

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

4-21-2021

Senate Meeting, April 21, 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 21, 2021" (2021). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 1281.

<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/1281>

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
April 21, 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.

[Recording malfunction]

Presentation: Report regarding the Recruitment and Retention of Underrepresented Students (Provost Aondover Tarhule and Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management Jana Albrecht) and Reinstatement Committee report (Amy Roser)

Ms. Roser: It is an honor to attend an Academic Senate meeting. I did participate in the Academic Senate for two years in my undergraduate career, once as a student senator and second as the representative to the Board of Regents, our governing board at that time. So now I have dated myself in that response, I will move on to my presentation. So, the Reinstatement Committee does have two categories of students that it reviews. We review students who are applying for continuation from semester to semester. So, a student who was dismissed, for example, maybe in the fall term, applying to continue for spring or a student dismissed in spring, applying to continue for summer and/or fall. We also review a second category of students, students who have taken some time off from Illinois State University and who are applying to return through the Office of Admissions. So those students are forwarded to us through the Admissions Office. Tonight, I'm really going to focus on those who come to us through the petition, through the continuation process.

In the report you see some trends. We have a different pattern in fall semesters vs. spring. So, our fall trends have a higher number of first-time probation students every fall, given that the University brings in new students every fall, and it's not uncommon that students may struggle in their first semester. Our first-time probation numbers are higher at the end of the fall, and dismissal numbers are lower. That trend flips when the dismissal numbers in the spring are higher than the first-time probation numbers.

In terms of reinstatement stats for our committee, we generally reinstate in the fall term around 60-70% of the students who petition for reinstatement. It should be noted that there's usually over 100 students who are dismissed who elect to not petition for their reinstatement. Similarly, in the spring, again, we're reinstating about 60-70% of the students. The dismissal numbers are higher. There's also a larger number of students who elect to not petition.

Academic Affairs Committee asked that I provide some information by major, so here I'm sharing a little bit of students who are dismissed and what majors they were in at the time. Certainly, this is indicative of our high enrollment majors as well as I think we see some patterns in the STEM fields as well. Undeclared students, I think, certainly would be a population that

are high on our list because (1) there are a lot of them but (2) they are certainly an exploring population and they may not have as clarified career goals or purpose as to why they're here or understand the reasons why they're taking particular courses. Additionally, they could be students who are forced to study something that they don't like because they couldn't meet the requirements for a particular major that they're interested in. We all know how hard it is to study and learn about a subject that maybe isn't our favorite.

We offer two different support programs for students who are on academic probation. Our first is Project Success. This is our program dedicated to our students who are on first-time probation, and it's designed to help our students reflect on what happened that led to their probation status, to develop some plans and through those plans set some goals for that semester. We also arm them with information about policies, and we talk to them about campus services and not just telling them about the services, but we give them some exercise that they can do to identify what their needs are as a student and then to identify what services could benefit them, based upon those needs. And they also have a ReggieNet site that's full of activities and resources on different study strategies, test-taking skills and other exercises that they can work through to help them on their way.

We do also offer Project Rebound. Project Rebound is for our students who have been through the dismissal process and have been reinstated to the institution. These are small-group-facilitated sessions lead by a staff member who's volunteered to take a group of Project Rebound students on in University College. Each of the group meetings and the content is directed by the students so that we can cover the topics that are most pressing and most important to them in determining their success. So, they get to design their Project Rebound seminars. Additionally, the group receives an ongoing support community and accountability to each other. Often times probation students feel like they're alone, they're the only ones that are experiencing the status, and so having some community support is often a good thing. They also have a ReggieNet curriculum site that has resources and other activities for them.

When we start with Project Success, our students come to us, and are really shameful. They're really embarrassed about being on probation. They feel like they're the only one. They really beat themselves up way more than we can ever imagine. And so, when we start our Project Success seminars, we ask them, "So how are you feeling? How are you feeling about being here?" And these are some of the words that they write in our little mentee thing: embarrassed, disappointed, anxious, tired, stressed, terrible. Some really powerful words that they're feeling, and they're not really very excited to be attending our Project Success seminar and not feeling very good about themselves. We spend time during the seminar really talking to them about how we believe in them, and that the University is here to support them, and how we believe that they can do this, and that we know that they're capable, and spend a lot of time really just being positive and being their coach and their cheerleader. So, then we ask our students at the end of the session, "So how are you feeling now?" And I think you can see some much more positive words of motivated, informed, confident, prepared, determined, ready. So, that really does give us some inspiration on how students are feeling about that program, but our goal after that one session to keep that positive motivation up for the full 16 weeks of the semester.

We also talk to students at these sessions about what it takes to be reinstated. In the event that they are academically dismissed and would have to go before the Reinstatement Committee, we want them to be armed with the information of here's the expectations that you could have to meet. Ultimately the Reinstatement Committee is looking for what is this student's best path to get their degree completed. Sometimes that best path is through us. Sometimes that best path is to take a break from us for a while and to complete some work elsewhere and come back, and sometimes that path is to find another alternative. We evaluate their Project Success and Project Rebound participation. We look at their personal circumstances of what happened during their time at ISU that influenced their academics but not only happened, what their plan is to fix that or to alleviate some of those concerns. Most importantly, though, we focus on their academics. This is an academic-based decision. We're looking at their grades while they're on probation. Did things change for them after they were notified of their probation status? What were their grades that probation term? Were they better? Was it worse than grades prior? We look at course repeats and if they've utilized repeats or could utilize course repeats in the future to improve their status. We look at their success in their major. Maybe sometimes they've written to us that "I was in the wrong major, and I don't want that major anymore," and so that could have certainly had an impact on their academic success. Looking at grade patterns and trends over time, did they do really well at one point and now they've just really struggled, and did they write about something in particular that's going on in their life that contributed to that struggle? We also look at a formula called Deficiency Point. A Deficiency Point is a mathematical formula that we calculate the number of hours of B grades that a student is to get to a 2.0. So, it takes out the hours and the fluctuation of graded hours in the GPA calculation. So, for example, a student who's -8 would be 8 hours of B grades to get to a 2.0 with the rest of their grades C or better.

In general, our decisions by the Reinstatement Committee follow a grid pattern outlined here. If you fall in the -1 to -6 deficiency point category, those are generally students that we would consider for reinstatement. These students are two classes, 6 hours of B, to a 2.0. That's pretty close. If students fall in the -7 to -14 range, that's where decisions get a little bit varied, depending upon the circumstances of that student and what their goals are. And, generally, -15 or above grade point deficit is a full semester of straight Bs for a student who's currently below a 2.0. So, in many instances it is more likely two semesters before the student could get off of academic probation. So generally, we would deny that student reinstatement, but there certainly are exceptions on both ends of those.

Our internal process to review petitions is when a student petitions for their reinstatement, we assign that petition to an internal team of two staff. That team of two independently reviews those petitions that are assigned to them, and then they come together, and they talk about those petitions, and compare their decisions. And together, then, they decide which of those that they feel warrants further discussion and should be forwarded on to our Internal University College Committee, which is made up of all of our teams. So, there are eight people, four teams that make up the Internal Committee. The University College Internal Committee reviews petitioned forwarded by the teams of two. The internal UC committee then decides which petitions should be forwarded on to the Senate-appointed Reinstatement Committee .

The Senate -appointed Reinstatement Committee reviews petitions that have been through three reviews already and are typically cases with no clear and easy answers. And so, we take those decisions to the Reinstatement Committee for review. After we complete the review of all petitions for reinstatement, we do an internal check of those decisions to ensure that we're consistent and have been fair and appropriate in the decision making. So, we sort our petitions by our deficiency points and compare decisions based upon the grade point deficiency. So, for example, we may have two -6 petitions, and one -6 petition we've reinstated and the other -6 petition that we're going to deny, we look at that and compare the two, and ask why. Why did we reinstate this student, and why did we deny this student, and are we, as a review committee, grounded in those decisions? We then document those reasons so that we have record of what that rationale is. An example for why that situation may happen is we may deny a -6 petition because perhaps they've been through the Reinstatement Committee before, so it's not their first dismissal. They've maybe had a couple of dismissals before, and they're not making the substantial progress that we need in order for them to get off of probation versus the other -6 that we reinstated might be somebody who it's their first time being dismissed. They made some progress the previous term, and they're just not quite there yet.

Students are given some information in their decision letters that provides the rationale for their decisions. Some of the examples of things that we would say for our reinstated student include, you know what, we reinstated you but, gosh, I have a few concerns about your desired major. Can you please go and meet with your academic advisor? Or, gosh, we recommend changes to your schedule for next semester. Go talk to your academic advisor, and make some tweaks to your schedule for next semester so that you can have a more successful term? We may also say, we noticed that you made a lot of progress this last term, but you're not quite there yet, so keep up the good work, and we know you can get there. We also use this as an opportunity to make a direct referral to different support services. We may say something like we noticed information in your petition indicated that you could benefit from this particular service. We encourage you to take a look.

