

## TRANSCRIPT

**FACULTY SENATE**  
**Wednesday, April 21, 2021, 3 p.m.**  
**Microsoft Teams Meeting**  
**Northern Illinois University**  
**DeKalb, Illinois**

*All Faculty Senate members will receive an Outlook invitation to this Teams meeting.  
Others wishing to join the meeting, please send your request to Pat Erickson at [pje@niu.edu](mailto:pje@niu.edu).*

**VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:** Akst, Allori, Aygen, Berke, B. Beyer, Blomquist, Books, Borre, Buck, Carpenter, Chen, Cheyney, Chomentowski, Collins (for A. Johnson), Creed, Dmitruk, Doederlein, Duffin, Fredericks, Furr, Glas, Grund, Hu, Hua, Hunter, Ito, L. Johnson, N. Johnson, Jong, Kasper, Keddie, Konen, Liberty, Maki, Mayer, McCarthy, McConkie, McGowan, Mellon, Miguel, Montana, Nesterov, Nicholson (for Royce), Onder, Palese, Petges, Qin, Richter, Riggs, Sharp, Sirotkin, Slotsve, Smith, Subramony, Sullivan, Surjadi, Tatara, Thu, Vahabzadeh, Valentin, Whedbee

**VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:** Bujarski, Demir, Fanara, A. Johnson, Lampi, Penkrot, Royce

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Barnhart, Bohanon, Boston, Bryan, Douglass, Falkoff, Frazier, Gorman, Groza, Halverson, Henningsen, Henry, Howell, Ingram, Jaekel, Klaper, McEvoy, Rhode, Saborío, Schatteman, Weffer

**OTHERS ABSENT:** G. Beyer, Marsh

### I. CALL TO ORDER

**K. Thu:** My laptop clock just turned 3 o'clock, and so I'm going to go ahead and call the meeting to order. As you can see, Pat has projected, as she always does, the Faculty Senate voting members. And keep in mind that we can't necessarily track exactly who votes, so this is an honor system. So, please when matters come to a vote, please adhere to the rules.

Meeting called to order at 3 p.m.

### II. VERIFICATION OF QUORUM

**K. Thu:** Pat, do we have a quorum?

**P. Erickson:** Yes, I think we do, and we can go ahead. I'd also like to call on George Slotsve at this time, Kendall. He wants to make a quick announcement.

**K. Thu:** Go ahead, George.

**G. Slotsve:** Yes, Kendall, I just wanted, on behalf of Faculty Senate to thank you for your service over the last couple of years. I appreciate it, and I believe the Faculty Senate, as a whole, appreciates it. You've shepherded us through a time of COVID. The format of the meetings has changed; that hasn't been an easy adjustment. I'll keep this short and just want to note a couple of the highlights of your two years. Even with COVID, you restructured the Faculty Senate so that academic truly comes under the Faculty Senate now. And I want to thank you for that, as well forming the Social Justice Committee. I think it's a very important committee, and I think it's a feather in your cap that you've been able to form that committee and get everything rolling. And, hopefully, it will be a great hand-off for Peter next year. So, thank you very much, Kendall. It's been an honor to serve with you.

**K. Thu:** Thank you, George. I appreciate it. I feel as though it's a bit of a Faculty Senate eulogy. I'm not dying yet, but I really do appreciate the sentiment. And if we have time at the end of the meeting, I'd like to say a few words by way of reflection on my role the last couple years and the things that we've been able to accomplish. So, thank you, George. Coming from you, I appreciate it. And I think the polar bear behind you has moved a little bit.

**G. Slotsve:** I was just going to say, Kendall, I believe Pat will be giving you a clock as part of the remembrance of your service here. That will be transferred to you at a later point in time. But I believe there's a clock that's involved here, as well.

**K. Thu:** Thank you very much. I appreciate that. And I thank all the Faculty Senate members for your generous words and your generous spirit in making shared governance work. A few more words about that as the meeting comes to an end, hopefully. So, thanks again, everybody. Yes, it is my final Faculty Senate meeting. It's no secret that, at this point, that not only is this my final Faculty Senate meeting as Faculty Senate president, but I'm likely going to retire come the end of June. So, a number of you already know that. So, this is a little bit of a bittersweet meeting, but there is so much to be thankful for and so much that we have going for us that I think things are at a good point.

**K. Borre** [via chat]: Excellent appreciation for Kendall.

**S. Vahabzadeh** [via chat]: Many thanks to you.

**B. McGowan** [via chat]: You have done a truly outstanding job these two years.

**G. Aygen** [via chat]: Congratulations!

**T. Boston** [via chat]: Oh No! You earned your retirement!

**L. Saborío** [via chat]: Congrats!

### **III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

**K. Thu:** To get back to the mundane task of piling through the agenda, I would entertain a motion to adopt the agenda.

**C. Doederlein:** So moved.

**K. Thu:** Thank you, Cathy. Do we have a second?

**J. Akst:** I'll second.

**K. Thu:** Thanks, Jason. Any comments or questions? If not, we'll do this by – can we just do it by voice, Ferald and Pat, rather than going in the chat box, unless you think we need to do it in the chat box.

**C. Doederlein:** I already put it in the chat box, but also I think

**K. Thu:** I'm so tired of all things Teams, like I know that all of you are, and making things as simple as possible, but okay, let's do it in the chat box. All in favor of adopting the agenda – I believe Natasha, are you

**C. Doederlein:** It's Cathy. I'm covering the chat box.

**K. Thu:** Oh, Cathy, you're covering for Natasha. Go ahead, Cathy. To make it official in my final stint as the president of Faculty Senate, we'll put this on the record. So, those in favor of adopting the agenda, hover over the yes. And those opposed, hover over the no. And those who abstain, just abstain. So, I'm not sure what's going on in the chat box, but I'll rely on Pat and Ferald's wisdom to say whether we have approved the agenda.

**P. Erickson:** Oh, that looks very good to me.

**K. Thu:** Okay, very scientific. Okay, we have approved the agenda.

### **IV. APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 24, 2021 MINUTES – Pages 4-7**

**K. Thu:** Next are the minutes from the March 24 Faculty Senate meeting. Again, I'll entertain a motion to approve those minutes.

**D. Valentiner:** I'll move.

**K. Thu:** Thanks, David. Do we have a second?

**I. Montana:** I'll second.

**K. Thu:** Thanks, Ismael. Any discussion, corrections, deletions, effervescent editorials? Okay, if not, again, if all those in favor of approving the minutes, if you'll indicate so in the chat box. Again, you can hover over the abstain, no or yes icon that Cathy has in the chat box and indicate your vote there. And it looks like we have the minutes approved, is that right, Pat?

**P. Erickson:** I think so.

**K. Thu:** I think so too. Okay, thanks, everybody.

## **V. PUBLIC COMMENT**

**K. Thu:** Next, Pat, do we have any requests for public comment?

**P. Erickson:** We do not.

**K. Thu:** Okay, thank you.

## **VI. FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**K. Thu:** So next that brings us to Faculty Senate President's Announcements. As I mentioned, this is the last meeting of the academic year, as remarkable as that may seem. It's been a remarkable year in so many ways. While this is the last meeting, we have a lot to do, so I'm going to keep my comments short and then we'll see what time we have at the end. I'm trying to get through everything so that we make it to adjourn the meeting by 4:30, but we'll see how it goes.

As many of you know, there has been a task force at work, working on the Illinois Board of Higher Education's strategy. And we've had two representatives to that task force, those being Simón Weffer and President Lisa Freeman. And they've been keeping me up to date on a regular basis on what's going on. And earlier this week, they both brought to my attention and the attention of others in shared governance, some concerns that they have. And I've invited Simón to share those concerns and ask you, as Faculty Senate members, to possibly chime in and have your voices heard as that strategic plan moves ahead. I know that, for many of us, what the IBHE does seems so far removed from what we do on a day-to-day basis. But it does have a real impact. And so, I want to invite Simón to spend two or three minutes as part of my president's announcements talking about what's going on with the IBHE strategic plan, and what we can do as a Faculty Senate, and the voices within Faculty Senate, to help deal with the concerns that I know you and President Freeman have. So, Simón, with that, I'm going to invite you to say a few words.

**S. Weffer:** Thank you so much, Kendall. Everyone, I will do my best to be brief. As many of you know, as I've discussed in previous meetings, the strategic plan the IBHE is trying to lay out a framework for the next ten years of higher education. It's so important because it's not just the possibility of what happens in a Pritzker administration; but should Pritzker lose in a few years, what the path will be for higher education moving forward. If Pritzker decides not to run, even if there is a Democratic, that person could have a very different point of view on higher education.

