

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

9-11-2024

Senate Meeting, September 11, 2024

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

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

Recommended Citation

Academic Senate, "Senate Meeting, September 11, 2024" (2024). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 1333.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/1333>

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

Academic Senate Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, September 11, 2024
7:00 P.M. (Hard stop 8:45)
OLD MAIN ROOM, BONE STUDENT CENTER

Call to Order

Chairperson Horst called the meeting to order.

Roll Call

Senator Cline called the roll and declared quorum.

Public Comment: All speakers must sign in with the Senate Secretary prior to the start of the meeting.

Fusun Akman: Good evening, Fusun Akman, Professor of Mathematics. I'll talk about the Gen Ed proposal that is before you from two viewpoints: shared governance and impact. You will see my name among faculty members who worked on this proposal. During my time on the committee, I continually opposed the principles and wanted more democratic participation. Membership worked by secret invitation. Departments and student groups were not asked to participate voluntarily. That's why most of you never heard of it until it arrived on your doorstep. All important decisions had been made beforehand; thinking and criticizing were not encouraged in the work group. The scant opportunities for public comments never included communal question and answer. For the rationale, we were told that students were sent self-selected surveys, where they allegedly said math was hard, like Barbie; also that they were stressed. True story. No academic study prompted these drastic changes. I can confirm there was widespread revolt in our group at some point, after which some cosmetic changes were made. The basics, however, remained the same: our students will have the option to graduate without taking a single English, math, natural science, social science, or IT course. "Gen Ed should not be discipline specific" is just an opinion; we were told bluntly that there were no sacred cows. Other opinions were quashed. Here's my and dozens of fellow faculty members' sacred cows. We are already out of compliance with IAI requirements in 2/3 of gen ed courses, so this doesn't seem the way to go. Transfer students will be confused; students transferring out will have to take real Gen ed courses wherever they go. Our students from underprivileged populations will be pushed further away from STEM. Instead, why not try professionally staffed walk-in tutoring and writing centers? And more mental health support. To me it's easier to dump it and start properly from scratch, with inclusivity. So, I'm asking you Senators to please question authority, slow down the process until you know what is involved, and then vote your conscience.

Presentations:

HLC Site Visit

***Assistant Vice President for Academic Planning Cooper Cutting
Special Assistant to the Provost Dr. Susan Hildebrandt***

Cooper Cutting: I will try to keep this quick, but I recognize there are a number of folks here who may not know what HLC stands for and what the reaccreditation process is. HLC stands for the Higher Learning Commission. It is the body that accredits us. It is a regional accreditor. Accreditation is important for a number of reasons. It allows us to award accredited degree, it allows us to disperse Federal Financial Aid, it helps with transfer and those types of things, but perhaps the biggest thing they do is provide us a framework for continuous improvement, such that we are offering quality programs.

As part of that we are reaccredited every ten years. We are coming up for the end of a ten-year cycle, so we have been working for about a year and a half to develop an assurance narrative that talks about why we feel we meet all of Higher Learning Commission's expectations for a university.

They are coming to visit us on October 28th and 29th. We want to make sure that we are getting that date out there so people can save the date. We will have folks on campus meeting with different stakeholders across campus to talk about your experience with ISU and what is your ISU story. We have moved into a phase of trying to get the word out, so this is part of that. We have redesigned the website to move into this next phase. We have provided on that website what the criteria of the narrative are so folks can read that. There is an opportunity to provide feedback to HLC with respect to the narrative or your thoughts about ISU.

We met this morning with the chairperson of the site visit, so we now have a sense of what some of those meetings will be. Hopefully in the next week we will start drafting what that site visit schedule will be so you will know when there is an open forum for faculty, when there is an open forum for students, when there is an open forum for staff. Hopefully that information will be up on the website in a couple of weeks. We will have some back and forth with HLC to make sure we get exactly what we want. There may be a few sessions that we won't know exactly what the topics are, because once we lock the data in at the end of this month, the reviewers will start to look at our narrative and they will make some decisions about what additional meetings they may want to have and whether we know that early October or a little later we are not sure.

The plan is to have two practice sessions on October 7th and October 8th where we will have a few folks who are on campus who happen to be HLC peer reviewers. They will do some practice sessions for us so that we can get a sense of the sorts of questions and interaction the team may want to have. That is another potential save-the-date. All of this information will be up on the website. In the handouts that we passed around there is a QR code. That is if you want to provide some feedback to HLC, you can use the QR code, and it is a way to do that. At the top we have the web address where you can see our accreditation page where you can look at the narrative and the schedules and things, and there is a fun sticker that

also has the date on it, so you can put that on the back of your computer or wherever you want it.

Sue Hildebrandt: There are sample questions that the HLC reviewers might ask of different audiences. There are two documents on the website if you would like to preview those. One is organized by criterion and the other is organized by audience, so those of you who are students may find value in some of those as well as other folks.

Chairperson Horst: Where are the sample questions, again?

Cooper Cutting: On the webpage there is “preparing for the visit” and on the page there are some sample questions. Those questions are pulled from other institutions where they had some questions that were asked, or they were preparing to answer.

Sue Hildebrandt: On the coloring sheet you will find a QR code. The deadline for those public comments is September 27th. If you have any interest in submitting one if you haven’t submitted before, there is your opportunity.

Gen Ed Revision Proposal

Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Education Amy Hurd

Gen Ed Task Force Co-Chair Dr. Chris Horvath

Gen Ed Task Force Co-Chair Dr. Cheri Simonds

Drs. Horvath and Simonds were also joined by Brian Aitken, executive committee member and associate director of the University College Advising.

Chris Horvath: My name is Chris Horvath. I am a professor in the department of Philosophy. I have a joint appointment in the School of Biological Sciences, and I currently serve as chair of the Department of Philosophy.

Cheri Simonds: I am Cheri Simonds. I am a faculty member in the School of Communication. I am starting my 28th year in Directing Communication as Critical Inquiry and have conducted assessment in General Education in relation to that course for the last 27 years.

Brian Aitken: I am Brian Aitken, Associate Director in University College with my main administrative responsibilities being over first-year and transitional academic advising. I am also a member of the Council on General Education.

Chris Horvath: We will start with the brief presentation. For reference, this is our current General Education program as it appears in the catalog that students see if they go online right now. It requires courses in 11 categories and 39 credit hours. Those are the current categories and course numbers. There have been concerns raised about the current program from surveys that have been done on campus- surveys from students, focus groups of faculty, focus groups of students, all of which took place prior to COVID. The basic results of those surveys on campus were that there needs to be several changes in the General Education program. They would include reducing the number of credit hours from 39 to something no lower than 30 no more than 36.

