

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

2-3-2021

Senate Meeting, February 3, 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, February 3, 2021" (2021). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 1278.

<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/1278>

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, February 3, 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.

Senator Kalter: 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 Participants function in Zoom or click on either the Yes or the No button if the Raise Hand is not available to you.

Please note that live transcription is now enabled. We apologize that the plan to enable it for the January meeting did not go off without a hitch. You may explore your live transcription controls along the bottom of your 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.

We're going to start tonight with public comment. The Academic Senate of Illinois State University welcomes constructive communications from members of the University community and the 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 comments and questions during a public meeting. An individual speaker will be permitted two minutes for their presentation. When a large number of persons wish 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 speakers' presentations, 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 comment, 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)

A reminder to our public commenters to please keep their presentations to two minutes. And we are starting the Dr. Fusun Akman from the department of Mathematics.

Public Comment:

Dr. Akman: Good evening. I am Fusun Akman, Professor of Mathematics. Tonight, I have shared governance on my mind.

First, I stand in solidarity with our financially distressed graduate teaching assistants. I hope ISU starts bargaining with them for livable wages in good faith.

Second, on Friday, ISU administered 300 Covid-19 vaccines. The notices were quietly emailed to an unknown group under an undisclosed plan, after which several ineligible people under 65 got their shots. Did they know somebody? Why wasn't the availability announced to all of us? Sadly, this is the kind of farce that we have come to expect.

In addition, we have a new variant of the virus that will overrun the country in a month or two. I quote the CDC report: *Increased transmissibility of the B.1.1.7 variant warrants universal and increased compliance with mitigation strategies, including distancing and masking.* What did the administration do for mitigation? Why, they just ordered the Milner Library to open.

So, I am asking the Senate to please forward my questions to the President: What are the exact *additional* (hidden) criteria (*not* 1A or 1B, etc.) being used for vaccine slots currently, and why are you not disclosing this information? Are you going to designate a person to work with the library staff who can't work in person yet or don't want to? Which agency is going to monitor masks and distancing? How are you factoring in the increased virus threat into your decision making, especially, into keeping Milner open and endangering our students?

Senator Horst: 30 seconds.

Dr. Akman: The Fall opening criteria of our campus is also a mystery. I find the pervasive disregard for students and instructors appalling. Recently we were asked what qualities we wanted in our new president. How about "100% commitment to open, shared governance."

In closing, many thanks to Chairperson Kalter and Provost Tarhule for their leadership in this vacuum. Thank you.

Mr. Rickerd: [My name is Trevor Rickerd. I am a 5th year PhD candidate in the school of biological sciences and a member of the ISU Graduate Workers Union.] Thank you. I'm timing myself and recognize I have two minutes, so I'll speak fast. I am here today to speak directly to Larry Dietz, and to have the Academic Senate as an audience to hear about the lies that Larry has been making about the Graduate Workers Union.

Larry, you sent out an email on January 28th regarding the status of negotiations with the Graduate Workers Union. It needs to be stated clearly and unequivocally that you blatantly lied, repeatedly, about the status of our negotiations with the university and the demands of the Union. First off, call us by our name, the Graduate Workers Union. I'll address you with yours. We are the Graduate Workers Union. We voted to form our Union in October 2018. We exist here in the campus community. We are workers in your departments performing the labor that produces the capital that this university accrues.

It needs to be pointed out that you lied about the Union's demand for meeting dates. You stated in your email "In March 2019, SEIU requested dates to commence negotiations. SEIU declined all of the dates proposed by ISU." [I have zero recollection of declining a single meeting date.] You also failed to mention that the university was unwilling to meet and turned down proposed dates by SEIU. You wanted later meeting dates. We wanted earlier meeting dates. Why would

we have voted to form a Union just to sit on our asses for a whole year [and let our team graduate and leave the university?], of course we wanted to leave with you. Don't make it sound like we didn't.

[Your characterization is just plain false. Regardless, you do state that "In October 2019, SEIU proposed dates and we began meeting that month" which I take to mean that you recognized that we were proposing meeting dates, but you didn't want to mention that your team was unwilling to meet.]

It needs to be stated that the Union asked for mediation three times beginning in October 2020, before we filed for mediation with the state without the University, which we could legally do since the number of days passed in our negotiations had crossed a legal threshold.

Senator Horst: 30 seconds.

Mr. Rickerd: Ahh. Screw it, I'm getting to the point. [The university stated that they believed it would be premature to ask for mediation when we were making such great progress, but what progress are you talking about? We literally have no concessions at all from the university so far. Nothing, neither non-economic nor directly economic. All The university succeeded in doing was stalling negotiations for an entire year, refusing to make any non-economic concessions, before we recognized the obtuse attitude of the university and decided that we needed to move onto new topics, as our discussions at that time were fruitless, continuing to endanger already endangered graduates in a pandemic. The university refused mediation up until they were legally forced to. Now we are asking for a second mediation date, and the university has until February 8th to accept the proposed date. If they don't, then the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Services will appoint a mediator for us and foot ISU with the bill. I hope you will accept our second proposed mediation date, and I hope that you have something to offer us when we get there.]

You know, it needs to be stated that at the negotiation table ISU's put forth an illegal proposal that would bar any worker from our union from condoning or supporting any form of strike or work stoppage, even legal ones [under the threat of punishment. This would reach beyond one's capacity as a TA, as the lead negotiator for the University, Mike Kruger, stated that even Facebook posts on an individual's profile would be subject to punishment under the terms of the article. This is an illegal article that infringes on the freedom of speech. Legal strikes are legal.] Even going as far as to bar people from making social media posts with impunity. You can't restrict a person's free speech and ask us to sit down and shut up, and act like we're not going to do anything. [You cannot restrict a person's freedom of speech to support a legal and just cause by firing them if you don't like their opinion. Mike Kruger stated that this is language that is standard and exists in the contracts with other Unions on campus. However, when we spoke to Union leaders from the AFSCME Unions on campus, they stated that they had no idea what we were talking about and that they would never agree to anything like that, as it would not be legal and it would invalidate the entire contract. Our Union subsequently filed an unfair labor practice charge with the state's labor relations board. The proposal by ISU is illegal and we will not willfully throw our rights away just because you demand that we sit down and shut up.]

It needs to be said that the university is refusing to provide discrimination protections for international workers on the basis of citizenship status and immigration status. We are asking for that. Do it. [This is the official position of the university at the negotiating table. The Union is demanding expanded discrimination protections, as we are well aware that discrimination happens all the time within this campus, yet international workers have no method of reaching justice through the university. When we asked for these discrimination protections, the university's lead negotiator Mike Kruger stated that providing discrimination protections for workers on the basis of citizenship or immigration status, would be like providing discrimination protections to child molesters. I don't need to explain how insensitive and racist that statement is. To explain how these discrimination protections are important, I need to state that a friend and coworker of mine, who was an international worker, was terminated by the university and subsequently deported in 2018 for their support of the Union. Prior to their deportation, this worker was given a verbal warning by her supervisor to stop supporting the Union or that there would be consequences. Discriminating against a worker for their Union support is already illegal, but furthermore leveraging this person's citizenship status to have them deported for their beliefs is illegal by the State of Illinois' Human Rights act 775 ILCS 5. While this law exists, international workers face an economic obstacle in the legal process for gaining justice in that they cannot afford a lawyer to represent them in court if they were to pursue this type of care through the office of the Executive Inspector General. When this grievance was brought to the university's Human Resources office, the verdict that was reached was that this was an abuse of power that resulted in no punishment, not discrimination on the basis of Union support or citizenship status. When I stated this to the university's lead negotiator, his only response was that I was not supposed to know about that. That is called a cover up. Don't send out messaging stating that "ISU has advocated that this contract, like all other collective bargaining agreements on our campus, include strong anti-discrimination language" when you are actively refusing to codify legal protections, even protections that are already supposed to be enabled by law. If you really want such discrimination protections to exist at ISU, then do it. Tell Mike Kruger to put it in our contract. It should not be hard to put your money where your mouth is when you've got so much of it since you got your \$46,000 bonus for the second year in a row, on top of your raises to \$375,000 a year. Do it. Tell Mike Kruger to codify discrimination protection on the basis of citizenship and immigration status.

It needs to be stated that when you mentioned "all graduate teaching assistants are compensated fairly and competitively", you are talking about paying graduate teaching assistants a minimum stipend of \$9,000 for two full semesters. This doesn't even take into account the \$2,400+ in mandatory fees that are taken out of our paychecks each year as well! The minimum take home pay for graduate teaching assistants at ISU is \$6,600 for two semesters! This is entirely, unjustifiably ridiculous and cruel! There is a reason that I along with my friends worked to form the School Street Food Pantry, and it was because not only did we recognize that ISU is a food desert, but people don't even have the money to buy food if they were able to! Both internal and external reviews by university administrators have concluded that the pay rate for teaching assistants at ISU is not competitive—ISU's own internal review shows this! The university's negotiating team even admitted this at the bargaining table. Now that the state passed a law to raise the minimum wage, you are acting like this raise in the minimum wage by law is a negotiated raise—it isn't. It is the status quo wrapped up like

something new. We aren't asking for minimum wage. We are asking for a living wage. The fees added on top of the paltry stipend make our conditions such that workers are earning a take home pay that is under the state's minimum wage and just barely pays rent alone. What do you expect people to do in these situations? We have heard horror stories about workers having to go through hell just to make ends meet at the end of each month. Do the right thing, tell Mike Kruger to waive our fees and raise our stipends!

The teaching conditions for our TAs are the learning conditions for our students. This university works because we do. Dietz, your days at the university are numbered. How do you want your legacy to end? With the first strike of this university's entire history, or with a celebrated mass of Teaching Assistants appreciative of their improvements? The choice is yours. Do the right thing.] If you want this to be an inclusive university, do it. Tell Mike Kruger...

Senator Horst: Your time has expired.

Dr. Rejack: Hi, everyone. I'm going to read a statement in support of a fair contract for the Graduate Workers Union, which I'm sharing on behalf of (so far) 34 faculty signatories, all gathered within the space of about 4 hours this afternoon.

The Graduate Workers Union began bargaining for their first contract in October 2019, more than 15 months ago. While disruptions due to Covid-19 have certainly slowed the bargaining process, the uncertainty and difficulties of the pandemic make it all the more urgent that ISU work to achieve a fair contract with graduate workers.

Many of us have had the pleasure and the privilege to work with graduates as both students and workers at ISU. Our experience in both categories has demonstrated the importance of a fair contract to be negotiated expeditiously and in good faith. Ensuring that graduate workers earn a living wage—in take-home pay after any mandatory fees—enables our graduate workers to dedicate their energies to their teaching and administrative duties and to excel in their research and coursework without juggling additional outside employment, something that visa restrictions make impossible for international students.

Negotiating a fair contract for graduate workers with a livable wage after any fees will be good for graduate workers but also for ISU's educational mission.

Senator Horst: 30 seconds.

Dr. Rejack: It will demonstrate our commitment to educational access and diversity by ensuring that graduate workers without individual or family wealth can succeed in our programs without taking on student debt. It will enable graduate workers to prioritize gladly teaching and learning, enhancing their substantial contributions to our success. We urge the university to understand that investing in graduate workers pays dividends across the entire campus and to negotiate a fair contract now.

Senator Horst: Your time has expired. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Thank you, Dr. Rejack. And do we have any others who are here for public comment? I see that Qazi Khusro has their hand raised. Were you here for public comment?

