

FACULTY SENATE MEETING TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, October 28, 2015, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Arado, Arriola, Azad, Baker, Beamer, Bishop, Brubaker, Burton (for Mooney), Carlson, Cefaratti, Chakraborty, Conderman, Demir, Downing, Dugas, Feurer, Freedman (for Hou), Gilson, Glatz, Grund, Hathaway, Hunt, Irwin, Jaekel, Kidder, Kim, Konen, Lichtman (for Than), Long, Macdonald, Manning, May, Millis, Moremen, Naples, Novak, Pavkov, Penrod, Riley, Rosenbaum, Ryu, Saborio, Shin, Siegesmund, Slotsve, Staikidis, Stephen, Stoddard, Un, Xie

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Abdel-Motaleb, Allori, Bumjarski, Campbell, Chen, Chung, Deng, Farrell, Giese, Hanley, Hedin, Hou, Jaffee, Khoury, Lee, Mogren, Mooney, Moraga, Patro, Pitney, Rodgers, Scherer, Than, Thu

OTHERS PRESENT: Adeboje, Armstrong, Bryan, Haliczzer, Kearsing, Klaper, Reynolds, Streb

OTHERS ABSENT: Doederlein, Falkoff, Gebo, Levin, Nicholson, Shortridge, VandeCreek

I. CALL TO ORDER

G. Long: Good afternoon. Thank for coming to today's meeting.

Meeting called to order at 3:02 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

G. Long: Our first order of business is call to order and adoption of our agenda. May I have a motion to adopt the agenda, please?

R. Siegesmund: So moved.

G. Long: If you would say your name, that will get things accurate. We got a motion for the agenda. May I have a second?

J. Novak: Second.

G. Long: I will say there is one walk-in item to be discussed under item no. II, Comments and Questions from the Floor. What we will do there is I've hopefully built in enough time for us today to do follow-up on the work that we started in September where we met with groups and we talked about concerns. I've got those organized. We're going to look at those again. That will be a walk-in item. Another change to the agenda is that our guest that we were going to have today, Jaime Schumacher, talked about the open access policy is unable to attend today. We've those two

changes. One is a walk-in and one is a change in item no. V. May I have a vote on this? Any discussion, I guess, first. Excuse me. Okay. All in favor of the agenda as amended say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? Okay. We have an agenda.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 30, 2015 FS MEETING

G. Long: Our next order of business is approval of the minutes of the September 30 meeting. We need a motion to accept the minutes.

R. Siegesmund: Moved.

V. Naples: Second.

G. Long: Corrections, changes, addition, typos? All right. Hearing none, all in favor of accepting the minutes say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? All right, we approved the minutes, and we have an agenda.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

G. Long: From President's Announcement standpoint, a couple of things to alert you to. I suspect most of you received this information already, but tomorrow afternoon at 4:30 in the Martin Luther King Commons the Student Association is going to be sponsoring an educational rally with regard to the budget impasse. Anyone who wants to attend, you are more than encouraged to attend. Let your colleagues and classes know this is happening. It will run roughly I think 4:30 to 5:30. Students have done a very good job of trying to get out information on this as well as bring in other speakers. Would encourage you to show up if you have the chance to do so. And as background, Governor Rauner is coming to campus as part of an opportunity being provided by the DeKalb Economic Development Commission. It's not that NIU is sponsoring his visit. The DeKalb Economic Development Commission is putting on the event here. Thought it would be valuable to have an opportunity to provide our input and the students came up with this. We've been working with them on it. Any questions on that?

Okay. Another just announcement, sometimes you try things and some things work and some things don't. My attempt to revise the Faculty Club lunches and to -- into a discussion kind of a format, was not terribly successful so far. We had -- in our first month, we were five people and five people, and our second month we had four people and zero people in the second meeting. Being a scientist as I am, I'm figuring the data are telling me this is not working. We're going to be resuming the more traditional Faculty Club lunches in the spring semester, and if we can do a happy hour, we will look at that. Things are still in process.

The next thing on my list is a quick update on Program Prioritization -- everyone's favorite topic. Something that's been very valuable recently is the addition of new resources for program authors. I'd like to introduce Jeff Reynolds and John Kearsing, in the back, and give us a little update on some of the supports that have been recently made available.

J. Kearsing: As of Monday we started offering open house style workshops right here in the Holmes Student Center for any authors and approvers that want to come in unscheduled and ask any questions about data, how to use the data in the narrations, and essentially get tips and help on how to write their program narrations. We started that Monday. This has been published to NIU Today and to the Program Prioritization website. We're having another two hour session on Friday and two next week and more if we need them. We had a pretty full house Monday and got a lot of good questions. We have about 20 things we're going to post up to the Program Prioritization website for FAQs. We have the -- data support teams that's a data hotline, Help Desk, Information Technology Help Desk that will field any emails or calls with questions about either the process or the data system questions. And so we've had -- we're about a month in, and we've had about 100 calls. Responded and fixed about 90 percent of those. Most questions come in just asking about the -- how to use the data, what it means. So we published a glossary, there's a data glossary. It is a lot to take in, a lot to look at. And there's a lot of question marks on how to use it. We have answers for those questions and, if you want to seek out those answers, I definitely recommend attending one of these workshops.

G. Long: The academic rubrics are available.

J. Kearsing: Yes. That got published on the Program Prioritization website. It's very well -- where is George? George is here. Seems like a very well written rubric.

G. Long: I think that would be particularly helpful for program authors to know how they're going to be reviewed. Any other questions for --

J. Brubaker: Jana Brubaker from the library. I wondered if the administrative rubric is available or what was...

J. Kearsing: It's not available yet. I thought I saw Dr. Streb here. Next week hopefully.

G. Long: It is underway, though. We're meeting tomorrow to put together -- for tomorrow. Great. Any questions -- number of people here representing program prioritization. Anyone who has any questions? Next month Provost Freeman will be our guest here and be providing an update and opportunity for questions. Right now as far as things go, any one have questions? Okay. Awesome.

