

TRANSCRIPT

FACULTY SENATE

Wednesday, September 2, 2020, 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, no later than 12 noon, September 2.

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Allori, Aygen, Berke, B. Beyer, Bohanon, Borre, Buck, Carpenter, Chen, Cheyney, Chomentowski, Clark, Creed, Demir, Doederlein, Duffin, Fredericks, Grund, Hu, Hua, Ito, A. Johnson, L. Johnson, N. Johnson, Jong, Keddie, Konen, Kuehl, Lampi, Liberty, Maki, Martin (for Tatara), Mayer, McCarthy, McGowan, Mellon, Montana, Palese, Petges, Pohlman, Qin, Royce, Sharp, Sirotkin, Slotsve, Smith, Subamony, Surjadi, Thu, Valentiner, Whedbee

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Tatara

OTHERS PRESENT: Boston, Bryan, Edghill-Walden, Edwards, Groza, Hunt, Ingram, Klaper, McEvoy, Oduwole, Saborio, Streb

OTHERS ABSENT: G. Beyer, Jaekel, Marsh

I. CALL TO ORDER

K. Thu: Okay, it's 3:00 so I'm going to call the meeting to order.

II. VERIFICATION OF QUORUM

K. Thu: Pat, can you verify that we have a quorum?

P. Erickson: We have a quorum.

K. Thu: Okay, welcome everybody. We have a full agenda today, and I have a few more things to say about that during the president's announcements. Remember that we're recording the meeting. If you want to say something, please indicate in the chat box, rather than raising your hand. Natasha Johnson will be monitoring the chat box. Thank you, Natasha. That way we know the order in which you want to speak. You can't do that very well with hands, especially when there are so many hands. So, these meetings will likely take longer than they have in the past. As many of you will remember, we usually get out by about 4:30, but because we have a heavier agenda, maybe because of technical issues, it might go a half an hour longer. So, just sort of set your expectations

for finishing up by 5, and I will make sure that we get done by 5, if at all possible. We are remote, at least through the calendar year. We'll monitor things, as we always do, and see what changes, if any, we're going to make in the next year. My suspicion is that we'll probably continue to have these meetings remote.

III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

K. Thu: Can I have a motion to adopt the agenda? Okay, Cathy [Doederlein]. Do we have a second.

Unidentified: Second.

K. Thu: Can you identify yourself?

P. Chomentowski: Chomentowski.

K. Thu: Thanks, Peter.

P. Chomentowski: You're welcome.

K. Thu: Any discussion, additions, deletions to the agenda? Okay, hearing none, all those in favor – tell you what, let's operate the way we did last year. We'll assume we're going to adopt the agenda. If there are any that would like to vote no, please indicate in the chat box. Or any abstentions. Okay, we have an approved agenda.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 22, 2020 MINUTES – Pages 5-9

K. Thu: Approval of the minutes from April 22, those were in your meeting packet. Again, I'll entertain a motion to approve the minutes.

N. Johnson: So moved, Johnson.

C. Doederlein: Second, Doederlein.

K. Thu: Thanks, Cathy and Natasha. Any corrections to the minutes? I know you've all dutifully read through them, right? Okay, again, the same process. If there's anybody that votes to no to approve the minutes, please indicate so by typing it in the chat box. And also if you abstain, type it in the chat box. I'll give you a few seconds. And you'll have a record of all these abstentions, right, Pat, from the chat box?

P. Erickson: I don't believe what's typed in the chat, comes out on the recording, but we don't need a count. This is a voice vote, so I think we're good there.

K. Thu: Okay. All right, thank you.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

K. Thu: Pat, do we have any timely requests for public comment.

P. Erickson: We do not.

VI. FS PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. [Illinois Open Meetings Act](#)

K. Thu: As mentioned, Faculty Senate now operates under the Illinois Open Meetings Act. And part of the reason for that is, because of the changes that we made to shared governance last year, the Faculty Senate now has the authority to set academic policy. And there are other factors as well. So, we will be operating under the Illinois Open Meetings Act. And, Pat, do you want to say a few words about training.

P. Erickson: Sure. All voting members of a body that complies with the Illinois Open Meetings Act must take a short training. And so in October I will be reaching out to you to take that training and provide me with a certificate of completion. Good to know that, once you take the training, you never have to take it again for the rest of your life. You can use it for any number of bodies you might serve on in the future that also comply with OMA. So, it's a one-time, and that's it, type of thing.

K. Thu: Thanks, Pat. I took the training two or three years ago. It actually is quite useful, unlike some of the other things that we do. I learned a lot. I think I've forgotten some of it, so I may want to do the training again. But it is useful, and you do actually learn something. Glad Pat is working with all of you to get through that.

Before we get to reviewing the changes to shared governance, I want to mention something that I neglected to mention at last week's Steering Committee meeting, which is: We are going to be working through updating the APPM, the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual, that behemoth of a document that everybody loves to hate. When this was brought to my attention for the first time, I thought, oh god, no, I don't have the mojo for it after what we did with the changes to shared governance last year. But it actually makes complete sense, because we cleaned up the bylaws and changed the constitution. Now in the wake of that, it makes sense to update the APPM. There are lots of things in the APPM that are related to the bylaws. There's also a lot of stuff in the APPM that really doesn't belong there. So I liken this to cleaning out from behind the refrigerator. We all it needs to be done once in a while, but we dread doing it. So, revising and updating the APPM will be an ongoing task. There's a group of us that will be working on it; but, because Faculty Senate now has the constitutional authority to approve academic matters, ultimately, those changes have to come back to Faculty Senate for approval. So, just like I did last year with the ongoing changes to shared governance, I will give you periodic updates on what's going on with the APPM. So, there's a core group that includes myself, Becqui Hunt, Brad Bond, Chad McEvoy – who am I forgetting – Omar Ghrayeb. We're going to be sort of the core players in updating the APPM. So, we'll keep you posted as that proceeds. I just wanted to make you aware of it.

B. Welcome new Faculty Senate members

K. Thu: So, a few announcements from my end. First of all, I want to welcome everybody to the Faculty Senate, the first Faculty Senate meeting of the year. I want to extend a particular welcome to our new Faculty Senate members, and I know there are a number of them. Let's take a moment for the new Faculty Senate members to turn your videos on and wave hello. Kris Borre, Lisa Liberty. I know we've got more than you two. Maybe they're shy new members. Natasha. And while you're doing that, I just want to express my appreciation for your willingness to step up and participate in shared governance. As I've said many times in the past, and others have said the same, shared governance is only as good as the people that are willing to serve and to participate and give their time and effort. So, thank you all, and I look forward to an exciting new year, a challenging year. And I look forward to hearing all of your voices as we work through a number of issues during the course of the year.

C. Review changes to shared governance – Pages 10-12

K. Thu: Okay, quick review of what we did last year. For those of you who were not on shared governance, while we went through this year-long process of changing our Faculty Senate and our University Council [NIU] Bylaws and the constitution, I'll give you a couple visuals of what things look like today. So, Pat, do you want to put up the first one?

And as Pat is doing this, just a reminder that we ask for your patience as we work through these things. We know there are going to be some stumbling blocks with the technology. We know that we're going to have to deal with unanticipated consequences of our shared governance changes. We've already bumped up against those so far, and we're working through them. So, I'm just going to ask that you be patient with us.

So, here is the new University Council. It has changed in several ways. There are several primary changes. First, it's smaller than it was. And we added instructors. So, if you can see in the color coding – I don't know whether we have the color coding there.

N. Johnson: If she scrolls down a little bit, it's there.

K. Thu: Can you scroll down just a little bit, Pat.

P. Erickson: You're telling me that you don't see the different color chairs?

K. Thu: I don't see the key.

P. Erickson: Oh, pardon me, excuse me, there you go.

K. Thu: So, in orange are the tenure-track faculty. Let me start with those. So, in the old University Council, under the old bylaws, University Council had to consist of 50 percent plus one faculty, so that the faculty would always be a majority. Now what we have is one faculty representative from each college. And I'll explain why. And then we also have students on University Council. We used to have students as well. We have, if you want to scroll up just a bit. We invited instructors to the

table, to both University Council and in Faculty Senate. It's the first time that they've been a part of shared governance, and they certainly should be. We also added a seat for clinical faculty and then five seats for operating staff, four seats for supportive professional staff. And then we have the president, CFO, provost and one of the dean representatives chosen by the Council of Deans. And I remain as the, rather than University Council executive secretary, I renamed it to the University Council chair, sounds a little less monarchical. And I don't vote on University Council. So I just convene and facilitate.