Dr. Khusro: Thank you very much, Dr. Kalter and the Senate for hearing me out. I am a physician in the community in Champaign and my son is attending ISU. And I just wanted to take a few moments to comment on the opening of the library. My concern is that that may still present a pretty high risk of COVID transmission. I'm a physician who works with high risk procedures, so we are exposed a lot to COVID. We test every single patient that comes into our center for COVID and if they're negative, we do see them, and even then, we still take multiple precautions including double masking, face shields and so on. And my concern is that not doing physical distancing in a library setting, especially with young students, may be too high a risk for them. There're two concerns. One is that we have variants coming through which are probably more transmissible than the ones that we already have. And the other concern that I have is that the vaccines that we have right now may not be equally effective against the new variants. So, I would urge the Senate to perhaps pass my concerns to the president and consider perhaps not opening the library yet. At least until, perhaps at least the library staff have been vaccinated. The students obviously will get vaccinated at some stage, but I imagine the library staff are older and they may be at higher risk as well. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Thank you very much. And are there any others who are here for public comment? We have time for one more. (Pause) All right. I see none then. So, thank you very much to those giving public comment. We're glad that you are here, and you are welcome to stay to observe the meeting.

It had not occurred to me to suggest this to Executive Committee last Monday, but we do have guests here to help the President and Provost make their presentation on the Engineering programs, I'd like to start with that presentation, and then go to Chairperson, Student Body President and Administrator Remarks and then to the rest of our agenda.

Discussion:

Engineering Programs proposal (President Dietz/ Provost Tarhule)

01.29.21.01 Education Program Framework (Provost Tarhule)

Senator Kalter: So, this will be our first discussion of the Engineering Programs proposal. Although this proposal is framed on the agenda under "Discussion," I think we should consider this the first evening of a set of Information Items about topics that we will vote upon in Action stages, possibly as soon as early March. This evening, we will hear about the continued development of the curriculum for the programs as well as, I believe, the proposal for an Organizational Change: the creation of a new College of Engineering.

Significant organizational changes such as the one recommended by the consultants are governed by policy, which indicates that the Executive Committee determines Senate's participation. Given that this change lies within the academic area broadly conceived, it naturally and without question falls within the Senate's purview, as would the creation of a new academic department or school.

So, now I will hand it over to Senator Dietz to start out our presentation and question and answer session.

President Dietz: Thank you very much. We have a lot of territory to cover tonight and we have about 50 slides to share, so in the interest of time if we took about a minute a slide, we kind of know where the presentations going. Some may not take as much but what we would like to do is to go through these as much as possible throughout the whole presentations and then if you have questions I think there's going to be adequate time, hopefully, at the end to answer the questions. So, as we go through this if you wouldn't mind trying to hold those and make a note as to what slide you had questions about, we'll try to get to those also at the end. Also want to thank our colleagues from Cannon Design for being with us tonight. And, Senator Kalter, thanks very much for having us at the beginning of the Senate meeting so they can be with us. Very nice courtesy there.

We anticipate a presentation tonight, as well as one in two weeks. And the presentation tonight will really be more about the background. And I realize that some folks that are sitting around the table now were not sitting around the table in 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020. So, this interest in Engineering has been going on for some time but I'm going to give a little bit of the background and kind of a where we've been and then also talk a little bit about where we're going. But tonight, is really going to be about the academic program and it's also going to be about the organization of all of that. And we're not going to get into space, and physical implication of Engineering. We'll save that for two weeks and come back and delve into those areas at that point.

So, these are the topics that we hope to hit tonight. I'm going to go through my 10 slides fairly quickly on this, because Provost Tarhule has the meat and potatoes of the presentation tonight. But we want to talk a little bit about, you know, what ISU's post-pandemic vision is and why Engineering is here, a little bit about enrollment management plan and then next steps. So, if you could go to the next screen.

If you'll think back to, for those of you that were here in 2015 and 2016, and those were two years when we didn't have a budget. And we were looking for ways to make sure that we were maintaining our institution the way that we've been used to for a number of years, which basically was strong and stable enrollment. And while a lot of our sister institutions were... their enrollments were declining pretty dramatically at that time; we were looking at ways to continue to bolster our enrollment. And so, if you'll go down to the green part there, the access to new students, that's something that we really talked about. Because of the demographic decline in enrollment in the direct from high school students in the state of Illinois, we were concerned that that might negatively effect our own enrollment, couple that with some out migration issues (that I'll show in another slide here) that ranks Illinois the second only in the United States for students who leave Illinois to go to other institutions for their college educations. We were concerned about that access to new students.

Another reason for an Engineering certainly is one of the ways to entice students who were really not considering ISU because we've not had an Engineering program. We've taught Engineering courses, have a strong reputation for that, but don't have specifically a program. So, if you then go up to the Illinois Universities not meeting the demand (right above that) there are a number of Engineering programs throughout Illinois. Obviously, the University of Illinois has a program,

Northern, Southern, Eastern has a small program. So, there are other Engineering programs available in the state, Western has a program, but they're not meeting the demand. There's a much higher demand from companies that want to hire students with graduate from Engineering than the current universities are supplying. So, there's a demand and the supply is not there for them.

In terms of work force development, one of the issues that the state has always talked to presidents about is what are we doing with workforce development and economic development in the state. Certainly, having more students graduating from institutions across the state with an Engineering background would help with workforce development. Also, one of the big areas that international students are interested in is Engineering. And that's really a worldwide demand there, so. Our international initiative, I'm convinced, certainly will return. The pandemic has put a pause on that as have some policies that heretofore have been existing in Washington D.C., but that's turning around a bit so international recruitment is another reason to get involved in Engineering.

And then, I think establishing an Engineering program ISU becomes a more comprehensive university is a biproduct of all of that, but a very important biproduct.

I'm not going to get into this too much. You'll see the two circles on the left, and the graphs. If you look at STEM degrees by subject area, the circle mostly to the left is all about Engineering, and the STEM interests in all of that. And then, secondly is Biological Sciences. The University of Illinois, I also know, rejects nearly 10,000 students who apply to their Engineering Program every year. And generally, if you scored even a 32 on the ACT you usually can't get into that Engineering Program at the University of Illinois. We anticipate that we would quickly become perhaps a second choice for those students who are still very very strong students that can't get into the University of Illinois, that it would represent a population that would be interested in Illinois State University because our brand is so strong in so many other academic programs. Also, Engineering is very popular on our own website, over 7,000 searches last year, and the third most searched major. And then the workforce piece again, Engineering jobs are expected to grow 10% in the next decade, and as a collection of universities we're not meeting the demand now.

We've been at this for a while. As I mentioned, we began talking about this in the fall of 2016 about adding Engineering. Those were just really in the infancy stage and discussion, what would that look like. Then in January of 2017 formed an Engineering Task Force made up of some faculty members who mainly were out of Physics, though there were some other faculty that were involved with that, some university administrators, and then some people with some Engineering Background in the community. And it began envisioning about what that might look like. In the summer of 2017, that task force visited some institutions. My memory is that James Madison University was one of those, Ohio University was another, Rose-Hulman was another, and since that time I think a couple of others have been visited to gain information and to talk to colleagues at those institutions.

Then in the fall 2017, there was a market demand for engineering in Illinois and the surrounding states to try to create a demand analysis and clearly the information came back indicating pretty much what we thought all along, and that is that there's a huge demand and not enough supply out there. One might say, well, what happened in fall 2018 or anytime in 2018, and it was really during that timeframe we spent a lot of time writing a request for proposals for help from individuals from the outside who knew a lot more about this topic than we did internally, and Cannon was selected as a result of that process that we went through in 2018.

Cannon Design has been working with us since the fall 2019, and the pandemic really didn't do much to slow them down in all of 2020, matter of fact, a lot of their work happened in 2020. Then in January 2021, they prepared a consulting report for us, and again three of the colleagues from Cannon that I'll introduce here shortly are on the Zoom call with us tonight to help us out in the presentation. So, that's been the timeline. It's been a consultative process throughout the entire process. You can see, you know, kind of where we've been, again, started in January 2017 with the task force, we brought it to the Academic Senate for the first time in the summer of 2018, and sought endorsement of the vision, or just you know what would this look like. And so, there weren't very many specifics at that point, but we talked about the demand then, and how that might fit into the curriculum here. In 2019, Cannon came on board. Fall 2020, there were meetings with potentially highly impacted departments that would be impacted as a result of an Engineering Program, and the plan was presented to Academic Senate. There were two open forums also that happened in the fall 2020, presentations to faculty and staff.

The next slide shows the individuals who have been with us every step of the way. Charles Smith is the Project Principle, Trevor [Calarco] has been the Academic Planning Strategist, and Vin [Vincent Manno] has been the Education Planning person and they've been terrific throughout this entire process, helping educate us about what other institutions have done and what might be the ISU approach to all of this. So, I really appreciate all their good work.

Next slide talks about Campus representative groups. We've had a number of faculty and staff and in some cases some people outside of the organization. We've had an educational working group, a technology working group, an architecture working group, and then the executive planning group. And I won't read all those names, but it was a very busy busy group. Two of the deans in particular have been the keys to all of this and Dean Todd McLoda in CAST and Dean [Diane] Zosky in CAS have been a part of this since the very first. And so, we appreciate all the good work from everybody.

The planning process also involves some external stockholders. Early on in 2017 through 2019, I personally met with folks from Cabot as well as from Caterpillar, and then Farnsworth is a local group and some of their folks have been meeting with us as well. More recently ADM, and the others that you see there. One of the most notable, obviously, is Rivian, with the line under it, for obvious reasons. I have met with their CEO a number of times. He's expressed an interest in helping support us in that area, and frankly in some other areas as well. But the two, actually three programs that we're thinking about of Mechanical, Electrical, and a General Engineering Program, Rivian would obviously have extreme interest in really all three of those. Other groups that we talked about, I've already three of the institutions but Campbell University. The EAB

was involved with this very early on about looking at demand but there's also been Vantage Technology and then Binghamton University also in SUNY. So, those are the folks that we've been talking to a lot outside of the organization.

Then we get into kind of a master planning process. And the focus in 2018 was really on the feasibility. The focus last year in 2020 was really about exploration, development, and refinement of projects. And again, the education group, the technology group, the architecture group, and the executive committee, as well as ISU leadership have been involved really for about the last year on all of this, and then you see all the different groups below that. So, 2021 is a critical time for us. And we appreciate the time that the Academic Senate is giving us to talk more about this and talk more specifically about this. The idea is that tonight would be, again, about the Academic program, about the organizational structure to support that program. And then in two weeks, we'll come back and talk about space and we'll talk about the financial pieces of all that. Our hope is that in March then would be a time that we could have more discussion and we would hope at that point that Academic Senate would have their questions answered that we know about at this point about the program. In April, we plan to have... well I should also say on February 19 we plan to have a presentation on this to our Board of Trustees. No action at all but just informational. We would hope that in March that Academic Senate would support the program. In April, we plan to have another meeting with the Board of Trustees about larger issues about facilities and so forth beyond Engineering. That's kind of an update but Engineering would be a part of that. Then our goal, and it may be an ambitious goal, but I think it's also a reasonable goal that perhaps in May they could vote to approve an Engineering Program. Again, without making financial commitments and so forth, but that would put us in good shape to then go to the Illinois Board of Higher Education, for their potential endorsement of that at their meeting in the summer. So, that's kind of the general timeline that we're working on. And with that I'm going to turn to Provost Tarhule for his part of the presentation.

Provost Tarhule: Thank you, President Dietz. I want to begin by apologizing for that technological snafu at the beginning. I can assure you that it has not dampened my enthusiasm at all for what I think is really an exciting presentation.

