

TRANSCRIPT

FACULTY SENATE

Wednesday, February 21, 2024, 3 p.m.

Altgeld Hall Auditorium, 2nd Floor

Northern Illinois University

DeKalb, Illinois

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Akst, Arado, Atkins, Barrett, Bohanon, Books, Boswell, Brain, Campbell, Creed, Duffin, English, Finch, Fotovat, Guzman, Hartenhoff, Ito, Johnson, Jong, Kim, Kupelian, Lampi, Larkin, Luo, Marsh, McGowan, McKee, Mellon, Mills, Naples, Nesterov, Nyunt, Palese, Porter, Qin, Ross, Rossetti, Salimi, Scanlon, Sharp, Sirotkin, Staikidis, Swedlow, Vahabzadeh, Valentiner, Wang, Whedbee, Zumanu

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Chomentowski, Demir, Harris, Kreitzer, Liberty, Martinez, Rajabi, Ruetsche, Slotsve, Van Wienen, Xie

OTHERS PRESENT: Bryan, Buhrow, Cormier, DeThorne, González, Pitney, Saborío, Schatteman, Sumner

OTHERS ABSENT: Cripe, Falkoff, Ferguson, Garcia, Hughes, Swingley

I. CALL TO ORDER

B. Creed: I'd like to call to order today's meeting of the Faculty Senate, Wednesday, Feb. 21.

II. VERIFICATION OF QUORUM

B. Creed: Pat, can you verify that we have a quorum.

P. Erickson: We do have a quorum.

III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

B. Creed: Next up is adoption of the agenda. May I have a motion to adopt the agenda?

F. Bohanon: So moved.

B. Creed: And a second?

C. Campbell: Second.

B. Creed: All in favor of adopting the agenda for today's meeting, say aye.

Members: Aye.

B. Creed: Opposed?

IV. APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 24, 2024, MINUTES

B. Creed: Next up is the approval of the January 24, 2024, minutes. May I have a motion to approve the minutes?

T. Arado: So moved.

B. Creed: Therese. And a second?

B. McGowan: Second.

B. Creed: Thank you. Any discussion, corrections? Hearing none, all in favor of approving the January 24, 2024, minutes, please signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

B. Creed: Opposed? Abstentions? The minutes are approved.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

B. Creed: Pat, do we have any public comment?

P. Erickson: No public comment today.

VI. FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

B. Creed: That brings us to item VI. As you can see, we have a pretty packed agenda today. It will get a little lighter as we get further on, but I'll touch on that in a minute. I'll keep my announcements fairly short. First, in conversation with Janice Hamlet, she'll be coming to present to Faculty Senate in an upcoming meeting, the March meeting; and I'll be sending out a survey around mentorship and some opportunities that faculty might be interested in to help inform her and inform her presentation. So, please look for that.

I've been working on compiling – I've used Faculty Senate Social Justice Committee as my guinea pig to share a little bit about overview of shared governance. I'm continuing to work on that orientation document about how it all fits together within the university.

I wanted to share an update on the executive vice president and provost search. We are in the middle of that. We have our second candidate on campus today. Our final candidate comes tomorrow. So, those who have already participated in the open forums, I appreciate that; and we all appreciate your feedback on the process. Tomorrow and Friday, if you look at the search website – and I'll share that after this meeting too – there are opportunities to participate in a faculty open

forum and a staff open forum. So, please do consider joining those in person or even online if that's better.

And then the final announcement that I have is just a reminder that we are in the recruitment campaign for university committees. So, if you've seen those go out from your deans or their assistants, and you can think of somebody to fill those positions, or yourself would be interested in, do please consider serving or encouraging those you know to serve in that capacity.

That ends my set of announcements.

VII. PROVOST'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

B. Creed: Moving on to item VII, Provost Announcements, I'll turn it over to VP Bárbara González to kick us off with that, thank you.

B. González: Hello, good afternoon. I'm here representing Provost Elish-Piper, who cannot be here today. I have a few announcements for you. The Preparing Future Faculty of Color Conference starts this Friday; it's Friday and Saturday. As you know, this event brings graduate students of color representing 17 universities to NIU's campus to learn about the professoriate as an impactful career and how to prepare for it. If you see them around on Friday or Saturday, please say hi and tell them how great it is to be a faculty member. This year's theme for the conference is Representation Still Matters: Creating Pipelines and Pathways in Promoting Faculty Diversity and Championing Social Justice in Higher Education. The conference begins this Friday at 3.

As you may already know, we have a new director of academic and labor relations. Dave DeThorne is our new director. Prior to coming here, he served as director of academic labor relations at Western Michigan University in Kalamazoo, Michigan, and he brings a total of 13 years of experience with labor relations to his position here at NIU. So, please help me welcome him.

