**Academic Senate Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, February 19, 2025**

**7:00 P.M. (Hard stop 8:30)**

**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.

***Presentation:***

***Gregory Ferrence, IBHE-FAC Representative***

Gregory Ferrence: Good evening. This is the IBHE-FAC summary report to Academic Senate. Thank you for the invitation and opportunity to address Senate with regards to the Illinois Board of Higher Education Faculty Advisory Council, IBHE-FAC. This oral report will briefly summarize the role and structure of IBHE-FAC and provide highlights on its activities over the past 9 or so months. IBHE-FAC was established in 1963 by State of Illinois Senate Resolution SR0661. According to its bylaws, IBHE-FAC’s purpose and functions are:

“FAC members may consider any issue deemed to be of significance or interest, including items listed in the agenda of any Illinois Board of Higher Education meeting, and instruct the chair on how to react to present the council’s position in formal statements to the Board or in other forums as deemed appropriate.

Any IBHE agenda item may be selected for informational presentation during FAC meetings. Position papers or recommended policy or procedural changes are often developed as a result. Additional topics may be addressed at the Board’s request by the FAC.

The Council shall receive and respond in a timely manner to any request by IBHE for input or feedback.”

This informs the current IBHE-FAC structure and output as follows:

The body has 36 members comprised of one representative from each of the 12 public universities, 12 representatives of the private and proprietary institutions, and 12 representatives of the public community colleges in the state. It is supported by IBHE staff including a formal liaison. Monthly meetings, excluding July and August of the full IBHE-FAC, are held at academic institutions around the state, occasionally via Zoom, and we gather typically once a year at the Illinois Association of School Boards facility in Springfield. It is worth noting that one of obligations of institutions being represented is to host at least one FAC meeting during its representative’s term as a member of the FAC. ISU last hosted in October 2023, so I suggest ISU consider offering to host sometime in 2026 or 2027. Members are grouped into 3 caucuses: The Private/Independent Institutions Caucus, The Two-Year Institutions Caucus, and the 4-Year Institutions Caucus, the latter of which includes the ISU representative.

Distinct from the caucuses, we currently have 5 working groups: Higher Education Funding, Equity, Technology and Pedagogy in Higher Education, Early College/Dual Credit, Prior Learning Assessment, and Faculty and Mental Health.

Caucus and Working Group deliberations regularly lead to full IBHE-FAC approved position papers ranging in detail from the extensive FAC position paper of 2022 – Advancing Equity in in Illinois Higher Education, to the succinct FAC Resolution Statement of 2024 – Community Colleges Bachelor’s Degree – opposing the awarding of bachelor’s degrees by 2-year institutions. See [www.facibhe.org/documents.php](http://www.facibhe.org/documents.php) for links to the position papers.

The same link directs to other documents such as the IBHE-FAC generated “Equity Tools & Resources” for faculty engagement document. This is a collection (last updated in November 2023), of annotated links to 18 websites showcasing tools and resources for faculty in their ongoing work in creating and maintaining equity-focused classrooms, curriculum, and research labs. I joined IBHE-Fac in May 2024. The council does not convene in July or August. During the September 2024 meeting librarian-related concerns, particularly with respect to tenure-track faculty librarians and the interplay with campus literacy, were raised in the 4-year institutions caucus. Conversations at subsequent meetings led to the production of a FAC position paper of 2025, “Supporting University Librarians,” which was ratified by the full IBHE-FAC at our January 2025 meeting. In short, IBHE-FAC asks the IBHE to support and publicly promote the retention of professional librarians as fundamental to any institution of higher education in the state through endorsement of the Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Illinois (CARLI), “Statement on the Importance of Librarians in Academic Libraries.”

IBHE-FAC minutes from September 2023(prior to my joining the working group in May 2024) indicate that the “Technology and Pedagogy in Higher Education” working group began efforts to offer guidance to the IBHE on matters under the broad category of Artificial Intelligence (AI). This resulted in the ratified FAC position paper of 2024, “Generative AI and Natural Language Processing Task Force Report.”

The, “Supporting University Librarians” and the, “Generative AI in Higher Education” position papers and the “Generative AI and Natural Language Processing Task Force” report may be accessed at [www.facibhe.org/documents.php](http://www.facibhe.org/documents.php).

With the release of the “Generative AI in Higher Education” position paper, the “Technology and Pedagogy in Higher Education working group, which I co-chair, has begun efforts to gather information and potentially draft a position paper regarding how Illinois academic institutions navigate compliance with the recently updated April 2024 final rule updated the Federal Government’s regulations for Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The final rule has specific requirements about how to ensure that web content and mobile applications are accessible to people with disabilities. The final rule is further interpreted by the State of Illinois via the Illinois Information Technology Accessibility Act (IITAA). We anticipate having significant discussions on this subject at our February meeting.

IBHE-FAC monitors the higher education relevant legislation that is being drafted and are considered by the Illinois House and Senate. Recent discussions of our group have noted the desire to see the faculty voice amplified during the legislative process and have the importance of having faculty serving on state-level committees elevated. Particularly noteworthy at this time is the higher education funding bills that were under consideration during the past legislative sessions. These have been reintroduced in 2025 with the same content as previous iterations, but with different new numbers, specifically as HB 1581 and SB 0013. New bills were due by February 7, so it is anticipated that my report from the February IBHE-FAC meeting will include information about additional bills of relevance to higher education. If I may, I would like to encourage Senators to monitor these bills as they progress through the state legislature.

Matters considered by the IBHE-FAC since April 2024 are too extensive for this oral report, however, more detailed reports on the seven IBHE-Fac meetings held during this period are forthcoming.

This concludes my report.

Chairperson Horst: We had a report on the ADA compliance issue, and I think there is some sort of task force being formed with Alice Maginnis. You might reach out to her, given your role at the state level.

Gregory Ferrence: Thank you for that suggestion. I had asked around and wasn’t sure who the contact was. I thought that might be a timely thing. In my role, those things that you as senators think are of importance, one conduit is to communicate with me, and I can try to bring it to the group as we articulate what projects we are working on.

Chairperson Horst: I will look into the minutes and forward those to you. The AI task force is meeting this Friday, so thank you for letting us know about the IBHE-FAC position paper. We will try to get that group to look at that as well.

***Guiding Principles from the RISE Taskforce***

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

***Associate Vice President for Budgeting and Planning Amanda Hendrix***

[***Link to Guiding Principles***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:b:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/Senate/Senate%20Packets%2024-25/2025.02.19/Linked%20Items/ISU_AcademicSenate_RISE_GuidingPrinciples_02142025.pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=fxoZwU)

**(The slides for this presentation can be found at the end of these minutes)**

Senator Nelson: Good evening. I would like to give you all an update on where the RISE Taskforce has been and where we are in terms of our budget redesign process. For the agenda, I want to talk briefly about how budgeting impacts higher education. I want to give you a project overview and status, talk about project governance, then get to the Guiding Principles that Chairperson Horst spoke about and how you all can get involved, and then we have time for questions and answers.