Some of the reasons for denial that we would put in would include your petition lacks sufficient information. Sometimes a student will only write a couple of sentences. That really doesn't tell us much about where this student is, so we would just kindly ask them to resubmit that petition. We would deny because the conditions of their previous reinstatement were not met. For example, we set a condition last time for you to do these things. Those things haven't happened. We haven't seen the progress that we need, so at this point you're denied reinstatement. We may see some things in the petition or in the record that it's like, gosh, you know, this student really has some potential, and if we work with them to do this or that it could yield a more successful outcome for them. We always have an option of, contact me, and we can work on a plan for you to meet your goals. And commonly we will say to students why don't you take some time off and go finish your general education requirements or your major prerequisites elsewhere before you return.

So, some final thoughts about our work on the Reinstatement Committee is (1) ultimately, it's about helping the students find their best path to graduation and degree completion. The shame and embarrassment that our students feel about their status is very real, and it's often times that shame and embarrassment, I think, that is the biggest hurdle for students while they're on

probation and working toward meeting their goals than it is more so their academic ability. So, my primary message when we talk to students or students come in and talk to faculty about their grades is that we express a message of don't give up. I see over and over that the pressure of being on probation is so great that students just find it easier to give up and not try and say, well, I didn't try. I didn't put in my effort, and that's why I failed, as opposed to, I worked as hard as I could. I did the best I could, and I still failed. So, I really try and find ways to encourage our students to not give up and to continue to persist during this time. And I think of all the students that may, as faculty, that come to you to ask, how can I get an XYZ grade in this class. I know that you, too, are sending them messages of you can do this and don't give up. For a probation student, there's such a huge difference in one letter grade. One letter grade can make such a big difference in their GPA and determine their reinstatement. Improving an F to a D is huge. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: All right. Thank you very much, Ms. Roser. Do we have any questions? Looks like Senator Lucey unmuted.

Senator Lucey: Yeah. So, actually I have a couple of questions. The first question I have is what analysis do you do or has been done to analyze any correlations between the deficiency points and student traits and how that might relate to patterns of bias that are unintended? And then, finally, you mentioned how students are denied their petition for brevity, and I'm wondering since brevity might be a symptom of frustration or embarrassment and anger, what provisions are there for counseling sessions for these students to alleviate any potential embarrassment that might be preventing their articulation of their perspectives?

Ms. Roser: Right. Those are some great questions. So, we do look at the deficiency point analysis in terms of, what happened next, what works for the student in terms of whether or not they have been reinstated or what their results are for the next term. Did we make the right decision, and what should we learn from our formula and our rationale, based on those decisions? For the student who writes just a few statements, it's generally a statement to them about, we think you might have more to share with us. It's often also followed up by a phone call, by an e-mail message as well to please ask that they provide us some additional information. It's not a blanket decision that anytime you write two sentences you're going to get that message. Sometimes, it's evident through other materials that the student had a lot going on. And sometimes I've even told students after I've met with them, you know, I've met with you and I know your story. You don't have to regurgitate that on paper. I can share that for you, because maybe it's just too painful to share. So, they always have other options. You know, and we certainly do work with our counseling center staff who have helped many of our students in crisis and can talk our students through that.

Senator Otto: I wanted to echo Senator Lucey's comments as well and extend it a little bit. I'm interested in if you disaggregate the status by race, first-generation status, and potentially by disability status. And I would also just advocate for maybe changing a term like deficiency point to something that's less mired in deficit thinking, just as a friendly suggestion.

Ms. Roser: Right. To answer your first question, we don't have the data disaggregated by those variables that you indicated. That would be for someone from a higher pay grade. So, we can

ask for that information if that's something that you want, but we don't have that readily available. I do want to point out, I did delete out of my presentation the changes that we've made recently to our probation and dismissal letters. And I just had the first paragraph of our dismissal letters in the statement. The dismissal letter used to say something like, "Please consider this as your official notification that you've been academically dismissed because you failed to meet the 2.0 GPA requirement. You will not be permitted to return." And I'm not joking. Those were the actual words. And we revised that to be "As you may be aware the University standard for good academic standing is a 2.0. Unfortunately, this past semester your GPA fell below that for a second time. But we understand and we know that things happen, and please consider petitioning for reinstatement, because many students who are dismissed are eligible for reinstatement." So, a very different tone and a very different message being sent. Instead of saying, you know, this is the policy, and this is the requirement, it says something much more understanding... The first-time probation letter says things like, you know, we know these things happen, and we believe in you, and you can turn this around. Here's some support services, and we're going to be partners with you in this journey. And, we very much do that. I debated about our usage of the term, deficiency point, for that very reason, and I couldn't think of a better term, and so I guess I'm asking for you to see what term you would call this. And this is just an internal grade point deficit formula. I don't ever share that language with students. And I was really trying to think of what else to call it. It's not anything we share with students. It's totally kept behind the scenes, and it's a mathematical calculation. But I did think about that in terms of a deficit language. But since it was a mathematical formula, I felt like maybe it might be a little bit better, and I didn't have an alternative. So, I'm going to ask you all to help me come up with an alternative.

Senator Kalter: So, I have a couple of comments, Ms. Roser, and that can be one of them. Something like GPA improvement target or something like that might be a good way to approach that. The comments that I wanted to make... It seems to me that one of the biggest things I see in students who are struggling is negative self-talk, and I would love to see sort of required, you know, student counseling intervention here so that it's not just a pep talk. Right? So that they have sort of continued training in how to turn around those negative comments, because they can be very, very persistent and long-term, and are often rooted in negative messages that people in their past have given them in some way.

Senator Meyers: Another thing that I was wondering.... Senator Otto asked about... I think it was Senator Otto asked about disaggregation by race, etc. I would also be interested in rural student identities, because I do find that some of our rural students struggle quite a bit here. Not all of them, but that does seem to be sometimes one of the points of challenge. I would love to know a little bit more about how we're more proactively using our Leave of Absence Policy. I think we've got, you know, sort of some time limits tonight, so I'm not going to ask you to answer that, but I think that would be really interesting, and I would just encourage, frankly, a longer on ramp. It seems to me that just giving some students only, you know, a semester is not enough, and I do know that there is good heart behind that. Right? I've heard people say we don't want the students to be spending a lot of tuition money when they keep, you know, hitting a brick wall or what have you. But I do think that it takes some students longer than others and that that's conversation that can be had, you know, that where there are possibilities for a lot of students that if we gave them a couple of more chances. You know, most of the students I see

who are not succeeding, it is not because they're not capable of succeeding. I don't think we really admit students who meet that, you know, who would fall under that. They're having other types of struggles. Sometimes it's just showing up to class or turning in work or what have you. And so, sort of approaching them, you know, with a little bit more of an on-ramp would be helpful, I think.

Senator Meyers: Yeah, thank you. I would just like to echo the suggestions around changing the language to less deficit oriented, and I like the suggestion of GPA target points. Other options might be success points or reinstatement points.

Senator Kalter: Thank you, Senator Meyers. Do we have any further questions?

Senator Lucey: Yeah, I'd like to echo the comments of Dr. Meyers. I'd also like to suggest that when talking about the point structure, we need to consider that numbers are not neutral and that perhaps we need to have flexibility with those numbers, perhaps look at the different components and see if there might be thresholds in the different components that are indicative of the performances of the students and their backgrounds and their experiences.

Senator Kalter: All right. I'm not seeing any further hands. So, because we're a little bit tight on time tonight, we're going to thank our guest. Thank you so much. There are several information/action items that we need to attend to tonight, so I'm going to start with Senator Nikolaou to tell us about the changes, proposed changes, to the Course Materials Fees Policy.

Information/Action Items:

05.29.20.01 Policy 7.7.3 Course Material Fees Current Copy (Academic Affairs Committee)

02.25.21.02 Policy 7.7.3 Course Material Fees Mark Up (Academic Affairs Committee)

02.25.21.03 Policy 7.7.3 Course Material Fees Clean Copy (Academic Affairs Committee)

Senator Nikolaou: So, the changes that were proposed came directly from an audit that we got back, and the request was to clarify what is the process for a student to request reimbursement for Course Material Fees. Because the idea is that because these are required for the student to complete the course and they need to have access to these materials from the beginning of the semester, they are included in the course fees. But then if, down the road, the students find less expensive options, they can request a reimbursement, and because in the previous version of the post there was no description of what are the steps. What you see that all the changes are pretty much laying down all the steps that the students should follow. That's pretty much all the changes in the Course Material Fees Policy.

Senator Kalter: All right. Do we have any questions, comments, concerns, suggestions about that one? All right. I'm not seeing any.

Motion by Senator Nikolaou, on behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee, to move from Information to Action. The motion was unanimously approved.

Motion by Senator Nikolaou, on behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee, to approve the changes to the Course Material Fees Policy. The motion was unanimously approved.

