

TRANSCRIPT

FACULTY SENATE
Wednesday, September 29, 2021, 3 p.m.
Barsema Alumni & Visitors Center
231 N. Annie Glidden Road, DeKalb, IL
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Abdel-Motaleb, Akst, Bardolph, Bennett, Birch, Bohanon, Books, Carpenter, Cheyney, Chomentowski, D. Collins, V. Collins, Creed, Douglass, Duffrin, Fredericks, Gorman, Grund, Hu, Ito, N. Johnson, Jong, Keddie, Kim, Knoll, Liberty, Maki, Marsh, McConkie, McGowan, Montana, Montgomery, Nesterov, Palese, Penkrot, Petges, Qin, Richter, Rigert, Serowka, Sharp, Sirotkin, Slotsve, Smith, Sullivan, Vaezi, Vahabzadeh, Valentiner, Whedbee

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Allori, Bujarski, Chen, Clark, Duffin, Halverson, Hunter, Lampi, Staikidis

OTHERS PRESENT: Bryan, Falkoff, Freeman, Griffin, Groza, McEvoy, Saborío

OTHERS ABSENT: Beyer, Ferguson, Jaekel

I. CALL TO ORDER

P. Chomentowski: I'll call the meeting to order.

Meeting called to order at 3:01 p.m.

II. VERIFICATION OF QUORUM

P. Chomentowski: And now we will verify quorum.

P. Erickson: And we do have quorum. And just one little reminder. I just want to remind everybody to please fill out the attendance slip that's at your place. And then just leave it on the table when you leave; we'll pick them up after. Thank you.

III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

P. Chomentowski: We'll move to the adoption of the agenda for today. Can I have a motion to adopt the agenda for the meeting today, and a second.

G. Slotsve: So moved.

I. Montana: Second.

P. Chomentowski: All right. Is there any discussion? I would like to make a motion to amend today's agenda, and that is to remove section XI.D. under Rules, Governance and Elections Committee report. Originally, the item was placed on the agenda in order to identify a faculty member from Faculty Senate who could serve as a nonvoting member of the Baccalaureate Council for this year. But we have recently learned that the Department of Engineering Technology Professor Mahdi Vaezi is currently serving on both bodies. So, there is no longer a need to recruit someone this afternoon for that position. Could I get a second to my motion to amend our agenda today and remove that from the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee report.

D. Valentiner: Second.

P. Chomentowski: Is there any discussion on my motion to amend the agenda today? All in favor of the motion to amend the agenda, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

P. Chomentowski: No? Any abstain? All right, thank you.

Now, let's move to vote on the original motion and second on the floor to adopt the agenda. All in favor to adopt the original agenda, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

P. Chomentowski: No? Anyone abstain? All right, motion is passed to adopt the agenda.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2021 MINUTES – Pages 4-8

P. Chomentowski: Let's move on to the approval of the September 1, 2021 minutes. Can I have a motion and a second to approve the minutes from the September 1, 2021 meeting?

D. Douglass: So moved.

D. Collins: Second.

P. Chomentowski: Thank you. Any discussion about the minutes from that meeting? All right, all those in favor to approve the minutes from that meeting, say aye.

Members: Aye.

P. Chomentowski: No? Or any abstained? All right, the minutes from the September 1, 2021 meeting have been approved.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

P. Chomentowski: Moving to Public Comment. Pat, do we have any public comment?

P. Erickson: We do not.

P. Chomentowski: All right, so we have no public comment for today.

VI. FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

P. Chomentowski: We'll move on to the Faculty Senate President's Announcements. The only announcement I have is just to let everyone know that, once again, we have a lot of people in the room. And if you would like to make a comment or ask questions about anything, we ask that you please get up and go to the microphones. If you look around, we have three microphones set up in the room, one on the left, one on the right, and one in the back. If you want to make a comment or even just ask a question, please move to the microphone to actually state your comment so we can have it recorded and on the record. Thanks.

VII. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. University Goals – President Lisa Freeman

P. Chomentowski: We'll move to items for Faculty Senate to consider. Today we have President Lisa Freeman here with us, and she is going to provide a presentation today on the University Goals.

L. Freeman: Good afternoon, everybody. I was in this room last night at an event to welcome the faculty who joined us in 2020 and 2021. And I have to tell you, it was just so great to see their energy, their commitment to NIU, and to just get to hang out with them in person and hear their stories. And so, it's nice to be back in this room with all of you, who have been established at the university for longer than they have, but who bring the same commitment to our mission, vision and values to your work in shared governance. I think I will ask my assistant, Liz, to share the new faculty PowerPoint with Pat, so she can include it in the materials. This year, instead of having people stand up and talk about themselves, in the interest of COVID and networking and all of those things, we made a very lovely PowerPoint with pictures of the 2020 and 2021 hires and a brief summary of their research interests. I think it would be great to get to know who our new colleagues are, even outside their departments.

So with that, I'm here today to do a little preview of the academic year 2021-22 University Goals. And for those of you who may not be fully aware of the process, since I became president, part of the university's obligation to our Board of Trustees is to annually present goals that capture the university's aspirations. Over the time that I've been president, the process has changed a little bit in probably two really substantive ways. The first is, in the initial years, the goals were annual. They had to be things, really, that could be accomplished only in the course of the year, and they had to be things that could be counted very discreetly.

Over time, I think the Board of Trustees recognized that a lot of things that are meaningful at the university can't be accomplished in a single year. And that the type of metrics that may work in a business setting are not always easily transferrable to the university. And so now, we create goals, and we indicate progress at the end of the year by presenting evidence and asking them to evaluate the progress. So, the goals have gotten a little more complex and, I think, a little more realistic and aligned with what we want to do as a university over time.

Another change from the beginning is that, in the initial years, the goals ran from July 1 to July 1, and they were presented at the summer board meeting when we don't really have faculty and students on campus. And that really decreased the opportunity for preview, feedback, fine-tuning, with key stakeholder groups. So, right now the goals run from October 1 to October 1, and they're formally adopted by the Board of Trustees at the November meeting.

So, I've discussed these goals with the Board of Trustees. I spoke to the senior roundtable, who have been very involved in their creation. And this morning I spoke to the deans. And you are actually the next group that I'm speaking to. I'll show you, we'll take these on the road a little more. But I wanted you to have a sense for the process for the goals and then also the work that's done to inform the goals.

So, we did significant work over the summer to prepare us to think about the University Goals. The university collaborated with AGB, the Association of Governing Boards – our Board of Trustees is a member – and we did that because we wanted the clarity that can come from outside eyes on what's going on, but we also wanted to use an academic element. We wanted to use someone who knows us but who aren't us, and also an organization that has a lot of benchmarking data for comparison. We also included faculty from the College of Business in that collaboration. Drs. Mahesh Subramony and Bart Sharp worked with me, the CFO and the provost, and our partners from AGB.