So, what happened is that University Council used to be the body that had authority over academic matters. We pulled that out, and we put it into Faculty Senate. So, Pat, if you want to go to the Faculty Senate slide. So, this now is what Faculty Senate looks like. If you want to scroll down just a little bit. Tenure-track faculty members retain the vast majority of membership of Faculty Senate. But we did invite clinical faculty, instructors, students, SPS and OS. And, as I said, this is where academic policy matters will be brought and will be voted upon throughout the year. So, as an example of this, last year, as you remember, we changed the admissions policy for undergraduates. We did away with standardized testing. Last year, we had to run that through three different committees, including Faculty Senate, Baccalaureate Council and the University Council. And we had to go back and forth, like a ping pong game. If we were to do that again this year, this is where it would happen. It would happen in the Faculty Senate, and everybody would know this is where it should take place.

So, non-academic matters remain in University Council, so things like the budget, things like the capital plan, advising administration on a variety of matters. So, it's basically a trade-off is what it was. And I'm very pleased and proud of the process that we went through, even though part of it was during the origins of the pandemic for making this happen.

I think I'll just stop there. Do you have any questions about any of the items I covered, including the shared governance changes?

N. Johnson: I don't see anybody in the chat with any questions.

K. Thu: Okay, thanks, Natasha.

VII. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. Antiracism Planning Forum for Shared Governance – Page 13-19

Vernese Edghill-Walden
Vice President for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion

Anne Edwards
Director, Center for Black Studies

K. Thu: All right, let's move on to item VII., Items for Faculty Senate Consideration. We have four of them, and this will likely take the bulk of our time today. The first item, I'm just loosely calling Antiracism Planning Forum for Shared Governance, it's actually broader than that. And I want to

welcome Dr. Vernese Edghill-Walden and Anne Edwards, who have agreed to join us today. Anne and Vernese, are you with us?

A. Edwards: Yes, I am here.

K. Thu: Great, welcome. Earlier in the summer, as the Black Lives Matter movement became more widespread, I guess – it's been around a while, actually, a group of faculty and I decided that we wanted to take some sort of action. So, we decided to write a letter to returning students assuring them that faculty stood by the Black Lives Matter movement, that we are against police brutality and that we stand ready to have conversations and take action in the fall when shared governance convenes.

So, in response to that letter I had a number of students contact me. And those students that did contact me, I offered to meet with them virtually individually. And those conversations led to an idea for having a sort of mini town hall later in the summer, something that we eventually called the Antiracism Planning Forum for Shared Governance. And that forum included about 40 participants. It was run and primarily geared toward students. The students wanted the president and the provost to be there, so they were there. It was an hour and a half meeting. And we covered a lot of ground, a lot of different ideas. And in addition, we talked a little bit about ideas that came out of the Black Student Town Hall earlier in the summer – maybe it was late spring, I don't remember.

So, that sort of is the platform for this section of the agenda. Pat, would you put up all the issues that came out of both events that we have in the packet? So, there's a lot of them here, and this certainly is not a comprehensive list. But most of these came from the students. I added a couple, including the review of tenure and promotion. Some of you may be familiar with the case of Paul Harris at the University of Virginia this summer, a Black faculty member that was denied tenure at the beginning of July, and then administration reversed course by the end of that month. And a lot of issues came up about the tenure and promotion process, not just the rules, but the culture of tenure and promotion.

So, I think what I would like to do is turn this over to Dr. Vernese Edghill-Walden to talk a little bit about the Division of Academic Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, and let us know about some of the social justice training opportunities that are going on now. So, Vernese, I'm going to turn it over to you.

V. Edghill-Walden: Sure, thank you, Kendall. Welcome back, everyone. I wish I could see everyone, but I'm virtually saying hi to all of you. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I am happy to be here and share the conversation with the director of the Center for Black Studies. Kendall, the letters and everything that has been sent out and the information that's been provided to you by the students, you'll hear more about from Anne.

I will first start by saying that the murder of several unarmed Black people in the last – well for decades, but in the last three or four months, has definitely provided a magnified view of racism in America. But one thing I know for sure is that the concerns that you will hear about, the concerns that were brought up on the town hall meeting are not new concerns. And they are very much a part

of the narrative of students that attend NIU. And that's not to say that we have not come a long way, we have. But we have so much more to do.

So, with that in mind, I want to share with you some of the things that we have already done, but then also offer to you the thought that the continued work that we need to do absolutely requires the support and the commitment of Faculty Senate, and I welcome this continued discussion. So, as you know ADEI, the Academic Diversity, Equity and Inclusion unit, has three priorities.

One is cultivating equity. You know we've done a lot around equity, equity gaps, closing equity gaps, student success, being equity-minded, really looking at the way that the institution can provide the accountability that we need to support our students.

Our second priority is on education awareness and action. And many of you know that we've been doing a lot of work around – we have a Social Justice Education Department. We work with many of you on this call, and many of your departments, to offer CODE training, CODE institutes where we are training the trainers. I'm happy to say that just this past summer we have already engaged over 1,000 people. When the murders continued throughout July, we offered webinars on antiracism where we've hosted over 300 people at each of those webinars.

Those are the kinds of things that we knew from students and we knew from Black faculty and staff and faculty and staff of color that they wanted to do something beyond just talk about what was happening, but we needed to move to action. And so much of what you will see that we're offering this semester is really about: How do we go beyond just a conversation about race, but how do we move to really looking at policies and practices and our everyday lives that may be things that we may need to do differently as an institution and even within departments that is going to eliminate barriers that have been part of the institution for so long?

The third one has been that we build an inclusive community. And I think that, as much as we've done the work around equity, and we've got more to do. And as much as we've done the work around education and awareness, and we're moving into being more concrete in our actions, we have to look at building an inclusive community. And I think that when you hear and see and understand the students' concerns, it's very much built into climate, culture, institutional practices, things that, in many ways, as leadership we are committed to doing and working on, but absolutely need faculty to partner in this work, because some of those things we don't have control over. We don't have control over teaching and learning, but we know that our students spend a lot of time with you. And they are looking for something different. And so you'll hear more about that.

I also want to bring to your attention – and some of you might have been in the conversations that we had this past year on building an equity statement. Our equity statement is on our website. For those of you who may not know, our diversity, equity and inclusion button got a promotion on our NIU website. It's actually now on the main page, and you can go there to learn a lot more about the many things that we're doing around diversity, equity and inclusion. And when I say "we," I mean the institution, not just ADEI. ADEI is one unit that helps to support that work, but it really takes all of us to be involved in that work.

So, our equity statement reads: Northern Illinois University strives to improve outcomes for all students by identifying and removing barriers that disproportionately hinder the academic achievement and student experience of historically and currently underserved populations.

And I cannot say enough about how much COVID has brought to the forefront, as well as the racial injustice, the value and the importance of us working from an equity lens. And I look forward to continuing that.

The one last thing I'll end with is that we have also – when I say “we,” the senior leadership under the direction of our provost and our president – had a retreat this summer in August where there were four overarching themes that we were asked to look at. So, I'm happy to hear from Kendall that one of the areas that he wanted to address or spoke of earlier was tenure and promotion, because that was something that was one of the themes that was discussed – process, practice, culture, departmental expectations, what we value, what we don't – realizing that there's a tax that is often paid by faculty of color that often is overlooked and not valued in the tenure and promotion process.

So the four areas that we looked at were hiring and retention of Black and indigenous people of color, hiring and retention of Black and indigenous people of color from a staff perspective. We also looked at policies, or began to look at policies and practices, that impact the undergraduate student experience – and that would be outside of the classroom, related to student conduct, student conduct policies, appeals, student organization allocations, as well as resources and space. And then the fourth one, which again speaks to the experience of students, but at the graduate level, and that is where we looked at addressing the experience of graduate students from admissions through degree completion. We spent the entire day looking at the ways in which we, as senior leaders, can play a role in looking at, identifying ways that we can be more equity-minded in all of those practices. But again, at the end of the day, much of this, especially from the academic side of the house, the colleges, the departments, the department chairs, really require us to work together to look at some of the systemic institutional practices that have not always favored or included the success of Black, indigenous and people of color.

So again, I look forward to continued dialog, continued action, and I am excited to hear about the ideas or the agenda items that the Faculty Senate want to take on. I think there's absolutely room for it, and I'll just finally say that our faculty of color and our students of color, the things that they have been saying for so long, I am happy to hear that we are finally listening and we need to continue to do so. Thank you.

N. Johnson: We do have a question. How will we go about hiring more people of color, because we talked about this in one of the other committees that sometimes we get the top list of candidates, they have no clue of who these people are, and they can't go back and say well, you know, we don't have any people of color on any of these applications. How will they get through that process to make sure that our numbers are going to the rate that we want them to be?

K. Thu: So, I'll respond to that first by saying thank you, Natasha. That's going to be an entire conversation for Faculty Senate going forward throughout the course of the year. How do we diversity faculty? And do we just wait until the budget is at the right spot to start doing it? That's

never going to happen. So, this is going to be a standing item on the Faculty Senate agenda going forward. And hiring and retention of faculty of color, indigenous people of color, that has to be our conversation, because three percent of our faculty are Black. Over 17 percent of our student body is Black. Two-and-a-half percent of our faculty are Latinx. Over 19 percent of our student body is Latinx. Now that doesn't add up. So, we need to have an entire conversation dedicated to that piece of what actions we can take.