As another update in the University Council meeting earlier this month they did pass a resolution in support of the Student Association. And I just want to quickly read it to you. It's much shorter than the one we're proposing in here. Resolved that the use -- University Council support the student Association efforts in procuring MAP funding. Short and sweet. That was offered during the meeting. It was unanimously supported. So that is University Council has a resolution. When we get to new business, there's a suggestion that we have a resolution from this body as well. All right.

- A. Role of the NIU representative to the Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE –
Sonya Armstrong, NIU representative to the FAC to the IBHE

G. Long: And the last thing on my announcements is a sincere thank you to Sonya Armstrong. She has served as NIU's faculty representative to the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Illinois Board of Higher Education. She's been very good about keeping us informed. Oftentimes has reports for us. She's going to be stepping down in September. I've asked her -- in December. Not September. I've asked her to give us an update as far as what the role involves and how it works. I'd also like to identify that Paul Stoddard has served as her alternate for this year. And so he will be completing her term throughout the spring. We will, however, need to identify an alternate for Paul. So an alternate for the alternate, if you will. I would like first to have Sonya give us an update and kind of perspective on what the role is and what she's been doing.

S. Armstrong: So as a bit of background the Illinois Board of Higher Education is our coordinating board in the State of Illinois. And oftentimes we've heard from the student advisory council, so I serve as NIU's representative to the Faculty Advisory Council, to that group. We meet monthly, nine months out of the year. All around the state. The Faculty Advisory Council is comprised of members – representatives from each of the 12 four-year public institutions, 12 of the two-year institutions and also 12 representatives from private and/or for-profit institutions. It's intended to be kind of a collective representation from all types of higher education institutes in the state. We meet at different locations each month, which is actually one of the real benefits of this type of position. Because we get to go to various community colleges, campuses that -- for me, I would never probably ever go to. And we always start our meetings with that institution providing some kind of background on some initiative or -- you know, something that they're doing that seems to be working. And that's been a -- that's been something that I've really looked forward to with this position is learning what's workings at other institutions.

As well during each meeting we form caucus groups based on those different categories that I just mentioned. We have a four-year public university caucus -- I'm currently a member of that. And that allows for some specific -- some time that that group can talk about issues that are specific to four-year public institutions.

We do meet -- just so you know, we do meet with the full board once per year. The full Board of Higher Education. And we also meet at least once per year with the staff of the IBHE. Unfortunately, given the state budget over the past several -- actually several years now, whereas we used to have a staff member from IBHE who would be present at every FAC meeting, we would have direct line of communication with the IBHE staff and the board itself, that's no longer happening. So what we do is very often phone-in conversations with staff from Springfield and through those phone conversations we do get legislative updates, policy updates. And anything else that's going on with the board or with again, the legislation that we need to know about as a group. So we do serve in -- we serve in an advisory capacity, however, that advisory piece with regard to communication has certainly been less in recent days.

And then, of course, the other side is to bring back the information from those meetings, from the board, from the IBHE staff to our respective institutions. It's intended to be advisory going both ways. So -- did I catch everything? I think so.

So I'm happy to answer questions about you know, the type of position. It does require -- just in case you may be interested in spring -- it does require travel around the state quite a bit. Once per month and even in the summertime. So -- but there are a lot of great opportunities. I have personally learned so much about the structure of higher education in the state. And I think that's been a really valuable experience. And would I really encourage anyone who's interested in higher education to think about it.

G. Long: Is there any sort of compensation for doing this?

S. Armstrong: There is.

G. Long: Is it a monthly salary or something?

S. Armstrong: I think it's something like that. I actually could not quote that to you, but I think that is accurate.

G. Long: Okay. Thank you. Does anyone have any questions for Sonya? Excellent job of presentation, then. Is there anyone who is willing to be the alternate for Paul Stoddard for the spring?

R. Hunt: (raised hand).

J. Stephen: (raised hand).

G. Long: Becqui? Oh. Okay. Becqui. Becqui Hunt? Yes. Are we okay? All right? And, Paul, if you can't make it, and Becky, you can't make it, we know where to look. All right. Excellent. That's it in terms of president's announcement.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

- A. Our Open Access Policy – Impact and Opportunities
Jaime Schumacher, Director of Scholarly Communications, University Libraries

G. Long: Under V, Items for Faculty Senate consideration. I mentioned that, again, our guest speaker for that is unable to be here today.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

G. Long: No. VI, the Consent Agenda, no items.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

G. Long: Any unfinished business. We're going to have some opportunity to do some discussion later on. This was planned, just so you know.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Proposed [Resolution](#) to the Governor and Legislature of the State of Illinois – Page 3

G. Long: As far as New Business goes, this is an opportunity for some discussion because as I mentioned, University Council did put forth a resolution. Couple people had mentioned to me the idea of perhaps Faculty Senate. Tip of the hat to Mitch Irwin, who made an initial draft on this. I'd like to bring up the thought of would we like to have a resolution and if so, any comments on it? It's in your -- on Page 3 of your -- what you received in the mail, hopefully. And hopefully some of you had a chance to look it over ahead of time. I'm guessing you probably don't want me to read it to you. It's a page long. Okay. Take a look at it. If you haven't looked at it yet, if you would, just take a moment, please. So with this we need a motion to approve. Second, and then a discussion, we can vote on it. May I have a motion to approve the resolution? Paul Stoddard. Second? John Stephens. Okay. Any discussion on the -- on the resolution as written? Okay. I think it was a tip of the hat to Mitch, I think did a great job on this. Great job drafting it. Appreciate it. Not hearing any discussion, may I have a vote on this? All in favor of the resolution as currently written, say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? Excellent what happens with in is we'll take this one as well as the University Council resolution, write a cover letter and it will be forwarded to the governor and legislative leaders. That's where this will end up in terms of disposition. Anything else in terms of new business from anyone?

IX. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong; Paul Stoddard, alternate – [report](#) – Page 4

G. Long: Okay. Reports from advisory committees. Paul, you have avenue got a report on an FAC to IBHE.

P. Stoddard: Right. I think it's pretty self explanatory. I didn't really anticipate making an oral presentation about this one. Do we have -- is it in the packet? I know I got it in late. It's up there. So it is.

