

FACULTY SENATE MEETING TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, March 30, 2016, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Allori, Anderson, Arado, Baker, Bateni, Beamer, Bishop, Brubaker, Carlson, Cefaratti, Conderman, Demir, Deng, Downing, Dugas, Gilson, Glatz, Goldenberg, Grund, Hathaway, Hou, Hunt, Irwin, Jaekel, Kidder, Kim, Konen, Lichtman (for Than), Long, Macdonald, Manning, Martin, May, McHone-Chase, Millis, Mirman, Montana, Moraga, Naples, Nejdl, Novak, Patro, Pavkov, Pitney, Riley, Rosenbaum, Ryu, Saborio, Sagarin, Siegesmund, Slotsve, Staikidis, Stephen, Stoddard, Streb, Subramony (for Mooney), VanderSchee, Xie

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Abdel-Motaleb, Bujarski, Campbell, Chakraborty, Chen, Farrell, Jaffee, Khoury, Lee, Mooney, Penrod, Rodgers, Schatteman, Scherer, Shin, Than, Thu

OTHERS PRESENT: Bryan, Clemens, Doederlein, Falkoff, Holt, Jacob, Pickett

OTHERS ABSENT: Builta, Hoffman, Nicholson, Shortridge, VandeCreek

I. CALL TO ORDER

G. Long: Good afternoon and welcome to our Faculty Senate meeting today. I'd like to call the meeting to order, please.

Meeting called to order at 3:05 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

G. Long: The first thing we need to do is have an adoption of the agenda. So there are no walk-in items today. So I need a motion to accept the agenda.

J. Manning: So moved.

G. Long: Jimmie Manning. And Janet. All in favor?

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Opposed? Okay. Looks like we're good.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 24, 2016 FS MEETING

G. Long: Next is approval of the minutes of the February 24 meeting. We need a motion to accept the minutes.

R. Siegesmund: So moved.

J. Manning: Second.

G. Long: Corrections, additions, typos anyone noticed? Okay, call the vote. All in favor of the minutes, say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? Okay, so we have an agenda and we have minutes. We're in good shape.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

G. Long: As far as the president's announcements, I'll keep them short because we do have a very good presentation coming up at the end of the meeting on Program Prioritization. I want to make sure we have enough time for that. A couple updates: One our very last Faculty Club lunches is scheduled on April 13 from 11:30 to 1:30. Would encourage you to come. We've had a couple of them so far. It's been a nice chance to visit informally with people. Haven't hassled them with anything to read ahead of time. Been a nice opportunity to visit. And if you're interested in that, you will be receiving an email and will respond to Pat Erickson to let her know. We do have to provide them with a count.

Another thing to let you know, the Board of Trustees recently approved all the sabbatical requests for next year. That's a very positive step. And they also approved all the academic program requests that went through. So just as a heads-up from the Board of Trustees standpoint, that's a little bit of an update.

Another update: We've talked in this body a number of times about the frustrations or the difficulties in University Council with regard to how one changes bylaws. And so that's Article XXII. And at our most recent meeting, we did, in fact, pass that and so it will be in the future much more efficient for us, if you would, to change bylaws. The rule now states that if we're going to change bylaws, the new language – a vote on an amendment to the bylaws requires the presence of 60 percent plus one of the total voting membership of University Council, which, as a brief aside, we always hit that number. Our attendance patterns aren't an issue from reaching that level. Then it goes on to say, to become effective, an amendment must be approved by the greater of either: A) a majority of the total voting membership of University Council, or B) two thirds of the voting members in attendance. So that passed. That provides a lot of opportunity for making changes, making updates as needed. So a very significant change in how we're going to deal with bylaws amendments in University Council going forward.

Another thing update, Resources, Space and Budget Committee has been active doing a lot of work. Later on you will hear a report from Laura Beamer, our Faculty Senate liaison to the Resources, Space and Budget Committee. We also met as, in an effort to kind of be more inclusive, to increase collaboration, to serve as more of a resource, the Resources, Space and Budget Committee also held a meeting last week with the chair of the Board of Trustees, Mark Strauss, and the chair of the Board of Trustees member, who's in charge of finance and facilities, John Butler. We did have a

chance to meet with two of them, and chair of that meeting also included Al Phillips and Provost Freeman, others who were available to join in the conversation. Think it went very well, seemed to have a very good discussion, and I look forward to having the Resources, Space and Budget Committee continue to work and gather more information, be more of an active participant in the process. We've made good strides this year. It was another example of moving forward in a positive direction. That's it for my president's announcements unless there are any questions upfront.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. Presentation of the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award to Therese A. Clarke Arado

G. Long: Moving on then, the next item of business is a pleasure to do. It's presentation of the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award to Therese A. Clarke Arado. We have a plaque – and I know there's nothing like – that people like more than to get up in front of other people, you know, thank you very much for all of your service, Therese. As I read last week – last month – Therese is a long-time member of Faculty Senate and has been involved in University Council. She's done lots of work with Steering Committee currently serving on as the chair of the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee, and she's also part of the task force for Program Prioritization. Therese gives more than she gets back. She's one of the people who is an attribute to the university and someone I treasure working with and appreciate her contributions. And she's also smart enough and shrewd enough, as we put here, to know when there's some dealing from the bottom of the deck. So she's a good advocate for all of us. With that I would like to say thank you again, Therese, we so appreciate your help.

T. Arado: Thank you. I appreciate it.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

IX. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Paul Stoddard – report

G. Long: Moving on, no items for the consent agenda. And in terms of business, we have no unfinished business, nor any new business. So I'd like to move to reports from advisory committees. That would be first report is FAC to IBHE. Paul, Paul Stoddard.

P. Stoddard: All right. That one went a lot quicker than I expected. I don't have my notes pulled up in front of me. However, the FAC did meet the Friday of spring break down at Lakeland College in Champaign. The meeting was dominated by discussion of the lack of a budget in the State of Illinois, how the publics are faring under this. And we are doing rather well compared to our compatriot institutions. Chicago State is in serious trouble. They're struggling to finish the

semester. Western has just laid off some people. I believe Eastern has laid off 177 people. Schools are looking at furloughs for all the staff. So it's hard times in the State of Illinois. We are very fortunate here at Northern that those drastic measures haven't yet hit us. We know there's been belt-tightening going on but it's not as bad as it could be. Lakeland is a community college. We did hear from their president and how they are responding to the crisis. Basically they are preparing a budget that does not include any state funding. So it's all tuition and I guess direct tax levies. And they say they will shrink to whatever size their revenue allows them to exist at. And if that's a small size because there's no state money, then so be it. So they have, I guess, flexibility that they can adjust their size to match their budget. But it's not happy times. Really that's about all we did is talk about how unhappy the times are.