And so, I've been working on that task force, along with President Freeman and some other faculty members that have been part of some working groups on some of the larger strategies. But there's two things that have come up, in particular, that I'm concerned with, that President Freeman is concerned with, that we wanted to get on everyone's radar.

And those two things are: 1) a general underselling of the importance of four-year institutions in the fabric of our society as a state, which is extremely troubling. One only sees what happens on a fairly regular basis in the news to understand the importance of higher education. You would think that, after the events of an almost insurrection at the Capitol Building, that would be pretty clear cut. The concern that Dr. Freeman and I both share is that, while there is going to be some "narrative" in the final document about the importance of higher education, it's not actually in the metrics. And we know that, at the end of the day, for those colleagues that are quantitative, you know, you skip the narrative, you go straight to the tables, and you look at the results. Well, we're worried that, with this document, people will skip the narrative and go straight to the metrics and not see anything that really measures the impact of higher education on the greater society. And when I say higher education, I mean everything – research, artistry, teaching, civic engagement and on and on and on. And so, I know President Freeman and the other presidents and chancellors brought that up with Ginger Ostro, who is the chair of the IBHE, or executive director, I can't remember her title, excuse me.

And then the other one is a bill that was recently introduced that also has its foundations in, or has suggestions of it in, the strategic plan, which is allowing community colleges to award a bachelor's degree, so a community college bachelor's. This would specifically be targeting early childhood. Actually, initially, it was early childhood, but it was expanded to include ESL as well as special education. Those of you that are involved in any of those three topics know exactly how problematic that could be. The argument is from an equity lens that allowing community colleges to give these sorts of degrees will help with the lack of early childhood educators, but there's actually no evidence that that's the case. Matt Streb has been involved in countering this effort in the statehouse. Literally, yesterday there was a potential bill that was going to come to the floor. It ended up not happening. It's unclear exactly what the outcome is. But the problem is that, if we allow community colleges to start granting a B.A. in any way, shape or form, it's only a matter of time that they might say this is only early childhood education, it's a matter of creep. And we know that one of the things that happens is that these programs tend to be extended. It also flies in the face of programs, such as the one we have, which is a partnership between NIU and Elgin Community College that does training for individuals in early childhood education.

So, you might be asking, Simón, that's a wonderful preamble, what do you need me to do? Very soon, IBHE will be posting the final strategic plan for public comment. We need faculty to comment on it. I will be providing Kendall and Pat some talking points around that, and that will be distributed. It's also going to be important to get faculty appearing during public comment of IBHE board meetings, because it is more likely to be impactful if we actually tell the IBHE what's going on than hoping that the consulting company that's helping with the strategic plan takes our comments out of whatever is posted online.

And the last part is, if this bill does emerge from committee and is voted on, we would be asking you to contact your local officials, your state reps and your state senators to oppose the bill for a

variety of different reasons. And again, that will be a set of talking points that I will distribute. It's very possible that this will happen finals week. It's possible that it will happen during extra session of the Illinois General Assembly, which means that it's not technically on our nine-month salaries, or nine-month contract. But I would implore all of you to be active in this, because I think it could be very problematic if that passes. And I will say that I say all this, not just as a faculty member, but also as a union member. I was able to get on the IBHE Task Force in part because of the work by John Miller, the UPI president, to ensure that we had representation on that task force. And so, what I will be sending out will be some talking points from the union, but also some talking points that are generated in conversation with Dr. Freeman and Matt Streb, as well.

I think I'm probably over my three minutes. Kendall's probably wondering if he has a wrap-it-up sign that he can waive at me. I'll take a couple of quick questions, but would encourage anyone – I think, Kendall, I'll probably give a similar presentation to University Council next week, and that might be a better time to take more detailed questions. But if there are quick questions that I can address, please ask.

**K. Thu:** I see Linda's hand is up. Linda, do you want to add something. Linda has a piece of the agenda later on; so, Linda, if you have something to add that you don't plan on adding later on, go ahead.

**L. Saborío:** It's a question. I don't think that the board is meeting again until June 8. Is that correct, Simón? So, if they're looking to have this plan completed by the end of May, what will our opportunities be for writing public comment.

**S. Weffer:** That is a great question. They sent us on the task force a schedule that there was actually going to be a May meeting just for the strategic plan, but it's possible that that's not going to happen or it's going to be one of those very late adds, as we know, like, oh look, here's 48 hours' notice. Hopefully, no one will show up. Once I have more details, I will get that out. And thank you for reminding me, Linda, the other place where there will be opportunity for faculty to chime in will be some sort of town hall focus group-type thing. And, again, I will get that information out as quickly as I have it.

**L. Saborío:** Thank you.

**J. Akst** [via chat]: Thank you for the overview, Simón. This is definitely on my radar.

**K. Thu:** Thank you, Simón. And thank you, Linda. And thanks for keeping track of everything in addition to all you're doing as a regular faculty member at NIU and your work in the union. We all have a responsibility here. I realize that it's the end of the year, we're all so damn busy, but we have an obligation to weigh in. And so, once Simón gets that information to us, I'll be sure and get it out – or actually, Pat will bet it out asap. And I join Jason Akst in his comments in the chat box that this is on all of our radar screens. And let's make it a goal of having NIU faculty voices be the largest contingent of voices weighing in on this issue in the state of Illinois. So, I encourage all of you to contact Simón directly if you have questions or comments, as well as Linda. And I look forward to Simón keeping in contact to let us know what's going on and how we can help. Thanks, Simón.

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

**K. Thu:** Pat, do we have any items for Faculty Senate consideration under Roman numeral VII?

**P. Erickson:** No, we do not.

**K. Thu:** Okay.

## **VIII. FS-UC RULES, GOVERNANCE AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE – report Ben Creed, FS Liaison/Spokesperson**

**K. Thu:** Then we can move on to Roman numeral VIII in the senate agenda, the Faculty Senate-University Council Rules, Governance and Elections Committee that's headed by Ben Creed. And so, there are a number of things that Ben, with Pat's help, are going to walk you through, including the election of a new Faculty Senate president. So, with that, I'm going to turn it over to Ben and mute my microphone and let Ben and Pat take it away. So, Ben, the microphone is yours.

A. Nominations for 2021-22 FS president/UC chair – Page 8

1. Peter Chomentowski – Pages 9-10

**B. Creed:** Thank you, Kendall. Our first item, as Kendall mentioned, is to elect the Faculty Senate president for the 2021-2022 academic year. We only have one nomination, Peter Chomentowski. His letter of acceptance of nomination was sent out to all Faculty Senate voting members last week and is also included in the agenda packet for today's meeting. For this voting process, there will be three choices. One will be yes, accept this nominee. Two will equal no, reject the nominee. Or three for abstain. We're going to use Poll Everywhere to vote, and I'll turn it over to Pat to guide us through that process.

**P. Erickson:** I'm going to go into the chat feature now and put a link there for our voting members to access a poll, a ballot. And you should see it there now. So, you can click right on that link, As you know, you'll come to a ballot that will show you choices one through ten. And as Ben described, we're using one through three for this vote. You can go ahead and place your vote now.

**D. Valentiner:** Can you remind us what the numbers mean.

**P. Erickson:** Sure. One is yes, approve the candidate. Two is no, reject the candidate. And three is abstain.

**D. Valentiner:** Thanks.

**P. Erickson:** And I'm not seeing any votes coming in, so, if you're having trouble, can you let me know?

**A. Keddie** [via chat]: I voted.

**T. Sullivan** [via chat] I voted, too, about a minute ago.

**L. Johnson** [via chat]: I voted too.

**D. Maki** [via chat]: I voted.

**N. Petges** [via chat]: I voted too.

**P. Carpenter** [via chat]: I voted too.

**F. Surjadi** [via chat]: I voted too and saw a note “response recorded.”

**K. Thu:** I voted, Pat, so have you seen any votes at all?

**P. Erickson:** Okay. No, I see no votes coming in. I’ll give it another few seconds. And if I don’t start seeing votes, I’m going to dump this ballot and give you a new URL.

**K. Thu:** I’m seeing several folks in the chat box indicate they have voted.

**Unidentified:** I voted and then cleared and then voted again, and I’m not seeing anything.

**P. Erickson:** Okay, let’s stop that vote then and give me a moment to activate a new ballot. It did look a little funky when I activated, so maybe that was a problem. Let’s all just pause for a minute here.

**D. McConkie** [via chat]: It’s okay to let Pete sweat this out a little.

**B. Creed:** Would it be better if I moved on to the next one and then come back to it, because the next one is a motion vote.

