

## TRANSCRIPT

### FACULTY SENATE

Wednesday, November 20, 2019, 3 p.m.

Altgeld Hall 315

DeKalb, Illinois

**VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:** Arado, Bateni, Beyer, Bowers (for Shi), Buck, Burton, G. Chen, J. Chen, Chmaissem, Chomentowski, Cohen (for Koss), Collins, Creed, Demir, Dzurani (for Riley), Fredericks, Grund, Hanley, Hanna, Hua, Ito, Jaekel, Jong, Keddie, Kim, Kuehl, Lampi, Littauer, Macdonald, Mayer, McCarthy, McGowan, Millhorn, Millis, Mooney, Morales (for Schuller), Nelson, Newman, Pendergrass, Penrod, Petgas, Polansky, Qin, Reeves, Scherer, Schraufnagel, Sharp, Siegesmund, Skarbinski, Slotsve, Subramony, Surjadi, Tataru, Thu, Un, Vahabzadeh, Villanueva, Weffer, Whedbee, Wilson, Zheng

**VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:** Bujarski, Farrell, Johnston-Rodriguez, Konen, Koss, Kot, Martin, Montana, Moraga, Powell, Rau, Riley, Schatteman, Schuller, Shi, Sirotkin, Staikidis

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Barker, Bond, Bryan, Falkoff, Klaper, White

**OTHERS ABSENT:** Doederlein, Ferguson, Gelman, Groza, Marsh, Kortegast, Woodruff

### I. CALL TO ORDER

**K. Thu:** Okay, I'm going to call the meeting to order. Welcome to the very last Faculty Senate meeting of the 2019 calendar year, in case you didn't know that.

Meeting called to order at 3 p.m.

### II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

**K. Thu:** I'll entertain a motion to adopt the agenda, **Richard [Siegesmund]**. Do we have a second? Second [**T. Buck**]. Any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**K. Thu:** Any opposition? Abstentions? Okay, we have an agenda.

### III. APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 30, 2019 MINUTES

**K. Thu:** Next we have approval of the October 30, 2019 meeting minutes. They are a part of your packet. I'll entertain a motion to approve those minutes, **Patricia [Skarbinski]**. Do we have a second? It could be the first time in history we don't have – oh, there we go [**A. Keddie**]. Any discussion, corrections, deletions? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**K. Thu:** Opposed? Abstentions? The meeting minutes are approved.

#### **IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**K. Thu:** The next item is President's Announcements. I do have a couple things to say, but I'm going to wait until further down in the agenda to comment on them.

#### **V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION**

- A. Graduate School GRE Admissions Exams  
Brad Bond, Dean, The Graduate School

**K. Thu:** We have a guest with us today that most of you know. Dean Brad Bond is here. As many of you know, we're having conversations throughout the university about testing and admissions policy. As the chair of a department for nine years, I didn't know that GREs were potentially optional as part of our department's admission policy. And so as I learned more about it, I thought it would be a good idea for Brad to come and talk about admissions policy, particularly where GREs are potentially a part of your admissions policy.

So if we could go to the slide, Pat, that's lifted from the catalog, as I understand it, these are programs at the university that are exempt from the GREs. There are also programs for which the GRE could be used, but it is not used. So I'm going to turn it over to Brad to talk a little bit about that, and field questions from all of you eventually. So, thanks, Brad, for being here.

**B. Bond:** You bet. Sometime this summer I ran into Kendall on campus, and he said, you know, there's this conversation about ACT/SAT, and we should have that same conversation about GRE. And I said, Kendall, we're already having that. Departments have been falling away from requiring the GRE or the GMAT, for that matter, as a piece of the application package. The way that typically has worked is a department makes the request, it comes to the Graduate Council, and Graduate Council talks about it, and I don't think we've ever turned – and I'm looking at Graduate Council members – I don't think we've ever turned a request down when it's come through.

The pace at which a number of departments are making these requests to do away with the GRE is astronomically increased over the past three years. In 2006, I think it was the School of Art and Nursing and maybe one other department that did not require some sort of test. But through the years, that pace has really started to increase the number of departments that are requesting no longer to require an entrance exam.

Typically, when a department makes the request, they do it for a couple reasons. They typically cite the fact that they do not believe that the test is helping them to attract students to their program. It's a barrier to admission. Or they do not trust the test to be an accurate predictor. We need to remember, at least for the GRE, that ETS, the designer of the test, says that the test is intended to predict the first year of success. That's what it's intended to predict, the first year of success.

We are sort of riding a little bit of a wave here, nationally, as well. There are many institutions across the country that are starting to department-by-department do away with the GRE. There was an Inside Higher Education article maybe six weeks ago where Princeton University was eliminating the GRE for 14 science programs on campus. So this is part of a general reaction to what this test is not accomplishing, I think.

**K. Thu:** Thank you, Brad. I just want to emphasize that we're not attempting to adopt a policy of the use of GREs campus-wide. Each unit has the flexibility to do what they think is the best for their program. So for example, Geography in LA&S, when they created their new Ph.D. program, they decided not to have the GRE requirement as part of that Ph.D. program. So I've talked to my colleague, David Buller in Philosophy. They want to keep it in their program for certain reasons that are specific to the field of philosophy. So this is by way of just giving you information about what the options are for your particular program.

So with that, how many of you in the room are part of a program that decided to do away with the GREs in your particular? So Katy, Richard, that's quite a few. So I'm happy to listen to your comments about why you did it, and was it very difficult to do, I guess. And then maybe there are others in here who are thinking about bringing a proposal back to your particular program. And we're happy to field questions. I'm not an expert in this area, but certain Brad can. Richard, go ahead.

**R. Siegesmund:** Perhaps it's obvious that the School of Art would want to opt out of the GRE, because the GRE is fundamentally a test of mathematical and English skills. It's also a test of what you have right now. And I think within our school, we're very much committed that what we do is coach kids up, and that if you're going to put a baseline like that up front, you are, as Brad just said, going to cut off a lot of folks who you believe you can bring up over that bar. So I think there is a commitment as to whether you do want that sort of English skill, math skill entrance point as we're not going to deal with you unless you can hit that. Or whether for those kids who might fall a little bit short of that, you believe we can bring you up. And we got tired of making the appeals, and we could graduate those kids with Ph.D.s, and they get the jobs at Research I universities. And it just doesn't have validity for what we do. But I could see where, for another program, philosophy, having those skills might be just absolutely – if you don't have that, we can't get started.