G. Long: All right. Does anyone have any questions for Paul?

B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – no report
Greg Long, Dan Gebo, Rebecca Shortridge,
Leanne VandeCreek, Steve Builta, Holly Nicholson

X. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee – Paul Stoddard, Chair – no report

B. Academic Affairs Committee – Jimmie Manning, Chair – no report

C. Economic Status of the Profession Committee – no report

D. Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – Therese Arado, Chair – report

G. Long: Okay, moving along, I know – no official report on University Advisory Committee. They did approve all our sabbaticals and all the program requests that were put forth. That's very positive news. Those things have been vetted and they certainly are supported and do support our work as faculty. All right. When we look at standing committee, I'm going to X here, our first report is from our Bob Lane award winner, Therese Arado.

1. Letter of acceptance of nomination for President of Faculty Senate/
Executive Secretary of University Council;
Faculty Senate will vote at the April 27, 2016 meeting.

- a. [Greg Long](#) – Page 3

T. Arado: The first one is an informational that I want to call your attention to Greg Long's letter of acceptance of nomination for president of Faculty Senate, executive secretary of University Council on page 3 of the packet. We will formally select the nominee at the April 28 Faculty Senate meeting. That is drawing your attention to that.

2. Election of NIU representative to the
Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE – 4-year term

See [excerpt](#) from NIU Bylaws, Article 17 – Page 4

- a. [Paul Stoddard](#) – Page 5
- b. [J. Mitchell Pickerill](#) – Page 6

T Arado: The second item is something we are going to have to vote on. So if you haven't gotten a clicker and you are a voting member, you will need a clicker. That is item D. 2. We have two nominees for the NIU representative for the IBHE, Professor Stoddard's letter of nomination is on page 5, and Mitchell Pickerill's is on page 6. When Pat sent out the materials, we were asked to review the letters, but I will give everybody a minute now to review the letters to refresh your recollections and we will actually vote. So I will give you a minute, and then I will tell you what numbers to press for your choices for voting. I can't see behind me, I'm using the classroom technique of watching people's eyes and making my determination. That and getting up for snacks, which doesn't happen in class. Pat is going to open the polling, and clicking 1 or A is a vote for Paul Stoddard. Clicking 2 or B on your clicker is a vote for Mitchell Pickerill. And C or 3 is an abstention. If everyone would use their clickers and place a vote, I would appreciate it. Has everyone had a chance to vote and their clicker registered a letter on it? One more just went in. I think everyone got their votes in. All right. So that is 30 votes for Paul Stoddard, 10 for Mitchell Pickerill, and 7 abstentions. That means Paul Stoddard is the new representative. Am I correct? If I can count that correctly. All right, thank you.

G. Long: Thank you, Paul, for serving in that role.

- E. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Laura Beamer, Liaison/Spokesperson – report
 1. Approve [2016 Budget Guidance Letter](#) – Pages 7-10

G. Long: The next item is a report from Laura Beamer, Resources, Space and Budget Committee, with regard to the 2016 budget guidance letter.

L. Beamer: Hi, thank you. So as Greg said earlier, we had a really nice meeting with the Board of Trustees. It seemed at the beginning that everyone was nervous about what the other one was thinking about, but it turned out really well in the end where there was some trust generated and hopefully we'll have a voice in things as such. So if you look in your agenda packet, there is a letter that is coming from the RSB to President Baker. And we're interested in knowing if you have any comments or questions.

K. Lichtman: Foreign languages. Can you just give like two sentences of background on this? I am an alternate, so

L. Beamer: Well, this is a report that, according to my understanding, is that it's generated every year annually. And traditionally it's been coming from the Faculty Senate president. And this year we're being a little more inclusive about that. And it's kind of our state of the nation and a bit of a report on what the RSB has done over the year as far as collecting information about concerns and putting them forward and who we met with when.

G. Long: If you do have any comments, this would be a good time, or questions about this because this will be shared with University Council next week and will then be forwarded on to the president, provost and CFO and rest of the cabinet. So if there is anything in this that you think we've missed or that you would like to particularly endorse.

J. Stephen: I don't think I recall our previous discussion about salary inversion occurring again. I'm not positive but what I read it, I didn't see the [inaudible]

G. Long: So another comment with regard to salary because salary is listed here, but

J. Stephen: Salary inversion.

G. Long: Explain for us what you mean by that so we're on the same page.

J. Stephen: The fact that there are some people who have been here quite a while and haven't received a raise in say, 13 years that amounts to anything, and new hires are actually coming in at more.

G. Long: Okay, thanks. Just want to be sure. Okay, so comment on salary inversion. Anything else that you're looking at in this and see any concerns – we tried to – as a committee it was put together with the idea what if we have funding, what if we don't? Look at different options. And again, this is purely advisory. But if you agree with the advice, hopefully we'd like to get a motion to endorse. But if you have any particular questions, I would also like this opportunity to add those to our note here. Okay.

J. Stephen: Move to endorse then.

G. Long: We've got – let's make a motion to endorse?

J. Stephen: Motion to endorse the letter.

G. Long: Okay, second Bill Pitney. Okay, any further discussion on this? Okay, all in favor?

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Opposed? Abstain?

Unidentified: Abstain.

G. Long: We will put this forward, we'll add another sentence in there about the salary inversion to be clear on that. Mark?

M. Riley: Thanks for the comment about about salary inversion. We do have a paragraph about merit increases. So I think it will be relatively easy to fit a sentence or two saying: In addition, we face this issue of salary inversion and it's a part of this whole picture. So thanks.

G. Long: Okay. So, did we vote on this? We're good? We're good on this, then? Anything else? Okay, thank you.

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A. [Program Prioritization Update](#)

Task Force Chairs: George Slotsve, Alan Clemens, Michelle Pickett, Matt Streb

G. Long: With that, then I'd like to turn it over to Matt Streb and George Slotsve. They've been kind enough to come and share a little information about the Program Prioritization. I would like to call your attention to today's NIUToday, Program Prioritization Next Steps. I'll turn it over to the two of you.

G. Slotsve: We want to I guess briefly go through what a typical Friday looks like for our committee members on the task force. Try to give you an overview of what our committees have been involved in and what we are doing. Next slide.