**P. Erickson:** Yes, you could move on to that. I have the new ballot in there. It says second ballot try. So, folks can do that, but you could go ahead and move on if you want to while they’re voting.

**B. Creed:** Are you seeing votes come in now, Pat?

**P. Erickson:** Just going over to that screen now. Oh dear, I’m not seeing votes coming in. What is happening? Okay, I am seeing them come in now, we’re good.

**B. Creed:** Awesome.

**P. Erickson:** So, I’m going to slide that over so you can see that. Don’t know if we still have people wanting to vote, but we do have a clear majority there. I’ll leave it to you, Ben, or Kendall, to make that official call.

**K. Thu:** Ben, you’re the chair, you call it.



**B. Creed:** I think we have overwhelming support for our next Faculty Senate president, Peter Chomentowski.

**P. Erickson:** I agree.

Yes – 37

No – 2

Abstain – 2

**K. Thu:** Congratulations, Peter.

**B. Creed:** Congratulations.

**P. Chomentowski:** Thank you very much.

**C. McEvoy** [via chat]: Congratulations, Pete!

**D. Valentiner** [via chat]: Congratulations!

**L. Liberty** [via chat]: Congratulations, Peter!

**B. Creed:** And I'm sure that will not be an omen for things to come.

**P. Chomentowski:** That's pretty funny!

- B. Approve faculty candidates running unopposed to serve on committees of the university – walk-in

**B. Creed:** Okay, we'll move on to item B, which is the approval of faculty candidates running unopposed to serve on committees of the university. Pat is bringing up the committees and unopposed candidates on the screen. As that comes on screen, if you want to take a moment to look it over. It's also in your agenda packet, I believe. So, as you are looking it over, I'll just let you know that, for this voting process, I'll entertain a motion and then a second to approve the roster. And it will be for the full roster here, those that are unopposed.

**D. Valentiner:** I'll make a motion that we accept the roster.

**B. Creed:** Thank you, David. Do I have a second?

**Y. Ito:** I'll second it.

**B. Creed:** All right, we have a second from Yasuo Ito. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, I'll ask our chat monitor to enter yes, no or abstain into the chat box. And then if you could just hover over and use your thumbs-up icon to vote. All right, it looks like we've got enough yeses to carry that.

**P. Erickson:** Yes.

**B. Creed:** Great, so that means we have those approved.

C. Approve 2021-22 FS-Social Justice Committee membership roster – Page 11

**B. Creed:** Moving on to item D, this is to elect a faculty representative to serve on the Police Chief Search Committee.

**P. Erickson:** Ben, can we go back to C? Do we have Item C, the Social Justice Committee membership?

**B. Creed:** Yes, I jumped right over that one, sorry. This one is actually about the 2021-2022 Faculty Senate Social Justice Committee. This is to approve members who have agreed to serve on that committee. Pat has brought up the roster on the screen. For this process, we'll entertain a motion and a second to approve the roster. So, if we could have a motion?

**P. Chomentowski:** I'll make a motion to approve it.

**B. Creed:** Thank you, Peter. And a second?

**G. Aygen:** I second it.

**B. Creed:** Thank you, Gulsat. Is there any discussion?

**K. Thu:** I might just point out, Ben, as you can see, the roster is not complete. These are basically members who were in the previous ad hoc committee, for the most part, not all. And so I wanted to get a head start on this for the fall. And as I've said before, I've sort of had a personal connection to some of these members of the group, and I wanted to get a leg up on getting the committee filled.

**B. Creed:** Thank you. Hearing no other discussion, I'll ask Cathy Doederlein to put into the chat box yes, no and abstain and use the thumbs-up function. All right, it looks like we have the votes to approve that.

**P. Erickson:** Yes, I agree.

D. Elect faculty representative to serve on the Police Chief Search Committee –  
Page 12

**B. Creed:** Now moving on to Item D, the next up is electing a faculty representative to serve on the Police chief Search Committee. The candidates are listed in your packet and on the screen. And we'll use Poll Everywhere to vote. And I'll turn it over to Pat to guide us through that process.

**P. Erickson:** We're going to do the same thing again with an online ballot. And I'm copying the link right now. And my glitch is always coming back to the screen so I can get that into the chat, give me just a moment. Okay, you should see it there now. You can access that link. And for this

ballot, one will be selecting Jodi Lampi; two, Lisa Liberty; three, Rich Grund. I show 27 people have voted. Let's give it another few seconds. Okay, now we've got more. I'll bring that over to show you the results. And looks like number one – now I've forgotten who number one was, Jodi Lampi I think?

**B. Creed:** That's correct.

**P. Erickson:** Okay, looks like Jodi was elected there, thanks.

**B. Creed:** Thank you, Jodi, for serving in that role.

- E. Committees of the University 2021-22 – Election of faculty candidates who are running opposed and must be selected by Faculty Senate. Following the meeting, a Qualtrics ballot will be distributed to the tenured/tenure track faculty, clinical faculty and instructor members of Faculty Senate.

**B. Creed:** Item E is the next item of business, to elect faculty members who are running opposed to serve on various committees of the university. To complete this voting process, after today's meeting, Pat will distribute a Qualtrics ballot to the tenured and tenure-track faculty, clinical faculty and instructors members of Faculty Senate. So, please watch for that by the end of the week.

- F. Election of Faculty Senate Personnel Committee representatives for terms to begin in fall 2021. Only CHHS and CVPA have vacancies to fill. Those elected must be tenured faculty members of Faculty Senate. Following the meeting, a Qualtrics ballot will be distributed to the tenured/tenure-track faculty members of Faculty Senate, from CHHS and CVPA, respectively.

**B. Creed:** And then moving on to Item F, the final item of business is to elect the tenured faculty members to serve on the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee for terms to begin in fall 2021. Only the College of Health and Human Sciences and the College of Visual and Performing Arts have vacancies to fill on this personnel committee. To complete this voting process, following the meeting, Pat will distribute a Qualtrics ballot to the tenured/tenure-track faculty members of Faculty Senate from the College of Health and Human Sciences and the College of Visual and Performing Arts respectively.

And that concludes my report, I believe, thank you.

**K. Thu:** Thank you, Ben. Congratulations to Peter. Thank you very much, Peter, for stepping up with your willingness to serve. And also thanks to all the other faculty members who have agreed to serve on a variety of committees.

## IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

### A. Ad Hoc Social Justice Committee recommendations

[View draft report](#)

Ismael Montana, Chair

Kendall Thu, Faculty Senate President

**K. Thu:** We'll go ahead and move on. The next item is Item IX, unfinished business, the Ad Hoc Social Justice Committee recommendations. By way of very brief background primer, as you know the Ad Hoc Social Justice Committee worked since last fall in developing a report, including a set of recommendations for the university. The report and the recommendations were reported out to Faculty Senate in its March meeting. At that meeting, the [Ad Hoc] Social Justice Committee asked for feedback from the campus community by, I believe the deadline was April 7 or 8, I'm not sure exactly which. And we got some feedback, not a lot. And so, I'm going to turn it over to the chair of the [Ad Hoc] Social Justice Committee, Ismael Montana, to sort of introduce the committee's response to the feedback. And then at the very end, I'll have a little bit to say about the process going forward. So, Ismael, I'm going to let you take it away from here, as well as Ben. The mic is yours, Ismael.

**I. Montana:** Thank you, Kendall. Thank you for setting the context for the Ad Hoc Social Justice Committee presentation today. As Kendall explained, at the last March 24 Faculty Senate session, the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Social Justice Committee presented our summary of the draft report and outlined our key recommendations before the senate. As Kendall rightly pointed out, a deadline of April 7 was established to receive feedback and comment for members of the senate. As well as members of the senate, all stakeholders, through this initiative, were provided with copies of the draft report and a web link containing the report, along with Qualtrics survey. With the completion of that, we are happy today to present our response to the feedback that we received as a result.

So, today, I have with me two subcommittee chairs of the Ad Hoc Social Justice Committee, Ben Creed and David Valentiner, who will highlight the process involved in capturing and reviewing the feedback on the draft report. So, without further ado, I'm going to turn it over to my colleagues, and then they will continue with our presentation. Thank you.

**B. Creed:** Thank you, Ismael. I just want to note that Elisa Fredericks, the other subcommittee chair, is on as well. This slide is just an overview of the feedback process. We solicited feedback, as was mentioned, by the seventh. We did that both via email and then anonymous responses via Qualtrics survey that was sent out. We got four email responses, three responses via Qualtrics. And then we've also initiated conversations with the president, provost and chief diversity officer. They've either begun or will begin soon, as well as other stakeholder groups across campus.

