

FACULTY SENATE MEETING TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, April 27, 2016, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Anderson, Arado, Baker, Beamer, Bishop, Brubaker, Carlson, Cefaratti, Chakraborty, Demir, Downing, Dugas, Farrell, Fredericks (for Rosenbaum), Gilson, Grund, Hathaway, Hou, Irwin, Jaekel, Jaffee, Kidder, Kim, Konen, Long, Macdonald, Manning, Martin, May, McHone-Chase, Millis, Mirman, Montana, Moraga, Naples, Nejd, Novak, Patro, Pavkov, Pitney, Riley, Ryu, Sagarin, Schatteman, Shin, Siegesmund, Slotsve, Staikidis, Stoddard, Streb, Subramony (for Mooney), Than, VanderSchee, Xie

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Abdel-Motaleb, Allori, Bateni, Bujarski, Campbell, Chen, Conderman, Deng, Glatz, Goldenberg, Hunt, Khoury, Lee, Mooney, Penrod, Rodgers, Rosenbaum, Saborio, Scherer, Stephen, Thu,

OTHERS PRESENT: Bryan, Doederlein, Falkoff, Haji-Sheikh, Holt, Jacob, Klaper

OTHERS ABSENT: Bulta, Gebo, Hoffman, Nicholson, Shortridge, VandeCreek

I. CALL TO ORDER

G. Long: Good afternoon. I know we're getting a couple minutes' late start but I have to say thank you all very much for showing up on such a crappy day. That you're here is a good testament to your integrity and willingness to serve. Thank you very much. This is our last Faculty Senate meeting of this academic year, so again, congratulations and again thank you to all of you for your service this year. I know when we've got times of no salary increases and merit ratings that are oftentimes somewhat meaningless to continue this work is important and necessary. I recognize that and thank you for doing it. So the meeting is call to order.

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

G. Long: I need a motion to adopt our agenda. We have no walk-in items. So we have a motion to accept the agenda? Sean, okay. Richard, second. All in favor? All right.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Okay. We have an agenda.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 30, 2016 FS MEETING

G. Long: Next we move on to approval of the minutes of the March 30 meeting. I need a motion to accept the minutes.

T. Arado: So moved.

J. Hathaway: Second.

G. Long: Any corrections, changes, additions, anything to the minutes? Okay, all in favor?

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Opposed? Abstain? Okay, we approve the minutes.

IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION

G. Long: Now for all of you who just sat down, most of you will be able to stay, but we're going to need to go into executive session. I need a motion so we can move? George. Need a second. Sarah, okay.

G. Long: All the non-members must leave the room. We'll go outside the door. Going to hear a report from Cathy Doderlein on the evaluation of the President of the Faculty Senate and then also hear a report on the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor. So all of the non-members and myself included will need to leave the room right now.

Unidentified: What counts as a member?

G. Long: As far as members, we're putting it up there, the list. Those are our members. So with that, I will turn it over to Cathy.

- A. Report from the Committee to Evaluate the President of Faculty Senate/
Executive Secretary of University Council – Cathy Doederlein
- B. Report from the Committee to Evaluate the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor –
Katy Jaekel

V. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

G. Long: Okay, I'm expecting at this point we can move forward, right? Going on to No. V, President's Announcements. Just wanted to provide some reassurance. If you weren't at the Town Hall meeting immediately prior to the senate meeting, Al Phillips did make another statement with regard to our budget situation. He reiterated that there are no plans for furloughs or layoffs at NIU. And confident that we've got ourselves positioned to make it through the fall regardless of the budget passage.

And also as a heads-up, probably most of you already know this, but earlier in the week, Governor Rauner did sign a stopgap funding measure. \$600 million was allocated to higher education. The majority of that is going toward public universities. Out of the \$600 million, \$356 million goes to universities, \$74 million goes to community colleges, and \$170 is for MAP grants. So it keeps places afloat through the summer. From an administration standpoint, there's obviously significant

concern that we still have the rest of the year to get through. We're at this point even with the money, dealing with about 30 percent of our typical allocation from the state. So there's concern and it limits the ability to do any future planning. So just did want to give you a heads-up on that.

NIU from this legislation is going to receive is approximately 30 percent of last year's appropriations which is \$26 million. And the MAP grants will receive about 43 percent of what's needed to fund the FY16 award. We're getting some progress, but there's still much to be done. Any questions about that?

M. Holt: I'm a lobbyist that works with the Student Association. I would just like all of you to know that this stopgap funding isn't something that we're satisfied with. It was almost like a slap in the face because we went there lobbying for Bill 2043 which was going to fund all appropriations for MAP grants, all appropriation for community colleges and all appropriations for higher education, such as NIU. That's not what we got. We got a stopgap funding. We're going to go back there in the summer, we will be there this week, we will be there next week until we get funding. So I would like you all to know we're not giving up and we won't give up until we get our funding. Thank you.

G. Long: I'd like to say thank you very much for your efforts. Certainly we would agree with your position that this is not sufficient, it is merely a stopgap. It doesn't help us plan, it just delays the inevitable if we don't get back to this again. Agree. Thank you. Anyone else want to comment on this?

Okay I would like to offer my thanks to those individuals who participated in program prioritization. There was a meeting immediately prior to our senate meeting where president, provost, task force chairs gave a bit of an update. The reports are going to be available for distribution Monday the 2. Anticipation is mid afternoon around 3 p.m. So check out the program prioritization website. Certainly everyone is encouraged to read, review, provide feedback and comments on them. They are coming out. And for those individuals in this room who had leadership roles in this or were task force member the, or participated in any way, I say thank you. I'm very anxious to see what the reports say, but I know the approach taken was one with integrity and stewardship in mind. Be interested to see like the rest of you what they find out. Barbara?

B. Jaffee: I had raised a question in that meeting. Some of you might have been there, but I thought I might raise it again in this body because I'm just curious, frankly, how other people feel about this. But one of the points that came out of that meeting was, as you said, there will be an opportunity for feedback and response. Provost Freeman made the point that one reason for feedback might be concerns about underlying misunderstanding in the interpretation of the data. I'm going to go ahead and call it a mistake, because I think you know there are mistakes in the data that we are all familiar with. Those of us who filled out those program reviews know that there were mistakes that can, and probably will, lead to misunderstandings. So I'm thrilled that we will have an opportunity to respond, but what occurred to me in that meeting – I didn't realize that the task force report will include the quintile distribution, and that will become public information on Monday when those reports are uploaded. So in the case of a ranking or sorting of a program, based on an underlying misunderstanding, that may be or may not be corrected during the feedback period, that will nevertheless be public information. And if a program is listed as a candidate for reduced

funding, it will impact that program. I imagine in a worst-case scenario, but that's what I do, that it will impact the ability of such a program to recruit students. And if it's based on a misunderstanding or mistake, where does that leave us?