**K. Thu:** Thanks, Richard. Reed?

**R. Scherer:** I just want to point out that there are, as I see it, three potential levels here: One, GRE required; the other, GRE not required; and the third, GRE not considered. So whether it's optional or not for applicants. And that can bear on how a perspective student makes their application, because if you think you're a very qualified person but not a good test taker, then not doing it is a very good option for you. But if you are a good test taker, you might want to include it. And so I think in the application process, it needs to be clear whether it will be considered or not.

**K. Thu:** Thanks, Reed. You want to comment on that. I mean, again, that's up to the departments, your program. You can arrange it in whatever fashion you want in consultation, and with the approval, of the grad college.

**B. Bond:** The only thing I would say is, if you're going to receive materials, you should consider them as part of a dossier for a student.

**K. Thu:** Anybody else want to share? Go ahead.

**A. Keddie:** I'm from the Master of Public Health program, and we got rid of the GRE more or less for market reasons. We found that other Master of Public Health programs around the country were getting rid of the GRE; and so, to remain competitive with them – and there were more and more of these programs sprouting up – we basically had to get rid of the GRE. Now I'll be quite honest, we've had mixed results after that. Subsequent cohorts were having a larger percentage of students having trouble with getting through the program, writing, that sort of thing. And we did find that the verbal portion of the GRE did correlate with passing our comprehensive exam, which is a large written paper, on the first try. But time will tell, but we have mixed feelings about it.

**K. Thu:** Okay, great, thank you. Others want to share? Other questions? I think if you are considering doing away with the GRE or making it optional, you can draw on the experience of other units on campus that have done this, as you've heard, and bring them to your faculty meetings. I'm sure that Brad would be happy to attend those kinds of meetings as well. So this is just an informational item to let everybody know what the possibilities are for your particular program. With that, thank you, Brad for coming. We appreciate it.

**B. Bond:** You bet, thank you.

**K. Thu:** Take care.

**B. Bond:** Appreciate it.

## **VI. CONSENT AGENDA**

**K. Thu:** Next we have the Consent Agenda, and there is no Consent Agenda.

## **VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

- A. Proposal to amend Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 3.2  
Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee  
SECOND READING/ACTION

**K. Thu:** Which takes us to Unfinished Business. We are returning to a second reading of a proposed amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 3.2, which is on page 6 of your packet. And we had a first reading of this last time. And just to remind you what it's about. Because we got rid of the Faculty Senate Committee on the Economic of the Profession, that has an impact on another committee. That committee is Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, which previously had a representative from Faculty Senate – I'm sorry, I got this mixed up. We deleted the Faculty Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Profession, and one of the functions of that committee was transferred over to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. I got my committee changes mixed up.

Does everybody follow that? In 3.2.2, we add that line, “Faculty compensation and benefits not covered by the Collective Bargaining Agreement.” That is, that committee may have responsibility for that area for those faculty that are not in the faculty union. So that function has been transferred from Faculty Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Profession over to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. And Katy [Jaekel] and I had a conversation about this several weeks ago, to make that as simple as possible. With that, I will entertain a motion to approve. Oh wait, I’m sorry, we have to click in first, because we have to make sure that we have the necessary membership here to make a vote. So if you don’t have a clicker, go ahead and take time to go up and get one. And when we get to the voting – and Pat will signal us when we’re ready – okay, you can go ahead and click 1 for present and 2 for not being present. And go ahead and click. We’re good. We needed 49, and we have 54.

So now I will entertain a motion to approve the change, Vicki [Collins]. We have a motion, do I have a second?

**O. Chmaissem:** Second.

**K. Thu:** I can’t see the person, so do you have it? Okay, any discussion? Go ahead.

**R. Tatara:** [inaudible]

**K. Thu:** This is Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee, so it’s faculty by default, because of the committee.

**R. Tatara:** [inaudible]

**K. Thu:** Well it says faculty compensation and benefits. The very first word is faculty. Is there something else that you want to see there?

**R. Tatara:** [inaudible]

**K. Thu:** Right. Could you come to the microphone just so that everybody can hear what you’re saying.

**R. Tatara:** I’m not clear. Are we talking about – so we have faculty in the bargaining unit and faculty excluded, outside of the bargaining unit. Is this in regard to only those faculty who are outside of the bargaining unit.

**K. Thu:** That’s correct, because faculty compensation and benefits issues for those that are covered by the CBA, they would have their issues covered by the union, itself.

**R. Tatara:** So the language, to me, says this covers any compensation benefit issue, whether you’re in the bargaining unit or not, that happens not to be covered by the CBA. There may be people in

**K. Thu:** Oh now I get you. Okay.

**R. Tatara:** So we're talking about excluding the faculty, not the benefits and compensation.

**K. Thu:** So does everybody understand what Bob is saying? Okay. So it took me a minute to get there. Do you have a suggestion, Bob, on how we can amend the language to achieve the clarity that we need?

**R. Tatara:** I would say, compensation and benefits for faculty not covered by the CBA.

**K. Thu:** Okay. Can you read that back. Does everybody understand the change? Okay, thank you. Other discussion?

**Unidentified:** Can you repeat the change, please?

**R. Tatara:** Compensation and benefits for faculty not covered by the CBA.

**K. Thu:** Everybody have it? So who made the original motion? Vicki. So, Vicki, would you accept that as a friendly amendment.

**V. Collins:** Absolutely.

**K. Thu:** Okay, any other discussion.

**A. Keddie:** I have a question. Aren't all faculty, whether they're part of the union or not, covered by the bargaining agreement?

**K. Thu:** No.

**A. Keddie:** No?

**K. Thu:** No. The College of Law faculty, for example, are not covered. They're not included in the CBA. Just so everybody knows, the collective bargaining unit includes all faculty, even if they're not a union member. But there are certain exceptions, such as the College of Law faculty. I know that sounds strange. So the CBA will go into effect for union members and for non-union members – that is faculty who decided they didn't want to become a part of the union. But then there are certain excluded categories, such as the College of Law. I hope that didn't muddy the water.

**A. Keddie:** So is this for the excluded categories?

**K. Thu:** That's right, exactly. Any other questions or discussion? Okay, if not, I think we should vote formally on this using your clicker. One would be to approve the bylaw amendment. Two is to say no. And then three would be to abstain. Are we ready, Pat? Okay, go ahead.

