF class scheduling***
 - 03.10.21.01 From Provost Tarhule: Provost response MW courses to be converted to MWF courses***
 - 03.10.21.02 From Provost Tarhule: Provost email attachment Scheduling Category Table***

Senate Chair Kalter: Okay. Great. Thank you. So now we're going to move to our broader questions that include the scheduling and space for the fall, the vaccinations, the health and safety issues. We got a number of answers. I just will say I received questions from five individuals in my own department, Senators Avogo, Hollywood, Nahm, Garrahy, and Otto and also from a department chair. I'm just going to go around to those individuals and ask first Senator Otto... I'm sorry, not Senator Otto but Senator Avogo... if you have had your two excellent questions answered, because I'm hearing those two questions myself.

Senator Avogo: Yeah, I listened to the Provost. I don't think I have those questions addressed. So the question had to do with are we going to have accommodations for students who, for whatever reason that they may have, are not able to show up for a face-to-face class: They

refuse to be vaccinated, they are concerned about social distancing guidelines, and things like that. So are we going to be required to have faculty to have to do all arrangements where those students can participate in face-to-face class while the instructor is in class?

Senator Tarhule: Now we are guided by State guidelines. Phase 5 says that everything is open, and we fully expect that anybody who wants a vaccination will be able to get it at that point. And so we're not going to require faculty to have a dual mode of teaching for people, who for personal preferences, choose to not get the vaccination or to attend class.

Senator Avogo: Thank you.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Thank you. Is that all your questions, Senator Avogo?

Senator Avogo: Yes, please.

Senate Chair Kalter: Wonderful. Senator Hollywood, you also had questions. Have you had all of your questions answered?

Senator Hollywood: No. There were a few that weren't. So the ones that I wanted to have answered were for those who do get the vaccination, is some kind of proof of vaccination going to be required or proof of a negative COVID test? And then will departments be able to make up their own rules about how classes meet, because I've been hearing from non-tenure tracks across campus that there are some departments that are putting out their own directions that sometimes do and sometimes don't match up with the overarching University directives?

President Dietz: I guess I would be concerned that we have a lot of departmental practices coming forward simply because we want to make sure that we're in compliance with the Illinois Department of Public Health and we're not violating any rules unknowingly that they might have for us or that we're not violating any confidentiality of the students that are in the classes. But I would hope that we would come up with an overall University plan that individuals would be comfortable with. Provost Tarhule, I don't know if you want to weigh in on this as well.

Senator Tarhule: I think you have said it, President Dietz. I think we've got to remember what Phase 5 is. It's a little bit tricky to do because we're in a different phase now, and we're trying to imagine what 5 will be. But basically Phase 5 says – no restrictions. If you look at the bridge guidelines that came up. No restrictions. So everything is allowed. The only thing we think that will may still be required is face coverings. Therefore, the way to think about this is think about fall of 2021 in the way that fall of 2019 was. So whatever we did in fall of 2019 is what we expect to be doing in fall of 2021. Having said that, as President Dietz said, we expect that the fall will still be a little bit of a transition, and so there may be some slight variations, but you want to look at fall of 2021 the way that things are going to should be worked. So I don't know if that answers your question, but I think it's really the best example I can give now. And your first question was requiring vaccines. So that's a really Legal versus HR issue. My understanding is if the State does not say that it's required, we are legally not able to require it or ask for proof of it. So we're going to have to be guided, but maybe we can seek clarification from legal counsel. But what I understand is it's really what the State says that we have to do, so

we don't have much choice in that matter. So we'll wait for whatever the State tell us to do in that regard.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. So I just want to let everybody know I had Senator Garrahy, Senator Otto, Senator Nikolaou in order to enunciate Senator Nahm's questions if those were not answered, myself, and then we'll go after that to Senator Horst. So Senator Garrahy, did you have all of your questions answered?

Senator Garrahy: Yes, I did. Thank you very much.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Thank you. Senator Otto.