G. Long: Anyone want to respond to that? So the concern, if I can summarize it real quickly, is when the reports are distributed, the programs will be put into categories, you mentioned quintiles but I think they're trying to use candidate for increased funding, candidate for no funding changes. They've got the five categories. And so by listing them, the question, if I'm understanding correctly Is, let's say my program, allied health rehab counseling, is identified as a program for possible elimination. If I'm a student looking at that or am a faculty considering a position here, I might look at that and say: I don't want to go there because this program is in the bottom category. Is that your concern on this, particularly if it's based on some incorrect information?

B. Jaffee: My concern is if it's based on incorrect information, exactly. Yes.

G. Long: And I would say the only response I would have to that – perhaps any of the task force members may be able to clarify this – but I would assume that most anyone who is a program author will be on their computer Monday afternoon wanting to look at what the reports have to say. I can't imagine many people are going to let those sit long. The hope would be that, if you're the program author, you go immediately and look at it. And if there are problems, or mistakes, misunderstandings, however you want to look at that, then those get put in right away as feedback.

J. Manning: I've heard at two different meetings, this is a clarification question I guess. The comments that authors or other people make, there will be like a forum and that deans have been asked to specifically pull from those comments to try to clarify maybe any misunderstandings, or pitch arguments as to why something might be reconsidered, is that correct is?

G. Long: To the best – yes? Yes, it is. Just double-checking can my task force chairs. Yes.

J. Manning: I hear your concerns for sure is about you know, moving forward based on incorrect information but it really does seem like there's a process in place that if there is incorrect information, we'll have a public or semi-public opportunity to correct that.

G. Long: There will be. But your concern is valid from the standpoint point of – but if you're looking at this and you don't know the process and you're just looking at it, it may look bad. So that's a legitimate concern.

B. Jaffee: My concern is how it might affect the ability of a program to recruit students for next year and beyond.

G. Long: Right.

M. Streb: Are you saying you would prefer the task force report, you would like the narratives to only be available to university members? Or you have to know you're in a certain category to respond is to that. So how

B. Jaffee: Right. I guess what I – in thinking about how – what kind of corrective could be applied, it might be to say that these quintiles not be public information until after the feedback, tiered, yes.

G. Long: Does anyone else have a comment on this?

M. Streb: We have no input in that decision. Want to be clear – want to make sure

B. Jaffee: It's not a hypothetical. I mean, I know of a particular error that originated – in ways that isn't anyone's fault, particularly, but, nevertheless is an error. I'm sure there are many others across the programs. So, I mean, this is going to happen, it seems to me.

G. Long: No, I suspect you're probably right. I don't have an answer for it, but I suspect your concerns are that there will be changes that get made, there will be corrections that get addressed – I mean mistakes that get addressed. Meghann?

M. Cefaratti: Is there a way that we could request that this only be made public to the university community, as Professor Streb indicated, or was talking about, rather than the public-public? Could we ask?

G. Long: As the Faculty Senate, if we felt we wanted to share our perspective on that, we certainly could. As a protocol, at this point, I suspect as far along as they are, it may – the train may have already left the station. It may be too late. But if we as a group thought that that was important to convey, you know, that's – we have that right to do that. I just don't know that it's going to – it's probably not going to change anything given the process right now in place.

B. Jaffee: I would certainly support a recommendation like that. I think I've been paying as close attention to this process as anyone, and yet I did not know until today that these quintiles would be public information as of Monday. I just learned that today.

M. Falcoff: Hi. Just for what it's worth, I hear what you're saying, Barbara, and understand where you're coming from. I've already asked this question of Carolinda. Again, it's just something that maybe the prioritization coordinating group wants to think about. I don't know whether the train has left the station. I think it's worth talking about, and I've already tried to start that conversation. That's not official action, but I don't know if that makes you feel better, but I hear where you are avenue coming from.

M. Holt: It was brought up that these – to decide or perhaps call the question that we might want to just release this information to the NIU community. But I was just curious what did you mean by the NIU community? Do you mean just the faculty and staff, or the students as well, because there are blurred lines here that I'm confused about.

G. Long: Yeah. Let me ask Matt or George. Do you happen to know from a definition of university community, I'm assuming that includes students' access to this as well?

G. Slotsve: I don't know. I assume anybody who has a university email.

G. Long: That's my assumption as well. But in terms of being official and telling you, I do not know that answer.

M. Holt: Well, in response to that, if that is the case, then if we would want to give it to the teachers and faculty first to see their responses to the reports, and then to the students and the rest of the public, because if we're just giving it to the university community, that is going to go into the public if it is going to students as well. So changing it just to the university community wouldn't necessarily change too much of the outcome. I think that possibly making a decision to change it just to the faculty members first would be a better choice.

G. Long: Others?

T. Pavkov: My recollection is the program prioritization website has some capability or functionality in there that not everything was accessible to the general public. There was password protected sorts of capabilities there. Maybe it is the plan to put it behind that, park it, and that's not been verbalized as such. But it would seem to me that it would be a fairly mechanical process to locate those reports in a particular area of that website that, you know, if you have an NIU password and log on, that you could access them, and do it that way.

G. Long: Others? Jimmie.

J. Manning: Yeah. More to Professor Jaffee's concerns, it might also be a good idea, in addition to having a discussion or passing a message higher up regarding access, to talk about public relations and how this is presented to the community. I know as an undergraduate program director, a lot of the questions I get are not necessarily NIU specific but are more: Is it worth going to a school in the State of Illinois right now? And I know that sometimes NIU has had materials that I could use to point out that we're not going to collapse at least in the immediate future. Maybe something along those lines for this could be helpful, especially for specific programs on how do I address this with people should they hear. My hunch is that a lot of people really won't be tuned in on this outside of the university, but, if they were, it would be nice to have answers.

G. Long: Thank you. Sean.

S. Farrell: I'd like to support Barbara's original point. I think making the kind of placement of different programs and their location within the quintile structure there, making that immediately public undermines the kind of process of review and reevaluation and departments' and programs' ability to respond very severely, actually. And I, like Barbara, have been following this quite closely and this is the first I've heard of it. And very concerned would be a diplomatic way to say it.

G. Long: Bill?

W. Pitney: I think it might be important to think about the data, the use of the data in the narratives. I think every program had an opportunity to examine any institutionally uploaded data. If there were any disconnects or inconsistencies with the local program data, we could speak to that in our narratives and upload our own data for review by the task forces. So I think the task forces that were assembled had some folks with a good spirit of the process and made the best decisions they could

in relation to the whole presentation, not just the institutional data. So I don't know that I have the same concern. I think also we got to look at it from both sides, right? So if programs are in the upper quintile, right, and are going to get more resources, perhaps that would encourage more students to come to NIU for those particular programs. So I think there's two ways of looking at the issue.

B. Jaffee: I would just say in response to that, that I prefaced my remarks by saying they were not a hypothetical. I have a very specific instance in mind that I think without, you know, sharing it, I am not sure that that's useful. But my point is that there is at least one set of circumstances in which everyone acting in good faith could nevertheless have produced a mistake rather than a misunderstanding.

