**Academic Senate Meeting Agenda**

**Wednesday, April 09, 2025**

**7:00 P.M.**

**OLD MAIN ROOM, BONE STUDENT CENTER**

***Call to Order***

Chairperson Horst called the meeting to order.

***Roll Call***

Secretary 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.***

None.

***Approval of the Academic Senate minutes of*** [***3-05-25***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/Senate/Senate%20Packets%2024-25/2025.04.09/Linked%20Items/mch-Minutes%20-%20Academic%20Senate%202025.03.05.docx?d=w029e211e8dfb46c3bf32e23ebd709178&csf=1&web=1&e=ExmwHv)

Motion by Senator McHale.

Second by Senator Lawson.

Unanimous approval.

***Chairperson's Remarks***

Chairperson Horst: Good evening, everybody. This is our second to last meeting of the 24-25 Academic Senate. As such, we have another heavy agenda so I will try to be brief. I want to remind you that there will be no internal committee meetings on April 23rd. The work of the Internal Committees is now complete. Faculty, I want to remind you that on April 23rd we have a special caucus meeting for the 2025-2026 faculty senators so that they may choose nominees for the position of chair, secretary, and the executive committee. The Faculty Caucus Executive Committee has drafted a set of guidelines for this election, which we will distribute to you with the April 23rd Senate packet. If you would like to discuss these guidelines with me one on one before that, I would be happy to do that. The meeting on April 23rd will begin at 6:20 in the Founders Suite. To add to the confusion, faculty, remember that the 24-25 faculty caucus will most likely also meet after the full Senate so that we can do some elections.

On March 28 I went to Chicago for a meeting with the faculty senate chairs from the other Illinois public universities. I wanted to give you some news so you can reflect on what is going on with our sister institutions. NIEU is enacting differential tuition for several programs and will increase its graduate tuition and student fees. Even with these changes they will still be down 4 million dollars next year. University of Illinois Springfield will sunset one third of their major and minor programs if they do not increase productivity and enrollment. They are not dismissing faculty at this time. At the University of Illinois Chicago, two colleges are in the red. Because they have an RCM budget model, this may lead to some program cuts. Western Illinois University will lose tenure line faculty in May and has lost all non-tenure track faculty as result of their budget crisis this year. They are making structural changes to the academic programs and colleges based on the faculty who are left. The chair at Western said it is very important to know what your budget is, something he wished he had considered a few years ago. Chicago State University continues to report low enrollment and the faculty senate chair there was advocating for cutting low-enrollment programs. Programs such as the Pharmacy School, which used to enroll 100 students a year, are now enrolling 8 students a year. Please keep the overall health of higher education in Illinois in mind as you hear about local and statewide discussions about the health of higher education funding.

To that end, there are two important town halls coming up regarding new budgeting processes here at ISU. April 22 at 3 PM and April 23at 11 AM. The RISE Taskforce, administration, and Grant Thornton will be providing an update on where we are in the budget redesign process. I encourage you all to attend. This would also be a good time to plug another upcoming event that I am participating in next week: the Coalition for Transforming Higher Education Funding is sponsoring an event on April 14 from 12 to 2 on the Equitable University Funding at Illinois legislation. This is Senate Bill 13 and House Bill 1581. They are currently being considered in Springfield. This bill would be transformative for faculty and students alike in Illinois. If passed and funded, state higher education universities would receive up to 1.4 billion in additional appropriations over the next 10 to 15 years. I encourage both students and faculty to attend.

I want to congratulate the members of the UFISU faculty union and the members of the administration negotiating team for negotiating the tentative contract. I know that many faculty, students, and administrators are breathing a sigh of relief now that this labor dispute has passed. In the remaining month I have as senate chair, I look forward to discussing with various groups what this means for the Academic Senate, the Illinois State University Constitution, and shared governance work here at Illinois State University moving forward.

Senator McHale: Can I get the location of the discussion of the Equity bill?

Chairperson Horst: Yes, I will look it up for you after the meeting. It is also in the news report. It is somewhere here in this building.

Senator Pellegrini: For the town halls, would the topics discussed be any different than the town halls earlier in this semester?

Chairperson Horst: I have not seen information on that, but I do believe they will be different. We have been progressing with the budget model and I anticipate that they will brief the public on the budget model concept. The two are the same, but it will be different from what we did a month ago.

Senator Helms: We approved this evening, April 9, the minutes from March 5. Why are we behind? Shouldn’t we be approving the March 26, two weeks ago, minutes rather than our month ago minutes?

Chairperson Horst: Kevin Picket has been typing non-stop, I can attest to that because I am in the office right next to him. There have been long discussions, and we also have an involved Faculty Caucus discussion. This is where we are with the minutes.

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

Senator Blair: Good evening. The Student Caucus has received necessary feedback from stakeholders to continue its review of Policy 2.1.5 Student Leave of Absence. Additionally, our proposed edits to policy 2.1.28 the Medical Amnesty and Good Samaritan policy are being processed right now. While it might not be possible to get these items on the floor of the Senate during this Senate term, I hope that we will be able to complete our review of these policies before the end of this year so that they can move directly to the Senate as soon as possible. The administration and faculty union, their representatives have reached a tentative agreement in their bargaining negotiations, averting a strike. This is great news that should be celebrated. Moving forward, I hope that such tense bargaining and negotiations can be avoided through continued mutual good faith from all stakeholders. I am glad that the campus can begin to move forward and that students can focus on finishing the year strong without worry of disruption. Thank you.

***Administrators' Remarks***

* ***President Aondover Tarhule***

Senator Tarhule: Thank you and good evening. I have a few remarks. I continue to work on our legislative priorities. This morning, I had breakfast in Springfield with a number of representatives, senators, and leaders in the House advocating for our priorities. Those core priorities are trying to get funding for a new STEM building, trying to get some relief towards the Special Ed waivers, trying to get money for deferred maintenance on campus, and then also stating our position with respect to a number of deals that are working through the House. I think that was a very productive conversation. There is going to be a Senate appropriation hearing April 15th and a House appropriation hearing will be on April 24th. We present our budget request and also other priority requests and also give the House a sense of where the university stands. I am looking forward to again participating in those hearings.

One of the bills that is going on right now is the bill to allow community colleges to grant 4-year degree programs. Our university is currently opposed to this bill because of the impact it will have on ISU. The Governor’s Office is pushing this very aggressively, so the public universities and some private universities will continue to have conversations with the Governor’s Office trying to see if we can recommend some guardrails around how this could be done without hurting the four-year universities. In fact, we had a two-hour meeting today as well. Another bill that we are watching very closely is one that Chairperson Horst mentioned, which is the Equitable Funding Formula. That bill has been under negotiation for a while. Advance Illinois, which is one the entities that has been supporting this bill, is going to hold a hearing on campus, as Chairperson Horst said, on April 14th. I want to reinforce what she said and call on you to participate if you can. Attend that hearing and speak up so that we can get that bill through.

Some of you may have also been hearing about international students who have their visas revoked. This is something we have been watching and tracking very carefully. Unfortunately, I have to report that we also have had a few international students here at ISU whose visas have been revoked. We continue to work with the Office of General Counsel to see how we have been thinking about this even before it happened, because we knew it was happening at other institutions, to see how we can support these students and provide them appropriate resources and options. I, too, am pleased that a tentative agreement has been reached with the faculty union. We will not be making any additional comments until the ratification process is completed.

Senator Helms: President Tarhule, I agree that the ability to come together with administration and faculty is a fantastic thing, averting a strike that would have impacted our students, I think is great. I represent A/P and we are a non-represented group. We did not receive a raise this year, as you are very well aware, as neither did any CS people, who are not represented. In this negotiation to increase faculty salary, are you and your group considering how you are going to keep Civil Service staff who aren’t under any bargaining agreement and A/P staff also continuing to receive raises?

Senator Tarhule: That is a consideration we always take, every year. I am painfully aware that if we don’t give competitive salaries, we are going to fall behind if we can’t retain our staff. Yes, we are always thinking about that and if we can give a raise. We don’t make a profit; the university is not a profit-making entity. There is no reason for the university to hold back money or keep any money other than to spend it for what we know is good. To the extent that we have the budget to support a faculty raise, that is always the first thing we look at. The short answer to your question is yes. It is something we continue to look at very diligently. I am very aware that for those groups that are not unionized, that can create disadvantages for them. That is not something I want to see. If there is anything we can do to provide those raises and the budget allows it, I will definitely be doing so.

Senator McHale: I wanted to say thank you very much for your work with the legislature. It is so important. That bill in particular, what is the number of that bill? As we contact our representatives, we can easily reference it.

Chairperson Horst: The Equitable University Funding bill? That is Senate Bill 13 or House Bill 1581. We also have some information on the event. Monday, April 14th 12-2 in the Brown Ballroom. There is an RSVP for the buffet lunch.

