

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

---

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

---

2-16-2022

## Senate Meeting, February 16, 2022

Academic Senate, Illinois State University

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

---

### Recommended Citation

Academic Senate, Illinois State University, "Senate Meeting, February 16, 2022" (2022). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 1291.

<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/1291>

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](mailto:ISUReD@ilstu.edu).

**Academic Senate Meeting Minutes**  
**Wednesday, February 16, 2022**  
**Unapproved**

***Call to Order***

Academic Senate chairperson Martha Callison Horst called the meeting to order.

***Roll Call***

Academic Senate secretary Dimitrios Nikolaou called the roll and declared a quorum.

***Public Comment:*** None.

***Approval of the Academic Senate minutes of 01/19/22***

Motion by Senator Cline, seconded by Senator Garrahy, to approve the minutes. The motion was unanimously approved.

***Presentation: Illinois Board of Higher Education Faculty Advisory Committee Report (Dr. Lane Crothers)***

- <https://www.ilga.gov/legislation/publicacts/101/PDF/101-0251.pdf>
- ***FAC report January 21, 2022***
- ***01.21.22.01 FAC Mental Health IBHE-FAC***

Dr. Crothers: I'm happy to come here today. I'm happy to answer any questions about FAC in general. I was instructed that your primary interest had to do with the work we added to the Mental Health Action on Campus Act. I thought I'd talk for a couple minutes about that as a policy and about where that came from. That was originally passed as a law in 2019, and at that time I was not a representative. There were several people on FAC that were supportive of what had come out, but also had some concerns about it -- people who were in Psychology, Counselor Education, and Student Counseling expertise and they had some specific questions and concerns about it.

When I joined FAC and was assigned to that committee, I think my primary function was to help people think about the way (I'm a Political Scientist) the state legislator and legislative staff think, rather than necessarily the way we as academics and professionals tend to think about these kinds of questions. They're not going to read a 25-page sophisticated analysis of things. They need the bullet points down to the point. So, what you see in front of you reflects those discussions. With a couple of exceptions, there were some ideas that didn't get into the final letter as people came in and out of the committee. But in any case, the key insights and support issues I think were one that FAC could endorse this, it's trying to take it to the State legislature now for discussion.

First, the language of the law talked about peer support. And was implied, at least to many of the people who are experts in this area, that the peers were going to be doing more kind of active counseling or making judgements of states of mental health and stress that experts would need to understand versus even a properly trained peer. So, they do suggest

more of a move towards peer mentoring standards to help in those areas where peers can help, and then also direct people to services that they might need.

Second, the legislation sets a baseline of counselors per student ratio. So, X numbers of counselors per Y number of students. Most of the people on FAC who are familiar with this, while they understood it, one didn't think the service levels were high enough and two didn't think there was any way that that could possibly be met at lots of institutions as a practical matter. It's hard enough to keep and maintain support staff in those areas, and then you're talking about doing it in some cases very rural very small schools that may or may not have the capacity to easily draw on a large population. So, it shifts then to recommendations that telehealth be a much more heavily assessed part of the program.

And finally, yes, there needs to be some kind of central clearing house, some kind of resource that universities and colleges can go to, of ideas that work across campuses, basic standards, basic arguments that can help and assess students, particularly at this time. As we all know that under COVID the demands for service have increased dramatically in trying to accommodate that set of interests in what is hopefully a cost effective, but also effective, way. Right. We often do the cost part of cost effective, and we often forget the effective part of cost effective. And so, that's the underlying main goal of this process. We are now trying to take this to the legislature for discussions, coordinating that with FAC.

Obvious next steps, eventually it will go to various campuses seeking endorsement perhaps from their Senate.

There is a Student Advisory Committee of the IBHE that perhaps might want to pick this up. Illinois State University is a structural member of that committee as well. But that's what I was asked to emphasize, so I'm here to answer any questions that I can answer or highlight that for you on what I know is a big agenda.

Senator Horst: Could you just give us some more information? It says this act is subject to appropriation. Do you have any idea as to whether or not it could be appropriated in the future? Do you have any indication of that?

Dr. Crothers: The person who follows the legislative matters for us reports every month on issues pending, on issues flowing through, and not a hint of a wave of a feather of a butterfly has come up about this particular piece of legislation. So, unfortunately, the political scientist in me will tell you that many legislators pass things so they can say they passed them, not because they intended anything by them. I don't know if that's true in this case, I can just tell you that that happens.

Senator Horst: There are a lot of great ideas and I hope at some point they receive funding. Any other questions? Okay.

We decided to couple these presentations because they are both having to do with mental health and the work being done about that issue. This evening we also have the Dean of

Students John Davenport, and interim Director for Student Counseling Service Carrie Haubner.

***Presentation: Mental Health Trends (Dean of Students John Davenport and interim Director for Student Counseling Services Carrie Haubner)***

Dr. Davenport: Thank you, everyone. In the interest of time, we're going to jump right to it. I'm John Davenport, the Dean of Students. I'm going to turn the mic over to Dr. Haubner, the Director of the Student Counseling Center. She'll talk a bit, specifically about Student Counseling, and then I'll talk a little bit at the end about the student death notification and death protocol. And then we will open the floor for any questions you might have, and turn it back to the chair.

Dr. Haubner: Thanks for the introduction, John. I wanted to extend my appreciation here to all of you this evening for the invitation tonight to kind of dialogue and offer some oversight of our student mental health trends here at ISU. I really just want to start very briefly by framing a little bit that the Student Counseling Service as a unit functions from a perspective of what we call a comprehensive university counseling center. So, all that that really means is that in addition to serving students mental health needs in more traditional ways that many people are familiar with, with regard to individual and group therapy formats, we also deliver quite a lot of services to the university through our prevention programming initiative where we consider the entire campus as a client, if you will. And really this approach serves us well, allowing us to be responsive to so many other campus partners who play really critical rolls in noticing, responding to, referring, and helping to connect students to the counseling center for assessment of and recommendations for their ongoing mental health care. We take a lot of pride in working collaboratively with others in this culture of care that the Division of Student Affairs, and really the University as a whole, has created for students. So, it's not terribly surprising then that this web of recognition, if you will, has kind of been one of a set of variables that have really contributed to the increase demand for services at SCS over recent years. And you can kind of think of it in this way, we're sort of victims of our own success, in terms of destigmatizing collegiate student mental health here on campus.

In terms of a quick overview and some broad brushstrokes of some data. If we take a retrospective look back over the last five years or so, you can see that for a number of years there's a pretty steady climb, in terms of the number of students seeking services. That increased each year, really across time. But over the last five years, between FY17 and FY 19, in FY17 the center served 1,847 unique students. This declined a little bit in FY18 to 1,923. And then increased just a little bit beyond that following year to 1,932. In FY20, not necessarily surprising because this is a bit with the asterisk if you think about FY20 being our pandemic year, we actually saw a drop off of utilization of services. I think that's probably true for many of us around the table in terms of contacts, but our total students served for all of that year were 1,782. So, that dropped about 150 students. But I think it's interesting because, sort of with the caveat, when I took a deeper dive into looking at some of that utilization data, when I look at that same time period, leading into the pandemic compared to that same time period in FY19, in FY 20 we had already eclipsed our utilization in FY19 by 143 students. So, really, I think that speaks to the fact that if the

majority of students hadn't gone home for the second part of the spring semester because of the pandemic, we would have absolutely exceeded our previous utilization of services in that year. I think that's worth noting because every year our numbers have consistently climbed and that would have been the highest number of students that the center has ever served in the history of the center.

