

TRANSCRIPT

FACULTY SENATE

Wednesday, January 22, 2020, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Arado, Bateni, Bennardo, Beyer, Buck, Burton, G. Chen, J. Chen, Chmaissem, Clark, Collins, Creed, Cripe (for Riley), Demir, Duffin, Duffrin (for McCarthy), Farrell, Fredericks, Grund, Hanna, Ito, Jaekel, Johnson, Johnston-Rodriguez, Jong, Keddie, Konen, Kuehl, Lampi, Littauer, Mayer, McGowan, Millhorn, Millis, Montana, Mooney, Nelson, Newman, Pendergrass, Petgas, Polansky, Powell, Qin, Schraufnagel, Sharp, Shi, Siegesmund, Skarbinski, Slotsve, Staikidis, Surjadi, Tatara, Than, Thu, Vazquez (for Whedbee), Villanueva, Weffer, Wilson, York

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Bujarski, Chomentowski, Gau, Hanley, Hua, Koss, Macdonald, Martin, McCarthy, Moraga, Penrod, Rau, Riley, Schatteman, Scherer, Sirotkin, Subramony, Vahabzadeh, Whedbee, Zheng

OTHERS PRESENT: Bolden, Bryan, Clay, Doederlein, Falkoff, Ghrayeb, Groza, Jensen, Klaper, Pearson

OTHERS ABSENT: Ferguson, Gelman, Marsh, Kortegast, Woodruff

I. CALL TO ORDER

K. Thu: Good afternoon, everyone. I'd like to call the Faculty Senate meeting to order, January Faculty Senate meeting, our first of the spring semester. So welcome back everybody.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

K. Thu: I'll entertain a motion to adopt the agenda.

G. Slotsve: So moved.

K. Thu: George. Second? Whoever you want to pen. Is there any discussion? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

K. Thu: Opposed? Abstentions? We have an agenda.

III. APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 20, 2019 MINUTES

K. Thu: Next approval of the November 20 Faculty Senate minutes that are on pages 3 to 5 in your packet, a very large packet I might add. Do we have a motion to approve the November Faculty Senate meeting minutes?

P. Skarbinski: So moved.

K. Thu: Moved. Do I have a second?

G. Slotsve: Second.

K. Thu: Second, George. Any corrections, deletions, edits? Okay, all in favor, signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

K. Thu: Opposed? Abstentions? All right, we have the minutes approved.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

K. Thu: Next, President's Announcements. I don't have anything formal, except to say what I said in the Faculty Senate Steering Committee and at the University Council Steering Committee meeting, which is that this is going to be a busier semester than the fall semester. So I'm going to ask your indulgence, because I suspect – not suspect – I know these meetings are going to take longer than they did in the fall. As you may remember, I tried to facilitate the meeting so you could get out of here usually be 4 o'clock or a little after 4. That's not going to happen this time. I'm still going to try to keep things moving, but I suspect that we're not going to get out of her until 4:30. And I know that meetings seem like they go interminably long when you're in the middle of them, but remember we only have four meetings. And so we have a lot on our agenda to cover this spring semester. So please indulge us and try to stay here until at least 4:30, and I'll try to keep the meeting marching along.

So that's it for President's Announcements.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

- A. The Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award – call for nominations
Submit written letters of nomination to Faculty Senate President Kendall Thu
no later than noon Wednesday, Feb. 12, 2020.

K. Thu: The other item for Faculty Senate consideration is under Roman numeral V. Just a note to you that there is a call for the Bob Lane Advocacy Award. There's a call for nominations. That's on page 6. The actual call for nominations says to send your nomination letter to Linda Saborío, but no, you should send it to me instead. So please take a look at that if you have faculty that you deem worthy of that award, by all means send me a nomination letter. And they don't have to be very long at all. And the deadline, as it indicates in the agenda, is Wednesday, Feb. 12, so you do have

some time. And if you do nominate someone, please contact them to let them know; or let us know so we can make sure that they're I guess amenable to being nominated.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

K. Thu: So we have no consent agenda.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- A. Proposed Admissions Policy
Related research articles

K. Thu: Let's move quickly to the two major items under Unfinished Business. By way of sort of bringing us up to speed from what happened last fall, as you may remember, a proposal to change our undergraduate admissions policy came before this body. And the Faculty Senate voted in concept to proceed with a test-less admissions policy. The Faculty Senate asked the Baccalaureate Council to operationalize that policy. And the Baccalaureate Council agreed to do that, and put in diligent work to craft catalog language to accommodate that change.

So, I want to talk about what those catalog changes are first. And then we have with us folks from the Admissions Office and Sol and Omar and Quinton to answer questions. There were questions that came up during the Faculty Senate Steering Committee meeting and more so in the UC Steering Committee meeting that I really couldn't answer very well. So they're here to answer questions.

By way of explaining the process, as you know, Faculty Senate as of yet doesn't have any power to set academic policy, but I was insistent that this proposal, since it's a significant one, be brought before the Faculty Senate. And once it went to the Baccalaureate Council, I promised to bring it back for your comments, so that's what we're doing here.

So what I want to do if I can turn around here is I'm going to go through – I'm not going to – the intent here is not to wordsmith during Faculty Senate, but I do want to go through the major changes that are highlighted in yellow. And in your packet, you have two versions. You have one with the tracking in it. And then you have a clean version that follows that. So you have two different versions. The language is identical; it's just that the first one has the tracking changes in it. And also in your packet are all the academic articles that we've assembled that support the move towards test-less admissions policy. So I'm going to go through these. I might turn to our admissions experts at points here if I need some clarification.

The major change, of course, is to remove the requirement for ACT and SAT scores. There is a consistent set of research literature that shows that high school grades are much better predictors than standardized tests. And it's also the case that standardized tests discriminate against marginalized groups. And there are, as you'll see in your packet, if you haven't read it already, there are some thousands of universities, colleges around the country that have moved in this direction or are moving in this direction. In Illinois, I believe Quinton you told me, there are four schools that have already moved in this direction or are moving in this direction. And so because as we went

through the exercise last fall, that recruitment and retention is the top priority for Faculty Senate, this is, of course, an important element of that effort.

A few things that we're going to go through here: The Baccalaureate Council attended to situations where we don't have high school grades. So people, students who want to apply to NIU who are, who get a GED or perhaps the very few schools where there are no grades, they added language for a sort of holistic review of those applicants. And by the way, the entire application process is focused in large part about holistic review. And as you'll see, the actual grade point average requirement for automatic admission has been raised.

So as we scroll down to the next yellow spot, then it's made explicit that ACT and SAT scores are not required, but they may be required for those programs that have limited admissions requirements. That is, there are those programs that have more stringent requirements like I believe engineering and others. So it may be the case – is that correct? Nursing, I'm sorry, nursing is in that. And computer science, for example, is another one.