Part of the reason for that has to do with different academic programs on campus increasing the number of credit hours that they are requiring for majors, which makes undergraduate education more expensive as students have to satisfy those increased number of credit hour requirements in their programs and the Gen Ed. It also makes for difficulty meeting time to graduation in four years or five years, because the more Gen Ed courses they have to take on top of the more major courses they have to take, it delays time to graduation. It also makes their time at ISU highly constrained; they can't choose many electives because their time is filled with Gen Ed requirements and requirements for their major.

Our goal was to increase flexibility for our students to allow them to make choices that would make their General Education experience more meaningful to them and to decrease the number of credit hours by three to provide them with more flexibility. There is more on the slide, but that is what I would like to emphasize right now.

Another one of the clear signals we got from the surveys was that many faculty don't want to teach in our Gen Ed program. They are not interested in developing Gen Ed courses, they don't want to teach Gen Ed courses. One of our motivations was to create a Gen Ed program where more faculty would actually want to participate. This would require changes in our Gen Ed so that the courses we were going to offer would match better with the academic experience and with the interests of contemporary faculty. Our Gen Ed program was put in place 35 years ago and has not significantly changed since then. Our faculty has changed significantly and so have our students since then.

The core principles that guided our development were the following: it needed to be student-centered, increase flexibility to time to degree, we would prefer it to be innovative, new, it needed to be IAI-friendly, it has to be a curriculum which faculty want to teach. Assessment is important; our current Gen Ed program is not assessable, at least not very well assessable. We needed to increase the ability to assess it. Again, between 30 and 36 credit hours was our target.

This process started five years ago in the fall of 2019. It was started by Provost Murphy, who created an executive task force with the CGE that started the Council on Gen Ed, which is one of the committees of the Senate. They started this process. There was student survey in 2019 and another one in 2022. There were focus groups. There were supposed to be many more focus groups, but COVID came along and many of the focus groups couldn't take place.

After each of these attempts to gather input from faculty, students, and staff on campus, the committee would meet and revise whatever we were working on. As the process continued and we presented our draft proposals to UCC and CGE and the Honors program, and the curriculum committees of each of the colleges several times; and after each of these conversations with these groups we revised our proposals to better reflect the information we were getting from the constituent groups.

Students were surveyed again in 2022; there was a special survey done in the spring of 2023 about writing and how writing should be handled in the Gen Ed program, and after each of these attempts to solicit feedback from the campus, the committee would meet and alter our proposal to be more consistent with the information we had gathered. We completed this process and

produced a proposal that you see in front of you in the spring of 2024. It has undergone significant revision all throughout this process based on the feedback we received from faculty, students, and staff.

Cheri Simonds: The vision of the program is very much in line with the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AACU). Our previous General Education program relied heavily on the learning outcomes of the AACU, but in the 35 years since we have been doing this program, they have come up with a few changes. We wanted to look at what their current General Education recommendations were. Our vision is based on their idea that students should be informed, engaged, and responsible in their General Education program. We took in their learning outcomes from their current iteration of their General Education recommendations, and we started with those. The learning outcomes, we have three associated with the Informed Learner, we have seven associated with the Engaged Learner, this is where we want to get the cross-disciplinary schools that students need and that they can explore in their undergraduate education. Then the third – Responsible Learner, so that they become engaged members of a democracy and that they understand that they have a responsibility to the social outcomes and civic engagement outcomes that are associated with our new program.

We didn't want to have any courses that would carry over; we wanted to talk about this in terms of categories of courses. We came up with ten categories of courses and then one General Education Elective to make it more flexible for students where they can explore things that maybe they want to have in their major, but they just didn't know enough about that in order to make that decision. Because these are categories of courses, there is not one course that is associated with any one of these categories.

The Information Fluency Through Writing is an additional course based on the feedback we were getting from faculty about students needing at least two writing courses in order to be able to write effectively within their major. Information Fluency Through Writing, where it might stand to reason that somebody from Milner might teach these courses, and a department could propose a course within this area. In fact, my department is considering proposing a course on Information Fluency Through Writing. Communication Inquiry- this is the course that I directed for the last 28 years, but it is not COM 110. It is a Communication Inquiry course.

Theoretically, any department could decide that they want to submit a syllabus for Communication Inquiry, and that would be OK with us. If anyone wants to take off our load 100 sections each semester, we are happy for you to do that. These are categories of courses, not discipline-specific.

We have reduced the number of credit hours from 39 to 33 to make it more flexible for students. I did forget to mention on the vision that while we took those learning outcomes from the AACU, we also consulted the guiding principles of AASCU, the American Association of State Universities and Colleges, because they are the ones that have more civic engagement, political engagement of citizens in a democracy. We wanted to embed those ideals into the new General Education program.

One of the things that we did with the learning objectives to pare-down what the AACU had was we had conversations with faculty who would typically teach courses within that category, and we showed them all of the learning outcomes and said, “Which one of these resonate with you the most?” We had them choose anywhere from two to five of the learning objectives that are key to the courses that they had previously taught in General Education, and then we made those courses categories rather than courses themselves. We wanted to make sure that all of the learning outcomes were reflected in the categories for the courses.

We did an analysis, and we can tell you that every one of the objectives that we landed on were reflected in at least one of the categories. That way, if a student goes through all of the categories in General Education, they are meeting all of the learning outcomes within those categories.

One of the other things that we spent a lot of time doing was defining the categories. What is the description of the category? What the definition of the category? What should courses within that category do? What will the students learn, and what learning outcomes are associated with that category? One of the things that we wanted to see was that if this category has these learning outcomes mapped and aligned to it in the course proposals, we want to see an assessment plan for those behaviors within that category. The significant changes are on the screen, I won't read them to you, but one of the things we wanted to do was have an increased focus on globalization, social justice, problem solving, and civic engagement from the AACSU, and we wanted to have a category on experiential learning and civic engagement. We wanted to reduce the credit hours, increase cross-disciplinarity and decrease the siloing that happened with our current General Education program. We feel this program provides a lot more flexibility and control for the students. We have addressed faculty concerns and added an additional writing course; we provide opportunities for student to make meaningful connections between their courses and their certificates, and they can even design their courses or categories around a particular theme, and that gives the students much more flexibility.