V. Edgehill-Walden: In addition to, I think that there are different hiring processes and different strategies with different classifications of employees. And so what you raise is indicative of what happens in Civil Service and sometimes in SPS searches, which are different than faculty searches. But yet all three of them need to be addressed. And there are strategies that we can use that will help us resolve some of those issues. Some of it is at the system level if we're talking about Civil Service, but there are things that are within our institution's control that we can proactively do that will allow for us to look at how we can build more diverse pools, not just of faculty, but of staff. And I'll put on my HR hat, but being over HR now, I do absolutely see opportunities for us to do that. Right now I'm looking at what policies we have to do and what policies we have control over is going to be at the core of how we then transform our hiring practices.

K. Thu: Thanks, Vernese. Now I want to turn it over to Anne Edwards to walk us through some of the concerns that our students have expressed to us, and then let that segue into a conversation with everybody. Again, as I mentioned, this is going to be a standing item on the agenda. I almost hesitate to have it as an agenda item, because it looks as though it's an entity unto itself. These conversations should be rolled into everything we do, not just in place in the agenda. So, with that, Anne, I'm going to turn it over to you.

A. Edwards: Thank you so much. Earlier in the summer, the Center for Black Studies hosted a Black Student Town Hall meeting, and the students came out with their own list of items, action items, that they felt like were reflective, were basically their demands, that they reflect that these items reflect things that they feel like are missing in the academic part of their experience at NIU. [inaudible] They have been working, because they wanted to make sure that it was really concise. And they gave me some general statements in addition to the items. And so, here are some general statements that they gave:

They would like for students and faculty to develop a strategic plan to combat racism. And they're asking that students and faculty reconvene on a recurring basis to make sure that these items are met, to talk about which demands still need to be completed and be presented, explanations as to why some of the demands have been met and some not complete. [inaudible] to what you were saying, Kendall, to have this as an ongoing conversation, because that is something that the students are definitely asking for. [inaudible] meaning the easiest way to complete, but that all demands be looked at, because if the institution is unable to fix all the racial inequalities of the institution, there's no reason for that to be true. So, they're asking that everything have a target date. They ask that a proposed target date, and if it needs to be postponed, a solid and not vague explanation as to why. They're going to send whatever issues that they have and concerns to the parties to which they are affiliated with. So faculty would be a faculty stuff and so on.

One of the one statements that they made which was this: Faculty must keep in mind that these demands are coming from Black students and are meant to be in regards to Black students. And that it's not prejudice to specify Black students as opposed to encompassing all people of color. When other people of color present their demands, they are expected to be met as well. However, these are meant for Black people, right? And keep in mind that other ethnicities have contributed to the prejudices and underrepresentation of Black people other than non-people of color.

And so I say all that to lead into some of the items that they presented. So, I think it's already been discussed the lack of representation of Black faculty and staff. They would like mandatory antiracism training for all students, faculty and staff; an education-pushing an intro course on racism in the workplace for employees, especially; [inaudible] goes to the decolonizing of the curriculum and the classroom, teaching more about Black, infusing more information about Black and African peoples in the curriculum. Specifically, they asked for a question on the end of the semester survey that addresses the classroom climate and experiences of racism within a course, within the specific course; making Black courses more visible; more transparency in the bias incident reporting process, which is through ADEI; having seminars about systemic racism embedded into courses that are not only Black Studies courses. We talked about the faculty of color and tenure and promotion policies and practices; and providing an inventory of courses of racial and social justice. Additionally, they asked for some education courses concerning institutionalized racism. I'm trying to kind of see what else looks like – some of these other things – I think that would be what I would say were their items pertaining to what faculty has purview over.

K. Thu: Thank you, Anne.

N. Johnson: We do have a couple questions in the chat.

K. Thu: Yes, I see that. I just wanted to point out that I would like to see Faculty Senate as an important forum for these conversations since we have so many stakeholder groups represented. So, we are a campuswide body, and I would like people to feel comfortable understanding and using this forum as a tool for these conversations and as a tool for the actions that we can take.

A. Edwards: I know there are comments, but I want to add one thing that I did not read on their general statements. And what they said is that these are headers and sub-headers. These students are coming up with an entire strategic plan, which will include not only the individual action items, but a detailed plan of how they feel like the university can go about achieving and accomplishing it. So, stay tuned, because that is coming soon from the students.

K. Thu: We have some amazing students. It's unbelievable, and one of our proud reflections on the university is how engaged our students are, how engaged a university we are. We have a lot of work to do, and we have a lot of student leaders that can help point us in the right direction.

So, let's go to the questions here. George Slotsve is asking, should an ad hoc Faculty Senate committee be formed? It might help us to stay on task. So, last week at the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, George brought this idea up. I went back and looked at our committee structure to see whether these kinds of issues could be handed off to a committee to in part do the work. And the committee doesn't really exist. I did look at Vernese's committee, as well as others. And there's

places where it could go, but there are also lots of things on their plate. So I like the idea of having an ad hoc Faculty Senate committee with representation from all stakeholder groups in the Faculty Senate so that we could prioritize which issues we want to tackle, how we want to do them, listen to the students and their suggestions for actions to take and hold us accountable for the actions we're going to take. One of the things I'm going to do in the aftermath of this meeting is Pat is going to help me with a Qualtrics survey for all Faculty Senate members to see which issues on the list that Anne was reading from are priority for you. Some of the things we can do in Faculty Senate, and some things we can't do. So, stay tuned for that survey tool.

And Jeffrey [Royce] followed up to George's point by saying he'd like to see that committee include staff and students. Absolutely, we'll include staff and students.

So, you've heard from Anne; you've heard from Vernese. And you have a list of those issues in your packet. And now Vernese is suggesting we get involvement from other commissions as well, because they've been working on these issue areas for a long time. To facilitate this process, and that's a lot of what I'm going to try to do, is to facilitate a process, what I'd like to have are volunteers. You don't have to volunteer now. But volunteer for an ad hoc committee that will look at all the issues that students have brought before us and we will have the ad hoc committee report back to us on a regular basis. Are there any comments about that general concept?

So, Vernese said that it might be overlap, okay.

V. Edghill-Walden: I was just correcting my statement. I wasn't answering your last question.

K. Thu: Okay, got you. I'm not suggesting right now how large the committee be, but it definitely needs to be a diverse committee. It needs to be representative of the different stakeholder groups, and it needs to get to work right away. So, just as we encourage our students to think big, be ambitious, we need to take that on ourselves. We need to think big and be ambitious. And I will work with Pat putting together this ad hoc committee. And if you have any suggestions for how that should be done or a process for doing it, I'm all ears. I don't want to get bogged down in bureaucracy. Lord knows, we've had enough of that in the past. So, I want to get us to work as quickly as possible.

So, Kris Borre is asking how this committee might intersect with antiracism committees in – I can't see the rest of that.

N. Johnson: It says how would this committee intersect with the antiracism committees in departments?

K. Thu: Well, one of the things that has come out of the many conversations that I've had, and I'm sure it's the same for others, is that there's a lot going on that we don't know about. And so, the ADEI website is a wonderful place to find out what's going on, lots of resources. But there are departments and faculty in the department that don't even know much about the ADEI. And I was one of those not so long ago. So, part of what I think this ad hoc committee could do is to help make sure that each hand knows that the other is doing.

A. Edwards [via Chat]: I would be happy to serve as ad hoc on these committees and can recommend students as well.

N. Johnson: And Felicia [Bohanon] made a comment too that there's definitely an overlap with the Presidential Commission on the Status of Minorities' work. And then Anne [Edwards] noted that she'd be happy to serve on the ad hoc committee and can recommend some students as well.

K. Thu: Great. And I see that Vernese has her hand up.

V. Edghill-Walden: I want to say I appreciate the willingness to want to put together a group to do this. I'm concerned about the establishment of another committee. And to your point, Kendall, there is a lot of work happening, and some of the commissions I know have this as part of their agendas as well. I'm almost thinking that maybe it should be less of a planning group and more of a report-out and holding accountability group, because if you use this group to plan more, we're not going to then use the groups that are planning to do what they need to do.

K. Thu: Right, good point.

V. Edghill-Walden: And then there's the silo effect. I think thinking through the purpose of that group, because at the end of the day, there has to be accountability to what we say. And I know that, as part of the leadership, that the president and the provost and the senior leadership team have things that they want the institution to work on, as well, which are in line with, and almost identical to, some of the things that the Faculty Senate want to do. So, I think it's a matter of figuring out how you organize all of those bodies and then come up with a structure for reporting out on progress.

N. Johnson: Yes, I agree with action items or something, because they've been talking about moving the needle forward for at least three and a half years. And it would be helpful to see the progress being made or action steps being taken, because people can talk all day long, and have really great ideas, but at some point, we need to have action.