There are four co-chairs, the academic co-chairs, myself and Alan – Alan Clemens, 21 task force members on the Academic Program Prioritization Committee. On the Administrative Task Force, Matt Streb from Poli Sci, and Michelle Pickett, joining us right now. There are 21 members of the Administrative Task Force. What the task forces have been asked to do is review, in the case of administrative programs, 236 programs for academic programs, 223 academic programs. And essentially in the formal definition I guess is they are a collection of discrete activities and functions that consume resources, time, money, effort. Probably what's more useful at least from the academic side is if I just give some examples what a program is. A program would be, for example, if you offer a B.A., a B.S., or B.A./B.S., it could be considered one program. A master's, an M.A. or M.S. might be considered another program. If we were offering a Ph.D., that would be a third program which would potentially be offered by a department. You may offer a minor. That will be treated as a program. May offer different certificates. Some departments offer one or two certificates. They're considered separate programs.

So essentially for each of these programs, what we're doing is we meet and discuss the nature of the program and basically try to evaluate the programs. To give you an idea of time spent, the task forces formally meet on Fridays. Initially they were meeting from about 1:00 to 5:00. We started meeting I believe the 8th of January. We've been meeting every Friday since. The meetings normally run four hours. The Academic Task Force, in order to complete our mission, started meeting four and a half to five hours on Fridays. And for the last two weeks and for the upcoming two weeks we've been meeting eight hours a day on Fridays, to evaluate the programs. We polled the task force members and they say they spend anywhere from about 15 to 30 hours per week on Program Prioritization. Generally what that involves is the meetings, but also there's a fair bit of reading. We're reviewing approximately 20 programs roughly a week. And each program is probably 30 pages' worth of reading, roughly 600 pages of reading to do each week. And then you're making notes on that, and going through on that. Next slide

So at the meetings, we have the in-depth discussions of the program, discussion rationals for our scores and take a final vote on program rankings. I'm not sure is what it is for the administrative

task force. There are 21 members of the Academic Task Force. What I can say is that we do not view it as a done deal in the sense of assigning the score to any category. Unless we have a minimum, 17 to 21 people vote for that. So we've got a fairly high standard. Over 80 percent of the task force members have to be in agreement before any decision is made.

M. Streb: The Administrative Task Force, 18 out of 21. Very similar.

G. Slotsve: Next slide, please. On the Academic Task Force, each member is reading all narratives. So for all 223 programs, as I recall, every member of the committee is reading every program report and contributing to the discussion as we go through it, score the different programs. On the administrative side you're doing things slightly different.

M. Streb: Two components, the score, at the end of the day doesn't really matter because what really matters is the category. You go through and you score, and that gives you kind of a starting point. And then at the end of the day you need to put it into some sort of category. The Administrative Task Force decided we would read about half of the programs each, first. And if we came to consensus on – so 9 out of 11 people agreed on the score – we would move onto the next step. If we couldn't reach consensus on the scoring, then everybody would read the narrative.

Then when we go to categorization, it's the same thing, 9 out of 11 people agree to the category, it's done. If you don't have consensus, then everybody goes and reads the entire thing. What I can tell you at the end of the day, we did this because we thought we were going to actually be able to go into a little more detail, depth, and spend more time on each individual program. We have essentially read all 236 programs at the end of the day. Now you've got to norm everything and get it close to 20 percent in each category which is requiring us to go back and read everything anyway.

G. Slotsve: To give you an idea for the scoring rubric we vote on at the meetings, each of the eight categories, quality of faculty, we will have read the report from the program, we will discuss the criteria, quality of faculty and minimum of 17 members of the committee to agree to assign the score is to that particular category. We then will move on to the quality of students in a particular program. So for each of the criterion, we require a minimum of 17 members to be in agreement to assign a score to the particular program. This is for the Program Prioritization part of the exercise.

Once we have now completed this part of it for all 223 programs, we are now assigning programs to a category. So that's that 1 through 5 category that you've read about. Once again, each program is discussed, all members of the committee are involved in the discussion. And to assign a program to a category, once again, requires 17 of the 21 members to be in agreement. If we cannot reach that threshold, a score is not assigned. Sometimes we'll just have to go back and revisit a program later. We are also going through on the categorization, we're going to be doing it at a minimum twice. So we're going through once to assign an initial category, then go back and revisit our decisions on the categorization part of the exercise to make sure that we're still in agreement with the decisions that we have made. On the administrative side, there are a different number of criteria.

M. Streb: We went through a slightly different process. Again you start out scoring. So you have five criteria here. Unlike the Academic Task Force, we didn't go through and agree on the score for

every single program for every criteria, but we had more of a complex thing where we went in and we had a consensus rule. And if we met that consensus rule, we moved on. The thing that I think is really important for you to understand, though, is the score is just a starting point. It is not necessarily predictive of where a program is going with to end up. So you could take a program here that is really, really important to the mission of the university, and is functioning very well. And when you put that into our scoring system, that's going to come up in an enhanced category. We might look at it and say there's no need to enhance the program, it's doing fine, and we don't need any more resources to give to that program. That's why it's really important that you go back and have that second step, to make sure you're putting programs in the category where they really belong.

J. Stephen: Excuse me, I'm getting really confused. When you were talking before, you said the scores don't matter because the one category we're going to put them in. Then category got used in a different term to being scored in a different category to help you score them to put them in a final category, for the category they go in, the score doesn't matter. You're

M. Streb: Let me try to explain it again. We put it in an initial score, all right? And we use something called the Parker Model, probably too detailed to go into here.

J. Stephen: No, don't -- okay. There's an internal category system and we saw is that on the previous plot. That gives you numerical scores for a particular program. Those scores have to be agreed upon by certain members of the committee with a certain surfeit, all of that. And then there's another use of a word category that you're going to put a program in, that previously you said it doesn't matter what the score is because I know what category I'm going to put 2 in and now you're telling me if we don't have a score, we have to go back and read it all again. Two questions. What are these categories called, and what percentage of information -- programs need to be put into each category?

M. Streb: That's coming.

J. Stephen: Okay.

M. Streb: We're going to talk about the five. We thought that people knew what the five categories are. Let me make it a little clearer what

J. Stephen: Two different ways in the same sentence, it can be confusing.

M. Streb: The first thing we were asked to do is use the criteria, all right? And they have weights. And there's kind of a complex thing that we go through and we score these things, and it takes

J. Stephen: That's the model.

M. Streb: Then what happens is we put all of our programs, all 236 programs on a scatter plot, all right? And depending on where the scatterplot falls, where the plot falls on the scatterplot, there's five different areas. And they're the five categories we'll talk about in a second. Okay? And in some cases the scoring might be predictive of where we ultimately end up putting the program, all

right? But in other cases, like I was saying, if you have a score, a program that's really, really important to the mission, it's really functioning well, that's going to end up on the scatterplot that's going to be in the enhanced category, okay? But what we're going to look at as an administrative task force, we're saying: Do we really want to put that program in enhance? Our scoring would dictate that we with do that, but there may not be a real reason to put it in enhanced because it's functioning well and already has enough resources, doesn't need any more resources, so it wouldn't make sense to put a program in enhance. So there's two steps to the process. There's the scoring step, all right, which helps kind of lead to the next step, and then there's the categorizing step, which is the most important thing. One of the things that would be important to do is explain what the five categories are. Yeah.