Chris Horvath: I know we are running a little over. Last couple of points- to be clear, current students of ISU would finish whatever General Education program is in the catalog of their catalog year. If this proposal came to pass, it is not like current students would all of a sudden have to switch their general education program. Current students would remain in the General Education program that is outlined in their catalog year. Our committee wasn't charged with figuring out implementation. Implementation is clearly going to be gradual. It will require a significant amount of time to transition from one Gen Ed fully into the other Gen Ed, and a great deal of implementation planning will be necessary. That was not the charge of our committee.

Cheri Simonds: We did consider implementation issues as we were choosing learning outcomes and whether or not they were assessable.

Chris Horvath: The proposal also includes a bunch of institutional support that we think will be necessary for this program to be successful, including a writing center, incentives to get faculty to design new courses or revise existing courses. There will be ongoing support for professional development for academic advisors. All of these things will be necessary if this proposal is going to be successful. I have more slides if there are more questions, and the content is relevant.

Chairperson Horst: This item is about to go to Academic Affairs, but it is of such a complexity that we thought it important for all of us to get briefed at this point. Academic Affairs wishes to focus their discussion on particular concerns or comments from senators. Are there any questions, concerns, or comments that people would like to make at this time?

Senator Pellegrini: Would we be able to receive a copy of these slides?

Chris Horvath: I can make them available.

Senator Helms: Can you clarify that for me? It is about to go to committee who will address specific questions, so you want us to send specific questions to the committee?

Chairperson Horst: No, right now. If there are comments or questions that people would like to make at this point before it goes to committee, here is the time.

Senator Woolever: What academic class would this be implemented with?

Brian Aitken: It is hard to say. The Senate has to go through its process to approve or not approve and then it will have to come to the Provost's office. There will have to be significant planning. It is certainly not going to be next year. Is it the year after that? I don't really know. It will depend on how long it takes to develop an implementation plan, and it will be slow and gradual. It is not going to be end one, start another. They will have to overlap for a while.

Chris Horvath: Our current General Education program has approximately 250 courses and anywhere from 27 to 33 thousand seats per semester. It is going to take a little while to figure out how to organize all this.

Senator Helms: One of the slides talked about the commitment to a writing center, to professional development, to all of those things. Those things all come with a financial implication. If we are going to go from the number of courses that we currently have that are housing, for example, our BIO 101 class that is 1800 students per academic year, give or take, to now try to find places for those, that is a big financial change from not only support of faculty to design courses, but also a financial implication if suddenly we have mass changes in what students are taking. That is going to affect departments' abilities to recruit and bring in graduate students as well. How has the financial side of this been addressed by your committee?

Chris Horvath: Two parts to that question- When we met with the director of the School of Biological Sciences and with the faculty from the School of Biological Sciences we consulted with, we made sure that BIO 101 would fit within one of our categories; so we wouldn't have to design a new course. It will fit directly into one of the categories. BIO 196 will as well. CHEM 102 will as well. The big Gen Ed courses that the departments all offer right now should fit. If the department wants to design new courses they can, but we have been very careful to design the definitions in a way that the big courses should fit. If 196 doesn't count for Biology majors, that would be a problem. That is the same in many departments, and we consider all of that. As for who is going to pay for it, Provost Yazedjian is at the other end of the table, and I think that is a question better addressed to her.

Chairperson Horst: I would just comment that there was no Financial Implication Form filed with this, and I followed up on the writing center specifically with Dr. Hurd and at that point she said that was not part of this proposal. Is that accurate, Provost Yazedjian?

Provost Yazedjian: No one has submitted a written request for a writing center to me at this time.

Senator Edwards: I want to discuss the treatment of science in the curriculum. I was very shocked to see the treatment of science in this proposal. From COVID to climate change to reproductive healthcare, just to name some things that are on people's minds this year, science and technology and medicine are here and they are not going anywhere. Our students need a solid grounding in science content to fully participate in the Illinois economy and to be rational voters and rational consumers. I hope we can all agree on that. The posted FAQ that you presented as well as some of the slides there really didn't express the drastic change that we see here. The FAQ states that there are four courses that are retained under the general category of Science, Math, and Quantitative Thinking. That is a very broad definition of STEM, and that masks that actual loss of Natural Science in this curriculum. In the revision, there is no net loss of subjects outside of STEM, but both of the losses, going from 39 to 33 hours, are STEM- one Math and one Natural Science removed. Only one of the 11 courses calls for knowledge and understanding of scientific concepts as part of its goal in the description of that course. That goal is immediately undercut in the description which specifically omits scientific concepts and content.

I am wondering if you can explain if this is an oversight that we can correct with some language changes, or whether it was intentional. If you look at the scientific literacy category, the three things that are listed are "methodologies, applications, and intersections," none of which require science content and understanding of science content. For me that means not just the facts, but the facts formed into an understanding of science. What I wonder is why are those three items there? It gives the appearance, perhaps unintentional, that you are trying to mask a removal of science and leaving science-adjacent content in that description. I was surprised to hear you say that 101 or 196 in Biology, my department, will fall under that description, because it appears to cut out those courses or radically change them. Was this intentional or was it an oversight? If it was intentional, why is there no justification for it other than the focus groups' feeling that Math and Science are viewed as obstacles, to quote the report. Would you allow some wording changes in that description so that you can allow science experts to teach science content in a science literacy course?

Chris Horvath: Our intention was always to allow science experts to teach science content in science literacy courses. If that is not clear from our language, then that is the problem. The intention was to broaden the options for students to take science, to study science, and to study math. While it is true that under our proposal a student could graduate from ISU without taking a course offered by the Math department, it is not true that they could graduate without taking math. Maybe they would take a statistics class offered by the Psychology department. Maybe the College of Business would design a mathematics course that was relevant to students who are more interested in business or finance. Maybe economics would develop a course that was

mathematical in nature and offer it; the Gen Ed. students would still be required to have math literacy, it just wouldn't necessarily be the Math department.

It was a similar thought about the Natural Sciences. While I can't imagine any department other than one of the Natural Science departments will propose and teach courses in those categories, they could. The intention was never to eliminate science or math from the curriculum. The intention was to broaden students' options in how they study science, or the courses they take that focus on Natural Science or Math.

Senator Gizzi: You had said about us getting comments and input to Academic Affairs, but we don't have the actual policy, just the presentation. Would it make sense for us to be able to share this with our faculty so we can get broader comments?