G. Long: So if I'm going to summarize this, are we asking to have a motion to publicly request that the – I mean to request that the initial categorization of programs is not made public until X period of time when people have had a chance to review it? From an actionable standpoint, what are we asking here?

M. Streb: Greg, just a point of clarification to Matthew's [Holt] point: Students will have access to the narrative.

G. Long: Okay, so students will have access to the narrative.

M. Falkoff: I think what we want is for it to go behind the same kind of password protection that the task force narratives will be behind. So, yes, anything could be found by anyone who's determined, but it's not advertising this to the entire world.

G. Long: Right. Rich?

R. Grund: If I may, I just want some clarification also. In the town hall meeting that we were in earlier this afternoon, I completely understand the point and I'm thinking about it too. However, the feedback process finishes on May 23. I may have missed it where there would be a reranking. So if there actually was a reranking, at which point if that's specific date we would say can we publish to the public what that ranking is at that date? But I haven't heard there is an actual date or a process for an actual reranking. Is that correct? In that case, the request would have no merit or bearing anyway.

M. Streb: I'm not so sure that we're ever going to see a reranking. I think the task force is going to give a report and I'm going to find out if political science has been cut when I find out if Political Science has been cut. I'm not sure I'm going to see a response to the task force report. That's something that we would like, but I'm not sure that that's what the intent is.

G. Long: Thank you. Others? Do you want to make a motion and have a specific statement from the Faculty Senate? Do you want me to simply – we've got two of the four task force chairs in this room – to have them convey that forward? How would you like to handle this from here?

V. Naples: I would like to see the Faculty Senate make a formal statement regardless of whether it will affect the outcome or not. I think Faculty Senate far too often does not take a position on things that would be appropriate for us to do, and I just like to see us do it.

G. Long: Okay, so is that a motion?

V. Naples: I will make a motion, but I don't know the correct wordsmithing that needs to be done.

G. Long: Okay, so we're making a motion to basically suspend the distribution of the quintile information until after – I mean the categorization information – until after programs have had a chance to review them, is that what we're asking? I'm needing clarification.

B. Jaffee: Maybe what we need to do is express our strong concern about the potential detrimental effect of the categorization information on programs given that the rankings – the categories – may be based on misunderstandings.

G. Long: Uh-huh, Meghann?

M. Cefaratti: I'm trying to think of wording. Could we word something that said: We recommend the initial release of the reports on May 3 be made to the NIU community only, and not to the public. Then we would need to define the NIU community as the young man pointed out over there.

G. Long: So we've got a motion on the floor from Professor Naples. Do we have a second? I know we're still working on the wording, but...

J. Novak: I second using the wording that she gave.

G. Long: Okay.

J. Novak: Is that what you need?

G. Long: Yes. So John Novak has – so the wording Meghann provided. Sarah, please.

S. Klaper: I'm Sarah Klaper, University Ombudsperson. I'm not allowed to give legal advice. In theory, however, I believe it's all FOIAable anyway after it's released. So just FYI, it's all FOIAable. So under the Freedom of Information Act, the final report is.

G. Long: Okay.

J. Manning: I would just like to add, that's why I think it's good to send along some verbiage even if it's not a part of this motion that the university stand ready to respond. I can't imagine they don't have that already, but, again, this is a place to use our voice to try to get that message across that we are concerned and we do want with to make sure that any program that might be received negatively isn't tanked by the release of the report if that makes sense.

G. Long: Absolutely. So are we going to do this as a formal motion? Do we just – we've got, again, two of the task force chairs here. I certainly have contacts with, you know, the individuals on the committee. Do we want to do this formally as a motion? Or not? I mean, we've had a second. I guess we should actually call the question. Sean?

S. Farrell: Either we word it more tightly than that, with concern around the – or I think we work more informally sending a message through you, through the chairs, to express concern about this notion that the quintile rankings will immediately be available publicly about programs. And I'm not so concerned about the kind of division between NIU and the NIU community and public. I guess I'm a little surprised that, for example, if history or history MA program is ranked in transformation or in elimination mode, I'm a little surprised that my colleagues in anthropology would know that before I had a chance to respond to the arguments that I believe, to reflect Bill's comment. I mean, I believe everybody has worked damn hard and in good faith. I'm not challenging that. Just the mode of delivering this information immediately concerns me.

G. Long: So you would suggest a little more caution as far as: As we're putting this out, don't have it be as publicly available, particularly regarding the categorization of programs.

S. Farrell: The particular concern I would have or the location of programs in these quintiles being made publicly available kind of to everybody on campus, various programs, before the programs themselves have a chance to evaluate and respond to the arguments made in the report.

G. Long: Okay, Virginia?

V. Naples: I'm scribbling down some partial language to try to make this a little bit more direct. Could we use a motion something like: Faculty Senate would like to express its concern and ask that publicizing the initial quintile rankings because they could be detrimental to programs before the final rankings are determined?

G. Long: Okay. Mark?

M. Falkoff: I think there's a misconception that there's an appellate process in play and that there's going to be a reranking. That's not what's happening. What's happening is the task force did its job and they spent a lot of time doing it. First of all, it's – as I understand it – not really even a ranking per se, but the programs will be in quintiles. And then the categories: The programs will have an opportunity to respond to their placement in those categories and have an opportunity to have an effect on how that information is going to be used. But today is the first I have ever heard of anyone even suggesting that there's going to be a reranking or that this is a nonfinal ranking. I just don't think that's in the cards.

G. Long: I have not heard any discussion on that account either. Matt?

M. Holt: If and when we release this information, I would suggest that, when we release the information, we let people know that this is just advising, that the program prioritization isn't something set in stone by saying that they want to eliminate or reduce funding for programming or increase funding. It is just advising that is going on. It is not something that is set in stone. I think

people reading it, faculty, students alike should know that when they read this unless that is already something that we're doing. I just want the faculty to also know that that is advisory.

G. Long: Thank you.

G. Baker: I still have a little bit of concern about the quality of the argument that's being made. The process of program prioritization was an objective process, a data driven process. We had data that we knew was wrong, and we fixed it. We had data that was incomplete, we expanded it. We had an opportunity within the department to vet the data. The institution had provided to correct that data, to expand it with external sources of information that we had. That was very objective, very data driven. This process – the discussion that's going on – strikes me in the absence of specifics to be subjective. It lacks the objective quality of argument that is normally applied to processes. And also there are many processes that occur out there where it's publicly available and sometimes you have to retract the information. Like teachers are RIFed, for example, at school districts and they make that publicly accessible at board meetings and so forth. And if an error is made, then they have to retract that. It's process that they go through. The process we went through with program prioritization as authors was objective, it was data driven. We had the opportunity to fix errors. I agree with Bill Pitney, for example. But in the absence of specifics, I understand there may be a point, but it strikes me as a subjective foundation. I'm not seeing the quality of the argument.