How does budgeting impact higher education? Budgets essentially provide a framework to inform decision-making, allocate resources strategically and to their best use, and build resilience towards economic fluctuations. Another way to look at this is that they create a systematic approach for distributing existing resources across departments, programs, colleges, or other departments within the university. They leverage dynamic planning cadences so that we can have a seamlessly integrated financial and strategic annual planning process, track key performance indicators so we can evaluate the effectiveness of the budget allocations, analyze student outcomes, revenue, and expense trends to identify risks and opportunities. Finally, they provide data driven insights on financial drivers to improve transparency, inform decisions, and enhance the institutions mission achievement. This is what a best-practice budget process does.

One of the challenges that we are facing with where we are with our current budget process is that our current budget process, an incremental model that hasn’t been updated in years, is backwards looking. It is a prescriptive model, it is not diagnostic, and it lacks the mechanisms to invest strategically. It really doesn’t accomplish any of those goals or any of those attributes that we find in best-practice budget processes. We really want ISU to not just grow in terms of the effectiveness of our programs, the effectiveness and success of our students, but really to thrive. In order to do that from a financial perspective, we need a budget model that really embraces those five factors that are found in best-practice budgets.

An overview and status of where we are now is part of the RISE initiative. Our budget redesign and resource allocation project aims to enhance financial transparency, modernize our budget practices, and implement effective systems and processes. From December 24 through the end of February, we worked on the Guiding Principles. Those were created by the work group in the RISE Taskforce. There was a lot of wordsmithing, a lot of back-and-forth in arriving at those, they then moved up the line and went to the Steering Committee and the Executive Committee. We will be presenting those to you tonight.

Within those Guiding Principles, we then want to talk about budget framework design. That is what we will be doing between now and the end of the semester. We will be answering and debating and discussing a number of key decision points or policy decisions that we would like to see as a community in our new budget practice. Once that work is done, we will then go into the summer months where we will look at budgeting and forecasting systems that we can utilize with our existing financial models so we can get reports out of the system that will help us make timely and strategic decisions. Concurrent with that, we will be using the budget framework design discussions that we have had along with the Guiding Principles to then build a model, or several models, that we can test when people return to campus in the fall. We will be running parallel next year, with the budget that developed for next year so that we can see how the new model works vs what we have for next year.

In terms of project governance, one of the things that I am really proud of is that this represents a wide range of involvement across campus. I have worked on a number of budget process redesigns in my career, and I have to tell you that this is the most inclusive participatory process in terms of a new budget model that I have been part of. The Grant Thornton consultants who are working with us have echoed that same sentiment, and they have done many more of these than I have, or probably any of us in the room. If we look at the right-hand side, we have the groups that were in charge of ideating and verifying the Guiding Principles and those items that we have been discussing. That consists of 35 faculty and staff, students, and shared-governance partners. This is the RISE taskforce. Within that, there is a subset of the RISE Taskforce with several other individuals making up a working group.

The working group’s charge was to develop and prepare the Guiding Principles to then move up to the Taskforce for the Taskforce to give feedback on, and then make a recommendation on that. From an information standpoint, the campus stakeholders really consist of campus leadership, deans, chairs, directors, ISU shared governance groups, students, faculty, and staff. We will be informing the community and the constituents through a series of open forums beginning next week in which we will be sharing information and also accepting feedback and input.

On the left-hand side of the screen, we have three groups. That is the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee is consisting of the executive sponsors, Amanda Hendrix, AVP for Planning and Budget, and Carlos Garcia, our comptroller. Their job is to help align the work that comes out of the RISE Taskforce. They then present that to cabinet; cabinet then refines and gives feedback to the documents or decisions that are coming forward and they make a recommendation to the executive sponsors for final decision. The executive sponsors are President Tarhule, the Provost, and myself.

We have mechanisms in place that allow plenty of feedback, plenty of participation, and as you will see there is a lot of back-and-forth, wordsmithing, and discussing what we wanted as a community in the guiding principles for a new budget process.

There are 8 guiding principles. These will serve as a foundation for our informed decision-making in developing new budget practices. In other words, as we develop a new model, one of the things we will want to do is test that model against these 8 guiding principles. You will also notice as I go through these guiding principles, that our current process doesn’t hit very many of these if any. I think that is another reason that is a ratification of why we need a new budget process.

The first being Mission and Vision. We want to be able to have a process that will allow us to strategically align our resources with the university’s mission and vision to advance excellence in student, faculty, and staff success, education, and research. How can we align our spending with our mission and vision?

The second item is transparency- to uphold transparency in our decision making and communications so that we can build and sustain trust, understanding, and confidence across all stakeholders. In terms of transparency from a contextual standpoint, it is so we all know how decisions are being made for strategically allocating the resources. It is not done behind closed doors or in the dark. It also allows the key decision makers and budget managers to understand how decisions are going to be made in the new environment.

In terms of accountability, we want it to promote institution-wide and unit-level accountability by allocating revenues that are aligned to goals and objectives that advance our university’s mission and values.

Adaptability- we want to have a flexible and responsible budgeting practice that will allow us to be very timely in supporting new initiatives and to be able to adapt to evolving institutional priorities, new opportunities, and unforeseen challenges. Those could be increases or decreases in our standard appropriation, changes in the number of students that we serve that we may not have been planning for, it will allow us to adapt to those types of changes or any other unforeseen changes. From a sustainability standpoint, we want to have the model predict outcomes so that we can facilitate multi-year planning and forecasting in a financially sustainable manner. Currently it is very difficult for the deans to do multi-year planning with the current process that we have.

We also want to have an era of simplicity. We want to be able to establish budget practices that are clear, consistent, timely, efficient, and more importantly- easily understood by the campus community, not just the budget and planning group or the finance faculty or people who are really focused on debits and credits in Accounting. We also want the new processes to be data informed. What we mean by that is to strengthen our practices so that we have reliable, consistent, and accessible data and systems and processes to inform the strategic making and allocation of resources in an efficient and effective manner.

Finally, collaboration: that we will be able to work collaboratively to drive institution-wide alignment and enable a culture of excellence, development, and continuous improvement within our university budget practices.

These are the Guiding Principles that have come through the RISE Taskforce and have moved up to the other side of the groups that you saw, and we are bringing them here to share them with you tonight.

How to get involved? First of all, you are here tonight, listening to this. Second, attend a town hall forum. You will see much of this information, but you may also hear some additional FAQ’s or some additional talking points. You may pick up something else in that presentation that may have gone past you tonight. We need as many people as possible to attend the forums so that we can get feedback and at the same time help educate the community on what we are trying to do in developing a new budget process. Visit the RISE Taskforce website. We have an FAQ section out there and will continue to expand that in the coming weeks. Based on questions that may come up tonight, that may come out of the town halls, there may be more questions that are added to the FAQ’s. Submit feedback. Whether you share your questions and comments with the RISE taskforce through their feedback form or through the website, or talk to anyone on the RISE taskforce, or leadership within your college or department, or with any of the senior leaders of the university.

Senator Blum: If possible, could you give us an example of how things might work now on a particular budget item and how you might envision it going through the new process? I understand the principles, but it is hard for me to get my head around what is really different.