Chairperson Horst: We have a specific catalog language. We have this presentation, but the actual thing that is going to go in front of the Senate is the actual catalog language.

Chris Horvath: The proposal itself is available on the Provost's website. It is on the Gen Ed tab.

Cheri Simonds: It has been open for faculty comments for quite a while.

Chairperson Horst: We have also circulated it to the entire university community again, and we have something like 70 comments right now that we will forward to the committee.

Senator Helms: If the intent was never that somebody who wasn't a science content expert would not teach a science literacy course, why not include that verbiage? Why not make it part of it rather than leaving it open? I'm not picking on anybody here, but a health historian could create a class in scientific literacy, it seems problematic that that content expert might misrepresent the actual scientific method. Part of our scientific method is to gather evidence, to do it in a way that is without influence of society, without influence of other's views. We send it out for peer review, we do those kinds of things. I believe Dr. Nichols has made it very clear or been asked to talk to the General Education task force about this and has brought up on numerous occasions his concerns. I could forward a couple of questions that he sent and if that is useful, but I am concerned why, if the intent was that wouldn't happen, why not codify that?

Chris Horvath: I don't think that is what I said. I said I couldn't imagine that faculty from outside the sciences would design and want to teach those courses. I'm a philosopher of science, that is what I do. I don't see a problem with a health historian teaching a class in science literacy. I don't see a problem with a philosopher of science teaching a course in science literacy. It would be up to the CGE to look at the syllabus for those proposed courses to make sure that they covered the scientific content that the description requires. As with all of us, it is up to the chair of your department or the school director to decide whether you are competent to teach that course. If someone were to propose a course in science literacy who didn't have the competence to teach it, one would think their department wouldn't assign them to teach it. That is how that works here. If you don't have the competency, you are not supposed to teach those courses.

Chairperson Horst: There are content experts for IDEAS that are part of CGE, so do you envision at all, for the Creative Arts or the Sciences for instance, that there will be some sort of content expert to verify that the course is meeting field expectations?

Chris Horvath: Absolutely. How CGE operates to evaluate this is up to you. You can devise whatever procedure or protocol you want for the CGE. It would be totally consistent with our view if there were content experts who looked at the syllabi to make sure the content was appropriate.

Senator Beddow: From my recollection from when I took a math course, our current math courses, or some of the Gen Ed ones are 4 credit hours. Are we concerned with adjusting credit hours from our current Gen Ed courses to fit this new category? Is that something we are thinking about? Or if a course is 4 credit hours or less, is there some fluctuation in categories? Can a course equal more than one category and count for more than one?

Chris Horvath: The simplest thing to answer is the last thing – no. A course can only count in one category. The more complicated question about credit hours...

Brian Aitken: There has not been any discussion in the past 5 years; in fact any discussion we have had was to say that credit hours are credit hours. If a course is a 4-credit hour class, it is a 4-credit hour class. That is what is approved by the Curriculum Committee. What you see on the slide in front of you, and the way that we have always looked at General Education for graduation purposes was, “what is the minimum required?” the same thing happens in the math category right now. If you take a MATH 130 class, a 3-credit hour class, if you take MATH 113 that is 4. If you at least have one course/3 hours you might end up with more depending on your major and minor or career focus.

Senator Helms: The rest I will send to the committee. One of the things that I notice in reading through this is a point-blank lack of any requirement that a course be a lab-based course. I have done a little bit of research with our comparators. They have similar types of approaches, but there seems to be a consistent statement of, “At least one course must be lab-based.” Why did we choose not to do that?

Cheri Simonds: We had a lot of discussions about it.

Chris Horvath: As with all of it, it was a compromise. How flexible can we let our program be for students? It was the consensus of the committee, but no means unanimously. There was strong disagreement by some members that not all students need to take a lab class. Some students do, so lab classes need to be offered. They need to be in the Gen Ed and students who need them need to be encouraged through advising to take them; but not all students need lab classes. We decided not to require it of all students.

Brian Aitken: Without using names, because I don't trust my memory, there were those on the committee that teach lab sciences that believe we did not need to require a lab. That was not agreed upon amongst everybody, but those were comments made by some on the committee.

Chairperson Horst: I have a general question. You have the learning outcomes, and my understanding is that is for the assessment that HLC is asking for. Because we have these learning outcomes, that is going to lead to a reevaluation of all of the General Education courses. I appreciate that you weren't charged with implementation, but my first question is how long is that going to take and how many man hours? My second question is, if we ever changed these learning outcomes, would we then be required to reassess the entire Gen Ed program?

Cheri Simonds: Anytime there is a change in learning outcomes, I revisit my course and remap and align it to those outcomes. The outcomes are fairly general enough that you, as someone teaching the course, can say, "Yes, we do that and here is how. Here is what we assign and here is what we assess." As someone who has done this at least three times with different learning outcomes, it is not too difficult to remap and align your course to those outcomes.

Chairperson Horst: I understand that we are going to have to reevaluate all of the Gen Ed courses because of these learning outcomes. How long is that going to take and if we ever change these in 10 years will we have to go through that entire process again?

Christ Horvath: That is a question about implementation more than anything else. The honest answer is the CGE will have to review every single course that is proposed for the new Gen Ed to make sure that it meets the stated learning outcomes associated with that course in the proposal before they approve it. How they are going to do that and how long it will take, I honestly can't tell you, but it seems like it is necessary. If you implement this, then every course that is approved for the new Gen Ed will have to be reviewed by CGE or whoever the Senate decides is in charge of that to make sure it meets these learning outcomes. If we change a learning outcome, do we have to go back and review all of them? My understanding is no. Only the courses who cite the changed learning outcome are the only ones that will have to be reviewed.

Cheri Simonds: There is also in the proposal a 5-year review from the CGE for every syllabus so that we can determine whether or not they are actually addressing and assessing those learning outcomes. If the learning outcomes change, they just need to do an addendum that says, "This is how we are going to do this revised learning outcome.

Chairperson Horst: It could be surgical.

Chris Horvath: That is my understanding.

Chairperson Horst: Good luck to the Academic Affairs committee. You have a lot to think about. Thank you very much to the co-chairs, thank you very much to Brian Aitken for coming, and hopefully we will see you again soon.

Approval of the Academic Senate minutes of [08-28-2024](#)

Motion by Senator Yost.

Second by Senator McHale.

