

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

4-7-2021

Senate Meeting, April 7, 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, April 7, 2021" (2021). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 1280.

<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/1280>

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, April 7, 2021
Approved

Call to Order

Academic Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

Roll Call

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

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Wonderful. We have a quorum. So good evening, everyone. I wanted to start just by acknowledging and remarking the deep pain that I think we are all feeling as we witness the trial for the murder of George Floyd, a death that I think of as a public lynching.

It's hard to watch and to listen to it and, again, to feel the loss of the man without weeping almost as though he was one of our own immediate family on hearing the testimony of the witnesses. Who were not a crowd or a mob. To our black senators, colleagues, and students and others in the room, although those of us who are not black cannot be with you on this whole journey, you are not alone in your grief and your soul-deep frustration. We may never know what it's like to be treated in these ways, but the pain of witnessing it is keenly felt.

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 to the participant's function in Zoom or click on either the Yes or the No button if the raised hand is not available.

Live transcription is enabled. You can use your live transcription... Actually, I'm not sure I enabled it... So if somebody could, that would be terrific. You can use your live transcription controls along the bottom of your screen to enlarge the font, hide the transcription if it's distracting to you, or display the full transcription along the right-hand side of your screen.

Public Comment

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

The Academic Senate allows up to ten minutes in total for public 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 speaker's 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 start with Debbie Shelden, an Associate Professor in the Department of Special Education.

Prof. Debbie Shelden: I want to start by addressing the student senators. Your display of solidarity at the last meeting was incredible. To me it reflected a commitment to equity.

I'm here tonight to speak to another aspect of equity, equity for disabled members of our campus. The pandemic has revealed to many what disabled people have always known. We are not seen as full humans. Our lives can be sacrificed. The pandemic has also revealed that so many of the accommodations requested by disabled people, but denied, are indeed reasonable.

Our ableism affects faculty, staff, students. It affects those with disabilities widely known to others. It affects those of us with mental illness, chronic illness, and other disabilities people outside our closest circle are unlikely to know about. Ableism is found in institutional policies, ASPT, attendance policies, syllabi, everything. It's reflected in the ever-growing grind culture expectations of the faculty and the disposition system in teacher ed programs. It's reflected in inaccessible communications. It is everywhere.

One lesson of the pandemic is the faculty role can indeed be fulfilled largely or entirely from home. So, too, can the student role and likely many staff roles. We can now allow for work from home in technology accommodations without undue hardship to ISU, even as we return to being a primarily residential campus.

Is this Senate ready as a body to include an anti-ableism review for every policy that comes before it? Will you continue to meet online post-pandemic? Are individual senators ready to interrogate their own ableism? Are we each prepared to question assumptions about what it takes to fulfill campus roles?

The failure of administration to approach labor negotiations with justice in mind casts a shadow on progress toward equity. The failure of administration to regress the harm done in recent years to EAF faculty and graduate students casts a shadow on progress toward equity. So, too, failure to use the lessons of the pandemic to dismantle ISU's ableism would cast a shadow on progress toward equity.

Thank you.

Senate Chair Kalter: Thank you, Professor Shelden. We'll go next to Jonathan Jerkatis, a political science and history major representing members of Fossil Free ISU.

Jonathan Jerkatis: Hello and thank you for letting me speak here tonight. I am here tonight to speak on behalf of Fossil Free ISU. Many of you know us, but for those of you who do not, let

me briefly introduce us. Fossil Free ISU was formed in response to irresponsible investments of the university's endowment in fossil fuels made by the ISU Foundation. This is of grave concern because ISU's endowment funds go to funding academic scholarships that allow many students to have the opportunity to attend ISU. After a full year of working to convince the Foundation to divest from fossil fuels, the first real hope for substantive change was the announcement that the Foundation was going to be drafting an ESG statement. Regrettably, though, the ESG statement that was written by the Foundation and released was mainly performative and does not create any incentive for the investment managers to change the way in which they are investing. The Foundation had an opportunity to distinguish ISU as a leader in climate action but instead chose to take a path that was easier. To those of you on the Academic Senate who also serve on the Foundation, we ask that you lobby on our behalf that the Foundation revise their ESG statement to make Illinois State University the first university in Illinois to have divested fully from fossil fuels. Thank you.

Senate Chair Kalter: Thank you, Mr. Jerkatis. We'll move now to Steven Lazarov, who is a doctoral student in the Department of English, graduate teaching assistant, and a member of the Graduate Workers Union.

Steven Lazarov: Thank you. Good evening, everyone. Thank you. I want to begin by thanking the coalition of undergrad, graduate, and faculty senators who voted down the College of Engineering at the last Senate meeting. It was so moving for us in the union as TAs to see such loud solidarity with our efforts for a fair contract that recognizes the dignity of our lives and the value we create through our work at ISU. It's this kind of democratic coalition that can come together to make an ISU that actually serves the people who make ISU work rather than merely serving the power of the people at the top. However, though, at Saturday's emergency Board of Trustees meeting, President Dietz and his team showed their intent to ignore the will and advice of this Senate in voting down the site plan. In voting down the formation of a College of Engineering and standing in solidarity with TAs and the Graduate Workers Union. There was a lot of talk at Saturday's BOT about different College of Engineering concerns that confront issues about that proposed new college. But there wasn't a word from President Dietz that addressed the reason why the College of Engineering was voted down at the last Senate meeting, namely solidarity with the Graduate Workers Union, solidarity with TAs who have been bullied and disrespected throughout the past almost two years now. The voting down of Engineering was a recognition that ISU and President Dietz have actively sought to wear TAs out, to stall using the pandemic, to ensure that TAs are still paid wages that push many of us into a choice of poverty or debt. President Dietz now seeks to cast away the Academic Senate's vote. He seeks to cast away a deliberative body, the primary body of shared governance at ISU whenever he doesn't like an outcome. This is not democracy, and whether he voted yes or no on Engineering on the 24th, this is deeply troubling for the future integrity of this body and this University. Folks voted down Engineering because they wanted ISU to bargain fairly with TAs, to treat TAs with dignity and respect. Nothing has changed in that front except the fact that President Dietz is attempting to circumvent the democratic deliberation of the March 24th Senate meeting. Thank you for your time.