And what AGB did with us over the summer with that group is, first of all, they reviewed a lot of our materials. Our mission, vision, values, our strategic action planning framework, the minutes of presidential commissions and shared governance groups, and really got to know us that way. That material was also supplemented with interviews, so interviews with leaders on campus, interviews with some of groups I mentioned, interviews with the president's budget roundtable. And the material that we got out of that was put together to create a SWOT analysis and Imperatives for Change and Sustainability. And I will show you those and explain those in a little more detail in just a minute.

The SWOT analysis and the imperatives were then taken to our summer leadership retreats, which include members of the senior roundtables and the deans. And those retreats were, again, facilitated by Professors Subramony and Sharp. And from there, we developed key facilitators and inhibitors of change that reflect the situation at NIU and some innovation strategies, pillars and principles. And I won't show all of that work to you, but I will show a sampling of it. That was used as the foundation to start talking about the University Goals, obviously along with last year's goals and the progress that we've made. So, I'm going to give you just a little bit of that background and then preview the University Goals for you today.

The SWOT analysis represented on the next slide is what came out of our planning work. And, although I would say in any group that looks at it, there's always opportunity for additional wordsmithing. Overall, the groups who've reviewed this information generally agreed with the strengths, the weaknesses, the opportunities and threats that made up the SWOT assessment.

On this slide, we see the identified strengths and weaknesses. And just to remind you, these are internal factors, where the strengths are things that give NIU an advantage over others. And the weaknesses are the things that do the opposite. The strengths that emerged in the analysis are shown on the left, and our planning work suggests – and this probably isn't a surprise – that we're proud of our status as an engaged student-focused research university. We change the lives of our students and their communities. And our faculty and staff are dedicated to our mission.

The identified weaknesses may not be a big surprise either. And the good news is that they're addressable. We need to align intentionally around NIU's priorities to think about how resources are allocated and actions are incentivized. And to invest in the leadership development of our faculty and staff. And we took these weaknesses to heart as we created the university's annual and multi-year goals. And I hope that you'll see that.

This slide shows the opportunities and threats. And these are external factors where opportunities are elements in the environment that NIU could use to our advantage. And the threats are elements in our environment that could be detrimental to the university. We have significant opportunities. Our mission and the work we're doing aligns with the national conversation around an equity mindset. We've learned to be innovative and to pivot. And we create resources from relationship.

Our threats are not unique to us. A major part of our budget is controlled externally. The demographics of our student body are changing, and the demographics of students who are available to our applicant pool are changing. Every public university is in the same boat, and every university will be, like us, trying to position ourselves for success.

The SWOT analysis and the related analyses were used to establish imperatives for change and sustainability. And these are really here to serve as a foundation for our multi-year planning effort. I think of them as keys to success and things that we can't avoid if we're going to be successful. And the good news is that they're not new ideas. Many are things that we are already doing or moving toward.

I also want to take a moment here as you read these to define what I mean when I say multi-year planning. Some people immediately think we're going to create some large document that sits on a shelf. Some people think it's all about the budget. When I think about multi-year planning, I think about a thinking a process, a forward-thinking process, that has to be true to who we are, but also informed by our changing environment, a planning process that focuses first on what NIU must look like in the future, in 2025, if we're going to be able to continue to advance our vision, deliver on our mission and stay true to our values. A planning process where we create and commit to a multi-year road map. And that's something that we're going to be talking about more over the coming months.

I told you that the SWOT analysis and the imperatives were shared in the summer retreats with members of the senior and academic leadership. And they were used to spur very honest conversation about things that facilitate and inhibit change at NIU. The facilitators appear on this slide. And you can see that there's an appetite and an opportunity for doing things differently to better serve our students, our mission, our vision and values.

There are also aspects of our culture that make change hard. In the summer retreats and in the discussions that followed, attention was focused largely on what should be done to overcome the reluctance to innovate. When you look at what's on this slide, it's actually a lot easier, although it seems daunting, to align the budget cycle and some of the department needs than it is to shift culture. But that's going to be important.

So, as we talked about what we could do to overcome the reluctance to innovate, we had very, very rich discussions. And Mahesh and Bart summarized the work by creating what they called innovation strategies, pillars and principals. I'm not going to show you the full version, but this slide really summarizes the strategies that were suggested for promoting a positive narrative around imagination and possibilities; and encouraging and enabling innovation. And I want to say that, in this context, when we use the word, innovation, it's not about creating an invention and transferring the technology. It's really about creativity and imagination and empathy.

It was also noted that, in addition to doing the things shown on the slide, that it would be important for us, as leaders, to be accountable and to hold others accountable for acting in accordance with our mission, vision and values, especially our unwavering commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion. The leadership team and I were very mindful of this guidance, meaning precaution about remembering how equity has to be infused throughout our work; the importance of being accountable; and also the strategies shown on this slide.

Now, I'm going to transition to talking about the university goals. Our annual and multi-year goals have been organized and continue to be organized around six core themes – themes that align with our strategic action planning framework. There are two or three goals under each theme; and in this preview, I tried to focus on the goals most relevant to faculty interest and responsibility. And those are the ones that fall under themes 2, 3, 4 and 5.

But before I move to the slides that I want to share with you with specifics, I want to share briefly that the goals under theme 1 in this year's goals are largely about professional development opportunities to build leadership capacity across our faculty and staff, and also to move forward the recommendations we received in August from the Task Group on Remove Work. And if you haven't had the chance to look at the full report from that task force, I urge you to do so. It's posted on the president's website under the leadership meetings. And this was a great example of how powerful shared leadership can be on our campus. The task force was co-led by Fred Barnhart, the dean of University Libraries, and Professor Jessica Reyman. There were 12 people on the task force. They covered six areas of concern. Through their work, they did a survey of almost 1,000 students, and they engaged 55 others from the university community in the work. Their recommendations are spot on, and we've already moved forward with most of them, or are in the process of moving forward with most of them.

The goals under theme 6 focus on improving our budget planning process, and we're going to be engaging campus voices in that improvement process, advancing capital projects and technology projects, and then transitioning from the planning phase to the launch phase of our multi-year strategic fundraising campaign in partnership with the Foundation.

So, that's sort of a thumbnail of goal 1. Goal 1 is professional development and moving forward the remote working task force recommendations. Goal 6, improving our budget process, advancing capital and technology projects, and moving the campaign forward.

I'm not going to have time to go through everything that's under goals 2-5, but I really want to highlight the ones that I think are going to be of most interest to this group.

The second bucket, student recruitment, success and experience, the first goal under there, goal 2A, is about continuing to grow and stabilize enrollment, both by attracting new students and improving retention rates for continuing students, maintaining our focus on closing equity gaps and retention and graduate rates. And we have been working very hard on this goal. We've been making great progress on this goal. But, obviously, in a world where COVID is still with us, we have to think about this goal a little differently, because some of the circumstances that we live and work in have changed.