Okay, are we ready? So we need two-thirds of 60. I don't have my calculator with me.

**Unidentified:** 40.

**K. Thu:** Ok, there you go, I wasn't in my stats mode. So we need 40 to approve. So it easily passed. Thank you, everybody.

- 1 – Yes – 57 votes
- 2 – No – 2 votes
- 3 – Abstain – 1 vote

B. Prioritizing faculty issues

**K. Thu:** The next unfinished business item is to return to our discussion of prioritizing faculty issues. And if we could refresh our memories of what the top five issues areas are. At the top of the list is Enrollment, Recruitment and Retention. And we generated a number of ideas last time that I'm going to come back to here shortly. The second-most important was Tenure Track Lines, and I want to talk a little bit about that as well. I put some information in your packet that I want to go through. And then third and fourth are the Equity Gap and Decentralizing Budget.

There's already been movement to decentralize budgets. Some of you are aware of this, so we're making progress on that. When I say they, I'm talking about the Provost's Office and Sarah McGill. So I can talk a little bit about what I know on that end.

But if we would return to our discussion last time. This is a bulleted list of the ideas that were generated from that conversation. And what we want to do on this front is really up to you. We can simply be a clearing house for ideas on how individual units and programs can work on recruitment and retention. There may be ideas where you would want the Faculty Senate as a whole to work on a particular idea. This is where I want Faculty Senate to have a conversation and take ownership of what it is that faculty want to do on this end. So with that, those of you in particular who generated these ideas, if you want to offer up additional strategies for implementing these ideas, or how you want Faculty Senate to work in this arena. So with that, I leave it open for responses. Jason.

Enrollment/Recruitment and Retention

**J. Hanna:** I don't know if this made it on the list from last time, but issue has to do with student support services regarding retention. We're at the end of the semester now. I'm having this experience that I have every semester where you look at your students' grades, and you realize – I realize at least in my course – that the number one predictor of whether students will pass or not is whether they turned in the first assignment that I gave them in August on time. And I'm able to tell with surprising accuracy who will or won't pass just by whether they turned in – not that it counts that much toward their grade – but just it's sort of a pattern. And I'm often in a position where I want to provide those students with extra help, but sometimes they face obstacles like they work 40 hours a week and can't make it to class. I've had students whose cars break down and they can't afford to get them fixed. And they live in Chicago so they just stop attending classes for a month. And often with those students, I'm not sure, I mean, meeting with them for an hour a week to help them is not going to do it. So I'd like to be able to send those students somewhere where they can get help, but I'm not sure what I can do. And I know that we've tried in the past projects like early alert system, things like that. I don't know if we still have those. But I think exploring something

like that as a way of identifying problems early in the semester and, ideally, early in the students' academic careers, so we can deal with it.

**K. Thu:** Certainly all of us are teachers, and we're aware of what's going on with our students in our classes. Does anybody want to speak to Jason's suggestion in how we might move on that? Reed, go ahead.

**R. Scherer:** Perhaps a number of you heard a couple of weeks ago on NPR, All Things Considered, they had a great little piece about how students are terrified of showing up for office hours. They're terrified of us somehow, not in the classroom. They'll walk up to us in the classroom and talk, but when it comes to coming to your office, somehow there's a real – I don't know if others have the same experience. Very, very few students show up for office hours. And I think extra reaching out to the students at the beginning, encouraging them not to be afraid to come and talk to us early and often, but please not too often.

**K. Thu:** I have experienced the same sort of thing. And I hearken back to when I was an undergraduate. I forced myself to go to office hours for a professor that I was scared to death of. But I did it. I don't remember what I got out of it.

**R. Scherer:** Those are the students who show the most improvement [inaudible]

**K. Thu:** Anybody else want to speak to that, because I've seen it through my 20 years here. I see a pattern of fewer students coming to see me. And I've heard it from my colleagues as well. Somehow creating a comfortable climate, a comfortable relationship where students, all students, particularly students from different backgrounds that don't look or talk like us, are comfortable coming and talking to us. Go ahead.

**A. Keddie:** This might not be practical for everyone, but just to add more information to the discussion, if there is a teaching assistant or a tutor, I find they feel more comfortable going to that person than they do the professor. They're closer to their age. They're somehow less of an authority figure, or whatever it is. If given a choice, they go to that person.

**K. Thu:** I agree. I've experienced the same sort of thing. Others want to share? Go ahead, Therese.

**T. Arado:** Another thing that I've done over the years is have online office hours. So it breaks down the geographical barriers, the time – you can do them in the evenings. Sometimes faculty and student schedules don't always match up with when they're on campus, and that gives a way to reach out in a different format.

**K. Thu:** Right. I think part of what's happening, and Reed's right. Some students are afraid to come in. But we have so many commuter students that time is an issue, and they may not be available at the time that you have office hours. I think that many of us say, okay, office hours or whenever we can make an appointment and get together. And we don't have to get together in my office. We can meet somewhere else, in the new Holmes Student Center basement or someplace on campus where they may feel more comfortable approaching you, rather than sort of the authoritarian air of your office. Other comments or suggestions? Go ahead.



**R. Villanueva:** I think the culture has changed. I feel that it's easier for me to communicate with them via text than having them come to my office. For some reason, they feel more comfortable texting and asking questions, even after hours, than showing up and doing one-to-one conversation. So I have changed a little bit my approach. While in the past I was against that, I try to be accommodating by helping that way. If they feel more comfortable texting, I have no problem with that.

**K. Thu:** We have to be a little bit careful about cell phone numbers between faculty and students. We do have a technology policy at the university. I can't recite it off the top of my head, but it specifically alludes to social media, not necessarily cell phone numbers. But I think we'd all agree that students need to understand the implications of handing out their cell phone numbers to faculty, because there's an inherent asymmetric power relationship there, right? So it's very important that both parties understand what's going on. If you're interested, I'm willing to pull out the social media policy involving students and faculty to share with you at a subsequent meeting. For example, I never invite a student to my Facebook page. I don't do Instagram, and I don't tweet, so that doesn't matter, but if they invite me and they're not in my classroom, they're not my student anymore, and that power relationship no longer holds, then I may accept them. But we have to be mindful of that.

So any other comments or suggestions in terms of recruitment and retention?