G. Long: Even better.

P. Stoddard: Even better. So yeah. I went down, it was a nice visit, four and a half hour drive. So sometimes meeting around the state has its drawbacks. I got down there -- I had something up here until 9:30. I got down there at 2 a.m. But they had coffee in the morning. So all was good. I guess one of the things that came up was -- generated the most discussion is these report on under-performing programs that the IBHE has been instructed by law to put together. And I think this is the first year they've actually gone through the exercise. So people were concerned about what type of metrics were being used, what the implications of having a low-performing program might be.

Answers were not forthcoming on those two particular issues, in particular. But that was some concern expressed there. Other than that, the FAC gets to -- well, there's a faculty member on the IBHE, Alan Karns has been that person, a former FAC member. He's leaving that position. And we forwarded two names. Terry Clark from IU Carbondale and Debbie Palori, from Chicago State, to -- as nominations to fill Alan's position as he's leaving. We talked a little bit about supporting students lobbying Springfield on the same issue as they are here and in regards to releasing MAP funds. There's an action day I think down in Springfield. So a lot of students from various colleges, along with some faculty advisors, are going down to express their desire to see those MAP funds released. And I think those were really the main things that came out from last Friday -- Friday before that's meeting.

G. Long: Great. Does anyone have any questions for Paul? Okay. Thank you very much.

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

G. Long: In terms of second report, the University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees, we have no report or than to say we're setting up some additional meetings with them. One of the concerns I've mentioned is as faculty our desire to have greater input to the Board of Trustees through the president's office. This was raised with President Baker recently. And one suggestion was that we have our restores space and budget committee have a meeting with the subcommittee of the Board of the Trustees, that's the Finance, Facilities and Operations subcommittee as an opportunity, again, to start creating a dialogue. Right now we have very limited opportunities to provide input. So participating in ad hoc meetings and/or setting up some additional meetings with our committees of Faculty Senate, University Council may be our best strategy for getting some input. Wanted to let you know that's underway. Any questions on that? Okay.

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 – no report

G. Long: In terms of reports from standing committees, we're pretty lean there. I would say as the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee, that has been combined. We've got a combined Faculty Senate/University Council Rules Governance and Elections Committee. I would like to thank Therese Arado because I twisted her arm and asked her to chair that committee for us. She will be chairing that. And we've talked about certainly one of the issues for that committee is a discussion of voting patterns and voting requirements, if you will. As related to us as a senate, not such a big deal because we're largely a caucus body. We don't really pass much as far as rules, regulations, policies in this body. But when we move it up to the University Council, faculty are

still a majority of that group, but just barely. And we have issues with voting. If that if you're -- as it currently exists, it's easy to change the NIU Constitution than it is to change a bylaw. Logically that makes no sense. It was done years ago to create some protection and keep things constant. However, 30 years have passed and it's now being a particular -- or challenge for us. So I've asked Therese to bring this up in the committee and see if there may be some strategies we can look at in moving that idea forward. Any of our other committees with reports. I don't think we're missing anything. Yes? Okay.

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

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A. Discussion of [Faculty Concerns](#)

G. Long: Now, you have never had a meeting -- at least in my years of being on this body -- that in theory I could say it's 3:25 and you're out of here. But I'm not going to say that. Just so you know. But I do want to take this opportunity, because we've had two meetings thus far this year. In the first meeting I thought it went really well and we had -- I liked the opportunity at the end for people to generate topics and ideas and working in small groups gave people an opportunity to contribute that might not have otherwise done so. Compared to our meeting -- our last meeting where we didn't have this opportunity and just opened it for some general questions and there was no discussion.

So I'd like to go back to having a bit more of a structured discussion because we really, as our perspective as faculty, needs to get forward as much as possible. I've had the opportunity, thanks to all of you who have come to see me, meet with me or invite me to your faculty meetings -- if you haven't, I'm still open for this -- but I've gotten a lot of feedback from people. But as a body it would be nice for us as a senate to put forth some ideas as well.

So as I mentioned, we had this walk-in item. And this item is a summary of the comments that we developed during the September 2 meeting. So the faculty concerns. I have done a very, very quick rough ordering of them to be -- kind of conceptual categories. But what I would like to do is have you -- much like we did before -- meet with the people at your table, three or four of you together. I'd like you to look at this and two things: One, is to look at it, think of what are the broad categories that items fit in. All right? And then once we think of what are the broad categories where would they fit and do you have things to offer, things to add? Have we nailed all the concerns? Are the things that are yet to be identified? Because this exercise will give me an opportunity to then share this forward with the president and provost and, you know, it's more meaningful if it comes from us as a group than simply Greg Long's thoughts. That is the strategy. I guarantee we will still be able to do this and get you out of here well before 4:30. Does that seem reasonable?

J. Stephen: Is the chair open to new questions?

G. Long: Yes.

J. Stephen: I notice in the parking lot we have two spaces blocked off by an unfinished project – electric car charging. How much does it cost; how many are we putting on campus, and whose dumb idea was this?

G. Long: And how do you feel about it?

J. Stephen: I can't buy gas at -- why should we be charging cars?

G. Long: I can look and we can provide the information. I didn't know we were having that.

J. Stephen: They're there. I think somebody's padding their resumé.

R. Feurer: I was asked to bring this up by a colleague in the history department. A couple about the safety issues. And I don't know if this is the appropriate time. Concerns about school shootings again and what are the plans. There was some comment that with the -- with the recent, you know, campus alarm --

G. Long: Bomb threat?

R. Feurer: The bomb threat. There was really mixed signals and...not exactly confidence. There's not a lot of confidence that the administration has really got its act together. So that was the comment from a colleague. And I was asked formally by the history department to raise it here. Someone mentioned the possibility of camera -- security cameras. In -- and do we have those? And how do we fair relative to other campus security systems.