Enrollment is the sum of recruitment and retention, and COVID has definitely had an impact. Our approaches have to change. And if you look at the first bullet, the first bullet is really about continuing to adhere to our Protecting the Pack health and safety measures. And it's under enrollment goals because we've really learned from the past year's experience how important the face-to-face experience is to our students. We heard in the survey that was done by the remote working task force that 70 percent of them prefer in-person classes; that the opportunity to connect to faculty, advisors and to each other in social settings is an essential part of the university experience; and it takes a lot of work from the leadership team and from all of you to keep the campus open and safe in this way. So, I felt very positive that the trustees wanted to actually put this in our annual goals, because it's something that we would be working toward obsessively anyway. And I think acknowledging that that's part of our reality is important. And acknowledging how important that engage piece, that in-person piece, is to our students, I don't think we can do that enough.

The second bullet that you see on this slide is about delivering Strategic Enrollment Management Plan 2.0 to cover fiscal years '23 to '25, and have version 2.0 come out in February. I think you know we're about at the mid-point of our first Strategic Enrollment Management Plan. We've accomplished a lot of what was in there, but post-COVID, we need to think about things a little bit differently. We're actually ahead of our recruitment goals, but we took a hit at student retention, especially rising sophomores this year. We're way ahead of where we thought we would be in terms of the technology that's available to us. And that opens up some different possibilities. So, there was always a plan by the people who work in our strategic enrollment management strategies to have a refresh mid-point in the Strategic Enrollment Management, or SEM, Plan. We decided that a refresh might not be enough. We might actually need a re-boot and re-think about our targets and take advantage of what we've learned in COVID. So, that plan will be coming out in February. And I think that it's a good time to do it, because as we think about what we saw in the SWOT analysis

and the opportunities to also appeal to adults who have some college but no degree, we can now try to think about how we would incorporate that into SEM Plan 2.0. So, stay tuned for that. I have promised the board that, when that plan is ready, we will do a public presentation at the Board of Trustees meeting, and I'm sure that Vice President Jensen and Omar Ghrayeb and the SEM team will also be taking that around. I also want to say we're certainly not giving up on the elements that are in our equity plan. Our commitment to closing equity gaps to working on gateway courses and all of that, that work will continue.

I'm going to shift now to the third theme, academic excellence and curriculum innovation. I'm going to focus on the transdisciplinary work goal, goal 3A, and its three sub-goals. And I'm going to focus on this and the goals for the coming year focus a lot on doing transdisciplinary work. And I just want to make it clear, that's not really to diminish the importance of discipline, but it's rather to expand their impact and to think about the opportunity the university has in many different domains to collaborate more effectively and bring disciplines together to attack a problem.

Goal 3A, bullet 1 is about supporting ongoing work. Last semester, Dr. Blazey and Provost Ingram convened and charged two task forces to look at barriers to transdisciplinary scholarship and curriculum innovation on our campus. They're still working and I have not yet seen their recommendations, but I want to receive them, think about them and think about moving those forward. So, again, that first bullet is just about continuing to support work that's ongoing but not yet complete.

The second bullet is also about work that's ongoing and not yet complete. Everyone in here knows that there is absolutely amazing work that's being done by our Faculty Senate Social Justice Committee. And I know that Dr. Edghill-Walden has already spoken to that group about our plan to create a Community of Practice around equity at NIU. And that shared leadership structure is going to coordinate a lot of the great work that's going on within Faculty Senate and across other groups on campus. And it has the potential – and the work of the Faculty Senate Social Justice Committee – has the potential to catalyze bottom-up and top-down efforts to modify practice and systems that limit our faculty's creativity and impede the progress of faculty who work in transdisciplinary areas and BIPOC faculty whose scholarship can be devalued and diminished. This is something that's very important to the university, but it's not something that can come from the president or the provost or the leadership. So, the commitment of the Faculty Senate to interrogating our practices is something that's really special and really forward-thinking on our campus, and it's certainly our goal to help support that work. I want to note that the second bullet has parentheses at the end. It says that there is intentional overlap and synergy of goal 3A, this bullet, with goals that appear under the diversity, equity and inclusion theme. And I don't have time to go through how those goals synergize, but I want to just say that throughout our plan, some of our aspirations are important and bold enough that they get extra emphasis by being incorporated under more than one theme. And the work of the Social Justice Committee and the work across our campus on diversity, equity, inclusion and belonging is in that bucket. So, it appears a number of times in the university goals.

I also want to show another example that will be of interest where goals intersect and synergize across the themes. And it's also a subgoal of goal 3A. This subgoal of goal 3A speaks directly to providing positive incentives to pursue transdisciplinary scholarship and curricular innovation. This

goal is under academic excellence and curricular innovation, but it's one of three synergistic goals with the other under the four themes of diversity, equity and inclusion and research, scholarship, artistry and engagement. So, here you have a commitment that we will empower, support and incentivize teams to develop transdisciplinary initiatives in areas of social, racial and ethnic inequities, environmental justice, STEM education and artificial intelligence/machine learning, encouraging research questions to be framed with multiple lenses and to seek to address inequitable conditions.

Under this particular bucket of academic excellence and curricular innovation, the projects, the outcomes, will be opportunities for student engagement and learning, cross disciplinary coursework, credentials, capstone experiences, etc.

So, you may be wondering, how did these areas appear? How did we get environmental justice, STEM education, artificial intelligent and machine learning. And some of you may remember that pre-COVID, which seems like it was like years and years ago, but only a few years ago, there was a competition that came out of the vice president for research office, out of the RIPS division, for emerging research initiatives. And those proposals were submitted. They were reviewed. And then the process was halted, because no one was allowed to be on campus working in labs or collaborating with each other. Well, these areas are areas that emerged in that competition. And so, they're being revived under this transdisciplinary initiative so that we can make good on our commitment to moving those forward. They're also areas that really engage the interest of many of our students, as well as faculty and staff.

This is the goal 3A version. I'm now going to show you the goal 4C version. 4C is under our diversity, equity and inclusion theme. I don't know if you all know this, but there is a program that was piloted by the Academic Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Division and the Research Innovation Partnerships Division for a program of post-docs and post-graduate fellows to create a pipeline to diversify the faculty workforce. I think we've all spoken alone, in groups, on this floor and at University Council, about the fact that doing all the things we're doing is helping, but we need to try some innovative strategies. This was a strategy that was brought up. This is a strategy that we're expanding under the umbrella of this particular transdisciplinary initiative. We're going to be looking, not just for post-docs and post-graduates fellows, but also for visiting professors and research professors to support and enhance transdisciplinary scholarship in these key areas.