**J. Chen:** I'd like to share some strategies that we have been using from our school. We have this student success program, and we have a coordinator taking care of this program. So what we do is, one, we set up student tutoring sessions for each of the specialty courses, start in the beginning with [inaudible] master. Those students go to those sessions every week to help improve their score on exams. And second one, we have, we call it intensive. So, like one-on-one tutor work with those students who are at high risk of failing in the courses. And then we have really good communication between the coordinator and the individual faculty. So if faculty identifies some students who are in high risk of failing and we're going to reach out to the coordinator and also students who feel like they are failing in a course, they're going to contact the students' coordinators too. And we also have remediation course to help those students who failed the class in the last semester, they will go to that course to help them improve the grade. So if you'd like to – I think our program and our school would be happy to share more information.

**K. Thu:** Yes, if you have collected data on what you're doing, what the outcome is, we would love to hear that.

**J. Chen:** I think they are tracking the retention.

**K. Thu:** Great. One of the things that I've done in the past is when a student is performing extremely well in my class, I will ask them for permission to be contacted by another student in the class who is not doing so well, so that they can study or review together. And most of the time, those higher-achieving students are willing to do that. Other ideas? Okay, well we'll keep talking about this, and I think it's important for everybody to be aware of what kinds of strategies you might implement in your own program.

## Tenure track lines

**K. Thu:** Next we have – well I want to go back to one of the second-highest priority item for Faculty Senate members is retaining tenure track and tenured faculty as the backbone of the university. As most of you know, the Board of Trustees passed the CBA – when was that, a couple weeks ago, maybe last week – and during that meeting, Chair Dennis Barsema, the chair of the Board of Trustees, reiterated the importance of faculty as the backbone of the university. And certainly we want to make sure that the tenure track system is central to that mission.

So one of the things you asked me to do last time was to pull out some data on the number of tenure track faculty we have at NIU. And then also somebody suggested pulling out data on the number of non-tenure track instructors that we have. So my first step was to go to the institutional data set. And in the institutional data set, they keep track of the number of tenure-track faculty by college. And if you look at the bottom here, this is a four-year run of data, from 2014 to 2018. And at the bottom of the chart there, you'll see that the tenured and tenure-track faculty are the first two lines at the bottom. And the first column is 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018. So if you add those two rows together for each year, you'll see that – and I know that George is back there; he's done the numbers – you'll see that there's been a slight decline in tenured and tenure-track faculty at NIU. I would say it's not as precipitous as I suspected. We really need to look farther back to get a long-term sense of the numbers of tenure-track faculty. But at least in this four-year window, the decline has not been – this is my characterization, you may look at it differently – has not been that precipitous. It's somewhere in the neighborhood of, we had about 630 some odd tenure track faculty in 2014. And in 2018, we had about 600. Now the numbers are a little bit fishy. This does not include library faculty, and it does not include faculty that are not housed – there are tenure track faculty, and I just learned this – that are not housed in a particular academic unit. So I have been in email exchanges with Dan House at institutional data, as well as the provost, trying to figure out what the most accurate numbers are. The actual numbers for each year are probably not as important as the overall trend.

The bottom line is the number of non-tenure track faculty – instructors, VAPs, adjuncts that we have at the university. Again, it doesn't include the library. But I have the library numbers in another chart that I'm going to show you. Again, the numbers of those instructors has actually gone down a little bit. I know I have a concern that we're losing tenure track faculty and that they're being replaced by non-tenure track instructors. This was a bit surprising to me, because I had a preconception that we were losing ground.

So I wanted to give you that as background information. And then I just got the data from fall of 2019, this year. So this one does have the library. It also has tenure track faculty that are in other units, that we don't normally think about. You can see there that the total number of tenured and tenure track faculty is 661. It's higher than those other numbers, because it includes the library and tenure track faculty elsewhere. We need to clean up these numbers to find out exactly what's going on, because the university is required, as part of its federal reporting requirement, to report the number of tenure track faculty we have, as well as instructors. And in email exchanges with the Provost's Office, we were trying to figure out why there were these discrepancies, and actually

different numbers in different sections of the institutional data report. But this gives you some sense of where we are at the very least in the last few years with tenure track faculty. Go ahead, Richard.

**R. Siegesmund:** Is it possible to break down those numbers a little bit further by departments, because I suspect that, if you looked within a college, that some departments are doing far better than other departments, and that you would begin to see some really shocking information. The School of Art is 60 percent delivered by instructors now in terms of where we are. And that is not reflected at all in what we see here.

**K. Thu:** Yes, you all have access to this. If you just google institutional data on the NIU site, you'll be taken to a home page. And there will be annual reports. And in that annual report, it's I don't know how many pages, hundreds of pages, and it breaks it down, not only by the college, but I believe by departments as well. And this is relevant for all of you when you're making your hiring pitch for your college and for your units, because you want to know, not only what's happened to your department, but what's happening in your college compared to other colleges and departments across campus.

And this is related to the decentralization of the budgeting that's going on now, because it will have relevance for how we can or can't do hiring going forward. So I'm happy to pull that data out for you, but it's there in the institutional data set, and it's worthwhile to just know that it's there and go to it and see what you need. Other comments or questions. George.

**G. Slotsve:** The other thing, just so people can think about it and have an idea when you're thinking about these numbers. We're going to get slightly different numbers if you get the updated numbers, Kendall. But if we look at the numbers you provided, overall there is a 6.7 percent decline in tenured and tenure track positions in the numbers provided. What I just want to know is, there was a 16.7 percent decline in the number of students on campus. And if we look at full-time equivalent students, that declined 15.2 percent. So when we're thinking about this, I just want everyone to realize we've had about a ten percent larger decline in the number of students than we have in tenure track positions.

**K. Thu:** That's right. And the next page after this gives you the total student enrollment numbers from 1984 through 2018. Jim, I think you wanted to make a comment.

**J. Millhorn:** I think you need to go way beyond 2014. Our decline started in 2001. And we've been losing faculty steadily since then. So it doesn't really necessarily coincide that student decline matches the timeframe for decline. Another thing that could be done that makes this much more granular is put the Working Papers online, and make those things live. The Working Papers show break-out by department, by college, of all employees. And that could make it very trackable.