Chairperson Horst: I do have some corrections from Senator Bonnell. She pointed on page 9 we needed to say “inconsistent” instead of “consistent” and she corrected a name, “Fred Hampton.” We made those corrections in the document.

Unanimous approval.

Chairperson's Remarks

Good evening, everyone.

Thank you to our presenters this evening. As you heard, the HLC visit is October 28-29, and there is a possibility that they may want to meet with senators. So, particularly if you have a leadership position in the Senate, please try to keep your calendar flexible on these dates.

Thank you to Professors Horvath and Simonds co-chair General Education task force, for their presentation this evening. I think the Academic Affairs Committee now has a lot to discuss at their upcoming two-hour committee meeting.

I want to remind everyone that in two weeks, we will have internal committee meetings from 6-8 pm and there will be NO senate. Administrators who aren't on internal committees, enjoy your evening off. Also, Executive Committee members, there is no Executive Committee meeting until September 30th. If you feel lost on Monday and want to stop by and get some coffee, we can do that. Committee chairs, you have until September 26th to submit material to the Executive Committee via the SAR system. Senators, please make sure to review your committee's materials in preparation for the long meeting on September 25th so that you all can have a productive meeting.

Faculty, we will be approving candidates for two administrator searches this evening at a short but important Faculty Caucus meeting after this meeting has concluded. As well, there are now two additional administrator searches –the Director of the Graduate School and the Associate Provost—for which we need volunteers. Per policy 3.2.13, we need seven tenure-line faculty from different colleges for the search committee for the Director of the Graduate School. Please talk with your colleagues about serving on these important search committees. We will be closing the nominations for these two searches in less than two weeks.

President Tarhule is in Washington D.C. today. If he were here, I am sure he would want to remind everyone about the upcoming State of the University address. This event is sponsored by the Academic Senate. Hope to see everyone on Thursday, September 19th at 2 pm at the Center for the Performing Arts.

Also, I wanted everyone to know that President Tarhule is holding several meetings with shared governance leaders later on this week as a follow up to his email regarding the financial outlook of the University. We will have some budget presentations at the Senate in the coming weeks, so that will be a great opportunity for all senate members to ask follow-up questions regarding President Tarhule's economic forecast for Illinois State.

Student Body President's Remarks

Senator Blair: Thank you, Martha. I hope everyone is doing well today. I wanted to give some updates about what Student Government has been doing as well as Student Caucus. Student Caucus held its first meeting of the year last Wednesday where we began our review of policy 2.2.1 Student Employment. We have some remaining questions on that that I have sent out and we will take those answers into consideration and hopefully complete that policy at our next meeting and be able to send that here. Additionally, I want to let you know that Student Government is taking on a couple initiatives from our last meeting. The one that is relevant here- we passed a resolution urging the Academic Senate to consider cancelling classes on future General Election Days, not 2024, beginning in 2026. This is something that was submitted in a Senate Action Request that will then go to Academic Senate Exec where further conversations will be had. Prior to this, other conversations have been had, last semester as well, including with Ani Yazedjian and with other people about cancelling classes for this cycle and why that is not practical, and other options. That is just a heads up, that might be coming down later when we get to it. I also had a meeting with Susan Hildebrandt about how Student Government can help support University efforts to get civic engagement out there and assist things with the election.

Administrators' Remarks

- ***President Aondover Tarhule (absent)***

Chairperson Horst: As I mentioned, Senator Tarhule is in Washington DC, and he did send me some remarks. I am going to read those, and I believe some of the cabinet is prepared to answer questions on various topics if there are any.

These are the President's remarks of the Academic Senate meeting on September 11, and they are being read by Chairperson Horst.

"I regret my inability to be present at today's Academic Senate Meeting. I assure that my absence is for a good cause in the service of Illinois State University. Our federal lobbyist has arranged an in-person meeting for the Illinois Congressional Delegation and need to advocate for funding for our STEM building. Yesterday I met in person with Eric Sorensen, Darin LaHood, Dick Durbin, and Tammy Duckworth's staff. The senator herself was in Philadelphia for the presidential debate. Chief of Staff Katy Killian and Director of Public Affairs and Policy Brad Franke accompanied me on this visit. We have been very well received and I am encouraged by our discussions.

Last week I communicated to the campus regarding our future financial outlook and Illinois State's path to resilience, innovation, sustainability, and excellence, or RISE. Subsequently, I consulted with the leadership of each division in Intercollegiate Athletics. Additional meetings have been scheduled with shared governance partners, community partners, and other stakeholders to share more information and outline proactive action steps the university will implement as soon as possible. The crux of our problem is that our expenses have been rising at twice the rate of our revenues annually for several years. As early as next year, our expenses will exceed our revenues if we do nothing, which is not a responsible option. Therefore, we must take proactive steps to cut costs to avoid ending up in the crisis we see at other universities around us.

It is essential to mention that the current situation regarding higher education funding is national and international. Only a few of the most elite institutions nationally will be able to avoid budget

deficits. I invite members of the Academic Senate to learn as much as possible about the crisis facing the higher education sector and its causes and scope. I look forward to engaging with the Academic Senate leadership and other shared governance partners. Vice President for Finance and Planning Dan Petree is prepared to answer questions and present to the full Academic Senate once a suitable date has been set. Chairperson Horst has also been involved in the President's Forum presentation and may share her perspectives.

Finally, I am aware that some constituents continue to ask for a statement from me regarding the reported hate crime on campus a few weeks ago. As I said in my interview with WGLT last week, I abhor hate and intolerance in all forms. Under my leadership, reports of such occurrences in our campus community will elicit a swift response. While privacy and legal requirements most often mean that our work must take place outside of the public eye, please know that the University has well-developed processes for investigating and making informed decisions including about providing support for those impacted, due process and appropriate consequences for those found to have violated policies, referral to the legal system when applicable, developing education for our community, and identifying areas for potential improvement. I receive regular updates from the investigating team and ask that we allow law enforcement to do its work, confident that they are diligently following appropriate operating procedures, and working hard to support campus safety. Those with information regarding this incident are encouraged to speak directly to the investigating team as soon as possible to share what they know. Please see the Redbird Folder mentioned at the last Senate meeting and available on the Dean of Students website for a great compilation of information on helping students navigate resources at ISU. Additionally, Interim CEIO Byron Craig, the Dean of Students Office, and the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access are all available to serve as resources for those who may have questions or concerns. I wish you all a productive week and go, you Redbirds!"

That is the statement from President Tarhule. Are there any questions that the senior leadership could address?