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

03.08.21.01 CAS Bylaws Mark Up (Rules Committee)

03.04.21.03 CAS bylaws CLEAN revised March 3 2021(Rules Committee)

To be numbered CAS bylaws email March 21, 2021 (Dean Zosky)

Senator Horst: Yes, I'm going to do highlights, as there are a lot of changes. I'm also going to incorporate changes that I reviewed on an e-mail exchange with Dean Zosky. And so those are going to be included as well. Throughout the document there is gender-neutral language. The tenure track and non-tenure track of the faculty was specified. In Article III, the Dean is now a non-voting member because the body advises the Dean. Significant changes to the three divisions of CAS. There was some movement to make it more even between the three divisions. Article V.B and C, there is now staggered elections, and I believe that was a suggestion from Senator Kalter. Article VII, there's language about virtual meetings. Article VII.C – the quorum language was slightly shifted to reflect the number of people on the Council. Appendix A – there is now specification about electing a Secretary of the Curriculum Committee. Appendix B.III.C – they've changed the language regarding the elections of the Search Committees to make it in line with Policy 3.2.13, and I appreciate Senator Nikolaou's attention to that detail. There was some reordering of the appendices, and I believe that's what happened from Appendix C on; the material was underlined, but that is because the ordering of the appendices was changed. Appendix G – the Process and Policies for Selections of Associate Deans and Assistant Deans is new, and there was an additional change suggested in an e-mail that was incorporated by the CAS Council. Appendix H.III.C – the Search Committee dissolution if the member becomes a candidate is specified there. Those are details. Dean Zosky is online if there is further discussion about any of the other changes.

Senator Kalter: All right. Wonderful. Do we have any questions, comments, any concerns or suggestions? (Pause) Looks like there are none. So, thanks again to Dean Zosky and the College Council for the final friendly amendment changes that you see in the to be numbered file that was with your materials.

Motion by Senator Horst, on behalf of the Rules Committee, to move from Information to Action. The motion was unanimously approved.

Motion by Senator Horst, on behalf of the Rules Committee, to approve the changes to the College of Arts and Sciences Bylaws.

Senator Kalter: All right. And on behalf of Rules that doesn't need a second. Do we have any debate?

Senator Nikolaou: I have only two very tiny things. On Appendix E, in the pink copy, Appendix E, the last two should be VI, VII. It does the numbering. Because right now it goes to V and then it goes back and forth. And then the same on Appendix A. It should be where it says initiation of selection process, it should be II instead of I. That's the only things.

Senator Horst: I would note that I'm observing some changes made to documents that are going through Teams, so that might be it, but that sounds like a friendly amendment to me.

Senator Kalter: All right. And so, is there any further debate? (Pause) All right. Seeing no further debate, let's go to the vote on making those changes.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: All right. Wonderful. Thank you to Senator Horst and the Rules Committee for that. I'll also mention that the Senate owes Senator Nikolaou a big thanks, because he caught a number of things at the Executive Committee stage that were considered by the College Council and either accepted or modified, so we had better bylaws here because of that.

Academic Impact Fund Report (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)
To be numbered 2021 AIF Recommendations from Administrative Affairs and Budget
To be numbered Guiding Principles document
To be numbered AIF Report from Provost presented during FY20
To be numbered AIF Report from Provost presented during FY21

Senator Kalter: Let's see. We're moving to the Academic Impact Fund report. This is the annual recommendation as crafted by the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee. It goes from the Senate to the Provost. We usually do try to have an information item at the early April meeting, but this has obviously been a very busy year, so, if possible, we would like to move this one from Information to Action this evening. But first I'm going to go to Senator Marx to run down the main three or four recommendations that are being made.

Senator Marx: Thank you, Senator Kalter. The Academic Impact Fund is now in its 25th year as serving the University's academic mission. As explained in the statement of priorities and guiding principles, the fund holds moneys from tenure-track lines returned after retirements or resignations, enables the hiring of new tenure-track faculty and provides instructional capacity funds to cover programmatic requirements and payouts for sick leave and vacation pay when those individuals that earned it leave the University.

The Academic Affairs and Budget Committee received the annual report from the Provost Office on the Academic Impact Fund and met with Associate Vice President Dan Elkins early this semester. Because there was no AIF reported to the Senate last year, we included in your packets the FY20 and FY21 reports. These reports give the details of the permanent and temporary funds distributed from the AIF for tenure-track faculty positions, instructional capacity, and general education support. The FY20 reports provides a final summary from FY19 and the year date information for FY20. The last page gives a tenure listing of the relevant data.

The report also lists the spending of Strategic Budget Carryover monies which were used for academic facilities and other academic support following the guidelines of the Ad Hoc Committee formed in 2017. In FY19, \$3.2 million in permanent funds were transferred out of the AIF to the listed departments and schools to provide funds for long-term and NTTs that were being paid out of the AIF each year already. The rationale for that, as described by Dan Elkins' predecessor, Alan Lacy, is given in our committee report.

Our committee last year had concerns with regard to the AIF in terms of the amounts of monies that have been taken out that seemed to reduce the fund balances more than expected. This year,

we looked at the effects on the AIF of the SBC's spending, the permanent removal of funds for NTTs, and increased instructional capacity costs. The SBC spending seemed to be within the guidelines set forth by the Ad Hoc Committee. The funds removed from the AIF for NTTs is expected to come back to the AIF when those positions are vacated. So that should improve the AIF going forward.

In our committee report, we have provided a graph which should be labeled Figure 3 that shows the instructional capacity costs for the last ten years. Over the last five years, those costs have nearly doubled. The second graph in our report shows that the numbers of students have not varied much during the last ten years. The Provost and his staff have been looking into the details of this increased spending since last fall and are hoping to make adjustments that will help reduce them going forward.

The committee asked for information on how many personnel and the amounts due to be paid in the future from the AIF for vacation and sick pay. The final table in our report indicates that there are at least 74 people and a total of about \$1.7 million to be paid. We are asking that this information be reported with the AIF report on a regular basis, perhaps every two years.

The committee looked into the increases in non-tenure-track lines that have occurred since the beginning of the AIF. The first graph in our report shows a slight decline in tenure-track faculty and a significant increase in NTT faculty over the last ten years. The graph also shows the ratio of tenure-track faculty to total faculty, which has declined to about 68%. In its ten-year review of the AIF, the AABC in 2007 recommended that this ratio should be increased to 75% or more, and this recommendation was adopted by the full Senate.

We conclude by recommending that an ad hoc committee be formed to gather data from departments and schools all across campus on tenure lines and the use of NTTs in the various programs since 2007. The committee would also be informed by examining studies on this matter that have been reported by the AAUP and elsewhere. The 2017 to 2019 Ad Hoc Committee had also collected and considered relevant data as well. The primary goal of the committee's work would be to understand the reduction in the faculty ratio and to make a recommendation regarding the faculty ratio. There may be other related charges that the Senate or the Faculty Caucus may wish to add to this. That completes our report, and I would be happy to hear any comments or to take questions.

Senator Kalter: All right. Thank you, Senator Marx. Do we have any comments or questions about the report?

Senator Horst: I also was struck by the decrease in the ratio, and I support Senator Marx's idea of having an ad hoc committee. I know that the AAUP suggests the ratio of 75%, so that's well in line with the recommendation.

Senator Kalter: Thank you, Senator Horst. Any further comments, questions?

Senator Mainieri: Thank you so much for the report, Senator Marx. I wonder if you can speak just a little bit more on the reasons the committee put forth an ad hoc committee as opposed to,

you know, just on issues pending to look into the ratio. Just if you can explain just a little bit more about the choice of an ad hoc committee.

Senator Marx: Just to clarify, are you suggesting that the AABC have this as an issue pending or someone else?

Senator Mainieri: One of our internal committees that would be determined by the Exec of course.

Senator Marx: The feeling is that this would require a significant amount of time to gather the data and would probably be served well to have members on an ad hoc committee that are from a variety of places that could address this question rather than just the senators on a given internal committee.

Senator Kalter: All right. Any further comments or questions? (Pause) I'll just make two observations. I actually believe the AAUP recommendation is 85% tenure track, but I think that is also taking into consideration a lot of different types of universities and colleges, liberal arts, etc. The only other thing that I would mention is that the work of that ad hoc committee, should it be formed, might be expedited slightly because the Academic Planning Committee for several years, but not for the last eight years, has been correcting information about preferred ratios from programs. So, that might be helpful data, but it's not complete yet. So, just wanted to mention that. All right. It looks like we might need now a motion from Senator Marx. Oops, Senator Mainieri. Go ahead.

Senator Mainieri: Sorry. Can I just ask a procedural clarifying question? If we adopt the report, is that automatically instating the ad hoc committee, or is that a separate item for consideration? Can you just clarify that for me?

Senator Kalter: Yeah, that would be a separate item. So, these are recommendations mainly to the Provost, but they can also be recommendations to the Senate. And so one of the recommendations that AABC is making is for the Senate to form an ad hoc committee, but they would have to come up with the charge and the description and the function and all of that, so that would need to be a separate item.

Senator Mainieri: Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Sure.

Motion by Senator Marx, on behalf of the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee, to move from Information to Action. The motion was unanimously approved.

Motion by Senator Marx, on behalf of the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee, to approve the Academic Impact Fund report.

Senator Kalter: All right, and coming from committee, that doesn't need a second. Did you want to say something else, Senator Marx?

Senator Marx: No. That's it. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: All right. Do we have any debate about adopting these recommendations?