G. Long: Okay. I can respond to some of that off -- right off bat; or would you like to do it?

J. Stephen: I get a report to University Council on campus surveillance. It hasn't changed much.

G. Long: What did your report say?

J. Stephen: Only a very few places: Bursar's office, and some places in the dorms.

G. Long: Following the bomb threat, I did have email communication with both Police Chief Phillips and Brett Coryell, the CIO, to say this is a concern. Because several people have brought up -- I don't need to receive ten messages. On the other hand, from a messaging standpoint, I have people say yeah, and I have colleagues who refuse to leave the building, that they thought it was a joke. There's a lot of detail yet to be worked out on this. And certainly Chief Phillips was aware of this. And said that they are continuing to work on this to make it be smoother. So I think we're in some growing pains with this as a -- how do we deal with alerts and how do we keep them at a manageable level. But they are certainly aware of this as an issue. In fact I'm having lunch with Chief Phillips tomorrow to talk about some security concerns much even if you think about it, from a bomb threat standpoint, what do we do? I mean, evacuation, well, that was asked for, not everyone did it. But what if you have a shooter in the middle of campus, evacuation isn't going to be the right thing. Can we -- like a classroom lock down procedure. What do we do in those kinds of situations? It's not reasonable to figure we can lock a building down. But if I'm teaching a class, I'd

much prefer to get a text message that says lock your door than nothing, or run out and -- in the environment who knows what's happening. That's part of an ongoing discussion too. Paul?

P. Stoddard: I know -- Back in 2008, I believe it was, I was actually on a committee in response to the Virginia Tech event that was looking at campus response to something similar that might happen here. Ironically we were actually going through that process when we did have our own event here. I'm not sure -- I know we finished -- we came up with a document that had a lot of recommendations on things. I'm not sure whatever happened to it. I'm not sure what the status of it is. But that might be a good place to start looking for at least some of the issues that are being raised here.

G. Long: Was that done within Faculty Senate, or who -- who commissioned that?

P. Stoddard: No; this was -- I think it was the chief -- NIU police was chairing the committee. It was -- I was on it as president of the Faculty Senate. But it was an across-the-campus effort.

G. Long: Do you happen to have a copy of that?

P. Stoddard: I probably do not. But you might check with the police office.

G. Long: Okay.

P. Stoddard: Or the president's office.

G. Long: This is the first time I've heard about that. Thank you. Virginia?

V. Naples: Yeah. Right after the event took place, I think -- I put into an email to you that another colleague and I went through the biology building -- which is many spaces, lots of doors and things like that -- north section and south section, some people were not alerted because they either did not have a cell phone in operation on them at the time, or they were not using computers and they did not know.

G. Long: Right.

V. Naples: A couple people that I spoke to and said get out, there's been a bomb threat. Said no, I'm not going to leave until the alarms in the buildings go off. That night about eleven o'clock I sent an email to my department chair and he answered first thing the next morning, which I really appreciated, that the alarms in the buildings are exclusively fire alarms. But it seems that, if we have gone to all the trouble to install alarm systems in our buildings, that they should be able to be modified to provide a better amount and better quality information. At the minimum, they should be able to tell us two things: Emergency, leave the building immediately; or, because we are in a tornado belt or we might need to lock down buildings or something like that, emergency, take shelter in the basement or whatever other secure area immediately. That would be a very simple message and it could be then followed up by greater detailed information through text messages. And I know I articulated that in the email I sent to you and you said you were going to meet with Chief Phillips. Has anything come about, a decision about how to do that?

G. Long: When we have lunch on Friday, I will probably get a better sense. I did relay the text of your message to Chief Phillips and Brett Coryell. I don't know what outcomes or efforts have been made in response to that. The concerns have been forwarded.

V. Naples: Just regardless of what the decision is about what they want to do with the alarm system, could that be publicized a lot more widely? Because it does not seem that people know. People expected the alarms to go off. And if they are only tuned in to going off for fires, there are other equally as significant emergencies. And the varieties of emergencies are increasing as well. So people need to know that the alarms will only operate in certain circumstances if that is the case, or be informed that the alarms will operate telling them a variety of different kinds of things.

G. Long: That's very fair and reasonable. It will be passed on.

R. Freedman: From computer science department. In addition to the fact that the distribution of the messages was poorly done, some people didn't get it, some people got 16, some people got it when it was too late. The content wasn't very good either. The messages kept saying stay 500 feet away from any campus building. I looked because I assumed that would have meant they would have had to block off Normal Avenue, which they did not. Route 38, they did not. There was traffic going down 38, there were people walking down 38. There were no cops in evidence. Boy, was that a mixed message. I hope they do that better next time also.

G. Long: Thank you. Any other feedback on this topic? We have the opportunity to share this forward. I'm happy to do so. Yes?

V. Demir: Veysel Demir, Electrical Engineering. The problem -- from NIU, when you look at the message, it was from some other company. So I don't know if it's another -- like a phishing email. I didn't take it serious.

G. Long: Yeah. I wasn't aware of that. Okay. Yes?

O. Adeboje: Timi Adeboje, the Student Association rep. I want to echo a previous comment made. Being on campus at the time as a student, there was a lot of confusion of messages. First we were told to go to the street. Then we were told to stay 500 feet away. But then even a concern that came about was, if that's the emergency procedure, that's not effective in the case of let's say there was a shooter going around. And basically their idea of 500 feet at the time was to herd everybody in the middle of MLK Commons. You're a walking target at that time if someone was to come up and do something harmful. As students, we echoed the concerns there. There's a lot of -- it seemed very rushed and not as well thought out or executed. So if that could be examined in the future how they execute out that information in a more efficient manner. I wanted to echo that as a student as well.

G. Long: Thank you. We certainly do expect that the next time something like this happens it will be smoother. There's a learning curve to this. Yes? Meghann?

M. Cefaratti: Department of Accountancy. And to our student representative's point, when you look at the Virginia Tech report, the individual actually tested the response using bomb threats first prior to the event. So I was -- I was at Virginia Tech and then came here. So it's all still very -- very clear. So just very good comment from our student representative. And I'm sorry, I didn't know your name. I apologize.

G. Long: And I do have a real quick question -- well, go ahead, John. I'm sorry.

J. Novak: I received a lot of messages. Most of them were telling people to go to the convocation center and there was a weird plug for football -- basketball. Midnight madness basketball, go watch it instead of watching this -- I thought that was weird.