So, it's almost a year to the day since I interviewed here for this position and there were a number of things, actually several things that excited me about ISU what I was applying. One of them was obviously the people, you always start with the people because they make all the difference. But the other thing that I found really exciting was the Strategic Plan. I thought it was a really well written document, it was forward looking, it was comprehensive, and it was very aspirational. As I looked at that plan it also, the other initiatives that ISU was thinking about engaging in, I saw the Engineering plan, and I was super excited. I remember thinking to myself, how cool would it be to work on this project and this great idea.

Well, so here we are, as you can imagine why I'm really excited about presenting this. Part of the reason I'm excited is because there's a lot of academic folks who go through an entire academic career and never get a chance to participate in a program like this. And here we are, you know, we've gotten that opportunity to create something that is long lasting. So, I'm really excited.

I'll go through this presentation very quickly; I think the Senate already received some copies. So, I'd like to make sure that we have some time for participation. As President Dietz already mentioned, we have people from Cannon Design and the Engineering Task Force that worked on this, they're all online here, so they'll be helping me out if I misrepresent anything. But I think this is an exciting opportunity for all of us.

So, in the last several years, I think anybody in Academic Affairs has heard about this enrollment crisis, demographic shift. It's something that seems like the only thing we talked about (until the COVID pandemic came along) for the past six or seven years. The root crisis of the pandemic dates back to last economic recession in 2007-2009. What happened in that time period was that the number of birth rate fell precipitously and so when you project from that time period to about 2025 the children that were born at that time of college age, so about 18 years old, and because there were fewer of them born, fewer of them are going to graduate high school. And so, the number of students that will be entering universities nationally is going to dip very significantly. The difference will be uneven nationally. Here in the Midwest because we already have an outmigration problem, the problem is going to be exacerbated. So, this is the root cause of the challenge that we're dealing with, and our confidence in these projections is very high.

The slide on the left shows you the number of high school graduates in Illinois has been going back to 2011, and you can see the dip that I'm talking about coming our way in about 2025. On the right, you can see a number of analysis that shows the change in enrollment expected in 2029, compared to 2013. Illinois ranks towards the bottom, in terms of the deficit that we expect, right around 18% decrease number of students. Now, this graph relates to major open areas, and for Illinois we're looking at the data for Chicago. This matters to us because a very large percentage of our students come from the Chicago are.

So, in the Provost's office led by the Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management Dr. Jana Albrecht, we have tried to look at what these projections might mean for the state, for ISU. So, you are looking at the screen at four models that we have analyzed, models 1-4 based on three variables. The variables are first time in college (students FTIC), the number of transfer students, and graduate students. So, I'll give an example on two of these, and I think you can follow the rest of that. So, in Model 1 we are assuming that FTIC enrollment is going to be about the same going forward, the same as it is now which 3,600. We assume that transfer students are going to increase by 2.5% per year going forward. And graduate students' enrollment will increase about the rate that they have done in the past several years, which is 3%. In Model 3, we're assuming that FTIC will decline to about 3,300 and remain at that level. We assume that transfer number will be stable. And that graduate student enrollment will remain stable. If those things happen, the curve on the right shows you what will happen to each of those models. In Model 1, which is the most optimistic model, we see an increase of about 167 students compared to now. In Model 3 we see a decrease potentially of about 900 students. And in Model 4, we see a decrease potentially of over 2,000 students. In blue you see what the financial impact will be associated with each of those models. If Model 1 happened, ISU will receive about \$1.5 million additional dollars in tuition revenue. Model 3 would be a decrease of about close to \$8 million a year in tuition revenue. And Model 4 would be a decrease in tuition revenue of over \$19 million.

Because of those challenges, we began putting together a plan of how ISU would beat this enrollment crisis, and how we would respond. So far, the plan developed in Academic Affairs has about five pillars. We think we have an opportunity to create new programs, such as Engineering, that will attract students that typically, at the present time, don't apply to ISU because we don't have those programs. The second area we think we have an opportunity to grow current programs that we already have, such as Nursing and STEM. By the way, if you don't see your program listed here this list is not meant to be exhaustive, it's illustrative only. So, there are many other programs that could be listed here that are not listed. Our third plan is to continue internationalization drive through our partnership with INTO, but also new partnerships that we can develop. I mentioned previously that graduate programs have been growing at about 3% per year for the past several years, so we see an opportunity for creating new graduate programs as well as developing several accelerated 4+1 or 3+2 graduate programs that would keep the students here for five years, after which they receive a BSC and a masters degree. And five, partly because of the pandemic we've built a considerable amount of expertise and also technology in the area of online and distance education. We see an opportunity to capitalizing on that to serve the markets in micro-credentials, lifelong learners, and also upskilling demands. For this presentation I'm going to focus almost exclusively on Engineering, but I wanted to give you this overarching framework so that you could see that Engineering is only one piece of a much larger expansive plan that we are putting together partly in response to the anticipated enrollment challenge, but also partly of the post-pandemic vision of what we think ISU can be, and what it should be doing.

So, the academic programs that I'm going to describe here, as I said, a sense of work that was produced by Cannon Design in collaboration with the ISU Education Planning Group. Members of both of those groups are represented here and would be happy to answer your questions or help me out if we need that. I thank then in advance for the work that they have done, which as you will see I think is pretty impressive.

So, the planning process proceeded sequentially but iteratively beginning with developing a number of project goals and the scope of the project. And then Cannon Design explores, took a 360 overview of the employment landscape as well as educational landscape from which they developed a number of program archetypes. Those archetypes were then converted into prototypes and then through several discussions we refined those prototypes to produce what we're calling the Educations Framework, and then spend ta considerable amount of time elaborating that framework.

As President Dietz said, much of this work goes back to 2017- 2018 timeframe, during which time the feasibility study was conducted and included a business plan, EAB conducted a market study that identified the number of degree programs that they believed would be best for ISU, the ISU Engineering Program at this time, and those were Mechanical Engineering and Electrical Engineering. When Cannon Design came on board, they spent a considerable amount of time trying to understand ISU, our student profiles, our culture, technology, and the aspirations that we had for this program. They also took a scan outside of the university to try to understand the

technology drivers that were relevant to the program we wanted to develop, as well as conducted a number of focused research interviews with various people on campus.

One of the things they spent a good amount of time doing was to figure out the types of engineering activities or programming or opportunities that students would be interested in. And so, what you see on the screen is just an example of all of the many programs and activities that they considered. There's a lot more than this, but in the interest of time I just wanted to show you an example of the scope of work that was done.

Early in the process the group developed a number of project goals (on the left of the screen). These goals are not ordered. They do not represent a priority or hierarchy in any way at all. They were simply the goals that it was decided early on we would return to over and over again. They would serve as anchors and guardrails, if you will. This included using the Engineering Program to diversify the student body, increase student enrollment (as we've mentioned), prepare the graduates for the workforce, and all of those other goals that you can see on your left. In parallel with those goals, we also developed a number of principles that we thought should guide this problem. We thought it was important that the program should exemplify ISU's mission and Strategic Plan. We didn't want to develop something that was outside of that. We wanted to make sure that it would embed the individualized student experience for which ISU has become famous, and rightly so. We believed that by combining this project goals and the foundational principles, we were going to be able to create a program that was distinctive, that was feasible, logistically and financially, and that was grounded in ISU's Strategic Plan.

And so, the group developed a mission or vision statement. I don't know if it's light enough for you to read but we thought it was important to have an overall vision that we would, again, refer back to over and over again throughout the development process. We took total scan of all the activities that would be required to have students in place here in the Engineering Program, including the recruitment pathway is; What the first-year experiences were going to be. We wanted to be sure that we considered how transfer students would fit into the program as well as international students. The number of specific degrees, as I mentioned, that were proposed during the micro study were Electrical Engineering and Mechanical Engineering. However, as we discussed the program further it was decided that it makes sense to add a third degree program in General Engineering. We also considered a possibility of minors, which I'll talk about in the next slide, as well as a post-graduation pathways and opportunities for students in the program.

Even though we have three separate degree programs, the decision was made to make sure that those programs are not isolated or siloed or independent. And so, we identified a number of what we call Global Features, that all of the degrees would share. This would be in common regardless of which degree program the student was in. This included all of the activities designed to support student retention, success and diversity, the culture of the university, experiential learning, those types of things. We felt it was also important that a student has hands on practical experiences through design, and again, intentions to help with the practical learning and stakeholder engagement. We then decided that it would then be useful to add a number of concentrations to the degree programs. This would be a set of courses that would allow students

who wanted either for intellectual job prospects, potential job prospects, could focus on to gain additional knowledge and is a selected aspect of the program. Possible examples that we talked about, thought about included things like Computer Systems, Robotics and Embedded Systems, Renewable Energy, and so on and so forth. Again, this is illustrative only. We also discussed the possibility of minors. These decisions were greatly influenced by discussions that we've had with the Cannon group and the academic planning group had with a number of faculty as well as industry stake holders, as well as rooted in what we understood to be the strength of ISU, so that the department programs were not hanging in space but we're connected to what were ISU's traditional strengths.

Here's an example of what we think the curriculum would look like. The degree programs would each have 122 credit hours, divided into four categories bucket. One would be general education. The second would be Mathematics and natural Sciences which would require 32 hours. The Engineering degrees themselves will take about 54 hours. And electives will comprise 6 hours. It is not unusual. This is actually fairly typical in professional courses we stand to gain. But professional disciplines we stand to be very prescriptive to have unlimited number of elected courses, partly because we want to make sure that the students learn all the material, they need to in order satisfy our accreditation. And on the right, you can see any example of how those gen ed courses break down, and again, an illustrative listing of the types of categories that will be covered under the Engineering Programs.

We spent a lot of time thinking about how we would make sure that the students who come to this program are successful. So, as part of those success strategies we decided to develop a balance credit across four years so that you are not overloading the students in one year and idling them in another year. Again, as you saw from two slides ago, we have several courses that are common across the grade. This will allow students to move back and forth as well as share experiences between those degree programs and of course an emphasis on transfer students as we mentioned. Down below you see some of those initiatives that were embedded in the design process to make sure that students who are coming would like the program and find it exciting and rewarding and be successful including things like design and experiential learning beginning in their first year. We also made sure that the students would take at least one known technical course in each semester throughout the period that they're here. And then the lab courses project work to enhance experiential learning as well as internships.

This slide shows a marking of what the degree may look like. At the top, you see the four buckets I just referred to: general education, math and science, as well as engineering courses, and of course the elective courses. And then down below you see year by year and semester by semester an example of the types of courses that a student might take to get through the course. If you look at the top towards the right, you can see in each year the students are taking between 15-16 course. This is the type of balance distribution of courses throughout the semester, throughout the program that I mentioned.

This slide focuses on what the Engineering Program will look like. So, you could see towards the right, the students are beginning with an introduction program and then design. As they move

through the years, they are taking more and more engineering specific programs and they are also moving more and more into hands on projects and capstones and technical type courses.

If you look at the documents that we circulated beforehand. The academic curriculum plan, there is student outcomes associated with each year of the program. Here I'm showing you only one example of the type of student outcomes we expect. This basically says if a student goes through the program, these are the types of skills and things that they would have learned during their study in the program. So, on the right you can see we're stating specifically they would be able to acquire knowledge that can identify, formulate, and solve engineering problems, all the way down to designing and improving existing systems or components, and right at the bottom they can ascertain new information through information literacy and personal inquiry.