Senate Chair Kalter: Thank you, Mr. Lazarov. We now go to Trevor Rickerd, who is a doctoral student in Biological Sciences, a graduate teaching assistant, and a member of the Graduate Workers Union.

Trevor Rickerd: The Graduate Workers Union still has seen no substantial movement from the University in negotiations, despite what mischaracterization the Dietz administration is posting on its anti-union propaganda page. Despite what the site says, the University's bargaining team is not offering any amount of fee waivers, only restating that we are getting reimbursement of our health care fee that we already have. This changes literally zero in material needs. We're not even mentioning the fact that in the Board of Trustees meeting on April 3rd, the Dietz administration recommended that they raise the mandatory fees even more, citing the Multicultural Center as a reason for raising fees, for which they already have raised our fees for in the past. This would completely negate the minuscule pay increase that they are offering at the bargaining table right now. What's even more ridiculous is that this is not even the first time that they have done this. The Dietz administration, last time they gave the TAs a raise, they immediately coupled it with an increase in mandatory fees that far outpace our pay raise, effectively making our take home pay even less than where it was before. That's a pay cut. You can tell me that you're paying me \$1,000 a month, but if you're immediately taking \$300 in fees, you're effectively paying me \$700 a month. The more you raise fees, the less my monthly take-home pay. We're not stupid. We can do math. The amount of disrespect that this University has towards its graduate workers is ridiculous. Even when the Academic Senate voted to halt the formation of the College of Engineering, the Dietz administration went right on ahead talking as if the vote didn't even happen. They'll just say the Academic Senate is no longer the primary governing body of the University but instead that it's just purely advisory and isn't necessary for the purpose of approving huge projects or expenses. Right now as we speak, we are holding our strike authorization vote to allow our bargaining team, including me, to authorize a strike if we are to reach an impasse. At this point we will have met each legal criteria to form a strike. I hope the University is willing to concede at the next negotiation on April 12th so that we can move forward without a strike so that Dietz can get his College of Engineering, be happy, and leave the University with his legacy intact.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Thank you, Mr. Rickerd. And our last speaker is Pamela Hoff, a professor in the Department of Educational Administration and Foundation.

Professor Hoff: Thank you for allowing me to read, which is what I'm going to do. So I pose to my colleagues a question. Who are we? And I have to start by saying I'm not the person who writes reviews when I buy things online. I'm not the person who sounds the alarms, but I feel compelled in perhaps the same way that Emmet Till's mother, Mamie Till felt, when she said she wanted the world to see what Jim Crow had done to our baby. I feel compelled by the anguish and disgust that we are all feeling as a nation. We're living George Floyd's execution, through the Chauvin trials. Perhaps I'm compelled by Fannie Lou Hamer's word when she said I'm sick and tired of just being sick and tired.

So I'm here today to sound the alarm, to ask the question. Who are we? I seek to make transparent living injustice nuanced in the university structures, which has upheld one person at a time, one decision at a time. In EAF we are a depleted faculty who have made tremendous

strides while navigating intradepartmental trauma and triumph while suffering institutional divestment. These concerns are based on and underpinned by three complaints that ground our duress. One is institutional neglect, patterns of racial hostility that can be seen in ignored complaints, climate studies of our department and the institution in general. We also see a correlation between the divestment in our department and the hiring of our first Black chair. Because of this divestment our conditions of employment have radically changed. We were unable... I, in particular, was unable to get a sabbatical after 11 years because we are short on faculty. So this divestment has had a disproportionate impact on Black women.

Senator Horst: The time.

Pamela Hoff: Okay.

Senate Chair Kalter: Thank you, Professor Hoff. If any of you, of the five people who spoke today, have more, you can send us to us in writing, and we can distribute that. So thank you, all, to those giving public comment. We're glad you're here. You're welcome to stay to observe the meeting.

Just a reminder. If we do experience disruptions from any non-senators in our audience, I will be giving a single warning. If they continue, we will remove the individual or individuals causing this disruption from the Zoom room, and you'll be asked to watch the rest of the meeting via the YouTube livestream. Please remember that in all cases under Roberts Rules of Order, only sitting senators and expert witnesses whom the chair recognizes has speaking privileges. The chair of the meeting must recognize you from the floor before you're permitted to speak, even if another senator has invited you to speak. Non-senators who raise their hand or the equivalent, such as hitting the yes or no button during the meeting following public comment will be warned once and then removed from the room if they continue. During presentations and administrator remarks, I do generally allow our ex-officio administrative senators to be a chair's proxy, but the chair always does reserve the right to take back the floor and to mute microphones on Zoom in order to do so in the absence of a physical gavel.

Chairperson's Remarks

We start tonight with Chairperson's Remarks.

First, I want to let everyone know again that we must have a hard stop time this evening. I guess it's the first time I've said that, so we do have to have a hard stop time this evening due to a piece of urgent business in the Caucus and other important Caucus work.

I have two somewhat lengthy chairperson remarks this evening. One is a carryover from our last meeting regarding the process for Monday/Wednesday, Monday/Wednesday/Friday (MW/MWF) scheduling. And the second relates to the IDEAs graduation requirements on our agenda.