K. Thu: I like the way Vernese has framed it. This can be a report out committee. What I would like to see is some sort of – and I hate to say spreadsheet – for each of the issue items that we have, what actions can we take, what actions have already taken place and what can Faculty Senate, in particular, do as a body, that maybe can't be done elsewhere since we are now constitutionally the home of academic policy.

Other comments or questions? I don't want to shut this down too quickly, but we're going to be coming back to it repeatedly.

N. Johnson: There was one more. Gulsat Aygen asks: I wonder if we could find a way to have this committee interface with all other relevant commissions and committees. And then that person also agrees with what Vernese just said.

K. Thu: Yes, I think that's right. I think we interface. We don't have to reinvent the wheel because a lot of work has already been done. We need to know what actions have taken place. We need to

learn a lot, and then figure out what we can do, what role we can play in taking those action steps, because that's clearly what the students want, that's clearly, I think, what we all want.

Do we have time for another question or comment or two, and then we have to move on.

N. Johnson: There's no more comments.

K. Thu: All right. Thank you, Anne. Thank you, Vernese. We will certainly be in touch. Do you still have your hand up, Vernese?

V. Edghill-Walden: Sorry, no I don't.

K. Thu: Okay.

V. Edghill-Walden: I'm going to stay on, because I think I'm on the agenda again.

K. Thu: Yes, you are. Good, thank you.

B. Assessment Review – Pages 20-21

K. Thu: Next under Items for Faculty Senate Consideration, Assessment Review. So, some of you may remember that during one of President Freeman's leadership meetings, she asked campus leaders to come up with strategies to lessen the load on all of us. And we divided up into tables. And at my table, there was a strong suggestion that try to lessen the load of assessment at NIU. I was a department chair for nine years. I know what assessment looks like. I know how much of a burden it is. And I know how much it over-taxes us, particularly in a day and age where there are fewer of us, and we have a lot more to do.

So, the president asked myself and the provost to come up with ways to lessen the academic load at the university. And I took on the assessment piece of it. So, the first step I took was to reach out to directors and chairs across campus and have a conversation with them about their experiences with assessment. Assessment covers a lot of territory, and we'll talk a little bit about that here in a minute.

I spoke to 24 faculty department chairs and directors across the colleges that had experience in producing program reviews, assessments and documents for professional accreditation or documents for the Higher Learning Commission. And I also met with the assessment office. They're not really called the assessment office, but that's the way I refer to it in the document that's in your packet.

So, the primary finding really was – and I'm a cultural anthropologist, so using my own language – it was a cultural chasm between the faculty – thank you, Beth, Institutional Effectiveness – between the faculty who write these assessment reports and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. Basically, you can say that people who write these reports didn't see the value in them, that it was just busywork, that didn't necessarily improve the program. And there are a number of specific

questions and issues that they raise that are listed on page two of the document that Pat is showing. So, I am not going to go through those.

I've had several conversations with Provost Ingram, who is on this call. Thank you, Provost Ingram, for joining us. She took action. She told programs that had professional accreditation that they could use that accreditation process for the state review, for the IBHE review. Beth, please chime in if I get this wrong.

And then the second thing that we did together was to send an email out to all the chairs and division heads suspending the annual assessment report. All of that pending a review by the Academic Planning Council that Provost Ingram heads up. So, Beth and I have agreed that reviewing our assessment practices and policies at NIU will be taken up by the Academic Planning Council. That's the committee that will handle it. That's the committee that Beth chairs. And the committee can, of course, call in people from around campus that are not necessarily on the committee as part of its review process.

So, I just wanted to make you aware of that. And I don't know, Beth, if you want to say anything about it, or if others have questions.

B. Ingram: Yes, I'd certainly be happy to answer questions. I think the most confusing part is we really have two things going on that are underway. One is program review, which is a periodic process that happens. And then the other is assessment of student learning outcomes, which is an annual process. And Kendall wants to tackle both of them. They each have different implications for what kind of reporting requirements we have. So, program review, we have to report to the IBHE. Student learning outcomes assessment, we do because the HLC requires us to do some of that. So, there are some nuance differences here. But I'd be happy to answer any questions as well.

K. Thu: Okay. Thanks, Beth. Any questions for Provost Ingram? Again, this is going to be going on throughout the year. I think Beth suggested that maybe they could get a report back to Faculty Senate by the end of the calendar year, but we'll just have to see how that goes. The best laid plans, right?

C. Five-Year Review of [Student Evaluation of Instruction](#)

K. Thu: Okay, so let's go ahead and move on, and I'm still mindful of our time here. The third item on our agenda for Faculty Senate consideration is the five-year review of student evaluation of instruction. This actually harkens back to one of the things that Anne Edwards reported on from students about how we craft and implement our student evaluation of instruction. We are required under our bylaws to take a look at our student evaluation of instruction every five years. Quite frankly, I don't think we did this five years ago. I think Pat and I had a conversation about this. I know it came up in last year's UCPC meetings, that they wanted to have an evaluation of the way we evaluate student comments and evaluations. And it's particularly timely because of the change in teaching modalities, online, hybrid, in-person. I think this is much needed at this particular point in time.

So, I am going to turn that over to the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee to handle. That was one of the committees where this came up in last year, so that will be the primary committee handling it during the course of the year.

Any questions or comments about that? I know a number of departments are working on changing their student evaluation of teaching.

D. Valentiner [via Teams Chat]: Can you provide information about how student evals are used?

K. Thu: Yes, we will certainly do that, absolutely, as part of the process. Currently student evaluations are used in merit, merit reports in departments. They're also used in tenure and promotion. And, of course, the faculty union has a lot to say about that as well. The current policy for student evaluation of instruction is contained in the APPM, the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual. And basically, it says that you have to do it, and there is only one general required question for all student evaluation forms. And we had a long conversation about this, I think, about ten years ago, when I led the Academic Planning Council. So, certainly reporting out, figuring out how student evaluations are used, should be an important part of what the FSPC does.

Other questions or comments about that? Go ahead, Beth.

B. Ingram: I'd just like to make one comment, because I think this is tied in with the first topic that you talked about. There's a lot of evidence that it's very difficult to use paper forms to do evaluations of teaching without introducing bias against particular groups. I think this dovetails with the other discussion that you want to have about how we conduct evaluations that are less biased.

K. Thu: Absolutely. And I can tell you, historically, doing online evaluations, we've gotten poorer response rates. So, we need to be better at that, and we need to make certain – the purpose of student evaluation of teaching is to improve teaching, to improve our courses. So, it needs to be actively used. And many of us who do that understand that the feedback that we get from students is what enhances our course deliveries and our teaching styles.

Okay, if there are no other questions or comments, Natasha, we can move on.

N. Johnson: Just the one from David Valentiner, that's it.

K. Thu: Okay. I know, David, that you said student evils. I hope that wasn't a Freudian slip.

D. Return to the fall semester – [Protecting the Pack](#)

K. Thu: Okay, the next item on the agenda is return to the fall semester, Protecting the Pack. Here I just wanted to open it up for conversations. I think we're all feeling various layers of pressures and stresses. And I wanted to provide an opportunity for folks to share their experiences, to let us know what they're doing, maybe in response. And maybe I'm going to turn to Peter [Chomentowski], because, Peter, you shared an important story during the Steering Committee meeting last Wednesday. I wonder whether you would start off our conversation here with your story.

P. Chomentowski: Which story was that again?

K. Thu: About what happened over the summer before Protect the Pack was in place.

P. Chomentowski: Oh yes, so, over the summer we were thinking about how we could actually assess our students. So, we were meeting in the lab in person to have our students do videotapes. And so, one of the things that we actually had happen was, there was no real self-assessment in place. And so, when we were trying to kind of figure out, I actually had a student who before Protect the Pack – I know they were working on it at the time – who tested positive for coronavirus. And she wasn't on campus, but she was still around the campus and stuff like that. And then when we tried to get things situated where we were trying to figure out like well, does she come back, it kind of got into a dismal situation where we didn't really have any real concrete structure [inaudible] I think that's what we were talking about, is that correct, Kendall?

K. Thu: Yes, that's right.

P. Chomentowski: So, I think the Protect the Pack is great, what we're using right now. I think it was just kind of like one of the things we had is we didn't have any really self-assessment. And the question I was asking was, we were talking about the honor code. And I understand the whole honor code, the honor policy of the students. But like I said, that's why I'm like the whole Campus Clear now that we're using, because it was just an interesting situation where we were working, and we really had no way of tracking students that were coming to campus. And we didn't think it would happen. And I had a student who I did not know was actually going to her gym where at least five people had tested positive. And she was still working out there, and she just kept coming to campus, because, well apparently, she didn't think it was important to tell anybody, that she was working out with positive people. I don't know, I think it's a great thing now with the Protect the Pack, because it helps to inform some of the students. I just don't think they realize the impact of their daily lives.