Senator Otto: No, I haven't. Our faculty's question is, because there may be a larger number of faculty that need to apply for accommodation through the ADA process, what are you recommending for the timetable for folks to get in their materials in order to be, you know, ready for fall? To be accommodated, I mean.

Senator Dietz: That's a good question. I don't know the timeline, so I'll just have to get back with you. That's a great question. I don't know that we've... I certainly haven't discussed that with our accommodation folks. Maybe some of our work groups are addressing that, but I'll write that down, Senator Otto. It's a good question.

Senator Otto: Thank you.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Thank you. I'm going to go to Senator Nikolaou in case Senator Nahm's questions have not been answered.

Senator Nikolaou: I believe they have been answered, both of them.

Senate Chair Kalter: Okay. Wonderful. Thank you. And I'm going to go to myself, actually, because I had two that I don't think were addressed or at least that I had set up earlier today to make sure to ask, and I don't think I've heard answers. So Dr. Lisy Seloni wrote this. "In addition to the 'will the vaccine be required' question, I would love to know if faculty who live with non-adults who won't be vaccinated by this fall will be given a modality choice." And I would actually personally add staff into that, because I know that there a number of advisors, a number of other people who have children who may not be vaccinated by this fall and may need to have some work from home kinds of accommodations. She says "I don't know how seriously this will be taken, but I'm concerned about the fact that children won't be vaccinated until early 2022. Emerging evidence suggests children significantly prevent spread of the virus and they will be the next susceptible host for the virus after many adults are vaccinated." She's reading stuff that says it's hard to reach herd immunity before children are also vaccinated. Would like the administration to take this into consideration for fall planning.

President Dietz: I read some data today about the positivity rates of very young children. It was only about 1 or 2% positivity rates. And so I think, you know, the concern about young children is one of the reasons that they have reduced the six-foot distancing thing to three feet, overall. I

don't know. I think that's something we're just going to have to see how the next month or so goes. I don't have a good answer to that. I would think that there are really two issues that you brought up. One is about staff and, you know, potential work-from-home agreements. They're working on some of what I hope will be a little bit more hospitable language in that to allow folks that have been working from home to potentially continue to do that if, in fact, the supervisor agrees with all of that. The modality issue about faculty teaching from home or teaching online – I'm going to really turn this over to Provost Tarhule to have him weigh in on that. But the young children issue, to me from a research point of view, is a very low positivity rate of those individuals, so I'm a little less concerned about that than I am with some of the older individuals in that same household if you will.

Senate Chair Kalter: Before Dr. Tarhule speaks, I just want to say, I respect you a lot, Larry, but I really am disappointed in that response because it seems to minimize the concerns of parents about their own children, and I really do hope that there is flexibility and understanding as we move out, that just because we go back into Phase 5 that not everybody is going to be in the same situation and that not everything is accommodated through OEOA. There are many, many instances that I brought up in my one-on-one with you on Friday where there may be people who are in situations where they're concerned about transmitting the virus to their own children. Perhaps, for example, if somebody who has allergies themselves and cannot get the vaccine and they are worried about transmitting it to their own child, that's just one instance. Or on to somebody else's child who they may live with but not be directly related to. So I do want to plead that we do have language, not just language but a spirit, in our HR, OEOA, Legal office and the Provost's Office that says, you know, that we need to do a shift on an easing back in rather than treating everybody in sort of an all or nothing type of way.

Provost Tarhule: Thank you, Chairperson Kalter. Let me make two general comments that I hope address the question. If they don't, I'm happy to come back and be more specific. One of the general comments is to say that since this pandemic began, I think ISU has shown great flexibility at the pivot in the face of data as it emerges. The problem we have now is nobody really knows what fall is. So what it is going to be exactly like, so we are working on the basis of assumptions in terms of what we think the best situation is likely to be. I say that to make the point that as we get closer and data becomes more available and trends become clearer, if there is the necessity to change from this plan as we have outlined it, we will change. We will pivot just as we have done many, many times in the past. So what we have now represents our best case guess for planning purposes about what we think fall should be like. We'll continue to monitor the situation very closely and be prepared to be flexible and to pivot in response to the data and the trends that we see.