**K. Thu:** Good, thanks. We are a smaller university, so we all want as many tenure track faculty as possible in our departments and our colleges. But I know from conversations with the administration and the decisions about hiring are now going to be in colleges. When I rolled out my hiring plan for Anthropology the last time, I didn't start with the argument that, once upon a time we had 300 faculty, which Anthropology never had. I started out by saying, realistically, this is the kind of department and structure that we might think about being going forward. I did refer to the

historic numbers, but I didn't use that as my prima face, I'm not a lawyer, as my primary argument. So I just throw that out there for your consideration. George, go ahead.

**G. Slotsve:** We don't have the tenure track numbers, but if we do, I think it was, the full-time equivalent students since 2001, there's been a 25 percent decline in student body there.

**K. Thu:** Other comments or suggestions? Other things that you would like me to try and pull out. I'm going to try and clean up the numbers. I'll try to do what Jim suggests, which is to give a fuller historical picture of what these trends are. I can bring that back and make sure that everybody is aware of those. Go ahead.

**A. Keddie:** I think it's important to consider the faculty-student ratio, not just by the whole university, but by sub-units, especially if it's going to influence hiring decisions. For instance, in our school, we're growing our online program tremendously, but yet we have to make arguments for adding faculty.

**K. Thu:** Absolutely. And hopefully, this conversation and the data that we're providing is going to help you make your case. Go ahead.

**M. Subramony:** Because I studied turnover a little bit, one of the things I would like to say is, when you look at these numbers, when you see 60 in one year or 58 in the next year, it's not just the absolute decline. You also have to think about the fact that there might have been some replacements. So folks leave, and then they are replaced. So what these numbers essentially are telling us is that, in general, when folks leave, we replace them. It doesn't tell us how many people are leaving in any given year.

**K. Thu:** That's right. And that's not in the institutional data set at all. So I don't know how I'd do that, pull that data out. I could try. Maybe, Greg [Barker], you might help me. No? Okay.

**M. Subramony:** I think the only way to do that would be

**K. Thu:** I can ask Dan House, or maybe you can help me do it.

**M. Subramony:** I think the only way to do that would be to essentially look at how many years folks have been around. So you look at tenure data, and that helps you figure out who's leaving and who's not leaving and get the absolute numbers.

**K. Thu:** So that connects to the decentralization process, because as I understand from my meeting this morning with the CFO and meetings with other administration members, positions that are lost to retirement or somebody's just leaving the institution, currently those positions are swooped up by the Provost's Office centrally. That's not going to be the case going forward. So as part of the decentralization process, if your college loses a faculty member, they will be able to replace them, and they will decide what flavor of faculty member you want or need. So that's going to be an important improvement over the process, and something that I have hammered home with the administration since I've been in this position.

And then, of course, colleges are going to get their own budgets to make decisions about what they need to do. So in other words, we don't have to run through the Provost's Office to buy paperclips anymore. We can make those decisions locally.

But they're in the process of trying to figure out how to calculate a budget for a college. What do you use as the baseline for the budget going forward. And those conversations are going on between Beth Ingram and Sarah McGill and college deans to figure out how do we determine what your budget is going to be starting January 1 of 2020 for the rest of the academic year. And then how do we operationalize it going forward? And I know there's going to be a fear that that means you're going to get a budget for your college that's going to contain an inherent cut. And from what I've been told, that should not be the case. But stay tuned.

Any other comments or questions about faculty lines or any information that you'd like to have? Okay.

### Equity gap

The third most important issue in your voting is the equity gap. And I don't know if any of you were at the press conference yesterday. A number of universities in the region are partnering with – and I can't remember the name of the group, maybe somebody here can help me. Equity gap means a lot of things. It's purposefully vague. It could be equity gap in terms of in-class performance by students. It can be equity gap in terms of salary discrepancies by gender or via compression. It can be equity gap in other ways as well. What I would like to know from you is what kind of equity gap do you think is most pressing. We know that in the CBA, collective bargaining agreement, there is money set aside to try to address faculty equity issues, particularly compression. We know from faculty studies that there are gaps between men and women in terms of salaries. We know that in the CBA there are plans to continue to do the salary studies on an ongoing basis. But what I really want to know from you, what should we be advocating for in terms of dealing with equity issues in all its shapes and flavors? Go ahead, Richard.

**R. Siegesmund:** In 2018, there was the salary report that was prepared here in Faculty Senate and that Linda Saborío asked Laura Johnson and I to respond to that report. That response was basically told that we couldn't do that, because it would violate collective bargaining to actually look at that at this point. But what happens quietly behind the table, there was besides compression, there is inversion. And in the salary report, we use the word, bias. And that word, bias, has quietly morphed into the word equity. But the collective bargaining agreement said, I believe it's \$500,000, has been set aside to address compression and inversion and equity. The study that was produced could actually track compression and inversion, but the finding was that to actually statistically tease apart bias equity would require further statistical analysis that needed to be addressed. The agreement was that the administration and the union will choose collectively a methodology to tear into that long-term issue. So just in terms of that is still to be done, but that was something at least some of us that were on that initial panel felt that the issue of equity was being swept under the rug under compression and inversion. It appears that it has been brought and agreed to in the collective bargaining agreement, but what that methodology is and how that is going to be taken apart is a big question, because the statistical people that we worked with all said, this is a really messy problem. And to try to come back and to say that is what the number is that will correct that is going to take

some statistical skill to do it. But those three things. In that sense, it is a continuation of what Faculty Senate has done, and I did want to bring out that that conversation did come up because of the 2018 which Linda Saborío, who I think slipped in here somewhere was overseeing that and just to credit that she was the one who kind of kept pushing that forward. And so just something that the work that we do here does resonate out and continues.

**K. Thu:** I want to comment that Faculty Senate can still talk about faculty compression, faculty and salary discrepancies, even though it's covered under the collective bargaining agreement. Where you have the greatest strength is when the Faculty Senate and the faculty union are messaging in concert. And so we can talk about what we want to do in terms of equity as Richard discussed in terms of salary. And we can pass along those conversations to the union. There are union members here. There are union members that participate in shared governance, and there's nothing with that. In fact, it's beneficial. And we should be sharing information back and forth. Other comments about the equity gap.

**Unidentified:** [inaudible]

**K. Thu:** Would you go to the microphone?

**S. Vahabzadeh:** My questions is are we just talking about salaries?

**K. Thu:** I prefaced the conversation with saying it can cover a lot of ground. It certainly includes faculty salaries, but it also includes equity gap for students and their performance in the classroom, and the equity gap between white students and students of color.