* ***Provost Ani Yazedjian***

Senator Yazedjian: I would like to take a couple of minutes this evening to acknowledge all the work that has gone into getting us to this vote tonight for General Education revisions. This work started several years before I became provost and involved hours and hours of investment by faculty, staff, and students over the last 6 years. I think it should stand as an example of shared governance at its best. As scholars, we are used to starting with the literature to learn about a subject, and that is what this team did. Then we collect data and analyze it, and this is also what the Gen Ed Taskforce did. The taskforce then offered surveys, open forums, town halls for people to learn and provide input. They analyzed the data that came in and made adjustments based on their findings. The recommendations they developed were based on best practices, the data they found, and their understanding of our unique institutional context. All this happened before the proposal even came to Academic Senate. Once at Academic Senate, there was a similar vetting process through committees and on the floor including presentations, additional opportunities for feedback, and opportunities for discussion and deliberation at the last couple of meetings. People had a chance to voice their concerns and share their support. I firmly believe that these initiatives are made better when there are multiple voices at the table sharing a range of thoughts.

I appreciate everyone who took time to share their thoughts throughout this process. As an institution that serves the public good, I see it as our responsibility to critically and systematically examine our curriculum on a regular basis. I believe this needs to happen in both departments and schools and in our general education program. This is not something we have done for Gen Ed in decades. If we are to remain relevant in such a rapidly changing world, it is our obligation to ensure that we are preparing students to be knowledgeable, thoughtful, and responsible citizens. What we teach them both in Gen Ed and in their majors should work toward achieving those outcomes. I know there are a range of opinions in this room this evening about how well we have accomplished this goal. I hope we can all be proud of the fact that we went through this process, and we did it in a way that invited all voices to the table. All senators have had this information for a while, and I trust you have done your due diligence to review it thoughtfully and come to your own conclusion, and I want to thank you for your time and participation in this process.

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

Senator Johnson: Good evening. Just a reminder that we are going into finals and a stressful time period for our students. Last week you all should have received an email from the Division of Student Affairs outlining some of the resources that we have for counseling services and providing support for students. One of those resources is our Timely Care. That is ISU’s 24/7 365 days a year virtual health platform. That is a resource for our students. To date, we have close to 600+ students who are registered on Timely Care. We encourage our students to leverage that platform. It is not just available during the fall and spring semester. You can leverage that during the summer months as well. If finals stress you out when you go into the summer, leverage it then as well. Faculty, we remind you that we launched the Red Folder platform back in the fall. You all can leverage those resources for directing students to the various services that we have. We wish you all the best of luck going into finals, and I will open things up to any questions.

Senator Sharp: For students who are graduating, when does their access to services like Timely Care come to an end?

Senator Johnson: More than likely into the summer, but it would probably end when the fall begins.

Senator Helms: What was the number of students who are currently engaged in Timely Care?

Senator Johnson: 673 registrants. Of those, about 384 have actually visited the site, and 163 unique users, so we have individuals who are using it multiple times. That 673 registrants represents just over 3% of the student population. Our goal is to get to about 13%, but for only being active about 6 months, we are on par with other institutions that have launched and are at this point.

* ***~~Vice President for Finance and Planning Glen Nelson~~***

***Consent Agenda:***

***(Final Academic Senate approval of all Consent Agenda items will occur during a regularly scheduled Academic Senate meeting. All items presented on the Consent Agenda to the Academic Senate will be enacted by one motion. There will be no individual discussion of these items unless a senator so requests, in which event the item will be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered at the appropriate point on the agenda. All matters on the consent agenda that are not removed will be voted on by one vote. The motion to adopt the consent agenda shall be nondebatable. There will be no separate discussion on consent agenda items.)***

* ***School of Teaching and Learning –*** [***Early Childhood Education Workforce Online Pedagogy Sequence***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Executive%20Committee%20of%20the%20Academic%20Senate/2025.03.17/Linked%20Items/Consent%20Agenda/Early%20Childhood%20Education%20Workforce%20Online%20Pedagogy%20Sequence.docx?d=w30cb61edb7f94f35bd51459c5a172789&csf=1&web=1&e=rjJ6S8) ***–*** [***FIF Here***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/%3Ab%3A/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Executive%20Committee%20of%20the%20Academic%20Senate/2025.03.17/Linked%20Items/Consent%20Agenda/FIF%20-%20Early%20Childhood%20Education%20Workforce%20Online%20Pedagogy%20Sequence.pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=YW13vF)
* ***Department of Anthropology –*** [***Graduate Certificate in Museum Studies***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/ExecFCE/Exec%20Packets%2024-25/2025.03.31/Consent%20Agenda/Graduate%20Certificate%20in%20Museum%20Studies.docx?d=wde8ac276d15c4f1b9b4e3890bd9d6810&csf=1&web=1&e=TWEonH) ***–*** [***FIF Here***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/%3Ab%3A/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/ExecFCE/Exec%20Packets%2024-25/2025.03.31/Consent%20Agenda/FIF_Graduate%20Certificate%20in%20Museum%20Studies.pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=jSLISk)
* ***School of Kinesiology and Recreation -*** [***Accelerated Athletic Training Sequence***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/Senate/Senate%20Packets%2024-25/2025.04.09/Linked%20Items/Consent%20Agenda/Accelerated%20Athletic%20Training%20Sequence.docx?d=w482bc986c2b64483ac5bbf2ae4a4ca5f&csf=1&web=1&e=5lBdOE) ***–*** [***FIF Here***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/%3Ab%3A/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/Senate/Senate%20Packets%2024-25/2025.04.09/Linked%20Items/Consent%20Agenda/FIF%20-%20Accelerated%20Athletic%20Training%20Sequence.pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=I2Yh1f)

Motion by Senator Pellegrini.

Second by Senator Beasley.

Unanimous approval

***Advisory Items:***

***From Lea Cline: Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee***

[***AIF Report***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/Senate/Senate%20Packets%2024-25/2025.04.09/Linked%20Items/AIF%20Report%202025/AABC%20AIF%20Report%202025%20-%204.1.25.docx?d=w1bc6eae18ee947dc98242295cd410d56&csf=1&web=1&e=H6TTG8)

[***AIF Data***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/%3Ab%3A/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/Senate/Senate%20Packets%2024-25/2025.04.09/Linked%20Items/AIF%20Report%202025/AABC_FY24%20Report_FY25%20Year%20To%20Date.pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=s48M4I)

[***AIF Dashboard***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/%3Ab%3A/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/Senate/Senate%20Packets%2024-25/2025.04.09/Linked%20Items/AIF%20Report%202025/AABC%20AIF%20Dashboard.pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=rk6GEH)

Senator Cline: The Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee is charged annually with a review of the Academic Impact Fund, the AIF. Upon review and consultation with the appropriate member of the Provost’s staff, we draft a report on our recommendations and review of that fund. You will see on your agenda three items: The AIF report, which we authored as a committee, the AIF data, and the AIF dashboard that we used as part of our review. We have Dr. Elkins here as well, who is the author of the initial data report, if anybody has any questions.

Chairperson Horst: Are there any reflections on how the AIF will evolve, given the current budget model shift?

Senator Yazedjian: What we can say is we are not sure how the AIF is going to evolve until we have a better sense of how the rest of the institutional budgeting processes will be evolving. It is certainly a discussion that we are having. I believe that future discussions will occur with the RISE Taskforce as well as decisions are made. It is part of the discussion, but no immediate decisions have been made at this time.

Chairperson Horst: I note the recommendations at the end, and I asked Kevin Pickett to put this in the queue for next year’s committee regarding updating the AIF principles. I note there were some lines authorized for the College of Engineering, if either you or Dr. Elkins could walk us through how the College of Engineering lines relate to the AIF funds?

Senator Cline: The AIF shows some lines that were directed towards the College of Engineering, but those faculty lines do not draw from the AIF balance. New funds were transferred from the university to the AIF to pay for the College of Engineering lines. While you see them reflected in the AIF and they will be continually included in the AIF as a matter of reporting, they do not actually tax the AIF.

Chairperson Horst: On table 8 some Instructional Capacity was allocated to the university college. One of the reasons I am curious about this is, we are talking about credit hour production and how it relates to specific colleges. Is there credit hour production in the University College and will that at all relate to what we are talking about with the RISE taskforce?

Dan Elkins: I can’t tell you how Instructional Capacity is going to work in the new budget model, but what I can tell you is that University College teaches developmental math. They have NTT’s who teach that, and their section counts have gone up dramatically in the years leading up to this. You can see there were some years they didn’t get anything, depending on additional sections needed for U-College and honors sections. We had a couple of years of record numbers of honor students, so there were additional honors sections. They do produce credit hours. Those credit hours are actually housed in the provost’s office.

Senator McHale: Housed in the Provost’s office? I don’t understand that term.

Dan Elkins: University College and honors are units that report directly to Amy Hurd, who is an AVP in the Provost’s office. Her budget is not one of the colleges, it is in an umbrella under the provost’s office.

Senator McHale: As we cut, let me just ask that we be sensitive to how many credit hours are generated through the use of, for instance, teaching assistants. I know I can generate 450 hours a year with the assistance of graduate students. That drops to 200 without their help. Just a thought that how much they help us generate that metric and generate that revenue. I would ask for consideration of that.