Senator Nelson: The first thing to think about in our current process is, you will see next year’s budget is based on what you received last year in terms of expenses. That was based on what was received the year before, and that was based on the year before that. There may be some minor increases if we had salary increases, but for the most part the budget every year was based on the prior year. If you don’t reassess how those allocations are made, the current budget is really a sum of the decisions that were made over the last 20 or 30 years. The context today may be totally different and is totally different than what it was 10 years ago, 5 years ago during COVID, 15 years ago, that is how our current model works. A second aspect of our current model is that we don’t budget revenues. We simply roll the expenditure from the prior year. I base my personal budget on what I know my income is going to be for the year, rather than what I spent last year. I may have had some expenditures last year that were greater that my income. That is not sustainable in the long term.

It is important for me to think about, “how much income am I going to have this year?” and then create an expenditure budget. That is another thing that will change in the future, and we will be changing for next year as we move forward in this process. We will be projecting our revenues to identify how much money we really have to invest in our academic enterprise. Another aspect is, we may be allocating resources based on where the students are. In today’s environment, there may be some programs or colleges that have many fewer students today than they may have had 5, 10, 15, or 20 years ago, but they still are getting the same expenditure budget that they were getting at that point in time. We have other areas in the university where there are many more students and we are serving more students in that college than we were 5,10, or 15 years ago, but they are still being funded at where they were at 5, 10, or 15 years ago. It is really an effort to align the revenues with where the students are and where the expenses are. There are some other nuances, but does that help?

Senator Blum: When I think about data, I foresee faculty going, “well, what data is actually going to matter?” We have a low-vision and blindness program. You are probably never going to have more than 5 students or so in those groups. It is extremely crucial for the state that we have programs like that. I can tell you right now that our more low-incidence programs, as we would call them, when you start talking about data and how many students are in their class, they get worried.

Senator Nelson: I understand where that can be a scary position to be in if you are in one of those programs. I can assure you we are not going to be creating a model that is purely 100% driven on those metrics that you are alluding to. We know as a university community there are certain programs that are more costly to teach. The answer is not to simply grow the enrollment in those programs. The answer is, how do you subsidize those programs? The budget process is really a series of models. It is designed to allow us to make those strategic decisions. If you look at the history of higher ed, we have always cross-subsidized different programs because we are a university. We are not a vocational school focused solely on profit. We are here to serve all of our students, so one of the things the model will need to do is be able to allow us to make those decisions to continue funding programs at a higher level of investment that may not be generating as much revenue as some other programs. We’ll have a process identified that will be transparent and everyone will be able to see the decisions that we are making, or that the university is making.

Chairperson Horst: I hope in the fall, once we are a little bit farther along in this process, you can come back to the senate and give us a bit more detail. We are in the beginning of the process now and we are really focusing on the Guiding Principles.

Senator Tarhule: I just wanted to use this opportunity to respond to Craig’s very insightful comment. The RISE Taskforce is very broad and very representative. Even that group is not going to be able to understand all the nuances of the programs that we have to run, just as you mentioned in the example you cited. To me, this is the perfect reason why everyone should be involved. We are at the beginning of the process; those decisions have not been made. We have to assemble all of the things we need to know and the criteria upon which those decisions are going to be made so that when we make them eventually, we know they are as comprehensive and robust as possible. I just wanted to build on the Vice President’s comment- please be involved. If you don’t share the details of your programs or the issues that are important to you, we may not know. Get involved in one of these meetings, listen to the discussions, try to identify places where you think we could do better, or the types of information or unique program characteristics that we need to keep in mind as we develop this process.

Senator Helms: I appreciate your presentation this evening, especially with regard to the Guiding Principles. President Tarhule, I appreciate very much you allowing a link to the RISE Taskforce being put on the president’s homepage, as well making it much easier for constituents to actually be able to find that. I was in a meeting last week and the idea of the work group came as a surprise to a number of people there. They were under the impression that the RISE Taskforce, working with our outside consultant and working with the executive group, would be the primary driver. Suddenly there is this 10-person group that was a working group and not all of which are on the RISE Taskforce. Can you help me understand for transparency how that work group came about and why, rather than the taskforce serving that role?

Senator Nelson: Working with a taskforce as large as RISE, it is much harder to be nimble, to have some of the discussions, to flesh out the issues. A decision was made to have a subset of the RISE taskforce and to bring some other individuals in who had specific skill sets within the finance and budgeting area so they could wrestle with the issues before it goes up to the RISE taskforce. They could have a deeper discussion on identifying what they thought those principles should be, and then that went up to the RISE taskforce, and that is when the wordsmithing and the negotiating came into play to refine those. It was really an effort to be more nimble and productive in getting the work , and to also bring several people in who have some specific finance background or end-user finance background.

Chairperson Horst: The working group is really set up to do the deep dive with the numbers; so for instance, the comptroller is on the working group, but the comptroller doesn’t necessarily have to be part of the larger discussion. The idea is you have a group of people who can supply Grant Thornton with the data.

Senator Helms: If I go to the RISE Taskforce page, why do we not at least discuss that we have created a working group that is doing those kinds of things? Why, for transparency, do we not talk about that except in presentations at Senate or in a few other places?

Chairperson Horst: We could certainly add it.

Senator Helms: I think it would be worthwhile.

Chairperson Horst: How often do universities typically shift budget models? Is this once every ten years, once every 30 years?

Senator Nelson: In the spirit of continuous improvement, there will be continues tweaks to the model as we go forward. For a number of decades, universities didn’t change their models. Most universities have an incremental type of process. It has been in the last 20 to 25 years that we have seen increase in the activity-based models and incentive-based models similar to what we are talking about here. This isn’t the kind of thing where we invest 18 months in developing this new model and in 36 months we are going to go through the same process again to create a completely new model. That is not something that you see. The idea is that we develop something that can be predictable and allow us to do multi-year planning for a number of years into the future.

Chairperson Horst: I am appreciating this special moment we are in right now, where we are shifting the course of Illinois State so it can be more nimble for the 21st century. We are taking what has been the process since, I think, it was part of the system of 3 different universities and finally transforming it.

Senator Nelson: There is a number of universities that have moved to these types of models earlier in this century, and they are still using those models today because it did add more transparency. It allows them to be more nimble, it allows them to be more strategic in the investments that they make and in the allocation of their dollars.

***Senate vote to endorse RISE Guiding Principles***

Motion to endorse the RISE Guiding Principles by Senator Cline.

Second by Senator Blum.

Unanimous approval.

***Approval of the Academic Senate minutes of*** [***1-22-2025***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/Senate/Senate%20Packets%2024-25/2025.02.05/Linked%20Items/mch-Minutes%20Academic%20Senate%202025.01.22.docx?d=w3c8dc759c60743cea18745443e1c6fad&csf=1&web=1&e=VRFp5n)

Motion by Senator Blair.

Second by Senator Yost.

Unanimous approval.

***Chairperson's Remarks***

Chairperson Horst: Good evening. We haven’t seen each other in a while given the days off we had. I want to welcome our new members, Senator Angel Trader, Senator Jones, and Senator Sweedler. I want to thank Professor Ferrence for his IBHE-FAC report, I know firsthand how much time it takes to travel to those meetings given that my husband did it for years. I am grateful to him for representing us on that statewide shared governance group. Thank you to Senator Nelson for his first presentation to the Senate.