Then go down to the next. The same point as with students who get a GED, home schooled students, those students that apply for admission will also undergo holistic review.

And if we can scroll down. Here we have the change to the automatic admissions policy. It used to be that if students had a high school GPA of 2.75 or above, they would automatically be enrolled. Now that's been changed to 3.0. So 3.0 and above, those students are automatically enrolled.

And then here we have two other categories of students based upon their high school GPA. So there's a little bit of confusion about this – well actually, a little bit of confusion by me in the University Council Steering Committee meeting – that I want to make sure I get right here, respond to. A student with a GPA of 2.5 to 2.99 are eligible for holistic review by the Office of Undergraduate Admission, so Sol's office and Quinton's office – one of your offices. And then there's some criteria down below that we can get to for what is considered as part of a holistic review.

Students who have a GPA of between 2.0 and 2.49 will have their application go before the University Review Committee for review. So at the time last week, I wasn't able to make the distinction. Now I think I understand it a little bit better.

So one group is the Admissions Office. The other group is a University Review Committee, which is, as I understand it, is going to consist of representatives from each of the colleges, is that right? And faculty from each of the colleges, is that correct?

S. Jensen: Unknown.

K. Thu: Unknown, okay.

S. Jensen: Inaudible

K. Thu: So those students who have a GPA between 2.0 and 2.49, if they get the go-ahead by the University Review Committee, then do they go back to the Admissions Office? No, okay, got it. So there's two groups doing the review, Admissions Office for those who have a slightly higher high school GPA, and then the University Review Committee for those who have a lower GPA of 2.0 to 2.49.

Any questions about any of that yet. James?

J. Burton: Thank you. It says, "are eligible for holistic application review by the Office of Admissions." So that doesn't mean they're required to have a holistic review if I'm at 2.5 to 2.99. I just want to clarify for the record, are these folks, 2.5 to 2.99 actually being reviewed? Or are they just eligible for a review?

K. Thu: They will be reviewed, correct? You want to hand a [microphone] back to Omar there?

Q. Clay: Yes, this is language that the Baccalaureate Council crafted, but they will be reviewed. It's not optional. They will be reviewed.

K. Thu: So we could make a friendly amendment here. I don't want to wordsmith here, but rather than "are eligible," we could change it to "will undergo a holistic application review." And I don't think the Baccalaureate Council would mind that sort of change. Would that deal with your question, James?

O. Ghrayeb: Can I say something? Actually, this is just to make the distinction between auto-admit and the other two categories. So if they are not automatically admitted, and they only can be automatically admitted if their high school GPA is 3 and above, then they can be eligible to this or that. So that was the idea. So they are not admitted, but they are eligible for admission review. Does that make sense? Now if their GPA is less than 2.5, they're not automatically admitted, but they are eligible for committee review. So it's like, if-then rule.

K. Thu: But I still think the language change would make it clearer, unless somebody objects to that. Rather than "are eligible," "will undergo a holistic application review by the Office of Undergraduate Admissions." Is there any objection to that by any of you?

O. Ghrayeb: I can bring it back to the BC. The intention is the same.

K. Thu: Yes, I think it is.

O. Ghrayeb: Right?

K. Thu: Yes.

O. Ghrayeb: I don't see a problem, because anyways, it has to go to the UC [University Council] for culmination, because it culminates, this process will culminate at the UC.

K. Thu: Right, right.

O. Ghrayeb: So, sure.

K. Thu: Okay. Other questions?

B. Creed: In there it talks about schools without grades. I know the state of Illinois and in the K-12 public school sector is moving towards competency-based grading, which is not necessarily going to produce a GPA. And so I'm looking at this and seeing there's an additional barrier for kids in those schools that they would have to submit additional materials. There's no automatic enrollment even if they're deemed competent on all core subjects, which would be equivalent to at least a 3.0 probably. So I just wonder if that's something to consider, adding some sort of piece in here saying, if meeting all competency requirements, they fall under that 3.0 or above automatic admittance. And that's statewide going on led by ISBE. So just wanted to know if you all have thought about that a bit; and if so, how that fits into this process.

Q. Clay: Absolutely. We're still thinking about that. All of the directors of admission across the Illinois publics and many of the privates, we've been in communication, because this is really new. So all of us are going to have to make an adjustment. But we're fully aware and we're trying to make sure that we have a strategy that's sensitive to that and not institute a barrier.

B. Creed: I just think it's an opportunity for NIU to be a leader [inaudible].

Q. Clay: Absolutely.

K. Thu: So then that brings us to the actual holistic review factors, which are added to the language. And I want. Quinton, do you want to talk about the holistic review criteria and the process?

Q. Clay: Absolutely. The holistic review is really important to us, because again – and I'm new to NIU if there's a lot of folks who don't recognize the face or name, this is my second year as director of admission here. But the holistic review, I think, is really important, because if we're removing the standardized test score, I think it's really critical that we institute one more layer of scrutiny to make sure we've evaluated all of the information possible to make the best decision on behalf of the institution, but also be familiar with our student population that's here and all the services that can accompany and support those students forward.

So now we have an additional layer that's not currently in place. Not only have we raised that automatic admission grade point average, which is the highest predictor for persistence in graduation to 3.0 from the 2.75 with the test score, but now we've also instituted one more layer of consideration. And that layer is highly individual and flexible. For some students, we'll be able to tell and determine by the curriculum what the student has selected in comparison to what's actually available at their school, that that student has taken on more rigor. And we can gauge that performance. We can look at grade trends. Some students will show an upward trend, or a steady trend, or it will be evident if students are declining by the time they get to their junior and senior year, which is really critical for us to know. We can look at the courses that pertain to the declared major or field of study and see how the student has performed in those courses. We can look at a lot

of factors in a context that we're currently not doing. And that holistic review, again, is designed for us to tease out, what are some of the questions, what are some of the red flags potentially, or what are some of the more strong elements of promise that we can zoom in to for each student.

But it's important to keep that holistic review flexible, because all students don't look the same. And having been a person who's read admissions applications for 15 years prior to coming here, I'll tell you that there's a thousand different circumstances that we'll run into. But again, this criteria is really important to guide that process within the Office of Admissions, but also in the University Review Committee.

The last thing I'll say is that I think it's extremely important to think about introducing an opportunity to look at seventh semester grades, and then also to look at the context of the high schools. Students are coming from sometimes under-resourced schools. And sometimes students are coming from schools that have a very strong track record in curriculum. The Office of Admissions being sort of that outward facing sort of tether to the secondary education system, not only has a chance to grab more information directly from the schools and the school counselors, but we also have an opportunity to build relationships with these schools. And those relationships certainly will be productive for NIU as we're not just trying to review applications and make a decision, but we still want to yield the student, right? We still want to enroll those promising students. So I think this presents us also a great opportunity to build and deepen roots and relationships with schools and communities that not only inform our practices, but also lead to the ultimate goal, which is to enroll students and have strong relationships and brand recognition.