Chairperson Horst: Does the Instructional Capacity include TA-ships?

Dan Elkins: It does, in some cases. Lots of departments currently have their own graduate assistants and their own budgets. There are some additional sections of gen ed courses that are taught that have high volume, and we need to add sections and the departments don’t have the money. If it is a GA who is teaching, and if it is in the statement of guiding principles, if it is a GA that is a lead instructor, we will allocate Instructional Capacity to cover those much needed sections.

Senator McHale: Also, facilitation of labs. Is that part of the consideration?

Dan Elkins: It is probably part of the metric of the future budget model. We do not fund lab GAs with AIF funding. It is strictly for tenure-track faculty, permanent hires, all of the non-tenure track money is also AIF technically, and then the Instructional Capacity for GTA’s and NTT’s and tenure-track overloads and things of that nature.

***From Angela Bonnell: Planning and Finance Committee***

***Associate Vice President of Facilities Services Mike Gebeke***

[***PFC Priority Brief 2024\_2025***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Executive%20Committee%20of%20the%20Academic%20Senate/2025.03.31/Linked%20materials/PFC%20Priority%20Brief%202024_2025.docx?d=wb43650e7b3994b29bcd84aae5f68df27&csf=1&web=1&e=YxK9LO)

Senator Bonnell: Given the length of the agenda, I will be sharing on overview and highlights of a report that was linked in the agenda. It will take me about 4 minutes. Each year the Planning and Finance Committee determines an area of focus for the priority brief. This year we investigated the purchase of property owned by Country Financial at General Electric Road on the east side of Bloomington. The complex will be used for the new College of Engineering and for additional office and academic spaces. Over the course of the past academic year, the Planning and Finance Committee held information sessions with those having expertise on the subject. Among those consulted and those we want to acknowledge are Associate Vice President of Facilities Services Mike Gebeke, and he is here in the room today, thank you. GE Road building project manager Matthew Hanks, Dean of College of Engineering Tom Keyser, Provost Yazedjian, and past Interim Vice President of Finance and Planning Dan Petree. The committee also review relevant documentation and that is included in the “additional sources consulted.”

The priority brief is arranged into 6 areas, I am going to share some highlights from those. In the Facilities Review section, one area I would like to underscore is that in 2018, John Green had been selected to house the College of Engineering, but even back then it was not considered a permanent solution. You can read why in the brief. For the GE Road complex, the new facilities are located approximately 2 miles east of campus. The Country Financial property consists of 3 interlinked buildings offering about 400,000 square feet of useful space and over 1300 paved parking spaces. 1709 is the building that will become the College of Engineering, and it is about 200,000 square feet. When we went to on-site for that visit, project manager Matthew Hanks compared it to being larger than one of the big-box stores that you might visit, if that helps you visualize how much space it is. For me what makes more sense is if you consider another comparison: Milner Library is about 225,000 square feet, and that is spread over 6 floors. If you imagine Milner in one floor, that would be about the space we are talking about for just that one building.

In 1990, the facilities were remodeled and received asbestos-abatement treatment in 2022. Since 2015, Country Financial invested 20 million in renovations. All of these structures have been described as in “quality condition.” Under expenditures, if you take a look at table 2 for comparison, you will see John Green against GE Road and the bottom line is that if we had gone the course with John Green, it would have cost about 220 million, and that is probably conservatively given that the projected cost of an additional new building would have been about 137 million. Compared to GE Road, which is about a quarter of that at 55 million. In the Areas of Concern section, keeping centered on logistics of the off-campus facilities such as transportation and course scheduling, and more broadly on Redbird experiences like dining, public safety, housing, and the potential for feelings of isolation for those who might be located off campus.

After the committee visited the 1709 building, that vast 212,000 square feet facility, in person it really became evident that these facilities would be housing additional office and academic spaces. While the immediate needs of the new College of Engineering are vital and face tight timelines, planning and design for the future multi-use space is just as critical. Another note is that when the committee began its investigation, we were aware that given the tight timeline, not all of our questions could be answered this year. Questions needing further attention are found in Further Investigations that next year’s Planning and Finance Committee might consider.

The last two items in Recommendations: we cited the importance of sharing plans, transparency and analysis, and offering opportunities for stakeholders to provide feedback on the mixed-use spaces to take advantage of collective wisdom at the university. Speaking of collective wisdom, I want to acknowledge the incredible work of the Planning and Finance Committee’s members for their engagement, questions, careful review, constructive comments, suggestions, and edits. It was a fantastic committee. Lastly the section Requested Administrative Action addresses financial implications and future updates from the University Space Planning Committee. We appreciate the administrations engagement with the Planning and Finance Committee over the past year. The long-term implications for this off-campus purchase could not be overstated. The committee is excited about the long-range possibilities for this new Illinois State University property. We look forward to continuing conversations with the administration regarding its utilization. Thank you.

Chairperson Horst: I want to highlight Table 2, which is really astounding. John Green, with the renovations and then building the new building that will be required to scale up the College of Engineering, would have cost us at least 220 million. This GE Road complex cost us 55 million to get the same thing. That is really incredible. If people have not gone to the new facility, I really do encourage that you do. It might be closed at some point in the future. Maybe Mike Gebeke, can you tell us about the construction plans and when people might be able to visit the facility in the future?

Mike Gebeke: We will probably start demolition shortly in May for the construction. We have a Board of Trustees meeting for the final approval for the new design and everything else that is there, but we can do some early packages. The building will be very hard to get into once we start construction, so we have the month of April here if there is general interest in it and we want to try to get someone out there, we are more than happy to take some people through again like we did before.

Chairperson Horst: Would this be something that SGA might be interested in?

Senator Blair: Potentially. I would certainly be interested in seeing it.

Senator Cline: The building itself has reasonably up to date engineering and all the major stuff is actually in pretty good condition, that is there is no immediate crisis of maintenance, is that correct?

Mike Gebeke: Correct. In fact, that is saving us a huge amount of money, because the infrastructure is in such good shape in the buildings out there. What we are talking about for construction is putting up actual walls for classes so that we have soundproof walls. They have raised floors in areas that we need to make full walls that go all the way down to the floor so that we don’t have sound transmission between them, and things like that. We can look at some of the ductwork, so we have the air in the right rooms when we put up those walls. It is things like that, making sure we have electrical panels in the right place. They have plenty of power out there, but we have to put different things for each room for the labs, the classrooms, different things like that. All that has to be adjusted just to be classroom and lab space out there for Engineering. It is not a huge thing, which is why it was such a great building to get.

Senator Pellegrini: How would we go about requesting a visit?

Senator Blair: I am on it.

Chairperson Horst: You will be getting an email very soon. I do think it would be beneficial for SGA, particularly since we had lots of discussions about how students will get back and forth and what kind of facilities are there for students since they are going to be off campus. I do think it would be valuable to SGA to have a visit, if that can be arranged.

***Action Item:***

***From Dimitrios Nikolaou: Academic Affairs Committee***

***Gen Ed Revision Proposal***

[***Link to proposal***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/Senate/Senate%20Packets%2024-25/2025.04.09/Linked%20Items/08.08.2024.01%20-%20Gen%20Ed%20Revision%20Proposal/General%20Education%20Program%20Recommendation_FINAL.docx?d=w249df13b0aaf4c05a74c356f08d6d44f&csf=1&web=1&e=6n5hv6)

***Policy revisions related to Gen Ed:***

[***Policy 2.1.12 Pass/No Pass - Credit/No Credit***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/Senate/Senate%20Packets%2024-25/2025.04.09/Linked%20Items/08.08.2024.01%20-%20Gen%20Ed%20Revision%20Proposal/Revisions%20to%20Policy%202.1.12%20Pass.No%20Pass%20-%20Credit.No%20Credit_FINAL.docx?d=w96d8172b1cef41de841bd351e5f682ac&csf=1&web=1&e=TBRO0X)

[***Policy 2.1.9 Baccalaureate Degree Programs***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/Senate/Senate%20Packets%2024-25/2025.04.09/Linked%20Items/08.08.2024.01%20-%20Gen%20Ed%20Revision%20Proposal/Revisions%20to%20Policy%202.1.9%20Baccalaureate%20Degree%20Programs_FINAL.docx?d=w0afccb991dc44ba9bd096f24e7683c58&csf=1&web=1&e=HpSoZe)

[***Undergraduate Catalog***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/Senate/Senate%20Packets%2024-25/2025.04.09/Linked%20Items/08.08.2024.01%20-%20Gen%20Ed%20Revision%20Proposal/Revisions%20to%20Undergraduate%20Catalog_FINAL.docx?d=wfd568bdb127748f78a8648cf7447c109&csf=1&web=1&e=uLWDHK)

Senator Nikolaou: This is the proposal we saw back in the fall when Dr. Horvath made the presentation from the taskforce side. Then we had additional questions that came to the committee. I am not going to repeat the whole process because I did the presentation last time. We discussed about the proposal two meetings ago. One thing I want to clarify is that in the previous two meetings, we had the implementation plan listed. Now, because it is an action item, formally the Senate does not vote to approve the implementation plan because it is not under our purview. That is because several of the questions were about how the new program is going to be implemented if it passes. We received a comment about the expedited process where the Natural Science alternatives fall, so we added it on the implementation plan that they are going to be treated similar to the Natural Sciences and that is what we are also going to forward to the CGE if the proposal passes tonight. I am assuming, Senator Horst, you want me to do each one of them separately?