Last time, we had distributed communications from Dr. Brian Rejack, who is the Associate Chair in my department and Provost Tarhule regarding a proposed substantial change in MW course scheduling that had been in the offing prior to Governor Pritzker's announcements regarding

vaccinations and the Bridge to Phase 5. At first report, it apparently completely eliminated MW courses during a pandemic without any consultation with the persons impacted, whether students or faculty. It appears that what was intended was any MW course prior to 2 p.m. That does not make things much better.

I will say that I was and remain very concerned for how this type of change, which appears to be being discussed for the long term though dropped for the short term, would impact our English majors and our faculty, given that almost all of our courses are 75-minute courses. Such changes must be discussed with the Academic Senate prior to approval and implementation as this one was a decade ago when it was first proposed and defeated. Such a move would force all of our students in English to have to make very hard choices among TR courses or receive a pedagogically inappropriate 50-minute slot for courses that need 75 minutes. Many of our faculty had very heavy graduate student advising modes, and the only way they can keep up with them is to consolidate their classes on TR or MW. Classes which are most appropriate at 75 minutes already and use Monday, Wednesday, Friday or Tuesday, Thursday, Friday for the heavy reading and meetings that accompany such advising. This is for people who are already working Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday. I hardly ever take a weekend day off, much less a full weekend since I arrived here 21 years ago, and that includes most summers that most faculty do not get paid for. I'll remind everyone that English professors get paid about \$64,000 to \$95,000 per year. So four times less after 30 years of service to the University than our current University President (and that is very likely to widen as we hire a new president) and many times less than our football coach and other coaches. Whose salaries, by the way, were never publicly considered for reduction to help us through this pandemic.

According to the data provided by Provost Tarhule, English is the single most impacted department, but we would be far from alone in the potential fallout. Many years back, my understanding was that any such changes were going to be made gradually, but they would only apply to General Education courses that impact other majors, which, of course, doesn't make any sense because WTWR courses in Math and Languages were not going to be touched even though they are also non-standard and that they would impact only MW morning courses, not classes that go to 2 p.m. and not all MW classes. Although this imminent plan appeared on the surface to be being driven only by the pandemic, it had been raised with me by the Provost as a more general long-term issue back in the fall in our one on one.

Now I'll just warn you that what I'm about to say will rub some of you the wrong way if I haven't already, but I feel it needs to be surfaced as a perception. It seems yet another instance where shared governance is not being honored by persons lower down in the administrative structure and something that a few people in administration wanted a decade ago is being forced because they lost the argument at that time. I am not saying this about Provost Tarhule, who may only have had exposure to that one side of arguments until a few weeks ago at Exec, given that the arguments were coming, in part, from people in administrative roles. I think that if conditions change again and this proposal gets put back on the table during the pandemic, we would want to ask if we have considered classroom sharing and making classes hybrid where the class meets once per week online and once per week on campus or converting more non-instructional spaces into instructional spaces or renting more space close to campus or even asking for volunteers

rather than doing a massive sweep such as the one that was planned without regard to pedagogical considerations or individual and departmental needs for Friday time, maybe even having a MR, TF, WSat option or moving morning MWs to the afternoon and evening rather than to MWF and creating pandemic time slots for more early evening courses or other creative options. Moving MW to TR, as Senator Nikolaou had suggested at Exec, could have worked in some instances, but in English, it would force students to choose much more often among classes they need and possibly interfere with time to degree. It would be better to move MW to late afternoon and evening.

A very narrow definition of student success is being floated rhetorically around this pandemic change or the longer-term change that might be being pushed, but Exec students and faculty brought up a large variety of student success issues that were some of the many reasons why the proposal to force out MW classes got defeated in Academic Affairs in 2010.

It also may well be that discussions had to start being made on a schedule that was not the Senate's schedule, but once again not even I was being brought into the conversation. Why does that keep happening? Why isn't it a knee-jerk habit for all Provost office staff to contact the Senate chair and the relevant committee chair to keep us in the loop and get our feedback whenever there is a change or a difficult choice being made in the core academic area or the academic area broadly conceived? Why have we been told to communicate more but we hardly ever get communicated with when there is no way that we could know that something is going on that impacts faculty or students or both, and then it becomes a conflict because the Provost staff does not always have the shared governance mindset embedded in their practices?

Some of the impacts: English would have had 61 courses impacted by this change. And so does anyone wonder why English raises its voices loudly when we have so many classes that are impacted by so many administrative decisions? TCH had 44, ITK had 38. There are four departments in the College of Business, MQM, FIL, Marketing, Accounting. They had 35, 26, and 23 and 23, respectively, plus they also do all of their meetings and service on Fridays. IDS and WGS classes were 23. A large portion of those are taught by English, languages, humanities or social science professors. And I'll also mention Theatre and Dance, which had 12 that would have been affected, but they also do Friday production work.

So it was brought up at Exec that I am talking about the history, but the history is important because of the pedagogical and workload implications in a number of different ways that were recorded then and that are even more relevant today. And Dr. Rejack pointed out that it got dropped on staff and scheduling faculty just as the rather unpopular Well-Being Days were getting underway. As a senator from the humanities, it offends me when we dismiss even the most recent history because it is history as though somehow a focus on history is always a focus against change when it is, in fact, a stance of progressive action and thinking. To quote Faulkner, "The past is never dead. It is not even past." And one might argue quite successfully that it is a stance against change to want to go back to a standard schedule of only MWF/TR courses, especially when four-day-per-week courses are quietly accepted.