K. Thu: Other questions up to this point?

J. Lampi: I'm all for access and providing academic equity to all students. However, as you just mentioned, this is a good route to providing access to NIU, but it does not inherently provide access to the different majors and programs. And so I'm wondering if this requires some more buy-in specifically from the programs and departments in that, if we're providing access to NIU, that there is also a pipeline of success that they could also have access to programs and majors. If not, then it becomes an equity thing where we have students with financial aid, loans, and whatnot, but yet not yet able to get into the program. So that's one question I have is how do we build a pipeline not only from access to NIU, but also into the majors and programs.

A second thing I have too is that this research absolutely does ensure that there is higher enrollment, there's more access that's more equitable. But it does not inherently increase retention. So what do we do to bridge the gap between boosting enrollment, but yet also trying to boost retention.

K. Thu: Who wants to take part one? Omar.

O. Ghrayeb: Well let me talk about the access. Actually, let's compare the proposed admission standard to the existing, to the current state admission standard. Right now the current state admission standard, we have the traditional admission, and we have the conditional admission, which is the CHANCE admission. Now whether those students come to us through traditional admission or CHANCE admission, they can choose any major unless those majors that have certain set of prerequisites that they have to meet.

Now with the new admission standard, actually access is improved; and students who are admitted, whether through the auto admit or admission review or committee review, still they can choose any major. We don't have barrier admission to majors, as of now. In other institutions, just so that you know, engineering, for example, they might have barrier admission. Their requirements would be higher than requirements of other majors. At NIU, if you are admitted to NIU, you can choose any major you want to choose, right? So the access is not hurt, actually it is improved, because the current state again, another dimension to compare current practice versus proposed admission standard, right now students – we have about 25 percent of our incoming students, incoming freshman students, they come to us through CHANCE program. Those students, they don't have access or they don't have a shot at being considered for University Honors, right? Now with this change, we also changed the admission to the University Honors, and we are using holistic admission. So those students who are admitted based on the new admission or the proposed admission criteria will have a chance to be considered or to apply and be admitted to the University Honors. If we run the simulation, last cohort, last year, out of the 500 students, about 150 to 160 students won't be eligible to be University Honors, which is great step for those students.

Now another advantage in terms of equity, right now those students who come to us, 25 percent of our incoming freshman students, don't have a chance to be considered for merit-based scholarship. Now they will have a shot at that as well, and they can compete like everyone else who's admitted to NIU. So access, I mean to answer the question directly, the access is not only guaranteed, but actually is improved, as we don't have barrier admission to specific programs.

Now about – I cannot agree more with the statement about making sure that we provide services for our students to be successful. When we talk about enrollment and growing our enrollment, here enrollment has, you know, that equation has two sides. One side is to bring in the students, but that's not the end of the effort. Actually, bringing in the students is one element. But really we have to make sure that we retain the students. And that's why last year the institution developed the Strategic Enrollment Management – and I'm sure many of you have heard about that – where we address recruitment and what action items and what strategies we're going to use and emphasize when it comes to recruitment.

But also retention. And retention is – we don't have a silver bullet, and no institution has a silver bullet. It is a multi-faceted approach. And I don't think that we have the time to go through everything, but we will make sure that we're going to invest in all the services to make sure that our students are successful.

K. Thu: So I want to let Gary have a chance here, and then I want to go through the rest of the changes, and at that point, answer any other questions. Gary, you had something?

G. Chen: I have two questions. On holistic admission review, one is about the language – a minor question – under the yellow highlighted language, “To support NIU's submission, the holistic admission review is flexible,” etc., I agree with keeping holistic review flexible, because that is the gray zone that we really cannot identify very obvious, crystal-clear, numerical majors. That's why we keep it flexible. But my first question is how this statement is tied up with support NIU's

mission. That is unclear to me as we want to make this part of the vitals or our policy. This part is unclear to me.

My second question is that do we have predicted number of potential student applicants coming in to this range between 2.5 and 2.99? Assuming it is an x number, which is, for example, 500 students, and we are opting for this holistic review done by a group of staff in Undergraduate Admission Office, how this workload is going to impact the quality of the process into the holistic review process.

And also, on top of this second question, I feel unclear about how this process is going to take place in your office. I hope that we can make clear about all this if that is too much of asking. Thank you.

K. Thu: So we know how many students apply in those categories of 2.5 to 2.99. Those data are available. I'm going to turn it over to Sol to respond to the question about how many students you're going to find in each of these categories.

S. Jensen: And of course, all of our data is historical data. So we can't tell you how many we're going to expect to have. I can give you the data for fall of 2019; but, of course, every year we hope that our application numbers increase. So ultimately, we hope that we have more students in these pools that we can review.

The number of students last fall who were applicants between a 2.5 and a 2.99 was 2,379. Now I say that with also the knowledge that that doesn't mean they were all completed applications. In this case, we would not have reviewed that large of a number. That would be the ceiling. I can't tell you how many of those students were or were not completed, meaning they never sent us their final transcripts for us to even make a decision on those. But that's the number there.

And then I know you didn't ask it, but I'll share it anyway. For that next group, that 2.0 to 2.49, that would be the University Review Committee, that number was just roughly about 1200.

K. Thu: So the other part of Gary's question is back to the issue of capacity and our ability to do this review. None of us in here are experts in admissions. You've done holistic review with x number of staff and x number of students coming in. And we can't solve all these challenges via catalog language, so in some sense we have to trust that you know what you're talking about and you know the admissions world. So can you assure us that you have the capacity to do a holistic review and we have the capacity to retain those students? And by the way, this won't be the

G. Chen: Kendall, sorry for the interruption. As for the record, I'm not asking for the real assurance. I'm asking for the clarity of the process, which is going to take place in real time. When we are having this more than thousands of student applicants coming into the system, how that x number of staff in the office is going to take the real time process. This part of the process that is totally unclear to me. I hope that can be more clear. Thank you.

K. Thu: Do you want to respond to that.

Q. Clay: I'll tell you that a lot of this is to be determined once we have that opportunity to implement it, because there are so many unknown variables. One would be, as Sol pointed out, we don't know what the volume is going to be in each category. And I'll tell you how real this is, sort of to the response that I think is accurate. For many students, the deterrent of the standardized test score or the reality that being admitted to NIU means I might not be able to enroll because the scholarship opportunity doesn't make it feasible for me to show up. Once the message is out that NIU is reviewing applications without a standardized test score, there very much could be an influx of a market that we've never seen, because it's not just about having the grades to be admitted to NIU, it's about being able to afford coming. So once that message is out, what we might see is a shift in the numbers. And there might be more students at a 3.0 and above. Currently, if you have a 4.0, straight A's all of your life, you're admitted to the CHANCE program if your standardized test score falls below the automatic criteria. So there's a lot of unknowns that I cautiously try not to get in front of, because there's so many different shifts.