We have a Faculty Caucus meeting this evening, so I am going to try to be brief. In addition to the three action items, we have two significant policy revisions coming from the Academic Affairs Committee this evening. As well, we have a couple of bylaws revisions. For the bylaws, we will review each of the proposals separately, and there is text in between the proposals that is overlapping, and sometimes the text is revised and sometimes it is not. We are going to consider each document separately and look at the suggested revisions discretely. Once we have taken an action item vote on all three of those documents, then the Senate Office will compile them and present them to the President’s Office as one document; so don’t worry about the overlapping text.

In addition to finalizing the Guiding Principles document that we just did this evening, the RISE Taskforce will be participating in budget townhalls happening February 25th at 3 PM and February 26th at 10:30 AM. You can find the calendar invites for that through the President’s website. Go to the President’s website and then RISE Taskforce. Please share this information out with your colleagues. This is a very unusual thing that we are doing. It is transformative, and as we saw with Senator Blum’s point, it is very important that everyone understands what is going on and everybody’s viewpoint is being heard and considered. Please make sure that your colleagues are aware of these events.

Faculty, we have a Salary Report presentation by Associate Vice President for Academic Administration Gatto this evening. Please do stick around for that. Committees, please be aware that we have three committee meetings left: March 5, March 26, and April 9th. Anything you wish to be in front of the Senate this year should be well-along in its review process. April 23rd, we hold an orientation session for the new senators plus the pre-senate meeting with the Faculty Caucus. There are no committee meetings on April 23rd.

I want to commend the administration’s handling of the rapidly changing policy landscape that we have experienced in the last few weeks due to the new presidential administration. I appreciated the email that President Tarhule sent out regarding the announced and then retracted statement regarding the potential freeze of federal fundings, also, the 14-day notice, and the potential sudden indirect cost rate cut. There has been quite a lot, and I really do appreciate the administration keeping us in the loop with their emails. It is deeply concerning to many of us, and it is helpful that we are informed.

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

Senator Blair: thank you. I hope you are all staying warm in this frigid weather that has visited our doors over the past few weeks. I would like to echo Chairperson Horst’s welcome to our new student senators: Senators Trader, Sweedler, and Jones. I am happy to announce that SGA has scheduled a lobby day for March 19th. We will be going to Springfield. My secretary of governmental relations and chairperson of the SGA Civic Engagement Committee is currently working on further planning with advice from Brad Franke and hopefully soon I can unveil our full advocacy agenda for the trip. I am confident that one of our goals is to support MHEAC, the Mental Health Early Action on Campus Act.

I would like to highlight another of Secretary Mika’s recent efforts at our last meeting as she passed a resolution asking the Town of Normal to install audible crosswalk signals at the crosswalks between Mulberry St, College Ave, and School St. We have heard that these crosswalks are difficult for visually impaired students to traverse safely and comfortably. I look forward to hopefully seeing that busy area of campus made safer for our fellow Redbirds.

As Chairperson Horst touched on, students are understandably concerned about recent federal actions related to education funding, diversity, immigration, and other issues. I am glad that our administration has taken steps to provide informational resources to students and the campus community about what impact these actions might have on our campus, as well as to the rights and obligations to the university and its community members and students. I encourage the administration to continue to inform students and the campus to the best of their ability, as they have done, as we navigate the chaotic and rapidly changing circumstances.

***Administrators' Remarks***

* ***President Aondover Tarhule***

Senator Tarhule: Thank you, Chairperson Horst. Good evening to everyone and welcome to all new members. I would like to begin by reiterating that the university is closely monitoring and analyzing federal directives that come from the executive orders. I have shared this previously in my communication this week to campus and will continue to do so. One of the challenges with sharing this information is even knowing what to share. When the information first comes out, it is nebulous, it is confusing, it is difficult to understand who it affects and how it affects us. To help me pass through this, I created an institutional resilience steering group. It is a small steering group that will work with the Office of General Counsel to understand at the minimum what this is. Think of them as the first response. When the information comes out, as we have seen with some of these executive orders, it hits some people really close where it hurts. The level of anxiety and stress is high. They are looking to us to say something. We can’t always wait for a whole week to analyze it and understand it in depth in order to come up with information.

The purpose of this task force is not to make a decision. It is to look at the information that is coming up and try to understand as quickly as we can information that we can share. Who does it affect and who should be at the table as we consider the deeper meanings? Subsequently, that task force will then, as we understand what we have to work with or the requirements of the executive orders, we will then assemble content-matter experts across the university to then help us craft more in-depth responses. This is a first response team to advise me about how the very first actions in the first 24-48 hours should be, and what to do going forward. As we have seen, some of these actions tend to come out on Friday afternoon. By Monday, we already have dozens of emails of people asking, “what should we do about this?” I would like to be able to work with this group as soon as it comes out, so that by Monday I will be able to share information.

That group will continue to track and a lot of the work that they do is legal, that is trying to understand the legal language, then trying to see where we fit in with that.

We have a report on the Higher Learning Commission, I am going to wait for the Provost to share that. Last week I was a part of One Voice. One Voice is an advocacy group comprised of entities here in central Illinois. We go to Washington DC as one group comprised of 30-35 individuals. Before going on the trip, the group solicits for projects and initiatives, community development projects that they would want to advocate for, then they select 3 or 4. Once we are in DC, we advocate for those groups as a slate, for those initiatives as one set of requests coming from central Illinois. This year our efforts to try and secure money towards the STEM building was one of those projects that was selected. I went with a group along with the Associate Dean of Arts and Sciences, Laura Vogel. We presented to our congressional representatives trying to secure 15 million dollars for that project. It remains to be seen where that effort goes, but we continue to work on this as hard as we can.

Finally, the search for the Athletics Director is in progress. Some of the candidates have come through campus. If you have an opportunity to interact with them or provide feedback, please do so. I also look forward to receiving the recommendations of the search committee and to making a decision as quickly as possible. In the interest of time, I think I will pause there.

Senator Blum: Who is on the resiliency committee, so I can relay that back to my constituents?

Senator Tarhule: I knew that question was coming. I understand that there is interest in this. As I mentioned, much of the work that this group is doing is parsing the legal language. My understanding is by sharing the information publicly, that we lose the attorney-client privilege under which this analysis is being done. We will lose the ability to have the kind of protections they need. Nothing is secret, this is all for a purpose, it is just about being able to move as quickly as possible without becoming bogged down by too many non-related requests.

Senator Blum: So, the answer to my constituent would be that this is a discussion with attorneys, and this is really all it is?

Senator Tarhule: Yes.

Chairperson Horst: I would hope as we did with the COVID Taskforce which met many, many times, I assume this group will also meet many many times, and the Senate Chair does not want to participate in all of those. As issues with faculty or students come up, I remember Senator Villa-Lobos and I used to go and communicate with the task force. As needed, faculty representatives and student representatives will be included, I assume.