And I think the last goal that intersects in this area is 5B. And 5B is about investing in the research that goes with this that involves the fellows that could create the programs that will take part of the significant investment that the university is willing to make in these initiatives. At this point, you're probably wondering, how big is that investment going to be? What's the story going to be? And so, I can tell you some of the story, and I can't tell you all of the story. Exactly how these programs are going to roll out is under development; and Drs. Blazey, Edghill-Walden and Provost Ingram are talking about what the process or processes are going to look like right now. I know that they've had a few email conversations. I know that they have some meetings set up. But you'll have to remember you're seeing these goals less than a week after they were finalized with me and the Board of Trustees, so not all of the details are worked out.

What is worked out is that the university will invest at least \$1 million in three of the proposed transdisciplinary initiatives over the next three years. And based on my conversations with the other senior leaders, we feel that this is sufficient to start to move the needle, and we're committed to moving the forward.

I told you that we were at a point where we're previewing the goals. And just to kind of give you a sense of where we are in the timeline, I and members of the leadership team worked with the Board of Trustees on this from August 31 to September 23. Senior roundtable saw these on Tuesday. The deans saw them this morning. You're seeing them this afternoon. University Council will see a preview – and it may not be exactly this preview, it will be a little bit tailored for each audience – on October 6. On October 19, I'll go to an academic leadership meeting that includes all of the chairs. October 28, the Tuesday leadership meeting, that includes directors, will be apprised of the progress made. On November 11, the University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees will see what the final version that's going to be posted for the board meeting looks like. It will be posted on November 15 and formally considered by the board on November 18.

It's a fairly long process, but it's also a process that tries really hard to be efficient in gathering the input and the thoughts of all of you in creating a shared agenda to move the university forward in a ways that's consistent with our mission, vision and values. And I think at this point, I will just ask you if you have any questions. I know this was a lot in a short amount of time, and there is probably nobody in this room who has anywhere near the level of familiarity with the goal-setting process that I have. But this is my first step in trying to remedy that. And this is the first year that the way the timeline for goal setting aligns with the academic calendar really allowed me to do that, and I'm really happy to be here. With that, do I have time for a couple questions?

P. Chomentowski: Yes, and first I'd like to say thank you, President Freeman, for coming and providing this very informational presentation. If you have questions, please just move to one of the three mics around the room.

L. Freeman: It would really help me if you could identify yourself at the mic, too, because with masks on and without my glasses, it's not that easy for me to tell.

E. Nesterov: It was a very nice and informative presentation. I think all these goals are really very excellent and strong and will move the university forward. I think the devil is usually in the details, of course. And one thing, which I really liked is the attention to this face-to-face instruction, an in-person experience of the university. Unfortunately, like you know, this semester faculty are allowed to choose whether they want to teach online or face-to-face. And a lot of colleagues of mine and faculty in other departments, I know, teach online, which, actually, diminishes the student's experience, because again, I talk to students, and they are so happy that I teach my class face-to-face. But I see that other people teach it online. It's easier to teach online. It takes less effort. But it's a very bad experience for students, and I think, as we move forward, we really should look at this and see if we should allow faculty to choose or whether they should mandate face-to-face teaching. I know that a lot of big universities don't allow faculty to decide, and it's all face-to-face.

L. Freeman: Thank you for the comments. I think what I will say is the vast majority of our students prefer face-to-face classes, but there were still 20 percent of students who wanted to have

at least one class online. And there are also place-bound students, students who are in the incumbent workforce, who have really no choice but to have online instruction. In some of our graduate programs, that's true, but even for some of our non-traditional or post-traditional learners. So, I think we will always have online and face-to-face classes to meet the needs of the broad community of students that we serve. I think during a pandemic, we all have to show each other grace and understanding. All of our individual circumstances are different, and no one can predict what the virus is going to do. I'm going to knock wood when I say that, because right now I am extremely grateful for how fortunate we have been in terms of how seriously the members of our campus community take Protecting the Pack, the compliance that we've had with our COVID protocols, the willingness among our students and faculty to wear masks, which is not always fun, and the fact that the COVID rate on our campus and surveillance testing population has been at or below 1 percent since we came back in the fall. I want to do everything to keep it that way. I want to be respectful of people who have extenuating circumstances; and yet, I agree with you, our students want to be face-to-face with each other, with their advisors and with their faculty members. And I think it's a balancing act. I think that one of the things we've really learned from the pandemic is not just NIU, but higher ed in general, I think pre-pandemic, if you talked to most people about students who live in residence halls, the ability to live in a residence hall was seen as sort of a privilege, and residence halls were put in the same categories as climbing walls and floating rivers, like things that were great if you could afford it or parents could afford it. I think there's nothing that we've learned more from the last 18 months in that some of our students need to live on campus, to be close to support services, to have adequate technology, to have a study space where it's quiet, where they don't have overwhelming responsibilities associated with their families. And so to me, coming out of this, in addition to trying to figure out that right balance of online and in-person classes and respecting everyone in our community and their needs, figuring out how to make living on campus more affordable and more accessible for all of our students is another really important goal. I know that's not what you asked, but I have the microphone and the soapbox, so I'm just going to take advantage of it.

I know that's Dallas, I can tell, even with the mask on and without my glasses.

D. Douglass: Hello Dr. Freeman. I can tell it's you too. Thank you for coming. I really appreciate the dedication to shared governance and disseminating this information to us. Mr. Chair, do I have permission to ask two questions?

P. Chomentowski: Yes.

D. Douglass: Fantastic. First question, when this report is finalized and the goals are set in stone, where will that be published?

L. Freeman: It will be both on the president's website and on the Board of Trustees website. If you go to the President's Office website now, you can actually find this year's goals, the ones that we'll be getting progress reported toward the end of the year. If you go to the Board of Trustees website, I think you can look backward, I think you can look backward over a number of years of goals.

D. Douglass: Fantastic, thank you. Second question: You briefly mentioned the committee convened to increase diversity in faculty hiring. Could you provide kind of a status report on that committee? I'm personally invested in it and just curious.

L. Freeman: I don't know if I actually said there was a committee convened. I think what I was trying to say is that we've heard from numerous groups, from all of the groups on our campus working on faculty diversity. That would be the President's Commission on Race and Ethnicity, the Faculty Senate Social Justice Committee, the group formerly known as the Anti-Racist Committee, who I understand might have just changed their name, but I don't know what the new name is, from our Affirmative Action/HR talent acquisition people and from numerous folks across the colleges, that they appreciate the efforts we've made with implicit bias training, with bundling advertising in more diverse populations, in putting Janice Hamlet prominently in the Provost's Office with mentorship programs that are really accessible and available to faculty of color, but those are traditional things. They've moved the needle, but they're not everything we need. And when we look around the country at what universities that have been successful, have done to increase faculty diversity, often they've created cohorts, and they've integrated them with the university priorities in a very intentional way, research and teaching priorities. So, here, what we're trying to do is exactly the latter and to try to make that happen in a way that we can be accounted.