Engineering is very much disciplined. In many ways ISU is coming very late to this dance, if you will. There are, as President Dietz mentioned, there are many universities where engineering has been established for many years. And so, recognizing that, we spent several discussion sessions thinking about what would make our program at ISU distinctive enough that a student wants to come here as opposed to going to any of those other programs. And so, we ended up with about four categories characteristics that we think would distinguish our program. The first is ISU Core Values that we know. So, the ideas are to embed these Core Values throughout the Engineering Program. The second is to focus on Applied Learning, where the students are grounded in foundational knowledge and theoretical concepts at the beginning, and then as they move through, they get increasingly hands on applied learning strategies and experiences. And the third one is to make sure that the students are workforce ready, so we're not producing engineers that will only sit behind the table and do theory, but be able to walk into the industry or workplace and be ready to go right away. And then Interdisciplinary Relationships, we think engineering is going to be an integrated discipline and campus. It's not going to be a standalone type program that stands by itself after the size. We've identified a number of very exciting opportunities for the program to collaborate with existing departments and other programs. So, here you see examples in Assistive Technologies and Sustainability, but also many more in the academic program.

Further on the distinctiveness of the program, we think the Engineering Program at ISU is going to focus on skills development. Those skills are divided into three categories. Technical skills, including things like hands on experience, quality control, coding, design, additive manufacturing to Interpersonal and Communication Skills as well as Professional Skills. This also allows additional opportunities for collaboration between the programs because many of these skills will actually be thought in programs outside of Engineering.

So, where we are with the educational programming process is the following: The plan is almost finalized and it has been approved by the planning group, including the possible concentrations and minors that it might incorporate. The curricular and academic program implications have been shared with some departments that will be identified as potentially being most directly impacted by the Engineering Program, and the feedback that was received from those programs has been very helpful in developing the next steps. The information from that Engineering framework has been used and continuously be used in the space planning and also part of the

financial modeling that we are working on, which will be presented to Academic Senate two weeks from today.

I turn now to Project Implementation Considerations. So, Cannon Design did something, which was very clever, they could simply have given us one deterministic model that says you do this you get that, which would not have been very helpful and not been amenable to change at all. Instead what they developed was a very flexible planning algorithm that takes a number of inputs and then interaction of those inputs give you... and how you mix and match them, and it give you a number of possible outcomes, which then feeds into the financial modeling and organizational structure, as well as implementation strategies. Attractiveness of this conceptualization is if you don't like what you get you can go back to the beginning and mix and match some of your inputs and then see what speaks out, in terms of your outputs.

I said we wouldn't talk much about space planning, but I just wanted to illustrate that this is what Cannon Design does for a living. It's their business so they have a number of specialized tools to help them plan. You are seeing a snapshot of one of the tools that they use to help determine how many students we need in a program, how many faculty, as well as the sizes and spaces of learning that we require labs all the way down to even actuary things that may not be directly related to the problem.

They've spent a large amount of time looking at space utilization and planning and also a number of space typologies for the programing, including possible site. So, there will be more information about his two weeks from now.

All of that is to lay the foundation that based on a large amount of thinking and consideration we've come up with a number of recommendations. This one, with respect to organizational structure. I should say that at the beginning of this exercise no body thought about, and this was very intentional, about what the organizational structure of the proposed Engineering Program was going to be. We simply decided that we wanted to create a best Engineering Program that we could design, and given the constraints and opportunities we were working with, and only after that program was completed we felt comfortable and confident in the program that we had developed, did we then resurrect the question of what type of organizational structure did we feel that was going to be ideal for supporting the program we had just developed. So, we considered three types of options. One was to create an engineering department within an existing college. The second was to create an engineering school within an existing college. I recognize that here at ISU we tend to use the words school and department interchangeably, the sense in which we are using it however is somewhat different, it's the sense that the school can have a number of departments that are needed but still be answerable to a college. So, just that distinction. And finally, we considered the possibility of creating a whole new college. Within each of those options, we reviewed several different criteria, including the impact that this would have if we chose any one of these organizational structures. We looked at the resources that would be required. We analyzed compatibility concerns and also the significance in term of the statement or impact that that decision would make to stakeholders as well as the university at large. Based on this considerations, which went on over several meeting sessions, we finally decided with (I think) unanimous agreement everyone in the planning committee came to the conclusion that a

new college structure was what was really what would be ideal for ISU at this time, and that is what we're recommending.

We looked at the size of the program. I should state here that we think about the Engineering Program in phases. What we're presenting today is really what I call phase one. So, phase one, for those of you have heard about the Engineering Program before when the discussions started the thinking was that we would build a whole new Engineering complex, and that would house between 800-1200 students. That plan is still alive, and we've submitted a request to the state that Engineering plan is actually our number one Capital Request to the state. But experience and history tells us that it can take decades, literally, before the state approves that money. We're dealing with the College of Fine Arts right now. We're just in the process in assessing the money that they approved, I believe, ten years ago, maybe a little more than ten years ago. So, we can't rely on the state. That being the case, we looked at what we could do as a university and be able to fund and finance in a manner that was financially prudent and to get the program going while the state would eventually give us those resources to expand to the scale that we would like. And so, the size that you are looking at is really constrained by the size of the facility that we've decided to house this Engineering Program in, which is the John Green, but you'll hear a lot more about that two weeks from now. So, that size can only take (by Cannon Designs analysis) a maximum of 520 students, and that's what has determined the size of this program. And so, we see four different cohorts of 130 each coming in to make that 520 at steady state for phase one.

The delivery for the program as we mentioned before is designed to ensure that we keep ISU student focused... make it a student focused program. And so, class sizes will range from about 25-50. It would include emphasize inclusive teaching excellence that we've recently adopted at the university. It would promote active learning strategies and experiential learning. We want students really to learn by doing and creating, and of course all of them to be comfortable with problem solving skills.

Based on the 520 students estimation, we have calculated that the program will have about 88 course sections when it is fully implemented and it will require 21 faculty members. These are new faculty. These are not faculty existing, faculty that we have. In terms of the staff, and administrative staff, because it is a college we envisioned that it will have a dean and each of the academic departments will also have a chair, and we have calculated that it will require 11 staff, including academic advisors, lab technicians, and office support personnel.

This is a very busy slide, and a very complicated one, but also very important one. So, if you look at the top right where it says implementation timeline to the right of that. It says that before the first cohort of students arrive and about two and a half to even three years before the first cohort of students arrive, we are going to need to have to begin a number of really important things. First of all, we plan to house this in the John Green Center but there are people and activities in that building presently, so we will need to relocate them. And then we will have to design and renovate the John Green Center, and then actually carry out the renovation. So, we need to be doing that about one and a half years, way before the student, maybe even two years, before the students arrive. The curriculum that I show here is just a template. No Engineering faculty will agree to take a template that was designed primarily by non-Engineering folks and

deliver it. And so, we fully expect that what we have developed is not more than a template or guide. When we hire a dean and a faculty of Engineering, those people will work with that template that we have produced to refine the specific curriculum that will actually guide this program. And so, we'll need to hire a dean at least two years before the first students arrive, and faculty about 1.5 to one year before the first students arrive. The reason for that is what I just described, they would need to then design a curriculum, that curriculum would come back to the Academic Senate for approval, and ultimately to IBHE before it gets delivered. So, it's of the utmost importance that we have all of that done before the first students arrive. And so, we anticipate that when the students arrive, when they start coming, they will come in cohorts of 130, as I mentioned. And so, one year before that date we expect to hire about seven faculty members, and then to add about five going forward, until we reach the status state in this phase of 21.

Looking ahead, this slide essentially exemplifies what I just described in another way. Between about two and 2.5 years we need to secure Academic Senate approval for this plan. This is the beginning of that process here tonight. Subsequently, we'll have to go to the Board of Trustees to also get the endorsement, and then submit a proposal to IBHE. If all goes well, my plan is that we submit that proposal by the summer of this year because there's a meeting of the IBHE sometime in August and it would be terrific if this plan is one of those that they consider. So, about 1.5 years before the students arrive, we would hope that we would have IBHE approval and that we started recruiting the Engineering leadership team, including the dean and maybe the first set of six to seven faculty that will design the curriculum. One year before the first students arrive, we have to make sure we recruit the first staff, recruit the faculty, with secure approval for the curriculums, so that will be the second round. Then the space is renovated and ready to go, and that we have a quiet, and installed equipment and software that the program will need. And then, the students arrive on this scale T-0. That's not the end of the program. We'll continue to assess the suitability of space and personnel and continue to recruit additional staff as needed.

We have looked at what the impact of the program will be and other academic units across campus. On this slide, please don't pay specific attention to the numbers, it's a very difficult estimate to derive. And so, I think take the concept that we're looking very largely and very comprehensively at all of the departments and programs that are likely to be affected. And we've done a very rough estimate of how many students we think would be in each of those different departments on campus. The takeaway message from this slide, again, is not the specific numbers. It's the fact that we're thinking about departments that are going to be impacted and we plan to be ready, to make sure that we get all departments the support they would need as a result of having this additional students come to the University.

So, very similar to the last slide, we are again trying to map the impact on different departments, how many large sections, how many additional courses we think will need to be introduced in this different other departments as a result of the influx of Engineering students, most of this was done in collaboration with the different departments. Again, please don't pay too much attention to the specific numbers. We plan to be very flexible and to adjust, and to make sure that the resources are ready for all departments that are involved in the program.

As I've mentioned before, we think Engineering is really going to be an integrated discipline. It's going to afford us an opportunity to make the kinds of connections that we currently don't have. Some of those will be... in all the various colleges we see opportunities for collaboration, in some cases, in ways that we never thought about before. Many of this came about as a result of the faculty that are on the planning group identifying opportunities in their various colleges about how those would collaborate with Engineering.

So, I want to go a little bit back to where I began this. What we're doing is a very comprehensive overview of how ISU is going to respond not just to the enrollment challenge that we've been hearing about for six or seven years, but indeed, how we expect to be able to try being post-pandemic landscape. So, I remind you that we've identified a number of five categories. Everything I've talked about is in number one category. I'm going to very briefly mention some of the ideas we're thinking about, in terms of growing existing programs. Again, this is not comprehensive. If you believe you have opportunities in your departments that can fit in here, I'd like to talk to you.

So, Nursing is one of those opportunities where we think we could grow significantly, and it just might help us with our enrollment challenge. Currently, the State of Illinois experiences a nursing shortage of over 5,000 nurses each year. At the same time, ISU is rejecting something like 1,250 fully qualified candidates that apply to come to us. The reason we don't take them is primarily limitation of our simulation lab. So, after considerable discussions with Dean Judy Neubrander we have concluded that if we could double the simulation space in the nursing facility, the Mennonite College of Nursing would be able to attract 276 additional new students within four years. This is a very conservative estimate actually. The other thing to keep in mind here is the demand is here. And history tells us that where there is demand and money involved there's somebody there to meet that demand. If ISU doesn't meet that demand, somebody else will in our backyard. So, it seems to make sense to us to expand the facilities in Nursing so that it can serve as another pillar of how we think we might meet enrollment challenges. So, this is something that will probably be coming back to you at a future date.

Another area we think there is opportunity is in the STEM. Through discussions with Biology and Chemistry, we have very high confidence that if we could expand their laboratory space, they're likely to bring in an additional 350 students over the next four years. So, we're continuing those conversations, and this is another area that we'd like to be able to come back to you at a future date.

So, I've talked very briefly about two, as I've mentioned there are three others. We can't estimate precisely how many students would be in these initiatives. My hope, and my request to all of you is to see how your departments would fit into this plan that we're developing and have further conversations, so that we can leverage the expertise and network of our faculty through the development of new partnerships, work with your departments to create those new graduate programs, as well as those 4+1 programs, and also online and distance education.