J. Stephen: Okay. I have one more question. If the scoring model is not necessarily adequate for putting something from a score in the enhanced category, what mechanism is there for low scoring programs that perhaps upon a more subjective look don't deserve to be disenanced or whatever name we put there?

M. Streb: Wonderful question. What we would do is we went through and scored all of our programs. This is a little different than the Academic Task Force. This is the Administrative Task Force. We went through and scored the programs, 236 programs put on a scatterplot and they fall into five categories. We go through all 236 programs again, talk about it the second time. The first question we ask is if this program fell in enhanced based on the scoring, do we agree that this program should be enhanced? And if 18 of the 21 of us agree that the program should be enhanced, then it's enhanced. If we don't, then we go through a whole complex process of how we actually get to where the program should fall. We have preferential voting and comfort voting, something called the Goldstein Model which I don't need to get into. I hope, anyway. But every program essentially is going to be looked at twice, talked about twice, and it will require 18 out of 21 of our task force members to ultimately put it into a category.

Now let me explain, we go too through all of our programs, and we're looking at our programs. We want to get about 20 percent of programs in each category, but it's not fair to sit there and say, well, this week we put a whole lot of programs into enhanced, so next week we need to make sure that we fix this and now we're going to put a whole bunch of programs somewhere else. Every program has to be evaluated fairly. At the end of the 236 and we categorized everything, it's not going to fall perfectly 20 percent, 20 percent, 20 percent. That's where we're at right now is we're trying to decide who are we can we move from sustained to reduced if we have to.

J. Stephen: One more technical question. You said when we get the scores they fall into the categories. How are the categories determined? Are these from norms from previous use of this?

M. Streb: Let's get to the categories, I think that will help a lot.

K. Lichtman: Comment and a question. As a social scientist, what you said is the scores are not predictive of what category they fall into and what you want to say is that the scores don't determine what category they fall into. So obviously they're predictive, right, because otherwise why would you score them at all? So it's not like the final determination of what category they go

into. So then my question is if they're going on to a scatterplot, one axis of the scatterplot is the score, what's the other one?

M. Streb: They're both scores. One is mission and internal and external demand. The other is quality and effectiveness. Productivity, opportunity analysis falls on both axes.

K. Lichtman: And the other half, like an average or a sum?

G. Slotsve: Can you back up one slide please? On the academic side, we're using two models, the scatterplot model there is importance of the program would be one of the criterion. Then another one is performance of the program, to find the two axes for the scatterplot. The second way that we're using the information, though, in the Academic Task Force is we're taking the scores that are assigned to each of the categories and taking the weighted value of those scores and then we're literally just rank ordering. So we're using both the scatterplot and that rank order, how you score, highest score to lowest score to cross-examine the programs and see are we complete agreement or are there disagreements when we're going through.

K. Lichtman: Yeah, my question is what is the scatterplot telling you that the weighted average doesn't?

G. Slotsve: If you take a look at how things are broken up, I think it was 52 percent of the criteria are for importance and 48 percent are on performance. You could very well have – you can try to lose it in the mix. Because it's just an average if you use the weighted average. Here you'll have two separate scores. You could have a very highly important program, but it could be very low performing. So that's one that you want to trigger in your mind, maybe the university needs that program, it's important to the university. The problem is it's just not performing particularly well versus a program that may be very highly performing but might be low priority or of low importance potentially to the university. So it allows to kind of distinguish importance and separate out performance and importance. Particular program, rather just kind of getting a mean, weighted mean that both are mixed in and that's hard to pull that information at that point.

K. Lichtman: You're saying the criteria are – there's categories of criteria, so importance and performance.

G. Slotsve: Right.

K. Lichtman: And last thing, the person who spoke before me is from math, so you can probably tell him all the models.

G. Slotsve: Can we move ahead --

J. Stephen: Units are too --

G. Slotsve: We just want with to thank the division of IT. They customized the software for scoring and categorization and actually has been quite useful. And what they've provided us. The categories that programs are being placed into – and it's approximately 20 percent programs are being placed

into each of the five categories. Not hard and fast, just an approximation. Category 1 will be candidate programs for enhanced resources. Category 2 is programs that are candidates for continue with no change in resources. Category 3 are candidates for reduced resources. Category 4 are programs that are candidates for transformation; and Category 5 are programs that are candidates to possibly be phased out but that's a subject to additional review. So please understand that what the task force members have been asked to do is to categorize programs, and our role is only advisory. So our report, we will be writing up and submitting to the senior cabinet, and it will be their responsibility to make any final decisions. Our report – everyone knows – Is going to be an advisory report to them. Approximately 20 percent of the programs will go into each category.

J. Stephen: That was part of the charge?

G. Slotsve: Yes.

M. Streb: None of what you saw was anything the task force came up with. We didn't come up with the 20 percent. We were --

G. Slotsve: Percentages.

M. Streb: Yeah. We were told five categories.

G. Slotsve: We were given the weights for the criteria.

J. Stephen: And the models came from our standard cohort?

M. Streb: I didn't --

J. Stephen: Our model norms, your norms for your models – for your scores came from our standard cohort, Wednesday --

M. Streb: We didn't have – these are the criteria and the weights. If you all remember, you all had an opportunity, I think, to kind of weigh in on that at one point. The task force had nothing to do with that. The task force got: Here's the criteria that we want you to evaluate --

J. Stephen: No, the norm from the Snyder model.

M. Streb: Parker model – Chris Parker was somebody who created it. And essentially, what it allows us to do is it allows us to take the scores and transport it, put it onto a scatterplot.

M. Pickett: So it basically reconciles the categorization piece with the actual criterion. So we can have a way to take what we have from the criteria and have a way to put them in the actual categories. So that's what the Parker model is, is looking at the importance and performance of programs.

J. Stephen: No, I understand – misunderstanding about the scoring having been imported and comparative across other institutions.