So let's quit this rhetoric of resistance to change, stick in the mud whenever the administration hits a roadblock to plans formulated in an echo chamber. Let's also raise the time problem

versus the space problem. The space problem could be solved by being very careful only to schedule 75-minute classes in the same rooms as one another and only to schedule 50-minute classes in the same rooms as one another. We do need to room schedule smartly, and I'm not sure it's smart right now, given how haphazardly that grew up. With regard to the time problems, we are talking about how we need to make data-driven decisions, but Exec has yet to see data that supports the claim that is being made within an echo chamber of non-consultation with faculty and students that a large number of students are experiencing time-to-degree issues or student success challenges compared to the number who would, should this change be effected. And I have sat on the Academic Planning Committee now for eight years, seven in my ex-officio role, and can tell you with certainty that most, if not all, of our programs have successfully reduced their time to degree, not increased it over the last decade and a half.

If we are talking about the pandemic, we need to focus on the 100 levels and other courses that are particularly likely to have a large number of frosh and sophomores. Many of our sophomores and transfer students have never even seen this campus, so there can be give and compromise on this but not a "my way or the highway" approach.

I want to point out, too, that decisions made during these kinds of times can lead to permanency. The reason we got to where we are with MW scheduling had to do with the renovation of Schroeder Hall and the need to expand classroom spaces across more days when the very large classroom building was offline, and it continued when half of Stevenson at a time was offline and receiving only a health upgrade with none of the comforts and aesthetic upgrades that Schroeder received. Not that we're jealous.

We were told by one person that the intent is being made to keep the decisions as local as possible, yet that is not the feedback that I'm getting, and certainly if local means that faculty and students who are impacted participate in those local decisions, none in my department have yet been invited to my knowledge. It has all been at the chairs and department administrators' level. We may need a directive from the Provost to chairs and directors to involve their faculty.

My second comment about IDEAS is being made here in case there is no space at this or subsequent meetings. I believe I'm the only senator who was on the original task force, which I got invited onto because of my roles as Program Director of two Interdisciplinary Studies programs, not as Senate Chair. I want to lay out some of my own concerns regarding the proposal, some of which were raised by the members of the task force or in the open forums from persons friendly to the idea of the proposal. And I will state here unequivocally that I am friendly to the idea of the proposal, but I do have several concerns that I'd like addressed.

I believe this proposal is going to take and probably should take more than one Information Item, given that it is a proposal to add a graduation requirement, which is a big deal when it comes in the form of a class. It is not easy to do an index search for graduation requirements in the undergrad catalog anymore, but the current ones are: A total of 120 hours to degree, requirements attached to the BA or BS if that is what a student opts for. There are other Bachelor degrees that students can opt for, but for BA completion, you need to take a Languages 115 level course, and for the BS you have to have three hours of math, science or technology beyond the Gen Ed minimum. You have to complete General Education, declare and complete a

major, complete at certain number of senior college hours, maintain a minimum GPA, complete or remove Incompletes, remove disciplinary holds, take 30 hours of junior-senior year residency at ISU, complete up-to-date pre-reqs (for example, in Nursing where a pre-req might go out of date in less than a four-year period). You have to complete one course in AMALI, the courses that educate about Africa, the Middle East, Asia, Latin America, and the indigenous peoples of the world, and you have a limitation on the number of hours you can take as professional practice internship or independent study. So you can see that some, but not all of these graduation requirements do involve the required course.

So here are the concerns I want to surface. It does not seem to be what the students have been asking for as a result of the campus climate study and the continuing issues that it revealed. If so many people are already taking one of these courses, as the data suggests, how will making these courses a requirement change the campus climate? I asked for these course completion statistics during the task force meetings, and yet we were not provided them until this fall or spring. At the time, I had asked because we were concerned about resistance to the proposal from departments that felt they could not add hours. Now I am interested because it speaks to whether the cure is efficacious in addressing the disease, as identified through the Campus Climate survey. On the other hand, if we were to create a different course that no one has ever taken and require that, which would be an added several credit hours, how would we ever get support?

I'm also very concerned as one of the faculty who teaches these courses regularly for the past 21 years: How would making my two courses required, rather than voluntary courses, potentially change the classroom dynamic? Will it add an element or an increased element of hostility to the class? Will it change the tone of the class? Will it add an element of stress and ethno-stress and gyno-stress on the instructors and students in all of these courses, whether Native American studies, Ethnic Studies, Women's Gender and Sexuality studies? Nearly all the students that I teach come in completely ignorant of Native American lives, history, literature, and issues. Except for students for whom it is a lived experience, and then that causes a clash within the dynamics of the course, it can be very difficult to manage such that the second kind of student does not have to suffer daily macro- and micro-aggressions. This is also true when I teach noncanonical African-American, Latinx, Asian-American, and AMALI texts in my American Literature and Gen Ed courses. That's what I was hired in for when I was first appointed. The courses I teach in Native-American Studies and literature are already to some extent involuntary in the sense of being, in the one instance, a Languages in the Humanities course in Gen Ed and, in the other, one of only a few required non-Western courses in English Ed. But at least the English Ed instructors/teachers are mostly eager to learn, and at least the Gen Ed students generally have a broader choice of courses and come in mostly with an open mind.

There were also workload issues that were raised in the task force and in both of the public forums, and not putting this work on the backs of non-tenured tracks or hiring more non-tenure tracks to accommodate increased need for capacity. If we are serious about this commitment, we should hire people with solid research agendas and healthy equitable salaries to teach them and support those agendas. This was not a concern about the qualifications and excellence possible with non-tenured track teaching but about whether the University is willing to put its money where its mouth is and pay people for the research that is necessary to keep current in these fields rather than load them with four courses per semester at low pay and force any research to be

done on the side, if at all. And I think, also, there was a sense that these fields come with extra service, especially for faculty of color, so that tenure line commitments are needed if additional instructors are needed.