B. Jaffee: I'm actually not going to go into the specifics of it, but an error was made, which will create a misunderstanding. I don't think there's any way around that. I have talked to people who are – I became aware of it a week ago and immediately tried to find ways that it could be remediated. But we are well beyond that point. There is objectively an error that occurred, and people who are in a position to judge mistake versus misunderstanding have acknowledged that there was a mistake. So I don't know. I mean, maybe part of the reason I'm not interested in divulging the specifics is because I do think even if it were an entirely hypothetical argument, that it's possible to imagine similar kinds of cases in other areas without the specifics of this particular case.

M. Streb: Although a concern – we were bound by confidentiality so it concerns me that there is a specific example out there that has been shared with somebody. That bothers me. I guess I would just reiterate Sarah's point that, when we release the task force report, it is FOIAable, and it will be FOIAed. There's no doubt in my mind. I'm for whatever gets me fewer phone calls on Monday. If that means it's only released to the university community, that will be great. But I do think in some ways, it will be FOIAed and released some way, Monday or a couple days later.

G. Long: The overall release is almost inevitable, particularly once I get access to it as a faculty member, what's to stop me from sharing with others or so forth. I appreciate the point that it's a delay at best. Yes, Todd.

T. Gilson: I think those are good points mentioned. The only other thing I can really add to that that we might want to consider is it seems like if something becomes secret, or even illegal or something we don't want to engage in, it becomes all that more attractive. So for us to maybe hide those reports actually may cause more interest in them by the outside. I might use the example I've heard

the example of if tomorrow a federal law came down saying it was illegal to brush your teeth, I'm pretty sure we all go in the bedroom, shut the door and brush our teeth, because it was Cool. That would be my point is that we might actually draw a little more scrutiny by holding it with ourselves.

G. Long: Exactly, thanks.

M. Konen: I've heard the word, "transparency," more times from people in this room in the last year than I have any other group in my life. And now we're talking about not showing part of a report. That's just crazy. There's going to be bad parts to this and good parts and, as mentioned before, there's a system to deal with this if you think something's erroneous in it. But I think if we start picking and choosing what we don't want reported, we set ourselves up for a nightmare.

G. Long: Thank you. Janet.

J. Hathaway: I agree. I think the report will come out whether it's FOIAed or whatever, and I think getting ahead of the message, providing enough context. I think there's enough confusion about whether or not there's rankings or not. I remember Matt Streb saying these are categories, it's not actually rankings, and we're still using the word quintiles. So, I think getting ahead of the message and handling our own message and providing sufficient context if people decide to – from the outside – look at how we have categorized all of these programs. I doubt that it's the first thing that people will be looking for and I have looked at other university's web sites to try to find their program prioritization website or wherever they kept the information, and I had to search a little bit. I don't think it's going to be front and center.

G. Long: The casual peruser is not going to find it. Jimmie?

J. Manning: I wanted to jump off that again. I know I probably sound like a broken record. That's why I think the public relations is important, not just for the external community but for the internal community as well, to make sure that people really know what this represents. And I have to agree, if somebody said we're just going to send this to department chairs, imagine how furious all of us in this room who are not department chairs would be, right? We want to know what's going on. I think we waited long enough. So let Monday come, but let people be educated about what Monday means.

G. Long: Okay.

M. Holt: It's my understanding it wasn't really about transparency and not being, trying to hide things from people. Rather if you picture the program prioritization as an almost finished project and the public being almost like your boss, you're not going to send them an unfinished project or something that you think might have errors when you think there might be work to be done. So send it to faculty members and department chairs to review the reports. Get back to the program prioritization so they can fix any errors, if there are errors or complaints. And then send it out to the public as the finished product, not being non-transparent but just giving the public what they deserve.

G. Long: It appears we have a variety of opinions.

S. Farrell: I'm convinced actually by Matt and Janet and others about the process. I guess my own confusion on this is just kind of the suddenness, I guess. As somebody who has been paying attention to this thing, the sudden awareness, all of a sudden, that this is going to be more broadly available in one's location within the categories. It's going to make its appearance to more people than I had originally thought. So I think this does speak to talk to a communications or public relations problem, I think this discussion reflects the kind of huge concern I have about the aftermath of prioritization in terms of morale, and confusion about the process, and the lack of clarity, and the fact that suddenly everybody hears this about this is going to be out Monday sows confusion. I'm persuaded by these various arguments. I think it's very true. it's better to get this out there and respond tactically and more effectively and with more effective arguments. But it does reflect, I think, a confusion about this process and the suddenness with which we heard about it. Thank you.

G. Long: Thank you. Any other final comments on this? We have a motion on the floor. Can we go back and – how are we stating the motion? It's hard enough running this, let alone figure out how we're stating the motion. Pat, do you have anything?

J. Manning: Point of personal privilege, could we put the actual motion up so we can see what we're voting on?

G. Long: Yes. Patience for just a moment. Technology is wonderful when it works. There we go. So now with the language that Meghann had offered so we'll have it to look at.

M. Falkoff: Can I say something while the typing is happening? I just want to say, as far as the transparency is concerned, there was an NIU Today article can about what was going to happen with the task forces releasing the reports. That was in March, the end of March. And I believe everything that we know today was in that article as well. I guess with the one exception, which I hadn't actually thought about, there was a statement that we would be posting the task force reports to the website. It wasn't clear whether it would be password protected, which is not insignificant. But I just wanted to mention that.

G. Long: Right, thank you. Could you make that bigger? So Meghann, what do we need to finish as far as that statement up there?

M. Cefaratti: I'm open to smithing if somebody else has a better way to say.

T. Arado: Today is May 2.

G. Long: Yeah. So, Jimmie?

J. Manning: I am just concerned that this – I hear what Professor Naples said earlier about getting our voice across but not making it available to the public would clearly go against the law. And to the freedom of information and I think we all support the freedom of information, or I hope we do.

B. Jaffee: What if we asked for, recommended that the report be considered preliminary rather than final so that we're not objecting to a final report being made public. Is there – I don't – I'm not making a recommendation because I honestly don't really see what the way forward is, and yet I am still quite concerned.

M. Streb: It is a final report. I can tell you after May 2. But I think a better point, that goes back to what I think Matt was saying, if we want to make very clear on this, this is advisory, right? And even an advisory body and other people well above our pay grade will be making decisions on what we as -- the suggestions of --

G. Long: Yeah, the task forces are done, once these reports are -- next Monday, we thank you for your effort and work, but you need to be off the hook. Right. All right, here's the thing. I think we should call the question because we do have other business to take care of. At the very least, though, even if the motion doesn't pass, if you would, I think that the discussion we've had in this room is very valuable and I will certainly convey the sentiment further up. And certainly George and Matt have heard it as well.

M. Falkoff: If there's a chance that this language passes, I don't think it's very politic. The sentiment I entirely understand. I don't think anyone wants to make sure the public doesn't read these things. The concern is broadcasting this to the public at large and inviting them to think about the low categorized program. So rather than saying we're trying to keep it from the public, which is not what we're trying to do, the recommendation could be something along the lines of: We'd like the task force reports to be released in the same manner as the program prioritization narratives, with password protection.