K. Thu: Yes. Thanks for sharing that, Peter. As a social scientist, as a behavioral scientist, we know we can't control everybody's behavior. We can do the best we can, and I think we're doing a very good job. But, we can't control everything. There was an MOU agreed to by the faculty union and the university leadership about testing. And I just saw it recently. I wonder, Beth, whether you would be willing to share what the testing is going to look like on campus? Or maybe there's somebody else in the group that could?

B. Ingram: Matt Streb's not here, but I think he would be better to talk about the surveillance. He's been more on top of that.

K. Thu: So, I can tell you that Northwestern, NIU and the DeKalb County Public Health Department are working closely together on a new surveillance program where all students are going to get tested. I believe that's correct. But, before I speak much further about it, I think this needs to wait for someone to come before us with a little more detail.

Anybody else want to share experiences or concerns about returning to campus, Protect the Pack or anything that you're seeing or hearing. I mean, how's your first week of classes gone?

R. Grund: I am teaching face-to-face. I know there aren't a lot of us doing that. So, I'd like to think positive. I really appreciated the collaboration with the university. We have our filters in our classrooms. I appreciate our collaboration with the university that Protect the Pack has spoken to students, and they're wearing masks in our building. I think that, obviously, we all know that's really important. I appreciate the collaboration with the university that we have cleaning supplies, we have masks available, and we're using them. Those are all good things in very uncertain times, especially when we're kind of dealing with a crisis, as well. [inaudible] sort of voluntary, so we are also making it very clear to our faculty and students that, if you are at risk or at any time you feel that the risk is too great for you, that you can move into an online experience, yourself; and we're keeping that flexibility of modality, which is why the testing is so critical. As a person who's teaching face-to-face, I know I speak for some others, and I know a lot of us faculty are not teaching face-to-face, but what is going to, I believe, keep us safe is when and if we know how we are doing and if it is spreading. And we can't do that without proper testing. So, getting an update from Matt, I think, would be very valuable to the faculty, just an information check and just to have an understanding that things are getting done, and the data's being tracked, and we know where you are, because we kind of need to know if the CDC guidelines have been following, and the good collaboration that we've had with the university, and they've been great – if it's working. Thank you.

K. Thu: Thanks, Richard, appreciate it.

N. Johnson: We have comments. The next is Jeffry [Royce] and then Sarah [Klaper].

K. Thu: Go ahead, Jeffry.

J. Royce: Good afternoon, Kendall, thank you. A lot of the feedback I've heard obviously doesn't relate so much to faculty as it does staff. But it has to do with enforcement, which is a word I use very lightly. I'm here at the student center, obviously. We now have some classroom space. We have event space. A lot of our lounge and dining space. And there's a concerning number of students and guests and staff, who are really not wearing their masks. They're not wearing them properly. And my staff and I try to navigate those encounters where we give them a friendly reminder and then insist a little further. And then we're stuck. And that's unfortunate, because this kind of goes back to what we were speaking on earlier. I don't want to call the police to the building every day. Just the atmosphere regarding police, currently, although our police department is exceptional, that's not a good look. But we as staff really have no way to enforce these things. And unlike faculty in the classroom, we also have no way to know what a student's name is or what a staff member we're not familiar with, what their name is either. So we can't even report it when we see repeat offenses. And I don't know whether I'm asking for guidance here or not, but I know other staff members, other students, they see the same thing. They're concerned about it. They wonder why we're not enforcing, and I really don't know what to tell them.

K. Thu: Yes, I hear the anxiety that we all have. I can respond in a couple different ways, and then I'm going to let Beth maybe chime in. Earlier this summer, I convened a meeting with the provost, Chief Phillips, Matt Streb, maybe I'm missing a person or two, to talk about how faculty should respond in the classroom if somebody is not complying with wearing a mask. Not somebody who's just forgotten their mask, someone who's willfully not complying. We wanted to make sure that the

police were not the go-to place for responding to this, for obvious reasons. And this is a student conduct issue in the classroom, so all faculty now have a card. They should have gotten a card in their mailbox, specifying what actions they can take. If the student does not comply with the mask, even if you give them one, then the faculty has the right to dismiss the class, report the student conduct to the department chair and then go through the chain of student conduct.

However, the cases that you're referring to, Jeffry, take place outside the classroom. I know that I've been in conversations with the provost about an incident reporting system. When you come across something that happens in DuSable or Graham or someplace and you don't know who it is, but you want to report the incident – and I'm going to ask Beth to report on what she knows about that – that gives the leadership the added information about knowing where hot spots are, having a little more surveillance information about what's going on. So, with that, Beth, I see you have your hand up, do you want to chime in?

B. Ingram: I don't know if this note has gotten out yet, but Kelly Wesener Michael and a team of others have been working on a way to more quickly respond to COVID concerns. You're nodding your head, Kendall, I don't know if the message actually went out today.

K. Thu: No, I haven't seen that. I thought you were talking about the classroom message.

B. Ingram: No. I think as of sometime today or tomorrow, there'll be a form on the website. It will be available in several different places where you can report a concern about a specific person if you know that person's name or if you want to report a concern more generally, like I notice that students are gathering in the first floor of DuSable and they're not wearing masks. And we start to get reports about that, we could pay more attention to that.

The idea behind the form and the committee is to respond quickly to concerns. And so, the idea is that, if you express a concern, somebody will address it within 24 to 48 hours. So, it's a quick response that way to quickly, if we need to respond to a student who's not doing what they're supposed to be doing, but also to give us information about where we might be seeing issues and pushing those issues off to the right people. So, that should be out today.

K. Thu: Great, look forward to it. Natasha, what do we have going on in the chat box?

N. Johnson: Sarah was next. Do you still have something, Sarah?

S. Klaper: Yes, hi, I'm Sarah Klaper. I'm the university ombudsperson. My job on campus is to work with everybody, faculty, staff, students, administrators, alumni, everybody, about conflict resolution, help people through problems. And I just wanted to share some of the things that have come to my office so far this year. And it's really been about flexibility, because the messaging that we're all receiving from the president, provost, chief of staff, everybody, is about flexibility and having empathy for each other, and also for our students. And so the main concerns I'm hearing are things about attendance policies and students' concerns when they are having to go into quarantine or if they are not officially supposed to go into quarantine but they feel like they shouldn't come to campus, that they're having an issue and can't attend an online class. And having attendance policies be standing in their ways, and faculty members or instructors who are rigid about those.

And so I would just ask for everyone to consider your attendance policies and flexibility. And Vernese's comments earlier about equity, they do not have to be the same for every single person in order to be right. You don't have to treat everybody exactly the same. Sometimes people need different things. And now is particularly a time for that. But other than that, I've really heard mostly very positive things as some people have mentioned in the chat box, and so I, for one, appreciate that. And if anybody has any issues or concerns that they need to talk through, need somebody to bounce their ideas off of, feel free to give me a call or email me, because I'm available confidentially, all that. Thank you.

K. Thu: Thanks, Sarah.

F. Bohanon [via Chat]: The leadership has quickly responded as issues have presented themselves and overall been very supportive. The regular and quick communication has been helpful.

D. Valentiner [via Chat]: Is 600 tests per week really adequate? What is the range of surveillance testing rates recommended by public health experts?

T. Buck [via Chat]: On an up note, so far my students have been terrific with the online classes. They seem to really be supporting each other with great sensitivity and compassion.

G. Aygen [via Chat]: Same experience in my online classes. The sense of community and the call to protect each other, if not ourselves, maybe our last resort and main channel to reach out to such students.

K. Borre [via Chat]: That is my experience online as well. Students talk about needing to take responsibility.

J. Lampi [via Chat]: I am working with roughly 800 students across 30 classes in our program. We are having to be extremely flexible, as many students are accessing class via cell phones, no web cams, accessing class via video consoles, parents "in the classroom" trying to help with technology and so forth. Students are eager to learn and curious, as incoming freshmen, but technology is still a major factor.

M. Berke [via Chat]: Fair is not always equal. Be flexible as Sarah mentioned.

B. Palese [via Chat]: Any chance NIU is planning on joining the initiative of University of Illinois? Illinois State just recently joined it [referring to the University of Illinois' rapid saliva test for COVID-19 now operating under FDA Emergency Use Authorization].

G. Aygen [via Chat]: Technology is another issue for diversity, equity and inclusivity.

V. Edghill-Walden: Kendall, I sent you a note on the side, you might not have gotten it. But Matt is able to join us if we would like for him to at this point. I don't know, in terms of time, but he said he would jump on if you needed him to.

K. Thu: Well, I would appreciate that. I don't want to wait until the next Faculty Senate meeting. So, if we can take five or ten minutes. I know David Valentiner had some very specific questions about testing, and I don't know that we have the public health expertise here.

V. Edghill-Walden: I'll call him and patch him in, give me a minute.

K. Thu: At least Matt can tell us about what's going on with this recent surveillance program that's being put in place.

V. Edghill-Walden: Okay, let me patch him in.

N. Johnson: And then Kristen [Borre] had a question too.

K. Thu: Okay, and then we're going to have to draw this to a close, because we have to get to the rest of the agenda. It's a balancing act, isn't it.