Senator Lucey: I'd just like to encourage the adoption of the ad hoc committee as soon as the committee is able to.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Chairperson's Remarks

Senator Kalter: All right. We go next to Chairperson's Remarks. I am going to defer a portion of my Chairperson's Remarks until Communication, but I do have several announcements and first some thanks. First, I give thanks for yesterday's verdict. I do agree with one person who said that this is not yet justice, but it is accountability. There remains work to be done to remove implicit biases based in race, class, and other factors from policing and the trial system in our country. I wanted to thank all the senators, presenters, and expert witnesses or administrative staff for their work this academic year, especially those of you who are graduating or moving off the Senate. It has been a difficult Senate year with ultra-long meetings due to the pandemic, the Open Meetings Act requirement when on Zoom, and all sorts of big things going on, several involving levels of conflicting point of views that are rarely seen until now in the Senate. Your dedication, endurance, patience, and either caffeinated or un-caffeinated attention has been appreciated more than you may realize. You all deserve more food and beverage catering than Zoom allows for.

The first announcement... Professor Debbie Shelden asked the Senate to respond to her question about whether Senate will continue to provide virtual access in the fall. The Executive Committee discussed this, and the Chair will be working with Cera and the Bone Student Center to see what is possible, possibly as modeled on the hybrid sessions that SGA has been holding in the Bone, possibly with some sort of non-interactive livestream. Until we enter a phase of Restore Illinois that permits the numbers we anticipate at Senate meetings and/or the Open Meetings Act Executive Orders change, Senate will have to keep meeting completely online rather than hybrid of face to face.

Second, I wanted to let people know that we placed the CTE Annual Reports on the agenda, because two years ago the SGA and several faculty senators asked for changes to the CTE seating method for students. CTE indicates in their Annual Report that they are initiating a modification of that recommendation. They plan to incorporate it into their bylaws, and Senate will likely see these bylaws coming in next year and will have a chance then to weigh in on the plan. Just a reminder that Senate does have the ability to modify that plan further, if desired, while working with Legal regarding the legal parameters of that.

Third, the Executive Committee decided to defer the first Information Item on the IDEAS graduation requirement proposal until the May meeting, in part because we are just beginning to

receive feedback from departments regarding any impacts to time to degree and in part because if we begin that one today, all of the information would need to be repeated for the new Senate at the next meeting. So, Senators Nikolaou, Mainieri, and Harris all recommended deferral of that one. Other Exec members agreed. That means that I will not be here for the debate, so I wanted to read a portion of an e-mail sent to the original task force recently by Professor Toure Reed that relates to a change that was accepted by the task force but has not yet been accepted by DIAC. Professor Reed teaches the courses in African-American History and is the Co-Director of the program in African-American Studies. I consider his intellectual contributions to this topic crucial. He wrote, "I have three suggestions/thoughts. The first is the most complicated issue, which centers on my discomfort with the language of diversity spelled out here. Specifically, the current language may unwittingly reify fluid social categories by defining diversity as the acknowledgement of human differences. It includes a spectrum of intersecting cultural, social, and physical identity markers such as race, ethnicity, social class, gender, gender identity, veteran status, etc." By the way, to reify means to make something that is abstract concrete or to thingify something. "Excising human would mitigate this issue," he says. "However, the intersecting identities framework itself creates a problem for me on this front, because such constructs often presume the existence of fairly static, discrete, internally homogenous groupings, the sort that pollsters imagine to be real. Regardless, I don't think we want to refer to these almost entirely social frameworks as human differences, even as we are talking about human beings, since this is language that would delight scientific races such as Charles Murray. As an alternative, how about something like diversity is the acknowledgement of the cultural, social, and physical heterogeneity of human experiences. Diversity encapsulates matters such as race, ethnicity, social class, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, country of origin, language, ability, veteran status, and religious affiliation. Diversity in higher education acknowledges that some populations have been and remain underrepresented." So, this was Professor Reed's comment. I think the observation about the fluidity of social categories and identities embedded in the rationale and his reminder that social constructs reinforce static internally homogenous groupings that are false, illusory, and often punishing. Those are actually more important than the revision itself, but the revised language was accepted by the task force, so I think it should be incorporated into this proposal since (a) it's intellectually firmly grounded and (b) the proposal is coming from the task force through UCC to the Senate.

Next, I have received feedback from several faculty or faculty bodies so far regarding the RERIP information that I circulated as Senator to the full faculty after a meeting was never rescheduled that had been requested by the Provost and then postponed by the Provost in what appeared to be an effort to get feedback from chairs, directors and deans rather than faculty. One committee was unanimously opposed to the inclusion of curricular and other items in the jurisdiction of faculty in the plan. Another faculty member from a different college wrote, "It seems budget allocation should be changed only with faculty input as well as those from chairs and deans." A faculty member from a third college wrote, "In reviewing the documents I would like to comment on the following: Crothers brings up a great point that growth at all cost may not be feasible, given school/program funds faculty capacity. Bigger is not always better, and within my school the rising cost of materials and supplies juxtaposed by a drive for increased enrollment becomes a financial problem and faculty/staff vote issue. Recommend discussion with each school or unit to determine an ideal enrollment, given available resources and how each new hire may change the ideal enrollment. Another concern is how double majors are

counted. I have a limited understanding of how the numbers are counted, but it has been conveyed to me that double majors only have a single data point within their first major and are not reflected in the enrollment numbers within the second major. Recommend calculating second majors equal to first majors to ensure both programs are funded equitably. Third, the amount of funding being awarded to different programs, based on a one size fits all approach, is a problem. Recommend analyzing and funding programs based on needs of major and not average need per student." A third faculty member from a fourth college said, "Our department is riled big time about the financial model stuff." Finally, a faculty member wrote to me just this morning, "Dear Dr. Kalter and members of the Academic Senate: First let me thank you for bringing the matter of the RERIP to the attention of the faculty. Frankly, I'm surprised this has not yet become the public scandal it should be. To me, the fact that this was implemented without consultation means it should be simply withdrawn and done from scratch, even if the ideas were good, and I do not think they are, it makes no sense to start a good process from a rotten one. Also, I agree completely that talking about this as an optional incentive program is nonsense. It's obviously the plan for how the budget will be awarded in the future and a statement of values from ISU. Keeping in mind that there are political limitations, I would, if this were retained, simply ask that the wording "without reducing academic standards" be added to every single behavior described in this program. I find it hard to imagine how the administration could object to this. Is the wording perfect? No. But the discussions about what it means and how to demonstrate are the discussions that can address what I consider the main concern here - the decline in standards this program incentivizes. Of course, there are also simple math errors in the incentive structure as designed, and that really reflects on how little thought the administration puts into things like this. Another thing that stood out was the lack of accountability the upper administration must feel. The idea of rewarding and punishing and assuming "refusal on the part of departments versus being busy doing all the other things on their list would simply not fly if I used it to construct a syllabus. This, along with Dr. Elkins' dismissive e-mail to Dr. Kalter illustrates how insulated the administration feels and the danger of the top-down approach that seems to pervade ISU. Our plans never seem to even make a pass at appearing to value teaching our students anything. The administration seems to never even mention learning as a part of student success. I have been told explicitly that I'm wrong and I shouldn't mention this observation, so to some extent I'm glad we finally have this clear as day."" So that's the end of that comment.

I'll say because of the protest that used the occasion of engineering college proposal and engineering site plan proposal and because of other necessary remarks in business, we were not able to find time up until now to have the Provost Office give the full Senate an overview of RERIP toward distribution out to all the academic departments by Zoom recording for better understanding and even more thorough local analysis, critical thinking, discussion and dialogue that I also hope will reveal who invented the conversion of ERIP to RERIP how many or how few minds contributed to it. Therefore, the Provost may have to wait until May or August to receive our own initial feedback as senators. I hope the next Senate will study the faculty feedback thoroughly and responsibly and put aside personal relationships with the persons who appear to have invented the 'R' parts of the program formerly known as ERIP in order to uphold the foundational principles of shared governance that every Senate must uphold and that former Chairperson Crothers and I have so diligently researched over our careers. The administration must seek faculty input, not just chair, director, and dean input when budgetary mechanisms are

created that encroach into areas of shared governance universally acknowledged to belong to the faculty. A previous administration breached this trust. I would hope that the present administration suspend the program until faculty and Senate feedback have been responsibly gathered rather than sidestepped and Senate oversight put in place or the encroaching portions of it removed. Shared governance is not a self-appointed plutocracy out of a single administrative office.