So, the takeaway message from all of this is the following. We have a challenge that we know is coming. And so, we've taken advantage of that challenge, but we've also looked at the

opportunities associated with that challenge, and we think by putting all of these plans together that through Engineering, Nursing, and STEM we can add something like 1,126 additional students. Maybe those will replace students that we lose as a result of the enrollment crest, or if we don't lose many students then it may be an addition to the total number of students we have. In addition, there's a number of programs, as I just described, that can also help us with the enrollment challenge although at this time it's difficult to estimate, but we know that that change is likely to be positive.

As you look at all of this, we're not talking about finances today, but as you think about finances going forward, I can imagine that people have been thinking about the investment required to make this happen. Yes, there will be an investment. And it's logical and quite reasonable for people to ask, can we afford to do it. I think that question should be asked the other way, can we afford not to do it. Because based on our projections, we think that if we are not careful ISU could potentially be in a situation where we're losing something like close to \$20 million of tuition revenue in about five years. No institution would like to be in that position. So, I think we should be doing everything possible to avoid it.

So, for about six or seven years, the academic policy community has done nothing by talk about a demographic change and enrollment cliff. So, I think that these are challenges, they're not unique to us. Most institutions in the country are facing the same challenges—apart from the institutions in a few states in the south and south east that are growing—everybody else is having the same kinds of conversations that we're having, and trying to figure out how to deal with this. I believe that ISU is very well positioned to not only weather these challenges but in fact to thrive. So, I think that we need to take a number of proactive strategies. The Engineering Program that we bring to you today is the first of several such proactive such strategies that we'll be talking about throughout the year and beyond. Other examples are things like Nursing and STEM, we need to leverage our international partnerships/opportunities, create new graduate programs including accelerated degrees, and expand our capabilities in online and distance education.

I think this is really exciting. I want to go back to the beginning where I said this is a truly exciting project to embark on. It doesn't mean that it doesn't have challenges. If you are employed to worry about the challenges, I ask you to consider the following: think back to the people who created these colleges that we today occupy. In fact, think back to the people who created this college, the challenges that they had to overcome, the grit, the determination, the foresight and the vision they had to create an institution and the colleges that we are now taking advantage of. That button has been passed on to us. It is up to us and the challenge of our times to see whether we can continue that vision that old action, that unity of focus, that sense of history that says we will follow in the footsteps of all of these people who created these past colleges, and create a new college here at ISU that will stand the test of time. The question is can we do it. Can we do it? I think we can. So, with that, I thank you very much and look forward to questions and discussions.

Senator Lucey: So, thank you very much for the presentation. Also, thank you very much for all of your hard work with this program. It's a much needed program and it'll put Illinois State on

the map in a much larger way. My question has to do with diversity. And we talk about recruiting students of diverse perspectives and recruiting faculty of diverse perspective, my question is what specific strategies are in place to do that? We had a protest of students, many of which came to Academic Senate a year or two ago and expressed their concern about conditions on the campus. We live in an environment where we've had national protests about the way women are treated and the ways that people of color are treated. What are the strategies that you foresee as to recruiting people of color to be on the staff and to be part of this program, and how do you see that as... like in the program's development?

Provost Tarhule: Vin, do you feel like taking on that question?

Mr. Manno: It's an important question and something probably we all could spend several hours talking about because of its importance. And I don't think there's any one strategy, so I'll just mention a few things that are at least relevant to the work we've done so far. One has to do with the structure of the programs themselves, and how they need to be executed and that's as far as the focus on the individual students. The focus on sort of the non-traditional nature of the programs in the sense that something that the questioner didn't say but probably was in the back of his mind is also Engineering comes with an additional set of baggage, as far as diversity is concerned. So, the idea of putting together a program that, for example, where women and underrepresented minorities feel that they are part of the program. That you're out front about the implicit biasness in the curriculum, and the atmosphere of the department. So, I think that's usually important.

The recruiting aspect, obviously you folks at ISU know your market much better than I do, but I think it will require a focused outreach. You just can't use whatever your normal processes are. Something that came up in, I believe, the EAB study where the population of students in various relevant urban areas, and the idea of building partnerships with feeder schools in those areas I think would be very important. Something else we've talked about is the establishment early on of the student organization, such as the Society of Black Engineers, Society of Women Engineers, the Society of Professional Hispanic Engineers to build that into the program.

And finally, something that came up very interestingly in the engagement with the external stakeholders in the companies was that there were folks at those companies, including people from underrepresented groups who were very interested in being involved early in the program to help with mentorship and connectivity. Those are things that come to mind.

President Dietz: I would add to the comments that Vin made, which I think are right on. In addition, by being a part of the STEM, there's federal money available, and there's also interest in the private sector in helping in this area. Because the companies are also interested in hiring Engineers from underrepresented groups, and many of them are willing to invest in programs that will help with that. So, I'm optimistic that we will be able to get some private support with that and also qualify for some federal grant money to help us with that.

Senator Kalter: All right. Thank you very much for your question, Senator Lucey. Do other people have questions? (Pause) Wow. I'm seeing none. It looks like you answered a lot of questions. I'm just going to make a comment and ask two questions. They may be quick or not.

One of the things that I wanted to just point out is that there's a part in the report that we provided everybody where we're spinning the number of courses per academic year per faculty, etc., in order to try to model the number of faculty, and I was a little bit concerned that in that section it started at three course per year per faculty member and didn't go all the way up to six which is sort of a fairly traditional load, although not a load that every single department has. And I just wanted to point that out because also in that same calculation, at one point the student/faculty ratio at five courses per faculty seemed fairly large. So, I'm thinking that one of the things that we may want to do is potentially think that we may need more faculty and just sort of keep those numbers loose, because we're not going to have a perpetual, sort of, curriculum development. It's going to go on for a year or two or so, but at some point we're going to reach a state where we might expect people either to be grant getting or to be, you know, in the classroom, or what have you. And so, that didn't... I wasn't sure about that.

I'm actually going to wait on my question, because I see two other people have their hands up. So, I'm going to go to Senator Blum.

Senator Blum: I had a question, not so much about the Engineering Program but about the other, you had like five or six things to grow enrollment, and the last one in particular Distance Learning, and it talked about micro-credentialing and some things like that. One of the things, you know, just that I think is noticeable about where we are as a University is that we don't have a very strong footprint for this, compared to some universities that have, you know, have a global... they have a whole, you know... Arizona State University, all different kind of universities, that have kind of a really well put together set of programs, marketing program, and, I mean, kind of the benefit of distance learning is it, you know, we're not necessarily restricted to the geographic area of Illinois. All right. That there's other possibilities. We're a long way from where that needs to be but it seems like creating a footprint, you know, in my department, we have a graduate program that (I'm in the College of Education) doesn't even require certification. I mean, you could, at the very minimal, get that program out into a regional area. And it just seems like somehow as a university harnessing, you know, some kind of plan and putting it together would help bring all of this together.

Provost Tarhule: Craig, I couldn't agree with you more. Before I answer your questions, let me very quickly say that we are putting together an FAQ about this Engineering Program. So, if you can't think of a question immediately or an additional question occurs to you, please send that to me and I will compile all of those and start up a website where that information will be housed. So, if you have questions about this, you'll be able to go there and find your answers. So, that is forthcoming, and I'll talk about it more.

I couldn't agree with you more about the online education. And I think that in that sense the pandemic has really forced issues on us. You know, as we get out of the pandemic, we have acquired a considerable amount of technical expertise and technology, but also faculty have learned and become very comfortable in converting to online education. I think it would be a missed opportunity if we let all of that go post pandemic. And so, we have one working group of the retreat (that will be coming up here in about two or three weeks) that is focused specifically on this. I think that group is co-chaired by Charley and also Perry Schoon, and so they are

meeting with the various people about what are the plans that ISU can implement in terms of getting a footprint in this very important area. There are plans that we have developed in the past but not implemented. We have found those and we're trying to find elements of those plans that we can put into place. So, if you have any suggestions, or you have an interest in this area, please forward those suggestions to Perry or Charley and maybe come to the Retreat, so that... at the end of the Retreat we want to be able to have a plan that says exactly what you just specified, given how late we are coming to the game, what are the opportunities that we can... what are the niches that we can colonize, if you will, and take advantage of this technology that we're in. So, I 100% agree with the things that you said and we're working on it.

Senator Horst: When you presented this idea previously, you didn't have the idea of the new college. And I was wondering if you could expand on your reasoning behind going with the college model as opposed to the department. Even with 40 faculty it would be below the level of some bigger departments like English. So, I was just wondering if you could flesh out for us the logic behind having a new college?

Provost Tarhule: I'm happy to do so. But any of the other members here, please feel free to jump in. Let me begin by addressing the issue of size. Every college starts small, but ultimately grows. I was looking at the numbers and the Mennonite College [of Nursing] when we acquired it in 1999 had only 300 students. So, we could have easily said, well, that's too small for a college but we kept it as a college. Today it has about 860 with the plans that we're developing it's likely to grow to about 1,100-1,200. So, when you're starting a new entity, it's actually not very desirable to start it really large because if you mess up you have a very big mess up. So, it makes sense to start small and then to grow, and we fully expect that this will grow. In fact, part of the reasons for proposing the college is precisely because we wanted to grow. We think that as a new college there will be more opportunities for these to grow. Remember I said that Engineering remains our number one request to the state, so we start a program with 520 students, if the state was then to give us \$100 million in Capital expenditures that we asking for, that would allow us to start on phase two of the Engineering Program, and potentially grow it to 1,500 or maybe even 2,000 students. So, that is the vision. This is only phase one, as I said, it's the starting point. We do not expect it to remain at 520 for long.

There are many different considerations why we eventually decided to go with a college. I'll give you just two because of shortage of time. One is we've been talking about this since 2016. By the time the first students get here, it will not be until the seventh year before we get the program running. If you have to break it down, let's say you started it as a department in another college and then it grows and it has to break up, it will take you another four or five years to break it up. Dividing programs is extremely difficult and complicated. It turns out that I was part of a college that broke up and I can tell you it was a very painful experience. It takes us long and it's nearly as expensive to break up a college and we still lose faculty. So, you are much better off just starting it where it is so that you don't run into the questions of, oh, well how big does it have to be for us to break up, and by then you would be so intertwined with the existing department and your resources will be so mixed up that... it's always very messy trying to break it up like by that time. You would also have, if you have it in an existing college, you would work with the

ASPT guidelines on that college and then when you break it apart they would have to start their own culture, their own ASPT all over again, essentially relearning all the things that they have done. And then from the point of view from industry and impact, think about if you were a potential donor, like say Rivian. You know, if you're going to donate, or have a naming opportunity, would you do that in a new college or in a department that is an existing college. And on, and on, and on. As we reviewed all of these ideas, it became very clear to all of us that the right thing to do was to start a new college.

Senator Kalter: All right. Does anybody else have any questions? (Pause) All right. I have gotten plenty of both face time and email time with Dr. Tarhule about my questions, so I think what I'm going to do is actually save them for February 17 and maybe put them in my Chairperson's Remarks as questions, basically the topics are spinning different scenarios about whether we're at flat enrollment or growing enrollment, and how that impacts ISU overall. How much consultation we've already had and are going to need with some of the other departments that aren't on the slide, like we saw Chemistry and Physics but not necessarily some of the other programs like the gen ed programs and that kind of thing. And then, sort of the timing and logistics, you know, about delays in the process and how we might have built in or not built in, you know, wiggle room for those type of things. But I think that doesn't need to be talked about here, we're concentrating on curriculum and organizational change. And so, if we're not seeing any other questions, we're going to thank all of our guests, and thanks very much to Dr. Dietz and Dr. Tarhule for that presentation. And we'll move through the rest of our agenda tonight.