N. Johnson: I know it is. Kristen was pretty much saying that she asked her students to take the pledge. However, the question she has is, does this absolve the university from responsibility for maintaining a healthy campus by her asking them to take the pledge?

K. Thu: I do know, I've had a conversation with the president about the students not signing a waiver of liability, like other universities have done that. So, we're not doing that. I don't know if that answers Kris' question directly. But let's let Matt say a few words about the surveillance program, have one or two more questions in the comments, and then we really are going to have to move on.

K. Borre [via Chat]: Yes, it is not a waiver, good.

V. Edghill-Walden: Matt is on now.

K. Thu: Matt, are you there?

M. Streb: I am. Hello everybody.

K. Thu: So, wondering, Matt, if you could just give us, walk us through for just a few minutes, because we don't have a lot of time, what's going on in terms of the development of the most recent surveillance approach to testing.

M. Streb: Starting today, we have started our surveillance testing in our partnership with Northwestern Medicine. So, this week we're going to do about 60 tests a day. But next week, we'll start doing 120 tests a day. We have a pool of about 3,000 students, these are students who are in residence halls, and these are students in classes where physical distancing may be difficult or mask-wearing may be difficult. You know, if you play the trombone, you're in a dance class, those types of things. And so we will be randomly selecting students to come in to get a nasal swab test. We will take those results, obviously, and I want to be very clear, we're going to have positive cases. We're really trying to look to make sure that we're able to detect the symptomatic cases,

those types of things that will help us figure out where hot spots might be on campus. But we will report those once a week on our COVID dashboard. If we do 600 tests in a week, every Monday we'll put that up on the COVID dashboard. We'll tell you whatever it is – 30 positives, this was our positivity rate. We will, just to be clear, though, when we test on Wednesday, let's say that we get our test results back on Thursday and it's a positive, we will include that, as you know, we update our results daily, so that will go into our daily result as well. And then on Monday, we'll say, here's the overall numbers related to surveillance testing. So, that's in a nutshell kind of where we're at.

I want people to know, too, that faculty and staff, we're in negotiations right now with Northwestern to allow faculty, certain faculty and staff, to also be tested. Unfortunately, our relationship with Northwestern is simply a student contract right now. So, we have to go back and redo that for faculty and staff. I don't anticipate that being a problem. We hope to have that done fairly soon.

And then, of course, the ultimate goal is that this is a stop gap, right? As a matter of fact, I was just on a call right now with the SHIELD group, which is our University of Illinois group that has done the saliva-based test. And ultimately, we'd like to have a saliva-based test up and running here on campus. We're hoping that we can get that up maybe by mid-October. It's looking more and more like November, because we will actually have one of the labs that will be affiliated with NIU, and again, through our partnership with Northwestern.

I know that you've got a lot of business. I'm certainly happy to answer any questions quickly. And if you need anymore details, Kendall, I'd be happy to talk to you about that.

K. Thu: Those saliva tests were just recently approved by the FDA, correct?

M. Streb: Correct, yes, although for surveillance, they don't have to be approved, but it's still a huge thing for the University of Illinois.

K. Thu: Just a reminder to everybody, if you want to speak, please indicate in the chat box rather than raising your hand so that we know the order in which to call on you. So, we have time for maybe two or three more comments and questions. And, Natasha, who do we have next?

N. Johnson: It looks like it's Lisa Liberty.

K. Thu: Okay, go ahead Lisa.

L. Liberty: I'm sorry, I didn't mean to raise my hand.

K. Thu: Okay, it happens, right?

N. Johnson: And that's it. He answered the questions that were already in the box.

K. Thu: Okay. Oh, Peter has a question. We'll make this the last question, Peter. You get the last say.

P. Chomentowski: Matt, I've got a question for you on the random testing. So, I had two students that asked me questions today. One of them asked about, she was selected for random testing. Does she have to do it through NIU, or can she actually now go to her own physician that she's been tested for before and then provide you with the results.

M. Streb: That's a great question. We would prefer that she goes through, and does, the NIU testing with Northwestern Medicine. A couple other things too. If you get students who are asking about this, we give them a time. So they get, you're supposed to come Tuesday between 8 and 12. We realize that students have class, students may be working, so we do give them the opportunity to reschedule their test within a short period of time. So I wanted to make sure that people know that. The other thing, too, is that there are a few classes. I don't know if we have anybody from the School of Nursing on the call here. But there are a few classes where we thought we weeded everybody out, but apparently, there's a handful of people who are doing clinicals, let's say, in Chicago, who don't have any in-person classes, anything like that, and we're not making them come all the way out to DeKalb. If you're selected, we would want you to go through the NIU Northwestern Medicine testing.

P. Chomentowski: And could they talk with your office about that, because one GA I had, she runs her own business, she's not on campus a lot. She's an older, GA, she's not 20 years old, she's in her 40's. I'm just kind of curious, she's kind of worried about coming in to use your facilities also.

M. Streb: Peter, that's a really good – I want to be clear too, this is really, obviously, we take it very seriously. But we're also willing to work with our students. And there may be some options that we can work with. So, by all means, have her send me an email, and I'll be happy to look into it a little bit further.

P. Chomentowski: Thank you very much for your time.

K. Thu: Thanks, Matt. And, Vernese, thanks for bringing Matt in so quickly. And, Matt, thanks for being willing to jump on at a moment's notice here.

M. Streb: Absolutely.

K. Thu: So, I think we're going to have to move on. Let's keep this conversation going. Look for additional announcements about the surveillance. And by all means, let's stay in touch with each other and ask a lot of questions. And we'll all do the best we can at getting the answers for you.

M. Streb: Absolutely. Thanks, everybody. Have a great day.

K. Thu: Thanks, Matt.

VIII. CONSENT AGENDA

K. Thu: The next item on the agenda is the consent agenda, so we'll zip through this pretty quickly, because that's the nature of a consent agenda. We're approving the Faculty Senate standing committees for 2020-21, it's on page 22 of your packet. And by the way, the packet is not as large

as it was last year – I wonder why? We’re approving the University Advisory Committee members to the Board of Trustees. I asked Katy Jaekel and Greg Beyer to serve on the advisory committee to the Board of Trustees. They’ve already participated in one virtual meeting with the board. We also are approving Department of Communication Professor Ferald Bryan to serve as our parliamentarian this year. Ferald, if you’re on, how many years have you been our parliamentarian?

F. Bryan: Do you really want to know, Kendall?

K. Thu: I do.

F. Bryan: This is my 24th year as parliamentarian.

K. Thu: Well, thank you for all your service. You’re not worn out yet, right?

F. Bryan: Well, we’ll see how long the meeting runs, okay?

K. Thu: Okay. Thanks, Ferald.

F. Bryan: Sure. Colleagues, Thank you for your support. I do enjoy serving as your Parliamentarian. A new edition of Robert's Rules was released yesterday--the 12th edition--first new version since 2011. For information about the changes in the new edition, see: <https://robertsrules.com/books/newly-revised-12th-edition/#major-changes>

K. Thu: And then we’re also approving faculty candidates running unopposed to serve on committees of the university, which is on page 24. Pat, we have no unfinished business, correct?

P. Erickson: Kendall, why don’t we take a motion, a second and a quick voice vote to approve the consent agenda.

K. Thu: Oh, that’s right, okay. So, do we have a motion to approve the consent agenda?

D. Valentiner: I’ll move, David Valentiner.

K. Thu: Okay, do we have a second? Looks like Nick Pohlman is the second. All those in favor. If you are in opposition to the consent agenda, indicate by saying no in the chat box. If you want to abstain, you can abstain in the chat box. Otherwise, we will assume that this passed to save time. Is that okay with you, Ferald and Pat.

F. Bryan: Yes.

P. Erickson: It’s okay with me.

K. Thu: Okay, so we’ve approved the consent agenda.

- A. Approve the 2020-21 Faculty Senate Standing Committee membership rosters per FS Bylaws, Article 3 – Page 22

- B. Approve the 2020-21 University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees membership roster, confirming Katy Jaekel for a three-year term and Greg Beyer for a two-year term per NIU Bylaws, Article 8.4.1.1 – Page 23
- C. Approve Department of Communication Professor Ferald Bryan to serve as the 2020-21 Faculty Senate parliamentarian per Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 2.2.
- D. Approve list of faculty candidates running unopposed to serve on committees of the university – Page 24

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Approve Appearances Before the Faculty Senate and FS Standing Committees policy per 5 ILCS 120/2.06(g) Illinois Open Meetings Act– Pages 25-26

The proposed policy is consistent with the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees, Article II-Board Operating Procedures, Section 4-Appearances Before the Board, currently in effect.

K. Thu: So that takes us to New Business. The first item is to approve Appearances Before the Faculty Senate and FS Standing Committees per the Open Meetings Act. That’s on pages 25 and 26. This policy is to make us consistent with the bylaws of the Board of Trustees, and it requires a request form from members of the public who wish to address the Faculty Senate because, of course, now we are abiding by the Open Meetings Act. Pat, remind me of where we are with this. Is this a first reading?