The second general comment is that we have said we expect fall of 2021 to be in some ways a transition fall. It's going to be a transition, not just in the processes and how we get back to class, but in some way some kind of psychological shift as well. We have spent, what, a year, maybe 18 months on that point, telling everyone to stay away, be afraid of crowds, don't do this, and now we're thinking about fall as going back, come back to class. That's not going to be an automatic switch. People are going to have to get used to, in some ways, unlearn all of the messaging and some of the scare that we have put into everybody as a means of trying to control the pandemic. And so as we think about fall, looking forward, I know there are going to be two

complications. One is this idea of trying to unlearn and, two, it's the fact that we are actually imagining one state of situation while we're in another state. So I just implore everybody and encourage everyone to continue to be patient and understanding as you have been. We are making guesses to the best of our abilities. As data becomes clearer, we will be more taking into consideration the safety of everyone as we have done throughout the pandemic. I don't know if that addresses the question. If it doesn't, I'm happy to try a more specific response. But I thought that overarching framing really covers a lot of ground.

Senate Chair Kalter: Okay. Thank you. And I did appreciate my conversations with both of you. I think both of them were on Friday or maybe this Monday about that. And I think it's a continuing dialogue. I'll ask Dr. Susina's question. He actually made it as a statement that what the CDC is currently recommending and what ISU is planning are not the same. So my question there is whether those are going to align by the time we hit summer and by the time we hit fall.

President Dietz: I'm not exactly sure what he's referring to. I'd have to know a little more specific about that.

Senate Chair Kalter: I can go and look back at that a little bit more closely, and we'll move on then and have that answer at the next time, and we'll move to Senator Horst.

Senator Horst: Yes, this is just a comment to the Provost about the role of departments in setting guidelines for the classrooms. And I just want to note that the School of Music has a lot of unique demands because we have instruments where people blow air and people are singing, so I hope that there's still some flexibility on the department level about setting those guidelines.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. And Senator Mainieri.

Senator Mainieri: Yes. Thank you. I just want to follow up. My question came from hearing all the responses from President Dietz and Provost Tarhule this evening, and I want to follow up specifically on the phraseology, Provost Tarhule, that you just used about the psychologic shift that fall '21 will be, and I really appreciate that phrasing, because I feel like for me when we think about the fall, we've been focusing a lot on the passing of the physical threat of the virus when the mental health impacts of the collective trauma that our students, faculty and staff will have gone through this past year will remain for the foreseeable future. And so my question is how do we take that ideology that Provost Tarhule, I think you started to address there... How do we ensure or what steps are we taking to ensure that that acknowledgement of the mental health impact is baked into the policies for fall '21 so that it's very clear that the mental impact of the pandemic is not over and they need to be clearly considered and having clear avenues for students, faculty and staff to find outlets for those complications that will continue to take place?

President Dietz: I think you've articulated that very well, and I think that's what I was trying to get at in answering the question that Senator Kalter had in that particularly the work-from-home policy, temporary work-from-home assignments. As I've talked about, you know, coming up with more hospitable kind of language to listen to individual circumstances and what individuals need related to that and try to be not only empathetic but potentially provide some resources to help all of us. I don't really think that we... You know, we're not going to know about a lot of

the prevailing and lingering fear, if you will, that a lot of people have. As Provost Tarhule mentioned, it's not going to be just flip the switch and go back to fall of '19 mentally on this. I think we're just going to have to be very attuned and, frankly, very attuned with each other and be aware of campus community that needs to be sensitive and aware, in my estimation, of that. And as we find needs that are out there that we can help meet, we will do our best to do that. I don't know, Provost, if you have a more specific response.