Senator Tarhule: Absolutely. I don’t know how many of you read the Chronicles this week, but the Chronicles of Higher Education had an article that I thought really captured the mood of the country. It says, “Higher education is tired.” This is true; we are all tired. We are all exhausted. My point is there is a lot of work to go around. We are going to have to pool up all of our collective intellects and understandings and energies to try and understand these issues and how we respond. That is a long-winded way of saying, “absolutely.” We will be inviting the individuals, as many as possible, as the issues come up, who can help us move as quickly as possible to craft responsible strategies that still respect our values as an institution.

Senator Cline: I understand the premise of your response to Senator Blum. Have you retained outside counsel for this discussion, or is this all internal counsel?

Senator Tarhule: Not this component of it. I can tell you the President and Chancellors Counsel met yesterday, this is the group of all presidents and chancellors in Illinois public universities, and one of the questions that came up was, “how many of us are retaining external counsels to help them navigate this landscape?” Some already have. We are not yet there, but as we look at the scope of the issues involved and the amount of stress that is places on our resources, we may have to do that.

* ***Provost Ani Yazedjian***

Senator Yazedjian: I would like to make an announcement that we have a new dean for the College of Education, Dr. Bryan Zugelder is coming from James Madison University. He is currently an associate dean in the College of Education there. Thank you to all who participated in the search process. We are happy to make this announcement.

Dr. Judy Neubrander from the Mennonite College of Nursing has announced that she will be returning to faculty at the end of the academic year on June 30th. We will be looking for an interim dean moving forward, given the timing in the semester. I am going to be meeting with stakeholders from the college to get a sense from them about how they would like to proceed, and we will keep everybody updated through my messages to the division.

I want to point out an event I am excited about- Women as Transformational Leaders. This is the second year we are doing this event. I included this in my message that went out to the division today. There is an opportunity for anyone on February 24th for faculty and staff from 9-10:30. There is some registration information, you can google it for the link. For the students in the room, we have two events, and I believe that we are partnering with SGA to get the word out about this, I hope you will continue to tell people about it. A panel discussion on February 24th and then food on February 24th from 5-6:30. Come to the leadership soiree, it is open to learn about some networking skills and food. Please come.

I will point out a couple of other great pieces of information also related to students. For the second year in a row, an ISU student has been named the Research Assistant of the Year at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Construction/Engineering Research Lab, CERL. Why this is neat is that this relationship started a couple of years ago at the University Research Symposium. We had students presenting research, we had some folks from CERL who came. The first student who was from the Math department got connected, was named this person of the year, and then this next person is also from Math who got this recognition. It is really great to be able to have those partnerships between students and our corporate partners and the University Research Symposium is a great place for those connections to happen.

To close out, I will talk briefly about our Higher Learning Commission reaccreditation. The good news is that the university has been officially reaffirmed and reaccredited for 10 more years. Thank you to all. This really was a campus-wide effort. This is institutional accreditation, so it is not just for Academic Affairs. A lot of people were involved. We had a 35,000-word assurance argument and a site visit that went over very positively. We got a lot of positive feedback about our facilities, our budgeting, our commitment to academic freedom. We got specific callouts about student research, academic support, the Multicultural Center, all as examples of great ways that we positively engage students. We were recommended for our processes for monitoring student success metrics like retention, persistence, completion rates, etc. One criterion we didn’t do great on. That was assessment of student learning. This is the point of this process is to go through a process of reflection and review from our peers to see what we are doing well and what are some areas that we need to improve. This is one that came up as an area that we need to improve.

There are a lot of units that are doing assessment, but to varying degrees and we don’t necessarily have an institutional structure that coordinates that assessment, review, and facilitates that process of continuous improvement. We have a monitoring report that is due in two years. We are going to have to do some work to that end. For faculty and staff, if you want some more information about how we are doing that, it is in the message that I sent out today. More to come on assessment of student learning as an institutional commitment to continuing to get better every day. Thank you.

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

Senator Johnson: I want to provide a couple of staffing updates within the division of student affairs. If you have not heard or read the information, we have two retirements that we have announced. One is Dawn Pote, who is the Executive Director for Wellbeing and Recreation. Many of you may know, she has served the institution for over 15 years with a number of significant accomplishments, including most recently the red folder program that we launched, a partnership between Academic and Student Affairs, as well as managing the MHEAC grant that has provided us timely care, our online counseling services. We are going to miss Dawn in that role and thank her for 15 years of service.

The other position would be Jill Benson within the Dean of Students Office who is retiring as well after 31 years of service. I see a senator shaking his head, it is a big loss. Many of you may know Jill from her work with thousands, if not tens of thousands of students and parents and case management and being the dean on duty and addressing student needs on campus and working with a lot of faculty around this table on issues critical to students. Jill in that office has also coordinated our commencement program over the years and done a tremendous job in providing that personal, individualized attention to our students and our family.

We are going to miss both of them, but we are going to celebrate their moving on next week with a reception for Dawn on Monday. You can go to the ISU news link in order to find specifics on that, as well as Jill’s retirement function next Friday. Again, go to the ISU news feed and you can find detailed information on that. That being said, we are doing a search for Jill’s replacement right now, that is in progress.

We have actually completed the search for our new Executive Director for Wellbeing and Recreation, and she is here. I would like to introduce and welcome Mary O’Mahoney, our new Executive Director. She comes to us with 21 years of service at the University of Arizona, she is a former Redbird as well and worked within our Recreation Department for a year.

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

Senator Nelson: I think I already gave my report for tonight.

***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.)***

* ***Department of Family and Consumer Sciences -*** [***Major in Fashion Design/Merch- Accel. FM seq***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/ExecFCE/Exec%20Packets%2024-25/2025.02.10/Consent%20Agenda/Major%20in%20Fashion%20Design%20Merch-%20Accel.%20FM%20seq.docx?d=w2f51c4976319424ea81b60f356de23ef&csf=1&web=1&e=waYqAz) ***(FIF*** [***Here***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:b:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/ExecFCE/Exec%20Packets%2024-25/2025.02.10/Consent%20Agenda/FIF%20-Major%20in%20Fashion%20Design%20Merch-%20Accel.%20FM%20seq.pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=XtNrL1)***)***
* ***Department of Family and Consumer Science -*** [***Major in Fashion Design/Merch - FM seq***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/ExecFCE/Exec%20Packets%2024-25/2025.02.10/Consent%20Agenda/Major%20in%20Fashion%20Design%20Merch%20-%20FM%20seq.docx?d=w042b8d2d25604ddeaabd3f22292ba088&csf=1&web=1&e=fb64WE) ***(FIF*** [***Here***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:b:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/ExecFCE/Exec%20Packets%2024-25/2025.02.10/Consent%20Agenda/FIF%20-%20Major%20in%20Fashion%20Design%20Merch%20-%20FM%20seq.pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=WkQelU)***)***
* ***Department of Marketing –*** [***Minor in Marketing***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/ExecFCE/Exec%20Packets%2024-25/2025.01.27/Consent%20Agenda/Minor%20in%20Marketing.docx?d=wee1dfe047960410ea9d79f768a86a048&csf=1&web=1&e=SFEiN2) ***(FIF*** [***Here***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:b:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/ExecFCE/Exec%20Packets%2024-25/2025.01.27/Consent%20Agenda/FIF%20Minor%20in%20Marketing.pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=rZTGRt)***)***
* ***School of Art -*** [***M.A. in Visual Culture***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/ExecFCE/Exec%20Packets%2024-25/2025.01.27/Consent%20Agenda/M.A.%20in%20Visual%20Culture.docx?d=w1031535a0e14477ea2066419341c2c59&csf=1&web=1&e=Ph0HHp) ***(deletion)***
* ***Department of Accounting–*** [***IS Audit and Control Specialist Graduate Certificate***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/Senate/Senate%20Packets%2024-25/2025.02.05/Linked%20Items/Consent%20Agenda/IS%20Audit%20and%20Control%20Specialist%20Graduate%20Certificate.docx?d=wb07d8c50afa54d3c8b3d3e1c22a0345e&csf=1&web=1&e=OFZp1k) ***(Deletion)***

Motion to approve the Consent Agenda by Senator Lucey.