And, finally, I just want to make one more specific point about the proposal itself. On page 5 an IDEAS Curriculum Committee is described, and it is described as parallel to the AMALI Curriculum Committee, but it is not quite parallel as described, and it seems as though both AMALI faculty and IDEAS faculty should be able to elect their own screeners of appropriate courses rather than being appointed by the Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Education, who usually has no expertise in either AMALI or IDEAS, because it is not a qualification for the role. The function should be seated in the area of faculty and formalized by the Senate as a subcommittee or panel of the UCC, similar to CGE, and the same should be done for both IDEAS and for AMALI.

Action Items:

01.03.19.02 Milner Bylaw Current Copy (Rules Committee)

02.04.21.02 Milner Bylaws Mark Up (Rules Committee)

02.04.21.01 Milner Library Bylaws CLEAN (Rules Committee)

So we're going to now move to our action items. Senator Horst, would you like to make a motion to approve the changes to the Milner bylaws?

Senator Horst: Certainly. I just wanted to quickly review the changes that we made to the document after the Information Item. In Article V, we specified that there was an election of the civil service member. In Article VI we deleted a council in one situation when referring to the Elections Committee. In Article VII we added some wording that Dr. Nikolaou recommended: communicate and facilitate discussion with constituent groups which members represent. And in Article VII we clarified what "publicly" referred to at that point. And I'd like to make a motion to approve this document on behalf of the Milner Library Council and the Rules Committee.

Motion by Senator Horst, on behalf of the Rules Committee, to approve changes to the Milner bylaws.

Senate Chair Kalter: Coming from an internal committee, it does not need a second. Do we have debate over those changes? All right. Seeing no debate, we will move to the vote.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Horst: Okay, the bylaws passed.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Terrific. So we have new Milner bylaws. Congratulations, and thank you. I'm still going to get your name wrong, Joan, so I'm going to call you Joan. Thank you, Professor [Schuitema]. And we'll see you next time, we have bylaws.

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

02.25.21.09 Policy 9.7 Mass-Electronic-Mail-Policy Mark Up (Rules Committee)

02.25.21.07 Policy 9.7 Mass-Electronic-Mail-Policy Clean Copy (Rules Committee)

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

02.25.21.10 Policy 9.7.1 Mass Electronic Mail Procedures Mark Up (Rules Committee)

02.25.21.08 Policy 9.7.1 Mass Electronic Mail Procedures Clean Copy (Rules Committee)

Senate Chair Kalter: So, Senator Horst, would you like to make a motion to approve the changes to the Mass Electronic Communication Policy?

Senator Horst: Yes. I just want to point out there were a couple of changes. I don't necessarily have to go over them unless anybody would like me to, but the Rules Committee voted on some additional changes that were suggested on the floor, and that is before you. The procedures and the policy together, Susan, or separate?

Senate Chair Kalter: I think you can do them together.

Motion by Senator Horst, on behalf of the Rules Committee, to approve changes to the policy and procedures on Mass Electronic Communication.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. And coming from Committee, that does not need a second. Do we have any debate? All right. It looks like none. So we'll go to the vote on that one.

The motion was unanimously approved.

(Previously Tabled)

10.22.20.02 Policy 6.1.13_Sound Amplification Clean Copy (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)

02.18.21.21 Sound Amplification mark up (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)

02.18.21.22 Sound Amplification clean copy (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. We move to the Sound Amplification Policy. You may remember that this was placed on the table at a previous meeting. I'm wondering if somebody would like to make a motion to take the Sound Amplification Policy off the table.

Motion by Senator Horst, seconded by Senator Mainieri, to take the motion on the proposed changes to the Sound Amplification policy from the table.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. So there's no debate on that. We do need to vote, however, untabling something.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Senate Chair Kalter: So the policy is off the table. We are already in debate regarding the changes to the policy, as the motion to approve the changes was made previously. So Senator Marx, did you want to say anything before we continue debate?

Senator Marx: Yes. As we're bringing this back for the Senate consideration, we have made some revisions to the policy since last time. Concerns were raised on the floor of the Senate

about the effects this policy might have within academic areas, and a paragraph has been added since last time. May I read it as follows?

Senate Chair Kalter: Yes.

Senator Marx: Okay. It is expected that amplified sound may be part of some classroom activities. Should the use of amplified sound in an academic setting cause interference with other academic interests, faculty members are urged to work with other faculty or between academic units via school directors or chairpersons to resolve the conflict. If the conflict cannot be resolved, the dean or deans of the respective colleges should be contacted to resolve the conflict.

Under general policy provisions, we expanded item number 4, which previously only specified Athletics to now read that the sound amplification approval is not required for classes held in their regularly scheduled classroom, indoor performance venues such as the Center for Performing Arts, Westhoff Theatre, Allen Theatre, and Braden Auditorium or regularly scheduled athletic events.

Finally, in the section regarding noise complaints, the University Police Department may be called on to handle those complaints, and if the complaint relates to an approved event, the contact person will be asked to take immediate steps to reduce the noise level. If the complaint involves amplified sound in an academic area, we have added that competing academic interests will be taken into consideration when determining if the noise level can or should be reduced. With these changes, we hope that we've addressed the concerns of various senators to this revised policy and that we will be able to approve this policy this evening.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Thank you very much, Senator Marx. And do we have any further debate about the policy? All right. I see no debate, so let's move to the vote.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Information/Action Item:

Proposal to extend the suspension of ACT/SAT scores as an admissions criterion through 2023-24 admissions cycle (two-year extension)

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Terrific. So we have a new Sound Amplification Policy. So we'll move on to our Information/Action Item. For this item, it's a pandemic-related item, and so it did not go to committee. I'm going to ask Provost Tarhule and/or our Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management, Jana Albrecht, if she's here on the call, to introduce this one.