Provost Tarhule: Yeah, just one. And thank you so much for the excellent comment and question, Senator Mainieri. Associate Provost Ani Yazedjian in my office, brought up to us in our Provost Staff meeting maybe two or three weeks ago, a really interesting proposal. He said assuming that we are in Phase 5 in the fall, how do we help departments and individuals get back together. Because with our people who stayed away for almost a year and in some cases more than a year, we have students who haven't met their faculty in person. Some of them will be going into year two that maybe haven't met a single faculty or staff member in person. And so she said what can we do to help departments who want to have events or programming that will get back together. And she had a proposal for some micro-grants where we give out micro-grants to departments to organize events to help people get back together. We haven't really acted on that proposal, not because we don't support it. Everybody thought it was a great idea. We just don't know the exact mechanisms yet, so we're continuing that discussion, but I'm happy to put it out here and invite all of you to think in your departments. Getting back together is not going to be automatic. We have learned to not shake hands. We've learned to not do high fives. When we get back together, maybe with masks on, it's going to be really strange, in some ways weird. And I think we have to be very intentional about helping people to get back together. So I just put that out there so that you know we're thinking about this. If you have an idea that can help us refine that proposal, I'd be very happy to find a way to develop it so that we can support the department and support you in your programming and your activities to bring your people back together. So that's one thing that I wanted to put out there. So in terms of the programming, I think this demonstrates the fact that we are really thinking about this, and Tracy you can be sure it shows up in the policies that we talk about, and we will continue to think about it to make sure that we really have to help people to get back together in a way that we know is helping, because these last 18 months have really been weird and strange.

President Dietz: I think most people on this Zoom know that every Wednesday I meet with the other presidents and chancellors at the other public universities, and I think this would be a great agenda item for that group next Wednesday, so I will see if other universities are thinking about this and what thoughts they might have, or at least we can think about it together. Thank you for the question.

Senate Chair Kalter: Before I go to the next three people, I want to say just a couple of things because we've hit our 9:30 usual hard stop time. I think this is a really important and good dialogue to have, and I actually think that we're going to have some dialogue about this at a lot of different meetings, but we also have a lot of work to get done, you know, by the end of this year. So a couple of things. I'm going to ask the committee chairs to send us their reports as usual. Obviously, we already knew at the Exec that we weren't going to get to any of our information or action items tonight. So those are going to get deferred until next time. I was going to make a comment about an issue that is related to all of this fall planning. I'm going to defer that to my

Chairperson's Remarks [next time]. I'm going to suggest right now that we can do one of two things. We can either formally adjourn but continue to talk through the next three questions and however many others come up. I'm personally willing to stay to do that. I don't know if our administrators can do that. So we can either adjourn formally and keep talking, or we can continue and just let people know that if they need to drop off, there is no need for a quorum anymore, so if anybody has, you know, a particular preference there, you know, you can articulate it. So in the absence of any strong thoughts about that, I'm going to go to Senator Samuel for the next remark.

Senator Samuel: One thing I haven't heard tonight but that was brought up previously was changing Monday, Wednesday classes to Monday, Wednesday, Friday classes. I do have several comments to share on it, but since it is so late I just want to know right now if that is still a discussion that's happening. And it's too long to read all the comments I've gotten on it. It's very negative to swapping to Monday, Wednesday, Friday both from the graduate students I represent and from the School of Theatre and Dance which I'm a part of when those conversations came up.

Senate Chair Kalter: I'll say, by the way, Senator Samuel that that's what my long comment is about, and that's why I'm deferring it.

Senator Samuel: I wouldn't mind deferring that as well, then, if that makes more sense time-wise.

Senator Tarhule: I'm happy to give you a short response, and we can take the longer version when you bring it up again. That came up because of first planning for the fall. I assumed this was before we had all of this news about vaccinations and the guidance from the State. So our planning frame at the time assumed that we were going to have to maintain some physical distance. And in that framework we were unable to provide as many in-person classes as we wanted to do. We have very small classrooms, and so each time you apply physical distancing, you lose space very quickly. So we were looking at different options of how we would be able to provide more in-person classes, and the idea of extending classes to Friday was one that would have allowed us to accommodate many more classes in person. We don't need to do that in this planning anymore, because the most current guidance in my communication that I just sent out says if we're in Phase 5, which we're expecting to be, then we're fully open, and so we're going to plan more or less in the same way that we planned in 2019, which was part to the present floor planning. This is not part of the plan anymore. I would say, however, that in my communication with chairs and directors, I'm encouraging them to continue to look at this issue long-term, because many departments are having space issues, and so if each day of classes on Mondays and Wednesdays and we have space issues, it makes it extremely difficult, if not impossible, for us to go to the Board to find money to do additional classes when we know that by extending the lectures to Friday will open a lot more space. So it's a space efficiency, it's a cost issue, it's a longer-term type conversation that we will be having, but at the present time we don't need to have it as part of the current planning process.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. And, Senator Blum, I have to apologize to you. You were actually next before Senator Samuel, and I just missed it somehow.