But I'll tell you, my job is to figure out the capacity of my office, because in my opinion, this is the most important thing that a director of admission can do, actually admit students and craft that class. I've already made some adjustments to my organizational chart to accommodate what this additional workload would be like. But I'll still tell you, and admittedly, there's a lot of gray area, because we don't know what the market response is going to be. There may be a shift where more students, you know, in that middle category, that 2.0 to 2.49, apply, compared to trends in the past, because, again, once that word is out there, the market is going to respond one way or another. But we're currently assessing our capacity. We're currently assessing staffing. And we're making sure we can create efficiencies around this, which I consider to be one of the most central things that we can do.

I do have, over the course of 15 years, four different institutions that I've reviewed applications for. And based off of the admission criteria, components of the process, and the rigor and the selectivity of the institution, I have in mind what the average time is going to be for reviewing. I'll also note that we have the application for admission open from July 1 all the way until August essentially in the next year. So, we do have the course of several months to review these applications and render admission decisions. So, I think we've put ourselves in a good position to have some runway. But, of course, please expect that we're going to have some bumps in the road as we pilot this. But that thoughtfulness is there on the front end, and me having that direct experience, I'm confident that we'll be able to make this happen and enroll some great students for NIU.

K. Thu: And, of course, shared governance – oh, we need to move ahead, Gary, because we have a heavy agenda. This is not going to be the last time it will come before Faculty Senate. We'll learn about the bumps in the road as we go forward.

So, let me go through the rest of the changes, which is not that much. And then any unanswered questions.

P. Erickson: Kendall, do you want to invite some people to take these chairs up front. I think we've got people sitting on the floor and standing.

K. Thu: Sure, come on up. Come join us. If you want to scroll down through the rest of this, Pat. So, there's not much left here. This is all the competency requirements. Here's the GED again, referring to how they're going to be treated. The rest of this is somewhat repetitive with what's been stated earlier, concerning the freshman applications and then others. Go ahead and scroll down. There's nothing really new there. Keep on going.

And then there's a new paragraph about the CHANCE program that's been worked out in consultation with folks in the CHANCE program.

And that's it. As a matter of process, I want to share the Faculty Senate's feedback with the University Council. By rule, policy that's approved by Baccalaureate Council, if it's significant policy, gets forwarded to the University Council for review. They have to review it at one of the next two University Council meetings. So Baccalaureate Council approved this policy in December, and then that means that the University Council has a chance to respond to it in January and at least in February. If they don't do anything, by default, it becomes policy. So with that

G. Chen: Kendall, sorry for interrupting. May I have one last chance? I do hope that before coming to University Council meeting, I do hope this part of the process, which is going to take place, is going to be made clear to the University Council members. That's what I'm hoping for, because from your responses, that sounds from the [inaudible] good to me, but you also had mentioned there are many unknown factors, which are understandable. And I'm pretty sure you will be doing your best, but this is a policy-making, I don't think policy-making is going to be best on [inaudible] in my humble opinion. So I do hope the process going to take place, this is very informative. I'm supportive to this initiative, which is going to help NIU. But at the same time, I'm also concerned if we have let's say 10 staff members taking care of more than 1,000 or 1,500 applicants altogether. How do we make sure the quality of the reviewing process. So the process is what I'm unclear of. Thank you very much.

K. Thu: Thank you, Gary. Just a couple more questions or comments. Marc?

M. Falkoff: Thanks. I'll be very brief. Just for the applicants with a GPA less than 2.0, they don't meet the GPA requirement, but under some circumstances we'll still consider them. It looks like what they have to do is apply, be automatically denied, then file a petition and they'll be considered. That doesn't seem particularly efficient. Why don't you just say, if you have under a 2.0, you're unlikely to get in, however, you can submit a petition making the argument for why you should be here.

K. Thu: Well, as I understand it, it's not really a problem, because we get so few of these students under 2.0 that, if they want to petition for entry, very few of them are going to be approved. And I think you said last time one student got approved in the previous year? So it just hasn't been a problem.

M. Falkoff: I assume there's some way to deal with a student who has a 2.995 GPA?

K. Thu: Do you round up?

Q. Clay: 3.0 is

K. Thu: 3.0. Well then that's got to be part of the holistic review, right? Any other questions? Yes, Vicki.

V. Collins: Just a quick question. I noticed that there's two holistic reviews done, one by the Office of Undergrad Admissions when the GPA is 2.5 to 2.9, and one by the University Review Committee when the GPA is lower. And I guess my question for just clarity is, will the second holistic review committee by the University Review Committee, is that going to be a more extensive holistic review? How do those two differ?

K. Thu: They're going to have to answer that one.

Q. Clay: I do want to make sure that the distinction is, if a student is between a 2.5 and a 2.99, that's one review decision made. The second tier, if you will, would be the 2.0 to 2.49. And the University Review Committee would make a decision, and that's done. It doesn't go back through another part of the process. Now the holistic review process would be the same for both. And again, what's presented when you have an application would be the areas of emphasis that you have to dig into; and naturally, students with a 2.0 to a 2.49 would have a bit more of an in depth review. And I think again, having the presence of the colleges in addition to some of our academic advising staff and other support services around campus, I think that collective opinion is one that's done with great confidence, because of all those eyes and lenses. And again, we're identifying information that could be helpful in supporting those students once the decision is made. But when we looked at the data, the correlations of that population that's at the 2.5 to 2.99 and persistence demonstrates that you're not going to have a whole lot of surprises that require the same kind of depth that you do for those students at that lower level, the 2.0 to 2.49. Typically, I think what we're going to see is in the 2.5 to 2.99, it's going to be a red flag check in many instances; and if anything, again, requires some additional follow up, those things will be determined when you see it. But I'll tell you, in this process, you're going to see so many variables, I always caution that it's not valuable to have a holistic review process if you prescribe it out, because then it's not really a holistic review process. So I hope that addresses the questions and concerns.

V. Collins: Well for clarity [inaudible]

Q. Clay: I think the language in the catalog serves a particular point and purpose. And more extensive, in my sort of vantage point, sounds prescribed, because then it's well, what is that extensive, or what's the comparison. So, I think we might have landed at the language that serves the purpose for the catalog; and then procedurally, the practice of it again is where we have a lot of training. We have a lot of follow-up. We have a lot of touch points. And then we have an end-of-the-year assessment to make sure if there's lessons that we learned, we can implement those.