M. Pickett: I don't know about that.

M. Streb: The development of the criteria were probably looked at by other institutions. My assumption is. We weren't involved in the creation of the criteria. Mark, you're on the coordinating committee.

M. Falkoff: The criteria were initially taken from the Dickinson book, many of you are familiar with that. Dickinson, who's the guy who laid out the idea of the Program Prioritization. He had a number of criteria that he suggested as a starting point. A number of schools have gone through this kind of process. And indeed what we did in the early stages is pulled together – Bill can talk about this too – we pulled together what we thought were exemplary criteria. And this went to the whole community. Everybody was invited to comment on the criteria, what you thought was appropriate, if you thought any were inappropriate. If you wanted to add any. APC [Academic Planning Council], RSB [Resources, Space and Budget Committee] got together and hashed through what criteria we would use, what the final language would look like and what percentages we would ultimately assign to each of the criteria before handing that off to the task force. So I don't know if that illuminates anything. But the whole community was involved in a lot of that. But a little while ago now.

M. Holt: Hi, I'm Matthew Holt, a representative of the Student Association and the [Student] Senate. In regard to the categories, I have two questions. The fourth point on requires transformation, what does that incur?

G. Slotsve: It's a fairly broad category. It could be many different things that are involved there. Maybe that you change an emphasis in a program. It could be that you're asking a program – maybe possible mergers. But we are not necessarily giving advice on that. Those are decisions that would be made by the senior administration.

M. Streb: Transformation – George said could be a couple things. Could be a program that's really important to the mission of the university but it's just not functioning well. So we need to transform it and we need it to function better. I think the real difference between the Academic Task Force and the Administrative Task Force is that we are looking at the entire administrative structure of the university, 236 programs. One of the things we find is that there are a lot of inefficiencies in the way we're doing things. Another way the transformation could occur is we might say we've read these four programs, right? And they all seem pretty similar to us. We're not experts in these four programs but we think someone who is an expert might want with to look in to see if there are ways to combine these or merge these or transform the way we do a certain function on campus.

G. Slotsve: To some extent that's going to be similar with the academic. There may be very similar programs that might be offered across the university, and it may make sense to say: Does the business school understand what's being offered in LA&S and does LA&S realize what's being offered at nursing and there may be synergies that will be available. So that could be part of the transformation as well.

M. Holt: In regard to the third point, reducing resources, if there has been any change to producing resources, what qualified for that and why?

M. Streb: A reduction in resources generally what we're thinking about is something that may be functioning fine but it probably isn't essential to the institution, right? And so, therefore, maybe our dollars are better spent elsewhere. One thing I would say is we have not been -- there are some task forces that have gone through this process and said we need to find \$1.5 million to give back with to the university or whatever. We have not been asked to do that. And so when we reduce resources, it can be reduces resources from a program that has a large budget, reducing dollars from a program that has a small budget. We're not considering the size of the budget when we're talking about should it be reduced. We're considering: Is it functioning well, how important is it to the university.

G. Slotsve: Essentially that's the same on the academic side. You could very easily have programs where you just got a large number of faculty and very few students currently and you might consider that for reduced resources, where you have other programs that are expanding and you'd like to see more faculty hired potentially in some of those programs would be an example.

M. Holt: Thank you.

M. Subramony: My name is Mahesh Subramony from Department of Management. You have five categories there, but when you really think about it, it's more like a normal curve, so it's 20, 60, 20 kind of a thing. So how far are you likely to deviate from the 20 percent specification? So could you live with 10 percent? Could you live with 8? Could you live with 18? In other words, how close is this an approximation of a forced grading or a vitality curve as opposed to, you know, judgment, which is basically what it is.

G. Slotsve: Yes. We're in our first pass-through on putting programs in, assigning each program to a category at this stage. We're about three quarters of the way through. We've still got to visit it a second time. So I don't think we, as a committee, we haven't put any rules that we've got to be 20 percent exactly or 22 or 18. So I can't address the question completely at this stage because we really haven't got to that point.

M. Streb: I think you're right. Some of this is arbitrary, right? You know, we can accept 18, 17, is 26 too much? I think the real benefit from this Program Prioritization is going to be the narrative we write; not so much the categorization we put a program in, but what we say about that program. And I think that is where you're really going to find a lot of the information that is going to really matter. I don't mean that the category doesn't matter, but more important, I think, than making sure you get, you know, 20, 20, 20, 20, 20, is that we've got the programs where they need to be, and if that means that we need to, you know, if we think we need to reduce more than 20 percent, that's what we'll do. We may decide that we're not going to enhance 20 percent because we really want to make sure that the programs that we think are important really are called out. Those are the types of things we're going through right now. But you're right, we've been told to be around 20, 20, 20. Nobody's told us exactly how much we can vary from that.

M. Subramony: Thank you from the clarification. Just looking in from outside, I think one of the key questions is going to be that of transparency and the clarity of communication to the other stakeholders. I mean, I think it's wonderful, I bet you're really working very hard. I think the key is to make sure that folks outside, such as us and, you know, people in the campus community, understand what you're really doing. And the fact that we got [inaudible] an objective mathematical model, because there's really nothing called a Parker model in nature. This is really essentially a way for you to make a judgment. And if that could be communicated in a sort of effective way, to the campus community along with the idea that there's a fairness in the process, which is really what you're going through, everybody reviewing everything kind of a thing. That would be my perspective.

M. Cefaratti: Department of accountancy. When I'm looking at the five categories and if I think about the 20 percent, or about there, whatever it comes out to be, if I look at categories 3, 4 and a half, I'll call it, and 5, 3, 4, and 5 could potentially be read into as programs that will have resources reduced.

M. Streb: Potentially, but one of the problems that we have is that these are not ordinal categories. I've argued for a long time that: I'm the chair of political Science. I'm not on the Academic Task Force, but of course I want to be in enhanced, right, that's where I'd ultimately want to end up. But if you're going to make me choose between being in reduced and transform, I'm going to take transform every day of the week because transform may very well mean you need more resources to function at a higher level. So, you're right, transform could mean we're going to find inefficiencies and make some cuts. But it also could mean this is an important program to the institution and it needs more funding. It just isn't performing. And enhanced would be this program is going really well and we need it to even perform better, we can give more resources to have it perform well. Transform is it's not functioning very well, we need it to function well so we might need to give it more resources.

M. Cefaratti: With that, then, I'm looking at about 40 percent of the programs may receive a reduction in resources, possibly, and I guess that's why we can kind of call I guess 4.5, because of the example that you just gave. So when I think about the categorization, just that 40 percent of programs may receive reduction in resources, is how we can interpret. Thank you.