Chairperson's Remarks

Senator Kalter: I have a very brief Chairperson's Remark. Yesterday Cera forwarded the press release regarding the Presidential Search and just wanted to point out there that either the Board chair or the Board as a whole have decided to make the search an entirely closed search until they have selected a President. According to the press release, they will reveal the new President's name after they have signed a hiring contract with that individual. While they intend to involve a wider array of employees and students in the interviewing process beyond the search committee at the finalist stage, they do not intend to reveal the names of the finalists to the rest of the campus community as a whole, or to allow persons outside of the expanded search process to meet any of the candidates prior to the hire. So, I just wanted to make sure that people understood that, because I'm your representative on the search committee.

So, we're going to move on to Student Body President Remarks, and I think I saw Senator Harris. So, I'm going to do collective comments at the end after we get through Administrator Remarks. So, let's go to Senator Harris now.

Student Body President Remarks

Senator Harris: I'm actually still going to defer to Senator Toth because he was prepared, and he has his button down and tie for us to speak. So, he's ready.

Senator Kalter: Sounds good. Go for it, Senator Toth.

Senator Toth: Wonderful. You've got to dress to impress, right. No. But hi everyone! Some of you may know me, some of you may not, my name is Dylan Toth and I am the President of the Assembly in SGA. Of course, Lauren had some prior educational commitments, so I was prepared to fill in in her place - so here I am! SGA has been busy. Last week, we unanimously passed three ambitious resolutions which provided \$2,000 of funding towards engagement efforts surrounding the 2021 municipal elections and we pledged more collaboration with the Center for Civic Engagement. So, we look forward to continuing those valuable partnerships across campus.

Last week was busy, but today was even busier. 13 SGA members (including 10 Senators that are here right now), joined forces with the Alumni Center and Dr. Jonathan Lackland and we virtually lobbied for some more resources for ISU and our surrounding community. We were able to thank them for the work they've done for us and the support they've shown, but also acknowledged that we have a lot of work to do together. The bottom line was that we need equitable appropriations as Vice President Stephens has shared with this body before. Early this morning, President Dietz sent us off to meet with Rep. Brady, Sen. Barickman, Sen. Chris Belt, Asst. Majority Leader Burke, and most notably, we got to have a great conversation with the newly elected Speaker of the House, Chris Welch. So major shout out to the Director of Government Relations, Dr. Lackland, and our Alumni Center for organizing this. So not too much to report. That's the end of our student report, I'm surely not as knowledgeable and poised as Lauren, but I can try to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

Administrators' Remarks

- ***President Larry Dietz***

President Dietz: Thank you very much! I wanted to say thank you to the students involved with lobby day today. That makes a difference with legislators, as I mentioned this morning that some of those legislators haven't been on campus in an active way in some time; other's that live close have been, but many of the others haven't. So, it's always great whenever they can hear from students. And thanks for the time for doing that.

I want to make some comments about SEIU, about vaccinations, and also about Athletics. The first comments about SEIU Local 73. Last week, I delivered an all-campus message regarding the status of the University's ongoing negotiations with SEIU Local 73, the union that represents our approximately 400 graduate teaching assistants or GTAs since 2018. In that communication, on behalf of the entire University community, I publicly affirmed our respect for the important contributions of our graduate teaching assistants and ISU's intent to continue ongoing good-faith negotiations with the union. I want to emphasize again here today that ISU has and will continue to work diligently to reach a fair and fiscally responsible contract agreement that addresses the concerns raised by the SEIU without disruption to university operations. We are fully committed to the mediation process and believe much can be accomplished and resolved through additional dialogue and negotiations. I ask you to join me in encouraging both parties to continue good-faith negotiations. We have another session scheduled with the federal mediator for Wednesday, February 17, and hope that it will move us closer toward resolution. Lastly, I encourage you to visit the SEIU Negotiations website for up-to-date information and regular updates at www.seiunegotiations.ilstu.edu

Moving on to comments about vaccinations, I know that's a big topic for folks. We remain in constant contact with the McLean County Health Department (MCHD) regarding vaccine availability for the campus community. The University is following the Illinois Department of Public Health's (IDPH) vaccination distribution plan. Due to the limited amount of vaccine available, it will take considerable time to advance through the IDPH's vaccination phases. As you are aware, the state is currently in Phase 1B of the state's vaccination plan. The University is continuing to vaccinate employees in Phase 1A, which includes health care workers. As part of 1B, the University is vaccinating employees age 65 and older, Frontline Essential Workers as defined by IDPH which includes: University Police, Lab Schools teachers and staff, Day Care Center employees. The University has also vaccinated students who are participating in clinical experiences in health care settings and schools, for example, MCN students, Psychology interns, and Athletic Training interns. And again, I encourage you to visit the FAQ section of the Coronavirus website which includes information about vaccine distribution on our campus.

In addition, on Tuesday, the presidents and chancellors of the state's public universities and with the support of the Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges and Universities (basically the private institutions in the state) and we sent a letter to the Governor requesting that higher education be given greater priority in the state's vaccination plan. Why is it important that higher education be given greater priority? The health and safety of students, faculty, and staff remains the University's highest priority. It is critical that colleges and universities be able to return to teaching as much as possible most courses in person in the fall and meet the student's expectation. Students and their parents want a traditional residential undergraduate experience, which has been our hallmark at the University. Students and their parents are waiting to see what the fall will look like before making a commitment about college attendance. Applications for the fall semester are running 23% behind last year. Surrounding states like Iowa, Missouri and Wisconsin list higher education in Phase 1B as does the CDC and Kentucky is included in Phase 1C. Colleges and universities in these states recruit heavily in Illinois and promise a more traditional experience that includes in-person classes and educational activities.

At this point however, higher education is not included in 1B, and unfortunately an error occurred last week whereby some faculty who are listed as teaching face to face classes this spring were able to schedule an appointment to receive the vaccine. Again, that was an error. The error was discovered and some faculty had already received the vaccine and so those that had already scheduled appointments received the vaccine but the error was an error and that error was corrected.

Finally, I want to say a few things about attendance at athletic events. Quick update on that, in accordance with IDPH guidelines for sporting events, the University began inviting immediate family members of student athletes to attend their events on campus. For indoor events, the total number of spectators is limited to 50 people. We've also asked the governor to consider somewhere between... what is there between the mitigation area that we're in right now that talks about 50 people to being completely open. Isn't there something in between all of that? And so, they're working on that according to the head of IBHE.

But the first home football game of the season is February 27. We only have four home games this spring. According to IDPH guidelines for outdoor athletic events, 20% of the facility capacity may attend the event. For Hancock Stadium, occupancy is limited to 2,678 persons while providing physical distancing in seating areas. The priority for football game tickets will be for Weisbecker Scholarship Fund donors and season ticket holders. There will be an allotment of tickets for students who are Red Alert members to attend, as well as the band, the cheer section, and other folks connected with that. Persons must wear facial coverings within the stadium. Concessions will be limited to prepackaged food and beverages that must be eaten outside in the stands. There will be no gathering in the Club space. So, just a brief update on Athletics and that concludes my remarks for the evening.

Senator Kalter: Thank you, Senator Dietz. I just want to remind all of our public commenters and other guests that you do not have floor privileges during question and answer sessions or in any other part of the Senate meeting except for Public Comment or unless you are called on as an expert witness by someone who I recognize from the floor. So, we'll go to Senator Tarhule.

- ***Provost Aondover Tarhule***

Provost Tarhule: Thank you, Chairperson Kalter. I'd just like to pick up on the question that Dr. Blum raised when we were discussing online education in the engineering presentation to emphasize again that we have a Retreat, as I've mentioned, the 24-25th of this month. That Retreat has 10 working groups. One of those working groups is Online and Distance Education. We want to hear from you. There is a website that you can access from the Provost webpage to see what those working groups are and what they're working on. So, if you have ideas and suggestions about what we should be doing with respect to any of those working groups, please send us your ideas. The more ideas we get the more comprehensive the plan, and I think the more robust the plan that we will develop will be.

The only other announcement I will make is that the CRCC Spring Institute which I think I've announced the past two meetings, it will be held on March 19th via Zoom. The theme for this year is Equity with a Mirror, and again it is supported by the Division of Student Affairs, the Multicultural Center, the Office of the Provost, and the Office of the President. So, I think registration is open. I hope you would register and make plans to attend that very important workshop. Thank you.

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

Senator Johnson: Thank you. I actually only have one item to share and that's actually a shout out. And that's to the Code of Student Conduct Review Committee. They have been doing just a fantastic job of meeting every Friday. Attendance has been great. The engagement has been off the chart. The suggestions, collaboration, thoughtfulness for the recommendations that are being put forth is extremely encouraging. So, shout out to Bradley Pearson, who's the Assistant Dean of Students for Student Conduct and Conflict Resolution, that office, as well as Senator Harris and other members of the committee who have just been extremely engaging in making recommendations. So, very encouraged by the work they have done in that group.

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

Senator Stephens: Thank you, Senator Kalter. I'll keep my Remarks brief. The only thing I wanted to bring up this evening is a safety warning about the weather. It's turning very cold this weekend. National weather forecast has temperatures falling below zero, beginning this Saturday and staying very cold throughout all of next week. High not to exceed 15 degrees and lows unfortunately are going to be somewhere between minus 5 and minus 10, and temperatures are not expected to get back to more tolerant levels until Monday, February 15. Please keep a watchful eye on water pipes, both during this cold snap and afterwards. Pipes can actually break and remain frozen until the temperature starts to rise. So, leaks may not start surfacing until several days after it starts to warm up. So, if you see any plumbing conditions on campus that concerns you, please report it. You can reach our emergency facilities hotline at 438-5656. So, please stay safe and remain indoors where at all possible. That's all I have for this evening.

Senator Kalter: All right. Terrific. Thanks very much. I'm actually going to start out question and answer and then we'll go...I have two sets of questions. I'm going to start with one of them and then we'll go... open up the floor, and then I'll go to my second one. So, these are both for Senator Dietz. I had two sets of questions for Senator Dietz. Apologies for the long explanation I'm about to provide before getting to the first questions.

So, my first set of questions has to do with a series of confusing emails regarding vaccinations. Senator Murphy from the Library had emailed you and your staff and copied me last Thursday morning to ask about how she had heard from a couple faculty members that they'd been invited to make appointments to get vaccinated at Student Health.

We were told that McLean County Health was determining when and how much vaccine ISU receives and if the number of persons scheduled is low, additional emails are sent to eligible persons. We were told that there were many more employees eligible under Phase 1B than doses ISU receives each week.

Senator Murphy then asked how the subsets were being chosen. Dr. Paterson replied that the subsets were "largely random.... There are some situations where we have focused on specific departments such as" SHS and University Police as well as people over 65.

Meanwhile, I had started a separate email thread, attempting to assist regarding communication and asking that faculty/staff listservs be used to let people know these facts so that uninformed guesses wouldn't start. You folks were either already on it or thought that was good advice, as a mass communication came within about 4 hours.

I then gave a bit more information anticipating possible questions that you might get here tonight and Brent responded early on Friday afternoon. And so, I thanked him and then mentioned that I'd noticed that instructors who were face-to-face at some point during this academic year seemed to be in the pools (even if they were not 65 or older), adding that basically as a question to be addressed tonight. That was Friday a little before 1.