Upon receiving the feedback, the committee and subcommittee chairs met along with the Faculty Senate president to discuss the feedback. This group put together a response to the feedback, which was then shared with the full Ad Hoc Social Justice Committee membership for comment and review. We're here today to share a quick recap of that feedback, how it has impacted the report to be voted on today and then how that feedback will stay with the report as it moves forward to the newly-created Social Justice Committee.

The feedback, which was shared, generally was high-level in nature and primarily positive. Comments focused more on the report as a whole rather than investigating the specifics that were brought up in the report. As such, there were not many directly actionable recommendations or suggestions made on how to improve the report. But we did want to cover two points here that the committee learned from the feedback and will be submitted to the permanent Faculty Senate Social Justice Committee.

First, the responses highlighted the importance of clarity and specificity of language. This was emphasized in the subcommittee and full committee conversations as the report was conceived and developed. But there were still places where the language could have been improved to better highlight the intentions of the committee and reflect the conversations which took place within the committee and subcommittees. One example that we wanted to point out was related to the second recommendation in the Academic Affairs Subcommittee report, which was to create a unified policy document, which addresses faculty hiring, tenure and promotion, aligns each component with the others and with university goals and embeds equity and social justice principles throughout. The intention behind this was to broaden the factors, which were included in hiring, tenure and promotion to include the work that may currently go or that does currently go unacknowledged, unrewarded or is discounted in the current system. In other words, we were looking for a way in which perspective or current faculty members could show evidence of teaching or librarianship, research and artistry and/or service under a broadened definition of what those relevant and meaningful categories might be.

Second, there is agreement amongst the committee members with the [inaudible] for including richer data into the work. The committee did recognize the constraints and limitations of the data used in this report, particularly when it relied on data that was produced for other reasons. Many pieces of information were not consistently captured in current data systems, such as things that we would have liked to included, which were related to timed tenure, promotion and retention rates in a disaggregated form. When new data was collected, we did have to make decisions about how to be economical with the limited volunteer time of committee members, as well as those we called on to support our work from across campus. As we mentioned in the report, we want to reiterate all of these recommendations where we saw room for more data and important data to be included will be forwarded on to the standing Social Justice Committee, including making sure we speak with all faculty groups, not just the Black faculty focus groups that we were able to conduct during the timeline.

Related to these points, we want to just remind folks that this is a report and the recommendations are just that – a report based on a distinct set of evidence to address a specific change within a given timeframe. The report recommendations should be seen as a step along the path, but not the end. And these recommendations are recommendations; and turning the recommendations into action plans will require the work of this body, bodies across NIU, as well as the individuals throughout NIU. The actions will require the appropriate approval from the governing bodies and will incorporate additional data and voice. So, this report, along with feedback we've received, and we

continue to receive and other relevant information will be forwarded along to standing committee as they begin their work to operationalize these recommendations and address the committee's charge.

With that, I'll turn it over to David Valentiner for further discussion of the feedback we received.

**D. Valentiner:** As Ismael and Ben said, we didn't get a lot of feedback. Most of what we did receive was positive. And I've picked out some of the concerns that were addressed. And so, this is a selective, not a representative, collection of the feedback we got. It really kind of emphasizes the more negative feedback that we got. I did include my name and email address at the bottom of this slide if any of you have any desire to converse or contact me, I hope you'll do that. The forum here really isn't conducive to giving a fair representation to the feedback that we got, some of which people took time to write and were very thoughtful about. And it's also not a forum that's real conducive for me to give a thorough response. But I did want to at least acknowledge that we got some of these concerns and that we have thought about them.

One set of comments that we got, that first bullet point there, says that our university needs to do everything possible to increase enrollment. This person, actually, had a lot of positive, supportive things to say, but did express this concern that some of the language that's used in the report might be easily misconstrued. And I think that there is some merit to that. Enrollment is very important. Enrollment is essential. And I think it was the feeling of the committee that we really need to balance the concerns about enrollment and about business with concerns about the university mission. Generally speaking, the issues of social justice have really been compromised quite a bit for quite a while. And so, I think that's possibly, that's really why we're coming down with the language that we came down with. But I do think that's a judgment call.

There was another set of comments that were also pretty positive where somebody asked us, expressed a desire for more of a call for NIU to work with the local community on addressing racism, not just within the university, but within the community and within society. And we actually did include material about that in the institutional racism report. There's a framework section and a context section, and we do talk about that. But we didn't raise it to the level of a prominent recommendation, because we see that as part of the work of the Faculty Senate committee, the standing committee that has been created. And we see the establishment of that committee and the establishment of partnerships across the university as a prerequisite for doing that work with the local communities.

There were a couple of sets of comments that we got that were pretty negative. In this next set of quotes here, "I'm offended that NIU is using critical theory as the basis for trainings at NIU." And "...this type of nonsense needs to stop." Again, I'm just going to remind you, this isn't a forum where we can really present, where I can really do justice to the comments that were written or to do a complete response to it. My sense of this set of comments was that somebody had a bad experience with an ADEI training, and that negative experience was the filter with which they looked at the report. And I would just encourage this person to go to ADEI to have conversations with them about their training experience. Of course, you're welcome to contact me and to participate in the Faculty Senate standing committee and the process in and around the Faculty Senate. I don't immediately have very much that I feel like I can say about a training that I'm not really a part of.

There was another set of negative comments that expressed a number of concerns, argued that we have weak data at best, kind of categorized critical race theory in a way that isn't consistent with my understanding. And, again, I don't know that this is really a forum for being able to represent their concerns or express an adequate response. I think that if you are wanting to have a conversation and are willing to listen, I'm certainly willing to listen as well. And I think that that's the best we can hope for here. I hope that you will reach out and contact members of the committee – my name and email are at the bottom – and to participate.

Finally, I did receive some verbal feedback from some people that expressed concern that the report could have included stronger and more straight forward, direct calls for NIU to, for example, hire more BIPOC faculty. And I think, although that was implicit in the report, it wasn't made as explicit and straight forward as some people would have liked. And I think one of the problems, one of the things that we really struggled with in the report is trying to balance this call, this need for action, this sense of the urgency with also wanting to create a shared understanding, a shared analysis, to get us all on the same page, and to really transform our thinking about the problem of institutional racism so that the actions would be informed by that solid foundation.

That's all I have to say. Again, please do send me an email if you're interested in discussing any of this.

**K. Thu:** Thank you, David. Thank you, Ben. And thank you, Ismael. I appreciate all of your work on this committee. And the work will continue. I would encourage everybody on Faculty Senate to get in touch with all of the subcommittee chairs and to stay in touch with the standing Social Justice Committee as its work moves forward. As I've said to all of the members of this committee, we all do service as faculty. You are involved in service on steroids in doing this work. And by steroids, I mean in a legal sense. So, thank you so much for the dedication and the time and effort. By way of the process moving forward, I have heard from President Freeman that she would like the committee to identify which of the recommendations are a priority. And I had a conversation with Provost Ingram about this. The committee is going to meet soon after the semester is over and identify what those priority recommendations may be. And then, hopefully, the plan is to have a meeting between the subcommittee chairs, the Faculty Senate president and the provost and the president to identify mechanisms of moving ahead, because we all understand that, in the end, we want actionable items, not just recommendations on paper, as eloquent as those might be, as well researched as they may be, as well intentioned as they may be. We need to have action in response to all the work that this group has put together. So, we will keep you posted. There's a lot of work that needs to be done going forward. It's not lost on any of the committee members that yesterday when we were meeting in preparation for this Faculty Senate meeting today, that in the midst of that meeting, we had the news on in the background with the pending verdict coming forward from the George Floyd trial. So, thank you again to all the committee members, and there's a lot of work ahead, but you've certainly provided a tremendous, tremendous service to the university. And now all that's left is the rest, as a Norwegian carpenter once said to me.

[There is a gap here as the body moved on to Items X, A and B.]

**K. Thu:** I need to circle back here, because I made a mistake. At the Faculty Senate Steering Committee meeting last Wednesday, it was decided that we would entertain a motion to do something with the Faculty Senate [Ad Hoc] Social Justice Committee report. And so, I'm going to circle back to item number IX, the Ad Hoc Social Justice Committee recommendations. And I see George Slotsve's hand is up, so, George, would you like to offer up a motion?

**G. Slotsve:** Yes, I would. I move that the Faculty Senate endorse this report of the Ad Hoc Social Justice Committee and direct the Faculty Senate Social Justice Committee to continue its work moving forward into the future.