Senator Blum: Yeah, that's fine. I've got to say that I think of fall a little bit differently. There isn't a post-COVID world. COVID is here. Right? And fall, while it definitely may be looser in rules and transition, COVID is going to be here. Right? No one believes... There is no credible medical etiologist who thinks that COVID, by fall, is going to be gone. Right? So a lot depends... I'm sort of realizing that we can't require vaccines to be a State law. But not knowing how many people are immunized and having no proof of that could make a significant difference. We could have 70% of the University community vaccinated, and you have a class that could conceivably have 50%, just by the random draw, not vaccinated. COVID is going to be... There will be outbreaks. It is predictable that there will be outbreaks. Certainly hope that we will have nothing like we had last year. So I don't think any of that is going to change, and so I think that what will hopefully happen is that we'll have mitigated, through the vaccine, deaths and hospitalizations so significantly that... But I just don't think, certainly within 2021 and probably even beyond... I mean I just can't see a world anytime soon where we're not having some kind of concern about COVID. Now if we had very large, large numbers of the University community were, in fact, vaccinated, and as was pointed out earlier, children are just not six year olds. My son is 13, and he's practically adult in size. So he's as much as likely to spread the virus. It is well known adolescents can spread the virus. They just haven't really been in school. And then whenever... Currently schools are using masks and three feet was noted earlier, and they are slowly going back to four days. But I think this notion that.... You know, I don't know what the State will choose to do, but the reality is that no matter what as a University community, we are going to be dealing with COVID. COVID is not going away in the fall and possibly even longer. So there will be those types of realities. And I think that somewhere as we think about policy, as we think about protecting people, about the protecting the University community, about protecting students, that all has to be in consideration. So, anyway, I'll stop there.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. I'll just add to that since I also talked about the children that I think that anytime we lose a child, whether the odds were, you know, going in that direction or not, that we would, it's going to be a tragedy, and we want to do everything we can to protect our most vulnerable. So even though the odds may be low that children might die because they get it, that doesn't mean that we can't do the best that we can to make that that doesn't happen, or, as Senator Blum just said, that they might spread it to somebody who is vulnerable. Senator Swiech, you had your hand up a little while ago.

Senator Swiech: I'll just wait until next meeting.

Senate Chair Kalter: Okay. Anybody else want to go before we have a motion to adjourn?

Motion by Senator Pancrazio, seconded by Senator Lucy, to adjourn.

Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Nikolaou

[The Academic Affairs Committee met this evening and finalized its recommendation for the IDEAS graduation requirement. We also discussed 3-week courses during summer and winter terms.]

Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Senator Marx

[No report yet received or report not sent to acsenate]

Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Hollywood

[The FAC continued working on 1.8 Integrity IV. We completed IV.F.]

Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Avogo

[No report yet received or report not sent to acsenate]

Rules Committee: Senator Horst

[The Rules Committee met on March 24, 2021. We finalized the language on the Mass Electronic Mail Policy and Procedures. Anne Shelley, Chair of the Textbook Affordability Committee, was in attendance. We reviewed and finalized the Textbook Affordability Committee Appendix II charge. The Rules Committee reviewed research that Senator Nichols had completed on the Council on General Education. The group agreed to continue to review the CGE charge at their next meeting. Finally, Senator Horst briefed the group on work to be done at their final meeting on the external committee slate.]