I think I talked about a Community of Practice, and that might be where you got the committee word.

D. Douglass: I think so.

L. Freeman: Dr. Edghill-Walden has been talking to colleagues in Chicago and around the country. And the general idea of experts in building equity leadership and sustaining momentum in DEI and belonging work is that we're actually pretty far ahead for a university, especially a university that was historically a predominantly white university. And so, there are a lot of things that they look at that we're doing that they can say others could try. But saying, NIU, where you are at this point in time, there are a lot of models for you to follow, there actually aren't a lot of models to follow. People are kind of interested in studying us. And yet we know that we've had a passion for diversity, equity and belonging on this campus for a very long time. We had it before we came together as a community and asked to hire a chief diversity officer in 2015-16. But part of the problem was that work was going on kind of like in uncoordinated sparks, and we did have a flame, we didn't have the collective impact. And now we have so much great work going on, and it's pretty far along. And we want to make sure that that work builds on each other, that it's synergistic, that the administration can catalyze and support that work effectively, which means we have to know about it and we have to know about each other's work. And so she's working on what a Community of Practice for equity at NIU would look like. And it would have representation from numerous groups on campus that are doing this work. They would meet regularly, not like once a week regularly, but maybe once a semester regularly – I don't know if that's worked out, I'm just trying not to scare anybody about how often it would meet – and it would be about information exchange, planning for collective impact. And also, we have a great narrative, and I'm not sure – I mean, obviously, we're starting to know how to put the narrative together, because we won two diversity, equity and inclusion recognitions that are public, and there'll be another one announced next week, so we're starting to get our story out – but I've seen the applications for these awards,

and they're very, very long, very long and small font. I think we really need help with the one paragraph elevator speech about our mission, vision, values and our commitment to DEI, belonging. And I think having that Community of Practice will really help us all develop those talking points in a way that it doesn't become Dr. Edghill-Walden's job and Jocelyn's job and the job of our ADEI division to tell that story, but all of us to tell that story, and all of us to tell that story in a way that we're really equipped and really proud to do.

D. Douglass: Thank you. The Community of Practice is what I was thinking of, and I look forward to seeing that work. Thank you.

L. Freeman: Thank you.

D. Bardolph: I appreciate the Community of Practice as an anthropologist. I come from the discipline of cognitive anthropology. I think that the idea about targeted post-doctoral fellowships or other programs like with the DEI aim in mind is really fantastic and a great idea for thinking about potential cluster hires. I'm curious with our current budget situation and hiring chill, what that timeline might look like and what we're thinking about in that regard.

L. Freeman: Exactly how that \$1 million will be distributed across the initiatives and goals has not yet been determined. But that \$1 million is a one-time commitment, not an ongoing commitment. So, the idea that would be used here, which is an idea that's worked at many other institutions is that we can front load hiring of folks to develop into faculty positions, but over time with faculty attrition, those folks would be hired and integrated and picked up by departments and colleges.

D. Bardolph: Thanks.

P. Chomentowski: Anymore questions?

T. Sullivan: I'm an instructor, so thinking, how about targeting grad students as instructors, as opposed to just going for the post-docs?

L. Freeman: I think that's a great idea. One of the reasons we're taking the goals out on the road to get input is at this point in time I don't think we're going to erase or blow up, but those are the kind of ideas that we're looking for. And I think that's a really great idea. And I think we have a goal that's all about hiring, retention and advancement of faculty. And I heard another idea from the deans this morning about them having better access to funds to help hiring incentives or retention incentives for faculty from diverse backgrounds. And so I think your idea and their idea can certainly be baked into the final document. Thank you.

P. Chomentowski: I want to say once again, thank you, to President Freeman for presenting today. [applause]

VIII. CONSENT AGENDA

P. Chomentowski: We'll go to Section VIII, which is our Consent Agenda for today. And we have no consent agenda for today.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- A. Proposed amendment to FS Bylaws, Article 2.1.3, Officers of the Faculty Senate
Page 9
SECOND READING/VOTE
Peter Chomentowski, President, Faculty Senate

P. Chomentowski: So, we will move on to Unfinished Business. So, we have two things under Unfinished Business. First is A, the proposed amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 2.1.3, Officers of the Faculty Senate, on page 9. I'll just read through it. It has been determined that the reference to the term, secret ballot, in Article 2.1.3 does not comply with the spirit of the Illinois Open Meetings Act (OMA). As a result, this proposal seeks to remove the word, "secret," from the language in Article 2.1.3.

Can I have a motion to approve the proposed amendment?

D. Valentiner: So moved.

P. Chomentowski: And a second?

I. Montana: Second.

P. Chomentowski: Any discussion or questions about this? It's kind of straightforward, comes from legal. All right, with no discussions or questions, hearing none, I think that we are ready to vote.

P. Erickson: Okay, so first thing, just a reminder, if you see your name up on this slide, that means you're a voting member, and you should go to the back and get a clicker if you haven't done that already. Or if you see the name of someone that you are here subbing for today, same instruction. And just a reminder, there is no need to turn the clickers on or off. They activate automatically when you vote, and they deactivate after several seconds of non-use. There's also no need to erase votes. The clickers automatically erase previous votes when you enter a new vote. In a minute, I'm going to open some software and give you three choices. One is yes, you agree with the motion to approve the proposal. Two is no, and three is abstain. Once you've pressed the selected number on your clicker, you should see a smiley face or a check mark. And as long as the poll is open, if you change your mind, you can just click a different number, and your old vote will go away and your new vote will take its place. So, now give me a minute to open the software for you.

Okay, so you can go ahead and click now. One is yes, two is no, three is abstain.

Unidentified: What channel?

P. Erickson: It's channel 45. They should be pre-set. Anybody having trouble with their clicker? Beth, are you having trouble.

B. McGowan: I'll get another one.

P. Erickson: Okay. Did it go through now. Is everybody okay? You good, Vicki? If you want to bring it up to me, I bet I can, hopefully, I can fix it.

P. Chomentowski: Maybe it's batteries?

P. Erickson: I checked the batteries a few weeks ago, but I will do that again tomorrow. Anybody else still waiting to vote? Okay, so that passes.

Yes – 46

No – 1

Abstain - 2

- B. Proposed amendment to FS Bylaws, Article 4.3, Academic Planning Council
Page 10
SECOND READING/VOTE
Beth Ingram, Provost
Omar Ghrayeb, Senior Vice Provost

P. Chomentowski: All right, so I'll move on to unfinished business B, proposed amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 4.3, Academic Planning Council, on page 10.

The proposed amendment is the position of the vice provost for institutional effectiveness has been eliminated. This proposal updates the bylaw to bring it into alignment. Chad, do you have anything that you'd like us to talk about on this?