G. Long: There you go.

M. Falkoff: And implicit, recognizing of course it's FOIAable. You can print it out and show it to your brother.

G. Long: Okay so, how about that change to the wording? Richard?

R. Siegesmund: Could we say the report is advisory? The release of the advisory reports? Because these are an advisory report. It's not a final report.

G. Long: Okay.

B. Jaffee: Maybe we could say something about we're concerned about the release of a report that is still subject to feedback and reconsideration. We're concerned about the widespread distribution of a report that has yet to go through a process of feedback and reconsideration.

G. Long: Okay.

B. Jaffee: I mean, that's what I am. I am concerned about that.

G. Long: Right. No, and like I say, and as – I think there are a number of us who support and appreciate that concern. There’s no argument about the worry on that concern. It is a concern.

K. Jaekel: But are we so sure it doesn’t already say that? I listened to the town hall meeting today and on the website. It’s been really pretty clear that there has been some work done, this is what the committee has found, and it will be up to senior leadership to make those final decisions. Do we really need to go forth and say again, this idea of kind of obscuring community or larger partners, feels creepy to me. That was my academic word, “creepy.”

G. Long: Okay. No, I appreciate the discussion we’re having. I think it’s a very healthy, very worthwhile discussion to have. For interest of time and needing to move forward, though, let’s make sure we’re clear on the motion and let’s then take a vote. I’d like to call the question. So we’re saying that we recommend the initial release of the reports on May 2 be made to the NIU community only and not to the public. Is that what we’re going with or the second one?

B. Jaffee: Well, I’m just wondering, do we want to make a recommendation or do we want to express concern? I raised it because I wanted to express concern.

G. Long: Well, and I’m very flexible. Expressing concern I think we’ve already done the expression of concern and we can know that two of the task force chairs have heard that and anybody with contact with administration, this will be shared. But it’s not the same as having a motion. So I am very flexible.

M. Cefaratti: Can I withdraw the motion on the first – the one that I submitted, just putting up there, the first sentence because it was not the intent to keep it from the public in the foreseeable future. It was just first wording. I think if we do anything, it would be the second, it seems.

G. Long: Okay. All right, so we have a motion on the floor that says we recommend the task force reports be released in the same manner as the program prioritization narratives with password protection.

M. Riley: I have a question, a clarifying question. Would this motion contemplate eventual lifting of the password protection or would the report be password protected permanently?

G. Long: Password protected permanently? I suspect that’s not likely. I suspect from a dissemination of information, what we’re saying here – if I’m understanding the gist of the conversation, it’s the concern that there be built in a little bit of time to look at reports and categorization by the authors and the community before making it generally available. Is that…

M. Riley: Do we want to say with password protection for a specific amount of time? I’m just asking the question. If that’s not necessary, I’m fine not doing that too.

G. Long: A specific amount of time from my standpoint would strike me as rather arbitrary. Do we say one week, ten days, three weeks? Our intent is to encourage the task forces to look at the reports, provide context, have the PR story to go along with how this works and what the categorization might mean. Personally I’m concerned with even like setting a timeline. So when

would they become available? Is it one week or two weeks and if we're going to be making them available at some point in time, you know, why not do it upfront and get any mistakes dealt with initially? Mark.

M. Falkoff: I personally wouldn't try to micro manage this because it's not this body's decision. This language expresses what we want to happen, which is mostly to keep this as you have described it, a little buffer zone. So we can digest this in the same place. I personally wouldn't want to try to get relief from that.

G. Long: I'm good with that.

S. Farrell: As I listened, I think this is best expressed, in my personal opinion, as a concern, articulated, rather than a general recommendation. I don't think there is a consensus view about how this is going to be articulated. So I think this would be more effectively expressed as a concern, which I think is initially – which could be articulated through you, Greg, with Matt and George have heard probably far too much of over the last three months. Thanks.

G. Long: Okay. So we're still – do we – we're in the position right now where we still have the motion on the floor. Unless it's withdrawn, we do need to vote on it, and I'm guessing it's not withdrawn. So, let's do this.

P. Stoddard: She requested it be withdrawn.

G. Long: No, well.

B. Jaffee: The language.

G. Long: Virginia Naples made the initial motion and Meghann modified some of the wording. But Virginia, it's still your initial motion and, John, you were the second, right? Am I accurate on that? So Meghann can't withdraw the motion. If you want to withdraw the motion, that's your call. But that's not – or do we vote – or do you want with to vote on it?

V. Naples: Well, I am not sure that there makes much of a difference whether I withdraw the motion or whether people vote on it and they vote it down. So why don't we just vote on it? Call the question. People can vote it down if that's their choice.

G. Long: Okay. Can I – one final and then we'll go to the vote. Paul?

P. Stoddard: This is really going to muck things up, just to warn you. I would like to propose an amendment that we remove the language that's up on the board and replace it with: The Faculty Senate would like to express its concern that the information to be released as part of these reports be handled with sensitivity to the possible damage it might do to poorly categorized programs.

G. Long: Is that a new motion, then?

P. Stoddard: That is an amendment to replace the language there with totally new language.

G. Long: Ferald Bryan, help me, where are we at on this? This whole evaluating this position, any of you try this position up here, just so you know.

F. Bryan: We tried to call the question, if I recall correctly, three times. And that means we should vote on cutting off debate. That's ultimately what that means. So no one agreed with that. So we continued to debate. So I would recommend the will of the body on this. And vote it up or down. And then, I think Paul would understand, I sense your frustration. And a lot of us are going to be unhappy about what happens in that report, and we want to express that. But as a responsible body, we need to use good language to express that. And the first one we have is there. If we don't like that, we can go to Paul's language. That's what I recommend.

G. Long: Thank you. Jimmie, and then let's

J. Manning: I think we should vote on this. I think I have a diplomatic way to express kind of everything that's been said here, but we'll see, including what Paul said.

G. Long: Okay. So what is –

J. Manning: Let's vote on it. Call the question.

G. Long: Let's call the question. But now we call the question, we've got that statement.

J. Manning: So we can vote it down.

G. Long: Up or down. All right. So, if I'm understanding correctly we've got a motion, we've had a second, we've had plenty of discussion on this. Time to take a vote on this. Let's use our clickers. because I don't want to do a voice vote because I suspect that people may have some worries. So let's do this anonymously. And a simple majority will be sufficient to pass this. This is not a bylaw, so it's a simple majority. If you vote 1, that's a yes. That means you support the motion that we as a body send this forward. If you vote 2, that's a no. That's a we're not going to send this forward. We will express our concern but we won't do so formally. So 1 is supporting this as a formal motion from the Faculty Senate to the administration, that's a yes. A 2 is we'll still express our concern, we just won't use it as a formal motion. Does that – are we all okay on that? Pat, are we set to vote?

B. Jaffee: We're voting one thing. Up or down. We're not voting on two things.

G. Long: Up or down.

B. Jaffee: The rest of that language after, I don't think is part of this vote. The either/or part where you said or we're just expressing our concern.