Senator Lucey: The statement was made that the crux of the financial problem is that university expenses have been rising at two times of income over the past several years. My question is, we have had presentations about the Color of Money ever since I have been with Senate. Why hasn't this issue been talked about before?

Every fall we have had a presentation about that. Nothing has been said about the rate of increase and how it is becoming dangerous. Why haven't those statements been made and why are we being told about it now?

Senator Petree: It's great question and I don't have a good answer for you because I just got here in January.

Senator Kapoor: I don't know if this can be answered in his absence, but I am confused about the status of the statement regarding the hate crime and would like a little bit more of a clarification and an explanation. Given that certain things can't be said until an investigation is done is one thing, but I think I would like a little bit of clarification. If there is a large percent of the population of this university that feels they are not supported, that feels threatened, that feels

scared, which has at least in my office been made clear to me and in conversation with other faculty members- if that is a concern, why then can not a statement and a more official position that makes those concerns allayed be made? Even without the investigation, I feel like these are two things that can be dealt with separately. If people still feel this way, why can't that be addressed?

Senator Craig: Thank you for the question. One of the things that we are working on, and I understand your comments about getting a statement out and this is something that I have been in conversations with President Tarhule about, but one of the things that I would like for us to do more so than just creating statements is action behind that. In my office one of the things we are working on is figuring out what kind of programming, what kind of education can we do to, not necessarily prevent things from happening here, but to educate students, staff, and faculty on issues of hate and violence. I think often times we are very reactive to things. I am trying to set a tone of being more proactive. I am working with President Tarhule on that now. I understand your question is just about getting a statement out. I think understanding his point of view, his perspective, of wanting to be careful what is put out when there is an investigation still happening and working with him on that... that is where he is coming from with this. From my office, what I am trying to do is create programming to address this. I'll just put a shameless plug in, next week and in October I have two ISU in Conversation series coming up. One for students and one for faculty and staff to come and just talk about their feelings, talk about how these things made them feel. That way I can take all this back to the President and maybe we can start thinking about how we can make better statements when these issues happen.

Senator Kapoor: That's wonderful to hear about it, I'm excited about the idea of action over just reaction, but at the same time, when things happen that reaction does matter and that statement matters within a certain amount of time to respond to things. I think particularly hate crimes... I sympathize and empathize with my colleagues and students that are deeply upset that there isn't something more immediate and official and concrete that the administration has done. I think the proactivity and policy initiatives that you mentioned are great and I will take those back to the people I have been speaking with. I wanted to express some of those frustrations here.

Senator Craig: I will take those back to him as well.

Senator Sharp: I know there was a portion that talked about getting resources to student who might be feeling affected because of this. Has there been any effort to reach out to the several queer communities on campus like our Rainbow Floor, Pride, any of the other ones there? I'm just curious.

Senator Craig: I am reaching out to different organizations also. I am working a lot with Queer Coalition and letting that trickle down to other organizations as well. Queer Coalition is for faculty, staff, and graduate students. In working with them we are also working on programming. For instance, the first Conversation, hopefully the word is getting out for this. It is in the media. It is going to be designed to talk about issues for LGBTQ+ students and then for faculty and staff as well. Those are next Tuesday and Wednesday. I was also on the LGBTQ sub-committee under DIAC, the President's Diversity Inclusion Advisory Council, and we are still making

recommendations to the President about how we can create a more belonging and inclusive community for everyone.

Senator Pellegrini: This is more of a clarification, but will we be notified on when the investigation is complete and how we can respond?

Senator Johnson: Once the case wraps up, that is something that we can probably speak to. That is probably whether or not individuals are identified. We would probably first take steps to work with the individual who is the victim and make sure that they are comfortable with where we are at and where we stand, then give some kind of notification. There are several different ways that our police department can do that as far as posting.

- ***Provost Ani Yazedjian***

Provost Yazedjian: I have no remarks this evening, thank you.

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

Senator Johnson: I am glad to be back, so thanks for all the well-wishes and things like that when I was gone on medical leave. My only announcement is this weekend is Family Weekend, so if you want more details and information on all the wonderful programs and activities including the football game, go to the Dean of Students Family Weekend website where you can get that information.

- ***Interim Vice President for Finance and Planning Dan Petree***

Senator Petree: The last time I answered a question it was on behalf of the President. I am here to put some of the things that were communicated by him in his email to the campus last week into perspective. When I first arrived here in January and met all of you for the first time, and you were all very welcoming, I felt great about being here. I told you that the state of the financial situation at the university was we were solvent and liquid. We received an audit that confirmed that, I was able to confirm that information again with the cabinet, and again with the board. That is still the case. We are still solvent and still liquid. Our problem is that if we don't take action now, that will be a much more difficult statement for my successor to be able to say to you. I urge you to pay close attention to the communications that are going to be coming out. There will be one that goes to budget managers by Friday of this week that will provide some specific information, and I know the President will cover this at some length in his State of the University address next week.

- ***-Update on Hiring and Employment of SURS Annuitants – Associate Vice President Bonneville***

Associate Vice President Bonneville: Good evening. Senator Horst asked me to address with all of you a memo that was sent out from our office in the middle of August regarding the rehiring of SURS annuitants. Currently the university has a policy in place that allows us to rehire SURS annuitants using what we call the "60-day rule," which is a rule which is applied by the retirement system that says a retiree must have a 60-day break in service before returning in any role at the university, be it paid or unpaid. This is consistent, however the university is running into an issue with respect to the terms of the Affordable Care Act, and our responsibility as an employer to provide health insurance for an employee. It seems counter-intuitive because retirees

get health insurance from the retirement system, but that does not count. We are the employer, so when someone returns within 60 days and we are looking at their health insurance, we have to look at the time they spent as a full-time employee. It attaches and we are responsible for writing that person an offer of coverage. If we don't do that, we are subject to fines by the IRS or if we don't do that for at least 95% of our employees we are subject to fines by the IRS. Consistent with Vice President Petree's message just now, those fines over that last two years have averaged between 7 and 10 million dollars. We have not paid those fines because we have always been able to provide alternative health insurance. The ability for us to provide alternative health insurance is going away. We don't have a large enough footprint to get a vendor to say they will provide us with that health insurance, so the only way to resolve the issue is to break service for employees so that we don't have to go back and measure. A break in service is 26 weeks, so effective December 31st of this year, for anyone who retires on or after that date, they must be separated from the university for at least 26 weeks before they may return as a re-hired retiree.