Can I have a motion to approve the proposed amendment for Item B under unfinished business?

D. Collins: So moved.

P. Chomentowski: Can I have a second?

D. Douglass: Second.

P. Chomentowski: Any discussions or questions? Chad?

C. McEvoy: Happy to make a quick comment. I think this proposal is pretty straightforward. For a long time, the Academic Planning Council has been represented by faculty amongst each of the colleges at the university, along with student representative. The committee has had, historically, two ex officio administrative nonvoting members, the provost, as well as the vice provost for institutional effectiveness. This past year when Vice Provost Carolinda Douglass announced her intention to retire, our office decided to explore reorganization efforts consistent with the university's goal of reallocating resources and taking a hard look at the different things that we do. The opportunity presented itself to streamline that office and find efficiency. If you've worked with them, Greg Barker and the area of institutional research and testing, does a fantastic job in his area

as a director. And Ritu Subramony, similarly in the area of assessment. And so there was an opportunity there to reduce some of our administrative spend in that regard and eliminate that vice provost position.

P. Chomentowski: Thank you, Chad. Any discussion? Questions? Hearing none, I think that we are ready to vote.

P. Erickson: Hopefully, everybody has a working clicker this time around. And again, one equals yes, two equals no and three equals abstain. And, as you can see, it's open. Anybody need more time?

Yes – 48

No – 0

Abstain - 0

X. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Proposed amendment to FS Bylaws
 - Article 2, Officers of the Faculty Senate
 - Article 8, Personnel Review Responsibilities
 - Article 14, Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor
 - Pages 11-15
 - FIRST READING
 - Peter Chomentowski, FS President

P. Chomentowski: Now we'll move on to the new business. This is a first reading that we're going through for proposed amendments. The first one, during the 2020-21 academic year, Faculty Senate discussed and considered that the existing annual evaluation process of the Faculty Senate president and the faculty personnel advisor, as outlined in Article 8, should be streamlined. This proposal removes the existing evaluation process outline in Article 8 and, as an alternative, establishes a streamlined process, which requires that an annual report be provided to the Faculty Senate at the last regular meeting of the spring semester and subsequently provided to the executive vice president and provost. This alternative process was piloted during spring 2021. This proposal incorporates the alternative process in Articles 2.5 and 14.2.6.

Number two will be: The title, scope of duties, and compensation for the faculty and SPS personnel advisor have evolved over the years. The person holding this position is now considered to be a faculty personnel advisor, and the scope of duties relates only to faculty. This proposal incorporates amendments to align with the current practice.

Are there any questions about this first reading? We will have a second reading at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

A. Keddie: I don't quite understand it. Is it just going to be a report given to us, or are we going to have a chance to vote on whether the term should be renewed, or elect somebody else?

P. Erickson: Thanks, Arlene. I'm going to rely on some notes that I used last spring when we started piloting that program. And the simple answer is yes. The faculty personnel advisor, as well as the Faculty Senate president – both of those positions are elected positions. The faculty personnel advisor is elected every two to three years. The Faculty Senate president is elected every year. So, part of the discussion that we had last spring in Faculty Senate, we talked about a variety of things about whether the current process of the more formal evaluation committee, if that was warranted and valuable. We talked about how people are drafted from this body to serve on those committees. And often, because of their already busy schedules, really aren't even able to participate on those evaluation committees. And then we also talked about the fact that very often we are asking you all to serve on these ad hoc evaluation committees, evaluating someone who is the very next month going to be up for reelection. So, we felt that the election process being so frequent was an organic evaluation in and of itself.

P. Chomentowski: Any other questions or discussion?

V. Collins: Because I've served on this committee before, I'm just wondering – so, the proposal is for us to switch from having a subcommittee gather information and review and then prepare a report, to the president of Faculty Senate and the other position preparing the report themselves and then presenting it. And I'm just wondering, those are two very different processes for evaluating. And I didn't serve on Faculty Senate last year, so I'm just wondering about that. You provided a little bit of a rationale, but maybe a little more discussion would be helpful for me. Thank you.

P. Erickson: Yes, and you're accurate in your assessment, that is what the proposal is. Last year, some of the discussion included the fact that the committees, these ad hoc committees that are put together each spring to go through this more formal review process – they rely heavily on a survey. And for the Faculty Senate president, the average response rate is between 22 and 26 percent. For the faculty personnel advisor, it's between 2 and 6 percent. So, the thought of that item was that we weren't all sure last year if those surveys were really valid.

E Nesterov: I have a question about this article 14 some changes there. Why has “tenured” been removed, because it says it serves for three-year term. But, you know, a non-tenured faculty member may not necessarily be able to serve a three-year term, because they may be not receiving tenure and removed from the personnel before the expiration of the term. So, I think having tenured faculty is really important to ensure that they can serve a three-year term.

And the second is a question, why is it non-unionized? What is special about non-unionized? Won't they be able to advise unionized faculty members?

P. Erickson: The first part was why did we remove the word, “tenure,” and I think part of the thinking in that was that it would allow clinical faculty to serve in the role, whereas, if we keep that word, “tenured,” in there, they would be excluded from the pool. But, of course, this is the body that decides whether or not that word should be in there, so that's feedback for us all to discuss and think about now. Now I forgot the other question.

E. Nesterov: Why non-unionized?

P. Erickson: Oh, yes, the advice that we received – do you want to take that – it was advice from General Counsel?

P. Chomentowski: Yes, the advice we received was to actually move it toward being the non-unionized, because the union actually does cover those people. So a question that comes up is how many non-unionized faculty we have, and we do have quite a few. [inaudible] Counsel that the faculty personnel advisor should be more working with the non-unionized faculty when the rest of the faculty, who are considered unionized, would be working with the union themselves.

E. Nesterov: [inaudible] applies to all the faculty, regardless of whether they're unionized or non-unionized and, therefore, the same conditions will be applied to non-unionized faculty, even if they are not unionized, I mean as unionized, because this is the same rules as has been negotiated, really. We cannot apply different rules to non-unionized faculty simply because they are non-unionized. Still union-agreed contract is applied to everyone, even those who are not part of the union officially.

P. Chomentowski: Go ahead, David.

D. Valentiner: I wonder if part of the problem might be that there may be faculty who are not members of the union, but are members of the bargaining unit. And I think that they could, if I understand correctly, they can avail themselves of the grievance officer in the union. I may be mistaken about that, but I think that that is the case.

Then there are faculty, such as in the College of Law, who are not part of the bargaining unit. And so, in essence, this to me, sounds like it's a faculty advisor for the College of Law.

C. McEvoy: Thanks, David. The College of Law, plus I would add we have additionally a number of clinical faculty on campus who are not represented by a bargaining unit, as well as a smaller number of research faculty who are also not a member of the bargaining unit. And so those faculty colleagues, too, lack the union representation in that regard. And so the faculty personnel advisor would exist to serve their needs with disputes or concerns.