Fifth, there is an item on the agenda regarding the Academic Planning Committee charge tonight, and I don't think we're going to get to it, so I wanted to protest an item that was removed from consideration during consultation with the Provost Office by the Rules Committee. A previous Academic Planning Committee had approved a change to the charge that pulled review of the IDS minors over from the UCC to the APC where they rightfully belong since the APC is the body in charge of program review. IDS programs should be included in number 1 of the proposed new charge or in a different section, but Rules Committee removed this change, even though we had been honoring external committee recommendations in all other instances and even though we were able to provide the vote of the full committee recommending this change. There is a great deal of burden placed on the program directors of the IDS minors for reporting as compared to the minors that we review through APC's departmental review and yet fewer resources of time and salary for this reporting. This burden falls disproportionately on the IDS minors serving students of color and topics related to their lives, like Ethnic Studies, Native American studies, African-American studies. There is a double standard at play here. Departments can write a paragraph or even less about their minors, and they rarely even get mentioned in the IBHE summary. IDS programs have a multi-page full-on self-study required for their minors, equivalent to the ones for majors and graduate programs. This arrangement was put in place in 2008 by a previous Associate Provost and seemed to me at the time to be a punishment for the faculty in areas like African-American studies, Latin American and Latinx studies, and Native American studies having saved the Ethnic Studies program from deletion after the administration tried to erase this now nearly 50-year-old program without consulting any of its faculty. I would like to ask the Senate and Provost Tarhule to review whether that burden and that double standard are justifiable and necessary. I request that it be put an end to.

Finally, I have received from the President a letter with his written rationale in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding for rejecting the results of the final two votes on Engineering that occurred on March 24. I will circulate that letter after the meeting. I know that several of you will read this letter in action with cynicism and/or outrage and say that the administration is bypassing the Senate. This is far from the case, and it is certainly not the case that the President is ignoring the will of the faculty whose votes were in favor. I am fairly certain that the vote does not represent the view of the majority on campus. This is the first time in ISU history that the Memorandum of Understanding has been invoked, and I hope it will be the last. However, the President and the Board do have acknowledged veto power regarding Senate actions. I would counsel future senators, especially student senators, in order not to jeopardize the power of the Senate to keep union negotiations and Senate business in their separate lanes rather than attempting to negotiate through the Senate by holding long-planned and thoroughly vetted academic initiatives hostage and making items that had never been an element of a negotiation a new element beyond the legally recognized bargaining table. In my view, had senators studied the financials with greater attention, the pro-union vote would have been a vote in favor of the

Engineering College and site plan, given the new revenue that is projected, particularly if and when we are able to get State capital support and attract private funding.

So, we now move on to Senator Harris for her last Student Vice President's Remarks.

Student Body President's Remarks

Senator Harris: Thank you. So, hello, everyone. I will try to be brief, but like Senator Kalter said, this is my last Senate meeting. But I wanted to first congratulate this year's Student Government Association on their hard work. Having been a part of SGA for three years, I can say that this has by far been one of the most progressive associations that I've been a part of, and the ideas and the work that have come out of this year I think truly reflect that. From the beginning, our student senators took an active role in asking questions and advocating for their peers as ISU navigated another year in COVID. On top of their own studies and obligations, the students in SGA continue to seek accountability, remain engaged, and did their best to represent the students that elected them. This work continued through conversations about student success, retention, conduct, EEI initiatives, and other issues that remain concerns for students on campus. More recently, the students took the initiative and their advocacy on behalf of the graduate students.

On behalf of our student senators, I also wanted to thank our faculty and staff that served both in various committees that we've been a part of and also by being a guiding force for us in Senate at times. I know I'm not alone when I say that this has been one hectic year, and I know that this year has taken a toll on a lot of us in unspeakable ways, but I am proud of everyone that has continued to persevere in serving the campus community the best that we could. I know that we've all grown together stronger because of the great tenacity that we've held.

Looking back on the year, despite the challenges that we've all faced, I do believe that the association was a force for good on campus. We have had our hands on civic engagement efforts for the general and municipal elections, support of divestment of fossil fuels, once again support of our grad student unions and funding for our School Street Pantry, providing free period products on campus, and many more accomplishments that are worth mentioning, but that would take all day for us.

So, moving forward, I am excited to pass on SGA to a new wave of student leaders, and I'm confident that the organization will be left in very capable hands. As soon-to-be an alum, I will be undoubtedly checking on the association and the campus community to see how far we've come. In the future I envision the campus being the continuous champion for the advancement of DEI initiative, and I think we can start with IDEAS, students using their voice to advocate for what is right and just, and ultimately continue to sing the value of shared governance being respected by all of our stakeholders. I encourage everyone here to continue to advocate, ask questions, listen, learn, seek accountability, represent student interests, and most importantly work for a better ISU. I'm grateful for the chance that I have had being part of Academic Senate and to serve in my capacity as President. It has given me opportunities to learn and grow beyond my wildest imagination. I have gained many valuable life lessons during my tenure at ISU, but I look forward to contributing to my future school endeavors, careers, and communities that I find myself in. And that is it for me.

Senator Kalter: All right. Thank you, Senator Harris. And it's been wonderful to serve with you, and I only regret that you we were not able to it in person. We'll now go to Administrator Remarks. Senator Dietz for President's Comments.

Administrators' Remarks

- ***President Larry Dietz***

President Dietz: Thank you very much. I have one business item, and then I have a number of acknowledgements and thank yous. The one business item is planning for the fall of 2021 and on-campus vaccination clinics. Just briefly, the University continues to collaborate with the McLean County Health Department to offer on-campus vaccination clinics. And as of this afternoon, there were still a few open slots for the on-campus vaccination clinic that's scheduled for tomorrow, April 22nd.

Moving to acknowledgements and congratulations and thank yous. Before I get into that I would echo Senator Kalter's comments about the verdict yesterday. In listening to the Attorney General, I couldn't agree more that it's not justice. It was progress but not justice. And I think we all share the sentiment that we're going to continue to work for justice and continue to move DEI initiatives on the campus. And so I had hope as a result of yesterday's verdict about all of that.

My math may be a little off on this, but I was trying to look at how many Academic Senate meetings that I've attended over my tenure here at the University, and I've only been here for ten years. Many of you have been here much longer than that and perhaps have been on Academic Senate longer than that. But I think I'm somewhere around the 180 mark over those ten years. That includes Vice President and President and somewhere around 130 as President. And I can tell you that I've always appreciated the interaction between the faculty and the students and administration in this format but also in less formal formats and certainly in more warm and face-to-face formats. I've appreciated the guidance and the advice given by this organization, and I've met many good and wonderful people who are dedicated to the advancement of the University, and I appreciate the amount of time and attention and expertise that all of you have lent to the effort this last year, which albeit has been a very tough year. I think we all acknowledge that, and I think we look forward to the time that we can put the pandemic perhaps in the rear-view mirror and move further ahead and in one room. So, unfortunately, I probably won't be part of that room, so this will most likely be my last Academic Senate meeting as well.

I do want to acknowledge Senator Kalter, and I have a Certificate of Appreciation that I will send to you, but Senator Kalter and I started in Senate (her role as Chairperson and my role as President) at about the same time. So, the Certificate of Appreciation talks about that and the timeframe of 2014 and 2021. And it's been a long time, but we've learned a lot from each other. We haven't always agreed, but we've always respected the difference and then move forward, and I appreciate that very much.

I also want to say how much I appreciate the work of all the senators this year. Senator Harris was very eloquent in expressing her sentiment, and I share her sentiment as well in thanking everybody for their good work. The "gladly we learn and teach" isn't just for our students. It's

for all of us, and I think we continue to try to learn from each other and teach each other, and I hope that the new President, whomever that person might be, will continue in that vein.

So, I also want to say thanks to all the students who are graduating, and best wishes to each of you. We look forward to continuing to follow your careers and your interests, and we hope you come back for Homecoming and other events like that so we can see you. So, stay in touch and become active alums as you've been active students.

So I want to congratulate President Rodrigo Villalobos, Vice President Patrick Walsh, Chief of Staff Andrew Fulcer and Student Trustee Devin Paoni in their newly elected positions and acknowledge the outgoing leaders of Student Body President Lauren Harris, Student Body Vice President Ethan Kosberg, Chief of Staff Kianna McClellan and Student Trustee Jada Turner. You all have made a mark, and it's been a positive mark, and we look forward to continuing to follow you and wish you the very best.

So, I just want to say thanks to everyone for your good service. Thanks for working with me over my tenure as President of this University. It's been a pleasure for my wife and I to serve as your First Lady and President. She just likes to be known as Marlene, but a lot of people refer to her in the First Lady role, but nevertheless it's been a capstone of our career, and we couldn't think of a better institution and finer people to work with. So, with that I'll just say thank you very much, and I'll end my comments tonight the way I generally do, and that is Go You Redbirds. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Thank you, Senator Dietz. I know that this is not your very, very last Senate meeting because we have one in May, but I want everybody to give a round of applause to our soon-to-be-outgoing President who has led us through a very, very, very tough time that nobody could possibly have anticipated. There was the Rauner budget crisis and then the pandemic. I think, frankly, the pandemic, for anybody who was any sort of leader of any large institution, it's astonishing that it did not kill, literally kill, not because of COVID itself but because of the stress of having to bring an institution through something that has been this difficult. So, we honor you. As Larry said, we're coming in together. We're going out together. It's been a pleasure to serve, as you've said. You know, we are a family, and families have their differences. One of the great things is that as we went into the pandemic, Senator Dietz and I, President Dietz and I, had established a very solid relationship in the six years coming in. And so our main differences have happened during the pandemic, but they will not rock the solid friendship that we formed, and I learned a lot from you, Senator Dietz, and I really honor you for all of your service to all of the universities that you have served in a very, very long and distinguished career. So, thank you very much.