K. Thu: And like any policy that you put into place, you have to see what works and what doesn't. And you have to keep track of what's going on. So, this won't be the last bite of the apple for shared governance to take a look at this.

So, we can do one of two things. Or there can be a third thing. I can just take the feedback that you gave us that's in the record now and share that with University Council. We can do that and/or if you want to vote on this, you can, to send a signal to University Council what the Faculty Senate's sentiment is. This is your call. This is the faculty's voice on this issue. Richard?

R. Siegesmund: I'd like to make a motion that we approve this with the correction in that one sentence that James pointed out to make it clear that students will receive a holistic review

K. Thu: Right, rather than be eligible, they will receive

R. Siegesmund: that those students in that bracket will receive that.

J. Burton: Second.

K. Thu: Second from James. Additional discussion? This is the easy item on the agenda, by the way. Okay. Do we need clickers? Oh, I'm sorry. Naomi, I apologize. I got so caught up in trying to navigate the – I would like to introduce Naomi Bolden, who is the president of the Student Association, and who spoke eloquently on this issue during the Baccalaureate Council meeting. And you're sitting right here in front of me, and I forgot – I invited her here, and I forgot to let her speak about this issue. So I want to give you a moment to have your say before we vote.

N. Bolden: Hello. For those who don't know me, my name is Naomi Bolden. I'm a senior here at NIU studying journalism and political science. And as Dr. Thu said, I'm the president of the Student Government Association. I did speak at the Baccalaureate Council meeting just to give a little perspective from someone who went through the testing process when NIU was still accepting the test submissions.

I took my ACT when I was in high school, of course. I was in my junior year, I believe. And there weren't many resources that I personally was able to access. For example, tutoring. I think what I did was I attended the University of Illinois at Chicago, they provide weekly sessions for some of the high schools in the city that they partner with. And it just so happened that my high school was one of them. So I would go to their tutoring sessions once a week, and I think they lasted for a span of maybe six to, eight weeks. Within that, I got to take a practice test, just like the one that I took at my high school.

So, I'll give you a little timeline. My first practice test exam, I scored a 17. And to me that was really disheartening, because I'm thinking like, I'm a smart student. I've got good grades. Why can't I do a 27 or a 25 on the ACT? Then came another practice exam. I went up two more points and got a 19, so I'm like, okay, I see some improvement. So I keep working at it, you know I could get that very good score. What is a good score? To my knowledge, and maybe the Admissions Office can correct me if I'm wrong, but the average ACT in the U.S. is a 21. And that's actually what I scored when I went and took my actual first exam. To me a 21 was average, and thinking of myself highly, I'm like I'm not an average student. Maybe I should go and try it again. I tried two more times and, statistically, they say that your score does not change. And my changed. It just didn't change in my favor, and I actually went down a point and took it three times.

So for me, that was just kind of like it wasn't a wake-up call so to say, but it was just sort of an even though it's just a number, that number holds weight with my college application. It kind of pre-determines where I'm going to go for school. And because of that, I kind of got discouraged from applying to some other schools. Although I'm happy that I did come to NIU, I was discouraged from applying to some other schools that I was interested in because of a lower ACT score. I did maintain over a 3.0 when I was in high school. I was involved in student government, dance, mainly some of the things that I'm also involved in at NIU, came to NIU, got involved in those same exact things and have done extremely well, in my opinion. And I can definitely say that, without an ACT score, I probably would have gotten other opportunities. There might have been other opportunities for scholarships. I know someone had mentioned staying at NIU, which I have personally struggled with, and I am very open about that, because it's not easy. And I can definitely say that, although a test score kind of gives you a little bump for some students with that 27 or that 28, and they have a 4.0 GPA, that's great. But then there's other students who don't do as well on standardized tests, and I'm one of those personally. It kind of comes with that mindset of this: if I don't pass, if I don't do well, I'm not going to do well in college. And that's really not true. And I can definitely say that I – and I'm sure the student government are very supportive of NIU going test-blind, is what I believe it's called. Thank you.

K. Thu: Thank you, Naomi. We're glad that you came to NIU. [applause] And I believe law school is in your future?

N. Bolden: Yes, I actually will be graduating in December, so my applications will be coming right along with it. And NIU is one of them.

K. Thu: Marc, did you hear that? Okay, we have a motion on the floor. Anymore discussion before we vote? I think we do have to clicker vote this one. I think it's important enough that we actually have a record. So, Pat can you walk us through?

P. Erickson: I think everybody is pretty familiar with using the clickers. Remember, you don't have to turn them on. One is yes, you're in favor of the motion. Two is no, you are not in favor. Three is abstain. And we're open for business, and you can go ahead and click. And you can click a different – you can change your mind – you can do anything you want with those three choices up until the time we close the ballot.

K. Thu: So, we're ready to click. [pause for voting] Everybody ready? Okay, let's go ahead and close the vote. 45 for, 5 against, 6 abstain. And the motion carries. Congratulations, I think this is the right thing to do for NIU.

YES – 45 votes

NO – 5 votes

ABSTAIN – 6 votes

K. Thu: So your sentiments will be clearly communicated to the University Council at next week's University Council meeting. And then we'll also make the language change that James suggested.

B. Restructuring Shared Governance
Faculty Senate Bylaws portion of packet – FIRST READING

K. Thu: Next, we have – thank you very much for coming, and thanks for all your work on this; appreciate it. Item B. under Unfinished Business – I’m mindful of time. I want to make sure that we try to get you out of here by 4:30. It might bleed over a little bit. But what you have in your packet in pages 210 to 433 are documents related to proposed changes in our shared governance structure. So, I want to spend some time explaining what our shared governance structure is, because I don’t want to make the mistake that I’ve made in the past and assume that everybody knows what the structure looks like. And then go through – and I’m going to tag team this a little bit with our colleague, Richest Siegesmund, who is the chair of the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee that’s been working on this as well.

Last fall I presented a sort of benchmarking data for you, looking at shared governance structures at our sister institutions in Illinois. And at that time, I also spoke with my counterparts at all of our sister institutions to make sure I understood where we stand with our shared governance structure compared to our sister institutions. And what I came away with is the fact that we have a very strange shared governance structure where we have University Council and a Faculty Senate. And in our bylaws, Constitution and Bylaws, this lovely document here, we have what I think of as three sets of documents. Maybe Pat doesn’t think of it this way, but I do. We have a Constitution. We have a set of bylaws under the Constitution that govern University Council. And then we have a set of bylaws that governs Faculty Senate.