M. Streb: Yeah, to go back to the gentleman's question back there, if we go back to the process and say, guess what, 80 percent of our programs are going in enhanced and sustained, we wasted everyone's time. Ultimately, we have to make difficult decisions. At the same time, does it have to be exactly 20, 20? No, we want to make sure we're making the right decisions and putting programs in places where they really need to be.

G. Long: A question.

R. Jacob: Rachel Jacob, Student Association. What's the prospective timeline from here on out in deciding the categories and when they're going to be announced?

G. Slotsve: Our final reports are due April 30, we will submit our final reports on April 30. And a few days thereafter, I think around May 2 I believe, is the date that we've heard they will be made public.

A. Clemens: On the Program Prioritization website it says on or about May 2 for release of the final report. On the Program Prioritization website, the Next Steps, that we'll be referencing or maybe referencing – I haven't seen the final slide set. But the next steps are detailed on the prioritization website. And that site indicates on or about May 2.

M. Pickett: Just to add, from that point, feedback will be taken from campus of the shared governance bodies so that that can be given to the administration. So when they're making their decisions about what our final report is and what they want to do with that, there will be feedback from campus.

R. Jacob: Thank you.

M. Pickett: You're welcome.

J. Stephen: Feedback after May 2?

M. Pickett: Yes.

J. Stephen: Before when?

M. Streb: Three weeks.

J. Stephen: Okay.

M. Holt: Forgive me for lack of knowledge, is this prioritization going to be something to continue into next year or perhaps doing something like a yearly review?

G. Slotsve: My understanding, I do not believe the decision has been finalized or formally made. There's been discussions of periodically going through this process. Whether that's every year, three years, or five years, I don't know. It has been discussed going forward.

M. Streb: That certainly isn't our decision to make.

M. Pickett: We don't believe that it will be yearly.

J. Stephen: I would suggest it's not cost effective.

M. Pickett: We don't believe it will be yearly, but probably three to five, something like that.

M. Holt: Thank you.

H. Bateni: In Health Sciences, we have departments that have several programs. By program, do you mean departments or programs?

G. Slotsve: Departments have many programs. As I said earlier, examples of programs would be if you offer a bachelor's degree, that would be a program. A master's would be another program. A Ph.D. would be a third program. A minor would be a program. Different certificates are each programs. So those are examples of programs. And the department then may have many different programs. A department may have two programs, a B.A. and a master's. It could have three programs. Some departments may have seven programs because they offer four certificates additionally or have minors, etc.

A. Clemens: I think it's important to recognize that, as an outcome of the process, we'll probably be discussing recommendations for how programs are defined. It's difficult to answer that question because they're defined inconsistently across departments across campus. There are programs with bachelor's programs with embedded minors and programs that have separated minors. Departments across campus have operationalized it differently. That's been one of the challenges in dealing, at the academic level, in determining how to deal with the individual programs and their alignment.

M. Streb: The Administrative Task Force, one of their recommendations will come out of this is we need clearer definitions of programs. On the administrative side we have programs – we have units – that have submitted 20 different narratives that probably could have submitted one. We've had units that have submitted one narrative that probably could have submitted 20. So we've had narratives – we've looked at five narratives that are essentially evaluating the same five people about how they spend their time doing their job. So I think that is really important that we have a much clearer understanding of what a program is going forward and I think we'll have some recommendations for that. But for right now it's not departments, it's a program.

M. Cefaratti: For category No. 4 that requires transformation, will the task force be giving guidance in terms of: When we considered this and categorized it as requiring transformation, we would like to see it like this. So that way there's some guidance in terms of what you thought of it. So if you categorize a program as requires transformation, you'll give additional: We think this is what the transformation should look like.

G. Slotsve: We will be commenting and try to give some additional information on that. As well I guess I should note that every program that's been evaluated, we are providing comments for. So every program will receive some comments back to try to summarize what the committee saw. So every program will be get that.

The outcomes – our role as I've already mentioned is advisory. Once the reports are written up and submitted, they will be submitted to senior leadership at the university. And it will be their responsibility to act upon the recommendations of the two committees. And I do not know if they're – I don't think they're bound by our decisions. Our role is just purely advisory and they will decide what to do at that point. As Alan has already mentioned, the next steps, is posted on NIU Today. So they've released what the next steps are. There's also a town hall scheduled with senior leadership for April 27 to try to explain some of the next steps and to take questions. Our role basically at that point will be finished, so we will no longer be involved. So at the town hall meeting, if you've got

further questions on how the information in the committees have provided, senior management, and how they plan on using that, that will be at the town hall we'll be able to address – they'll be able to address those issues.

So we'll be done – our work will deliver the final reports on April 30. The reports will be made publicly available around May 2, providing narratives for every program. Our reports, will be publicly available and as I recall, the program narratives that we actually are working from will also be publicly available. So you'll have the full information to go back and see the information we were given as committee members and had to go through and evaluate. So you also have that. When the report is released, on the website, it's my understanding there will be a feedback mechanism so you can comment on the reports and provide input, further input to the administration. And I believe there's a three-week period for that. I could be off half a week in there, but I think I read it was a three-week period for those responses.

J. Stephen: Another question. The administrative side of this task force got the charge to break the programs into 20 percent, 20 percent, 20 percent, 20 percent, quintiles. Slightly misleading, if I compared the Ph.D. program in mathematics to the certificate program, there's hardly anything to compare there. So I'm wondering on the administrative side, did your charge include – let's not say fine lines, let's say 18 to 22, or if you're comfortable 17 to 23 percent of the budget for support should lie in each of these quintiles for the programs?

M. Streb: That's an excellent question, and the answer is no. There are universities that have gone through this process, that have been given a charge to find a certain amount of money to reduce, let's say. We were not given that.

J. Stephen: I know that. Because \$1.5 million is not enough.

M. Streb: No, I understand, but hypothetically. We could literally come up with, you know, 20 percent of our programs that are put in review, that are going to save the university no money. Let me give you an academic --

J. Stephen: No, that's true, but you're here representing the administration, correct?

M. Streb: Right.

J. Stephen: But the administration must have had a financial goal here because you're not going to come out and say these 20 percent are the ones that they fall in category 5 but they're only going to save us about \$8,000, and up here we want to enhance these. There's got to be a financial push from somebody who's in an office upstairs from you on this.