Chairperson Horst: Unless there is a motion to bundle them together.

Senator Blair: I support the Gen Ed proposal. I think it is a great reform in the right direction. It improves the general education experiences and outcomes for students, reducing the structural rigidity present in the current system and giving students more flexible learning options. It brings our requirements with credit hours and other metrics closer in line with the common practices at peer universities. This gives students more opportunities as well to engage with courses within their program. The proposal’s strong focus on learning objectives and course design ensures that our Gen Ed system is aimed at the proper objective: the development of skills and core knowledge in students. I think the presented learning objectives within the new categories are comprehensive and balanced. While this proposal is not perfect, I believe it withstands many of the criticisms I have heard.

The new proposal is IAI-aligned, it doesn’t reduce academic rigor or unduly ease requirements on key topics such as mathematics. The learning objectives in these categories reflect what I believe is a balanced spread. Additionally, I do not worry that any student will graduate without the necessary basic skills needed to succeed in their career or in their program as every major and program is free as it is now to require additional courses if they deem them important and if they deem those needs unmet by the Gen Ed standards and classes available. Lastly, I am most excited by the potential for more interdisciplinary courses. This new proposal is a less siloed system and creates the opportunity for departments and instructors to design innovative courses that are more applicable for students and still meet the clearly required learning objectives. This is a big and consequential decision, and it deserves a strong debate. We have long discussed this proposal both here in the Senate, in the Academic Affairs Committee, and throughout the long development process as the provost highlighted earlier in her remarks. I think this proposal presents a net good for the university, and most importantly the students. I strongly encourage each of you to vote in support of this proposal.

Senator Bever: I believe there is so much good in this policy, and I think a lot of us agree that the Gen Ed proposal is needed, I just don’t think we are in the right direction. I think there is generally so much good with this proposal like the specialties and concentrations. I am really worried, and the more I heard about it the more worried I got, there seems to be so many unanswered questions. The biggest thing I am worried about is the math portion. 26% of 11th graders in Illinois are proficient in math, only a fourth. Our decision is to reduce the rigor of our math courses? It doesn’t make much sense. Another senator here a couple weeks ago pointed out when comparing with other institutions, we are going from five STEM courses to three. We are going from the top of the list to the bottom of the list. Many others have four, why don’t we do four? I think there is so much wrong in the sense of our STEM classes and reducing the rigor of our classes. It is almost like we are not holding up to our true academic standards and we are just trying to pander. I don’t think we are heading towards the right direction with making sure our students are ready for the real world. I think we should keep up our standards we have now. This is not the right direction with this specific Gen Ed proposal.

Senator Helms: I agree with Senator Bever and would encourage everyone to think long and hard prior to the vote this evening. We heard that President Tarhule is in Springfield lobbying for our community colleges to not be able to offer four-year degrees while at the same time we seem to be turning our Gen Ed more into a community college liberal arts style Gen Ed than a 20,000 student campus general education system. Senator Blair talked about this being IAI compliant. I am sorry, it is not. We continually hear that it is, but IAI requires a lab course, and just because our current one doesn’t list it as being required, it is because of the way the Natural Science category is set up. All of the classes within those two are lab with the exception of one. By not having it, we are not IAI compliant -- we just don’t meet that. The idea of reducing math classes to a point where I am also not convinced a student could necessarily come through and have the necessary math skills. Do I think they all have to be calculus experts or algebra experts? I don’t, but we definitely have to have people who, students graduating from here, future citizens, who will be able to understand the challenges put in front of them.

The pandemic clearly demonstrated we have a lot of people in the United States right now who don’t understand science, who aren’t willing to evaluate evidence, etc. I think that our Gen Ed is moving towards supporting that lack of understanding. We also have heard multiple times through this presentation of the things that we think students are going to be able to do. “Students can take more. They can do those things.” The reality is, part of the original survey of this was, “what did students think of our existing Gen Ed?” and part of it was that it wasn’t flexible, that it had a lot of rigor. The idea that we are going to change some of this and that those students are now going to select that more rigorous pathway on their own or with the help of their University College advisor, I just don’t think that makes sense. That is an assumption that I don’t see data for.

We talk about peer institutions; we talk about the number of Gen Eds that are there. As was pointed out, we went from the top, which I don’t necessarily think we have to be, to the bottom. We shouldn’t be there either. That shouldn’t be our aspiration, to be the bottom. I love the idea of the flexibility, but I don’t think the learning objectives and the categories align well with some of the things that are important to ISU at this point. I will be voting “no” as I represent administrative professionals, and I asked my colleagues, “I represent you, if you want me to vote yes, I will vocalize my no but vote yes.” I heard from only one who wanted me to vote yes. I’m sorry, I have been here for three years, I get to vote no. I will be voting no and I encourage all of you to vote no as well on this. We need Gen Ed change; this isn’t the change we need.

Senator McHale: With all due respect, I wondered as an undergraduate why I was taking Algebra 107 and 108, I wondered how I was going to use it in my life. Now 28 years later, I wonder why I had to take Algebra 107 and 108 and how it affected my life. I support the proposal and some exclusion of those harder Math/Science areas where it just hasn’t proven to have much relevance to my professional and personal life. I will be voting yes.

Senator Cline: I am going to be voting yes; I have been working for five years with this committee, and I suppose it is hard not to take it personally when we are accused of not having put rigor into this process and not having listened to feedback and not having changed when we did that repeatedly and repeatedly and repeatedly. Members of every single part of this campus were part of that. We didn’t make decisions without Math at the table. We didn’t make decisions without Biological Sciences at the table. Everybody was there. There is always, when you deal with compromise, some limit. I would love everybody to take five Art classes, that would be great. I don’t think we need a whole lot more tech engineers in the world, we need people who have empathy and humanity. If it were up to me, we would change the way that this looks, but it is a balance. This suggestion that there is no rigor, what you are suggesting is that the faculty who teach in the Gen Ed sequence are going to somehow reduce the rigor of their courses. Rigidity in the program was the problem, not rigor in the program.

I teach a Gen Ed class. My class is not going to become less rigorous because the program changes. I don’t expect any member of the Biological Sciences department is going to reduce the rigor of their course because the structure of the Gen Ed program has changed. I think that is a conflation in an attempt to malign the program, and I don’t think it is a fair one. Nothing about the rigor of individual courses is going to change. The rigidity of the program is going to change, and that is what students did say in their feedback, was that the rigidity of the program left them very few opportunities to choose electives along the way within Gen Ed, that was the issue. I think this idea of the race to the bottom, I don’t consider the University of Illinois the bottom in terms of math and science, and that is who we are going to be matched with. Three Math and Science courses are required of the students, they can take two additional ones. It is up to us to make those classes exciting and interesting. I had my dean come last time, we had a meeting to let you know that despite the fact you are hearing a lot of negativity from math and sciences, there is a tremendous amount of excitement in the arts and humanities areas about what we can do with this program, because we are adding the ability to teach writing. I teach a seminar course. I just taught five seniors how to write a bibliography for the first time. They said to me, “In my writing class I never learned this.” This is something that is serious.

People need to know how to write. They need to know how to communicate. They need to know how to read and comprehend things. Receptivity and knowledge of science is not just the hardcore science part, it is also learning how to read and comprehend information and collate information and engage with the world around you. I am really thrilled about this expanded ability to teach our students how to read and write better, earlier. This IAI thing, IAI and our Gen Ed these two things are parallels, they are not joined. They are parallels. These accusations against the program have been refuted by all of the people in this room whose job it is to ensure that we meet state standards. I understand this is the core of our institution, but I would say as someone who has been on this committee for five years, and I wasn’t in the first committee, there was another committee that formed before even I was on it, is there has been a tremendous amount of sympathetic work, hardcore sweat-on-the-brow type work to make sure that this is the best program we can possibly make it at this point. Nobody is stupid, everybody knows there are going to be some things that might need to be adjusted in the implementation plan as we go through. We do have the core best interests of our students at heart, and I encourage you to vote for it.

Senator Helms: I want to first state clearly that I appreciate all the hard work. I do feel like members of the committee that I have talked to are taking this incredibly personally when we talk about these things. I think personal emotion from committee members is also driving some of the ideas and the inflammatory types of statements. The idea at the last Senate meeting was stated, “I didn’t take four or five science classes, yet I got my PHD” was said. The idea of the race to the bottom, I am not saying the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign is the bottom, but we are definitely moving downward. I am not talking about, when we say a reduction in rigor, I am not picking on individual people. I truly believe we have dedicated faculty who are going to have quality classes. I value your argument, Senator Cline, about the writing. I wholeheartedly agree with you, we need students who are able to read and write appropriately across disciplines. I just don’t believe that this is the way to do it.