Provost Tarhule: Thank you, Chairperson Kalter. I believe Jana Albrecht is on the call as well. But the motion we're bringing before you, as you know, because of the pandemic, a lot of students have not been able to take their regular exams. So several institutions across the country have gone to a test optional admission process. We did that this past year, but the authorization we got is about to expire, and the challenge for students remains. So as we look forward to the next admission cycles, we'd like to extend this policy for two years. This would bring us, make us consistent with some of the other public institutions in the State of Illinois that

have also gone test optional. This is not asking for a permanent change. We expect this to be a trial period. We are collecting data, and we're going to need a little bit more than one year's worth of data to examine the success, persistence, and maybe any challenges that students face who have been admitted through this process, and then we might come back at a later date to talk about a permanent change, but at the present time we are asking for your endorsement for us to go test optional for another two years. And Associate Vice President Albrecht is here to answer any detailed questions you may have. Sorry.

Senate Chair Kalter: I was just going to ask Associate Vice President Albrecht if she had anything that she wanted to add before we take questions, comments or concerns.

Associate Vice President Albrecht: Sure. The only thing I would say that wasn't in the document or the memo that we sent is that we were shocked in Admissions to see that about 47% of our students for this incoming fall term didn't supply test scores. So we thought that was a relatively high percentage. It does match what the University of Illinois is seeing, too. I think they were at 50%.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Thank you. Do we have any questions, comments, concerns? All right. It looks like. Oop, there's one. Let's see.

Senator Blum: Yeah, I support this, but I do have a little bit of a question in terms of the long term. For example, for my college I think that this would have little impact one way or the other, but I don't know if there are different disciplines where this may matter more than others, and I just kind of wonder that as we move through this, are we going to look at... I don't know. There might be a particular major or discipline where it actually might be important to have those test scores. Or maybe not. I don't know. But I do think it's worth looking out. A universal policy may be terrific. It may be great. Or it may also have to be applied in different ways as well.

Provost Tarhule: Let me attempt an answer, and then Dr. Albrecht can clean it up. So there are two things. Even before the pandemic, there were some institutions that were considering going test optional for a variety of reasons. The particular reason that we are doing it now is really out of necessity. Because of the pandemic, a lot of students did not take the test at all. In fact, the tests were not offered in some areas. So, at the present time, we, along with many other institutions, feel like we don't have a choice just because so many people did not take the test. So this pandemic-related decision is very different from the long-term decision about whether a test option is desired. So, Senator Blum, I hear what you're saying. We are also using this opportunity, as I said, to collect as much data as possible. But at the present time, this is not a conversation about going test optional on a permanent basis. It's a situation that we feel we have almost no control because so many students didn't take the test at all. I don't know if that helps clarify.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. And I'll also just add to that that, Senator Blum, we are collecting information from department and college curriculum committees for the long term because of that question about whether or not specific programs might need a standardized test or not, and so, as far as I understand it from my check-ins with the departments, over half or maybe about two-thirds to three-quarters have already given their information and

recommendations to the College Curriculum Committees, or they're in the process of making the recommendations and finishing that discussion in the departments. Those would then come up to the UCC and the Senate, and we'd have further conversation with Associate Vice President Albrecht, Jeff Mavros from Admissions, and etc. to get input from other than the faculty and the programs.

Senator Samuel: I just wanted to comment that I hope this goes through, and I hope as we collect data we also collect on whether it is helping diversity on campus, because these tests are quite often classist and racist, and I think a benefit of getting rid of them would be if we actually do see an increase of minorities and specifically racial minorities on campus. If there's any data so far, I'd love to hear it, but I can imagine that the time so far isn't enough. But definitely at the end of the two years, I would want to see data regarding that.

Senate Chair Kalter: Thank you. And I'll just mention because Senator Samuel is, I think, one of our two graduate senators, the decisions about the GRE and other graduate level things would go through either a local department or through the Graduate Council, just in case anybody is wondering that as well. All right. Any more questions, comments or concerns? All right. If not, what we want to do here is to move this from information to action, so we first need to have a motion to that effect and then a second and a vote.

Motion by Senator Samuel, seconded by Senator Mainieri, to move the proposal to extend the suspension of ACT/SAT scores as an admissions criterion through the 2023-24 admissions cycle from information to action.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Do we have any debate about moving it from information to action? And it looks like probably not.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Terrific. So we have moved the item from information to action. Do we have a motion to move to approve this extension for two years?

Motion by Senator Palmer, seconded by Senator Toth, to approve extending the suspension of ACT/SAT scores as an admissions criterion through the 2023-24 admissions cycle.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Terrific. And do we have any debate about the motion? All right. We'll move to a vote on that then.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Terrific. So now, unfortunately, because of the time and because the Caucus does need to begin meeting in about 10-15 minutes, we're going to have to go to Student Body President Remarks and Administrator Remarks, and then wrap up this meeting. So I'm going to ask the committee chairs if you can again send in your reports.

Student Body President's Remarks

Actually, I think that Senator Harris is not here. Senator Toth, did she leave any remarks for you?

Senator Toth: No report tonight.

Senate Chair Kalter: I thought so. Okay. So we'll go to Senator Dietz for President's Remarks.