G. Slotsve: Taking what David said, do we want to change the wording to “non-unionized faculty that are not represented by a bargaining unit”? Would that clarify, just say that you aren't represented by a bargaining unit to try to clarify who's covered and who isn't covered?

E. Nesterov: It would be a good idea, I agree, to remove “non-unionized” and just leave faculty who are not represented by the bargaining unit. That will take care of those who are not represented, like college of whatever, I forgot what colleges they are.

D. Valentiner: I think I agree with you on that, although I'm not sure. What I'm wondering is if we're saying that the unionized faculty could not avail themselves of the services of the faculty advisor, then they would have to go through the grievance procedure. And that would place a greater burden upon the grievance officer in the union. So, I would very much like to hear from the grievance committee of the union about this particular issue, because I think it will mean that 600-some-odd faculty are now going to rely exclusively upon that process and will not have this process.

By the way, there is a third process that they also have, which is the ombudsperson. So, as a faculty member, you can go to the advisor, you can go to the union grievance officer, or you can go to the ombudsman. And to me, it seems as though having perhaps all of those people weigh in on this would be prudent.

D. Douglass: Are we voting today or is this a first reading.

P. Chomentowski: This is a first reading. We're just having discussions.

D. Douglass: Okay, in that case, can I make a discussion point?

P. Chomentowski: Sure.

D. Douglass: I might recommend contacting the union board or gathering more information before making a decision on this, so we might postpone or table.

P. Chomentowski: Thank you. Any more discussion? Like I said, this is a first reading, and we'll go back and look at the comments that were made. And we'll see about changing the wording before we bring it back.

XI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

- A. Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE – report
Linda Saborío, NIU representative to FAC-IBHE

P. Chomentowski: Next, we'll go to Reports from Councils, Boards and Standing Committees. Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE – Linda.

L. Saborío: Hello. The FAC met on September 17 this month via Zoom, and we have several new members this year on the council, including a faculty member from Kishwaukee Community College, right down the street here. At the meeting, we had the opportunity to meet our new members virtually, at least.

Then we had a report from Jen Delaney, she's the faculty rep on the IBHE. And she reported on the Higher Ed Strategic Plan. It looks like the IBHE is in the process of creating two checklists, one with short-term goals and one with long-term goals. And then, rather than create just one overarching implementation plan committee, they are looking to create smaller working groups with experts in particular areas who can contribute to the discussions. One example of this is the early childhood consortium that we have ongoing.

Mike, who is our legislative liaison, reported that the General Assembly passed a committee to look into performance funding. I was going to ask President Freeman about this, but she left already. It's called the Committee on Equitable University Funding and it plans to convene in October. It does look like the committee will include – and I'm quoting here from the report – “two members to

advocate on behalf of public university faculty members,” which is good so that we can have some input to this process.

And then that was it for my [inaudible]. Council discussed the new legislative map for Illinois. It was more of an informational meeting, as you can tell, the first meeting of the year.

In our public caucus, we discussed plans for teaching this semester, different modalities at different public universities; campus vaccination efforts, which seem rather similar across the 12 public universities; and shared governance group meetings, which surprised me when I heard that other public universities are not convening in person.

And then our working groups met. Like I mentioned at the last meeting, we have six working groups this year: mental health; dual credit; alternative credentialing; equity and diversity; performance-based funding; institutional closures; and college affordability and student debt. So, if you have any issues or ideas that you would like to share with me or ask me to bring to the FAC, please contact me directly, or you can reach me through Pat. Everybody knows how to contact, Pat. If you don’t, well I don’t know what to tell you.

Our next meeting of the FAC will be on October 15. We were supposed to meet down in Springfield, but they decided that they’re not ready yet for large groups at the university. So, we’re going to meet virtually, but we do have a few guest speakers who will be joining us that day.

Any questions? Thank you very much.

P. Chomentowski: Thank you, Linda.

- B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – report
Felicia Bohanon, Holly Nicholson, Peter Chomentowski
Katy Jaekel, Karen Whedbee, Greg Beyer

P. Chomentowski: Now we’ll move on to the University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees. Do any of the members have any report? I’ll note that the Board of Trustees met last week. At the last Faculty Senate meeting, I presented you with some information that came from their individual committee meetings. They had their full board meeting on Thursday and so, basically, it was approving most of the things that came through their individual committee meetings. So, things that I gave you information on last time like the new phone systems and the printing services. If you’d like to view the items, you can look at the Board of Trustees website. Besides that, I don’t have any new information from the Board of Trustees meeting from last Thursday.

Any other members of UAC, Felicia? Karen?

F. Bohanon: No.

- C. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee –no report
Nancy Petges, Chair

P. Chomentowski: Moving to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee. Nancy, we don't have any report, correct?

N. Petges: Correct.

- D. FS/UC Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – ~~report~~ no report
Ben Creed, RGE/FS Liaison/Spokesperson

P. Chomentowski: For the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee, we have no report.

- A. Per FS Bylaws, Article 4.5.1.1 (D), selection of one tenured or tenure-track faculty member of Faculty Senate to serve as a nonvoting member of the [Baccalaureate Council](#) for 2021-22.

The BC meets the second Thursday of the month, 12:30-3 p.m. via Microsoft Teams.

- E. Social Justice Committee – report
Ismael Montana, Chair

P. Chomentowski: The Social Justice Committee, Ismael has a report.

I. Montana: For the Faculty Senate Social Justice Committee, we held our first meeting on September 15. And it being the first meeting, one of our main action items was to seat the new members and also assign members to three working groups that the Faculty Senate standing committee created within. And these are Institutional Racism led by Beth McGowan; Diversity, Equity and Inclusion working group led by Elisa Fredericks; and Academic Affairs led by Ben Creed.

Because this was our first meeting, we discussed our agenda for this academic year, 2021-22, briefly reviewed the Faculty Senate charge to the Social Justice Committee, because that is primordial and that is central in terms of the work ahead.

And most importantly, we reviewed five prioritized recommendations that are going to guide our agenda moving forward. In light of President Freeman's reference to the work that the Faculty Senate Social Justice Committee is doing, I think it's kind of [inaudible] going back to the process from when the then-Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Social Justice Committee presented the report; and then after that report, feedback was received; the leadership of the committee including [inaudible] and Kendall at the time, we held a series of meetings with university leadership. And out of those meetings, they asked us to come up with tangible recommendations that we could work together. And it was through that, we identified five prioritized recommendations that, as I said, form the core of our agenda. And, of course, among the issues as they may arise.

So, that's where we are now. Each of the working groups have been delegated and tasked to tackle one or two of these five prioritized recommendations.