M. Pickett: Right. So we were not given a dollar amount. We were mainly looking at the importance to the institution and the performance. Those are two things that we were looking at. And so there's no dollar amount that was told to us about how much to reduce or anything like that, or put in any type of categories. So we were not given that. Now, that might be a question that, when you go to the town hall, that might be a question to ask senior leadership. But I don't think that that's their intent either. I mean, it has implication about resource allocation.

J. Stephen: Of course it does.

M. Pickett: But it's not something that was directed and told to the task force of what they had to reduce, no.

J. Stephen: Okay. So in terms of goals on budget reduction, that's for the town hall. Ask them what their motives of what to do with your report is.

M. Pickett: Yes.

J. Stephen: Because it just spreads around culpability on this really.

A. Clemens: Just to be simple and blunt, we weren't given any directives with a specific economic target or economic impact to the reduction. We're simply scoring, categorizing the programs with regard to the objective modeling with the subjective of modification of the modeling. And then that gets turned over to senior leadership for incorporation into whatever financial model they're --

J. Stephen: And I guess we have to admit that it's going to have an economic impact somewhere. You guys just don't know what it's going to be.

A. Clemens: Right. And we were not given a charter, whether a percentage or a particular dollar figure to modify our results to satisfy some economic gain.

J. Stephen: Okay. Thank you.

M. Streb: We may look at a program and say, that program looks overstaffed, so therefore we expect you to reduce it; but we don't say how much you should reduce it or that type of thing.

J. Stephen: That makes sense, because I think of several programs that are understaffed.

M. Streb: Correct. And we also are looking at that as well. That would be likely a candidate for enhancement.

J. Stephen: Thank you.

M. Holt: I understand there's a Student Program Prioritization in the progress, correct?

M. Streb: Student Program Prioritization Task Force you mean?

M. Holt: Yes.

M. Streb: Yes.

M. Holt: Is that going to work in conjunction with yours?

M. Streb: The Student Program Prioritization Task Force will be similar to the University Council. When we release a report on May 2, the Student Program Prioritization Task Force will have an opportunity to respond to our reports like the University Council will and Faculty Senate or Operating Staff Council or whatever. Yeah.

M. Holt: What value does that response hold?

J. Stephen: Could I answer that? They do listen and you don't want to be doing what he does right now. But they do listen to the students on these big projects like this, because it's too painful if you don't.

M. Streb: Again, I think the important thing is this is advisory. One thing I'd say is we've had the luxury of looking at all our programs, which I think is really important. But it's certainly advisory, and I know the upper administration wants feedback from the various constituencies on campus. And even if you're just a political science professor not involved in Faculty Senate or whatever, you'll have the opportunity to respond to the reports. Marc, did you want to add more on that?

M. Falkoff: I'd like to add a little. Of course, what you're doing is advisory. What category a program ends up in is information that's created, that's going to be given to the ECB, the Executive Budget Committee. What's going to happen is after the task force report is released, the student body – because the students ask for an opportunity to provide some input into what was going on and you guys are putting together your committee, you're going to issue your own findings and recommendations – that's all going to go to the EBC. The deans and vice presidents are going to take all this information from the task forces, the rankings, the narratives, information collected from the website, comments from the community, the student report, and it's going to have all of that information at its disposal. It is going to work up – this is all, by the way, described in the NIU Today article which I recommend if you haven't looked at it yet – going to work up action plans. In light of these rankings and in light of the narratives and in light of the student reports, what are you going to recommend to happen to the programs within your purview? Ultimately, those decisions about what actually is going to happen and going to be made by the Executive Budget Committee and at least a representative of the APC [Academic Planning Council], a representative of the RSB [Resources, Space and Budget Committee] and perhaps some other shared governance representatives. And to the extent that there are going to be any kind of changes that require shared governance approval, those will have to go through the ordinary processes. So there's a lot of process that's still unwinding here. This is not the end game as of May 2.

G. Long: And I would make a note too as a heads-up, really encourage you to read the NIU Today article on next steps, because it does lay out what the plans appear to be. And also to call your attention to there is a bit of an a discrepancy between what we've endorsed and what next steps are listed. Because in next steps, we talked about the involvement of shared governance in this process, and it talks about a group made up of the Executive Budget Committee and representatives from NIU shared governance committees charged with providing budgetary recommendations to senior leadership. These committees are the Academic Planning Council and the Resources, Space and Budget Committee. But within both of those, it's the vice chair because the chair of the APC is Provost Freeman. So it would be the vice chair of the APC and the chair of RSB. On our annual

budget guidance document that we just endorsed, what we suggested is that that group is too limited and we suggested adding the executive secretary of University Council/Faculty Senate president, which is my position, the co-chairs, academic and administrative Program Prioritization task forces, the SPS Council president, Operating Staff Council president, Student Association president, and Speaker of the Student Association Senate. I wanted to bring that to your attention because there is a bit of a disagreement right now as far as the group that would be doing it. I know there's a push that we use what's in the NIU Today article. And from my standpoint I think there would be value in having the presidents of the various governance groups. Even though it adds to the complexity of the task, it provides a good representation of the constituencies, because as currently listed there are no staff or students represented, excuse me, on that Executive Review Board. And I think that potentially puts us in a difficult position to defend. So I'm just sharing my opinion on that. And I note that this is a process that's still unfolding. But there is a conflict between what we just endorsed as a Faculty Senate and what the next steps are as far as being looked at from the Program Prioritization Coordinating Team.

J. Stephen: Can I? The students that you had some questions about this. The administration can't even so much as demand we change a catalog description for a course. They may suggest we do a program, but to actually do these programmatic changes, if such are called for, that actually has to go through a whole bunch of committees and go to the University Council and everything. And a lot of shared governance on it. However, where the money goes, that's not a decision of the faculty. But they can't just arbitrarily do away with a major. If you see something important when you read that, pick your fights carefully and fight hard.

G. Long: Thank you. Any final questions? Any additional comments from our panel? Well, I would like to say thank you very, very much for coming and answering the questions. I found it was very helpful. I appreciate the transparency, the honesty. I know this is going to be an ongoing challenge for all of us, but I think we're up to the task.

B. Faculty Unionization

P. Stoddard: As many of you I'm sure are aware, there are reps of the union on campus who are in the process of trying to sign people up to join the union. One of them visited me this week. I asked him some questions about the process. I believe he said they have about 200 people signed up already; they need 340 before it takes effect. So this is something that is coming. Most of us may have met with these people but we have not had any sort of campus wide discuss on this process. Before it becomes finalized, I thought it might be a nice idea if the Senate could host an information session where we could invite people pro and con to come talk and make themselves available for questions.