The idea of IAI being refuted, I recognize there are experts in the room whose job that is, but they are not refuting that we are not IAI compliant. They are saying that we are now, based on how we are classifying. It is playing games with words. I don’t like that we are creating a policy that is going to impact our students moving forward, or worse yet, our students who come, find that a four-year institution isn’t for them, and choose to use the reverse transfer process to go back and get their AS degree to find out we didn’t require them to take a lab, so that now is required. I just am uncomfortable with the way we have painted faces or masked some things with the idea that our attack is either math or science against the humanities. That is truly not it. We have concerns whether in science or humanities or others that I have talked to about how this is going to actually look and how it will work for our students. I also am incredibly offended on a regular basis in discussions with this where I hear things like, “I’m sorry, it’s just change is hard.” You can’t dismiss a legitimate concern and discussion about these things by simply saying “change is hard.” That doesn’t change the argument. We still have to look at the evidence. I appreciate the work of the committee. I don’t want anybody on this committee to think that I don’t value what you did. I just don’t believe we have gotten to where we need to go yet.

Senator McHale: My second comment would be that the study of the physical world is just a much a science as the study of creativity, of art, and there is rigor there too. It is a different kind of rigor, but studying those humanities have rigor as well, and I appreciate those who teach those courses with rigorous standards.

Senator Blum: I want to encourage support for this. There is no “perfect” with Gen Ed. I want to remove it from the personal. I think the issue at hand is, “have we done what is going to make it better.” It is not going to make it perfect. None of it is going to make it perfect. There is going to be challenges. There are going to be students this fits. There are going to be students it may be less better for. Everyone may find their new pathway. The whole of what we have before us has done its job. It is a way and a path forward. We get caught up in the rhetoric- “top”, bottom”, there was never a huge range between the top and bottom. We are acting like there is some sort of gigantic 5-course or 3-course difference that is hugely impactful. I encourage that there is no “perfect” in any gen ed anywhere. Overall, this is beneficial to our students, and it is beneficial to building a foundation for the future university.

Senator Peterson: As a representative of a department and college where we have sciences: Social Sciences and the Humanities, what I find positive about this plan is that it goes beyond the silo of a specific science and forces students as well as faculty to look at how their discipline is integrated and impacts others. I think the way that the proposed plan works, it forces us to think about that and it forces us to take that next step that I think advances overall our educational mission. I teach a physical science water class. We have been able to work it into the current general education system, but in this proposed one we can fit in wherever we want. It is a question of, “how do we want our audience to think about this?” We are not just Social Sciences, we are not just Sciences, we are not just Humanities. We are collectively everything. This proposed program brings us closer to that end goal that I think we have. I think it ideally forces us to become better critical thinkers at all levels.

Senator Stewart: I feel conflicted about the proposal overall. There are parts of it that I like. I support the reduction of hours at the same time as taking away some of the exceptions or loopholes. That strikes me as very good. One of the things that I am not convinced by is the construction of some of the particular categories. I am not going to discuss them all, I will just focus on one. One of the categories is “Exploring the Human Condition.” This category as written seems to exclude many kinds of courses that would almost certainly be part of a general education program anywhere. It seems to exclude wide swaths of Humanities courses, both because of the assessed learning outcomes that require an intercultural or global component and from the claim in the description that there is no single right answer to questions about humanity. Many Humanities disciplines don’t conceive of what they do this way, yet they believe that they study the human condition. I am worried that several of these categories are overly idiosyncratic. Even though structurally I like the proposal, I am not sold on a lot of these categories. I lean towards voting no, but I admit that is a complicated balancing act. I do agree that no proposal is going to be perfect. I will point out that the amount of time this proposal was worked on strikes me as irrelevant. We should be looking at the proposal on its merits. I understand a lot of work was invested in this, but that is not a reason to do it if we are not convinced by the substance of the proposal.

Senator Sharp: We are hearing a lot from students and seeing a lot in the classroom that there were struggles with basic writing and grammar and that there was the want to create more of these classes, which I am very appreciative of adding and more going into depth about that. We are now hearing from Math how there are a lot of struggles from students of different backgrounds, from different high school educations that were probably funded differently having a lack of different skills. It is exciting to see potentially more offered in the information writing as well as the other writing category along with Comm. I feel the same then should be offered for one of the other categories we are seeing and hearing about major struggles from. We have been hearing teachers coming in to talk about it. I know personally, when I spoke to my constituents, that was one of the things they shared was the skill gap they were facing, not having a lot of the math skills they needed coming in.

I do see a lot of benefit in adding some, I feel that removing a lot of these STEM courses when we are still seeing the struggle for a lot of incoming students that it could be harmful. Not that adding English is doing harm, I think it is beneficial to teach that important skill. I just think lowering math is not the direction I think would be best for our students. As a student, I had a math gap coming into college and being able to learn here was a big thing for me. I think even though we have spent a lot of time on this already, it doesn’t mean we can’t keep working to make it something where both our creative professionals as well as the STEM-oriented ones can be in agreement about the level. If it offers slightly less flexibility than we hope, I feel it would be a better conclusion in the end. I am personally leaning towards no at this point in time. Great work so far with what we’ve done and the categories we have added, I just think there is a little bit more work to be done.

Senator Lucey: Along the lines of the comment about the work not being done, one of the things I hear when I am on a search committee is that you don’t make a hire just to fill the line. You make sure you have the proper candidate and position. I don’t think that this policy is ready for acceptance. My concern with humanities is the lack of attention to the humanities. While we are talking about how students don’t have the skills to write, one of the things I am concerned about is giving them the philosophical background and the background of ideas of our civilization and how we can reason about these things and communicate them effectively. Learning the communication skills occurs through the discussion and evaluation and reading process. I think there needs to be much more of an emphasis on the arts and humanities in this proposal.

Senator Reed: As a student who transferred here, I see the concern with IAI. A lot of my decision coming here was based on how my credits would transfer. I think that fear for many students who are considering coming to ISU might be something to consider. I think another concern also lies within the flexibility. Personally, I have never really done well at math. If I had this program coming in, I would do everything in my power not to take math class. I think there needs to be some sort of rigidity because that is an essential part of education that I think students need to have. That is something we need to make sure that is still within our core in our general education system.

Senator Hurd: If you are a transfer student, depending on how far along you are at your community college, you will most likely bring in IAI and complete IAI if you haven’t already. Our advisors will look at where you stand and will have you complete either IAI or ISU’s gen ed program, whatever is in your best interest. We have 38,000 courses articulated with our community colleges. Transferring in, whether it is our current gen ed or this revised one will not be a problem.

Senator Jain: I am from India and the math courses and science course I have taken there is really hard. The stuff I am doing right now I have done when I was in 10th or 9th grade. After coming here, in my first math course that I took, only one student got an A, 5 students got a B, and the remaining either got a C, or half the class dropped out of the course. The second course I took was about the exact same thing. I was the only one who actually got an A in both of them. I don’t think the gen ed reducing the science and math is a good idea because people keep telling me not to compare myself to U.S. universities because their expectation for math and science is so low and, basically, they are just not good at math. That is what people keep telling me. I have friends who cannot do basic multiplication or anything like that. I do agree with the step you guys are taking, but I don’t think reducing math and science is a good idea.

Senator Bever: Before we vote, I want to remind everyone to listen to what the students here said today. I think an overwhelming amount of the students who spoke today spoke against this. That is for a good reason, because we want to make sure our future students in our positions will be set up well when we graduate and so that we can compete with other people who graduate for good jobs. Please make sure you listen to the students who spoke today, because we all said some really good things.

Senator Blair: I would say, and this comes from our personal philosophy when approaching problems, but one of the things I really believe in is, “don’t let perfect be the enemy of good.” That is something that was said in other words a little bit earlier. Yes, there are valid criticisms with this proposal. I think taking it as a whole across the university, it is still a net good. Things like the argument we are having about IAI and specifically lab classes, what was said earlier was that right now we already don’t require that. The problem is this proposal is now not going to require that. I can certainly understand that and say if we are going to say it is a problem that is a problem that this proposal does not solve. Looking at it and saying, here is a problem we have now that is not being solved by this proposal, therefore we should not support that. I think you also have to consider the whole rest of it. If we are changing the rest of it and we think overall that is good, but there is one problem that is now not being solved that we already have anyway and it is not making it worse, I think you should focus more on what is actually changing as opposed to if it were creating a new problem. If we were already IAI compliant in that sense and now we are not, that would be totally different. I am not trying to belabor the point on that specifically, I just thought that was a good example of focusing on the whole holistic effect of the proposal and not specific parts. If you feel very strongly about those specific parts and think that outweighs the good, then I encourage you to vote with what you believe. For myself, I think the whole proposal does represent a net good in the right direction.