**S. Vahabzadeh:** One thing that I noticed as a female faculty is the maternity leave. I read in the email that it's been increased from four weeks to five weeks. Being equal means that both men and women should have the same number of weeks, but I feel that female faculty, just would say that female faculty should have more weeks, rather than using their leave to be able to take care of baby. So I do really think that this should be taken up.

**K. Thu:** Well to get to this point has been a long journey. Laura Vazquez, I don't know, Laura, are you here? Laura Vazquez led the charge in the Presidential – Anne [Hanley], were you on that as well – the Presidential Commission on the Status of Women fought very hard to get any kind of a leave policy. And so they were able to achieve five weeks. And as Dennis Barsema said when the Board of Trustees passed the policy, well, we're still behind when you compare us to Scandinavia or certain countries in Europe. That's true. It's kind of a low bar. We can celebrate what we've got, but there would certainly be opportunities in the future. It is the best quote-unquote best leave policy at Illinois universities, at least that's my understanding. So should there be more? Absolutely. I lived in Norway for a couple years, and my next door neighbor had a child. And both parents had one year leave, paid leave. That's the way it should be, but we live in a different kind of cultural and economic landscape. Celebrate what we have, and we can fight for more down the road. Other comments?

So I'm going to wrap up our discussion of faculty priority issues.

**K. Jaekel:** Kendall, to that point, I actually we have parental leave, which includes both genders.

**K. Thu:** Oh, it's very expansive. The definition of what constitutes family leave covers a broad range of situations.

**K. Jaekel:** But I think that NIU [inaudible] genders for parental leave. If that's not being communicated.

**K. Thu:** Yes.

**S. Vahabzadeh:** [inaudible]

**K. Thu:** Thank you for clarifying that. Other comments? Okay.

### C. Proposed Admissions Policy update

**K. Thu:** Let's move on to proposed admissions policy update, Item C under Roman numeral VII. As you remember from the last Faculty Senate meeting, we discussed the possibility of changing our admissions policy to test-blind or test-optional, that is not relying on the ACT or SAT, which is now SAT for us, in making admissions decisions for undergraduates. We took a conceptual vote last time. The faculty were generally in favor of the concept, but we wanted the Baccalaureate Council what that would look like.

So we did your bidding. We took it to the Baccalaureate Council. We worked on language, and when we mean operationalize the concept, what that really means is changing the catalog language, because that's where the admissions standard is located. So myself and several members of the admissions team and the Baccalaureate Council drafted language that the Baccalaureate Council considered at their meeting last Thursday. And for those of you who don't know, the Baccalaureate Council is made up of faculty, just like us. And let me just characterize the general response, which was very similar to what you heard in Faculty Senate last time. Because they're faculty, their response is likely going to be the same as yours. Their response was conceptually in favor of it, but the devil is in the details. The Baccalaureate Council was provided all the same background information that's in your packet in terms of articles, data and the like, including Greg Barker. I don't know how many of you know Greg. Greg is our sort of institutional data guru. He's done a lot of work looking at our internal numbers and the role of high school grades vs. test scores in predicting success for our students. And basically, the institutional data and the analysis that he's done matches what we see in the national data and the data that we've seen from a large cohort study in Chicago.

The Baccalaureate Council then had a very robust and very helpful discussion about the proposed draft language change to the catalog. I did not circulate it, because it's still a work in progress as you can see. Just very briefly, because I know we're running a little bit late, the Baccalaureate Council faculty flagged two areas that need more work.

One is what do we do with students that get their GEDs? They don't have high school grades, so how do we evaluate their admissions? What about home schooled students? We don't have high

school grades for them. What about students who come from those few high school programs that don't provide us with grades? So that's one area that we're working on going back and trying to fix. The second area that needs more work is what the CHANCE program means, how that works with the changed admissions policy.

There was some minor discussion, I would say, over whether we should move in this direction or not. But people who had read the background material, I think, were fairly convinced. And then Greg was there to talk about the internal data. So most of our time was spent working through the language. There's only four or five pages of this; I'm not going to go through it in detail. Once the Baccalaureate Council has come up with the final language, and we expect the Baccalaureate Council to approve it at their December 5 meeting, then it will come back to you. So the final language will come back to you for comment as we agreed the last time. And then it would be up to this body to make a recommendation to the University Council. So by way of a timeline, our next Faculty Senate meeting is January 22. I'm sure you're already anticipating that. So once the Baccalaureate Council approves it at their December 5 meeting, and there's every reason to believe they will, then their final language would go back out to you. Actually it would go out to everybody else for that matter, as well. And then we'd have a meeting on January 22 to talk about it. So that's the timeline. It's not a bylaw change, so it just would require a straight up vote. It's not required that it go through Faculty Senate, but I've insisted that it does go through Faculty Senate. But it would require the University Council to approve it, because they currently have the authority. If we get the structural changes to shared governance, then this would be a decision that would rest in the hands of Faculty Senate only, and it wouldn't go to the University Council and continue this godawful byzantine structure that we have.

So that's where we are. We're in the process of responding to the Baccalaureate Council comments and those will go back to the Baccalaureate Council on the 5<sup>th</sup>. You are all welcome to come to the Baccalaureate Council meeting. I found the comments by our colleagues in that body very, very useful and very thoughtful. And I think we're going to come up with a good proposal. Any questions or comments about any of that? Okay. Thanks, Greg, for coming.

## **VIII. NEW BUSINESS**

**K. Thu:** Let's move to New Business, of which there is none.

## **IX. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES**

A. Faculty Advisory Council to IBHE – Linda Saborío – report

**K. Thu:** And then we now have reports from the advisory committees. So we'll start with Linda, Faculty Advisory Council to IBHE. And they had their meeting at NIU, and I was able to attend my first one to see how that whole shebang works.

**L. Saborío:** Good afternoon. The FAC met last Friday here at NIU in the Barsema Alumni and Visitors Center. We had an exceptional meeting, and I would like to take a moment to thank Tony, is Tony here, Terry and Pat, for their help with organizing the event. Faculty reps were very



impressed with the venue, food service and NIU's generous hospitality. So thank you to all three of those individuals.

President Freeman addressed the group with a presentation on Generation Z – okay, boomers, I love that saying – followed by an informal conversation. So I would like to thank her as well for coming and speaking with our group.