In terms of last year, we served 1,433 students. So, it was decreased in comparison to prior two years. But we really have come to understand and believe that that was not a function of decrease of need, more so that more students were likely either accessing services in their home communities or they just weren't accessing services at all, as a matter of a number of things. And that really parallels with what we tend to see in terms of just summer utilization. Students tend to access services more when they're in their home community (when they go back home), but also just in terms of service utilization from spring 2020 through all of last academic year that was paralleled nationally. There was a pretty significant decrease in utilization of services on a national scale.

So far this year, we have served 1,240 unique clients to date. So, there's very much a growing demand once again, but our current staffing shortage has really limited our capacity to be able to serve the need that we know really exists within our student body.

Just a quick couple points in response to the demand that we've experienced across the last couple of years. We've used a number of what we call Demands Management Strategies. So, these are things like shifting from a full intake appointment to more of a brief or triage appointment using session limits, diversifying our treatment options, working to bring case managers into the center to help with referral and connection to the community, and then shifting to more rapid access appointments in comparison to more routine treatment. Again, those are all strategies to try to stem the tide and to be able to meet a larger number of students across time.

This past fall, the most significant change that we made was to institute a triage system in lieu of full intake. And really the purpose of doing that has been to manage the "crush of the doors" as we sometimes think of it, and to be able to decrease the wait times for that initial contact. Shifting to that triage has really allowed us to be able to put our eyes on students a bit quicker, to have a conversation about their concerns and their needs. And then to be able to provide a recommendation to whether SCS as a department is the most appropriate place to help them get their needs met, or whether connecting to another office on campus, perhaps a provider in the community or in our partnership with WellConnect, and if that might better suit the student's needs. So, really trying to quickly assess, identify needs, and help connecting a student. And if in fact, the student is being referred onto an off-campus provider because that's the recommendation for the next step, either the staff member who meets with the student, or the case manager remains in contact with the student to help offer a warm hand off, and to increase the likelihood that the students actually going to land in a successful connection with the provider in the community.

So, that's some hard utilization data, but I also thought it might be worth mentioning some of our typical and common presenting concerns. In some ways, a lot of these have held

constant in the last ten years or so, but there have been a few shifts that seem to be more specific in relation to the pandemic.

For example, anxiety and depression have been, and really continue to be, the two most commonly reported presenting concerns, roughly 52%-53% and about 39% respectively for each of those presenting concerns. And then in a separate but similar category, worry, that makes up our third most presenting concern. Like, it's discussed at that triage appointment, which accounts for about 32.6% of what students are coming in to talk about.

Pretty historically, relationships have come third or fourth in those top presenting concerns. But we have seen a bit of a shift this year in kind of returning from remote learning whereas, again, relationships very broadly kind of fall third. We're really seeing loneliness, motivation, and procrastination a lot of times. Academic concerns are emerging as more common presenting concerns. And then concentration difficulties come on the heels of that as a top presenting concern.

I'll round out my comments by mentioning that heading into the pandemic—again as a way to try to address the increase demand, but also as a way to try to serve students through the pandemic who may have been out of state, alongside being able to provide a longer range of counselors with diversity and social identity, that more closely matched either those of our students or those requested by our students—we partnered with WellConnect, new direction behavioral health as a way to scale up our care. The utilization data that we've gotten from WellConnect for the first two quarters of the contract show that 72 students, which is less than 1% of our students, have received services through this partnership. So, it's certainly less than we would have hoped, but it does seem to be a little bit of a consequence perhaps of the time that the contract was rolled out. We brought that on and implemented that in April of last year, so the timing wasn't great. But also, does seem to be a little bit a consequence to some limitations with regards to the scope of the service and stuff they offer. Nonetheless, in terms of the presenting data that we get back from them, it pretty closely mirrors the data that we have, with regard to the top presenting concerns. So, things that we see back from them as a partner are the anxiety, stress, depression, and then grief, bereavement, and academic concerns are their top presenting concerns that our students show them in their conversations with them talking about.

That's a quick snapshot of some of what it is that we're seeing within the department. And I'm going to turn back to Dr. Davenport.

Dr. Davenport: Thank you. I'm going to talk just briefly. We were asked to give some general information about the student death protocol or notification of the campus on the case of a student death. Optimally, the Dean of Students Office is notified by either ISU PD who's responding if it was local or informed by other police agencies. However, we've noticed in the last couple of years there's been notifications by either family, other students, or on some cases other university departments who become aware of it ahead of our office being notified.

If the event happens locally, and it's within a very tight frame, we first activate the Critical Incident Response Team. That team comes out and works with family and any other students that are around or affected by the incident, in conjunction with the Student Counseling Services, to provide support for those folks if they may need it. If this happens, again in a local hospital, the treating physician, they're responsible to notify the family if it's in the hospital. If that's not the case, it always falls on the coroner of the respective county to make the notification. The coroner is also responsible for determining the cause of death, and they always determine when notifications can be made. We had an incident not too long ago here, and I know there were some questions about it, many people knew what was going on but word wasn't coming out. In that situation, the coroner always—and we have a memorandum of understanding, the University with the County—the coroner always makes the determination when we can make the notification. So, once they feel all the proper family has been notified and things like that, and they give us permission, it's at that point that we can make notifications to the campus.

The actual notification is for the individual in departments who initiates specific action upon being notified. I know this is another question that popped up a lot. The student death notification, the purpose of it isn't to provide information and notify the campus or things like that. It's to specifically target people. One of the groups notified is media relations and they make the determination about contacting local communication agencies, but for the most part everyone (from student accounts to the faculty member of that student, deans, department chairs, anybody who has contact with that student, students who might work with the student who passed away) those folks are notified, as well as any other number of services around campus. Because everything from closing academic record, making sure no things are checked out from Milner, all those types of things, everybody on this official notification would have very specific action to do in regard to the student who passed away. And then they would report it back to me, so I can work with the Vice President for Student Affairs to make sure everything is closed out.

The other part of that Memorandum Of Understanding, the University is expressly prohibited from releasing the cause of death. So, that again is part of our Memorandum Of Understanding. So, our notifications, for those who may receive one, "a student has passed away at this time," with as much specificity as we have in terms of date and then we take the major UID number, where they live, either on-campus or off-campus, and then information about services and things like that, depending on the timing of it. From that point, the Vice President of Student Affairs then becomes the primary contact for the family. They express the official condolences. They attend any memorial services that we are made aware of. And then for the rest of the time, any other questions the family might have the Vice President for Student Affairs are the designee serves as the primary point of contact in most cases.

It is relatively rare, just going back to the last three years, 2019-2020 school year we had four student pass. 2020-2021 school year we had three. And the 2021-2022 school year up to this point we've had six.

Typically, like I said, we're notified. If we are notified by someone who is not a law enforcement agency, we do some independent verification. In most cases, it involves checking local newspapers, things like that, looking for obituaries to actually confirm. So, we won't send out a notification to those agents who act until we have official confirmation either through a coroner's office or through a local police agency that a death has occurred. So, we want to make sure that, in order to honor the family, that we get the information correct and we don't have something reported as a prank or an error. So, that was a brief overview of that particular protocol.