Second by Senator Blum.

Senator McHale: I would request that the name change from the sequence in Creative Technologies from “Interdisciplinary Technologies” to “Digital Media” be taken out.

Chairperson Horst: I do not see that on the Consent Agenda?

Senator McHale: Maybe it is not coming up till March?

Chairperson Horst: If you can send that request to the Senate Office, we will handle it in a different way. These are things that have been through the 10-day process.

Unanimous approval.

***Action Items:***

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

***Mennonite College of Nursing Bylaws***

[***Link to clean copy***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Executive%20Committee%20of%20the%20Academic%20Senate/2025.02.10/Linked%20Items/06.04.2024.32%20-%20Mennonite%20College%20of%20Nursing%20Bylaws/Revised%20MCN%20Bylaws-clean2.7.25-SN.docx?d=w74db3b607ad44499b8ca5804db798660&csf=1&web=1&e=uu1kuU)

[***Link to markup***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Executive%20Committee%20of%20the%20Academic%20Senate/2025.02.10/Linked%20Items/06.04.2024.32%20-%20Mennonite%20College%20of%20Nursing%20Bylaws/Mennonite%20College%20of%20Nursing%20College%20Council%20Bylaws%20Markup.docx?d=wb7d326cd78e04ced9f2fc7a7fa1e087e&csf=1&web=1&e=8X0XVf)

Senator Valentin: This is the Mennonite College of Nursing Bylaws. We saw this as an information item a few weeks back. This has been reviewed by the General Counsel and approved by the MCN counsel.

Motion to approve by Senator Valentin.

Unanimous approval.

***From Cobi Blair: Student Caucus***

***2.1.25 Short Term Emergency Loans***

[***Link to current policy***](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/students/2-1-25/)

[***Link to markup***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Executive%20Committee%20of%20the%20Academic%20Senate/2025.01.13/Linked%20documents/06.04.2024.36%20-%202.1.25%20Short-Term%20Emergency%20Student%20Loans/2.1.25%20Associated%20Documents/2.1.25%20Markup.docx?d=w33cd653ab97a4010a620ece9ae263f5d&csf=1&web=1&e=jO7dVm)

Senator Blair: As I mentioned when this was an information item, the changes to 2.1.25 Emergency Short Term Loans reflect an update to current practices and how those are actually administered, as well as the removal of procedural language.

Motion to approve by Senator Blair.

Unanimous approval.

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

***Update to Appendix II Re: Academic Planning Committee***

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

[***Link to Academic Planning Committee Markup***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/s/AcademicSenate/ESQDVCcXs1JFjwkGkZnR9lIBMXp1o0TV4NQ835zZzO8tqQ?e=o1edxN)

[***Link to Academic Affairs Committee Markup***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/s/AcademicSenate/EQYlfCdXKNpCgnwrxB6sB5oB_vGbzUqp_DqdhcXeqSv02w?e=3v0RzL)

Senator Cline: On behalf of the Executive Committee, I bring forth some updates to Appendix II. I think we can do both the changes to the Academic Planning Committee and the Academic Affairs Committee in one motion.

Motion to approve by Senator Cline.

Unanimous approval.

***Information Items:***

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

***4.1.19 Credit Hour Policy***

***Assistant Vice President for Academic Planning Cooper Cutting***

[***Link to current policy***](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/academic/4-1-19/)

[***Link to markup***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/Senate/Senate%20Packets%2024-25/2025.02.05/Linked%20Items/06.04.2024.01%20-%20Policy%204.1.19%20Credit%20Hour%20Policy/Policy%204.1.19%20Credit%20Hour_Mark%20Up.docx?d=w2c4a24f878414a509df540529b516570&csf=1&web=1&e=WFGNO1)

Senator Nikolaou: The Academic Affairs Committee reviewed policy 4.1.19 Credit Hour. The policy was last reviewed in 2016. Apart from some cleaning up of the language, we are including a specific reference to the article from the U.S. Department of Education. The definition for a credit hour remains the same. If you see, even though it shows the first paragraph is deleted, it is actually moved as the first paragraph under the definition of “credit hour.” We added that the credit hour definition applies to distance education courses, and we added the reference to policy 4.1.21, that is why you will see on the second page we are deleting the paragraph that refers to distance education, internet, and hybrid courses. Another change that we have is for the paragraph that talks about lectures. We added that at least 100 minutes per week are required, which is consistent with the language that we already have in the next paragraph about labs. The reference to the accelerated courses or courses that refer to “shorter than a semester” is language that comes from the second page which refers to short-term courses.

We made a small change for the lab classes so that we have it clear. For example, if we are referring to musicianship classes, they are not an existing type within the university so that is why right now we just refer in general to laboratory practice classes, where science, studio performance, and rehearsal classes are specific types of labs. We removed the quotation marks for how we define professional practice. In case there is a small change that is not as important, we do not need to come back and revise the policy.

The language that is included about the 16 credit hours of professional practice is standing language, as is the types of courses that are listed as 198, 298, 298, and 498. We separated thesis and dissertation classes from independent study classes, because the deferred credit is specific to thesis and dissertation courses. Then we added language on study-abroad courses, specifying that it is about faculty hours, not about the hour that you spend within a classroom or out of class activity. We added language on zero credit hour courses.

A change depending on what we do in another policy is that for the associated policies we may just update the title to Instructional Modalities and Distance Education instead of just Distance Education.

Senator Peters: I have a question about the section defining one credit hour. Then the requirement of at least 100 minutes of work outside of class. I am a big proponent of homework, but how does that get required? How do we ensure that a faculty member is actually making sure that their students are doing 100 minutes outside of class per credit hour?

Senator Nikolaou: I don’t have an answer for you on that.

Senator Peters: Are we going to be assessed to make sure our students are doing that? I am bothered by the word, “require.” I guess it is coming from the Department of Education, so we don’t really have a choice, is that true?

Senator Nikolaou: For the lectures we are just mirroring what was required for the lab classes which is a standing number of out of class activity.

Senator Hurd: I am not sure which part comes from DOE and which doesn’t. I would have to ask Alice Maginnis. There is no way that we could make sure a faculty has that requirement.

Senator Peters: I agree with that, I just find it odd.

Chairperson Horst: Would it be something as the curriculum committees are working, they would assess the proposed syllabus, and they could gauge as to whether or not 3 credit hours is warranted?