Around 4:30, Brent wrote just to me to confirm my original communication from you, [Senator Dietz] when we had talked with each other on January 8 and what you said tonight, right, that university faculty are not currently covered under Phase 1B, which is unlike K-12 teachers that

are in our lab schools. So, he wrote that there was an error in the notification, etc., and that the issue that caused the error had been addressed.

Then on Monday of this week, I received an email from a constituent in the Humanities. It read: “I am writing, because I am confused by the lack of clarity from ISU regarding vaccine distributions and was wondering if this aspect of the university’s COVID response is something the Senate has discussed. Specifically, I was surprised to see that ISU was distributing vaccines. (I had assumed I would have to go through my medical provider or a local vaccination center sign-up, when my time came.) I then learned from WGLT’s report this past weekend that persons not in groups 1A or 1B were recently vaccinated at ISU. I do not begrudge those individuals for taking advantage of the university’s error, and I realize that increasing the vaccinated population is good locally for everyone, even as others like myself wait. However, I wrote to the university with questions below, because I did not understand how they would know whether or when to contact ISU community members once we enter phase 1C, and the response I received (while pleasantly quick) does not really help me understand the process (nor was it signed, so I was unsure even with whom I was dealing). It would seem that the promised forthcoming info sheet should have been finalized and distributed prior to starting campus vaccine distributions, in the interest of transparency and equity (and also privacy, as regards their implied knowledge of who has pre-existing medical conditions).”

So, that was that individual’s comment. And I’ll say that I too for myself that I am thrilled beyond end with the fact that these few persons received their first vaccinations, even if it was in error. But it did create several questions in my mind and in this constituent’s mind:

This constituent asks: 1) “Are all ISU employees going eventually to be vaccinated through/at ISU? The last weekly email states, “University employees eligible to receive the vaccine in accordance with the State’s vaccine distribution plan will receive a prenotification email at their ilstu email.” And the person says, “But how can ISU know which employees will be eligible when we move into Phase 1c (“people 16 to [64] years of age with high-risk medical conditions”)? And so, that’s my first question for you, Senator Dietz.

President Dietz: Well, it’s a complex process, and complex processes, unfortunately sometimes get messed up and that’s what happened at the end of last week. That’s since been corrected but I know that also that Dr. Paterson is on the line and he chairs the steering committee related to this. We take our lead from the McLean County Health Department. We are a site that we’re glad to be for the county health department for vaccination and I think it’s convenient for a lot of people. In terms of this inclusion, we’re still, as I mentioned earlier, we’re still battling to try to get our faculty and staff into that 1B category. I’ve talked over the weekend to Deputy Governor Ruiz, pushing that idea again and indicating that we were going to be sending a letter to the Governor early part of this week indicating that. He told us that basically he was supportive of that, but that Dr. Ezike has a different view of all of that and doesn’t want to bring in thousands of people into the eligibility and not have the vaccines for it. So, I think it’s a process that’s being rethought again within the Governors office, but we’ve sent our letter in and trying to broaden that whole area. Some of the specifics of the question, I’m going to bring in Dr. Paterson

and he has a better idea of the processes and how we're working with the McLean County Department of Health.

Dr. Paterson: Thank you. I don't want to be contrite about this, but I just want to say honestly, you're assuming we know a lot more than we do. We get information from the Mclean County Health Department requesting how many vaccines we would need for people in the categories that are listed in the IDPH, so in 1A 1B. We provide that information to them and then we get a number of vaccines. We don't know for sure how many vaccines we will get until we get them. Sometimes that may be 50, sometimes that may be 300. And then we work to... we've identified, certainly in 1A it was fairly clear who fits into 1A. 1B was clearer, but with some interpretation that we have to work through. 1C, we don't know who will be in 1C. The state is still working on that. And the state definition isn't always in compliance with what the CDC recommendations are for the different groupings. So, for example, higher education is in 1B in the CDC recommendations, but not in the IDPH recommendations. We are, as the questions largely indicated, that in 1C a great portion of that will relate to people with medical conditions. We will not be participating in that part because we do not have a way... well, we don't have information about faculty/staff medical conditions, nor do we want to have that information for many reasons with that. So, people with medical conditions, it's not clear whether that'll be done through the county or maybe your medical provider. I've heard different stories on that, but I don't have any information at this point on what 1C's going to look like exactly, but I would say concerning medical conditions we will not be involved in providing vaccines to that group.

Senator Kalter: Thank you, Dr. Paterson. And with all due respect, I don't think either myself, nor the constituent from the Humanities assumed anything. Everything that I read to you was factual and we were asking questions.

So, let me go to my next questions. I'm wondering if the people who received their first dose in error will be allowed to receive their follow-up Moderna shot?

Dr. Paterson: Yes.

Senator Kalter: Wonderful. And I'm wondering also, was there, in fact, a notification that was based upon one's fall and/or spring face-to-face or hybrid course modality preference? Am I right that that information was provided to Student Health by the administration?

Dr. Paterson: It came from the Registrar's office. And we worked through, as the steering committee, that information. The email comes out through Student Health Services portal, yes.

Senator Kalter: Okay. So, I wanted to make a comment about that. First of all, I do believe that there were a few people who were notified as eligible who are not actually teaching face-to-face this semester, may not even be teaching hybrid this semester, may have been last semester or maybe not? I'm not really sure, but when asked, told me that they had taught online all year, so it's not clear to me that if that information is being provided that it's accurate.

However, I do also wonder if it is ethical for a healthcare provider to be distributing vaccines based on an ISU priority list of who selected online, hybrid, or face-to-face that would override both the CDC guidelines to the states, and our own states guidelines. So, Senator Johnson had

said last time that the COVID steering group was looking at which individuals are at the greatest ability to be exposed, who are working on campus, things of that nature, but did not come back fully with those recommendations and how that tiering would go. I thought at the time he was talking about our Frontline Essential Workers like police or medical personnel. I didn't think we might be considering other faculty or staff as Frontline Essential, even in Phase 2. So I understand that issue about who has the greatest ability to be exposed, right, I understand that, but there may also be people who are working from home solely because they can or were asked to, or who may be more prone to exposure in other ways or more prone to expose family members. So, for example, I think, that Senator Torry and Senator Nichols should definitely get vaccinated before I do if we happen to be in the same eligibility and if they are actively in face-to-face labs, but I'm wondering if Student Health or ISU can ethically get to make that decision when the state and the CDC are not making that distinction?

Dr. Paterson: I understand that. That's part of why that group was pulled once we found out that information that had gone to that group to be eligible to receive vaccinations.

Senator Kalter: Okay. And I would just request that that continued to be pulled even when we enter into Phase 2 as we go along.

The other thing that I wondered, and you may not have this information at hand, but I would appreciate receiving it after the meeting. I'm wondering if any of the individuals who signed this summer's health, safety and equity letter who are not eligible under 1A or 1B notified that they were eligible? And I don't mean to give me the names, but I'm wondering if any of those people who signed were notified, if they were not already eligible under 1A or 1B.

So, I'm also wondering if other people on the Senate have questions regarding the vaccinations? Or if they have any other questions for our administrators? (Pause) Okay. So, I'm going to go on to my second set of questions for Senator Dietz.

So, Senator Dietz, as you know, Dr. Tarhule knows also, that I'm also concerned about the reopening of the library, and we heard a little bit about this in public comment, both from a parent and from Dr. Akman.

To my knowledge, I don't think that you have met directly with our librarians regarding how decisions to open or close the library are being made and who should make them. So that is my first question: I'm wondering if you have met directly with our librarians to have a dialogue? And I don't mean a town hall but a true dialogue, you know. explanation about the decision already made...I'm wondering if you have met with them directly to have a true exchange about the issues that have been raised in the Executive Committee and in the Senate over the past several months and to hear any concerns, and to hear them audibly, not just in a chat that is then read back to you by an administrator? And if not, will you do that, if that is what they would like? Because we were told by our Library Senator at Executive Committee last Monday that the reopening was not a decision that was made by the shared governance body in the Library but an upper administration decision, and that the Library Council was told to create a plan for how to reopen safely, not to make a recommendation that the administration would honor regarding whether to reopen in Phase 4 or not.

President Dietz: The answer is that I have not met directly with the folks in the Library. I relied upon the dean to have those conversations internally, and then the dean will make recommendations on to the Provost, and that's how those decisions were made. I'm happy to have a conversation with folks there but I generally don't have those direct conversations, but I'm happy to do that.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Thank you. My second question is about the fact that gatherings of 50 persons or more are still prohibited. And so, I'm wondering how gatherings of 50 or more within Milner are going to be prevented especially during midterms, finals weeks, and perhaps at other times? So, this concern isn't about librarians per se—most of whom are staff, not faculty. It is about the opening of large spaces, whether it's stadiums or libraries or student centers.

President Dietz: Yeah. My understanding with that, again, coming from Library leadership is that there were going to be students that would be monitoring the students that are gathering, and basically going to try to ensure that there is distancing and that there's not going to be more than 50 in any one place there.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Thank you. And then I'm also wondering if you can publicize the ventilations and other HVAC statistics for the Milner Library building alongside CDC and ASHRAE (American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air-Conditioning Engineers) recommendations regarding building ventilation? I had actually asked for that over the summer for all our buildings, but I don't think we ever saw those postings on the outsides of our buildings as I requested. So, I'm wondering if we can get those.

President Dietz: I'd be happy to talk to Senator Stephens about that offline and see what we can come up with on that.

Senator Kalter: All right. Thank you. And let's see, Cera or Martha, you can help me with this. I'm wanting to make sure that... I don't recognize Hannah Hogue. If you are a Senator, I apologize. I don't recognize your name as a Senator. I just want to make sure that I'm calling only on Senators.

Ms. Hazelrigg: She is a new Senator.

Senator Kalter: No wonder I don't recognize your name. Now, I do see that Senator Harris has her hand up again, and she was first, so I'm going to go first to her, Senator Hogue, and then to you.

Senator Harris: Yeah, I'm sorry, I just got kicked out like two times in a row. But the question I had was for President Dietz or any other administration. I was not here for the beginning half so I'm not fully sure what happened or anything like that, but I know that there was public comment from our Graduate Students. So, I was curious if you all had a direct response to the issues that they addressed?

President Dietz: I think I covered that in my Administrator Remarks.

Senator Kalter: Do you have any other questions, Senator Harris?

Senator Harris: If you can expand on that a little bit, if you would like to. Because I know that these students are here still waiting for some kind of direct response to what they addressed.

President Dietz: The comments that I've made are about the only comments I would have tonight. There are other comments that are on the website and that's what we're going to continue to update our website on that.

Senator Kalter: All right. Thank you. And we'll go to Senator Hogue.

Senator Hogue: Hi. I'm the new Watterson Senator. So, I haven't spoken up. Anyway, hi. I wanted to make a couple comments. So, today I actually had the opportunity to go study in Milner and I did notice, although it's a wonderful space to study, there were many, many people there. And I love to see that people are getting involved, but the 50 or more, you have stated that there will be students that will be going around enforcing this. I didn't... it could have just been where I was sitting, but I personally didn't see really any supervision, I guess, when it comes down to making sure people are following COVID guidelines.

And that carries over to my second comment. I'm a freshman this year. I'm so excited to go out to sporting events, but at the same time, how do we necessarily have a plan to enforce masks in these areas? Because I know, especially in sporting events, people tend to get very riled up and may not use their best judgement in this time.

President Dietz: The answer to your last question is that all of that will be monitored by our staff within Athletics, and some student workers in Athletics and if individuals don't have their masks on and they refuse to do that they will be asked to leave the event.

Senator Kalter: All right. I'm not seeing any further questions. Is that right? (Pause) All right. let's move on then. So, thank you very much, Senator Dietz, and everybody else for answering our questions, and we'll go now to our two Action Items. Integrity Policy [is the first one].