Senator Sharp: Something to note with this process is how long it has been. A lot of time has been put into it. We are not going to know if it is negatively affecting students until we likely have a couple students go through the process. I am more in favor of doing what we can now and elongating this process until passing it, a little bit longer, to be our most confident going into it than potentially passing something where we don’t find out until it is negatively affecting our students, potentially. It is years down the line, and maybe we have to start the process all over , or not all over because we have some of the baseline stuff we got from this time around. I think I would rather do more now to improve and update this to be something where our faculty can all be in agreement from all different backgrounds, either humanities or STEM, than wait once it has been implemented potentially affecting a lot of our students who will be entering the workforce and competing for jobs. That is the big thing with going to college, it is being proficient in what you do. I wouldn’t want to hurt our proficiencies and our skills in these super important categories. We already know students are struggling.

Chairperson Horst: Thank you, Senator Sharp. I was on the taskforce in 2019, and I remember quite vividly Amy Hurd telling me she had all these important COVID meetings to go to and I was like, “What’s COVID?” That happened in the middle of this process.

Senator Yost: From my personal experience, I would enjoy it a little more if I did have more flexibility over what I got to do. I took math at junior college, so I didn’t take it here. I got a C in that, because I will say it, I am not good at math. You put an equation in front of me, I am not going to know what you are talking about. I think if I had a little more flexibility with what I can and can’t do, I think I would enjoy my classes a little bit more. Some classes in gen ed can be very boring because you just want to fall asleep. I do agree that you should know math and science, I think if we had more flexibility, they are going to enjoy the class more and actually be interested in learning. If you just tell them, “Take this class,” they are going to try to get a C because they are just trying to pass so they never have to think about it again if it is not connected to their major. I took Physics, how is that going to help me in History? I would enjoy if I had more flexibility over what I can and can’t take.

Senator Cline: Chloe, that is just because you haven’t taken my class yet. There is no snoring there. I show naked people at least twice a week. I want to say two things. I hope I would get agreement from most of my colleagues here that there is really nothing that an entire university-worth of faculty are ever going to agree on 100% except that we are here for our students. We come from different disciplines; we favor different forms of education. Just because you aren’t the best at math doesn’t mean that you aren’t intelligent, that you aren’t smart and well-educated. Just because you are fantastic at math doesn’t mean that I would want to go to a museum with you. It took a long time. What I am proud about the committee is that we listened to our colleagues again and again and again. The program that is front of you is so different from the program we started with because we took into consideration everyone’s thoughts. I don’t know that we could ever get to a program that would still reduce the numbers of credit hours that students could take, give them the flexibility that they want, and be perfect in all areas. Compromise is compromise for a reason.

I don’t think this idea of hurting our students is something I can get onboard with. They are still going to take majors. Gen ed is about a foundation of knowledge that gets built on by additional classes. You don’t graduate with gen ed, it is a foundation that you start with that you then expand on. I would say this idea of perfect being the enemy of good, anyone who has ever written a dissertation knows that expression. We do at some point have to accept that we are going to have different ideas about what is perfect and how to achieve that. This program, as I see it, better fits what is happening in academia. The students may not know this, but many of your professors who are coming out of graduate school are no longer siloed. Senator Kapoor is not here, but he has a history degree with a History of Science. About half of his coursework is in the sciences and his field is in history. Our universities are becoming more and more inter and trans disciplinary. Our old gen ed sequence really did not recognize this thing, this interconnectedness of our disciplines. As Senator Peterson said, the one genuine growth in this proposal is that we have created a situation where our faculty are actually teaching what they are specialists in. The interconnectedness of math with science and with humanities and with the arts. This interconnected nature of academia is the way of the future, is how academic institutions in our country at least are framing themselves.

This change, especially with the experiential component, is getting us closer to what is considered high-impact practice in higher education. I am not sure it is the best thing for those of us in the humanities and arts to say that we got Cs in accounting and that we don’t like math. I am an archeologist. I am an art historian, but I am an archeologist. I use math, I use physics all the time in my discipline. I am capable of doing that, but I think recognizing that people can learn those skills outside of the math department is an important thing that this gen ed sequence does. It acknowledges that you can learn some of these skills outside of the immediate silo of a department of math. You can learn them in archeology, it is really important. I am in favor of this in a dispassionate way, I am not emotional about it. I think this idea that just because we spent a long time on it means that we have to, we spent a long time on it because we actually listened to people and made adjustments the best we can. I am not sure what another year is going to give us. This is the compromise that we have been able to reach with all those constituents at this point.

Senator McHale called the question.

Senator Bever motioned to call for a division of the house.

Chairperson Horst: With a division of the house, we will do a roll call vote.

The Senate voted to pass the Gen Ed Proposal 23-16. The details of the vote can be found in Appendix I of these minutes.

Chairperson Horst: We will now look at policies related to this proposal. I will turn it over to Senator Nikolaou.

Senator Nikolaou: The first policy, the Pass/No Pass, on behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee we are bringing it for your approval.

The Senate passed the revisions to policy 2.1.12 unanimously.

Senator Nikolaou: The next policy we have is policy 2.1.9, Baccalaureate Degree Programs. One change based on what we discussed last time, under the second bullet point where it was talking about “no more than 50%”, the recommendation was to clarify that the major block is for a single major. That is why in that sentence we have added, “for a single major” The example was for BIO 196, that it is major blocked for Chemistry, Biology, and Math. That can happen, but then it cannot be major blocked only for Biology, for example. That is the only change.

The Senate passed the revisions to policy 2.1.9 unanimously.

Senator Nikolaou: The last one is the revisions to the Undergraduate Catalog.

The Senate passed the revisions to the Undergraduate Catalog unanimously.

Chairperson Horst: That was a very important debate. I do appreciate all of the comments that we heard. I want to thank people who worked on this proposal, the General Education Taskforce, I want to call out the co-chairs Chris Horvath and Cheri Simonds who took over in 2022, and then Jennifer Friberg and Erin Mikulec who served for two years 2019-2021. I want to thank all the members of the executive team of the General Education Taskforce. I want to thank the Council of General Education and Undergraduate Curriculum Committee for their efforts in reviewing this proposal; also Greg Ferrence, who serves as the Chair of the CGE. I want to thank former dean Shari Zeck who served as a consultant on this proposal. I want to also thank Soemer Simmons who I know probably did a lot of work behind the scenes in making this proposal and all of the paperwork happen. Last but not least, I wish to express my heartfelt thank you and congratulate Dr. Hurd. We would not be able to pass this proposal today without your leadership and your grace under pressure. I hope you can look back a few years from now and be proud of this major accomplishment. This sort of revisions to general education is a big deal for any institution and it took a leader like Amy Hurd to make this happen. Thank you so much for your service.
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***ISU Constitution changes Re: Bylaws of Schools***

[***Link to current constitution***](https://illinoisstate.edu/downloads/trustees/ILLINOIS%20STATE%20UNIVERSITY%20CONSTITUTION%202024-08-02.pdf)

[***Link to markup***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Executive%20Committee%20of%20the%20Academic%20Senate/2025.03.17/Linked%20Items/06.04.2024.30%20-%20Review%20the%20constitution%20regarding%20the%20review%20and%20approval%20of%20bylaws%20of%20schools/Constitution%20ARTICLE%20VI%20Section%201%20-%20Markup.docx?d=w387cdd21e0ea42e0a83fd4b07e12ad59&csf=1&web=1&e=KZNnmV)

Senator Valentin: This first item is a minor clarification of language in the ISU Constitution referring to bylaws approval. The use of the general term “school” would suggest that schools within colleges require bylaws approval, however only approval of the graduate school bylaws in terms of schools are called for in the constitution. This is just a minor edit in the language to clarify that school bylaws in general are not required to be approved by the Academic Senate and the President.

Chairperson Horst: During the revisions of the Wonsook Kim College of Fine Arts, Janet Tulley who used to work with the School of Music found this little loophole in the Constitution. I want to call her out for her thorough work.

***From Rick Valentin: Rules Committee***

***Appendix II Update Re: Panel of 10***

[***Link to current Appendix II***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/about/bylaws/#Appendix-Two)

[***Link to markup***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Executive%20Committee%20of%20the%20Academic%20Senate/2025.03.17/Linked%20Items/1.10.2025.01%20-%20Appendix%20II%20Update%20Re%20Panel%20of%2010/Appendix%20II%20Panel%20of%20-%20Markup.docx?d=w314a243e927042428dafc43cea8957cd&csf=1&web=1&e=H8bo8x)

Senator Valentin: This is yet another revision to Appendix II. This is just a minor revision to clarify the Panel of 10 membership and terms. In this case, it is just clarifying that tenured faculty may be elected as members of the committee as opposed to tenure-line. You will note in the membership description above that line it is, “nominations of tenured faculty members and positions are made…” It is just to fix a discrepancy between these two sentences in there. Also, the definition of defining the terms of service for Panel of 10 members beginning on May 1, annually.

Senator Nikolaou: On the paragraph where we added that the term begins May 1st, on the third to last sentence, instead of saying, “during an academic year” to change it into “during its term” because May 1st now does not align with an academic year.

Senator Valentin: On behalf of the committee, we can accept that as a friendly amendment.