Senator McHale: Are you saying that we must terminate their coverage for 26 weeks?

Associate Vice President Bonneville: No, sir. Your coverage would be under the retirement system. I am saying that in the past it had been the 60-day rule, now it is the 26-week rule. That is not a SURS rule, it will be a rule for us. People have to have a break in service, and as a friendly reminder you can't talk about coming back to work before you actually retire. That is a SURS violation. SURS considers that that you've never actually retired. I am happy to share the memo, Senator Horst, if you don't have it on the Academic Website. I will send it to you, and you can share it. If you look at it and you have any questions, please let me know. We will change the policy in December. It is not a Senate policy, but we will gladly bring an advisory notice to you so you know that it has been completed.

Advisory Item:

From Director of Emergency Management Eric Hodges and

Deputy General Counsel Alice Maginnis:

5.5 Emergency Response - New policy

Replacing policies 5.1.10 & 5.1.15

Chairperson Horst: We will not have the advisory item because our guests were not able to make it so we will skip that, and we will go to the Information and Action item.

Information/Action Item:

From Chairperson Horst - Executive Committee

Revise A.S. Bylaws Article VI

Chairperson Horst: This is coming from the Executive Committee. I was working with a person who is on an external committee of the Senate and I noted in our bylaws in Article VI, we did not have language that addressed how present voting members included those who were joining via video or audio conference. This is language that we have in Article III for the Senate Elections, we have it in Article V for Senators to obtain action. We have language about defining present voting members as including those joining via video or audio conference and we also have it in Article VII regarding how to change our bylaws. It is an oversight that affects people

who are now in the external committees, and we do have some members of external committees who have to join via video or audio conference. This language, “C. Present voting members shall include those members physically present and those permitted to join the meeting via video or audio conference resulting from an official accommodation received from the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access or from the Student Access and Accommodation Services for Student Members as outlined in the Reasonable Accommodation Procedure for Employees or Applicants Policy” would mirror other parts of our bylaws and give members of our community who are on external committees and joining via video or audio conference voting rights.

Motion to move from information to action by Senator Blum.

Second by Senator Nikolaou.

Unanimous approval.

Senator Blair: I move to pass the revision proposed by the Executive Committee

Unanimous approval.

Action Items:

From Angela Bonnell - Planning and Finance Committee

06.04.2024.19 - 5.1.1 Concealed Carry and Prohibited Weapons Policy

[Link to current policy](#)

[Link to proposed policy](#)

Senator Bonnell: Planning and Finance met today, and we discussed 5.1.1 Concealed Carry and Prohibited Weapons, but we did not make any changes so as a result, on behalf of the Planning and Finance Committee I would move to approve this policy.

Senator Helms: There is an outstanding question that I asked at the last Senate meeting regarding the verbiage associated with which parking lots were allowed to have concealed carry, were “unrestricted” I think is the terminology. Last meeting our attorney moved it to a tailgating question, that really wasn’t the focus of my question, it was more in general because the rule change is about all parking lots. When I last checked my email there had not been a formal response regarding whether or not there were truly unrestricted lots, lots where somebody who lawfully could concealed carry and met the other criteria could actually park on our campus. From my perspective, without an answer to that I don’t know how we could move forward.

Chairperson Horst: Thank you very much, I will read the correspondence. The Director of Parking has been corresponding with Alice Maginnis, our Deputy Officer of General Counsel. He is suggesting the majority of campus parking lots are unrestricted with respect to storage of firearms and the only lots that are restricted year-round and do not allow firearm storage in vehicles are lots adjacent to the lab schools. He is suggesting that they can define those unrestricted lots on their website. That wouldn’t necessarily change the language it would just change how it is presented to the community.

Senator Helms: If the Director of Parking is correct that, with the exception of those adjacent to the lab school and the tailgating lots which are specified during tailgating, the rest of the lots are

indeed unrestricted that has answered my question. However, being on Planning and Finance last year, that is not the way the information was presented by our Chief or by Alice.

Chairperson Horst: Could you point us to the language that is of concern to you, Senator Helms?

Senator Helms: Simply that the policy states that if you can conceal carry under these conditions, the number 1 is the parking space is not designated that you can't. I don't, based on my participation in Planning and Finance last semester, that was not how it was presented when Alice and the Chief talked to us. The bottom-line Chief presented was that there were no parking lots with concealed carry. I object to trying to pass a policy that we know can't be fulfilled with the exception of certain special interest groups like the Corvette group. We grant them opportunities to be able, but they are paying a lot of money. A student a who wants to go deer hunting immediately after doesn't really have, based on the presentation in Planning and Finance, doesn't have an opportunity to lawfully carry the rifle they may use to go deer hunting and park on campus. We were basically directed to, since those laws don't apply, since we are setting these just for our campus, they can park on the city street.

Chairperson Horst: Senator Helms, I would point out that the unrestricted parking areas is standing language in the policy.

Senator Helms: I understand that.

Senator Cline: It is my understanding also that we are in debate, not question and answer, but I would add my word on this as a member of Planning and Finance last semester. My memory of their response from the Chief of Police was that over-notification on websites, the concern was that there would be increased break-ins and attempts to steal those weapons. The lack of notification in a public way about specific parking lots versus other parking lots was not due to necessary restrictions being in place, but a concern based on the Chief of Police's experience that that would increase risk in those parking lots. I do not have the same memory of that conversation that you do.

Chairperson Horst: I am going to again point out that we are considering the amendments to the policy that are approved by Planning and Finance.

The motion carries with majority approval.

From Nathan Kapoor – Faculty Affairs Committee

06.04.2024.13 - 3.3.4 Non-Tenure Track Faculty Classifications and Performance Evaluation

Link to current policy

Link to proposed policy

Request to add Librarianship from NTT MIL Faculty

Senator Kapoor: The Faculty Affairs Committee met to discuss the proposed language changes to 3.3.4, most of which were agreed to last spring. These include language changes to include under “Instructional Professors” “Librarians” so that change was agreed to by the committee. Furthermore we agreed to alter the language describing emeritus faculty to match the use of “emeritus” in other places in our academic policy that included the full spread of emeritus, you

can see it on the revisions. We also removed the category of “visiting scholar” from one section because it did not match with other HR language elsewhere. We agreed to those changes.

Chairperson Horst: You made the additions in the document, is that correct?

Senator Kapoor: Correct.