**K. Thu:** Thank you, George. Do we have a second?

**Y. Ito:** Second.

**K. Thu:** Thank you. Discussion? There is going to be ample time for lots more discussion coming down the pipeline in the fall, going forward. As the committee members have said all along, this report is just a milestone along the way. And so, I thank George and the second for the motion. Unless I see any hands crop up with questions or comments, I am going to ask Pat to do an anonymous vote on this. Pat, if you will work your magic, we will wait patiently to respond to the voting poll.

**P. Erickson:** Okay, and you should see the link now in the chat. You can go ahead and I think for this vote, one equals yes, that you approve the motion. Two equals no. And three equals abstain.

**K. Thu:** And while the votes are being tallied, again my apologies for missing this as part of the agenda. And there we go. Thank you all very much for the overwhelming endorsement of the report and, more importantly, the endorsement of the process, I think, that this committee is undertaking and will continue to work on going forward with what is overwhelming support from the Faculty Senate. So, thank you again. And thank you, George, for the motion

Yes – 43

No – 1

Abstain - 5

## **X. NEW BUSINESS**

- A. Proposed amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 1, Membership of the Faculty Senate – Pages 13-14  
FIRST READING

**K. Thu:** Next is new business. We have three items under new business. The first one is a proposed amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 1. This one is fairly straight forward, and I'm going to wait for Pat to bring up the actual proposed change. This proposed change is for the membership from Operating Staff Council if I remember correctly. They desire to change the term of their membership. Up in the rationale box, you'll see that the rationale is to change the operating staff term of office from three years to one year. My view of this is that this is up to the Operating Staff



Council. This is really their purview, knowing what sort of service they need to provide to the campus and the availability of their members. So, you can see below in two different places, the language has been changed from three years to one year. This is a first reading, so it does not require a vote. But we wanted to get this under our belts with a first reading. Of course, we want to respond to any questions or concerns that you might have. Natasha, I don't know if you're with us – I hope you are – if you'd like to say a few words about this as the current OSC president. Maybe Natasha isn't with us. Any questions or concerns about this? I think it's just pretty straight forward. We're responding to the operating staff's desire to change the term of service. Okay, if there are none, then we will have a second reading in the fall. And, Peter, you can look forward to having your first amendment to the senate bylaws. Pat, do we have anything more on that item?

**P. Erickson:** No, I don't think so.

**K. Thu:** Okay.

- B. Five-Year Review of [Student Evaluation of Instruction](#) – report  
Chad McEvoy, Chair, Faculty Senate Personnel Committee  
Mary Lynn Henningsen, Member, SEI Ad Hoc Committee

**K. Thu:** Then let's move on to the next two items. Item B is the five-year review of student evaluation of instruction. We are required by the bylaws to examine university-wide policies that govern ways in which we deal with student evaluation of instruction. Chad McEvoy is here with us today. He headed up that effort, and I believe – and Chad, you correct me if I have this wrong – this is not a final report, but it is an interim report; and the expectation is that there will be a final report come fall. So, with that, I'm going to turn it over to Chad and Mary Lynn Henningsen.

**C. McEvoy:** Thanks, Kendall. Appreciate time on the agenda today. I just put in the chat the link to the Policy Library, which contains the current policy if you're not familiar with it. Our committee's been hitting this particular link on the Internet quite extensively this semester. Kendall, as you suggested, this is a preliminary report. Our committee has been working very hard this semester and is very close to wrapping up its work and submitting a final report of recommendations and findings. Happy to give what's called a sneak preview today. And then our final report and recommendations can be taken forward to the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee and the full Faculty Senate, I think, in the fall.

Our committee has worked really hard this semester. We've had a lot of really good, robust discussions about the existing university policy on student evaluation of instruction. Through those discussions, the committee has homed in on four areas. And I'm going to speak to a couple of them, and then I'll virtually tag in Min, my colleague, to talk about the next two. The first of the issues that we dug in on was the format of evaluations. The current policy says that online student evaluation of courses is permitted, but not mandatory. I think the committee recognized that, particularly as we are in a pandemic and so many of our courses are partially online, if not fully online, over the last couple of semesters, I think we realize that online evaluations is most certainly the norm now and quite likely the norm moving out of the pandemic. So, I believe our committee is going to recommend that we change the wording slightly there to say that online student evaluation of courses is recommended, but not mandatory, sort of a slight tweak there. We still want to allow if

there are particular programs or departments for specific reason think that pencil and paper evaluations makes sense for this class or this set of classes, we still want to allow units to have that flexibility. But we expect online course evaluations to continue to be the norm moving forward.

The second issue that we dug in on was the issue of response rates. We sent out a survey; many, if not most, of you likely received a survey from our committee back several weeks ago as we were having discussions. And one of the issues that we looked at was response rates. And we've heard a number of things anecdotally, particularly with online student course evaluations about issues with response rates. Also, again anecdotally, some notion that response rates may be skewed toward students that are upset with the way a class went. They may be more likely to fill out an evaluation than others. You might know that the current policy on student evaluations doesn't really speak to response rates at all. Our committee pragmatically had a lot of discussions, I certainly learned a couple of things that might take back to the classroom in the future about just some pragmatic tips for improving student evaluations. We had discussion about incentives such as extra credit, for example. Some faculty have had success with using extra credit as an enticement to encourage students to improve response rates. But we also recognize that's one of those issues that different faculty have different philosophical views in their own classrooms and in their own grading schemes, so we were certainly hesitant to impose a one-size fits all type of policy in that regard. The committee has been discussing, and I think agreed upon, a sentence that reads, "Departments or programs may choose to establish policy or consistent practices to enhance response rates." Again, we really thought that it made sense for those kinds of discussions to happen amongst the faculty at a program or department level, where if a group of faculty agrees upon a practice in this regard and wants to utilize that in their unit, that that might make sense.

So with that, I'll hand it off to Min to talk about the other two issues that we've been discussing.

**M. Henningsen:** Thank you. [inaudible] looked at in some detail was the issue of whether or not we should standardize questions. At this point in the policy that was in the link under chat, the current policy reads that questions are developed at the program or departmental level. And we debated a great deal whether or not that's where we should recommend that the policy maintain control. And since this last review had occurred, one of the things that we discovered is that a lot of peer institutions have developed university-wide steps. And at our own university, we had some colleges that have adopted a standard college-level set of questions. And so whether there should be program-level, college-level or university-level questions became a big issue in our discussion. We are likely to recommend that each college create a standard set of questions that also allows departments to add a few items to the end of those college-level questions at the program or department level. So, there would be a standard at the college level and then a few additional questions that could be allowed for programs and departments to add their own personal addition on it.

The final issue that we took a great deal of time on was the issue of bias within student evaluations. There's been a lot of literature on race and gender bias in student evaluation of instruction. And so, the first thing we did was we took on the opportunity to see what was in the literature. And in that review of literature, we did affirm that there is that bias, that it is in the literature. And so, we are going to recommend that a couple of recommendations follow from the observation of that bias. The first thing that we are going to do is offer a drafted statement that could be used that makes

students aware of their unconscious racial or gender biases that they may have. That kind of a precursor statement prior to answering the questions has been shown in the literature to reduce the likelihood of race and gender bias in the observation of student evaluation responses. And so, we're going to, hopefully, draft a statement that could be included in evaluations that could be used to do that.

And the other likely recommendation that we're going to forward is the recommendation to urge department personnel committees and college councils to discuss and adopt policies that address this issue of bias in their personnel policies or their bylaws, respectively.

And those are the four recommendation areas that the committee is working on. Is there anything else that we need to cover in our report before opening it up?

**C. McEvoy:** Kendall, we're happy to take questions if you think that time allows.

**K. Thu:** We have a couple minutes. I neglected an item earlier that we need to go back to as you may have seen in the chat box. But just as a reminder, we're not voting on this today. It's not a final report. There will be other opportunities for faculty members to weigh in on. But it is very important for faculty members to understand what's going on. So, I want to take a moment to field maybe one or two questions or comments that faculty may have at this point. I guess we have first Tim and then Linda. Tim, go ahead.

**T. Sullivan:** I have a question about – can the preamble be reviewed? I remember giving these out, and I'm always commenting about how this might affect my tenure, which I can't get; my salary, which it won't affect my salary; and something else that didn't affect me either. So, can it possibly be looked at again to see if that pertains to everybody who's passing out the student evaluations?

**C. McEvoy:** I don't believe that's specific to the university's SEI policy. That may be within a particular department instrument, I'm not sure.

**T. Sullivan:** I'll ask in the math department and go from there. It might be an LA&S thing. But I'll go from the department and on up, see where that's coming from. Thank you.