As most of you know from your experiences on Faculty Senate, under the Constitution and the Faculty Senate Bylaws, but primarily under the Constitution, Faculty Senate has no authority over academic matters. That’s different than other institutions. So many of us who’ve been coming to Faculty Senate meetings, sometimes we wonder why are we here? What can we get done? What can we actually accomplish?

Faculty Senates elsewhere, the academic policies are set under the rules of their Faculty Senate. Currently, it’s the University Council that has authority over academic policy. So, the overall policy change here is actually pretty simple. Operationalizing it may be a little more difficult, but the concept is to move the authority for academic matters from University Council over to Faculty Senate, which is where they rightly belong, because faculty should be in charge of academic matters – standards, admissions. So if the admissions policy that’s being proposed was being proposed to us with this structural change in place, this would be the last stop for it. It wouldn’t go to University Council. The Faculty Senate would approve it, and that would be it. Well it would still have to go through Baccalaureate Council. As it stands now, things have to get bounced back and forth between Faculty Senate and Faculty Senate committees, University Council, University Council committees, and then eventually approval will occur at some point if we’re lucky.

So this constitutes a first reading. I want to just reassure everybody who’s nervous about this, that a first reading under our bylaws for amending the Constitution and amending bylaws – it doesn’t mean anything in terms of triggering subsequent action. So a first reading today doesn’t mean we have to take a second reading in February or have to take a second reading in March. A first reading

is just a first reading. You don't vote on it. You just make sure – you try to let everybody know what's going on and what the proposal is.

I see this as an iterative process and a didactic process. The Faculty Senate has the authority to pass changes to the Faculty Senate Bylaws. University Council has the authority to change University Council Bylaws. And the University Council has the authority to change the Constitution. But the University Council doesn't have the authority to change Faculty Senate Bylaws. So, you have to have a process that is contingent on each other, because the overall changes require changes to both Faculty Senate Bylaws, University Council Bylaws, and the Constitution. So they each depend on the other. So, if and when Faculty Senate gets to a point where it wants to vote on proposed bylaw changes to the Faculty Senate, they're necessarily going to have to be contingent on changes that the University Council passes to the Constitution and University Council Bylaws. Does that gobbledygook make sense? It's a balancing act, because we're looking at the whole ball of was, and it's necessary to do that.

In your packet are the benchmarking PowerPoint from last fall, but also there is – I believe we sent out an addendum email that contained three documents, because it's a little bit difficult to understand. There's a one-page summary of all the proposed changes. And then there's two other documents, and you've seen them before. It's the current organization structure of our shared governance, and then the other one is the proposed. So, somebody, I believe it was in Faculty Senate, said just work from these three documents so that people can sort of fathom what's going on. And by the way, Richard [Siegesmund] has a graduate student who's going to actually respond to Vicki's [Collins] request that we have a graphic representation that improves – it's not that Pat didn't do a great job – but so you can see visually how that one-pager is represented in the graphic. So basically, the change is removing the reporting line of committees that deal almost exclusively, but not always exclusively with faculty, regular faculty matters and moving them over to Faculty Senate where they should be. So everything from curriculum to tenure and promotion, grievance procedures for faculty, everything there that's currently faculty-oriented in University Council, gets moved over under the Faculty Senate umbrella. And then we still have two committees that are joint. That is the Resource, Space and Budget Committee and then Richard's committee, which is Rules, Governance and Elections. What am I missing, Richard, before I turn it over to you?

Does anybody have any questions at this point, because we're not taking action today. We're just trying to inform you of what the landscape looks like and where we're trying to push it to. Okay, so, Richard, do you want to go through the one page – if you could go back to that, Pat.

R. Siegesmund: Page 210.

K. Thu: So this is the one page summary of changes. So there's changes in the Constitution that authorize the senate to become the primary academic body. There are changes in the University Council Bylaws. And then down below, there are some changes in the Faculty Senate Bylaws. Now there are other things that emerge as we go through this that we have to attend to, right, issues that we hadn't contemplated. I think at that point, I'm going to turn it over to Richard if you feel comfortable to take it from there, and then we may do a little tag teaming going forward. And by all means, ask questions, because this is a pretty significant proposal. So go ahead, Richard.

R. Siegesmund: The original proposal was really conceived as a cut-and-paste job, in which responsibilities in the University Council were simply moved in to Faculty Senate. A couple of things emerged from that, that once you begin to start moving those responsibilities, you are changing the way that University Council might be conceptualized, which is not our purview to change University Council. But if University Council were to cede those responsibilities, it's an issue that needs to begin at University Council. That creates a parallel process of dialog that needs to happen where University Council is really raising the issue of what does it become if these changes come through. And so that is a big shift in it.

And talking about this, there has also been raised and concerns that perhaps our Constitution, bylaws, are not perfect documents to begin with; and cutting and pasting is not really addressing things that may have been long-term problems. And that if this is the moment when we are reorganizing, this is the moment to think about what our long-term inequities in it.

One of those issues that has been raised is the fact that instructors and clinical faculty are disenfranchised in our joint governance system. It's a complicated process, and one of the aspects that in terms of how to go about that, the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee did not want to be working as a small committee trying to get this right and then bringing you a "perfect" document. That it would be better to try to be as transparent from the beginning as possible, knowing that we can't really specifically wordsmith in a situation like this. So, our suggestion is that concerns be brought forward. So, for example, the concern regarding instructors and clinical faculty, which James initially brought forward, and did that at University Council and University Council Steering, James put forward areas in the bylaws and Constitution where he sees problem with that. In response, Kendall met yesterday

K. Thu: I'll just share quickly. I met with Keith Nyquist, who is the president of the instructor union yesterday, and we went through suggestions for how to define instructors. Instructors are defined under the instructors collective bargaining agreement, so we can just use that language. And we also discussed instructor representation in Faculty Senate, because they are completely shut out now. And I think I can safely say that he was very appreciative that a group of instructors, that in many ways are treated like second-class citizens here, even though they do a fantastic job, are being listened to, recognized and incorporated into our revisions to our shared governance plans.

R. Siegesmund: So, in that sense, it's an iterative process of trying to fashion that. And that's a place, too, where the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee, as that problem sort of coalesces, can perhaps fine-tune it, and then bring it back here. What I think Faculty Senate can do, and which I would invite, would be to identify those places that might be problematic in the situation, invite concern for refinement of language. We don't have to work it out word for word. And we don't have to make motions and hammer it out on the big screen so-to-speak. But to say that this is an issue, and it needs attention, and the degree to which you can actually point to in the Constitution – here's the issue, look at that right here – we can then try to work that out in meetings like the one that Kendall just had with Keith in terms of get the right stakeholders, try to talk it out, move it back up to the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee that perhaps can then bring forward a specific recommendation for refinement of the language. And just in general, our attitude is these are all really friendly amendments at this point, that this is not, what has been forward is the lock-step system, and so this needs to be challenged, and we need to go through the formal Roberts

Rules of Order process. I hope that we are still in a more of a consensus oriented, informal process. But to actually be efficient with our time, I think we need to first of all kind of make those thematic problems that need to be addressed, to the best of our ability, where do those lie in the Constitution, and then come back into a next meeting and see how we could address those thematic problems.