Senator Kapoor: Under “Instructional Assistant Professor” the existing language said, “faculty with a minimum of a Masters Degree whose primary responsibility is classroom instructional duties” and it had ended there and we amended it to add “or librarianship”. The second major change was in the “Emeriti Faculty” section. The existing policy had said, “Tenured faculty who retire with rank and return to the university to provide services related to teaching or search or public service. Emeriti faculty shall be accorded the privilege of retaining their professional title after retirement with the added designation of the word” we took away “Emeritus/Emerita” and instead included to match other policy “Emeritus/Emerita/Emeritum/Emerit.” In the section of “Adjunct Faculty” the initial policy said “non-paid faculty members appointed by the university policy to provide support services relating to teaching or search or public service or visiting scholars” we took away the “visiting scholars” section and the “e.g.”

Motion by Senator Kapoor.

Senator Bonnell: I wanted to let you know that I am supporting this because all of the NTTs in Milner support this. In addition to that, we pulled all of the tenure-line faculty in Milner and, of those who completed this survey, they unanimously also support this.

Senator Nikolaou: Can we put “Department Chair/School Director”

Senator Kapoor: We did, and I forgot to mention it. We changed in “Performance evaluation” the initial language said “chairperson or director” we have changed that to say “department chairperson or school director.”

Senator McHale: Are we at all concerned that shared governance is reduced when only the department chair or director makes this decision rather than it being more members of the school or department that help the evaluation process?

Chairperson Horst: Thank you for that comment.

Senator Stiers: I would like to add to follow up on the previous comment. Within the NTT contract there is much more language about performance evaluation process that does include a little bit more about shared governance, so even though that is not in the document here that is covered under the contract language.

Chairperson Horst: Thank you for that clarification.

Unanimous approval.

Internal Committee Reports:

- ***Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Nikolaou***

Senator Nikolaou: The Academic Affairs Committee met this evening. We selected our Academic Planning Committee representative. Senator Sharp is going to be the member representative for the APC.

Chairperson Horst: The Academic Planning Committee?

Senator Nikolaou: Yes, the Academic Planning Committee. The bylaws say, “a member of the AAC” they don’t say “faculty member.”

Chairperson Horst: Is Cooper Cutting here?

Assistant Vice President for Academic Planning Cooper Cutting: I would have to check the bylaws.

Senator Nikolaou: The bylaws say, “a member of the AAC” it doesn’t say, “faculty member”.

Chairperson Horst: Senator Sharp, you are available 1 to 3 on Fridays?

Senator Sharp: Yes.

Chairperson Horst: Thank you.

Senator Nikolaou: We also discussed the reports from the external committees. The APC, CTE, CGE, UCC, UHP, and the University Library Committee and they are going to be coming to Exec. Also, if you have any comments for the Gen Ed, feel free to send me the comments and the questions, whatever you have.

- ***Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Senator Cline***

Senator Cline: The Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee met this evening, and you will be relieved to know we elected a secretary. Chloe Yost, thank you for your volunteer spirit. We spoke this evening about the three-year Athletics Budget. We have enough questions that we will be inviting someone from Athletics to our next meeting and we began discussion of 3.2.13 and the revisions left to us by the prior year’s committee.

- ***Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Kapoor***

Senator Kapoor: The Faculty Affairs Committee met to discuss the changes that we just approved for 3.3.4 with NTT classifications. We also then discussed the upcoming academic

year and prioritized the policies that we would be discussing, including in particular the policies that Craig McLaughlan will be presenting to us further on in the academic year about some things coming up in particular regarding grants, grant review, and financial interest disclosures. Those items will be discussed further.

- ***Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Bonnell***

Senator Bonnell: Planning and Finance Committee met this evening, we reviewed tonight's action item, policy 5.1.1. We discussed the committee's September 25th joint meeting with the Academic Affairs and budget Committee which will be followed by a meeting with Chief Information Security Officer Dan Taube to discuss policy 9.2 Appropriate Use and we discussed potential topics for the committee's 2024-25 priorities report.

- ***Rules Committee: Senator Valentin***

Senator Valentin: The Rules Committee review the committee's functions, reviewed the committee's issues pending, and discussed the committee's priorities, duties, goals, and schedule for the coming year and the committee began review of the College of Engineering Bylaws.

- ***University Policy Committee: Senator Gizzi***

Senator Gizzi: University Policy Committee met tonight. We began reviewing the priorities list for the year and started our discussion of the Code of Ethics policy which will be our primary discussion at the next meeting. We are also seeking input from the shared governance entities like A/P, and there is some arcane language in one of the appendices which we are considering potentially deleting. We voted to send to the Exec a proposal to delete the obsolete Television Programming Policy from 1975. It had a dean listed that doesn't exist or a Vice President that doesn't exist.

Chairperson Horst: That one was long time coming.

Communications:

[Ombudsperson Council Letter to President Tarhule](#)

[Ombudsperson Letter 2024 Update](#)

[3.2.12 Ombudsperson Policy](#)

Chairperson Horst: I have an official communication. Last year this body proposed to delete policy 3.2.12. When we did that, we also agreed to send the letter that you see to Interim President Tarhule because the deletion of the policy was predicated upon him hiring somebody. That has not happened yet; he is still in the process of conducting searches. I was concerned because this was last year's Senate's letter. I am proposing a new communication from the Senate. If someone would make a motion to endorse this communication, then we can consider it.

Motion by Senator Lucey.

Second by Senator McHale.
Unanimous approval.

Chairperson Horst: Thank you and I will send that on behalf of the Senate.

Senator Bonnell: Yesterday tickets went on sale for the Evergreen Cemetery Walk for October 5th, 6th, 12th, and 13th. The reason I care a lot about this is this is the 30th anniversary for the Cemetery Walk put out by the McLean County Museum of History. Because it is a milestone year, last year they asked for people to vote on the person they wanted to see represented again, so a reprisal of one of the people who is buried in the cemetery, they are going to update that person. Very exciting- Illinois State University's very own Angeline Vernon Milner, she was the fan favorite. She will appear again in the Evergreen Cemetery walk and I have on the table over there some brochures if you want to learn more about that. The last thing I will say is they just announced that this will be the last cemetery walk so the tickets are going fast. The last thing I will say is if anyone ever wants to learn anything more about the cemetery walk or Angeline Vernon Milner you will make my day if you come and ask me.

Adjournment

Motion by Senator McHale.
Second by Senator Hofstetter.
Unanimous approval.