Senator Biancalana: This might be a little beyond the scope of the presentation, but I've had a conversation with some people at the Center for Civic Engagement and Dr. Lackland about some legislation that was vetoed and then it's being reworked back to the general assembly, that is allocating mental health, specifically mental health money for higher education. Are there any plans or is the counseling services ready to use that money in any specific way? Are there any high priorities that that money would be used for? I'm just kind of trying to see if there's been any preparation for that.

Senator Horst: That is the presentation that Dr. Crothers gave, and it hasn't been appropriated yet. So, the state has the act, but they did not fund it.

Senator Biancalana: But that was the one that was vetoed, correct?

Senator Horst: Maybe he was talking about something else? Do you have any knowledge of anything else?

Dr. Haubner: I'm not sure of anything else. I was sort of on the same page with you, in terms of it being the Mental Health Early Action on Campus Act.

Senator Biancalana: Okay. I think I may be mistaken then. But I'll send you an email if I get more information.

Senator Horst: Perhaps it's been vetoed in effect because there's no money behind it.

Senator Biancalana: Okay.

Senator Horst: So, the act, if not appropriated, all of this language you just saw is not happening.

Senator Villalobos: My question is for your Dr. Haubner. How do we understand the number/data that you provided in a sense? How should we look at it? Should we look at it in the sense as a negative, in that more students are having or seeing the mental health being impacted? Or perhaps in a positive light, that the center is seeing more students? How should one interpret the data that you provided, and in what way?

Dr. Haubner: That's a good question. That's a hard question. I think it's a little bit of both in some ways. The fact that we're seeing an increase in demand simultaneously means that



there's greater recognition of mental health concerns and greater conversation around that. And that's ultimately a good thing, in terms of opening up space and destigmatizing mental health and people needing help. At the same time, the fact that we are not quite able to keep up with that demand is disheartening. Ultimately, getting people into treatment saves lives, we know that. People who end up in therapy are less likely to successfully die by suicide. So, that's a good thing, but it's certainly a double-edged sword, which is why I go back to the statement that I made earlier that we are kind of a victim of our own success in terms of this.

Senator Cline: Forgive me if you said this data and I missed it. But do you have any information about the class level of the students that you are seeing in your office? Do they tend to be on the younger side? Do they tend to be more advanced students?

Dr. Haubner: We see students all along the range of their educational experience. I didn't come with that specific data point per se, but I wouldn't say it breaks out 25% kind of across upperclassman. It's pretty evenly distributed across the educational experience.

Senator Stewart: Forgive me if I missed something in your discussion, but could you say something about, is ISU making any efforts to increase the availability and kinds of resources available to students suffering from mental health issues?

Dr. Haubner: You mean generally, broadly? Or out of the counseling center specifically?

Senator Stewart: I suppose both.

Dr. Davenport: I can speak to that. We are taking kind of a multi-phased approach to it. First and foremost is we've created a number of initiatives designed for us to engage with students sooner. Some things like our Redbird Care Team, the movement toward case managers in University Housing, Student Counseling Services, and the Dean of Students Office. It's our attempt to be more proactive as opposed to waiting for students. If we get information about our students not coming to class a lot, or someone who is a frequent attendee has dropped off, and things that they write, just anything that may display the sense that a student needs some help. We are trying to be more proactive about reaching out to them. I think that also goes back to what Dr. Haubner talked about, in many of those cases that may be leading to some of their heightened numbers. Because our goal, probably consistently, for the last four to five years is to be much more proactive in identifying students and just reaching out and saying, "is there something going on?" So, I think that we have tried to get to them must faster so that we can help them to get the help that they might need, and just determine if they need any kind of support, and things like that. So, overall, we've definitely tried to be much more proactive, and also getting that message out to students. I think we've been really successful at that as well as the de-stigmatization of seeking out that help. And so, we're finding out now that more and more students... it's not a hard sell to get students in. So, I think in some ways that's leading to some of these heightened numbers because thanks to your feedback, the feedback of peers who reach out concerned about a roommate or friend, we have some mechanisms in place to be much more proactive in talking to that student and determining if they need some type of help.

Senator Horst: Dr. Haubner, in your presentation you said you had a staffing shortage. Can you give us some more details about how many counselors would be potentially a full staff for you? How many additional counselors do you think you need?

Dr. Haubner: That's a complicated question because we could always use some additional staff. But we're also sort of experiencing the same staffing shortages that many people across campus are. So, just on the basis on where we are starting, we're five short from where we were prior to the pandemic. That's the consequence to a number of variables. I think if we look at American College Health Association data and try to think pie in the sky, in order to be able to meet the anticipated... I don't want to say demand, but likelihood that our students could benefit from counselors, we would need about another 30. And nobody has that. Nobody has that at an institution this size, so it's dramatic, and we know that we're not going to get there. But it does sort of speak to the gap between, at a population level, all of students across campus and what they could benefit from, and really where we're at. It's pretty significant difference there.

Senator Horst: Any other questions? Well, thank you very much.

### ***Chairperson's Remarks***

Senator Horst: I just want to start off by saying, part of my duties as chair is I'm a member of the Campus Communication Committee. We had a meeting on Monday with President Kinzy to finalize our letter to the Board of Trustees. At that meeting, we were wondering if we should include a sentence on masks, because of the recent Governor's statement. I said, "You know, whenever something happens with COVID, basically if you think you can do something chances are two days later something happens that reverses that decision." So, certainly that did happen yesterday with the legislative panel, called the Joint Committee on Administrative Roles, voting to suspend the latest version of the COVID-19 mitigation for public schools. I'm personally feeling quite confused about that and what's going to happen to Illinois State University. I was hoping tonight President Kinzy was going to be able to join us this evening, but she has other obligations. She might be able to join us, but hopefully Provost Tarhule will touch on some of that in his remarks.

I want to thank our guests this evening from Student Affairs and Professor Crothers who is our IBHE FAC rep. Thank you for their presentations.

Faculty Caucus, we have a meeting to consider the URC's response to Article IX, which is the tenure language and also includes language regarding external reviewers. We will start that discussion after the Senate meeting. If we get to 8:45 p.m., our hard stop time, we will take a short break and then begin that meeting.

In addition to two Action Items from the Academic Affairs and Rules Committee, we have potentially three Information Items this evening. I want to commend the Faculty Affairs Committee for finishing their work on the Sabbatical Leave policy. In reviewing my notes on this policy, I noted comments and suggestions going as far back as 2015-2016. So, this item has been to the floor a couple of times before this evening, and I am hopeful that we will come to a consensus on this language in a few weeks.

Committee chairs, I would like to remind you that we have three meetings left with this group of Senators and these committees. March 2, March 23 and April 6. The last meeting of this Senate is April 20, and there are no committee meetings on that evening. The first meeting of the Academic Senate of 2022-2023 is May 4. So, start doing your planning accordingly.

Finally, as you can see, several administrators are at the Honorary Degree Recipient Dinner in honor of Andrew Parnell who, among other things, helped found the student chapter of the NAACP. He also established the ISU Black Colleagues Association in 1984. This award is given posthumously, and I believe his family is attending this event. President Kinzy indicated that she may or may not be able to stop by after 8:00 p.m. but because of the weather she was even thinking it was less likely that she would be able to give any sort of statement or answer questions this evening. But we do have Provost Tarhule. So, if the President does come, we will take some of the agenda items out of order, otherwise we will go as planned.