During this meeting, too, we had the pleasure to welcome Vernese Edghill-Walden, who President Freeman mentioned during her speech here, briefed the Social Justice Committee about the work ahead, the work that has been done, and particularly, the Community of Practice that is about to be launched, and for which the Faculty Senate Social Justice Committee, just as we have been a central and core part of the anti-racist coordination committee, we will continue to work hand in hand with Vernese's office.

And we had a briefing from the three working groups. It was not an in depth briefing, because this was their very first meeting. So, our priority during this meeting was introductions, discuss our agenda and then review the prioritized recommendations, and then reconstitute into our working groups, and then take it from there.

Our next meeting is scheduled for October 13, and that will be held in Altgeld 125. Anyone interested in coming, we will welcome you. So, this is what I have to share. If there are questions, thank you.

P. Chomentowski: Thank you, Ismael.

- F. Student Government Association – report
Devlin Collins, President
Dallas Douglass, Speaker of the Senate

P. Chomentowski: Now, we'll move on to the Student Government Association. Devlin and Dallas, any report?

D. Collins: No report.

- G. Operating Staff Council – report
Natasha Johnson, Representative
Zac Birch, Representative

P. Chomentowski: So, we'll move on to Operating Staff Council. Is there a report?

F. Bohanon: Hello everybody. For the Operating Staff Council, if you all remember last time we were here, we voted to have two one-year terms, which is myself and Zac Birch. So, we'll be representing the Operating Staff Council on Faculty Senate this year; and Holly [Nicholson] will inform us of different things that she feels are urgent or for you to know. We'll be doing the same thing for University Council, as well, to my knowledge, it's already approved. We're just going to do elections and, to my knowledge, one person that's not on the council could give the staff at large an opportunity to join in without all the commitments of the committees and everything. And I will just send them an email saying, "hey, don't forget about this." We also decided that we would just

flip between Zac and me. I'll give a report and then he'll give a report, and we'll go on so on and so forth.

One thing that the Operating Staff Council is working on is the Civil Service Emergency Fund. We did get a chance to get a booth at Corn Fest, and we took some donations from there as well. The newsletter just came out, and it has information on how anybody can donate, how they can use their credit card or send a check. We have a Foundation account set up to be able to help staff who are going through very trying times. And, as many of you may or may not know, a lot of the civil service workers, whether it be through APAC [Administrative Professionals Advisory Council] – they have a letter out to address the concerns with so many of the administrative staff not being replaced and just today someone noted it was like 27 percent shortage based on this time last year. So, they're going to be working with senior leadership to try to figure that situation out as well. And many of the civil service staff are doing two, three and four positions, which is why we have such a bug turnover. People are trying to help out wherever they can and be truthful and honest about if they can take on something or if they can't. And so, sometimes you might see multiple people getting someone else to show up for them, that's probably why. And so, we're all still trying to work through all of that through this pandemic, as well. With that, OSC has partnered with Recreation, which is where I work, to offer bonus time for health and wellbeing initiatives for Recreation memberships. Currently, as a faculty or staff member, you get an annual membership for \$120 for the whole year. So, what we did, since we can't go any lower than that, that's the lowest anywhere, we added on three additional months. So, if you were to buy a membership today, your membership would not expire until January 2, 2023. So, as a way to kind of give back while people are still going back and forth with not understanding where can they prioritize their health, because maybe they're tired from working 12 hours a day, whatever it may need to be.

So, those are just a few of the things we're working on, and my hope is that I'll forward it to Pat, and Pat can forward that on, the Operating Staff Council newsletter that has all the information on how you can help donate. And we would just ask, put yourself in that position. If you're in the position where maybe your spouse or someone else who was helping in the household and they lost their job and you still have kids or whatever the case may be, if you can afford to donate, we're asking that you would help partner with us to do so. So, I'm going to forward the information to Pat, and then Pat is going to send the information to all of you lovely people. And hopefully, we can get enough funds to really help our staff who are working very hard to keep the university going. Thank you.

P. Chomentowski: Thank you, Natasha.

H. Supportive Professional Staff Council – report
 Felicia Bohanon, President
 Stephanie Richter, Representative

P. Chomentowski: Now, we'll move on to Supportive Professional Staff Council, Felicia?

F. Bohanon: Just a few items from Supportive Professional Staff Council. We had our first meeting on September 9. We are working this semester on our workplace climate survey, which I'm anticipating will go out in the next two weeks. One of the major issues that we're continuing to

wrestle with is the transition of SPS staff to civil service. So, many of the issues that Natasha mentioned are the same issues that members of the Supportive Professional Staff are dealing with, particularly issues of workload. And so, that's one of the major issues that we'll be focusing on this year. At our last meeting, we looked at individuals coming in to their officer positions and then making sure that we had all of the University Council positions filled. So, that's basically what we did at our first meeting.

P. Chomentowski: Thank you very much, Felicia.

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

- A. [Policy Library](#) – Comment on Proposed Policies (right-hand column on web page)
- B. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council
- C. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board
- D. [Minutes](#), Baccalaureate Council
- E. [Minutes](#), Board of Trustees
- F. [Minutes](#), Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
- G. [Minutes](#), Comm. on the Improvement of the Undergraduate Academic Experience
- H. [Minutes](#), General Education Committee
- I. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council
- J. [Minutes](#), Honors Committee
- K. [Minutes](#), Operating Staff Council
- L. [Minutes](#), Supportive Professional Staff Council
- M. [Minutes](#), University Assessment Panel
- N. [Minutes](#), University Benefits Committee
- O. [Minutes](#), Univ. Comm. on Advanced and Nonteaching Educator License Programs
- P. [Minutes](#), University Committee on Initial Educator Licensure
- Q. [2020-21 Annual Reports](#)
- R. FS meets monthly on Wednesdays, 3 p.m. in the Barsema Alumni & Visitors Center, 231 N. Annie Glidden Road, DeKalb. 2021-22 dates: Sep 1, Sep 29, Oct 27 (Altgeld Auditorium, 2nd floor), Nov 17, Jan 26, Feb 23, Mar 30, Apr 27.

P. Chomentowski: All right, the last thing is Information Items. If you would please look at Item R, you will see that on October 27, our Faculty Senate meeting will be held in Altgeld Auditorium. While we have this room for the whole year, for that one date, we were asked if we could give this room up for something else for the university, and we agreed. So, we were granted Altgeld Auditorium on the second floor. So, it's only one meeting, the next one, October 27. Please make a note of that. If anyone is curious about parking over there, you can park by the lagoon and also the parking behind the art and music building is blue parking. You'll also get an email reminder letting you know that, for this one meeting, we will be moving into Altgeld Auditorium.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

P. Chomentowski: With that said, I'll move to adjournment. Can I get a motion to adjourn the meeting today, and a second.

Unidentified: So moved.

D. Valentiner: Second.

P. Chomentowski: All right. All those in favor of adjourning the meeting today, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

P. Chomentowski: No? Any abstain? All right, meeting adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.