K. Thu: Thanks, Richard. And so I sort of cut myself off when I was talking about the process. So when I say a didactic process, what I mean is that whatever issues and concerns that come up in the Faculty Senate meeting will be shared with next week's University Council meeting. Whatever comes up in the University Council meeting will be shared with the subsequent Faculty Senate meeting. And on we go until if and when we get to a point where we feel comfortable with actually voting on the changes, which would be a second reading.

But everything's transparent. So, we keep track, we try to keep track of all the suggestions and concerns. And then those questions and concerns, that have not been incorporated into the drafts this time, will be incorporated after next week's University Council meeting so they're ready. And we'll prepare another executive summary that says, okay, here are these additional considerations that we need to attend to.

R. Siegesmund: Can I just clarify that the second reading, which is – we only vote on this when we're finished with the discussion.

K. Thu: Right, that's right.

R. Siegesmund: A second reading does not mean that next meeting we vote on this.

K. Thu: Right, that's right.

R. Siegesmund: That it's simply that this has been introduced onto the floor, we are in discussion, the discussion goes for as long as it needs to go until we're comfortable with it. And as part of this is, we need to put a package forward where University Council is comfortable ceding its power under those conditions to us. So we don't have the authority to actually do this. All we can put forward is a proposal for a better way of governance that we hope University Council is open to and will listen to, and which University Council thinks about: What does it become and how is it reorganized now. And so, both of those things kind of have to work separately, but together, and cross the finish line together.

K. Thu: Thank you, Richard. So, with that sort of overview, questions or concerns that any of you have? So I know it's exciting and glitzy stuff, shared governance, but it is important. And so we want to make sure that we provide adequate time for it to go through a vetting process. As Richard says, it's completely transparent. Everything that we are suggesting is going to be in the document, and we'll include – and what the Faculty Senate Steering Committee suggested is that what we present at this level be the summary and the graphic organizational charts. And hopefully, by the next Faculty Senate meeting, we will have the new organizational chart with a graphic portrayal.

R. Siegesmund: It will be so clear.

K. Thu: So we'll come back in February, at the February meeting, let you know what University Council opined on next week. And then we'll just continue the progression.

R. Siegesmund: If there are thematic concerns that you have, please – we didn't talk about this, Kendall, but I'm going to ask that they send them up to you and Pat.

K. Thu: Yes, absolutely.

R. Siegesmund: And Pat can keep a log of what has been raised, and that can go to Rules, Governance and Elections. And we can keep a scorecard as to whether we're addressing the issues that have come up. And so that in the next meeting, we can say that concern has been advanced, and this is how we propose that it be handled. But you know it's a lot expect, like in this meeting, for people to start grabbing microphones and saying, this is where it needs to be done. If you wake up at 5 o'clock in the morning on Saturday and you suddenly have a brilliant idea, you can fire off an email, and we can try to deal with it.

K. Thu: Okay, so we'll bring this back again in the February Faculty Senate meeting. And for those of you who are here and who are also on University Council, you'll also get to weigh in again on it at that point.

K. Thu: All right, next on the agenda, we've got several items that we need to get through. There is no New Business that I know of. We don't have any, Pat?

G. Slotsve: Kendall, I want to make sure [inaudible] do we have to table, or is there something we have to do to ensure this continues next time?

K. Thu: It's just a

G. Slotsve: Just want to double-check [inaudible].

K. Thu: Thank you.

F. Bryan: That part of Roberts Rules will follow. A first reading is simply advance notice that we're making this big change. And I think we've given adequate notice that this is as big a change as you can imagine. So everyone has to be on notice that the second reading would be a vote.

K. Thu: And again, the second meeting doesn't have to be in February. It doesn't have to be in March. I'm hoping that maybe we can get the proposed changes passed by the last meeting in April, but we'll see how it goes. Thanks, George.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

IX. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

- A. Faculty Advisory Council to IBHE – Linda Saborío – report (Kendall Thu)

K. Thu: So, Faculty Advisory Council to IBHE. Usually this is Linda Saborío, but I filled in for her at the last meeting in December, which was at DePaul University. First of all, how many of you know what FAC is? Therese does. Of course, she does. The Faculty Advisory Council is created by the bylaws of the Illinois Board of Higher Education. The Faculty Advisory Council to the higher education board is just that. It's sort of like our senate. It's completely advisory. The Faculty Advisory Committee to the Illinois Board of Higher Education met on the same day as the Illinois Board of Higher Education met at DePaul University. So I know we have limited time.

A couple of things that came out of that meeting – and my reports are not nearly as colorful as Linda's – but the committee was able to meet with John Atkinson, who is the chair of the Illinois Board of Higher Education. And the board is being tasked with developing a master plan for higher education that's supposed to be delivered by the end of the calendar year to the governor and the Governor's Office. What exactly is in that master plan, who knows. He didn't elaborate a lot. One of the things that I asked of him, well can we make a component of this master plan that tenure-track faculty are at the core of higher education and in community colleges. And that spurred a lot of positive comments from community colleges, in particular, and how they were losing tenure-track faculty to instructors. And again, I don't want to belittle instructors; they're extremely important. So, he indicated that that could be part of the plan. There were also concerns about – so what is going to be included in the master plan is something that NIU will be at the table for, both at the administrative level and at the faculty level.

There was also discussion of trying to get the Faculty Advisory Committee more closely involved in the machinations of the Illinois Board of Higher Education. They wanted to be heard. Discussion of dual credit by high schools and colleges – this is the same issue that came up when the meeting was here, meaning that high schools are now increasingly involved in teaching courses for which they are giving college credit. The issue from faculty was: How do we ensure the quality of those courses being taught at high schools if we're going to give them college credit for it? There wasn't a clear answer to that.

On the flip side, affordability and graduation is important, so we have to try to increase opportunities for students to finish on time, given the debt load that they're incurring these days. So that was part of the conversation.

I'm not going to go through all of this. This is just too much. But the board approved a 5.9 percent recommended increase in higher education budget. This is an increase that's comparable to what we got last year, but we're still digging out of a hole, and we still have a ways to go.

There is a link, I think there's a link in the Faculty Senate agenda that I want to point out. It's called Positive Picture for State Higher Education Funding. It's Item T. in the Information Items. That link will take you to where Illinois stands in terms of higher education funding relative to all of the states in the country. And there are only four or five states that had higher support for higher education in the last two years than Illinois. But, of course, we have those previous how-many years that we dug a hole for ourselves. But a little bit of positive news there.