***From Kevin Edwards: Faculty Affairs Committee***

***Policy 3.3.4 NTT Classifications***

[***Link to current policy***](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/employee/faculty/3-3-4/)

[***Link to markup***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Executive%20Committee%20of%20the%20Academic%20Senate/2025.03.31/Linked%20materials/12.20.2024.01%20-%203.3.4%20NTT%20Classifications/3.3.4%20NTT%20Classifications%20-%20Markup%203-21-25.docx?d=w8ba24f307aac48dba62af7aa1873dbfb&csf=1&web=1&e=tMi9XI)

Senator Edwards: This is policy 3.3.4 NTT Classifications. These are straightforward clarifications of ways that the NTT are classified by HR. Some minor wording changes have been through a few iterations and hopefully we clarified the policy.

Chairperson Horst: Thank you. We did do this in the fall, and we had some additional comments from the Office of General Counsel, so we were happy to review it again.

***From Lea Cline: Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee***

***Policy 3.2.13 Administrator Selection and Search Policies***

[***Link to current policy***](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/employee/faculty-staff/3-2-13/)

[***Link to markup***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/Senate/Senate%20Packets%2024-25/2025.04.09/Linked%20Items/08.27.2024.01%20-%20Policy%203.2.13%20Administrator%20Selection%20and%20Search%20Policies/3.2.13%20Administrator%20Selection%20and%20Search%20Policies%20-%20Markup%20April%201.docx?d=w39e2bcafe00147f49472b17752700f72&csf=1&web=1&e=y5FHje)

Senator Cline: The Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee brings a round of changes to 3.2.13, the Administrator Selection Policy. For those of you who have been on the Senate for more than a year, you will note that last year’s AABC passed a fairly hefty round of changes to that policy, and the committee left a laundry list of things they should have also changed. At some point you make so many changes it feels like too much at a time. We have gone back through and made some changes based on the recommendations from last year’s AABC and some changes that were brough forward to us this year. For instance, eliminating the search committee for the director of the Graduate School because there is no longer going to be a director of the Graduate School. We have now made that an AVP position. That is eliminated there.

I would point out to everyone that on page 7 of the document you will see a fairly large comment from me with some changes to the language for 2, A, 7 Other Academic Affairs Administrators. That language that is in the comment has been approved by the AABC, so we are suggesting that language as an adjustment there. “Other Academic Affairs Administrators. Searches to fill vacancies and roles that report directly to the provost may also require the participation of representatives of various constituencies. The provost shall consult with leaders of the Academic Senate to determine if such a vacancy shall require a Panel of 10 search. If it is determined that a Panel of 10 search is warranted, a search committee is formed when the provost or their designee, in consultation with the appropriate shared governance bodies, appoints:” and then there is the list of different members.

I am happy to answer questions about any specific part, but there were some adjustments, for instance, to how the Civil Service and A/P staff were listed for the college deans given that some areas don’t have any more than one A/P person or one Civil Service person. There was some adjustment made there. There are also some adjustments made for when you have to have a student from a college. Milner doesn’t have students or majors in the college, so how they can put students into that committee for the dean search. There are multiple changes.

Chairperson Horst: In the search committee composition, you simplified the language and said faculty seats on search committees listed in this policy may not be held by individuals that have administrative appointments. I pointed out to you that we get a lot of questions from people if it is not spelled out. “Does this apply to me? I am the grad director” or something like that. Could you do something like 100% administrative appointments? Something like that so it is clear that it is not just people who have some sort of administrative duty but are actually faculty members.

Senator Cline: We can consider that. My response to this question when we were in Exec was that people should know whether they are administrators or not. I would hope. We could take that under advisement.

Chairperson Horst: We get a lot of questions with every committee call for volunteers, so that is just a reflection from somebody who has to answer those emails.

***From Dimitrios Nikolaou: Academic Affairs Committee***

***Policy 4.1.4 Dress Codes***

[***Link to current policy***](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/academic/4-1-4/)

[***Link to markup***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Executive%20Committee%20of%20the%20Academic%20Senate/2025.03.17/Linked%20Items/8.12.2024.03%20-%20Policy%204.1.4%20Dress%20Codes/4.1.4%20Dress%20Codes_Mark%20Up.docx?d=we6a24c3030064aa99beab3b5b93c3d33&csf=1&web=1&e=cPqare)

Senator Nikolaou: We have policy 4.1.4 Dress Codes. One of the changes is that we have added that athletic practices, events, or performances require a specific dress code. That is what is added in the first paragraph. Also, item 4, that is the addition to refer to Athletics. We ran it through Athletics. Legal also has looked at adding this language. In the second paragraph, the addition that you see is pretty much coming from a different policy for nondiscrimination listing what are groups that are protected. Some changes that we discussed today is that under item 1, and they are reflected on the online document, that we included that “and must be outlined in the course syllabus.” Item 1 says that the dress codes should be reviewed and updated according to legal guidelines, industry best practices, and health/safety standards. We are clarifying that it needs to be included on the syllabus.

Under item 3, the main change is under item E. Now we are adding who is going to approve these student dress code standards. We talked with Dr. Horst about if it was the chair or the curriculum committee? In our committee today we decided to not specify the curriculum committee. We thought that they are going to be different departments or colleges where this might be a policy that is determined by their council or by their whole department, not necessarily the curriculum committee. The proposed addition is, “student dress code standards related to academic courses must be approved by the appropriate department/school committee and/or the department chair/school director (or dean of colleges with no departments/schools.” We are also adding, “any student dress code standards must be outlined in the syllabus.”

We changed the title of “enforcements” into “appeals” and then we added a long paragraph which pretty much mirrors what happens with other policies, for final course grade or student bereavement leave. We had to adjust it to reflect that now we are talking about faculty members and sometimes coaches. Since some of you might have the print version, I am going to read it, “If, after discussion with the faculty member, the student believes, in good faith, that the established dress codes do not align with items (1)-(3) above, the student may file an appeal to the department chair/school director or, when applicable, the dean in the case of colleges with no departments/schools, no later than five (5) business days after the start of the academic term. The department chair/school director or, when applicable, the dean, in the case of colleges with no departments/schools, will issue a written decision to both parties within five (5) business days. Both parties have the right to appeal this decision by filing a written appeal within five (5) business days to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The Provost’s decision shall be final without further appeal.”

Under “Review” we made some slight wording adjustment in the first sentence and then we deleted anything after “initiatives.” The parentheses and the last sentence.

Senator Helms: Under 1: Dress Codes for Health/Safety standards you list the idea of science, chemistry labs, facilities, athletic facilities, food service facilities, or construction sites. Then you say “must be outlined in the syllabus?” What food prep would have a syllabus?

Senator Yazedjian: FCS classes and Food Nutrition and Dietetics would have food prep.

Senator Helms: So, this only applies to the academic setting, not to a work environment?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. That is why we also changed the title to specify that it was student dress codes. We also thought in our committee that if HR felt that we need to have an employee dress code policy that is fine.

***From Dimitrios Nikolaou: Academic Affairs Committee***

***Policy 2.1.20 Equitable Treatment of Students Participating in University-Authorized Activities***

[***Link to current policy***](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/students/2-1-20/)

[***Link to markup***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Executive%20Committee%20of%20the%20Academic%20Senate/2025.03.31/Linked%20materials/10.17.2024.01%20-%202.1.20%20Equitable%20Treatment%20of%20Students%20Participating%20in%20University-Authorized%20Activities/2.1.20%20Equitable%20Treatment_Mark%20Up.docx?d=wa90d21dc37294b0da82add1b9bbff4d0&csf=1&web=1&e=wCQmeO)

Senator Nikolaou: Policy 2.1.20 is straightforward. We are adding the last sentence in the first paragraph to mirror language in all other policies that talk about exceptions, cases where students can request deferring some assignments or they need to miss classes or classwork.

Senator Yazedjian: I do have one question about the appeals process, particularly as it relates to Athletics. The appeals process outlines it going through the athletic coach to the provost. The athletic coaches report to the director of Athletics. Sorry, I was still on Dress Codes. Just wanted to point that out.

***From Todd Stewart: University Policy Committee***

***Policy 1.18 Compliance Program Policy***

[***Link to current policy***](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/conduct/1-18/)

[***Link to markup***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Executive%20Committee%20of%20the%20Academic%20Senate/2025.03.31/Linked%20materials/06.04.2024.42%20-%201.18%20Compliance%20Program%20Policy/Policy%201.18%20MARKUP.docx?d=w53ea882e1dfe49d2913d8bd3ead56d34&csf=1&web=1&e=5ILONr)

Senator Stewart: We are proposing revisions to 1.18 Compliance Program Policy. Most of the revisions are just to smooth out the language a little bit, perhaps make it a bit more elegant. In a few places we have tried to make the language a little bit more specific about, for example, who would receive certain kinds of recommendations or specifications. There is one instance where we rendered the language gender neutral. One of the other changes is that there is a link that has been added to the compliance matrix rather than just referring to it.