### ***Student Body President's Remarks***

Senator Villalobos: Thank you, Chairperson Horst. Sorry to do this to you, Provost Tarhule, but unfortunately my remarks are brief tonight. Our SGA sponsored Town Hall was held last night, and I believe it was a great success. We featured four prominent political student organizations and allowed them to participate in civil discourse and debate. I wanted to give a special thanks to the Civic Engagement Committee and Senator Biancalana, who chairs that committee, for their work in getting that event planned, as well as a shout out to several of the student senators here who either were moderators or participated in the event as well. SGA remains committed to upholding and promoting ISU's core value of civic engagement.

Due to no immediate business, items on the agenda for our scheduled general assembly for last Wednesday was cancelled. Committees still met and reports were still distributed amongst members. We will be back for our next meeting one week from today.

Lastly, I want to take this opportunity with you all to give a special shout out to Dr. Keith Pluymers from the Department of History, for receiving the Environmental Stewardship Award from the Office of Sustainability for his work as an Environmental Historian. Dr. Pluymers is not only a supremely knowledgeable individual in his field, but he is also an exemplary professor who has had a profound impact on countless students, including me. I cannot think of a more deserving person to have been recognized. To him I extend my warmest and strongest congratulations.

### ***Administrators' Remarks***

- ***President Terri Goss Kinzy-Excused***
- ***Provost Aondover Tarhule***

Provost Tarhule: Thank you, Chairperson Horst. I'm feeling under some pressure today. (Laughter) As the chairperson said, President Kinzy is with the family of Andrew Purnell

who is the Honorary Degree Recipient, so she is unable to be here today. But she did say that if there are any questions, comments, or concerns people have I should take those comments back to her. So, I believe that would include the comments about the mask, and everything else you want to know. I'm happy to take that back to her.

Now, when we met in Executive Committee, Dimitrios said, politely and in a diplomatic way, that we should keep our remarks short. So, I'm going to listen to Dimitrios and try to be as brief as possible. But I'm also going to try to get through some points that I feel are very important remarks.

First off, I'm really pleased to announce that we were able to appoint a new dean for the College of Arts and Sciences. As you can imagine, that's our largest college and we've gone without a permanent dean for almost four years. So, we're super delighted to be able to appoint Dr. Heather Dillaway. She comes to us from Wayne State University where she served as associate dean for many years. And she will be joining us on July 16. In the meantime, Dean Diane Zosky is going to remain as interim until Dr. Dillaway joins us.

I'd like to take this opportunity to say thank you very much, Diane, for being a very outstanding leader during very difficult circumstances. I think everyone would agree that her leadership was excellent and truly outstanding.

I'd also like to thank the committee members, those who served on the committee, and everyone who participated in the search (faculty, staff, students) and helped to make it a success. We are delighted to have Dr. Dillaway join us.

As you know, we are also searching for the dean of the College of Education. That search is ongoing and on track. The latest report I received from that committee is that everything is progressing exactly as anticipated, and they've got some good candidates. They are vetting those candidates, and I think they will start making another round of Zoom interviews with those candidates next week. We'll be making an announcement about the next stages as soon as the committee has something to report.

I'm also delighted about the undergraduate student's research. On February 9 at the University Gallery, the Illinois States Office of Student Research hosted an in-person finalist reception and exhibit for the Image of Research Competition. More than 30 people attended their awards reception for exhibit that featured images from 22 finalists, which included 12 graduates and 10 undergraduate submissions. So, congratulations to that group.

We have been talking about the COACHE survey. This is a collaborative and academic areas of higher education. So, you may have received, both NTT and tenure track members, may have received an invitation to participate in the COACHE faculty job service survey. This is one of the first systematic attempts to get a sense of our faculty's job satisfaction. So, I encourage you to complete that survey. The more information you provide, the easier we'll be able to use that information to identify where we need to improve. Again, I encourage

you to participate if you have not done so. It's going to be open until the beginning of April. So, participate.

Last year, I formed a committee to look at faculty diversity. As you know, faculty diversity is lacking behind. Student have noted this in a variety of places. So, I had a committee that was led by the dean of the College of Business, Ajay Samant, and from my office Yojanna Cuenca-Carlina as well as Roberta Trites. They led the effort. We had 17 members represented from the college and then several from across the university to take a look at our current pathways and how we're trying to serve or how we're trying to improve faculty diversity. The current plan we have is called EDEP, Educational Diversity Enhancement Program. So, that committee worked on several issues, they benchmarked against other universities, and they produced a very comprehensive report for me. I have been discussing that report with President Kinzy. We feel like we are getting very close to crossing all the Ts and dotting all the Is. I anticipate that at the next Academic Senate meeting we will be making a final decision about the steps we plan to take to improve the faculty diversity here at Illinois State University.

Finally, I'd like to congratulate Doris Houston for a very stimulating and successful EDI symposium, which happened on February 14. Those of you who were there, I hope you found it as rewarding and satisfying as I did. I thought it was very informative. So, I congratulate them.

That concludes my remarks.

Senator Phares: This was definitely meant a bit more for President Kinzy, but since you are here, every time we pretty much had one of these meetings I've asked what is our barometer for removing COVID restrictions or implementing more. As we hit one of the most turbulent times when it comes to the mask mandates in Illinois, I feel as maybe I need to alter that questions a bit as I've consistently got the same answer to that last one, and it's been fairly unclear. So, I guess my question now is, as we've continuously decided to follow the guidance of Governor Pritzker and the Illinois Department of Public Health and the CDC, they used to be all aligned together. Right now, it seems the CDC and Pritzker have different opinions when it comes to mask mandates. So, who are we going to follow this time and can I ask why, is the question I would have regarding that.

Provost Tarhule: As I promised I will take that question back to the President. So, the one comment that I would make, which is not an attempt to answer the questions but to help us all understand how we approach some of these issues, is sometimes when a mandate comes out, like we hear something over the weekend, by Monday morning I already have several emails from people asking what ISU is going to do about it. It doesn't happen quite as systematically in an institution our size. We have a Steering Management Committee. So, first of all, when an announcement comes out, the committee has to get together, and as you know, it's a large committee; sometimes it takes several days just to arrange the meetings. So, the committee gets together, they debate, they look at the data and the evidence from a variety of sources and perspectives. They consult with people. Then they make a recommendation to the cabinet or to the President. Sometimes the cabinet

discusses and then it comes up with what ISU's position is. So, sometimes when people say, "well, U of I just announce this, why hasn't ISU announced it?" It probably took U of I several days before they got there. So, when you hear an announcement come out, please be mindful that it takes the process to work out. It's not just a single individual that makes a decision. So, with respect to, maybe not directly what you've said, but this committee is going to have to study all... exactly what you asked. They're going to be facing the same dilemma, who should we follow, and what should we do? Which of this evidence seems to look right? What's the pros and cons? And then they will make a recommendation. Then the cabinet will review that recommendation and then we'll have a position. So, a few days will elapse, but it doesn't mean that nobody is paying attention, it's just the process working itself out. But specifically, I'll take your question and the parameter to the President.

Senator Phares: Thank you.

Senator Horst: I note that with the firing of Coach Mueller, that the University did \$1 million payout. My planned question to President Kinzy and Vice President Stephens, is how was that payout authorized? Did it go through the Board of Trustees? And where did the funds come from? I'm not sure you have the answer to that question, but I emailed them that question.

Provost Tarhule: I'll make sure she gets those questions.