We had an informal conversation with former State Rep. Bob Pritchard and current Rep. Jeff Keicher. Pritchard discussed the need for educational institutions to highlight the value proposition of higher education to individuals and to the state of Illinois. He said there has been a great deal of focus on K-12 funding, but not on higher education. He has noticed a paradigm shift in higher education in terms of faculty's role being more instrumental nowadays, both inside and outside the classroom. And he thinks more legislators should be made aware of this. And finally, he asked us to consider how we can work better with the K-12 system.

And then Keicher serves on both the Higher Education Committee and the Higher Ed Appropriations Committee. He stressed the need for institutions to brag to their communities, primarily through local media about their accomplishments. And he suggested that the best method of expressing and sharing our concerns about higher education is through our local reps. He also mentioned the idea of a win-back program for students that left early and never finished their degree. And finally, there was much discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of dual credit and the best way to monitor the quality of dual credit course offerings.

We ended our meeting with reports from the caucuses and working groups. Some items discussed were how to best communicate with Jennifer Delaney, the faculty rep on the IBHE, FAC's role in a master plan for higher education in Illinois, and the question: Is a college report card the best indicator of an institution's quality?

Next month we will meet on December 10 before the IBHE meeting that afternoon at DePaul University. I cannot attend that day because of final exams and presentations in my courses, but Kendall has graciously agreed to attend as my alternate. I will entertain any questions now. Thank you.

**K. Thu:** Questions? This was a new experience for me. I didn't know how this group operated. And so it was fascinating to see how different representatives from different universities shared similar kinds of concerns. And a lot of the conversation gravitated around dual credit. And I still don't understand some of the issues yet, but at least I understand how important it is to different institutions in Illinois. I have a little bit of background now going in and playing the proxy role at the next meeting. So thank you, Linda.

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

**K. Thu:** With that, the next is the University Advisory Committee report. It's pretty straight forward. The Board of Trustees at their last meeting approved the collective bargaining agreement.

There was a lot of support by board members, including comments by Dr. Freeman and Dennis Barsema. And I made a few comments about the importance of faculty and the faculty union. The faculty union bargaining team was there, and we recognized them. And also recognized the important role that the administration played in creating a negotiating atmosphere that was collegial. And I remember John Butler talking to him before the Board of Trustees meeting, and John, his job is doing union issues, so he has a lot of experience doing union stuff. He said when I read this contract, I knew that there was a negotiating atmosphere that was collegial and reciprocal. And so I think that speaks to both the union, itself, because I don't think this would have happened without the union, and also the administration's response to the union.

There will be three percent raises for faculty starting this year that will be retroactive to the beginning of the year. HR has already been working to make sure that the retroactive pay will be in your pockets at your December 15 paycheck. So you'll get a little boost before the holidays. You'll also get a \$500 one-time cash award that's sort of recognition for the lack of – it's not enough to make up for the lack of raise from last year, but it's the best they could come up with. So you get basically a \$500 one-time cash award if you were a faculty member here last year. And then three percent raise for each year, the next two years. There are also, if you haven't read the collective bargaining agreement, there are also base lines for salaries at the visiting, associate and full professor level that will benefit programs that are underpaid. And so CVPA I think will benefit from this. And those base lines for salaries for minimum salaries for visiting, associate and full professors increase in the next two years as well. So I think this is recognition of the important role faculty play at this university. And I think it's fair to say the administration and the board recognize the important role that we play. When the board passed the CBA by voice vote, they got a round of applause, and it was a pretty good feel-good moment. There are still issues that we have to work on, but we're headed in the right direction in my view. Does anybody want to comment on the CBA or any of the highlights that I sort of pointed out in the CBA. Go ahead, Jason.

**J. Hanna:** [inaudible]

**K. Thu:** Yes, it's exciting reading. And I actually attended a number of the negotiating meetings; and, you know, if you're in a long car ride across country with the people that you love, you're in the car in close proximity, you get on each other's nerves no matter what, right. And so that kind of happens at certain points in the negotiating rooms, but they worked through it and I think we came out with what could be one of the best CBAs in the state. So, hopefully, our agreement will help rise the tide for other universities that are in the process of re-negotiating their CBAs.

## **X. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**

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

**K. Thu:** So with that, let's move to Reports From Standing Committees. Katy, you don't have any report?

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

**K. Thu:** Peter, you don't have – I saw Peter here earlier. Oh, no wonder I can't see you. Peter has no report.

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

**K. Thu:** So we have a report from Rules, Governance and Elections that met this morning. So I'm going to let Keith and Richard tag team it in any way you want.

**K. Millis:** We met this morning in an open meeting to discuss the process of moving forward in changing the shared governance structure. And what I'm going to do is have Richard give us a couple sentences summary.

**K. Thu:** And Richard is the chair of that committee, by the way.

**K. Millis:** That's why

**R. Siegesmund:** This is the punt, because I'm the chair. We're looking at the change of moving academic policy to the Faculty Senate, and that is a significant reconfiguration of the university. We have approached that initially as basically trying to do the minimal amount of wordsmithing, but simply sort of cut and pasting things out and moving it into what is at University Council and changing it to Faculty Senate.

Our meeting this morning was a University Council/Faculty Senate combined meeting, and we had members of SPS, operating staff, students as well. And we had an extended time already with this document, and I've been impressed with, not only the care that the committee has done, but this has already been brought up for operating staff and SPS and students into greater circles of involvement as to what this means.

And what it means is this isn't going to be an easy fix. That there is going to be ramifications and not just only – no one is arguing about the authority of the faculty to have controls of academic affairs, but when you do something like this, there's also a moment of long-term inequities. For instance, as for one, the role of instructors at this university, which pretty much has been glossed over. And there isn't anything in the current document. So with the cut and paste, you never really get to the role of instructors. And if this is the time we're going to do something, are there other issues that need to be brought forward.

So today there was a commitment that we will have a report to the Faculty Senate for the January meeting. That will require the committee to meet one more time, which everyone is thrilled with, to make a commitment to another meeting. But it does mean that, when you receive these materials, it'll probably be the week before the Faculty Senate meeting.