P. Erickson: We can approve this right now. Why don’t we take a motion to approve, a second and a voice vote.

K. Thu: Do I have a motion to approve?

N. Johnson: We have Gulsat [Aygen] in the chat already moved.

K. Thu: Okay, do we have a second? I see Elisa [Fredericks] in seconding it. Any discussion about this? Again, it’s pretty simple. It’s just making sure that we are consistent with the way meetings are handled according to the Board of Trustees. And I want to thank Pat for keeping track of all this. Okay, if there’s no discussion, again, if anybody opposes this, please indicate so by typing in the chat box, or if you abstain, do the same in the chat box. Okay, seeing none, I will consider this approved.

- B. Proposed amendment to FS Bylaws 3.3 Faculty Senate Personnel Committee – Page 27
FIRST READING

K. Thu: Let's move on to the first reading of the proposed amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws 3.3 Faculty Senate Personnel Committee, page 27. Pat, can you scroll up just a little bit, or down, whatever the direction is there? So, this is just to update the language in that section of the bylaws for membership on the committee.

P. Erickson: That's right, Kendall. This was just an item that came to our attention while we were making the numerous significant updates to the bylaws over the summer. This is just something that's probably years old where these two positions weren't accurately represented. So, we're just correcting a long-ago oversight.

K. Thu: Yes, thank you. So, this is simply clean-up, basically, and we're going to see more of this as the year progresses, as we continue to implement shared governance changes. So, I'll entertain a motion to approve.

P. Erickson: This is just a first reading, Kendall.

K. Thu: I'm sorry, right. So, this is a first reading, we don't vote. We will vote on it after it's read a second time, presumably at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

- C. Proposed amendment to FS Bylaws 4.9.1, CAEIE membership – Page 28
Vernese Edghill-Walden, Vice President for Diversity
Tamara Boston, Program Coordinator, Academic Diversity, Equity and Inclusion
FIRST READING

K. Thu: That brings us to item C., proposed amendment to the Faculty Senate Bylaws for the CAEIE, Committee on Academic Equity and Inclusive Excellence, that's a mouthful. And I'm going to turn it over to Vernese, she's the chair of the committee, to walk us through what those changes are.

V. Edghill-Walden: Thank you. I was here last year adding people. As we continue to develop our work around equity and inclusion, it is evident that we need to make sure that we have the right people at the table. And so we have added, or are seeking to add, the IT accessibility officer, who would be an ex officio, voting member. And we, historically, have had a faculty member from each degree-granting college. What we did not have is someone from the library. And in the last few years as we've continued to work on equity issues, the library has been involved in that in terms of open source materials, book loans, just the work that they're doing around social justice and equity. It makes sense that they also have an opportunity to have a seat at the table. So those are the two seats that we would like to add.

K. Thu: Sounds good. So again, this is a first reading. We have no vote. But if you have any questions or comments for Vernese, I'm sure she'd be happy to respond. Okay, well seeing none, do you see any, Natasha?

N. Johnson: No, I don't see anymore.

K. Thu: Okay, well we will return to that at the next Faculty Senate meeting for the second reading and for the vote. So, thanks, Vernese.

V. Edghill-Walden [via Chat]: Thank you.

XI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. [Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE](#) – Linda Saborío – report

K. Thu: Next we have Reports From Councils, Boards and Standing Committees, which we always have. First, we have the Faculty Advisory Council to the Illinois Board of Higher Education. Linda, I see that you're in the chat box and that you're here. Would you like to give us a report.

L. Saborío: Hold on, I'm turning everything on. Okay, there we go. Good afternoon, everyone. For those of you who are new to Faculty Senate, I am NIU's representative to the Faculty Advisory Council for the Illinois Board of Higher Education. Let me give you just a brief definition of what it is that we do. The FAC is a representative group of faculty in the state of Illinois that acts as an advisory group to the Illinois Board of Higher Education. We have 36 members, 12 representatives from each of the 12 public universities, 12 representatives from private proprietary institutions and 12 representatives from public community colleges. If you are interested in reading more about who we are and what we do, we do have a new website. I'll put it in the chat box for you in a minute here, and you're welcome to check that out.

I don't have an official report for today, because our first meeting this year is September 18. And for obvious reasons, we were not able to go to Springfield this past May to visit with legislators, so I do not have a report of that.

I'm finished. If anybody has any questions, I'm going to go ahead and put that website for you in the chat box if you want to check out what we're doing. I'm done, you can move on, Kendall.

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

K. Thu: So, as you heard earlier, we have two new members of the University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees. They are Katy Jaekel and Greg Beyer. We have had one board meeting since they came onboard. The board meeting was lackluster. It didn't have a lot on its agenda. This committee, for those of you who are new, we provide input into what the board is going to attending to at their meetings. We also report out issues and concerns that we have from our constituencies. And I'm happy to say that all of the members are willing and able to speak up. I think they all spoke up at that first meeting, and that's great to hear. If there are issues that you want us to relay to the Board of Trustees, by all means, let us know. When the board is back in full session and tackling more substantive issues, particularly the budget in their next meeting, then we'll have more to report back to you with.

So, with that, I don't know whether Natasha [Johnson], you or Cathy [Doederlein] or Katy [Jaekel] or Greg [Beyer] have anything to add. I don't think Greg is on this call. Natasha or Cathy? Okay.

- C. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee – Peter Chomentowski, Chair – no report
- D. Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – Ben Creed, Liaison/Spokesperson – report

K. Thu: If not, I see we have no report from Peter [Chomentowski] who we heard from earlier from the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee. Obviously, these committees have not met over the summer, so that brings us to Ben Creed and Rules, Governance and Elections Committee. And I'm going to turn it over to Ben to walk us through these elections and panels. So, Ben, are you with us?

B. Creed: Can you hear me?

K. Thu: Yes, we can hear you.

B. Creed: Great. Good afternoon. Today we will hold several elections. Before we begin, I remind you that, even though everyone on this Teams meeting can access the ballots, that not everybody can vote. Please vote only if you are a voting member of Faculty Senate. Pat has put on the screen a list of Faculty Senate voting members, and we'll pause for a moment for you to review that list and entertain any questions anyone might have related to that. I'll pause so folks can find their name. If there are no questions, I'll move on to the first election.

K. Thu: Could I just add something here, Ben. As you can see from the list, we still have positions to seat. And that's part of the challenges that we're having with the revised shared governance system. We have to work through all of these. Hopefully, we'll get them seated quickly. But I know Pat's been working hard on it. Thank you.

1. Election of 2020-21 Hearing Panel – A Qualtrics ballot will be distributed to FS tenured/tenure-track voting members following the meeting.

B. Creed: First is the election of the 2020-21 Hearing Panel. The Hearing Panel is used for appeals based on Faculty Senate Bylaw Article 11.3 regarding due process for faculty dismissal issues and also for review of allegations regarding violation of academic freedom based on Faculty Senate Bylaws Article 15. For this election, a Qualtrics ballot will be used, and Pat will email that ballot following this meeting, along with instructions for completing it. The ballot will contain the names of 34 tenured faculty members selected randomly, and you'll be asked to vote for no more than 20. So, at this moment, there's nothing for us to do.

2. By-lot drawing of 15 FS tenured faculty members to serve on the 2020-21 grievance panel for student grievances – Pat Erickson will draw by lot and read the names out during the meeting.

B. Creed: The second item is per NIU Bylaws Article 6. The Faculty Senate is asked to identify 15 members of its tenured faculty membership to serve as a panel from which a student grievance committee could be created, should one be needed to review a student grievance. These 15 panel members will be selected by lot from all tenured faculty members of Faculty Senate and University Council. I'll ask Pat to draw those names now.

P. Erickson: Okay, so here I am and you can see I have this bowl filled with all of your names. So I guess my job today is to do the calling out of the names. The first one is Yasua Ito from Physics. And the second one is Florensia Surjadi from Family and Consumer Sciences. Veysel Demir, Electrical Engineering. Chong Zheng from Chemistry and Biochemistry. Janet Olson from Health and Human Sciences. Kevin Martin from Engineering. Shane Sharp from Sociology. Simón Weffer from Liberal Arts and Sciences. Karen Whedbee from Communication. George Slotsve from Economics. Bob Tatara from Engineering Technology. Mike Konen from Geographic and Atmospheric Sciences. Todd Buck from Art and Design. Arlene Keddie from Health Studies. And Valia Allori from Philosophy. And that looks like 15 slips here in front of me. Thanks. I will be in touch with all of you soon.

3. Election of 2020-21 non-union faculty and staff grievance pool – A Qualtrics ballot will be distributed to FS tenured/tenure-track voting members following the meeting.