- ***Vice President of Student Affairs Levester Johnson- Excused***
- ***Vice President of Finance and Planning Dan Stephens-Excused***

***Consent Agenda:***

***[Policy 7.1.4 Inspection, Examination, Use and Control of University Financial Records](#)***

***Physics: [Biophysics Sequence](#)***

Motion by Senator Pancrazio, seconded by Senator Vogel, to approve items on the Consent Agenda. The motion was unanimously approved.

***Action Items:***

***From Academic Affairs Committee:***

***09.14.21.03 Policy 7.7.8 Tuition and Fee Waivers Policy Current Policy***

***01.27.22.04 Policy 7.7.8 Tuition and Fee Waivers Policy Mark Up***

***01.20.22.09 Policy 7.7.8 Tuition and Fee Waivers Policy Clean Copy***

Motion by Senator Cline, on behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee, to approve Policy 7.7.8 Tuition and Fee Waivers.

Senator Horst: I have one friendly edit. Number 4 in the Waiver categories you list the employee waivers are governed by university policy 3.1.17. I suggest listing the name of the policy there, which is Educational Benefits.

The motion was unanimously approved, with a friendly amendment.

***From Rules Committee:***

***12.08.21.01 Policy 5.1.8 Skateboarding Activities policy Current Copy***

***01.11.22.07 Policy 5.1.8 Skateboarding Activities policy Mark Up***

***01.11.22.06 Policy 5.1.8 Skateboarding Activities policy Clean Copy***

Senator Stewart: At our last meeting, which has now been a month ago, we discussed policy 5.1.8 Skateboarding Activities as an Information Item. Just to remind the Senate, the primary changes being made, were first off, the policy was clarified at the very beginning to make sure that it applied to motorized and non-motorized skateboards. The policy was also expanded so that it also applied to bikes and other wheeled recreational vehicles. Second, a sentence was added stating that the use of such devices is forbidden inside all buildings on campus. And then finally, there were some minor edits, but the last major edit was to make clear that university students and staff could be in violation of this policy, not just students.

In light of the comments on the floor from last time, Rules has approved this evening some additional updates. In effect, I think that we've agreed to all of the changes that were proposed on the floor last time. Just to go through them, first off, we would like to replace the word "vehicles" with the word "devices," throughout, including in the title. Senator Pancrazio suggested that language. I did some poking around and it turns out that wheeled recreational devices is a common legal term that refers to things like scooters and rollerblades. So, I think that counts as a friendly amendment.

Second, in additional consultation with Legal, we would like to insert the word non-motorized in the first sentence before bikes and before wheeled recreational devices. The problem Legal discovered belatedly was that the motorized/non-motorized skateboards, one could take motorized/non-motorized to also apply to bikes, etc., and we didn't want to accidentally convey that suddenly mopeds are suddenly allowed on campus, etc. So, inserting non-motorized in those two places in the first sentence takes care of that problem.

We would also like to delete the word "other" in the first sentence before the term "pedestrians." It was pointed out by a member of Rules tonight that this is implying somehow that people on skateboards are pedestrians. So, it's just better to ditch the word "other."

At the suggestion of Senator Pancrazio, we propose adding the following as the second sentence, "Some examples of wheeled recreational devices include but are not limited to rollerblades, roller skates, scooters, etc." Senator Pancrazio suggesting adding a sentence that gave some examples.

Finally, Senator Nikolaou suggested that we add faculty to the sentence that explains that students and staff can be in violation, and we accepted that as a friendly amendment. This is the second to the last sentence of the policy. This would now read, "University students, staff, and faculty are subject to any and all applicable university..." the rest of the sentence remains the same.

Senator Horst: Senator Stewart, can you just read the first paragraph?

Senator Stewart: Certainly. “Motorized/non-motorized skateboards, non-motorized bikes, or other non-motorized wheeled recreational devices may be used on campus as an effective means of transportation as long as they are used safely by users that are mindful and considerate of pedestrians. Some examples of wheeled recreational devices include but are not limited to rollerblades, roller skates, scooters, etc. Use of such devices is forbidden inside all buildings on campus.” So, those are all of the changes that Rules voted to approve tonight.

Motion by Senator Stewart, on behalf of the Rules Committee, to approve policy 5.1.8 Skateboard Activities. The motion was unanimously approved, as amended.

***Information Items:***

***From Faculty Affairs Committee:***

***01.20.22.04 Policy 3.2.3 Academic Notice of Appointments Current Copy***

***01.20.22.05 Policy 3.2.3 Academic Notice of Appointments Mark Up***

***01.20.22.06 Policy 3.2.3 Academic Notice of Appointments Clean Copy***

Senator Nikolaou: The language change that you see came to us from Human Resources. First, we wanted to clarify that it is not only staff members, it is also faculty or staff members. The other main change is, before it was mentioning promoted immediately but the policy does not necessarily refer to promotion. That’s why the new language says, “become fully appointed and provisions of their offer will be fully executed.” These are the main changes to the policy. Thank you to AVP Bonneville.

***From Planning and Finance:***

***01.20.22.09 Policy 7.1.10 Fundraising Current Copy***

***01.20.22.10 Policy 7.1.10 Fundraising Mark Up***

***01.20.22.07 Policy 7.1.10 Fundraising CLEAN COPY***

Senator Vogel: The Planning and Finance Committee was charged with reviewing this policy. We got feedback from Vice President Vickerman’s office. His feedback was discussed by the full committee and then forwarded to the Executive Committee, where we received some additional comments that we discussed this evening and accepted as friendly amendments, along with some response from Vice President Vickerman that is not on the copy you have. So, I’m going to walk you through these new additions.

In the first paragraph, the second sentence, “The University sets the fundraising priorities,” the sentence will end there. We will strike the word “and.”

The next sentence, “University Advancement is responsible for all fundraising...” was just an edit to the word “and,” then including some additional information of the units available to collaborate with.

In the second paragraph after the word “hold” in the first sentence, there is a comma missing that will be added.



In the third paragraph, we have a change to the beginning of that sentence. The new wording will be, “The development department, within University Advancement, is responsible for coordinating...” So, the first part has been changed, again, just to reflect the unit.

In that same sentence, continuing on after the parenthetical statement, “including Athletics, Student Affairs, and WGLT,” end parenthesis, period. The rest of that sentence will be struck.

The next paragraph just has some clarification of the unit’s title.

Under the Procedures, again, just some editing of the word fundraising and clarification of units.

Just some small edits under the section called Definition to change the spacing there.

The section titled Fundraising Ventures and Programs mostly edits to correct the work fundraising.

And in the very last section under University Policy link, we are going to strike that last bullet since that is not a policy.

And then at the very end, the contact should read Vice President for University Advancement. Those are the edits we are proposing.

Senator Cline: It’s not content related but a scrivener’s error. At the bottom of the last paragraph, before the word procedures on the first page, there should be a comma after the phone number for the development department. Comma or.

Senator Vogel: Thank you. I would take that as a friendly amendment.

***From Faculty Affairs Committee:***

***01.20.22.01 Policy 3.2.8 Sabbatical Leave Current Copy***

***01.27.22.02 Policy 3.2.8 Sabbatical Leave Mark Up***

***01.27.22.03 Policy 3.2.8 Sabbatical Leave Clean Copy***

Senator Nikolaou: As Senator Horst mentioned earlier, we have comments on this policy dating back to 2015-2016 and a significant number of these comments come from this discussion in November of 2019 during Senate. During the revision in the Executive Committee in March of 2020, but then because of the pandemic they were not able to continue, and then they moved to the Integrity policy, so now we see it.