Chairperson Horst: It says the Compliance Committee is charged with meeting periodically. I was reflecting on the frequency of the meetings of the Compliance Committee in the last two years with Dan Taube, and we noted that it has not been meeting. Dan Taube informed me that the Illinois Auditor General recommends a definition of “periodically” as being at least once a year. Instead of saying “periodically” I would suggest that the wording should say, “at least once a year, annually” or something like that.

***From Martha Horst: Executive Committee***

***Appendix II update re: Academic Affairs Committee***

[***Link to markup***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/ExecFCE/Exec%20Packets%2024-25/2025.03.31/Linked%20materials/Appendix%20II%20Markup%20-%20Academic%20Affairs.docx?d=w56231d9d2f4241abbf3b483a50b78203&csf=1&web=1&e=kFngsi)

[***Link to 2015 report***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/Senate/Senate%20Packets%2024-25/2025.04.09/Linked%20Items/App%20II%20update%20-%20Academic%20Affairs/2-UnderrepGroupsReport-Johnson2015-04-17.doc?d=w078dbdcbdbe549ae99093b919269704e&csf=1&web=1&e=Vuu4Xf)

[***Link to 9-11-02 Senate Minutes***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/Senate/Senate%20Packets%2024-25/2025.04.09/Linked%20Items/App%20II%20update%20-%20Academic%20Affairs/9-11-02%20Senate%20Minutes%20Excerpt.docx?d=w584821456d2343dfa4aa0795eefb8fc9&csf=1&web=1&e=vZXW3p)

Chairperson Horst: The Appendix II revision has been withdrawn, so we will not be considering that.

***Internal Committee Reports:***

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

Senator Nikolaou: The Academic Affairs Committee met tonight. We talked primarily about the change to the Dress Code Policy. I would like to thank all of the members of the Academic Affairs Committee for all of their work, especially on the General Education Program where we spent the majority of our meetings. On top of that, we also reviewed 7 reports from external committees, 7 policies, and the catalog revision. Thank you everyone.

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

Senator Cline: The Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee did meet for 8 minutes this evening to talk about these final additions to 3.2.13. I do want to thank all of my committee members who all got a view about how insufferable I can be tonight, they put up with me all year. We managed to do some pretty big work in terms of evaluation of administrators in our campus and writing reports. We didn’t work on that many policies, but we did a lot of reports, and I am proud of them. And thank you, Chloe, for being the best of all of the minutes-makers.

* ***Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Edwards***

Senator Edwards: We passed slate of new members for next for various committees. We will be bringing that up next time. A couple of votes in there, we did find enough volunteers for most of the external committees of the Senate. We went through those. We also took a little bit of time to look ahead to what might happen next year. We can’t finish this project, but we looked at 3.3.13 Academic Freedom. I want to encourage everybody to read our policy on Academic Freedom. We noted that it is over 10 years old, maybe 12 years old. It probably is in need of an update. We looked at ways it could be updated and expanded. I think it is worth the look because it will be increasingly important to us in the next few years, I believe. That is something where we made some comments and left it in the folder for next year to tackle.

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

Senator Bonnell: Planning and Finance met tonight, and our guest was Dan Taube. He is the Chief Information Security Officer. We reviewed together the updates that we had made to 9.2 and I am sorry that we couldn’t get that to the floor of Senate. We hope that next year’s Planning and Finance Committee will be in a good place to move that forward. There are some really extensive changes. I also want to thank the committee. They are incredible people. I enjoyed working with and learning from them, and chief among them was Chair Horst. It was really a nice thrill to be able to work with you on the internal committee, you are fantastic.

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

Senator Valentin: The Rules Committee met today and completed their review of updates to the Athletics Council Bylaws and will be forwarding those changes. I too would like to thank the members of the committee for all their work digging through the mountain of bylaws and especially work on Appendix II of the Academic Senate bylaws this year.

* ***University Policy Committee: Senator Stewart***

Senator Stewart: The University Policy Committee did meet tonight. We approved some very minor revisions to policy 1.16 Recruitment of Service Members. I will send that along to the Senate Office in the next day or so. I would also like to take time to thank the committee members for their excellent work. One of the things we did this year, while we didn’t get around to, is starting to revise policy 3.1.44 Amorous Relations. We did gather a lot of feedback from a bunch of different constituencies. It will be very good to be able to pass that feedback on to the future committee.

***Communications***

Chairperson Horst: As you know, I am stepping down as chair. Next time is my last meeting. I have worked with Chris Horvath to arrange that we could go out to Stave after the meeting next time to celebrate the work we just did with Gen Ed, 21 and up, to celebrate all the work we did this year, to celebrate me leaving the Senate. They have requested a count; how many people think they would go?

Senator McHale: Thank you very much for the opportunity. I remember several years ago the state employee’s union prevented us from having the double what we dedicated to our healthcare. Likewise, I know that some people were not for the collective effort to raise our level to the level of standard of living. With that in mind, if we didn’t then we might want to pay more in taxes or give more to charity and not take the benefit of the collective bargaining that went on to try to come to an agreement with administration. I am very grateful to the administration for being so benevolent in the conversation. If you didn’t support what happened, as a result you can always pay extra federal taxes.

Senator Bever: Next week, Tuesday, on the quad from 11 to 3 PM we will have 101 different student vendors selling different various items from clothing to blown glass art, to art, to jewelry, a wide range. It is going to be the first student-ran thrift market on the quad from 11 to 3. If you have time between your classes or your job to stop by at lunch break, go stop by. You might have a student out there and it really means a lot to them. Next week, Tuesday, April 15, from 11 to 3 on the quad.

Senator McLauchlan: It is celebration season; you can celebrate every night through May 10. Happy Graduate Student Appreciation Week for those who celebrate. It is also recital season, etc. The student annual opened tonight to a full-packed gallery. Check that out through the beginning of May. It is the biggest event of the year, and the University Research Symposium will be this Friday 9-11 in the Brown Ballroom and then again from 1 to 3. Come out and support the work of your fellow students. Lots of celebrations with the end of the semester. Finish strong, but did want to give those shoutouts for those scholarly exhibitions for the rest of the year.

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator McHale.

Second by Senator Montoya.

Unanimous approval.

**Appendix I**

**Gen Ed Proposal Vote**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Faculty | Barrowclough | Michael |  |
| Student | Beasley | Braden | **A** |
| Student | Bever | Tyler | **N** |
| Student\* | Blair | Cobi | **Y** |
| Faculty | BlancoLobo | German | **Y** |
| Faculty | Blum | Craig | **Y** |
| Faculty | Bonnell | Angela | **Y** |
| Faculty | Braswell | Gregory | **Y** |
| Faculty | Cline | Lea | **Y** |
| Student | Cottingham | Tomas | **Y** |
| Admin | Craig | Byron |  |
| Faculty | Edwards | Kevin | **N** |
| Faculty | Godwyll | Francis | **Y** |
| Faculty | Hammond | Tom | **Y** |
| Faculty | Han | Hyoil  |  |
| Faculty | Helms | Jeff | **N** |
| Faculty | Henry | Sheryl | **Y** |
| Faculty\* | Horst | Martha |  |
| Admin | Hurd | Amy |  |
| Faculty | Ionescu | Lucian | **Y** |
| Student | Jain | Neer | **N** |
| Admin | Johnson | Levester |  |
| Faculty | Lawson | Justin | **Y** |
| Student | Leone | Casey | **N** |
| Faculty | Lucey | Tom | **N** |
| Faculty | McHale | John | **Y** |
| Admin | McLauchlan | Craig  |  |
| Faculty | Midha | Vishal | **N** |
| Student | Montoya | Noah | **Y** |
| Admin | Nelson | Glen |  |
| Faculty | Nikolaou | Dimitrios | **Y** |
| Faculty | Ozalp | Nesrin | **Y** |
| Faculty | Palmer | Carl |  |
| Student | Pellegrini | Malia | **A** |
| Faculty | Peters | Steve | **N** |
| Faculty | Peterson | Eric | **Y** |
| Student | Polizzi | Joseph | **N** |
| Student | Reed | Jamani | **N** |
| Student | Ruffin | Mitchell | **N** |
| Student BoT | Russell | Ryan |  |
| Faculty | Sankara | Jomo | **A** |
| Faculty | Schmeiser | Ben | **Y** |
| Faculty | Seifert | Deborah | **Y** |
| Student | Sharp  | Ella  | **N** |
| Faculty | Stewart | Todd | **N** |
| Faculty | Stiers | Ben | **Y** |
| Student | Susami  | Emma  | **N** |
| Student | Sweedler | Joshua | **N** |
| Admin | Tarhule | Aondover |  |
| Faculty | Torry | Mike | **N** |
| Student | Trader | Angel  | **Y** |
| Faculty | Valentin | Rick | **Y** |
| Faculty | Werner-Powell | Laina |  |
| Student | Woolever  | Marlie  | **A** |
| Admin | Yazedjian | Ani |  |
| Student | Yost | Chloe | **Y** |
| Student | Zagal | Alondra |  |
| Chair Rep | Adriana Ransom (4/9) |   |  |
| Dean Rep | Heather Dillaway (4/9) |   |  |