President Dietz: Thank you. Appreciate it.

Senator Kalter: And we're keeping remarks until later, so we'll go to Senator Tarhule for Provost Comments.

- ***Provost Aondover Tarhule***

Provost Tarhule: That's a tough act to follow. My announcements are quite mundane in comparison. But it's exciting to note that the finals blitz has started, so this is the period when we ramp up tutoring and support for students as they prepare for finals. So that's ongoing, and any kind of support that you can offer, especially if students need to be guided, spread the word. There is help for them at the advisor center. I also want to commend all of our faculty on progress grades reports. This return on progress grade report was especially good this year. So, the return was about 91%. That's truly amazing, and I'm very, very grateful for that cooperation. So, what we do with this report is to use them to contact the students who are having issues. As you saw in the earlier presentations about students that are being dismissed, students that are struggling, what do we do to support them. This is where it starts. First of all, we have to know that the students are struggling and then to be able to reach out to them and provide them the support that they need. So, I'm appreciative and thankful to all of the faculty who returned this really great report. Thank you.

Fall is beginning to look up, I think. It feels every time myself or Jana give the report about fall enrollment, it's been registration, it's been negative and somewhat moody, but there are some areas that are beginning to look positive. We're at 14% for undergrad and up 43% for registered graduate students, compared to 2020. Plus, 2020 was a low bar, but it won't show. This is very, very impressive. So, it looks like some of the good news that we're hearing will have sometimes good news about the pandemic might be helping out.

We've got a number of interim positions that need to be filled. I think I spoke previously about the Dean of Arts and Sciences position. That's the largest college on campus, and so we'll be moving forward with trying to constitute the search to fill that position on a permanent basis. We also have run the graduate school with an interim director for some time. Noelle Selkow has been in that role for a while. Her tenure expired. Interim status expired in June. I asked her to continue into December, and she graciously agreed to do so. So, we will be opening a search for that in the fall for that position to look for a permanent director of the graduate school. So, I just wanted to bring those updates to this month. Thank you.

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

Senator Johnson: Thank you very much, and I want to join others who have spoken earlier about the thanks that I feel as it relates to the court decision, and to acknowledge as well that there is a great deal of work that is yet to be done, and this is just the beginning, and we stand committed to it.

Second, I would like to again thank individuals who have served as senators this past year. Senator Kalter, thank you so much for your service as well. Senator Harris, then Senator Dietz as well. It has been a pleasure and an honor watching you all in your leadership of the Senate and sharing with the Senate, and, again, it truly is what family is all about. All right? To be able to share thoughts, opinions, sometimes differences but still that rock and that foundation is still there. So, thanks for everything that you all have done leading us to this point.

And I want to also congratulate, then, those senators who have served this year and may be moving on as well as those who are about to graduate and go through commencement ceremony. So, congratulations on moving forward.

And speaking of commencement, I had a chance to actually go over to Redbird Arena today and check out the decorations and the platform and everything that's in place for you all to be honored, and we hope that it's going to provide at least a little bit of that personalized individualized attention that we are so known for moving forward. So, congratulations on your accomplishment, and we hope that over the next series of days, starting but tomorrow, with people walking across the stage that you feel honored, because we're honored to have you as part of our community and moving into that alumni ship that you will hopefully start giving back to the institution and making us into a better place. So, thanks so much. And, again, it has been a pleasure working with you all, and looking for the new senators who are coming on for the next meeting then.

Senator Kalter: All right. Thank you, Senator Johnson. It's been a pleasure working with you as well and Senator Stephens for Vice President for Finance and Planning Remarks.

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

Senator Stephens: Thank you again, Senator Kalter. I only have one item to share. About three weeks ago we completed the refinancing of our 2011 COP Series debt, and I wanted to actually share some pretty good fiscal news with that. We refinanced about \$8.5 million and we were able to do so at 1.3% interest rate, significantly lower than what our existing debt was. That was between 4.5%. We were able to capitalize on this low interest rate during the pandemic. This debt refinancing will save us about \$170,000 a year or about \$1.7 million over the next ten years. And these funds being the COPs area of our financing is funds that are associated with our General Revenue area, which is our academic and administrative support area. So, we also chose to refinance what we call a community-based lending strategy where we partner with local banks within central Illinois to give them opportunity to lend to ISU. I set up this program about two years ago when we issued the \$7 million debt for the Redbird Arena seats. The PNC Bank out of Peoria was the bank that won that particular bid. In this particular transaction, our local community banks and relationships with Commerce and Busey Bank helped partner to issue this \$8.5 million. So, it's important for us to have a relationship perspective with the local community bank, because it helps our local economy. When we issued much larger amounts of debt over a 20 or 30 year time horizon, we typically have to issue those in the public bond market. Local banks typically can only lend between a 10-15 year horizon. So, over the last three years we've developed a fairly good relationship with all of our local banks, Commerce, PNC, JP Morgan, Busey Bank. It's a win-win situation for everyone. I wanted to bring those comments tonight, because we always are looking for every opportunity to make any cost savings we can, especially in our General Revenue side. So that's all I have for this evening. I'll be happy to answer any questions later.

Senator Kalter: All right. Thank you. And before we go to questions, I want to first thank our committee chairs for this year. Since we have deferred committee reports so often, I just wanted to give any committee chair a chance to sum up their year if they so desire.

Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Nikolaou

Senator Nikolaou: I would like to thank all of our faculty and student senators for their service in the Academic Affairs Committee. Our main task was the IDEAS graduation requirement,

which took pretty much the whole year with sprinkles of some other policies. So hopefully we're going to see either, you know, next meeting or starting fresh in the first meeting in the fall semester.

Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Senator Marx

Senator Marx: I'd only like to thank the members of my committee for their hard work this year and tough times being online only for the most part. And they all did a wonderful job. So, thanks to everyone.

Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Hollywood

Senator Hollywood: I would like to thank the Faculty Affairs Committee. This is my first year on the Senate, and so it truly was a group effort that we got Integrity almost completely done. I did get it sent into Exec to be looked at hopefully early in the next Senate session. So, thank you so much. And, Chairperson Kalter, it was really an honor working with you.

Senator Kalter: It was wonderful to work with you as well, Senator Hollywood.

Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Avogo

Senator Avogo: Yeah, same with me. I would like to tell the members of the Planning and Finance Committee we did some heavy lifting this year, and we have a rough report of our priority, and I'm so grateful for your cooperation. Thank you.

Rules Committee: Senator Horst

Senator Horst: I, too, want to thank all of the members of my committee. I know that we worked on a lot of bylaws. By the end, I'm not sure we even, which ones we did, but we did a lot, and we did a lot of different kinds of policies. My heartfelt thanks to Senator Kalter who led the Senate through probably its most difficult year since Senator Borg led the Senate through the dissolving of the Constitution, so she'll go down who led us through one of the most difficult years of the University, so I really appreciate all the hard work you did, Susan.

Senator Kalter: Likewise, Senator Horst. I think you have been a rock, and I really appreciate all of your hard work, especially this summer when so many people had so much to do during a very unusual summer. Do we have any questions for any of us? (Pause) All right. It's late.

Communications

Senator Kalter: So, do we have any communications for the Senate? (Pause) And I know you think that you're getting out quickly, but now I'm going to resume my Chairperson's Remarks. It is my last Chairperson Remark. Senator Blum, go ahead.

Senator Blum: I just wanted to briefly say thank you. All right. You've been a great inspiration to me and model for me, and I love the Senate. I love the Senate, and I love it partially because of you, and I just wanted to voice my appreciation, and I also want to say I've had the opportunity to work with Senator Dietz, and I appreciate his leadership. And then my general remarks to all the senators that I appreciate you all and even those of you who I disagree with. I have great respect for you being here and the things that you have to say. So I appreciate you so much.

Senator Kalter: Right back at you, Senator Blum. I love being a Senator because of people like you. Senator Toth.

Senator Toth: Yes, I also just want to say thank you for a great year. This will also be my last Senate meeting, but I also wanted to just kind of take a minute to express how I thought it was bold of you to probably call out the administration for examples of their erosion of shared governance but then finished your remarks as Chairperson by, in a sense, telling the students what they can't do and shouldn't fight for and put yourself in our shoes. We watch our friends, our peers, our teachers struggle to make ends meet in part because of this institution, and we cannot sit back and allow that to happen with the organizational power that we hold. So, for my last Senate meeting I'd like to praise the student senators and our faculty allies for standing up for what we knew was right and to the future generations of student senators. I ask each of you to continue advocating for yourselves, because it's unfortunately clear that not everyone on this body is willing to do that for you.

Senator Kalter: I am very, very willing, Senator Toth, to advocate for the people who live on my hallway, who I see every day struggling. Our graduate students in the English Department work harder than almost anybody else I know on this campus. I believe in their cause. I do not believe in mixing that cause with other Senate business. So please do not take my comments about that as anything that was in any way anti-student or anti-graduate student. They deserve better. They deserve a better stipend. They deserve to have the most competitive stipend that we can use to draw them towards our University and keep them here. Senator Lucey, I think, was next.