G. Long: It was a little odd. I have a question -- Oh. Timi?

O. Adeboje: Her comment reminded me. There was an additional concern I felt I should bring up as well. It was shared with me -- I don't remember -- I'm not sure the instructor, but I was told at the time of the alerts going out there was actually talk of there was an instructor that didn't let students leave. Like they didn't believe the threat. So they actually held students in the class. Maybe they were taking a quiz or exam at the time. So that was something that definitely needs to be addressed in terms of when these policies are reexamined, going forward, letting instructors know that while these exams are important, there are --

G. Long: It's not a choice.

O. Adeboje: Right. It's not optional for you to withhold students the right to their own safety, as well as their own safety as instructors, is bigger than that. So I think that needs to be taken into consideration as well. There was a report that there was a teacher that did not let students leave --

G. Long: Sorry to hear that. From a communication standpoint that does argue for greater efforts in this regard. Absolutely. You also had mentioned the video surveillance idea. In talking to Chief Phillips about this, he said there are some places on campus we have video surveillance, most typically in the resident halls or portions of them, a few places in -- around campus. But it's not a consistent thing. Now -- and I'm curious from your perspective, what do you feel -- how do you feel about video surveillance? Because on the one hand, you know, there's many arguments to say, yeah, why don't we have it throughout? And then I hear from other people that oh, they're concerned from a privacy standpoint. So I'm curious with a --

J. Stephen: We can't afford it. You have to have somebody monitoring 24 hours a day and the initial investments. Don't have it.

G. Long: All right. So -- and that's where we're at right now. As you say, we can't afford it and we don't have much of the campus covered in terms of a video surveillance. Are there any other general questions, comments, topics? Before I give you a task. Yes?

K. Lichtman: Foreign languages. I think the facts are that NIU is extremely safe and the safety concerns are more about perception than reality.

G. Long: Based on the data that you would -- I would argue that you're correct. Anyone else? Okay. So if you would do this for me, let's take ten minutes or so, and within your -- at your table...these are -- these are not edited. This is what was said during the September 2nd meeting. I took a very rough quick run through it to put them in a little bit of a order, but it's nothing that is -- is not open to shame, certainly. So if you would, like we did when we generated these, we're all at tables here. If you would talk with the people at your table -- and again, the task here too is, conceptually, how would you group these? And then, once grouped, are there things that we still need to add? So we will reconvene at five minutes 'til. So you've got 12 minutes to get a drink, talk to your neighbors on this. But let's take until five of and we'll reconvene and hear what you can share.

(Break.)

G. Long: Just real quick -- People asked what does FDID stand for? Faculty Development and Instructional Design. The QM is Quality Matters. That was the discussion on the first meeting. Related to online education. So...

(Break.)

G. Long: Okay. Thank you. Hopefully, you had a chance to meet some new people today. I think this is one of the values of having a discussion as well. What I'd like to do is have us go around and with groups identify what categories you felt -- I've asked Pat to -- feel like a teacher, over there, quiet. I've asked Pat to record these as we go along. I expect there will be redundancies and duplications. This gets us a start. And once we do the initial what do you see as potential categories that I would like to have feedback on any items that we've missed that need to be included. All right? So is there any table or group that would like to start off?

R. Moremen: Sure. Robin Moremen, sociology. This is odd because I'm not a quantitative person but we quantified these and actually did counts. And so we went through and the categories that we came up with in terms of what we thought had the greatest number of items on this list began first of all with human resource issues. We felt that a lot of those human resource issues, which really are, you know, how are -- how is our life here being affected, not only our life, but students' lives here being affected basically thinking of human resources in a very broad definition from students to faculty retention, etc. The next category we came up with was our future outlook in terms of enrollment and retention, followed closely by budget concerns and a category we called information and communications, how are we communicating with one another and how are we being communicated to. And the last category was concerns about program prioritization.

G. Long: Thank you. Who would like to go next? Yes?

E. Arriola: College of Law. First I want to raise a comment like one of my colleagues at this table that we should not have dropped the discussion about safety. I was thinking of looking at this list, and I said, you know, since we have this first discussion that produced this list, it's always been since then that we've had the bomb threats and then the notification about robberies and things of that sort. So he was really questioning the last comment on which we sort of ended, which is that

there may be a misperception that there's an issue of safety, that, in fact, it's a very safe place. And I remember that I said, well, were you here in 2008? You know? Because you know, we probably the day before all of that happened, February 13, 2008, maybe a lot of us thought that we had a very safe place.

G. Long: Sure.

E. Arriola: And a safe community. And there have been many improvements. Nonetheless, I do think it is an issue.

G. Long: Right.

E. Arriola: Beyond that -- I don't know.

G. Long: Just to make sure, would you suggest that adding a category of safety?

E. Arriola: Absolutely.

G. Long: I want to make sure I'm understanding what you're asking.

E. Arriola: Adding the category of safety and adding it as least as something worth discussing. It leads to the other issue that emerges from our discussion here, and that actually zeros in on the question that says why are faculty such poor lobbyists. And that there is this perception -- maybe among some of us who come here that we don't speak up enough, but that also sometimes it's a futile effort. You know? Maybe there's a sense that Faculty Senate doesn't have much power, that the power really resides in the University Council. Is that true? I don't know. Is that something that we need to educate ourselves on? What -- you know, what is our level of influence, if any?

G. Long: Right. And I would certainly agree that that is a topic for discussion, because, you know, we were established as a caucus body, we -- we have an all -- University Council, when faculty were gathering before University Councils together, President Winfield did not like that and that's what led to the establishment of Faculty Senate. You are right in we have no policy-making authority, we don't pass anything. What we do is basically discuss things and move them up to University Council. There are questions as far as what do we do other than discuss. So that's -- that's one of the charges I've asked Terese to look at with regard to the rule, governance and elections committee. Okay. Another group?

D. Dugas: Daryl Dugas, in LEPF. The categories we came up with are faculty salary; a category about faculty morale, well-being and disengagement; an issue of NIU's standing or image; the issue of retirement; we combined the issue of communication with transparency, put those together; then dissatisfaction with the administration.

G. Long: Thanks.

D. Dugas: NIU's standing and image.

G. Long: Okay. Very good. Other groups?

C. Carlson: Nursing. We chose some a little bit different titles, same concepts, but the ones about the faculty concerns, we called it group oppression.