So with that, any questions about the Faculty Advisory Committee to the IBHE. Okay.

- B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – report
Jeffry Royce, Cathy Doederlein, Kendall Thu
Alex Gelman, Sarah Marsh, Jason Hanna

K. Thu: If not, then the University Advisory Committee to the BOT. I guess that's me too. A couple of big-ticket items from the board's meeting on December 5. They approved two new degree programs. One is a Ph.D. program in kinesiology and physical education. Anybody here from that neck of the woods? And then also approval of a new degree program – a B.S. and a B.A. in women, gender and sexuality studies, which got a round of applause in the BOT board room. So those two new degree programs were approved.

Also they discussed budgeting. Tuition is held flat. Overall fees are down from FY20 to 21, student fees. Although, there's variation from one type of fee to the next. A new culture and arts fee was passed that will allow students to attend theatre events with no cost.

There was the recognition of faculty and staff awards, a list of the programs that are currently under review under the normal review process. And then a budget report. We are falling a little bit behind over budget for the first quarter of this year. I don't understand all the numbers. I don't claim to. All I understand is that we are, for the first quarter, a bit behind where we are.

Decentralization of budgets rolled out January 1. I'm very interested to hear from anybody who's gotten feedback on what is working, what's not working. I haven't heard much at all. So this basically is a change from where we were when we were back in the budget crisis to allow divisions to have more flexibility in dealing with their budgets. The central administration will still hold back money for things like raises – oh not raises – well raises and increment changes that need to be made on an individualized basis.

So that's my very spartan report from the Board of Trustees. Any questions about that? Okay.

X. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

- A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee – Katy Jaekel, Chair – no report

K. Thu: Moving on, we have reports from our standing committees. Katy, anything from Faculty Rights and Responsibilities?

- B. Academic Affairs Committee – Peter Chomentowski, Chair – no report

K. Thu: Peter, are you here? I think I saw Peter here. No, apparently not. Well he didn't have a report from Academic Affairs anyway, so.

- C. Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – Keith Millis, Liaison/Spokesperson – report

K. Thu: Then that brings us to Rules, Governance and Elections. And I'm going to turn it over to Keith Millis to walk us through that process.

1. Personnel Review Responsibilities per Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 7

- a. Selection of a committee for the evaluation of the President of Faculty Senate and Executive Secretary of University Council

K. Millis: We have two items today. The first is the selection of the committee to evaluate the president of Faculty Senate and executive secretary of the University Council, which is Kendall Thu. This evaluation committee consists of – let me read them, and then we’re going to draw names for each: Two faculty members of the Faculty Senate who are not also elected faculty members of the University Council, plus one alternate; two faculty members of the University Council and one alternate; one student member of the University Council and one alternate; one supportive professional staff member of University Council; and one operating staff member of University Council. So we will be selected names.

K. Thu: These are names that are drawn out of a hat effectively.

K. Millis: Yes.

K. Thu: So, hold your breath.

K. Millis: Let me just preface that I’m going to probably be mispronouncing some names, and I do apologize. Scot Schraufnagel.

K. Thu: I think your ballot must weigh more than others.

K. Millis: Reed Scherer of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

K. Thu: I don’t think Reed’s here.

K. Millis: And then the alternate is William Penrod of Education.

K. Thu: I don’t think William’s here either.

K. Millis: And now we will be selected names for two faculty members of the University Council and one alternate. Two faculty members of the University Council.

P. Erickson: Keith, I think you did just pick those. So, now you’re going to go to the envelope that is faculty members of Faculty Senate.

K. Millis: Okay. So we did this out of order unintentionally.

P. Erickson: It’s fine.

K. Millis: Mike Konen, Geographic and Atmospheric Sciences. Sahar Vahabzadeh, Mechanical Engineering. And we need one alternate. Heidi Kuehl, Heidi from Law.

So, one student member. This is a lot of hats. So, we'll be picking one student member of the University Council and then one alternate. Amari White from the Student Association. And the alternate is Stephen Binderup.

So, we need one supportive professional staff member of the University Council. Megan Woodruff.

And then one operating staff member of University Council. Natasha Johnson of Operating Staff Council.

- b. Selection of a committee for the evaluation of the Faculty Personnel Advisor

K. Millis: Next is the selection of a committee to evaluate the faculty and SPS personnel advisor, who is Sarah McHone-Chase. This evaluation committee consists of three faculty members from the Faculty Senate plus an alternate. In addition, this evaluation committee includes one supportive professional staff member of University Council. However, no drawing is necessary for this selection since University Council has only two voting SPS members. Whoever was not drawn for the previous evaluation committee will be automatically serve as the committee.

Jim Wilson, Liberal Arts and Sciences. And then the other, do we do three? Bob Tatara, Engineering Technology. And Jozef Bujarski, Biological Sciences.

P. Erickson: And then one alternate, Keith.

K. Millis: And the alternate is Jamie Mayer of Allied Health and Communicative Disorders.

K. Thu: Thanks, Keith.

K. Millis: Thank you.

K. Thu: Real good.

- D. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – George Slotsve, Liaison/Spokesperson – report

K. Thu: Report from Resources, Space and Budget, George? [alarm beeping] Is somebody backing up?

[fire emergency alarm]

XI. PUBLIC COMMENT

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

- A. [Policy Library](#) – Comment on Proposed Policies (right-hand column on web page)

- B. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council
- C. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board
- D. [Minutes](#), Baccalaureate Council
- E. [Minutes](#), Board of Trustees
- F. [Minutes](#), Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
- G. [Minutes](#), Comm. on the Improvement of the Undergraduate Academic Experience
- H. [Minutes](#), General Education Committee
- I. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council
- J. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council Curriculum Committee
- K. [Minutes](#), Honors Committee
- L. [Minutes](#), Operating Staff Council
- M. [Minutes](#), Student Senate
- N. [Minutes](#), Supportive Professional Staff Council
- O. [Minutes](#), University Assessment Panel
- P. [Minutes](#), University Benefits Committee
- Q. [Minutes](#), Univ. Comm. on Advanced and Nonteaching Educator License Programs
- R. [Minutes](#), University Committee on Initial Educator Licensure
- S. 2019-20 Faculty Senate meeting dates:
Sep 4, Oct 2, Oct 30, Nov 20, Jan 22, Feb 19, Mar 25, Apr 22
- T. [Positive picture for state higher ed funding](#) – Inside Higher Ed
- U. [NIU Social Media Policy](#)

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

K. Thu: Motion to adjourn. All in favor?

Members: Aye.

K. Thu: I think we're supposed to go down the stairs if I'm understanding correctly.

Meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.