First of all, I would like to thank all the Senators before that worked on this policy. The Faculty Affairs Committee, past and present, on working on addressing all the numerous comments that we received during the last two years. As well as the Office of General Counsel, AVP Bonneville, AVP Trites, for all the useful comments and recommendations.

The policy that you see in front of you, we have sent it to Human Resources, Legal, and VP Trites.

So, some general comments that apply throughout the policy is that we reviewed it to use gender neutral language. It's clarified throughout the policy that this is for full time tenure track faculty. And then throughout the policy wherever it was mentioned "department or schools" we've also added "or appropriate unit" because of the case of Milner Library.

If we take it in order of all the changes, under overview, we cleaned up the language.

In the second paragraph we reordered so that it is made clear that sabbaticals are mainly for scholarly, creative activity or teaching productivity to match the categories listed on page five.

The next part is that we reorganized what was previously called the Procedures so that there is one part that focuses on the eligibility requirements and then we provide the details about the length and the compensation.

So, if we move to the eligibility for sabbatical, item a, we clarified that two half year sabbaticals count as one sabbatical for the 1:25 ratio. Similarly, we added language for Milner faculty because they can get sabbatical for three, six, or twelve months. So, that's why you see in parenthesis that four quarter year sabbaticals count as one sabbatical for these calculation purposes.

Item b, we received several comments the previous time we saw this at Senate about whether eligibility for sabbatical should be 7 years, or if we should consider a different time period. So, for this we looked at 14 peer comparable institutions. We saw that 9 institutions use the same 7 years. 3 institutions provide sabbatical every 5 years. 2 of them have a much more complex continuous measure where they adjust the period, and then based on the period, they adjust how much you're going to get, in terms of pay. 5 of the institutions allowed for an exception. So, after looking at the comparable institutions, the Faculty Affairs Committee voted on maintaining the application and eligibility to be during the sixth year so that an awarded sabbatical will occur during the faculty's seventh year... so, the practice that we currently have. We also clarified that faculty who receive credit, who come with previous credit from a previous university, they can count prior service towards determining their sabbatical eligibility.

But for item c, we added a new section when we allow for an exception because that was one of the concerns that was expressed. Sometimes departments might need a specific faculty who has been awarded sabbatical because of teaching responsibilities or because of administrative purposes. So what we did is we added that section where it says pretty much that for the convenience for the University, we can request a faculty member who has been awarded a sabbatical to postpone their sabbatical for at most one year. But if the faculty agree to the postponement of the sabbatical, then the calculation for the time period of the sabbatical is going to start from the time they were awarded the sabbatical, not when their sabbatical starts. So, they are not penalized for this one year that they are delayed in

their sabbatical, again, for the convenience of the University. And we also added language that both the faculty need to agree to postpone the sabbatical and also that it needs to be supported by the dean, chair, and obviously the provost needs to approve it.

For section d, we clarified that chairs and directors are eligible for sabbatical leave consistent with policy 3.3.6.

For section e, we clarified the eligibility for sabbatical applications. If someone receives a sabbatical and then they decide to decline the sabbatical, what's the process they are going to follow.

The last part in this section includes a reference to policy 3.1.11 because one of the concerns was what's going to happen for faculty who may want to take an educational leave. So, we direct them to the appropriate policy. But then we include a reference to policy 3.4.8 when we have an educational leave for administrative professional personnel. And actually, this is the policy we are going to see after we are done with the sabbatical policy, because we want to try and keep some of the language mirroring each other.

The next section, the Sabbatical Length of Leave and Leave Compensation. If you see the structure a.1, we added that the sabbatical leave cannot exceed the regular appointment of the faculty. a.2 refers specifically to Milner faculty that they can receive a three-, six-, or twelve-month sabbatical. And a.3, refers to chairpersons and directors that they can receive but it cannot exceed 4.5 months.

And then if we move to b, it refers to the three same groups, but in terms of compensation. So, b.1 refers to a 4.5 month salary for faculty who get a half year. b.2 is specifics for Milner Library. And b.3. is specific for the chairpersons.

Section c, also represents several questions we received from the floor last time about whether faculty are going to be allowed to be paid from grants, scholarships, or a fellowship they may receive. And also whether they are able to use funds from such resources for paying for travel related expenses, for lodging, for any expenses related to that specific sabbatical. So, c.1 includes information about the actual salary. So, faculty on full year sabbaticals, they are going to receive the equivalent of 4.5 months pay. But if they get funds from a fellowship, scholarship, or other income, they can complement that income with the 4.5 months as long as it does not exceed the 100% of the IBS, the institutional base salary. For c.2, we added the language about non-salary compensation that it is allowed, and it will not count toward the IBS. But such additional compensation needs to be approved by the provost.

Then in item d, there is a clarification that if you are talking about secondary employment, or outside employment is this beyond what is included in c, you need to go and refer to policy 3.3.7.

We're almost there.

So, for the section on Sabbatical Proposals and Approvals, we clarified that if you have a full year sabbatical and you decide to get it only for one semester, then you need to provide a three-month prior notification. Then we added more details about how the process works.

For the Evaluation Process, we reworded so it's clear that there are three main categories for a sabbatical request. And we removed the advance degree option, because this is going to fall under the educational leave policy.

Under Criteria, the main change is the addition that the probationary tenure track faculty can apply for a sabbatical, but the leave is conditional on the award of tenure.

Under the Obligations, we clarified that the faculty needs to stay at the University for two consecutive regular academic semesters. Because the question was, "What happens if I get my sabbatical in the fall and if I get my sabbatical in the spring, how are you going to calculate what is this one year that I have to be at the university?" So, now we say it is two consecutive regular semesters.

Then the last change is clarifying the language and adding the description about sabbatical outcomes and how they are going to be used.

So, these are all the changes.

Senator Horst: Okay. Since this is almost a total rewrite, I thought we would go section by section and then maybe do some general questions at the end. Does anyone have any questions regarding the Overview? All right.

We can move to the Eligibility for Sabbatical section. Any questions about that? I have one from the previous list of 21 points. I just wanted to read it and get your report as to what the committee decided. Item 6, it said there were comments by multiple senators in 2015-16 regarding the need for stronger language regarding sabbatical eligibility not always to be exactly seven or more years apart. If a person has been unable to take a sabbatical exactly at year 7, 14, and 21, they noted there might be a discriminatory impact on current procedure policies for woman or for people who become gravely ill or go on FMLA for pregnancy. A faculty who time sabbaticals to make best use of their resource. So, I was just wondering if you have a response from the committee regarding the idea of being a little bit more flexible. For instance, I should have a sabbatical right now, but I am not taking it. So, if I looked at my service to the University and I divide it up in seven-year slots, I might be missing one at the very end. Was there any notion of being a little bit more flexible if somebody has a life event?

Senator Nikolaou: So, we talked a lot about the seven-year period, and that's partly why we added the exception to the timetable under c, where it is about the convenience of the University. But then we didn't see how we could incorporate all the other aspects. The only part we added was under page 6, under Faculty Obligations of Completion of Sabbatical where we say, "Any unexpected occurrences (such as FMLA or disability leaves) that may have an impact on fulfilling these terms will be handled internally according to University

policy and procedures.” But then when we look at other universities, none of them have specific language about FMLA or health conditions. That’s why we didn’t make any change specifically.