G. Long: You may appreciate I may not necessarily use that term as we move forward.

C. Carlson: But, i the shoe fits, wear it.

G. Long: That's right.

C. Carlson: Quality reduction, concerned about; there's distrust; retirement concerns; let's see, NIU image. And then we were addressing the outreach one about the lack of resources with trying to move programs forward. So we just put -- I put resources.

G. Long: Okay. Thank you. Other groups to add? Yes, Virginia?

V. Naples: One of the things that we talked about echos some of the things that people have said previously but expands on them as well. No one has talked about the faculty salary gender equity issues or minority issues. In the early 2000's, there were two faculty salary equity task forces that resulted in executive summary reports. There has been nothing since then and those were blatantly wrong. There is salary gender inequity on this campus and it has existed ever since they probably started hiring women and minority faculty. And that is a major problem that needs to be addressed. It is not unique to this university, nor is it actually unique to any industry. On average women are now doing better than they ever used to. Women used to make 59 cents on the dollar for men in the same employment categories. Now -- and including at NIU, they're about up to 80 percent on average. But that is not what we need to do. We need to address that very seriously.

G. Long: All right. Thank you. Other categories? Reva?

R. Freedman: A couple of items that could fit under a number of these categories. And one of them is failed experiments just disappear. We were told a couple years ago that -- bringing in students from China was going to save our problem, and maybe it did or didn't. All the feedback about wearing little buttons did not work. And the statistics were on that -- no official person said that. Other items related to NIU future. There is are certainly a lot of belief among the faculty, including at this table, that teaching load is going to go up. But no word from the administration about what the actual facts might be. Bait and switch in terms of bringing in new faculty and then not being able to give them the things we promised them last spring. Finally, the deferred maintenance is not on this list at all. And I think that's a different category of safety issue. Every time I see steps that are lacking a handrail and broken concrete and so on, think, hey, that could be my ankle, actually. And finally, the fact that the Huskie Shuffle, inability to affect anything, applies definitely to faculty as well as to students.

G. Long: Thank you. Does anyone else have anything on categorization? I want to go back and get your input on details. So if you were to look at this...yeah we got another list. So thank you for

making another list. We're done, right? No, what I'd like, though, is to prioritize this list. All right? So if you would, take out a piece of paper, because we'll collect these. But

D. Chakraborty: Can I add one topic to that? Mission. NIU's mission.

G. Long: Okay.

D. Chakraborty: NIU's future.

K. Lichtman: Can I add a category? Engagement in DeKalb/Sycamore. Only about 25 percent of faculty live near by. And if that figure were higher, it would probably be better for a place to work. Probably that figure is higher among the people in the room right now. To comment on prioritizing this list, I think that's what we did at the Bold Futures workshop. If you could get that data from Baker, that was the exact exercise that we did.

G. Long: Okay. On the other hand, I've got you here now and we're in October and so let's be current, you know. So I agree with you. I don't want to be confused with President Baker, so we're good. With that said, if you were going to look at this, what are your top five? Feel free to combine. If you were to look at think –

J. Stephen: Since this is a Faculty Senate, since we have an administration that's taking increasingly corporate view, we have to realize that we are the assets of the university. And we're not being well treated. And that is -- covers about half of that stuff. It covers the fact that, if you ask President Baker how much something cost, like the happy horse crap little meeting we had last fall, he doesn't tell you. Go ahead and try and find out what those electric charging stations are going to cost. I bet you can't find out. So we're not getting anything from -- from above in terms of information, we're certainly not getting support. I mean, we -- we all know how much more his salary was than the previous salary was of the president four years ago, and how much higher is any of ours? And that's about half of it. I mean, we're just -- we're doing fine up here in Altgeld. How about you?

G. Long: Certainly a perspective there. Yes. Others? Adding? Really this is something that I can't take forward with -- to represent us. So I know that -- yes, this is Bold Futures kind of an activity. But on the other hand, this gives me chance to share it forward. Yes? Daryl?

D. Dugas: It seems the tenor of the room is faculty morale and well-being is the issue that we need to deal with.

G. Long: Certainly can't disagree. Rich?

M. Irwin: I just want to mention two words, brain drain that I was glad you kept in the resolution. It's not just about faculty morale. In fact it's retention. Of the fact that faculty will take a national or international -- where they want to work. And if we lose a certain percentage of our faculty due to the budget crisis, declining morale, whatever it is, it's not a random slice of faculty, it will be the best people who have the options to leave, which will erode our capacity to do the mission in the future. Do you agree?

G. Long: Absolutely -- yeah. I do. We're already seeing it. You're seeing early retirement, you're seeing mid career changes and people who are junior faculty who have not achieved tenure moving away from NIU and Illinois. I think this is a significant issue. And morale, certainly -- like I said, I talked to a number of you or in groups, and morale is absolutely probably as low as I've ever seen it on campus. I think from our perspective as faculty members it does not feel like we have a lot of influence over what happens. We're trying very hard to encourage that, but we're -- we've got a lot of years of history to change on how things have been done. So yeah. Morale and communication are huge issues for us.

J. Novak: I'd like to emphasize NIU image because I think like he just said, it affects who might decide to come here or not. But it also affects who decides to come here to study or not. And the Tribune likes to make us look pretty bad. So we need those professors coming in and those students coming in from Chicago. If we don't get that, that's -- that's a typical large group of students that -- are people afraid to send their students to NIU because of the things that -- rumors around Chicago.

G. Long: Well, in fact, as support for that, met with Dani Rollins, and she identified in the Washington Monthly Report that NIU is 30th in the country in terms of social mobility, meaning value on your dollar. That we have -- we're 30th in the country as far as bringing in students who are lower income, disadvantaged, providing an education that's within their price point and being successful once they leave the university as graduates. So you know -- and to me that was an interesting thing. I had no idea that we ranked that highly on that particular scale. Yeah. It fits to your point. We serve a lot of students from Chicago who are economically disadvantaged, minority students, and we do a good job with them in terms of providing opportunities what many don't. We could argue we could do better. Please don't misunderstand that comment. But from what we do, there's a lot of efforts put in that. Other categories or topics or things that we may want to talk about because I'm getting morale as huge. If you were to identify something else -- what do you want me to carry forward? Okay? That's what I'm asking you. George?