**K. Thu:** Let me clarify, Richard. You're going to get the draft report. We talked about this this morning.

**R. Siegesmund:** Yes.

**K. Thu:** You'll get this report very soon. It's not a report from the committee. The committee will have comments, but the Faculty Senate doesn't have to depend on that committee to make its own assessment of the proposed changes. We want to hear what the committee has to say. So I'm going to circulate the proposed language probably next week to all of you, so you'll have the Christmas holidays to go through it with your raises. And then at the same time, this committee will be meeting and trying to come up with comments for the full senate's consideration. But this is the faculty body. This is the body that can decide what you want to do and how you want to respond to the proposed changes. And what that committee is doing is providing input on the issues that will come up as part of the deliberations. So the over-arching process is that the Faculty Senate will eventually, if you want to, make a recommendation. It would require – Faculty Senate has the power to change Faculty Senate bylaws, but we don't have the power to change the Constitution or the Constitution [NIU] Bylaws. So the proposed changes to the Faculty Senate Bylaws are contingent on corresponding changes to the Constitution and [NIU] Bylaws. So the senate can approve the Faculty Senate bylaw changes, and then there might be a motion to say, contingent on what happens in the University Council. So it would have to go through a first reading by Faculty Senate, and then there would be a second reading. And it would take two-thirds members voting to pass it. That would be, then, in part a recommendation to the University Council, and they would have to consider it through a first reading and a second reading as well. If we had these structural changes in place, we wouldn't have to do all this stuff, but we have to.

**R. Siegesmund:** I would just say, I would like to reiterate, this is significant issues. When we have our first reading in January, we hope that people will be ready at meeting to discuss this, and that we can have a real debate in Faculty Senate over what this means. And then it will go to a second reading, and that we can continue that discussion in a second meeting and to try to make sure that we have vetted this to the best of our knowledge and our collective wisdom on this. And it's a really historic moment, and so those materials are coming your way, and I hope you will pay close attention to them.

**K. Thu:** Thanks, Richard, and thanks for your leadership of the committee. It's a big task, and our Constitution and Bylaws have become a conglomerate of changes through the years that don't exactly have a linear intellectual trajectory to them. So we have to take care to take the time to try to do this as best we can with voices from all the different stakeholder groups, and that's what we're going to try to do. If it takes a little longer than this academic year, so be it. We'll be here.

Any comments or questions for Richard or me or Keith. Greg, go ahead.

**G. Beyer:** Does this effort then that you've been describing go a long way toward responding to the scenario that you laid out for us at the beginning of the year that NIU is not currently in line or in keeping with our cohorts around the state with regard to shared faculty governance?

**K. Thu:** Yes, exactly.

**G. Beyer:** So this effectively brings more decision-making power into Faculty Senate from University Council.

**K. Thu:** That's right. That's exactly right.

**G. Beyer:** Thank you.

**K. Thu:** Other questions or comments? Sure.

**R. Siegesmund:** With that, Greg, it means that University Council has to agree, in a sense, to let power go, and give that to Faculty Senate.

**K. Thu:** So more to come for sure on this front, and some of the down time that we've had in Faculty Senate will no longer be down time in spring.

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

**K. Thu:** Okay, last item on the agenda, Resources, Space and Budget Committee report, George?

**G. Slotsve:** Yes. The RSB Committee met on November 1, and the committee will be putting forth a proposed change to the make-up of RSB. The proposed change increases the number of student representatives on the committee from one to three students. Two of the students will be undergraduates, and one will be a graduate student that will be a representative on the committee.

We also began discussions of what RSB may look like in the future with the potential changes to the structure of shared governance and with the shift to local control of funds. Connected to the local control, Provost Ingram and VP McGill sought feedback on what people thought of when they hear the term, local control, what expectations people have of colleges and divisions in a local control environment, and what level of budget details is needed to ensure a fully informed campus. Additionally, there was a discussion of what should be left as centrally funded.

The next meeting of RSB was scheduled to be December 6, but President Freeman and VP McGill cannot attend the meeting. They've got meetings they have to attend in Chicago on that date. So really the next productive discussion is going to be at the meeting on January 10. President Freeman will be attending the January 10 meeting, and we plan to focus the discussion on strategic planning. So if you have any questions related to this, or anything you'd like brought up at the meeting, please send your questions to Pat Erickson by Thursday, Jan. 2.

**K. Thu:** Right. Thanks, George. Any questions? Okay.

## **XI. PUBLIC COMMENT**

**G. Beyer:** There is something that I was thinking about when we were talking about our agenda. Would you mind pulling that back to the, really quickly, so sorry, the one with the yellow highlights, the list of possible

**K. Thu:** Oh, this is the priority list. It's the priority issue list for Faculty Senate. I think it's embedded in the packet, isn't it?

**G. Beyer:** Yes.

**K. Thu:** There we go.

**G. Beyer:** When we brought up the topic of enrollment and recruitment, and Jason was highlighting some of his concerns with the students not being able to attend office hours and such, I think at that point, we were really talking about the retention side of that.

**K. Thu:** That's right.

**G. Beyer:** And not so much the recruitment side of the discussion. And when we return to this, as I'm assuming we'll be able to do every time we meet, I hope that we'll have time to talk about recruitment. But Jason articulated in his concerns for students not coming to office hours, he brought up a couple of situations where the students either are working 40 hours a week, they run into car troubles and literally can't come to class. And as he was talking about those things, it occurred to me that any of these topics that we do talk about are inherently interwoven into all of the other topics that are on his list. Topics like food insecurity, we know that there's the Huskie Pantry on campus, and that a growing number of our graduate students are using that on a regular basis. These are things that I think, when we continue this discussion, I for one would really enjoy seeing all of these topics continue to be on the board so we can talk about them in an interwoven and kind of a holistic sense, because I personally didn't vote for any of these five things. I was voting for other things that I thought we could talk about. And I would still like to be able to talk about them as they relate and as they are interwoven with issues of recruitment and retention and that, because I think there's a lot. Basically, what we're talking about are possible solutions to the manifold problems that the university faces, and I think the more possible ways that we can interweave those discussion points would be helpful as we move forward.

**K. Thu:** Yes, I appreciate that. I think most of us in the room, if not all of us, agree with that. This was just a vehicle for conversation, and it's not meant to exclude discussion on the kind of related issues that you suggest. Any other comments?

## **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

### **XIII. ADJOURNMENT**

**K. Thu:** I need a motion to adjourn.

**O. Chmaissem:** So moved.

**K. Thu:** Second?

**R. Siegesmund:** Second.

**K. Thu:** All in favor?

**Members:** Aye.

**K. Thu:** We'll see you next year.

Meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.