G. Long: Okay.

B. Jaffee: I'm willing to vote this up or down but I'm not will willing to vote on the alternative just yet.

G. Long: That's fine. We will vote this up or down. 1 is an up and 2 is a down. Are we prepared?

P. Erickson: Yes.

G. Long: If you would, 1 is yes, 2 is no. All right.

Yes – 14

No – 35

Abstain – 0

G. Long: So we have voted down the resolution. I'm assuming that we want to move forward with a – you know, sharing concerns. Jimmie?

J. Manning: I would like to move that we put the following language forward to be endorsed by the Faculty Senate: The Faculty Senate raises its concern regarding the release of the categorized program prioritization report. Although we appreciate that the release of the report will be semi-public, at least initially, we also recognize that the release of the reports, especially during the feedback period, will create an environment that is especially vulnerable to misunderstanding, misexplanation, or other miscommunication. We ask that the university leaders and stakeholders be mindful of these potentials and be ready to respond and educate as needed, especially when or where such discourse threatens to undermine the program prioritization process itself.

B. Jaffee: I second that.

G. Long: Okay. Second from Barbara Jaffee. Okay. Any discussion? All right. Do you need this typed out again?

R. Siegesmund: Yes. Let's get it, if possible.

G. Long: Could just do a cut and paste magically?

J. Novak: We had it up there [referring to CART transcription].

G. Long: You can imagine how much fun it must be typing in front of everyone and waiting to finish. We appreciate that Pat and Kathy are doing an excellent job right now. It's a tough situation. Who knew the president's announcements would take so long today? We need to reduce it just enough so it fits on the screen. Downsize, if you would. We need to make the font size smaller so it fits all on one screen. Oh, I'm sorry, okay.

J. Manning: There's one word missing, after program prioritization, process, last sentence.

G. Long: All right, so we have a revised motion on the floor. The Faculty Senate raises its concern regarding the release of the categorized program prioritization report. Although we appreciate that the release of the report will be semi-public, at least initially, we also recognize that the release of the reports, especially during the feedback period, will create an environment that is especially vulnerable to misunderstanding, misexplanation, and other general miscommunication. We ask that

the university leaders and stakeholders be mindful of these potentials and ready to respond and educate as needed, especially when or where such discourse threatens to undermine the program prioritization process, itself.

Unidentified: Just a friendly amendment, maybe misexplanation, a better word would be misinterpretation?

J. Manning: Yes, it would be, accepted.

G. Long: Good. Good. Any other discussion on this? All right. Mitch.

M. Irwin: End of the first paragraph, isn't it better to clarify that we're talking about among the public, not among ourselves?

J. Manning: I specifically did not do that because in my experience it's usually professors who are saying all the incorrect information.

S. Farrell: Absolutely.

M. Irwin: I just think we drifted from the original concern a little bit and it doesn't come through as clearly to me as it has been articulated.

J. Manning: I'm going to just stick with it because I think it's public and internal as well. I think the real battle is going to be each other, to be honest on Monday.

G. Long: Can we call the question? So again, same thing. If you vote 1, that's a yes. So you're supporting this as a motion that we forward as the Faculty Senate. If you vote 2, that's a no. And we won't be forwarding this. All right? So are we prepared? All right. So if you would, 1 is a yes, we support the motion. 2 is a no. And our vote is? All right. Motion passes. We will forward that to the administration. No zeros. Did I miss? Hard to do when it's behind you.

Yes – 27

No – 20

Abstain – 0

G. Long: Moving along with president's announcements. Sorry about this. Thank you for your Patience, but I do think this was a productive and helpful discussion to have. Thank you.

One of the things I wanted to mention to you, some of you may have noticed an article in the Northern Star on April 11, two weeks ago Monday, from actually a letter to the editor from Provost Freeman, CFO Phillips and me, primarily them. And it's in response is to the need to look at salaries on campus. And it was presented initially as a request to have a gender equity investigation. We've had previous studies in 2005, 2008, 2011, but it has been five years. Subsequent to the release of that, I have talked to a number of people, I have had individuals contact me. And we have a basically different plan in place at this point. I'm identified as the person who's organizing the task force but I'm certainly not the chair of the task force. And I did have a very fortunate

interaction with Virginia Wilcox-Gok. She's the former chair of the Department of Economics. She does labor relations as her specialty. She even teaches a class in the fall where they cover this type of review and analysis and we had a discussion yesterday. She's interested in taking a leadership role with this task force and helping us to develop a process that is consensually agreed upon that is transparent and produces an approach that is replicable because the only concerns I've heard about the previous studies had to do with sharing of information and process of putting it together. I'd like to do something that's very public, very open. And in talking to Dr. Wilcox, she suggested we look at this in a broad format so that it not just be gender, but it also include race, also include salary compression and salary inversion. We could look at ourselves from the standpoint of how do we compare relative to other institutions? When I met with Phillips and Freeman with regard to this as far as coming up with initial plans, they gave me lots of flexibility. I had no specific budget, no specific timeline, but all the autonomy we want to come up with the study. So, you know, many of us have complained in the past about being frustrated that things get, you know, we use consultants from the outside. Well, this is an opportunity to build a process internally with the expertise we have locally, potentially involve students as part of this process and do something that again is available to people to see what we're doing. So there's nothing hidden about this, but it is a comprehensive study that's being led by somebody who does this as part of her disciplinary expertise. So I did want to let you know, it's not really a vote for the senate at this point, it's more of an information item. But I do want to let you know that we're thinking of this in bigger terms and will be comprehensive in the approach and using participants who have significant background in the topic area. Any questions on that? Virginia.

V. Naples: It's not a question, but I would like once again to be the first person to volunteer to be on this particular task force, committee or whatever.

G. Long: Thank you.

V. Naples: I have lots more data than I have ever been able to present anywhere.

G. Long: So moved. John?

J. Novak: And a related matter there's been tantalizing rumors that there's going to be a raise. I mean I just want to know if there's any substance to anything about that.

G. Long: I think that's a tantalizing rumor. I know that – I mean certainly in talking to the administration they would say that raises are a top priority for them. But as far as specific plans, without a budget in place, without any guarantees coming in, I would be very surprised if we see anything in the immediate future. So it's absolutely on the radar, there's a recognition that it's important but it's a hard sell when we don't have my money to begin with.

A. [Recognition](#) of faculty members who have completed their terms – Page 4

G. Long: Okay, moving along, to what would be A under No. V, thank you for your patience today, and it is a recognition of faculty members who have completed their terms. I'm sure after today you will be sad you're leaving us. If you would look on Page 4, I don't want to mispronounce people's names. We do have those individuals listed who are completing will service. Those with an asterisk

beside them are eligible for another term. Some departments have not yet held their elections. For everyone here, I would say thank you for your service. Again, merit isn't a big aspect and service is not a big aspect of how we're evaluated. You're here participating and if this is meaningful to you, I sincerely appreciate that. I can say thank you to those people who are going to be leaving. Welcome back to those who are going to be staying with us. And hello to anyone who's new. All right. Moving on along – and I also – in terms of saying thanks, absolutely want to thank Pat Erickson, our administrative assistant. Pat is what keeps this operation going as smoothly as it does. Whoever serves in this role, you're in a great position because you've got someone who knows what's up. And same thing, I would thank Ferald Bryan for the help as parliamentarian. To sit in front of you and have to deal with parliamentary procedure, I'm thankful I have Ferald as a resource. I'd also like to acknowledge Sarah Klaper as ombudsperson. I have used her ear many times over the course of the term here just because it's a nice perspective. Sarah has a good view of things, and I appreciate her service to the senate. So I would just say thank you. And she gets very little recognition but you see her up here all the time, Cathy Rajcan is our captioner. And I would like to thank her as well. I think having the visual up there certainly for me makes it easier to follow, and I hope you have found this to be a useful addition to our senate meetings. I would like to say thank you to Cathy. If I missed anyone, I apologize.