Senator Horst: Okay. Are there any other questions about eligibility? I did have another question about the Educational Leave of Absence. A couple of years ago, Senator Ferrence noted that the Human Resources, if someone took a full year sabbatical, that Human Resources would code the second half of the sabbatical as an educational leave. And there was some concern about deleting that language. So, did you straighten that out with HR?

AVP Bonneville: I don’t believe we’ve talked about it. I’d have to go back and look at the coding.

Senator Horst: Okay. I’m not sure it was substantiated, but he understood that if he took a full year sabbatical, in your system for some reason, you had to code it as an educational leave. And we’re essentially deleting that reason for a sabbatical right now. Correct?

Senator Nikolaou: We are referring to the other policy that refers to the education leave.

Senator Horst: Right. So, if I’m taking a full year sabbatical, would I now have to apply for an educational leave? Hopefully not.

Senator Nikolaou: According to how we have it here, no, because we allow for a full year sabbatical.

Senator Horst: Okay. I don’t know the source of his information.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. I also don’t.

Senator Pancrazio: I do believe Senator Ferrence had made that comment, but he himself was unsure. While an individual, as Senator Nikolaou has already indicated, can take the entire year. So, I don’t believe there is a necessity to have that to be able to take a full year sabbatical.

Senator Horst: Okay. So, if Associate Vice President Bonneville could just verify that that’s not correct information, we’d appreciate it. Are there any questions about Sabbatical Length of Leave and Leave Compensation?

Senator Bonnell: This is really helpful, so I really appreciate this. I just have one super minor change, and that is under b.2 where it says, “For Milner library faculty...” just capitalize L or just remove library to make it more consistent with the other references. So, super minor, but thank you for all this work.

Senator Nikolaou: Do you have a preference?

Senator Bonnell: In my mind, it would be consistent to say Milner faculty.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay.

Senator Jordan: Looking at the language regarding directors and chairs, I looked at the old policy and I didn't see any such language. So, does this mean that a chair or director cannot go on a sabbatical that's longer than 4.5 months regardless of if they are able to obtain funding for a second semester?

Senator Nikolaou: That was part of our understanding that if it is a school director or department chairperson, they can get a 4.5 month sabbatical, and any additional leave is going to be an administrators leave that needs to be approved by their appropriate unit supervisor. And then that specific unit should come up with the funds.

Dr. Trites: The goal was to ensure that department chairs, just like faculty because they are faculty, receive 4.5 months sabbatical which they could take nine months at half pay. But it would not be appropriate for a department chair to have significantly greater amount of time on sabbatical than a regular faculty member.

Senator Jordan: If I could just follow-up. The language I'm reading, "The total sabbatical leave period for a Chairperson/School Director may not exceed a period of 4.5 months of full-time employment or its equivalent." I guess I'm not sure what the word sabbatical means there. That would be the semester 4.5 months that would be compensated by the university, and then I would have to take an administrative leave for the remainder. So, it is logically possible.

Dr. Trites: Yes.

Senator Jordan: Okay.

Dr. Trites: What we are doing here is describing current practice; I believe 4.5 months of the chairs and directors' salary can come out of the Academic Impact Fund, but 9 months cannot.

Senator Jordan: Understood. Thank you.

Dr. Trites: You bet.

AVP Bonneville: My team responds at all hours, so I have your answer. There may have been an instance where a person was only eligible for a single semester but wanted to take the full year. So, in that case we did do a sabbatical in the fall and an educational leave in the spring. But, generally speaking, if the faculty is taking a full year sabbatical, they're coded a sabbatical for the entire year. There is no switch to an educational leave.

Senator Horst: Okay. Thank you very much.

Senator McLauchlan: Can I add on? My conversation with AVP Bonneville, because I checked my notes, I know we've talked about it. It is how CMS codes it. Right. It's not necessarily how we do it, but it was a CMS thing. And that was true in 2019, so maybe not true anymore.

Provost Tarhule: Was the intention about chair sabbaticals that the chair or director takes a sabbatical while they are serving or after they step down?

Senator Nikolaou: So, policy 3.3.6 says that they are allowed to take a sabbatical up to five years, but it doesn't specify... it might be that you complete the five years and you are renewed, but it might be that someone steps down. So, it doesn't restrict it one way or another.

Provost Tarhule: I don't know how far we take the policy today, but I would be interested in having more discussions with you to understand the thinking on the financial impact. Because, in general, you pay a chair for serving as chair. So, when a chair takes a sabbatical, do they still get their pay as chair? Because when you go on sabbatical, you are not serving as chair anymore. So, what was the thinking on that? We can discuss that later.

Senator Horst: It might be something you want to think about in policy 3.3.6, which is the policy that allows chairs to go on sabbatical.

Provost Tarhule: I think that, if the chairs allows, I would like to have my office to have that conversation.

Senator Horst: Okay.

Provost Tarhule: Thank you.

Senator Horst: But at this point the sabbatical policy is just complying and describing how that would happen. Moving on. Are there any questions on sabbaticals and approvals?

Senator Lucey: So, the section on Sabbatical Proposals and Approvals, I may be misreading it, but that section doesn't really cover approvals. So, I'm wondering if it should be just Sabbatical Proposals? And there is a proposal evaluating process, and the committee talks about how there is a proposal evaluation process, but there's no real explicit statement that says that the Provost has the right to decline a sabbatical application. And I think it would be appropriate to say that a sabbatical application is not guaranteed to be accepted.

Senator Nikolaou: So, that is in the Overview where it says, "Such leaves are not automatically granted to individuals upon completion of a stated period of service. Each application will be judged..."

Senator Lucey: Can that be moved to the evaluation section?

Senator Nikolaou: We can consider that.

Senator Horst: And then that would make the title correct, & Approvals. Thank you, Senator Lucey. Any further questions? Okay. Moving on to Proposal Evaluation Process, any questions regarding that? Okay. Moving then to Criteria to be Used in Evaluating Sabbatical Leave Proposals, any question regarding that? Okay. Then the final section, Faculty Obligations on Completion of Sabbatical? I had a question. If you could explain where you say, “individuals who fail to return to the University for at least two full regular academic semesters after a sabbatical leave agree to reimburse the university for any salary and expenses paid.” Are expenses usually part of a sabbatical award?

Dr. Trites: It entirely depends on the nature, say of a Fulbright. If you are in a Fulbright area that’s in a very high rate of exchange people look at, for example, a \$2,000 cost of living adjustment, and the Fulbright Commission is very committed to recognizing that people who are from Elgin, Texas don’t have as high of living cost as people who are from Los Angeles or Hong Kong. So, what that is currently intended to do is hold the faculty member harmless in the case that they are going to a place that genuinely costs more. They are getting legitimately reimbursed for that cost-of-living difference from an agency, such as the Fulbright, so they are not then penalized and told by us, oh, well, you get \$2,000 less, and sorry the cost-of-living is higher in Hong Kong.

Senator Horst: Okay. So, you are articulating that any sort of reimbursement from any agency regarding expenses would not have to be given back.

Dr. Trites: Not so much given back as taken against one’s salary.