Senator Stewart: We certainly consider whether the number of hours seems to fit the specified content or the amount of work, but there is no clock. We don’t know how long it is going to take a student to write a paper. I don’t know how you would assess such a thing. This language may be written by external things, but a lot of us are very confused right now about LLM’s and AI’s and are switching to a lot more in-class work.

Chairperson Horst: Perhaps you could follow up with the senate and give us more detail as to where that 100 minutes of outside work is coming from.

Senator Nikolaou: For the labs, because it includes music classes where they have some outside practice that they have to do, it varies. For example, we got an email from Chemistry about how many hours they needed to have for their labs, which is much more than 100.

Senator Dillaway: Based on my previous experiences, I do think it is calculated right. It is a ratio of in-class time to out-of-class time. Combined you get the number of minutes that the students are supposed to be spending on course material. I do think the ratio is correct, 50 to 100, based on the federal guidelines.

Senator Cline: I am going to yield the floor to Cooper Cutting who can read from the Department of Education specifically.

Cooper Cutting: What it says for the credit hour is, accepted practice in post-secondary education and that one reasonably approximates not less than one hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of 2 hours of out of class student work each week for approximately 15 weeks for one semester or one trimester hour of credit, or 10-12 weeks of ¼ hour of credit or the equivalent amount of work over a different period of time. That is basically where it is coming from, it is the Department of Education.

Chairperson Horst: Is that word “approximate?”

Cooper Cutting: “Approximates not less than…”

Chairperson Horst: Perhaps that is a little bit better than “required?”

Senator Lucey: You have the section on independent study courses and what the requirements are, but then in the area of zero credit hour courses you say that they are often independent study courses. Is it possible that independent study courses could be offered for three credits?

Senator Nikolaou: An independent study course, yes, it could be offered for three credit hours.

Senator Lucey: What is the difference between a zero-credit hour independent study and a three-credit hour independent study, and could the policy distinguish between those?

Senator Nikolaou: It might mean that they fall under this other category. We can use alternative language. The idea was that it requires from the students to work independently without too much direct supervision from a faculty member.

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

***08.21.2024.01 - Policy 4.1.21 Distance Education***

[***Link to current policy***](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/academic/4-1-21/)

[***Link to markup***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/Senate/Senate%20Packets%2024-25/2025.02.05/Linked%20Items/08.21.2024.01%20-%20Policy%204.1.21%20Distance%20Education/Policy%204.1.21%20Distance%20Education_Mark%20Up.docx?d=w1a38a757ac1040ef927b9a8ec4a0a2f5&csf=1&web=1&e=nSVwLd)

[***Memo on 4.1.21***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/Senate/Senate%20Packets%2024-25/2025.02.05/Linked%20Items/08.21.2024.01%20-%20Policy%204.1.21%20Distance%20Education/Memo%20on%20Policy%204.1.21%20Distance%20Education.docx?d=we3a76a6057ee4fb499e118690113511f&csf=1&web=1&e=ncOsEa)

Senator Nikolaou: The revisions that came are mainly because of regulatory requirements and institutional needs. Before I start, thank you to Senator Cline for working on this policy last year as part of her duties as a Provost fellow. We can separate the policy into legal compliance issues and then other items that are more under our purview. The sections on regular and substantive interaction, student academic engagement in distance education courses, and accreditation and quality control for distance education are for legal compliance and this is the second half of the policy. For these sections, the focus was to clarify that when we are defining programs and courses, these focus on the distance education and that we do not have correspondence courses because we are not approved for correspondence courses.

If we go from the beginning of the policy, we are adding the definition of distance education according to HLC and the U.S. Department of Education. The next section adds definitions of the three program modalities: On-campus, which is programs that require 50% or more of in-person instruction; Hybrid programs where less than 50% of the course work is going to be in person; Fully online is going to be a 0% in-person requirement. We add that new and revised program modalities will need to go through the regular curriculum process for their approval or further change.

As we move to course modality, because the course modalities refer to the instructor of record, we worked with Legal and Cooper Cutting and Senator Cline to find a definition for instructor of record. The reason why this came up is primarily for professional practice courses and student supervision courses. Let’s say I am the instructor of record and I have a student doing a professional practice, I am not going to be the one who necessarily does the instruction. It is going to be the supervisor in the company where they are doing their internship. That is why the definition that we have added under course modality reflects these cases. If you looked at the document before tonight, you might now have that definition. We approved it in the meeting tonight, so I have uploaded it on our shared folder.

In that same section we refer to policies that need to be consistent when we are talking about distance education: Credit Hour, Final Exams Grading Policy, and so on. The next part is where we are adding the definition of the 5 course modalities: In-person courses, which means 75% or more of the instruction is going to be in person. Hybrid, where 25% or more of the instruction is going to be in person. Online enhanced, where we have at least 1% and less than 25% of the instruction is going to be in person. Online where 0% is going to be in person. HyFlex courses where it is going to be a combination where some students might be attending in person, some students might be attending online, then because online instruction might be happening synchronously or asynchronously, that is why the policy also adds the definition of what is synchronous and asynchronous instruction.

Another change is that when we talk about who decides and who changes the course modality, and also who needs to be notified. For that section, we defer to chairs and directors. For the Mennonite College of Nursing, it is going to be the dean. For interdisciplinary studies courses we added that this would fall under the provost or the designee. The last change is just a change in the title of the policy to reflect that we have now instructional modalities in addition to distance education.

Chairperson Horst: I have a question regarding a part under “regular and substantive interaction.” It says, “An institution ensures regular interaction between a student and an instructor or instructors prior to the student’s completion of a course or competency by monitoring the student’s academic engagement and success and ensuring that an instructor is responsible for proactively engaging in substantive interaction. Are we doing such monitoring? How is that going to be enforced? Is that something that is just required so we are putting that in?

Senator Nikolaou: So that’s my also and when Alice Maginnis came to Academic Affairs and we asked about the “substantive activities” the idea was that if these are fully online courses, they should not just be on auto mode, and you have no interaction with your instructor. It might be that you have a discussion board, it might be that you have office hours, there needs to be something where the instructor is actually monitoring what is being done in the class and it is not, let’s say, that I am using a publisher’s website resources and I tell me students, “go and complete that course without ever interacting with me.”

Chairperson Horst: Is there going to be some sort of audit of our distance education, or some sort of assessment? How is this monitoring the interaction between student and instructor going to be accomplished?

Senator Nikolaou: I think that would go back to the addition that we made about who approves and who changes. When chairs, or the dean, or the provost decide to approve a course, then the course would need to include specific items where it shows there is this substantive interaction.

Chairperson Horst: At the curricular department level?

Senator Nikolaou: Yes.

Senator Cline: I can’t really comment on how each individual department will handle this, but the meat of this section of the policy comes directly from our guidance from the Department of Education and from HLC. This is not our language; it is required of us by federal law. That being said, they are extremely explanatory about what is allowed, what qualifies as substantive interactivity. You can see that in the policy. That language was maintained so that people will understand that. In terms of oversight, more often than not it is a response to complaints. If a student reports that they have not heard from a faculty or what have you, that is primarily how these things get managed. I think that is department-level.