Action Items:

01.21.21.04 From Alice Maginnis: Rationale of Changes from Legal (Faculty Affairs Committee)

11.12.20.03 Policy 1.8 Integrity in Research and Scholarly Activities Current Copy (Faculty Affairs Committee)

01.26.21.01 Integrity Policy Section I Mark Up (Faculty Affairs Committee)

01.26.21.02 Integrity policy Section II Mark Up (Faculty Affairs Committee)

01.26.21.03 Integrity policy Section III Mark Up (Faculty Affairs Committee)

01.26.21.04 Integrity policy Section IV Mark UP EDITORIAL CHANGES ONLY (Faculty Affairs Committee)

01.26.21.05 Policy 1.8 Integrity in Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities Clean Copy (Faculty Affairs Committee)

Senator Kalter: You may remember, we saw this policy back in November. The Faculty Affairs Committee took the feedback from the Senate floor under consideration and also passed it by Legal. And Alice Maginnis is here tonight to respond to questions regarding the legal advice given to us about the policy, and also Kathy Spence from our Research Compliance office is here in case there are other questions. So, although the policy is now in Action phase, we often do

start in Information in case there are any lingering questions. And so, I'm going to hand it over to Senator Hollywood to take us through the first, second and third parts of the policy, and we're going to pause after each to take questions, and then we'll just vote on them all at once. Once through the third part we'll have her motion, you know, on behalf of the committee to approve the changes. And just to remind everybody... actually I'm going to leave the reminder about Section IV to Senator Hollywood because we talked about this in committee. So, go for it, Senator Hollywood.

Senator Hollywood: Thank you. So, in the first document, in Section I, we actually went through and just cleaned up some of the language as far as being scholarly and creative activities, and so you'll see a lot of strike outs on that one. Most of this was put together based on, for all three documents, was put together based on the comments that were given on the floor in the informational section. So, we changed, "it is their duty to exercise supervisory responsibility," so we actually changed that. So, those are the two things in Section I.

In Section II, there was a suggestion that we change "to protect the policy" to "to protect the principles," and that was deemed okay by Legal, and so we went ahead and switched that. And then we proposed... there was some alternate language proposed in Section II related to graduate student work, so I will let, I believe, Alice Maginnis or Kathy Spence who inserted that language... And then we change the reference section, in Section II as well.

And then in Section III, we accepted the change of changing the suggested wording to add "disseminating" rather than "accepted within the scholarly community for proposing, or conducting, or reporting." And then we also took out a portion because there is a... we're proposing adding language clarifying how does the administration distinguish what conflicts apply and the pathways of action, we're actually deferring that because there is 7.11 is actually going through a process at this particular time. So, we need to wait until that's finished before we can add this back in. So, we will most likely see Section III again. And then we added some semicolons and just made some further changes on Section III.

Senator Kalter: All right. Terrific. That was extremely efficient; we didn't have to go section by section. So, does anybody have any lingering Information Item questions about any of these?

Senator Horst: I have a question. I'm not sure if you want to incorporate this idea or not but I noticed in the plagiarism section in Section III. D that for self-plagiarism you have, "self-plagiarism as understood in the respondent's field," and I wonder if you want to add such a qualifier for plagiarism in general? Because specifically, like in the creative arts which this now applies to, the concept of what... you know taking credit for someone else's work or ideas it can be very tricky in Music or Fine Arts in general about what is a generic cord progression versus what somebody's ideas. So, it could sort of... plagiarism can be a little bit contextual depending on the field. So, I'm wondering if you wanted to add such a qualifier to plagiarism. It just might be something that you could consider.

Senator Kalter: Senator Hollywood, since you haven't been a committee chair, let me step you through a little bit of this. What we often do when people make those kinds of friendly suggestions is the committee chair will ask the rest of the committee who's here on the floor

whether they consider that friendly or not. And so, that sounds like one of those that we could do that for.

Senator Hollywood: Okay. So, the Faculty Affairs Committee, do we consider that a friendly change?

Senator Kalter: I'm seeing a yes from Senator Pancrazio. Let's see. Who else do we have? Why don't you call them all since we are on Zoom?

Senator Hollywood: Okay. Senator Pancrazio, said yes. Senator Jenkins?

Senator Kalter: She's got her thumbs up.

Senator Hollywood: Okay. I'm trying to remember who's all on there now. Senator Small?

Senator Small: Yes.

Senator Hollywood: I'm trying to remember who's on my own thing. I'm sorry. I've been on Zoom all day.

Senator Kalter: Senator Otto had her thumbs up. I'm trying to remember too. Senator Tallon? Senator Tallon has his thumb up. I have my thumbs up.

Senator Hollywood: Senator Chassy? Okay.

Senator Kalter: And Senator Small, since you are the secretary, have we missed anybody?

Senator Small: No, I don't think so. Oh, wait, what about our new members?

Senator Kalter: Yes, I think I called both the new members, right? Senator Otto and Senator Tallon.

Senator Small: Then I think we're good.

Senator Kalter: All right. So, that sounds like a friendly. So, we're going to insert (whatever it says) as in the field for plagiarism as a whole. Anybody else have any Information Item issues? (Pause) Okay. One thing that I... Oh, Senator Nikolaou, sorry.

Senator Nikolaou: Just a tiny one. I think when one item was moved the "e.g" remained under III.D so we just need to remove at the very end of III.D Falsification Research, we need to delete "e.g" at the end of that sentence.

Senator Kalter: I'm sorry. So, you're in which Section?

Senator Nikolaou: III.

Senator Kalter: Section III. Okay.

Senator Nikolaou: Item D. It's at the very end, "included in grant proposals." It just stayed when it was copy and pasted.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. I remember that the committee did intend to delete that, don't you, Senator Hollywood?

Senator Hollywood: Yes, and the "e.g" is scratched out. There is a period at the end of that.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Anything else? (Pause) I had one thing Senator Hollywood. I noticed that there might be a typo in Section II, in B, where it says, "The Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies (AVPRGS) has primary responsibility for fostering research" it should say "integrity" after "research."

Senator Hollywood: And where are you again? I was bringing up the document.

Senator Kalter: It's alright. It's Section II.

Senator Hollywood: Okay.

Senator Kalter: In letter B. And it's the sentence that reads, "The Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies (AVPRGS) has primary responsibility for fostering research" and then we accidentally erased the "integrity," I believe. So, it should say, "for fostering research integrity and for disseminating information about integrity in research practices and activities."

Senator Hollywood: Okay.

Senator Kalter: And then also in that same section in C, there should be an "a", you know, the article "a", right before the "RIO."

Senator Hollywood: Right.

Senator Kalter: And in F (this might have been the same one, oh no, I guess Senator Nikolaou was in number III) in F there should be a period at the end.

Senator Hollywood: Okay.

Senator Kalter: All right. So, are you ready to move that to be adopted?

Senator Hollywood: Yes. I move that we adopt I, II, and III Integrity 1.8.

Senator Kalter: Okay. And do you also want to include the editorial changes that we made to Section IV?

Senator Hollywood: Yes. And those are just editorial changes to make them fit with Sections I, II, and III. We started the actual going over Section IV tonight, but we still have a long way to go on those.

Senator Kalter: All right. And actually, I think we started it a couple weeks ago, but...

Senator Hollywood: We actually started it a while ago but, yeah, it's been a while since we've been in IV.A so I think it would behoove us to go back and look at that again.

Motion by Senator Hollywood, on behalf of the Faculty Affairs Committee, to approve the proposed changes to Policy 1.8 Integrity in Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity: Section I,

II, and III, as well as the editorial changes to Section IV. The motion was approved, with an abstention from Senator Torry.

12.10.20.13 Horst Email Reinstatement Committee Charge (Rules Committee)

04.06.18.01 Email_Student Representation on Reinstatement and LOA committees (Rules Committee)

01.04.21.01 Reinstatement Committee charge Current (Rules Committee)

01.12.21.01 Reinstatement Committee charge mark up (Rules Committee)

01.12.21.02 REINSTATEMENT COMMITTEE CLEAN Copy (Rules Committee)

Senator Horst: We've made no changes. Just to recap, we're expanding the committee at their request to include two advisors with knowledge of major admissions processes. Our committee did not support the deletion of the student members, as was requested. And we went with the revisions of the Functions as was outlined by the committee that submitted it to us. And then finally, Senator Nikolaou requested consideration of graduate students on such committees and that charge was submitted... I believe Lauren Harris said she was going to address that with SGA on a larger context.

Motion by Senator Horst, on behalf of the Rules Committee, to approve the proposed changes to the Reinstatement Committee Blue Book Charge. The motion was unanimously approved.

Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Nikolaou

Senator Nikolaou: The Academic Affairs Committee met this evening and we completed our discussion of the annual reports of all the external committees that report to the Academic Affairs. We continued our discussion of the Material Fees Policy and we did a bit of clean up in our Issues Pending discussion.

Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Senator Marx

Senator Marx: The Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee met this evening with Dan Elkins to discuss the AIF report, and we had a really wonderful discussion, and looking forward to producing a report for the full Senate.

Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Hollywood

Senator Hollywood: Tonight, we actually worked on the 1.8 Integrity, the fourth part of it, the procedural part of it. So, we've gone over the entirety of part IV, A, B, and C once, and looking forward to doing it again.

Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Avogo

Senator Avogo: The Planning and Finance Committee has been conducting our probe into the quality of online learning. So far, we have spoken to representatives from the CTLT, the nursing college, the Office of Student Success, and the Dean of Students. We expect representatives from the Provost's office and I'm sure that you all know that we both share the same interest. The Provost office is working on the same priority and we are happy to share with them what we've found so far, and then hear from them on the questions that we have. If we complete that, we would outline the scope of our report and then go ahead and draft a report and finalize it and send it to the Senate.

Rules Committee: Senator Horst

Senator Horst: Rules Committee met. We had two visitors J. Cooper Cutting and Dallas Long. We finalized the Mass Communications policy and we'll be forwarding that to the Executive Committee. We finalized the Milner Library Bylaws and we'll be forwarding that. And we continued our review of the Academic Planning Committee charge.

Senator Kalter: All right. Terrific. Are there any questions for any of our committee chairs?
(Pause) All right. Seeing none.

Communications

Senator Kalter: Are there any Communications for the Senate? (Pause) All right. I have just two. In the interest of time and to let the Engineering Program proposal go forward with as much time as it needed, I sort of abbreviated some of the comments I had prepared about the Library. So, I may send those around at some point tomorrow through our list.

The other thing I want to say, that I would be remiss not to say here. We have a Code of Ethics at this university and we have a Student Code of Conduct, and it is inappropriate for people to be using swear words. There were some people who were at the meeting today who were guests of ours who would have been escorted out had they been doing what they're doing on Zoom. We're not going to tolerate that, and I think that regardless of the sentiment, you know, people are in high tension over the negotiation, that does not excuse personal attacks against anybody on this Senate. And so, if it happens again, we're going to escort you out, and we're going to refer you to the Student Code of Conduct Committee for that to be dealt with. We call each other Senator rather than by first or last name in order to remind ourselves, first of all, that we are all equals here. Nobody on this Senate has any, you know, more privileges than the others, except for the fact that some of us are voting and some of us are non-voting and that's because the non-voting members have veto power. But we also do it in order to keep decorum and to remind ourselves that we are debating issues and not people. So, I just wanted to say that as we close and I'm wondering if we have a motion to adjourn.

Adjournment

Motion by Senator Garrahy, seconded by Senator Cline, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.