G. Slotsve: It's just something I heard over and over today, safety concerns. But that also is related with the NIU image. I just wanted to link those two. The image. What you hear is why I wouldn't want to send my kids to NIU potentially because, quote unquote, safety issues. And so I -- you might want to have that with NIU image.

G. Long: Sure. Absolutely. Virginia?

V. Naples: I would like to add something else too. That about a month ago I just happened to stumble across it on the Internet, the U.S. News and World Report rankings of universities in the country. And in previous years, NIU had been somewhere in the 170s. In this most recent ranking, it was down in the rank not reported category, but it was way down in the rank not reported category, which was very distressing. So it had dropped to well below 200, probably as many other universities were in there, if they just weren't putting in the numbers, we were probably down around 300 because I scrolled through lots of universities. But two other things happened. They gave a little blurb about the attributes of all the different universities and the only two things that were mentioned for NIU as things people needed to be aware of were that there were lots of social clubs students could join and there were several Division I sports teams, students could participate

in. Now, in many other of the descriptions they talked about academic programs, they talked about the campus, urban, suburban and whatever. And I was very distressed that the only aspects that they talked about were sports and socialization. The other thing that emphasized this problem for me was that shortly thereafter I received an email from the consulting company that was supposed to help improve NIU's recruitment and retention and craft the image, and the email came across to me saying hey, look, what a wonderful job we're doing. I was not impressed. And I think there are an awful lot of things that could be done to improve NIU's image. One of the things I wonder about is why an outside consulting company that cost over \$800,000 was used for this purpose when we've got marketing people and we've got business people and all kinds of very highly qualified potential consultants right on campus. We could get home grown opportunities to improve things for ourselves, bring ourselves up by our bootstraps and use that \$800,000 plus for other things.

G. Long: Right. And I will tell you that that particular perspective on let's use our own resources is something that I have routinely been saying in my meetings, with the administration. Because I do think that we could do a better job internally oftentimes. And certainly to have the opportunity -- and just be at the table to discuss it is an important part of it.

J. Stephen: That farming-out has gotten to the point that I have a colleague that makes a joke about President Baker that he can't make up his mind until he's paid somebody to tell him what he should think.

G. Long: Thank you. This is one of those awkward moment, and I say, what?

J. Novak: It seems a lot of this list is about faculty salaries. I think that needs to go in bold face right away. I just think that all sorts of things about raises and everything else, inequality, that's just a big issue.

G. Long: Right. And if you listen to Al Phillips and budget people, they are now talking about salaries as being on their radar and something that, you know, will be a priority. But at this point, you know, given the budget impasse we have no idea what's going to come down. But they are aware of that. And I think as I mentioned in this group, the bigger emphasis at some level is on staff salaries. Because many of our staff are so poorly paid, they can qualify for food stamps much and that's -- I mean, that's -- that's not the way universities should operate, from my perspective. So in looking at, you know, the distribution of wealth, so to speak, I think many of our staff are significantly underpaid relative to faculty. Trust me, I have been here 26 years, salary compression, I totally understand. I'm not saying that the faculty salary issues are irrelevant by any stretch. But I'm saying we do need to think about the impact on our staff, because they're critical to get the job done and they're not paid well or treated well. Other -- Mitch?

M. Irwin: Since it happened before I arrived at NIU, can anybody qualify when the last pay raise happened for faculty or staff? To me it has been this mythical beast in the past that people occasionally mention.

G. Long: There was a sighting once.

D. Haliczzer: It was a very small raise, proportionate, based on how much you made, January 2012 was the last raise. Unless you got promoted in faculty rank.

G. Long: Mark?

M. Rosenbaum: One of the issues I think we should put up is the future of Internet education at NIU. I think it needs to be clarified. If we look at these issues with building maintenance, students working and leaving here on the weekends, and we look at schools like Southern New Hampshire University that originally had 4,000 students and was about to file for bankruptcy. They brought on online programs and jumped to 35,000 student, more now. And it's a nonprofit campus school. I'm looking at the future of what our campus is going to be. I'm not advocating online education, but I'm starting to believe that we may not really have a choice. Especially with the building maintenance, and the funds that are going to be necessary, and the safety issues, and DeKalb/Sycamore, these situations are not gonna change. Faculty are not going to move back. They're not going to move back here if they're not living here now. And I think that the Internet vision needs to be clearer, especially in programs like business education, sociology, criminal justice. Schools like Northern Arizona University, Southern New Hampshire University, these should be role models for really what the future of education is. And I wasn't a huge advocate of online education, but I don't think China's going to save us in terms of enrollment. I don't think India's going to save us. But I think we now need a clear mission on what our online strategies going to be.

G. Long: From an input and governance standpoint it would seem like the online education point that Mark raised is something that this body, that we could talk about in more depth because right now it's still coming from above down to us. And in talking to faculty, there is hesitation about it. It's work to put it together, we question the value versus face to face. But I also agree with you that it may be inevitable. So as faculty to get on board or otherwise figure out how this works may be to our advantage because I hear often that change is going to happen. So if change is going to happen, let's get part of it. And I know that, you know, I like teaching face to face. I've done both. I much prefer face to face than online. But I also recognize that face to face is much more limiting in terms of numbers, geography and so forth. So we may need to do things. That's the kind of discussion that I think this body, if you want to, could have some input on and that could then be forwarded. Because right now we don't have that.

E. Arriola: I'm really glad that Mark raised that point. -- College of Law. Nowadays there are some tools out there. In fact, I was just having a discussion with our associate dean about experimenting with a kind of hybrid teaching of a course. Once I'm in retirement, since my retirement home is going to be in Texas, and there are some courses that I helped create for a certificate program, but we also, because of prioritization and so on, are probably not going to be able to hire someone to replace me. So in that transition period, why not create a sort of a short-term on campus presence along with availing ourselves of tools like Skype, like FaceTime, like many other Internet programs that are out there? And that is really something that NIU can begin to have discussions about. It is the wave of the future.