VI. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Approve [list of candidates](#) running unopposed to serve on committees of the university – Pages 5-8

G. Long: Number VII, our consent agenda is to first approve a list of candidates who are running unopposed to serve on committees of the university. They're listed on pages 5 through 8. Some of the committees on campus report to Faculty Senate. So if we've got people who are running who are unopposed, let's do a consent vote that puts them in place. May I have a motion to accept the consent agenda?

R. Siegesmund: Moved.

G. Long: Second?

T. Arado: Second.

G. Long: Okay. All in favor?

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Opposed? Okay, done.

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

IX. NEW BUSINESS

X. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Paul Stoddard – report

G. Long: We have no unfinished business or new business. In terms of reports from advisory committees, Paul?

P. Stoddard: I'll try to keep this relatively brief. We met a week ago Friday. Well, yeah, on the 15th. We met at DePaul University, which was a change. We originally were supposed to meet at Chicago State, but their budgetary situation prevented them from being able to host that meeting. They could not afford to do it. So the budget situation is very serious across the state. We had a discussion with David Anderson, who's the executive director for the Association of American Publishers. And basically we're talking about the digital delivery of material in the classroom. Digital Direct Access Programs. There's a lot that goes into that. There's concerns about the type of stuff you can deliver, the digital divide, unequal access that students might have to being able to get to that material for various reasons. But the basic point of the whole discussion was to introduce their dialogues that they're going to be having and I believe they've been having several of these throughout the state, or actually throughout the country. They're going to hold one in Illinois I believe sometime during the summer or fall. So that's something that, again, if people have input as to concerns or questions they have about digital content in the classroom, forward those to me, and I can raise those whenever this dialogue happens to happen. So that's really just a call for you guys to let me know what's on your minds regarding that.

The other issue I wanted to bring up actually was not addressed at the meeting because it happened after that particular meeting. You may or may not be aware that the governor has just appointed somebody to be the faculty representative on the IBHE. And this has the FAC up in rms. Traditionally how this has worked is the FAC recommends two people to the governor, and the governor picks one of those two people. The governor chose to ignore both those recommendations and instead appointed a part-time instructor from U of I who also runs his own cyber security concern. We on the FAC feel that this individual for that reason alone, as well as others that have come up in various blogs that I'm not going to go into, but feel free to look them up yourself. I will point out the fellow's name is John Bambenek.

G. Long: Spell that last name.

P. Stoddard: Bambenek. That's John with an "h." Anyway, there had been questions called into whether or not his views about higher education really coincide with the majority of tenured and tenure track faculty in the State of Illinois, if not around the country in general. So we're very concerned about this, we're concerned that the governor chose to ignore the FAC. We're more concerned with the particular choice that he has made. This choice actually does have to be approved by the Illinois Senate so there is time to react and perhaps have some meaningful input. And so I am here to ask that the Faculty Senate, as the representative body for the faculty at Northern Illinois University, to write a letter to the governor and the appropriate senators explaining, or expressing our concern over this appointment and recommend that the senate reject this particular appointment.

G. Long: Thank you. Questions for Paul? Matt?

M. Holt: Just out of curiosity, since myself and some of the senators, excuse me, part of the Student Association go down to Springfield often to lobby, is this something that you would want us to lobby for, against, since it is a motion that would be on the senate floor?

P. Stoddard: That would actually be excellent. My only concern is the timing, which we don't know the timing. We don't know when this is going to come up before the appropriate committee, whether it's going to come up for a final vote, when it's going to come up. But if it works into your schedule that you are able to do this, I think we would be extraordinarily thankful for your efforts. I think it would mean a lot more coming from the students, actually than it does from the faculty.

M. Holt: Thank you. Appreciate it.

G. Long: Students are always a very strong voice. Don't ever forget your power. It's amazing. Others? Comments on this? Are we proposing this as a motion, then?

P. Stoddard: I will propose it as a motion, yes.

G. Long: May I have a second? Janet. All right. Can we put it up so they can see? Do you have – or do you want with to reread it, Paul?

P. Stoddard: I will try to restate it. It was off the top of my head.

G. Long: You did good, did well, sorry.

P. Stoddard: That the Faculty Senate of Northern Illinois University, as representatives of the faculty of that institution, express our concerns to the governor and the Illinois State Senate, that this appointment does not reflect the will of the faculty, that this individual would not properly represent the intent of the faculty, the wishes of the faculty of the public institutions in the State of Illinois; and that we would recommend that the senate reject this nomination.

G. Long: Okay.

B. Jaffee: Could we get the name of the position in there?

P. Stoddard: This would be the faculty representative to the Illinois Board of Higher Education, and the specific individual being nominated is John Bambanek.

G. Long: Okay, do we need to see this written out or are we okay?

J. Novak: Okay.

G. Long: Okay. Call the question. Let's use our clickers again, what the heck, all right? Makes it very official if we do it this way. I'm getting tired too. All right. On this, I is a motion to – is

support of the motion to send this resolution forward, this motion forward. 2 would be to say no, we're not going to do it. 1 is we'll send it forward. 2 is we'll table it here.

B. Jaffee: Is it open now?

G. Long: One is support, 2 is not. All right? Okay. And, all right. We're making progress, very good.

P. Stoddard: Greg, I will work with you on the mail-to, list and the language of the letter.

G. Long: Thank you. Thanks.

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

XI. 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

1. Nomination of the 2016-17 Executive Secretary of University Council, who shall also serve as President of Faculty Senate per NIU Bylaws [Article 14.5](#) – Page 9

G. Long: Okay. As far as, there's no report from the UAC-BOT. We look at Number 1, Reports From Standing Committees. Looks like we need to go to Therese Arado for Rules, Governance and Elections.

T. Arado: All right, we have a few things to get through today. Thank you again, Pat, for giving me my script. Our first item of business is to select our final nominee to serve as the 2016-17 executive secretary of University Council who will also serve as president of Faculty Senate. We will accomplish this by secret ballot using our clickers. We already know we're voting members because we've been doing this. We have one nominee, Greg long. When the polling opens, we will vote as follows: 1, yes in favor of our nominee, Greg Long; 2, no, not in favor; 3, abstain. Go ahead and vote when...it's open. Everybody vote? Okay, we have 37 in favor. Two against. That appears to me to have passed.