Senator Lucey: Sorry. Yeah, I just also want to say thank you. Your presence as leadership for the Senate is a gift, and we all know that gifts are not things earned. They are things that are given to us, and you were leader of the Senate when I came on, and I consider that a gift to the direction I received being a Senator. I think one of the evidences of your gifts to the Senate is your sense of balance. So, you're very tenacious in pursuit of shared governance and advocacy for the students and for the faculty, but you also balance that with an element of control. And I think that's very rare in the committee where we have leadership in political position, I think it's... Having a practice of self-restraint and lack of selfishness and caring for the community is very rare in politics today. I'm very grateful for your leadership and your sacrifice and your selflessness. So, thank you very much for the gift of your leadership.

Senator Kalter: Thank you, Senator Lucey. And it has been a real pleasure to serve with you. I really appreciate how much input you've had this year in particular into our Senate. Senator Villalobos.

Senator Villalobos: Thank you, Chairperson Kalter. First, I want to thank you for the service that you provided in your role. Thank you to President Dietz for his congratulations. It means a lot to me. I was not expecting it, but it means the world to hear that from him. And thank you as well to outgoing Student Body President Harris. I would just like to say that she was a rock as well for us in the Student Government Association this year as well as the entire outgoing Student Body Executive Team. We will continue to build on the leadership foundation that you

have set for us. I'd like to thank the outgoing graduating student senators that are going to be leaving us for their great service this year. Also, special thanks to Secretary Horst for being the Chairperson of the Rules Committee, which was not the most glamorous committee at times, but we made it work. And I'd like to thank the student senators and the student body as a whole for entrusting Senator Walsh and myself to lead them in the next year and then echoing some of the comments that Senator Toth made. I assure the student body as well as the Academic Senate as a whole that under our new leadership and under the association next year, the Student Government Association will never stop advocating for Illinois State University students, regardless of who they are, where they are, or what they look like. We will tirelessly advocate for their concerns and work towards bringing positive growth change and unity to ISU in any way possible. That's all I wanted to say. Thank you very much, everyone, for a great year. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: All right. Thank you, Senator Villalobos. And great congratulations on your election. We'll go to Senator Rottinghaus.

Senator Rottinghaus: All right. Well, this is a sad meeting for me. It's been two years with the Student Government Association and the Academic Senate. It was kind of weird logging in and having to do it on Zoom to be my last time, but I'm so thankful for all of you. A lot of the same faces from last year, some new faces that I didn't get to meet in person, but it was great to see you over Zoom. Thank you, Chairperson Kalter, just for the great two years. I know people said it kind of already, but what an inspiration you are as a leader, and I hope that wherever I go after my time here at ISU I can lead in some fashion like yourself. And, President Dietz, thank you so much for your service to our University. I'm really sad to see you go, but I hope you enjoy your retirement, and I'm sure this year was just so much fun for you as your last year as President, but I really do thank you for getting us through it. And to all the other senators, I'm going to miss you all, hearing all of your opinions and the sometimes very thrilling, sometimes dull different debates on whatever topics may be. It's always a great time, and I hope you all continue doing great work in your departments, with your classes. And to the students, thank you for a great two years. And thank you, again, Chairperson Kalter.

Senator Kalter: Thank you so much, Senator Rottinghaus. It was a real pleasure to serve with you, especially last year on Rules Committee together, so we will find ways to work together towards common goals in the next year. All right.

Now, so now my communication. Today is an occasion for gratitude. Senate has been and can be a joy to be a part of. We always say that one of the best things about Senate is the deep education that all members get in how this University works. This Senate has also always been a place where people collect friends, some of them lifelong, a place that when we are live and in the round is like a family, a place where there are lots of personalities that are as entertaining as they usually are warm and quirky, and a place where a great sense of humor makes you stand out and goes a long way toward creating a good feeling that keeps us moving, though catered food also helps a lot. I want to devote this final portion of my final Chair's Remark in this past seven years to expressing heartfelt thanks to all the wonderful people who have made working as the Senator such a pleasure and a joy.

First, I want to thank Dan Holland, who served as an outstanding mentor to me during the seven years when I served as Secretary of the Senate, as well as Lane Crothers and Paul Borg, earlier Chairs of the Senate who have always been generous in their advice and guidance when requested. Professor Borg is the author of the Memorandum of Understanding that is the principle agreement safeguarding shared governance among the Board, the Presidents, and their administrations, and the faculty, students, and Senate, one of our sacred texts along with the constitution.

Three very dedicated individuals have served as Office Administrator during my time: Cynthia James, Adam Raboin and Cera Hazelrigg. I am vastly sorry that Cera cannot be here tonight. Maybe she's watching us on YouTube. She has been an outstanding person to work with over the past four years and one of the people I am going to miss the most in getting to interact with daily.

Although I worked with the next two people only as a Senate Secretary, I would be remiss not to mention the incredible leadership of our 17th President, Al Bowman, who was always gracious and calm under pressure and ever kind to me. Former Vice President for Finance and Planning, Steve Bragg was another mentor who I will never forget when a foolish, young, newly tenured Associate Professor volunteered to chair the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee, this VIP came over to my humble and tightly cramped English Department abode to offer help understanding the ins and outs of the committee and to share his sense of its importance and where improvements could be made to its functioning. It was impressive to receive the message that Senate is a leveling plane where the hierarchy can drop away, and persons interact on terms of equality and mutual respect.

Other wonderful administrators to work with that I cannot neglect to name: Bruce Stoffel, Jim Jawahar, John Baur, Craig McLauchlan, L.J. Johnson, Dan Stephens, John Davenport, Art Munin, Greg Alt and, of course, Larry Dietz, with whom I have had seven years of excellent rapport, cooperation, and collaboration, a couple of tense meetings, and a summer of e-mails to Eric Hodges and the Emergency Response Team asking for attention to serious employee concerns.

Members of the Executive Committee, over the years, have been for the most part fun to work with, and some of them are as dedicated as it gets and really deserve extra compensation or course releases. I'll mention Martha Horst and Dimitrios Nikolaou as extraordinarily dedicated, hard-working, and kind individuals. David Marx, Ann Haugo, Craig Blum, Mark Hoelscher, Ed Stewart and Kathleen Lonbom, two former Senate Secretaries, the unforgettable and true Farzaneh Fazel, Nerida Ellerton, Paula Crowley, Chad Buckley, Alan Lesshoff, Will Daddario, Kevin Laudner, Greg Ferrence.

The fantastic Student Body Presidents I have worked with, Lauren Harris, Sammy Solebo, Mike Rubio, Bo Grzanich, Kyle Walsh, Ryan Powers, Connor Joyce, and other student senators, some of the most memorable being Dylan Toth, Jacob Rottinghaus, Mitchell DeGrauwe, Isaac Hollis, Alex Campbell, Khyla and Kayhla Breland, Dan Heylin.

And other memorable and kind senators and administrative support staff, Dan Rich, Marie Dawson, John McHale, John Huxford, Lois Soeldner, Stewart Winger, Daniel Breyer, Sunil Chebolu, Michaelene Cox, Allison Alcorn, Peter Bushell, Jed Day, Jack Glascock, Jihad Qaddour, Adrienne Ohler, Art Martinez, Dan Liechty, Rose Marshack, Oforiwaa Aduonum, Patty Hoit, Richard Nagorski, Cindy Kerber, Angie Bonelle, Julie Murphy, Sudipa Topdar, Mary Hollywood, German Blanco Lobo, Todd Stewart, Kee-Yoon Nahm, Stacy Otto, Jean Ann Dargatz, Destini Fincham, Soemer Simmons, Dave Bentlin, Dana Tuttle, and so many others who I met before 2014.

And two people who contributed a good deal to the Senate, as I'll mention in a moment, from their external committee roles: Doris Houston and Chris Horvath.

I also want to thank the Senate for all the wonderful accomplishments that we have had in those seven years.

Until the day I die, I will consider the greatest joint accomplishment of the administration and the faculty/staff/students and the greatest occasion for gratitude to be the fact that so far as I know to this day, Illinois State University has not had any deaths from the coronavirus and particularly no deaths that could have been prevented. However, what we do not know specifically if anyone died because the virus spread from campus or campus housing to persons in the community or to a campus member's family during fall 2020 or spring 2021. It is likely. Thankfully, no one has reported that a student, staff, or faculty member died... Excuse me... as a result of contracting the virus during campus activities. Mike Gebeke's team and facilities (under Vice President Stephens) and Charley Edamala's team and the Office of Technology Solutions (under Vice President Stephens) had a huge part to play in that along with our Housing and Dining staff, our testing staff, and many others. While the joint work was often perceived as oppositional, there is no doubt that an Association of Concerned Redbirds deserves a large share of the credit as well. This Association was led by a dedicated contingent of faculty who contacted me first in late May 2020 when they saw our University headed in the wrong direction in April, May, and June and worked tirelessly and selflessly to do research, raise consciousness, and get staff and faculty policies and approaches changed for greater compassion and flexibility and toward abiding by CDC, de-densification recommendations. Five hundred and thirty-eight faculty, staff, students, and community members signed the Health, Safety, and Equity Letter delivered to the President this past June. This included nearly 200 faculty, over 160 staff or graduate assistants, all three current or past Senate Chairs, at least five sitting senators and 13 past senators, and nearly the entire tenure-line faculty of English who never received any response to their heartfelt earlier letter, a letter that I did not conceive or write. It was characterized to me as an ultimatum, though I challenge anyone to find any such language in that letter. The strong show of a vast majority of faculty members who responded to our all-faculty survey polled in favor of the proposals placed on the all-faculty agenda by a few members of this group.