Administrators' Remarks

- ***President Larry Dietz***

Senator Dietz: Thank you very much. A couple of items tonight. One is dealing with on-campus vaccination clinics. Earlier today, the University announced it will host vaccination clinics specifically for ISU students on Thursday, Friday, and the following Monday. So Thursday and Friday of this week and the following Monday. There are going to be about 3,100 additional one-dose Johnson and Johnson vaccines available for these dates. When you have the chance, please share this information with your fellow students and colleagues and encourage them to get vaccinated. These clinics are in addition to those already scheduled by the University in collaboration with the McLean County Health Department, which are scheduled to continue taking place on Thursdays. Illinois Department of Public Health has prioritized college-aged students in various regions throughout the State, including Region 2 where we're located. As COVID-19 cases increase throughout the State and the nation, particularly in younger individuals, IDPH and higher education officials are working to provide increased access to the COVID vaccine for college students. In support of this effort, the McLean County Health Department expanded eligibility to any individual 16 and older as of Monday, April 5th. For more information about on-campus vaccination clinics can be found at the coronavirus website at www.coronavirus.illinoisstate.edu and also the weekly COVID update. The presidents and chancellors have been encouraging this activity for quite some time, and the Chair of the Illinois Board of Higher Education has also been advocating for this, so it finally has come to pass, albeit very recently. We learned about this just the day before yesterday. So we hope to stand those up very quickly and get a lot of student vaccinated before they venture on back home at the end of the semester.

Second issue I'll talk about just briefly. ISU's commitment to good faith negotiations with SEIU Local 73. Last week the University released details of its current offers to the union. These offers were verbally presented on March 3rd during mediation were in the case of the two non-economic proposals and subsequent side meetings prior to March 18th and delivered in writing prior to the March 18th mediation session. The University has offered fair proposals that show meaningful movement and ensure the package provided to our GTAs is competitive with peer institutions. As I've stated previously, the University is committed to good faith negotiations with SEIU Local 73, and we continue to wait for a counterproposal from the union. The next negotiation with the federal mediator is scheduled for Monday, April 12th. For more information, please visit the SEIU negotiations website at www.seiunegotiations.ilstu.edu for the most up-to-date information about the status of our ongoing negotiations.

And the last thing is just briefly... I appeared on the 17th of March before the Senate Appropriations Hearing Committee, and our appearance before the House will be this Friday. We've asked again for a flat budget of \$69,600,000, which in this environment we think is really

terrific if we can get that again. But we've also asked for an additional \$11,000,000, but those requests are because of COVID expenses specifically. We also have listed our capital requests, and we hope that after all of this over that we'll get the operating requests and the capital requests. With that, I'll end my comments and be happy to entertain any questions if there's time for that. It's up to you, Chair Kalter.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. I think we're going to do questions all at once again. So we'll go to Provost Tarhule for Provost Remarks.

- ***Provost Aondover Tarhule***

Provost Tarhule: Thank you, Chairperson Kalter. In the interest of time, I'll make only one announcement. I am really pleased to announce that ISU of one of 16 institutions that were selected by the Association of Public and Land Grant Institutions (that's the APLU) to participate in the Institutional Transformation Assessment for student success and equity. The ITA (that's the Institutional Transformation Assessment) is a web-based tool that helps universities to understand institutional strengths and areas for improvement. And the goal is to build capacity to better support students on campus and develop an action for reaching the institution's student success goals. So participation in this process, we think, will allow us to advance planning and initiatives addressing both student success and equity. And the process will commence later this month and will continue throughout the 2021-22 academic year. So you're going to start seeing a lot of information coming out from my office about the details of this exciting opportunity. And that's the only update I'd like to give. Thank you.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Thank you very much. And now we'll go to Senator Stephens for Vice President for Finance and Planning Remarks.

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

No report

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

Vice President Stephens: Thank you, Senator Kalter. I want to spend a few minutes talking through some high-level comments about your question a few weeks ago concerning fiscal risk emanating from continued losses in the AFS system and its ultimate impact to GR due to the pandemic. First of all, thanks for asking this important question. In summary, there's no one single answer to this. It is truly a series of connected factors that involve both enrollment levels, housing occupancy levels, bond debt covenant calculations, LOC guideline limitations, and credit agency fiscal review. However, in order to offer some peace of mind, I believe I've arrived at a collective set of facts that may help everyone here feel confident about our financial future at ISU, both on the GR side and the AFS side.

First key fact to share: Our existing reserve levels as we effectively entered into the pandemic last summer. On June 30, 2020 we ended the fiscal year with GR reserves of about \$113,000,000, and the AFS system had about \$127,000,000 - the collective total reserve level of \$240,000,000, a very strong balance sheet. By the way, this level of fiscal strength kept us at an S&P A- ranking, three notches above the State of Illinois credit rating.

Now the fiscal '21 pandemic has certainly placed a strain on the AFS system, mostly hitting Housing and Dining the worst with only 50% occupancy levels this fall '20 and spring '21 terms. We are normally 100% full. The projected reduced revenues in Housing and Dining in fiscal year '21 are expected to hit close to \$30,000,000 by the time it's all said and done. Because we entered into fiscal year '21 with close to \$130,000,000 of ASF reserves, we were able to essentially observe these hits without having to endure staff layoffs or cutbacks on our ability to offer a safe and enjoyable housing and dining experience for our students who chose to live with us this academic year.

Another strategic move we executed to help weather this fiscal impact to our reserves was our issuance of approximately \$30,000,000 of debt with JP Morgan to help place back into cash reserves our investment in the major HVAC renovation at Waterson Towers. As you recall, this project was completed and funded with AFS cash reserves in the summer of 2019. We successfully issued this debt at only 1.45%, a very low rate to pay for the next five years, especially during the height of the pandemic when banks were very nervous to lend money to anyone.