**K. Thu:** Linda?

**L. Saborío:** In the literature that you read, were there any examples of policies that address issues of bias at the department level that you could perhaps share with us?

**M. Henningsen:** I'm trying to recall the literature that we reviewed. I don't know that they were at the departmental level. When the research was investigating bias, it had a tendency to look at the university level, rather than at the departmental level. So, we do hope when we forward a set of recommendations that, along with it, we will hopefully have the draft statement that might be tested by this body before it would be adopted. And so, it would be possible for you all to have a say in the workshopping of the way that that statement would read.

**L. Saborío:** Okay, thank you.

**K. Thu:** I think that statement will be welcomed by almost all of us, because understanding and dealing with gender-based, race-based bias, as well as other kinds of bias is very important for us to be aware of and to incorporate into those processes. We have time for one more question, I think. David Valentiner, I saw your hand go up and then maybe it was retracted.

**D. Valentiner:** My question got answered. I was just wondering if there was, at some point, going to be a written summary and recommendations that we could look at.

**C. McEvoy:** Yes, there will be, and we'll talk with Pete as he steps into his role when we get started in the fall semester. I think the likely path forward is to take that report first to the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee and then to this body. So, stay tuned for more information in the fall.

**K. Thu:** Well, thanks to both of you for leading the effort. It's extremely important for not only faculty, but for students and ultimately for improving our classes going forward. So, thank you very much. We will look forward to more in the fall.

**C. McEvoy:** Thank you.

- C. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment – report  
Marc Falkoff, Assistant Chair, Academic Planning Council

**K. Thu:** We'll get back on track with the agenda. Sorry, Marc Falkoff, for delaying this a bit for your piece. Item C under new business is student learning outcomes assessment. By way of just very briefly setting the stage, as many of you, if not most of you, may remember, back in around February of last year, just at the beginning of COVID-19, we had a leadership meeting. At that leadership meeting, President Freeman gave a charge to the campus community to try to simplify our lives in a variety of ways. And Provost Ingram and I were given the co-task of trying to simplify academic policies and procedures, as daunting as that task may be. And one element of that was to review our assessment policies and practices at NIU to see if anything can be done to relieve some of the challenges that those practices face. Provost Ingram, along with myself, helped put together an ad hoc task force to review those practices and procedures, and my understanding now is that Marc Falkoff, who is chairing that committee, is going to provide us with a report. I see a hand up from Tim Sullivan. Tim, do you have anything to add on this topic?

**T. Sullivan** [via chat]: No.

**K. Thu:** Okay, if not, Marc, I'm going to go ahead and turn it over to you, and the virtual stage is yours.

**M. Falkoff:** Thanks, Kendall. Thanks for the chance to talk briefly about the task force's recommendations. As you said, the provost put together a group of us to review the university's assessment reporting requirements for academic programs. Some of our colleagues who draft reports on assessment of student learning outcomes at the university had expressed concern that the reporting was unduly burdensome and insufficiently useful to the program; so, we were asked to consider ways to minimize the burden and promote meaningful assessment activity, and to do that

in a way that wouldn't involve recommending anything that would threaten our compliance with accreditation or government requirements.

The membership of the task force included three members of the APC: me, Judy Chitwood and Hamid Bateni; three members from the UAP: Katy Jaekel, Alecia Santuzzi and Ursula Sullivan. That covered six colleges, so we also asked Brianno Collier to step in to make sure all the colleges were represented. Ritu Subramony, our director of accreditation, assessment and evaluation, was on the committee, as well as Morgan Tillery, who is an education grad student. So, it was really a great group, very devoted to the project. We all spent a lot of time, did a lot of work on the report.

Now, our task wasn't to question whether assessment is required at the university or anything of that nature. No one doubted at any point the importance to academic programs of robust assessment and continuous quality improvement. Our focus was, instead, on the particular reporting requirements that the university has for all of us. Early on, we decided not to make any recommendations about the so-called mid-status assessment reports. Those are reports that academic programs provide to the university about once every eight years. After conversations with Ritu and Carolinda Douglass, vice provost for institutional effectiveness, as you know, that kind of full sum reporting, it was clear that that's key to demonstrating our compliance with HLC standards. Instead, we turned our attention to what seemed to be the common source of some discontent, which was the annual assessment update reporting that the university requires of academic programs.

Because we on the committee had only heard second hand about concerns with that kind of reporting, we sent out a Qualtrics survey to chairs and program directors that had been responsible for the task. We had a very strong response rate, and we learned a lot from that survey. I'm not going to rehash the concerns that were returned to us in the survey, but you can find the highlights on pages four to six of the report that we sent around. Broadly speaking, there was a feeling that programs needed to be freed up to report on their assessment activity in ways that were meaningful to them. Otherwise, the whole exercise just felt like a lot of paper pushing to folks.

At the end of the day, having heard the nature of the concerns of the reporting burdens and the meaningfulness of the task, we made a handful of recommendations. Just high level, first was that, rather than asking programs to use a one-size-fits-all assessment reporting template, programs, instead, should be authorized to annually report their assessment activities in whatever manner they and their college deem most meaningful. That could mean providing narrative reports to the AAE Office. It could mean meeting in person with a representative from the office and perhaps memorializing the discussion. It could mean utilizing the old template and old forms. It could mean collecting data about student learning outcomes and generating a quantitative report that might be useful for the program, a report of its own design. The key here is respect to program autonomy and just working to make sure that, if a program was going to be investing this kind of reporting, that they do it in a way that's meaningful to them. So, that was the first recommendation.

Second, there are a lot of accredited programs. So, accredited programs that already engage in annual reporting for their accreditor, we recommended should be allowed to simply submit those materials, if they chose, to the university instead of being asked to write up new reports.

Third, we said that we should maintain the option of the default system that we have right now, although, there should be some consideration given to transitioning from the kind of Word document set-up that we have, that kind of format, to an online reporting tool. Some of the committee members were given an opportunity to experiment with online reporting for some of our peer universities, and we found it to be quite user-friendly and, all in all, less frustrating, at least for many of us, than our current system. So, that was another recommendation.

Fourth, we suggested that it might be appropriate to enhance support for the AAE Office, given that it may be necessary to have expanded outreach efforts and training about assessment and assessment reporting and best practices.

Last, we had some recommendations to academic programs, themselves, about how they dole out responsibility for drafting these annual assessment reports, since it was pretty clear from the survey responses that – well several things, but including that the programs with the most concern about the reporting burdens had similarities, like assigning one person responsibility for drafting multiple reports or failing to rely on committees to assist with the workload. There was also some clear misunderstanding about some of what the assessment reporting expectations were. So, we had some recommendations on that score.

Of course, I don't want to rehash the entire report, so, I'll leave it at that with maybe one more observation. I think I speak for all the members of the task force when I say that we were really struck by the seriousness with which our colleagues across the university took their assessment responsibilities. And I think it's fair to say that the concerns that were being addressed and the survey responses were aimed at making sure that this assessment reporting requirement, to the degree that we have one, is a meaningful task and that it's really there designed to help enhance student learning. Hopefully, these recommendations might make that task more efficient and more meaningful. With that, I'm happy to take questions. I know Katy is here. I'm not sure who else on our task force is in Faculty Senate these days.

**K. Thu:** Thanks, Marc. Yes, let's take a moment. Are there questions or comments from anybody? And while you're considering whether to raise your hand or not, I want to thank Marc and the committee for all their work on this front. It's not glamorous work, but it's important for the day to day functioning of the university. Well, if there are no comments or questions, I would encourage you to contact Marc directly. Marc, do you want to include your email address in the chat box?

**M. Falkoff:** Sure. No spam, I don't want any spam.

**K. Thu:** No spam, no. Again, thank you for your effort. A lot of the implementation of this will be up to the Provost's Office. And so, if you do have responses to what Marc just presented, as well as the actual report that provides much more detail, please feel free to contact Marc directly. So, thanks, Marc, for your time. Appreciate it.

**M. Falkoff** [via chat]: [mfalkoff@niu.edu](mailto:mfalkoff@niu.edu)

**L. Saborío** [via chat]: Thank you for your work.

## **XI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES**

### **A. Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE – Linda Saborío – report**

**K. Thu:** That brings us to item XI, Reports From Councils, Boards and Standing Committees. First up, as usual, is Linda's report from the Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE. And before I turn it over to Linda, I want to say congratulations, Linda, on being elected the vice chair of the Faculty Advisory Council to IBHE. That's in recognition of your exemplary service to NIU, as well as the FAC, in general. So, Linda, do you have a report for us?