Cooper Cutting: This is what is critical for differentiating online instruction from a correspondence course. Correspondence courses don’t have that regular, substantive interaction. We are not approved by HLC to offer correspondence courses. As Dr. Cline said, this is pretty much language taken from HLC which is taking language from the Department of Education. HLC leaves it up to us to figure out how to do it. I think some of it is trust, some of it is complaints that trigger an investigation. I know of no plans to do a formal assessment of each and every course to make sure we are abiding, if that is what you are asking.

Chairperson Horst: I am thinking that as these courses are proposed and the curriculum committees are reviewing them, they should keep all of this in mind to ensure that there is enough interaction with students in this particular way, that is satisfies the requirement and it is in a correspondence course. I think the most likely level is it happens at the curricular committee. We might want to make sure the curricular committees at all levels know about this document when it is passed.

Senator Yazedjian: We also, as an institution, are saying that students who are taking an online class are having a comparable experience to students are in-person. I think it is just affirming the expectation that there would be interaction rather than setting up a monitoring strategy. Just setting up the expectation on the front end that you should be interacting in a regular, substantive way with students in your in-person class and similarly you should do that in an online class.

Chairperson Horst: It does say “monitoring” twice.

Senator Nikolaou: Senator Horst, you asked about moving the sections around a little bit. We talked about that in the committee, and we said that is fine.

Chairperson Horst: I had one other question. It said, “note, instruction assessment grading or feedback generated by third party applications rather than by the instructor is not considered substantive interaction. That would be Canvas and Canvas grading?

Senator Nikolaou: That is a question that we asked Alice Maginnis and when I mentioned the publisher’s platforms, that you cannot say, “I am just going to use all the resources that they have used and that is going to be my course.” You can create your own videos and upload them and that would be an item for your online instruction. If you are using a pre-recorded video from a publisher and that is the only think you are using, that would not satisfy at least two aspects of substantive interaction.

Chairperson Horst: If I design my own quizzes on Canvas, that is fine?

Senator Nikolaou: Yes.

­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­(information items below this line were skipped due to time constraints)

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

***06.04.2024.24 - Public Comment Time Frame for Int. and Ext. Committees***

[***Link to current bylaws***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/about/bylaws/)

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

[***Appendix II - Markup***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/Senate/Senate%20Packets%2024-25/2025.02.05/Linked%20Items/06.04.2024.24%20-%20Public%20Comment%20Time%20Frame%20for%20Int.%20and%20Ext.%20Committees/Bylaws%20Appendix%20II%20(Public%20Comment)%20-%20Markup.docx?d=we47d7474a6cb4ea6bd1e066a4a0fbf41&csf=1&web=1&e=CS2lZm)

[***Article 6.6 - Markup***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/Senate/Senate%20Packets%2024-25/2025.02.05/Linked%20Items/06.04.2024.24%20-%20Public%20Comment%20Time%20Frame%20for%20Int.%20and%20Ext.%20Committees/Article%206.6%20Markup%20(Public%20Comment).docx?d=wb3c74a7481a642dfa42e658825e1c058&csf=1&web=1&e=UOnpfD)

[***Article 5.4 - Markup***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/Senate/Senate%20Packets%2024-25/2025.02.05/Linked%20Items/06.04.2024.24%20-%20Public%20Comment%20Time%20Frame%20for%20Int.%20and%20Ext.%20Committees/Article%205.4%20Markup%20(Public%20Comment).docx?d=we00b1b6e1688468a9e0d8adbf41df008&csf=1&web=1&e=6mRsZD)

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

***09.26.2024.01 - Changes to Ex-Officio Members of Senate Internal Committees***

[***Link to current bylaws***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/about/bylaws/)

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

[***Appendix II - Markup***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/Senate/Senate%20Packets%2024-25/2025.02.05/Linked%20Items/09.26.2024.01%20-%20Changes%20to%20Ex-Officio%20Members%20of%20Senate%20Internal%20Committees/Appendix%20II%20B%20Markup%20(Ex-Officio).docx?d=w0fb01998fd424fa0a31665ae98ab7444&csf=1&web=1&e=pRzcx5)

[***Article 6.7 - Markup***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/Senate/Senate%20Packets%2024-25/2025.02.05/Linked%20Items/09.26.2024.01%20-%20Changes%20to%20Ex-Officio%20Members%20of%20Senate%20Internal%20Committees/Article%206.7%20Markup%20(Ex-Officio).docx?d=w9b023dac6c5e4269952d0be1fe83201f&csf=1&web=1&e=fbMMEo)

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

***10.25.2024.01 - Appendix II Update Re Faculty Affairs Committee***

[***Link to current bylaws***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/about/bylaws/)

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

[***Appendix II – Markup***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/Senate/Senate%20Packets%2024-25/2025.02.05/Linked%20Items/10.25.2024.01%20-%20Appendix%20II%20Update%20Re%20Faculty%20Affairs%20Committee/Appendix%20II%20B%20Markup%20(FAC).docx?d=w0c839fc3ee7b4941be4fdc0c4863a4cd&csf=1&web=1&e=Om4dKV)

[***Article 6.7 - Markup***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/Senate/Senate%20Packets%2024-25/2025.02.05/Linked%20Items/10.25.2024.01%20-%20Appendix%20II%20Update%20Re%20Faculty%20Affairs%20Committee/Article%206.7%20Markup%20(FAC).docx?d=w9b294314bca449ae88306e5f7c983b9d&csf=1&web=1&e=0tD3GG)

***Internal Committee Reports:***

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

Senator Nikolaou: The Academic Affairs Committee met this evening. We discussed and approved suggestions for Policy 4.1.21 Distance Education. We also finalized our discussion on the General Education Program revision, including changes in Policy 2.1.12 Pass/No Pass – Credit/No Credit, Policy 2.1.9 Baccalaureate Degree Programs, and the Undergraduate Catalog, and a sample draft implementation plan. The Committee voted to forward these documents to the Executive Committee for their consideration.

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

Senator Cline: The AABC met on 2/19. We passed revisions to policy 3.2.13 which will be forwarded to the Executive Committee. We received a report on the AIF from Dr. Dan Elkins. Our discussion of that report will continue on March 26. Our March 5 meeting will be dedicated to completing our work on the Presidential evaluations submitted by campus constituents.

* ***Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Kapoor***
* ***Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Bonnell***

Senator Bonnell: Planning and Finance Committee met this evening, and the College of Engineering Dean Tom Keyser was our guest. Keyser discussed and answered questions about the G.E. Road facilities. Keyser also shared a SWOT analysis for the G.E. Road and John Green facilities. This will inform the Committee’s priority report.

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

Senator Valentin: The Rules Committee began reviewing updates to the Athletics Council Bylaws.

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

Senator Stewart: The UPC did meet tonight.  We spent our whole time on an initial discussion of 3.1.44 Amorous Relations.  We had Amy Secretan (Chair of the AP Council) attending to help provide some suggestions and feedback.  We plan to have the Chair of the Civil Service Council attend the next meeting on 3.1.44; he couldn’t make it to the one tonight.

***Communications***

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator McHale.

Second by Senator Blum.

Unanimous approval.