Senator Horst: Okay. I see. Thank you. Any other questions on Faculty Obligations on completion of Sabbatical? Any other questions in general? I do note that you have “reviewed on 3/2020.” I don’t know if that’s typical to include that material when we review it versus approving it. But otherwise, I think the lack of questions is a clear statement to your thoroughness of this. And again, I appreciate the committee doing so much work on this and compiling many notes from years and years of discussion on this policy. I look forward to us discussing that in two weeks.

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

Senator Horst: Okay. We have some vice presidents here. Provost Tarhule was in the hot seat and took all the questions, but I didn’t know if anyone would like to... I asked a question to you specifically, Vice President Stephens, if you wouldn’t mind addressing it. I asked a question regarding the \$1 million payout to Coach Muller, and I was wondering if you could talk about the approval process for that payment and how it was funded?

Senator Stephens: Thank you for the question, Senator Horst. I’ve written some notes here and I’m just going to read them directly so I can make sure I clarify as much of the answer as I can. So, with respect to the contract settlement with Coach Muller, in consulting with the Athletic Director Kyle Brenan and his Chief Fiscal Officer, Associate Director Emily Newsome, the cost associated with paying out the final terms of Coach Muller’s contract are coming from the same funding source utilized to handle day-to-day operations of the entire



Athletic Division. It's their Athletic agency account. This agency account garners the majority of its resources from a variety of areas, including event ticket sales, corporate sponsorships, athletic fees, and NCAA Missouri Valley Conference revenues. The expense categories that flow from this agency account include all the Athletic department salaries, including coaches, administrative staff, student related positions (both at the undergraduate and graduate level). This account also covers compensation for vehicles, all travel costs for teams, include staff travel involved in recruiting, teams supplies and uniforms, team equipment, athletic marketing and promotion materials, athletic guarantee expense, expenses associated with non-conference play, and then any costs associated with medical and insurance related matters. General revenue funds supplement this operation only to a small degree, specifically for functions within the academic mission, such as salaries for academic counselors to help our student athletes with their studies, maintenance staff for the Horton Field House in support of being a shared space for instructional activities, and a portion of the financial aid provided to student athletes. And then finally, this athletic agency account that is being tasked with the compensation for the coach also manages certain foundation funds, respective of each fund type. The funds can be used for various expenses, including financial aid and general operating expenses. So, by and large this type of payment is essentially compensation payment for Coach Muller, which was included in his contract. I believe the contract itself dates itself back to 2017. And they're still, from what I understand, they're still working on a final agreement with Coach Muller that should be finalized within the next few days or few weeks. So, hopefully that answers your question.

Senator Horst: Yeah. So, just to be clear, Athletics is covering it and the Board of Trustees doesn't have to be involved, even given the size of the payment?

Senator Stephens: No. It shouldn't, it's inside a contract. And so, obviously a contract that is made, there are very few contracts around our University, usually it's the President and typically Athletic coaches, those are all handled through the Board of Trustees at the time that they originally signed. So, this particular agreement is just the ending of an agreement. The next coach that gets hired there will be a brand-new agreement associated with that one. So, this is just typical normal operations.

Senator Horst: Thank you very much.

***Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Cline***

Senator Cline: This evening the Academic Affairs Committee discussed some revisions to policy 2.1.12 Pass/No Pass Credit/No Credit, revisions that came to us from the Executive Committee, and that will be take back to the Executive Committee for the next meeting. We spent some time with Amy Roser discussing revisions to the Reinstatement policy 2.1.21. We also considered some input that was provided to us by Dr. Doris Houston from DIAC. We'll continue to work with the Reinstatement policy in our next meeting.

***Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Senator Smudde***

Senator Smudde: The Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee had a presentation from Dr. Dan Elkins, Associate Vice President of Academic Fiscal Management. We talked

about the Academic Impact Fund. That was the sole business of the committee. Next step will be working on our annual report for them.

**Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Nikolaou**

Senator Nikolaou: The Faculty Affairs Committee met this evening. We started our discussion of policy 3.2.12 Ombudsperson.

**Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Vogel**

Senator Vogel: Planning and Finance met this evening. We discussed those edits I brought to you on the Fundraising policy. We also talked about policy 9.6 Student Computer Ownership.

**Rules Committee: Senator Stewart**

Senator Stewart: The Rules Committee did meet tonight. We discussed and approved the final edits to Policy 5.1.8. We also discussed policy 10.2.1 and approved a revision of that. And we discussed a final version of the Wonsook Kim College of Fine Arts Bylaws and approved a version of that pending some very minor editorial corrections.

**Communications**

Senator Lucey: First of all, I want to thank Becky Beucher for subbing for me during the fall semester while I was on sabbatical. Her expression of gratitude with her newfound knowledge is that she wanted to share an announcement with you. On Monday from 1-3:30 in Stevenson Hall there will be a workshop that provides foundational knowledge on becoming an effective ally to your LGBTQ+ students and colleagues. This workshop is open to graduate students, staff, and faculty. So, please attend if that fits your schedule.

Senator Horst: Thank you. It was wonderful to work with her. I hope she comes back in the future. Any further communications? I have one. Senator Valentin and I did an art project together, compiling some interesting videos about Donald Trump’s presidency and that will be premiered in East Carolina University tomorrow night. So, watch your email, Rick; we might get some comments coming our way. But I enjoyed working on that project very much with you.

**Adjournment**

Motion by Senator Biancalana, seconded by Senator Rardin, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.

	Senate
Name	Attendance
Avogo, Winfred	1
Biancalana, AJ	1
Blum, Craig	1
Bonnell, Angela	1
Chassy, Grant	1

Cline, Lea	1
DeNeve, Sarah	1
Deutsch, Lucky	1
Garrahy, Deb	1
Harpel, Tammy	1
Hogue, Hannah	1
Holland, Dan (rep Marx, David)	1
Hollywood, Mary	1
Horst, Martha	1
Johnson, Levester * - EXCUSED	0
Kinzy, Terri * Excused	0
Lahiri, Somnath	1
Landfair, Lawrence	1
Lucey, Tom	1
McLauchlan, Craig *	1
McNab, Maddie	1
Meyers, Adena - EXCUSED	0
Midha, Vishal	1
Miller, Chloe	1
Monk, Eduardo	1
Nahm, Kee-Yoon	1
Nichols, Wade	1
Nikolaou, Dimitrios	1
Noel-Elkins, Amelia	1
Novotny, Nancy	1
Otto, Stacy	1
Palmer, Stuart	1
Pancrazio, Jim	1
Paoni, Devin (TRUSTEE) *	0
Peters, Steve	1
Phares, Kevin	1
Qaddour, Jihad	0
Rademaker, Hannah	1
Rardin, Nate	1
Restis, William	1
Samhan, Bahae - EXCUSED	0
Samuel, Isabel - EXCUSED	0
Schmeiser, Benjamin	1
Seeman, Scott	1
Small, Maddy	1
Smudde, Pete	1
Spranger, Avery	1
Stephens, Daniel *	0

Stewart, Todd	1
Swiech, Livi	1
Tarhule, Aondover *	1
Torry, Mike	1
Toth, Dylan	1
Valentin, Rick	1
Villalobos, Rodrigo	1
Vogel, Laura	1
Neubrandner, Judy (dean rep) *	1
Jordan, Scott (chair rep) *	1
VACANT - 1 CAS SS Faculty	0
VACANT - 1 Faculty Associate	0
VACANT - 1 Student Senator	0
VACANT - 1 Student Senator	0
<b>QUORUM (VOTING) (28)</b> <b>(* = NV)</b>	46