G. Long: I'm certainly open to that. I will acknowledge that, prior to today's meeting, I did spend about an hour and a half in a conversation with one of the union organizers because I'm trying to get some information. You have to understand, in my position, I'm neither pro nor con. My job is to facilitate the will of the body so I'm not pushing pro-union, anti-union, please understand. But I did want to talk and find out a little more information. Paul is correct from the standpoint of the earlier card, the commitment card that came around. The union rep said that absolutely that was just, in fact, a survey and there are cards coming around now that are actually card checks. And they

require two signatures, one to indicate your interest and the other to basically say I am willing to pay my dues. Those are coming around, being shared at this point.

P. Stoddard: They look like this.

G. Long: Right, the nice thing about them is that they are very clear. The concern that was raised about the earlier survey is that there was some, people were uncertain as to what it meant. So I tried to do my due diligence to find out. And, even with that, come to find out that that was a survey card and the commitment card is the one that's being sent around now. But it's very clear in terms of what you're signing for.

As far as responding to Paul's question on a town hall meeting, we could certainly ask for that. My sense from the discussion I had was that the preference was for them to meet in smaller groups, more individually. One could always argue that in a town hall meeting, if you are an untenured professor, are you comfortable saying certain things vs. others. We could certainly ask. I think there's value in having an open discussion on this. But that would be up to them as far as their openness to do this, and they have reasons pro and con not to.

J. Manning: I think it's really important that we have the town hall meeting, especially a meeting where, you know, I'm not worried about tenure/tenure-track, that sort of thing. I'm more worried about getting the people who have been floating out pro or anti-union stuff in the same room because it's kind of magical how sometimes when you get both sides in the same room, you get closer to that magical truth. People are more careful about what they say and how they say it. I think this is a really important decision that faculty have to make here. I know a lot of us are uncertain and don't know how to see or where to proceed or what it means to sign a certain card. And I think those things can be resolved at a meeting where people can show up. They can ask their questions and we can learn a little more about what this means. Because this is such a big endeavor. There is so much uncertainty; it could benefit us all or it could hurt us all.

So with that I would like to move that we as a Faculty Senate move forward in arranging some sort of town hall mtg that will allow for questions to be answered about the union process by all interested parties who believe they should have a place on the floor as determined by the organizers of that meeting.

J. Hathaway: Second.

J. Stephen: I think that's a good idea. I'd like to know what the younger faculty members feel like because I may retire before we get a union established here. Well, I might, I don't know. 30 and out, I can do it.

M. Cefaratti. I have a question about the town hall meeting and the union representatives that we invite. There has been a single union, from my understanding, going around and getting support from faculty. Should we reach out, what makes this the best union if we do unionize as opposed to otherse. Are there other unions out there? Do we consider both those who have an anti union stance, those who have a pro union stance, but also within the pro union stance, getting information on multiple unions because I think there's a choice in what union represents us.

P. Stoddard: this is something that I talked a little bit about with the fellow who visited me. The people on campus are the United Faculty Alliance and apparently they're affiliated with UPI, which is University Professionals/professors, I think; IFT which is Illinois Federation of Teachers, and they're affiliated with the American Federation of Teachers, and the AAUP. And as far as I know, those are the unions and I think they are all working together on this.

M. Cefaratti: Ok. Thank you.

G. Long: One thing I would say and, again, checking my bases to prepare for this mtg, I did get feedback from general counsel on this and in looking at procedural rules for special meetings of the faculty senate, there appears to be no prohibition on calling a special meeting to provide information related to unionization pros and cons, but with this following limitation: that NIU cannot prohibit or encourage unionization or union activities. So we can call something but we may not be seen as prohibiting or discouraging or opposing or supporting in any particular manner. So information can be shared but we have a limitation of we will not have a discussion where we say that, as a senate, we vote this way or that, because that is not our purview.

J. Manning: I just want to be clear that what I'm proposing would not be like a town hall debate or not an argument, but would be more like: I don't understand how do dues work? What does this mean in terms of how we interact with administration. So this would strictly be informational. Of course all information is rhetorical. But the idea ... are trying to gain more information about what's going on other than...

J. Hathaway. I just want to add that I agree that we should have an informed a discussion. I'll even register my concern that there's pro and anti when we just haven't had a forum for discussion, and not all of us have been approached and had conversations, so I'm very much in favor of having a forum for informed discussion.

M. Cefaratti: How do we know that when they really hit 200 or 340 signatures. Is there some type of assurance process to look at the cards that have been signed?

G. Long: It's my understanding that once they get a sufficient number of cards signed then they take it to the universeity. Both sides switch lists and comparisons are made.

M. Cefaratti: So there is some type of external confirmation?

G. Long: Yes, correct.

J. Stephen: a simple majority, they're not going to spend a lot of effort...it has to be more than 50 percent and it has to be verified.

G. Long: So we do have a motion on the floor. Do we have any other comments.

J. Stephen: Move the question.

G. Long: Move the question? Okay. So our motion is to request a town hall meeting for further discussion of unionization, pros and cons. Is that --

P. Erickson: I have part of it on the screen but I didn't get all of it.

J. Manning: Town hall meeting that -- process. Maybe since this meeting is intended to be informational nature.

The clarified motion: Motion that FS move forward in arranging some sort of town hall meeting that will allow questions to be answered about the unionization process. This meeting is intended to be information in nature.

G. Long: All right, so we all good on the question here? All right. Just want a clicker or voice vote?

Unidentified: Voice.

G. Long: Comfortable with voice vote on this? All in favor?

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Opposed?

G. Long: Abstain? All right, very good. Is there anything else for the good of the cause today? Any additional comments, questions, concerns?

[The motion passed.]

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

- A. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council
- B. [Minutes](#), Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee
- C. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board
- D. [Minutes](#), Board of Trustees
- E. [Minutes](#), Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
- F. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
- G. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience
- H. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum
- I. [Minutes](#), General Education Committee
- J. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council
- K. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council Curriculum Committee
- L. [Minutes](#), Honors Committee
- M. [Minutes](#), Operating Staff Council
- N. [Minutes](#), Supportive Professional Staff Council
- O. [Minutes](#), Undergraduate Coordinating Council
- P. [Minutes](#), University Assessment Panel

- Q. [Minutes](#), University Benefits Committee
- R. [Minutes](#), Univ. Comm. on Advanced and Nonteaching Educator License Programs
- S. [Minutes](#), University Committee on Initial Educator Licensure

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

J. Stephen: Move to adjourn.

G. Long: I bet we have a second.

P. Stoddard: Second.

G. Long: Thank you.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.