B. Creed: Next we are asked to identify three tenured, non-union faculty members to serve on the 2020-21 pool for non-union faculty and staff grievances, from which a grievance committee could be created, should one be needed to review a non-union faculty or staff grievance. SPS Council and Operating Staff Council also are selecting their own two representatives each to serve on this grievance pool. For this election of three faculty members, a Qualtrics ballot will be used, and Pat will email that ballot following this meeting, following directions for completing it. The ballot will contain the names of all tenured non-union faculty members, and you will be asked to vote for three.

4. Election of a Faculty Senate vice president per Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 2.2. Nominations will be taken from the FS floor, and election will take place during the meeting.

B. Creed: The next election is the election of Faculty Senate vice president. I'll open the floor for nominations at this time. Please unmute your microphone in order to make your verbal nomination or self-nomination.

K. Thu: I had a conversation with George Slotsve. He's been the vice president, I think, the last couple of years. And he's willing to do it again this year, if somebody would want to nominate George. He's already agreed to do it.

N. Johnson: I will nominate George.

K. Thu: Do we have a second for George?

P. Comentowski: I'll second it.

K. Thu: Take over the meeting, Ben. I didn't mean to take it over.

B. Creed: No, please, you're doing great. All right, so we have a second for George Slotsve. If there are no other nominations, we can elect by voice vote. And we'll proceed using, if that's all right, what we've been doing so far. If there are any no's, can people put them in the chat box? Or abstentions? Thank you. I think that means he is our vice president.

5. Selection of one FS tenured/tenure-track faculty member to serve as the Faculty Senate president's designee on the 2021 BOT Professorship Award Selection Committee. Nominations will be taken from the FS floor, and election will take place during the meeting.

Committee members review approximately 10 applications online, and the committee meets two to three times between November and February. The person selected to serve on this committee cannot be a candidate for the award, nor have submitted a nomination for the award.

B. Creed: On to number 5. Next is the selection of one tenured or tenure-track faculty volunteer to serve on the Board of Trustees Professorship Award Selection Committee. The assignment includes reviewing approximately 10 applications online, and the committee meets two or three times between November and February. Could we have a volunteer or a self-nomination to serve on the selection committee for this year? Looks like we have a volunteer from Gulsat [Aygen].

G. Aygen: Correct.

B. Creed: I'm just giving a moment for any other nominations. If there are no other nominations, we can do another voice vote to approve Gulsat as our representative. So, we'll go with all opposed or any no's, please post in the chat box. And any abstentions? Seeing none, I think that means your volunteer has gone through.

Thank you. And that concludes my report.

K. Thu: Thanks, Ben. And thanks for all the volunteers. Appreciate it.

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

K. Thu: That brings us to the report from the Student Government Association. Our new Student Government Association president is Antonio Johnson. Our new speaker of the senate is Brad Beyer. I've had the opportunity to speak to both of them over the summer. I think they're going to be great leaders for our Student Government Association. And I think I saw Brad in the chat box, so maybe just logging on. Let me turn to Antonio first, if you're here, if you'd like to say a few words.

A. Johnson: Hi. Once again, my name is Antonio Johnson. I am the Student Government Association president. I'm majoring in sociology and I'm also a senior. I don't have a formal report, but I do look forward to working with you all this year.

K. Thu: Great, thank you, Antonio. And thank you for your service and your willingness to step up. Brad, are you there?

B. Beyer: Yes, I am. For those of you who haven't met me, my name is Brad. I'm a senior this year, studying economics. And I am serving as the speaker of the senate of the Student Government Association. So, I'm taking over for Ian Pearson. We're going to start with our first official Student Senate meeting, not this upcoming Sunday, but the following Sunday on the 13th. And then hopefully, going forward, I'll have, like Antonio said, more formal reports. But one thing I will say is I remember last fall back when I was just a regular student senator, and Ian kind of brought up the shared governance changes that were being talked about. It's nice now then getting appointed to UC, being able to vote to approve those, and I'm looking forward to kind of implementing that and helping out where needed. So, it's great to be here.

K. Thu: Great, thanks, Brad. Ian played such an important role, which means the Student Government Association played a pivotal role in those shared governance changes. And I very much appreciated it. I look forward to working with both of you through the course of the year. By the way, I'm going to be contacting both of you about the work we're doing with the APPM, because I think we need student representation. So, maybe one or the other of you might be able to pitch in. But that's a different conversation. So, thank you again.

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

K. Thu: That brings us to the Operating Staff Council. Natasha is the new president. I guess it's not so new now, is it, Natasha? Do you have anything that you'd like to report, Natasha?

N. Johnson: We meet tomorrow, but just from the last time we met, the only thing that was of concern that stood out to me was the social justice piece, but then also them wanting to know how many people have been laid off from Civil Service, SPS. Like what are the numbers. And there just seemed to be a little bit of concern with how secure jobs are in this moment.

K. Thu: Thank you, Natasha. I attend the Operating Staff Council meetings on a regular basis, as well as the SPS Council. And it wasn't until I got into this position that I started to learn how the issues and concerns of the SPS and OSC are different in many ways from those of faculty. So, that's one of the reasons I thought it was important for you to become members of the senate, because, even though we deal with academic policy, your involvement in those conversations needs to be at the table, so thank you.

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

K. Thu: Last but certainly not least, a report from the SPS Council, Cathy Doederlein. Cathy, are you there?

C. Doederlein: Yes, I sure am. Thanks, Kendall. I've had the privilege of serving with SPS Council as the president for a few years now, so some of you are probably by now sick of me. But I appreciate the opportunity to be here as part of the Faculty Senate with the new shift that happened, and I really appreciate that, in the process of updating shared governance, that consideration of having instructors and SPS and operating staff and students be a part of Faculty Senate going forward was considered and approved. So, thanks to all those involved who felt that that was reasonable and who allowed that to occur, because I think it's a move that we appreciate being able to be at the table for these important conversations.

I'll just share the kind of broken record that many of you have likely heard before. Kind of the main ongoing concern for SPS that is specific to SPS is just the continued transition process that many SPS face when their job descriptions come up for review, and they are potentially reclassified to Civil Service. As I often share, the concern there isn't that being Civil Service is a bad thing, because it isn't, but really just better understanding for SPS as to what that impact is on their seniority, both with the institution and in terms of where they stand within operating staff in terms of bumping rights and things of that nature. And just kind of what their rights become when they shift from SPS to operating staff. So, I won't get too into the weeds now, but certainly if any of you are curious about it and want to know more, feel free to send me a note, because I'm happy to talk more about it, but just appreciate being here and looking forward to a great year. Thanks very much.

K. Thu: Thanks, Cathy. And I want to give a shout out to Cathy and Jeffry for their work in the shared governance changes last year as well. They played a pivotal role, and I really appreciate all that you've done. I think it's important for us to recognize that we have a lot of unions on campus. I don't remember the exact number, maybe 18 or 19. But we had to look after the backs of those who are not unionized. And SPS are not unionized. So, we need to make sure that we're all part of the Huskie family and recognize those that may be more vulnerable than others.

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, Student Government Association
- 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. [Annual Reports](#), 2019-20

- T. FS 2020-21 dates: Sep 2, Sep 30, Oct 28, Nov 18, Jan 20, Feb 17, Mar 24, Apr 21
All fall 2020 semester meetings will be held via Microsoft Teams. The Teams meeting link and the agendas will typically be sent via email on the Friday preceding each FS meeting.

- U. At large committee vacancies – Several university committees currently have at large faculty vacancies, which can be filled by faculty from any college (as opposed to college-specific representation). If you have interest in serving, or know someone who does, contact Pat Erickson at pje@niu.edu.

[University Benefits Committee](#) – Fall 2020 semester only (to serve as an alternate in an at-large faculty seat). Meets monthly on Thursdays at 2 p.m.

[Campus Parking Committee](#) – two-year term. Meets monthly on Thursdays at 1 p.m.

[Parking Appeals Committee](#) – one-year term. Meets second and fourth Tuesday of the month, 1:30-3:30 p.m.

[Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee](#) – two-year term. Meets the third Wednesday of the month at 10 a.m.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

K. Thu: With that, amazingly enough, it looks like we're 15 minutes before my expected end of the senate meeting. Again, I want to thank all of you for serving in the Faculty Senate. We have a lot of challenges ahead, but we're up to it. We can do it. And I appreciate your willingness to be a part of this process. We have some work to do between this meeting and the next meeting. Meanwhile, take care of yourselves, look out for others and be well.

So, with that, a question about when will we elect the ad hoc committee. I'd like to get that taken care of by the next meeting. We might even be able to do it via Qualtrics beforehand. I'll use Pat's wizardry to help me figure out how to do that, but certainly I'd like to have them seated by the next meeting. And I like Vernese's idea of having that committee be an action committee and work on priority items that we can take action and what those actions will be.

So, with that, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

N. Johnson: So moved.

K. Thu: Do we have a second.

Unidentified: Second.

K. Thu: So, I'm assuming that you all agree. And if you don't want to adjourn the meeting, you can stay on Teams and chat in the chat box. But otherwise, I consider the meeting adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.