**L. Saborío:** Thank you for that, Kendall, I do appreciate it. Vice chair, not the chair, like the president thought, right? They asked me about chair, and I said, no, no, not interested in being chair, way too much pressure there. The FAC met on April 16, and the legislative liaison discussed a few bills being proposed by legislators, such as HB3950 and a College Promise Grant bill. There are really quite a list of them that are being considered. So, if you want any additional information on these bills that are being proposed, just let me know, and I can provide you with additional information.

The liaison mentioned that the next IBHE board meeting is scheduled for June 8, which is why I proposed that question to Simón earlier. I'm not quite sure when we will have the opportunity to address the board before June 8, because they are looking at a deadline for that strategic plan for the end of May. So, as soon as we do hear something, of course, I will let you know, Kendall, and please share with others.

A draft of the strategic plan was shared with presidents of higher education, as you know, and other stakeholders. And they were provided the opportunity to submit feedback. I think public comment is being solicited on the website, and a few forums are being organized so that more stakeholders can offer their feedback. I know this is our last Faculty Senate meeting of the year, but Simón said we will do our best to keep Kendall posted for any opportunities for faculty to participate in these forums.

And our FAC rep on the strategic plan committee expressed similar concerns that were already shared with you by Simón, this lack of a significant research component in the plan, how to include scholarship, the importance of civic engagement. He also mentioned the idea of including the state's role in supporting research and artistry, not just at the federal level. And in terms of metrics, he proposed the question of how we measure research and engagement. And there was a lot more that we discussed, as well, with him, including dual credit, which came up again.

We had an invited guest at this meeting, and it was Ray Schroeder. He presented on being online in COVID times, and I can share his [site](#) with you in the chat box once I finish this report. And you're welcome to take a look at what he shared with us. He has a really nice [website](#) that he uses.

And then we actually had the opportunity to meet, at this last meeting, with John Atkinson, who is the chair of the IBHE. And, boy, did we have a lot of questions for him about the strategic plan, dual credit, early college, ECC, etc., the proposed B.A. for the community college, applied B.A. at

the community college level. This is very similar to what we saw in nursing, and we're going to have to really respond to this as Simón mentioned.

And then Marie Donovan also shared her thoughts on the applied B.A. degree at ECC and early childhood education at community colleges. She's one advocate, let me tell you. She is unrelenting in her advocacy for this.

Please let me know if you would like more specific information about what we discussed at our last meeting. There's a lot more involved here, but the FAC secretary takes more extensive notes, and I can always share those with you as well. Let me know if you have any questions.

**K. Thu:** Thank you so much, Linda. Any questions or comments for Linda? I think not only is NIU represented by Linda and Simón and President Freeman, but all of higher education in Illinois should be thankful that the three of them are part of this process. But again, we need to have our faculty voices heard. I know it takes time and it takes effort to comment, but we really need to make sure our voices are heard. And whenever Linda or Simón share the information with me about when and where we can comment, we will share that with you asap.

**L. Saborío:** Thank you.

**K. Whedbee** [via chat]: Congratulations, Linda!

**F. Bryan** [via chat]: Linda, congratulations!

**K. Jaekel** [via chat]: Congrats, Linda!

- B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – report  
Natasha Johnson, Cathy Doederlein, Kendall Thu  
Katy Jaekel, Sarah Marsh, Greg Beyer

**K. Thu:** That brings us to the University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees. I have no report. The next board meeting will be – I'm not sure actually – either May or June. I know that in June, they will be taking up the shared governance recommendation for defining faculty. So, I can report that the results of the referendum on defining faculty was overwhelmingly passed. I don't remember the numbers, although Pat may be able to share them. Because it passed, it means next it goes to the Board of Trustees, because it's a change in the constitution. And it was recommended by Matt Streb, our liaison to the board, that it be put on the June Board of Trustees agenda. And they are aware that it's coming before them. And I don't anticipate any problems.

I don't know whether anybody else on the UAC to the board would like to say anything. I will say that our board chair, his term is ending at the end of June. We do not know yet who the new chair will be, but we will keep you posted, of course.



- C. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee – Peter Chomentowski, Chair – no report

**K. Thu:** So that brings us to item C, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee. And, Peter, I understand you don't have any report.

- D. Student Government Association – report  
Antonio Johnson, President  
Bradley Beyer, Speaker of the Senate

**K. Thu:** So, we can move on to the Student Government Association report. I don't think Antonio is with us, but I believe Brad is. But, I don't want to automatically skip Antonio, though. I don't see him in the list of participants. So, Brad, as your final swan song in shared governance, would you like to share anything?

**B. Beyer:** Yes, this is, like Kendall said, my last Faculty Senate meeting, my penultimate shared governance meeting, if you will, because the last UC meeting is next week. I'll give a little bit of a brief SGA report. At this point, I'm just focusing on finals and finishing up classes of my own. But I can tell you that the [Student] Senate, this last Sunday, officially closed out the 52<sup>nd</sup> session of the Student Senate, and we passed our budget for the upcoming fiscal year. And now that we have all of the incoming officers and all the key positions in leaderships are filled, after finals are over in the first couple weeks in May, it will just be about transitioning. I did want to say, just in terms of shared governance, one of the things that I really wanted to prioritize with the new leaders is a real focus on shared governance. I'd say that being a student leader and going through 2020 and COVID times, having this at my disposal, I guess I have a lot more appreciation and respect for it now in hindsight than maybe I did when I first took on the job early last summer. Obviously, I knew about shared governance, but not really understanding the ins and outs of how exactly you can use it, that's something that I definitely want to focus on with the incoming leadership. It's definitely been a pleasure working with everyone and getting to know some of the campus partners, if you will, after being a student for all these years. I think that's pretty much it. I know when Antonio and I talked to Kendall last week, he did definitely want us to share just our thoughts. The school year was definitely tough. I had good days, but I definitely had some pretty bad days, too; not only being a student, but then being a student leader and kind of all the challenges that we had to go through. I'm grateful, though, for everything that I have gotten the chance to work on and the people I've gotten to work with, and I'm optimistic that better days are definitely ahead. I think that about does it for a final Faculty Senate report from me. Thank you all, again. Thanks, Kendall, especially. It's been an honor.

**K. Thu:** Well, thank you, Brad. It's been a pleasure working with you. Maybe you can say a couple words about what's next for you?

**B. Beyer:** Yes, I'm moving on to the private sector. I'm going to go into financial services at a firm in the Chicago suburbs, so my time at NIU is numbered at this point, unfortunately. But yes, I am moving on.

**K. Thu:** Thank you, Brad. And thanks to Antonio, as well. I know that there are bigger and better things ahead for both of them. And the fact that you lived up to the challenge in leading the Student Government Association in these challenging times. And that speaks volumes for your character and what you have ahead. I know it hasn't been easy. As I said to you when you and I and Antonio spoke the last time, as the Faculty Senate president, this is my full-time job. I get the pleasure of doing it and devoting my full attention to it. Your leadership in SGA, you have to do that on top of everything else you're doing in terms of your school work, which you have done so well, also. Thanks, Brad, for your future and stay in touch.

**B. Bradley:** Thanks, Kendall.

**T. Sullivan** [via chat]: Thank you for your service.

**C. McEvoy** [via chat]: Thank you, Brad. Your voice was very important.

**T. Boston** [via chat]: Thank you, Brad, and congratulations!

**J. Akst** [via chat]: Thanks, Brad, and best wishes for your future.

**A. Johnson** [via chat]: It would be today I have issue with my audio.

**B. Beyer** [via chat]: Thanks, everyone! It's been a pleasure.

**K. Thu:** Oh, there's Antonio. Antonio said he would be here today but he has issues with his audio. Well, Antonio, the same words for you. Thank you so much for your service. Thanks for everything you've done for the NIU community. And particularly, thank you for your leadership for the students and the SGA. So, it's much appreciated. I know that there are brighter things ahead for you as well, both personally and professionally. Thanks, Antonio.

E. Operating Staff Council – Natasha Johnson, President – report

**K. Thu:** That brings us to the Operating Staff Council report. Natasha? I don't know if Natasha is with us.

**N. Johnson:** Yes, I am here. I'm having computer issues back and forth, so, hopefully, everybody can hear me. We're just looking forward to hearing from Chris McCord again. He's going to give us an update at our next meeting about the efficiencies and things that are going on with the university. Also, we're gearing up for elections and appointments, and I feel like I got emails today about the different people who will be on the work groups. There are like six different work groups about working remotely. We'll notify people about that. And it looks like we're working on some bylaws, some updates and changes. I'm not sure if that had been brought up or not since I was having technology issues. But that seems to be the gist of everything. If I've missed it and Holly needs to speak up, then she can feel free. Thank you.