Our remarkable summer group had the greatest of all purposes in view to ensure that no unnecessary preventable death occurred even to the least of us, even to the youngest of us, even to the healthiest of us, even to those of us who were statistically insignificant to some. I was raised in a Catholic church and am proud of my Irish and German Catholic heritage, and I have

never apologized and will never apologize for the pressure that I hope to put on this University to put the staff, faculty, and student lives before bottom line.

Thanks to the summer, hundreds who buoyed up my morale and one another's morale as we faced hostility and outside political operatives' efforts to silence our voices and criminalize my efforts to protect the most vulnerable faculty.

Wonderful things that my fellow senators and others working with the Senate accomplished in the last seven years: Working with the wonderful Doris Houston when she served first on the leadership of the University Review Committee and then as its Chair we put in place after nearly 40 years of neglect a series of equity reviews for tenure-line faculty that will help this University ensure that gender, race, and other aspects of a faculty member's profile do not work against them when it comes to salary, tenure, and promotion. The Caucus also worked with the URC to complete a large five-year review and revision of appointments, salary, promotion, and tenure policies. Diane Dean, Sam Catanzaro, and the wonderful Bruce Stoffel who we all miss so sorely, though he is only a walk away, worked long nights and days on those revisions.

We also put in place for the first time detailed policies on discipline for tenure-line faculty members in response to a decorated former faculty member's request to protect more junior faculty from the non-policy-driven treatment that they had received as a result of a student accusation. This was a significant accomplishment for the University. Chris Horvath was one of the principle re-drafters of the original set of articles that the Caucus reviewed. Senator Horst had been one of the first to draft the articles and refer them to the URC. I then partnered with the Provost Office and the University Review Committee to train faculty status members, committee members, around campus and to create enduring video training modules.

I worked with Dr. Catanzaro, Greg Alt Vice President for Finance and Planning (he was the Vice President of Finance and Planning), Provost Krejci and others to restart salary promotion, tenure, and sabbatical reports required by the ISU Constitution and ASPT Policy that had been dormant since 2008.

From the start of my chairship in 2014 and for at least five years, the Executive Committee did a massive lift to clarify and regularize the University Policy Review Cycle, working in particular with the Legal Office so that it's now clear which policies fall under the policy on creation of academic policy and must be reviewed by the Senate and which need only administrative review and/or recommended review by staff councils.

I established with Milner Library a permanent digital institutional repository for the Senate minutes, agendas, and other records since the 1940s and arranged for University galleries to permanently pretty up the Senate office. Mr. Stoffel was extraordinarily helpful with the former project.

We passed a newly revised and much-improved Intellectual Property policy based on advisories from the American Association of University Professors.

We worked hard on whipping the policy on the Protection of Minors into shape with key contributions through a number of senators, most memorably the incomparable Nerida Ellerton and the indefatigable Paula Crowley.

I had proposed that we regularize the receipt of the Annual Recruitment and Retention of Underrepresented Student Reports that we saw this evening. I caught and corrected after almost 20 years an administrative misnaming of the AMALI graduation requirement that had occurred without consultation with the Senate. We also completed a survey in 2014 on course scheduling format with respect to Monday/Wednesday courses.

In 2015, I oversaw the process of Senate review and approval of the overhaul of the new Code of Student Conduct, of the Success Week edition to the Final Exams Policy proposed through the SGA, of the new Textbook Affordability Committee, an initiative of Student Body President Powers of the SGA, a committee that garnered gobs of faculty interest as soon as it was launched.

By 2016, we were working on what would eventually become our revised Academic Freedom, Ethics, and Grievance Committee Policy, our greatly improved Senate Bylaws thanks to Senator Horst, updates to our Administrator Selection policy, and revised Distinguished Professors Policy. The Institutional Review Board Task Force that I served on did a massive overhaul of IRB procedures. Senator Lessoff and the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee worked with Human Resources on visibility and return to work concerns for faculty members through revision of our Sick Leave and FMLA Policies. The administration was bringing us into partnership with INTO, and I had the good fortune to be able to serve on the Selection and Curricular Alignment groups. The Graduate Student Association was getting itself restarted. I had begun to organize budget sessions for the first Senate meeting of the fall semesters to update and inform Senators about our budgets, particularly during the Rauner impasse years when developments and planning over the summer had to happen and modeled on sessions developed by former Senator Crothers.

There has been ongoing and diligent work by several committees and committee chairs on the Academic Impact Fund and the problem of over reliance upon non-tenure-line faculty. Huge thanks to Alan Lessoff, Mark Hoelscher, David Marx, the members of the Ad Hoc AIF Committee, and others for that work. Come 2017, I was leading the initiative to open up the Strategic Budgeted Carryover Monies from the AIF for startup packages, needed instructional equipment purchases, and other purchases. I consider this work one of my major accomplishments that will serve the University for many years to come if properly managed. 2017 also saw fruition for another joint accomplishment through dialogue with the Provost and white paper from the University Review Committee, the retroactive increases to the promotional increments for associate and full professors.

That summer, the Provost appointed me to lead an ad hoc work group of current and former AFEGC members to create for the first-time uniform procedures for Academic Freedom, Ethics, and Grievance Case Proceedings. David Kopsell, John Kostelnick, Klaus Schmidt, Debbie Shelden, Brent Simonds, and myself created orientation and training slideshows, a website with policy and procedure step through, and manuals for the AFEGC Chair and Panel Chairs. We

identified several policy revisions, improved records retention, and worked out Laboratory School Academic Freedom issues.

Due almost entirely to work done by a huge administrative team before I joined it, including former Senate Chairperson Holland and led by Associate Provost Jim Jawahar, we had received reaccreditation as an institution from the Higher Learning Commission. Mr. Stoffel placed his impeccable drafting and editing marks on those documents as well. Later, I served on the Strategic Plan Task Force.

On October 9, 2019, I facilitated a three-hour Senate meeting during which protesters from the Black Homecoming Committee and #AntiBlackISU and students and faculty senators voiced their concerns to the administration through public comment and Q&A, and the Senate was following up on those concerns as the pandemic hit and is keeping them as a high priority.

Last year, we also put into place our new Student Leave of Absence policy, and we hope Facilities complete their Campus Master Plan update and successfully incorporated prioritization of space planning.

And I got flack from a few members and friends of the chairs, tables, and everything but the kitchen sink council.

Between 2016 when I saw the concept of new engineering programs for campus emerge from David Marx and the Planning and Finance Committee and this spring when the programs and financial model were approved as the last Senate sat before specific curricular approvals, I have been proud and honored to hold these plans to high standards by gathering all the fiscal skepticism and other suggestions and critiques, asking tough and interrogating questions and amplifying those of others and watching the current Provost and Vice President Stephens respond with acumen and a plumb to the challenges. This is not only a vision for bold new programs but a new and renewing envision for ISU.

This year we got pandemic changes to ASPT Policy, Withdraw Policy, Student Absence Policy, ACT/SAT Admission Criteria, we have a new Police Chief Advisory Council, and we have a new and enduring Textbook Policy thanks to Dimitrios Nikolaou and the Academic Affairs Committee.

I have had the good fortune and learning experience to help review each and every one of the nearly 180 programs and centers on campus through the incredibly fun work of eight years of Academic Planning Committee membership. All of the members of that Committee are in our records, and they have all been a joy to work with.

The foreseeable work to do for next year or subsequent years includes the next five-year review of our ASPT Policies, consideration of the IDEAS Graduation Requirement Proposal, finalizing changes to the Integrity and Research Policy, upcoming changes to the Code of Student Conduct, University Professor Policy, Sabbatical Policy, Ombudsperson Policy, expanding the non-tenure-line faculty representation on the Senate, possibly student seating changes to the CTE bylaws, possible addition as per Senator Horst's suggestion of a sixth Senate internal committee to spread

the workload and get more things done more efficiently, thorough examination of RERIP, an oversight of it should it remain in place, consideration of whether to make permanent the test optional changes to the ACT/SAT Admissions Criteria following receipt of feedback from departments, College Curriculum Committees, the UCC, and Admissions and Enrollment Management administrators, improvement of financial exigency trigger and procedure language at Board and University policy levels, and creation of an ad hoc committee to study faculty salaries.

So, thank you to each of the seven caucuses and senates that nominated and elected me for the privilege of being able to serve.

Adjournment

Motion by Senator Miller, seconded by Senator Swiech, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.