Yes – 37

No – 2

Abstain - 0

G. Long: Thank you.

T. Arado: Congratulations, Greg.

[Greg Long](#) – Page 10

2. Election of University Council Personnel Committee representatives for terms to begin 2016-17. Ballots will be distributed at Faculty Senate meeting. Voting will be by college; CEDU, CEET, CLAS, and CVPA have vacancies to fill this year. Votes will be counted following the meeting and newly-elected UCPC members will be notified – walk-in

T. Arado: Second item, I'm going to need assistance from those beside me. They didn't know that when they sat down. Our next item is to elect faculty members of University Council to serve on the University Council Personnel Committee, also known as the UCPC. If you are from Liberal Arts and Sciences, if you would raise your hand. The ballots are color coded, so you will get a pink ballot at the moment. Keep raising it until you receive a ballot. And then when you have completed voting, just leave that ballot at your spot. Once all of these get handed out, I will go onto the next colleges.

3. Committees of the University 2016-17 – Election of candidates who are running opposed and must be selected by Faculty Senate. Ballot packets will be distributed at Faculty Senate meeting. Votes will be counted following the meeting and those running will be notified of the outcome – walk-in

T. Arado: And while those are still being handed out, also at your place you have the election for faculty to serve on a number of committees of the university, the white sheet at your spot. There's a paragraph summarizing their qualifications. They submitted those on their own. Those are included in the ballot if they were submitted. And you can complete that packet and again leave that at your spot. So that's the white stapled together piece of paper. So that also will get left at your spot.

So if you are from the College of Education, could you raise your hand? Okay. Everyone from Education is good? Next one is College of Engineering and Engineering Technology. And our last one is the College of Visual and Performing Arts. Thank you. So is there anybody who I listed that should have gotten a ballot that did not get one?

All right. And then just to remind you, the other one that is at your seat is committees of the university for terms to begin next fall. So remember to fill that one out as well. Leave all of them at your spot along with the signature sheet. Thank you. And Pat, thank you for everything every year.

G. Long: Thank you, Therese. We're finished with that section then? We're good?

T. Arado: I am. Yes. Thank you.

- E. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Laura Beamer, Liaison/Spokesperson – no report

XII. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

G. Long: Excellent. And moving on, we have no report from the Resources, Space and Budget Committee. On Number XII, Comments and Questions From the Floor. Anyone? I know we have had a very quiet meeting. Mitch.

M. Irwin: Hi everyone, Mitch Irwin, Anthropology here representing a group of students, some of them are here today. It was a bit too late to get it on to official business, but I'm hoping that it can graduate there. And it's about divestment from fossil fuels. These students from the student organization, Green Paws and 350 Kishwaukee, a local nonprofit, are concerned about climate change which will impact our generation like never before. They realize their generation has a unique responsibility to address it head-on. I think you know where I'm going. Their overall goal is to ask NIU to divest, to cease their investments in fossil fuels through their endowment and eventually reinvest in nonfossil fuel-based companies. Within the last five or ten years, the topic of divestment has become a global phenomenon with more than 500 institutions representing over \$3.4 trillion in assets have made some form of divestment commitment. I'd add here that our administration's own words include "ethically inspired leadership." And I think this would be a good way with to put those words into practice. I think that just about says it. They've got full and unanimous support from a Student Association vote for their divestment initiative. I would like to, first of all, introduce this initiative to the Faculty Senate to make you guys aware of it, to encourage us as a body to take it up and consider lending our voice to the Student Association. It's always good when they step first and we step second. I would encourage you guys to ask any questions we have time for now which I will certainly divert to the students in charge and see what you think about adding it to our agenda.

G. Long: Okay. Questions? Do any of the students want anything to say?

Unidentified: [off-mic] I think he summed it up pretty well. Really honestly appreciate your support. The Board of Trustees and the NIU Foundation trustees as well. We have the fact you will and the students in support, I think – and actually be taken seriously.

G. Long: Thank you. Thanks. Any other comments from the floor? Now are you asking this as a motion or are you asking this as a this is something we look at as we go forward in the fall? How are you wanting to proceed with this?

M. Irwin: What am I allowed to do?

G. Long: You're allowed to make a motion. Certainly that would, you know.

M. Irwin: I think given that short time we have left it wouldn't be too rushed to make a one- or two-sentence motion in support if we felt like the people who were gathered here today know enough about the phenomenon and are willing to support it. Any comments in that regard?

G. Long: How would we word – I see no comments, but let's get those two sentences out.

M. Irwin: My turn. I move that

G. Long: I'm sorry.

M. Holt: I was there when we approved it on the Student Association Senate. What we did, they actually brought us a resolution. But I guess what you could do here is make a motion to approve a resolution of support for the Green Paws fossil fuel initiative on NIU's campus.

G. Long: So, to simplify, we're just approving a motion of support.

M. Holt: Exactly.

G. Long: And then we can deal with the specifics as we move forward?

M. Holt: Exactly.

M. Irwin: Is it right to refer to it as Green Paws initiative?

G. Long: Is that P-A-W-S? What do you think about the revised wording?

M. Irwin: Yeah, I think that's fine, and I think you don't want to make it longer than it is. I think the one sentence is just about right.

G. Long: Okay. Can we get that sentence up? Do we have? We have a motion that the Faculty Senate approve a resolution for the Green Paws initiative on NIU's campus.

M. Irwin: Could I add "of support"? And also add after Green Paws initiative, let's just say the Green Paws initiative to petition the administration of Northern Illinois University to divest from fossil fuels. Is that the right language?

P. Erickson: We need it much slower than that.

M. Irwin: To petition the administration of NIU to divest from fossil fuels. I think that's simple enough.

G. Long: Okay. So does this read correctly at this point?

Unidentified: [off-mic] Fossil fuels or

M. Irwin: I would accept that friendly amendment. Divest from investments in fossil fuels. That might be even too wordy.

G. Long: We're tired. We don't need to worthsmith as long as we have the concept.

G. Long: We're getting closer?

M. Irwin: Fossil fuels, plural, period. Yeah.

G. Long: Okay, any further discussion?

M. Riley: Second.

G. Long: Okay. Further discussion on this? Okay, let's use our clickers again. Making some use of these today, you know, by golly. All right, 1 is

P. Erickson: We need everyone to stop clicking.

G. Long: We need everyone to stop clicking momentarily. Okay. So, if you're voting 1, again, it's in support of the motion here. 2 is opposition. All right? So if you would, go ahead and vote, please. 1 is in support. 2 is no. Thank you. All right. Motion passes.

Yes – 29

No – 8

Abstain - 0

G. Long: Very good. Are there any other comments and questions from the floor?

XIII. 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
- T. [2016-17 Meeting Schedule](#) – Page 11

G. Long: Okay, the last thing I would mention is just under Information Items, do note Item T is our 2016-17 meeting schedule. So for those of you who are coming back, please make sure you've got that in your calendar. And for all of us, have a good end of the semester and thank you much.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

G. Long: Adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 4:46 p.m.