**K. Thu:** Holly, are you with us. Do you want to add anything?

**H. Nicholson:** I am with you, but Natasha covered it really well. Thank you.

**K. Thu:** All right, thank you. Thanks, Natasha.

F. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Cathy Doederlein, President – report

**K. Thu:** That brings us to Cathy Doederlein and a report from the SPS Council. Cathy?

**C. Doederlein:** Yes, just letting people know that the election, nomination process for elections for SPS Council opened this week. So, definitely, if you have any SPS colleagues that you think might be interested in serving on council, please encourage them to do so. If you are SPS, yourself, also realize that you can nominate people who are potentially going to be considered for council, and that will run through Monday. Not really anything else to report from SPS. This is actually my last Faculty Senate meeting as SPS president, as I shifted to civil service. I appreciate the SPS Council giving me the opportunity to finish out the fiscal year in my role as far as representing to this committee. Felicia Bohanon, who is in attendance today and has been in attendance at these meetings to get the flow of things down, is going to be taking over. So, SPS Council will be in incredibly capable hands. Thank you.

**K. Thu:** Thank you, Cathy. I personally want to thank you for all you've done as SPS Council president. You've not only been a great representative to SPS, but you've been a great leader for the campus as a whole. And I've enjoyed our conversations over the years. It's not as though our conversations will end suddenly with my stepping down from FS, but I think everybody recognizes the contributions that you've made and that will continue to be made for NIU as well. It's been a great ride for me to work with you in shared governance. So, thank you very much.

**K. Jaekel** [via chat]: Thank you, Cathy. Your leadership is amazing.

**K. Whedbee** [via chat]: Thank you, Cathy.

**N. Johnson** [via chat]: Yes, Cathy has been great, and we are glad to have her!

**F. Bohanon** [via chat]: Thank you, Cathy, for all your work.

**B. McGowan** [via chat]: Thanks, Cathy.

## **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](#), Honors Committee
- K. [Minutes](#), Operating Staff Council
- L. [Minutes](#), Supportive Professional Staff Council
- M. [Minutes](#), University Assessment Panel
- N. [Minutes](#), University Benefits Committee
- O. [Minutes](#), Univ. Comm. on Advanced and Nonteaching Educator License Programs
- P. [Minutes](#), University Committee on Initial Educator Licensure
- Q. FS 2021-22 dates: Sep 1, Sep 29, Oct 27, Nov 17, Jan 26, Feb 23, Mar 30, Apr 27
- R. Email Authentication – Upcoming Changes – Page 15
- S. Summary of Service – Faculty Senate President – Pages 16-17
- T. Summary of Service – Faculty Personnel Advisor – Page 18

**K. Thu:** That brings us to 4:30, so I'm almost on schedule as I'd hoped. There are three items that I want to bring to your attention that are in the list of information items on page 3 of your agenda. The Faculty Senate dates for meeting next year have been set, so please mark your calendar. Also, there are changes in the email authentication policy, a process that you should be aware of. That's on page 15 of your packet. So, please share those with your departments, your units.

Also, the final two items, the summary of service from the Faculty Senate president. I provided a summary of my service. Remember that this is a pilot year and that I provided a bulleted list of my work for Faculty Senate this past year, including the work that was started the previous year and continued this year. Faculty Senate will have to decide if this is the way you want to proceed going forward. Remember, this is sort of Pat's idea for simplifying the way Faculty Senate presidents report and that, rather than going through a formal evaluation procedure, really the evaluation for the Faculty Senate president is if they are voted into office again, assuming that they run again, and I'm not. But, of course, I did provide a report to the Faculty Senate.

In addition, there's a summary of service by the faculty personnel advisor on page 18. I should mention, and I want to thank Steve Howell for his service in that role. There will be a conversation going forward about the division of advisors between OSC, SPS and the faculty. And that conversation will continue into the fall.

So, I wanted to bring those items to your attention.

### **XIII. ADJOURNMENT**

**K. Thu:** Finally, this is my final stint as Faculty Senate president. It's been a great ride. As I said to the Steering Committee meeting last week, one of the things I'm going to miss is working with all of you. That has been my pride and joy, getting to know you, working with you. And I'm going to miss that the most in addition to missing the students that I've worked with in the past. I want to recognize. If you are a Faculty Senate member and this is going to be your final year, I wonder whether you'd turn your video on and just waive, because we want to recognize your service as a Faculty Senate member. And I know we're going to have new members coming on in the fall. But if you are going off as of this semester or the end of this year, please turn your video on and maybe

give a thumbs up or waive at us, because we want to express our appreciation for the work that you've done in shared governance. Or you can share your message in the chat box.

Shared governance is only as good as the people that serve in it, and we have a great shared governance system. We have a leadership that believes in shared governance. I can tell you from my personal experience that when I was a teenager, my father, who was a teacher at a junior college, was fired unilaterally by the dean of the college. And it was because my father was trying to organize faculty and give them better voice. But, as a faculty member, he had no recourse. And eventually, he took another job at another junior college in southern California, and he single-handedly unionized the faculty there, and he became the Faculty Senate president at that large junior college. So, I learned a lot from him. And I remember him being on the phone constantly with faculty members, and I was always kind of angry at him, because it was taking time away from spending time with me. But now I know what he was doing and how he was doing it. At 88 years old, I hope he's pleased with what I've been able to accomplish.

I think we are in a good place with shared governance and Faculty Senate. I want to thank Peter for stepping up and his willingness to serve as Faculty Senate president. I want to say thanks to Ferald Bryan for being our parliamentarian for far more years than anybody can recognize. And I want to extend a special thanks to Pat for all of the assistance that you've given me through the last two years. It's really been a wonderful ride. Yesterday was a major milestone. It's only one step in the direction that I think most of us want to see this country take, and it's a cue that the work of the Social Justice Committee and the way we are trying to change institutional culture at NIU to become an anti-racist institution is really something that we can all get on board with. So, with that, I want to thank each and every one of you for being members of the Faculty Senate and for your service.

**A. Keddie** [via chat]: Best of luck, Kendall. You were a great leader.

**T. Sullivan** [via chat]: Was there a policy put forth about changing the grades of F to U?

**Y. Ito** [via chat]: Thank you, Kendall. You will be greatly missed.

**N. Johnson** [via chat]: Thank you all.

**L. Saborío** [via chat]: Thank you, Kendall. You will be missed.

**F. Bohanon** [via chat]: Thank you all.

**L. Hua** [via chat]: Thank you, Kendall, for your great leadership!

**K. Whedbee** [via chat]: Thank you, Kendall. It's been an honor to work with you.

**A. Glas** [via chat]: Thanks, Kendall, for all your work.

**G. Aygen** [via chat]: Thank you, Pat! You help us all.

**B. Beyer** [via chat]: Thank you, Kendall! Very grateful to have had the chance to work with you.

**J. Akst** [via chat]: Thank you for your service, Kendall!

**M. Berke** [via chat]: Thank you, Kendall.

**F. Bryan** [via chat]: Kendall, it has been a great pleasure working with you! Best wishes in your retirement!

**G. Aygen** [via chat]: Thank you, Kendall. It was a pleasure and privilege to serve with you.

**P. Carpenter** [via chat]: Thanks, Kendall!

**M. Smith** [via chat]: Thank you, Kendall.

**K. Borre** [via chat]: Thank you, Kendall.

**J. Jong** [via chat]: Thank you, Kendall, for your wonderful work!

**E. Miguel** [via chat]: Thanks, Kendall. Pleasure working with you.

**M. Mellon** [via chat]: Thank you, Kendall.

**T. Sullivan** [via chat]: Was there a policy put forth about changing the grades of F to U?

**B. McGowan** [via chat]: Lovely tribute to your father. We will miss you.

**S. Vahabzadeh** [via chat]: Thank you, Kendall. You will be missed. And I'm sure your father is very proud of you.

**K. Thu** [via chat]: Thanks, everyone.

**K. Thu**: And with that, I will entertain a motion to adjourn our meeting.

**P. Chomentowski**: I will make a motion to adjourn the meeting.

**K. Thu**: Thank you, Peter. Do we have a second?

**D. Valentiner**: Second.

**K. Thu**: So, if we could all open up our microphones and say aye.

**Members**: Aye.

**K. Thu**: Any nays? Abstentions? Thank you all. Have a great evening, and take care.

Meeting adjourned at 4:36 p.m.