So as we look to exit the pandemic by the end of fiscal year '21, my high-level expectations of our annual reserve balances place us close to roughly the same level of GR reserves, approximately \$110,000,000 and approximately \$130,000,000 of AFS reserves, keeping us very close to the grand total of \$240,000,000, the exact same level we started a year ago.

So to quote one of President Dietz's favorite sayings, we remain strong and stable. So if there is a big risk moving to the GR needing to support the AFS system, the answer to that is no. In order for me to be nervous about this matter, we would have to remain in the current pandemic for at least three to four more years, experiencing only 50% occupancy levels, and also not being allowed to manage any such much-needed cost changes during this lengthy period of time. We would certainly make significant operational adjustments to address our persistent lower levels of occupancy. I hope that my summary level discussion here offers everyone listening some peace of mind. As we stand today, especially as we exit this pandemic and return to full occupancy levels or close to full levels this upcoming fall, ISU will continue to remain fiscally strong and stable. Thanks for allowing me to speak on this important topic, and I'll be happy to answer any questions.

Senate Chair Kalter: Thank you so much for addressing that question, Senator Stephens. I'll also say I forgot while calling on people to just mention for the record that Senator Johnson is at another event and so was unable to come tonight. Do we have any questions?

Senator Lucey: Yeah, so earlier tonight there was a presentation about, public comment in terms of expressed concerns about the University's investment in fossil fuels. According to Fidelity Investments as of March 31, 2021, the ten-year stock performance of 11 industries found only three outperformed the S&P 500. Energy stocks were not among these. Indeed, energy stocks were the only industry presented for which stocks actually decreased in value, losing 36+% over that ten-year period. This compares with the S&P 500 return of nearly 200% over that same time. The oil, gas, and consumable fuels component of energy stocks lost 28% over those ten

years. Now although this represents a better performance than energy stocks, overall it still represents a dismal performance, especially considering their recent short term increases in values. These gains are of questionable long-term sustainability. So I would ask President Dietz and Provost Tarhule, since you're ex officio members of the Board that oversees the investments for which the students have raised concerns, I'd like to know to what degree does the Board review investment policies to ensure they're consistent with the substance of the University's sustainability initiatives. What limitations does the Funds Investment Policy place on investments in any one particular industry? And given that a recent Board member was a former executive with a major oil corporation, to what degree does the Board review the Foundation's assets and investment policies with the goal of preventing conflicts of interests through investing products issued by industries or companies of which Board members have substantial interest?

President Dietz: I think in the interest of time, Senator Lucey, we'll get a transcript of tonight's remarks and get back to you with answers to that. Thank you.

Senate Chair Kalter: I should probably mention that's a great occasion to mention our 24-hour rule which says that if is something is not already in the administrator remarks and it's asked sort of on the fly on the floor, that we give our administrators a little bit of time to do some research on that. So thank you, Senator Dietz, about that.

President Dietz: Thank you.

Senate Chair Kalter: Any other questions?

Senator Blum: Yes. I have a question regarding is there any, I guess, would have to be legislative movement to ask the universities to require vaccines for students. I know we're seeing a beginning of very early... And they're usually smaller private universities that have this kind of requirement. But it seems to be that if, and it may take forever to get it through Springfield... I don't know. But if there was such a requirement that it would really limit the possibility of any outbreak amongst students or faculty. I don't think you will be requiring employees in the same kind of way, but we already do so for students, has been pointed out for.

President Dietz: Senator Blum, that was a topic of conversation this afternoon with the presidents and chancellors and with the Executive Director of Illinois Board of Higher Education. The Governor is considering that, but there's also a good deal of legal issues connected with it. But the conversation is quite lively right now in the Governor's office about this, back and forth with Illinois Department of Public Health and with their legal team. We are certainly suggesting that. So I think we'll see how it plays out over the course of the next week or so.

Senate Chair Kalter: All right. Any further questions? I just had one, actually sort of two. One is a followup from Dr. Susina, which I asked about last time. It was about ventilation and open windows in buildings according to CDC guidelines that he was reading. We did submit that detail on his question in time for it to be addressed directly two weeks ago, but it didn't get to the right people. I'm just wondering if Senator Stephens or if Mike Gebeke is on here. I know that they've been in touch with Dr. Susina, but if you can give sort of a brief on that here.

Vice President Stephens: I do recall today having a brief conversation with Mike Gebeke. I know he was crafting a response back to that. Unfortunately, I was in meetings for most of the day. So if it wasn't sent out today, I'll talk with him in the morning and make sure it gets sent out.

Senate Chair Kalter: Terrific. We've got plenty of time for that. I also just wanted to mark that my department met last Wednesday and did have further questions. But because there was no time for those this evening, I'll just get those to you as soon as I possibly can for distribution to the people who need to respond. Perhaps the most pressing question was whether faculty, staff and students who are parents with unvaccinated children or who in some other way are caregivers or who have, you know, occasion to be around those unvaccinated children will be accommodated even if their accommodation is not covered by the pandemic-level Americans with Disability Act or the non-pandemic-level Americans with Disability Act. I wonder if we have an answer to that particular question.

President Dietz: I don't specifically tonight, but again I think the best thing I can do is take this down and talk to some folks and get back.

Senate Chair Kalter: Terrific. Thank you so much. And we're going to again have the committee chairs just send in their reports.

Communications

Senate Chair Kalter: Do we have any Communications from the senators for the Senate this evening? Seeing none, do we have a motion to adjourn?

Adjournment

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