G. Long: Right.

E. Arriola: And I think this is -- the success story about hearing this about another university and other universities that are doing this should give us some sense of hope because we are also looking at a period of declining enrollment, which is going to force these other issues that we need to examine. Right? Salaries, the historic problems of gender and race in those salary structures, you know, fewer people hired. Well, then how are you going to hire them? And keep them? You have to make it attractive.

G. Long: Right.

E. Arriola: And the people that are coming in, even as new faculty, they're of the generation where they are absolutely comfortable with Internet and online education. And there is no reason why, with the brilliance of faculty that we have here, that we can't begin to explore that, you know, for keeping NIU alive.

G. Long: Agree. Richard?

G. Slotsve: Economics. If you move to online faculty, one question I would like to have answered or at least information I'd like to have is: Do you have tenured faculty teaching these online courses or is there a substitution towards hiring instructors to do the teaching and the education and handling it that way so that we move to the online, but okay, let's get rid of tenured faculty. Now I only need one tenured faculty, they can run a crew of instructors essentially. They can handle all the online. When we talk about this, I think there's a broader set of issues that we really should be concerned about here. We could be getting rid of our own jobs essentially too.

G. Long: And certainly that is a concern. I will mention to you, in University Council we did look at the numbers because we had to do reapportionment of seats to University Council. And from 2012 to 2015 we've lost 77 tenured/tenure track faculty. That represents about 12 percent. We are seeing a decrease in number of those of us on that path.

K. Lichtman: I'm a member of generation Y, I'm extremely comfortable with the Internet. I do not think that we should move in the direction of online teaching for many reasons. One reason is that the exact demographic we serve has very low completion and graduation rates with online teaching. They do much better with in-person connections with faculty. And that's something that we offer to the region that we're close to. And additionally -- what else was I going to say? Another reason that we shouldn't do online -- that we shouldn't move in the direction of online teaching is all those great universities that you just cited already have their programs up and running. Why would a student from Chicago not do the University of New Hampshire program or University of Phoenix program? Our strength is attracting students from the region and I like to get them on campus as much as I can.

G. Long: Thank you. Daryl?

D. Dugas: As a younger faculty member, also completely comfortable with the Internet and also I do not agree with the direction of going to online education. I'm really uncomfortable with looking at these schools that are doing this and calling them automatically success stories. This is not a purely economic issue and to frame it that way is to bind in the business model that we're criticizing

the administration for taking. It needs to be a larger conversation about what is the meaning of higher education, of a college education, of faculty and our role here. And it goes beyond issues of tenure and those things. Although I think those are important. But I want to have a meaningful connection with my students. And I can't do that through a computer screen the same way. It is not the same thing. So I really think that needs to be on the table as part of this conversation when it happens.

G. Long: Thank you. Mark?

M. Rosenbaum: I have a question going back to the Washington Monthly rankings. And I saw those rankings when they came out, and was very happy to see where NIU ranked. My question is why is that information not being just broadcast all over the state of Illinois? And I mean, I would guess that number of faculty in the room didn't know about that ranking. That just seems to me such a missed opportunity. And so I wonder what's the -- what's the game plan with respect to getting the word out outside this campus about NIU -- about the quality of NIU and the things NIU has to offer? If we don't do that, we can offer whatever we want. We can do online teaching, we can do the greatest work in the world, and we're just going to continue to see enrollment decline. So where -- where was that Washington Monthly ranking in -- why wasn't it -- why was there a full page ad in the Chicago Tribune? I'm just not advocating that specifically.

G. Long: Right. Promote the things we're good at. Let people know some of our strengths.

M. Rosenbaum: Absolutely.

R. Freedman: There's an interesting intersection between the issue of online education and the issue of failed experiments disappearing. The last time that I remember that we had a big push for -- let's go online, it will solve all our problems was I can't remember exactly when. I think it was approximately 2007. And a lot of those programs just sort of disappeared and nobody explained why, although they were really good reason, why they didn't actually work. Part of it was the way they set up tuition, part of it was the fact they didn't do a very good job of it. And part of it was the fact that as somebody just pointed out, a lot of other schools were already doing it bigger and better. So it was just another failed experiment that disappeared. Tom and --

T. Pavkov: I just want to make a point about online education. I think sometimes we make a false dichotomy between: It's either/or, face-to-face or online. I'm doing something now with an online course in a doctoral program where I'm meeting face-to-face online using Adobe Connect. And I find that to be a pretty effective way of building relationships, rapport with my students, and conducting a seminar and having meaningful discussion. So it, you know, if we use the tools that are out there, it can be done. Many times I found in approaching online sorts of modalities is that I don't know what I don't know because I don't know exactly what, how people do it. And so in exploring that world, it might, you might find some things that are interesting for you.

G. Long: Let's have ethis be our last comment.

R. Feurer: I think Program Prioritization somehow got left out of the bold there. And I think connecting that to a concern about, lack of faith, that the administration has the same priorities as

the faculty. The most disturbing thing that I've heard in the last year is when Lisa Freeman came and said that she felt rewarded by talking to state legislators who were very glad that we were undergoing program prioritization. And my heart skipped a beat or two at that comment, because as the chief intellectual officer of our campus, I think she should have questioned legislators' motives. I think we need an administration and faculty that fight for the salvation of public education. And every last little scheme that comes down the pike, it seems that administration buys into. And I would really like to have faculty express the voice that we together need to figure out how to save it public education for our citizens.

G. Long: Now, do you feel that as an approach to discussing this that using Faculty Senate time in this manner is valuable? Is this something as far as discussion moving forward that you would like me to continue to make a part of our meetings? Is that --

Unidentified: Sure. Yeah.

G. Long: All right, good. I mean certainly there may be other things going on, but I would like to continue these discussions. I think it worked really well. It was good to hear people talking at their tables, hopefully you met some new people. We will send this out, you know, we'll summarize this again, send it out to you. But it gives me something to work with. I appreciate feedback.

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

G. Long: And motion to adjourn?

G. Slotsve: So moved.

J. Novak: Second.

G. Long: All right. We're done.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.