D. DeThorne: I don't know if I'm supposed to speak or not, so I'm just going to throw that out there. I'm Dave. I'm glad to be here. Everybody is every welcoming. Anybody know how to make parking ticket appeals, meet me after the meeting.

B. González: I also want to announce that we are still accepting application for the David W. Raymond Award for Use of Technology in Teaching. All tenured and tenure-track faculty in all content areas using technology in their classes may apply for this award. It's a monetary award of \$1,000, so please apply if you haven't done so.

Another thing is to point you in the direction of the [Open Classroom Weeks](#). Excellence in teaching is a cornerstone of our mission here at NIU, and it is continued learning and development for everyone in our community. And yet, we rarely have the opportunity to learn from our best faculty by observing them in the classroom, particularly outside our own disciplines. So, Open Classroom Weeks is a brand new program that CITL is sponsoring that provides faculty with the opportunity to sit in on a college course or a co-curricular event. Participating in Open Classroom Weeks is an opportunity to learn new approaches to teaching and make connections across disciplines. Some of NIU's best faculty are opening their classrooms to colleagues interested in exploring teaching

strategies and techniques, including recipients of the Presidential Teaching Professor, Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching, Excellence in Undergraduate Instruction and Excellence in Online Teaching Awards, as well as ACUE Distinguished Teaching Scholars. So, we have really fantastic teachers opening their classrooms. You do need to register, because we want the classrooms to have a limited number of people, but I believe there are still spots in some of them. So, I encourage you and the faculty you represent, please let them know so that they register for some of these. It's a really great opportunity, and it's going on right now.

One more thing: There is a call for faculty presentations and judges for the [Conference on Undergraduate Research and Engagement](#). CURE, which used to be the Undergraduate Research and Artistry Day. They need faculty and staff for professional development sessions for the students. They need them for undergraduate research discovery hour. And they need them to judge student posters during the Undergraduate Research Symposium. If you're interested in doing any of those things, you can go to the [OSEEL website](#) and register to do those. I encourage you to do so and to tell the rest of the faculty to do so.

Any questions?

B. Creed: Thank you for sharing those, and I'll also include those in the summary afterwards that goes out to Faculty Senate.

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- A. Proposed amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws
Article 4.8.1.6, University Assessment Panel – Administration Representation
SECOND READING and VOTE
Amy Buhrow, Assistant Vice Provost for Assessment and Accreditation

B. Creed: That brings us to item VIII, Unfinished Business. First up is the proposed amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws, which is found on page 8, related to Article 4.8.1.6, University Assessment Panel, Administration Representation. This is a second reading and will be followed by a vote. So, if you don't have your clickers, while we do the motioning and opening up for discussion, please grab a clicker at the back. Before we engage in a discussion, can I have a motion to consider the proposed amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws under item A?

T. Atkins: So moved.

B. Creed: Second?

J. Lampi: Second.

B. Creed: Thank you. If I can invite up Amy Buhrow to set the stage for us.

A. Buhrow: Thanks, Ben. This proposal is to add a nonvoting representative from the Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning to the University Assessment Panel membership. The UAP reviews and offers consultative feedback on assessment plans and mid-cycle status reports. Our

work really lets our members see the patterns that indicate lack of assessment-related knowledge and skill, patterns that could be addressed through campus-wide CITL programming. By incorporating this CITL rep within the UAP, we anticipate improved communication between the two units and better understanding of the assessment-related professional development needs on campus, and more timely interventions. We think this is a proactive approach that will help us optimize our assessment practices on campus. In addition to adding this member, there's a small grammatical change, deleting the term, "ex officio." Can I answer any questions?

B. Creed: All right, sounds like there are no questions, thank you. So I will now turn it over to Pat to lead us through the clicker voting.

P. Erickson: Okay, and it's been a while since we've used clickers; so, just a reminder that there's no need to turn them on or off. In a moment, when I open the poll, we'll ask you to click 1 or A for yes, you agree with the motion to approve this amendment proposal; 2 or B is no, you do not agree; and 3 or C is abstain. And you can click in now. And we need two-thirds of those voting to vote yes in order to pass the proposal. Maybe another few seconds. Okay, and that clearly passes.

YES – 36

NO – 4

ABSTAIN - 1

- B. Proposed amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws
Article 3, Standing Committees of the Faculty Senate
Article 8, The Academic Personnel Process
Article 9, General Academic Personnel Procedures
SECOND READING and VOTE
Ben Creed, Faculty Senate President

B. Creed: That brings us to item B under Unfinished Business, which is another proposed amendment to the Faculty Senate Bylaws that are found on pages 9 through 30. This is an update to Article 3, 8 and 9. This again is a second reading and then a vote. Before opening discussion, can I have a motion to consider the proposed amendment as outlined under B? There's a second? Taylor.

Over the past three years, various groups comprised of both faculty and administration have engaged in reviewing various aspects of the tenure and promotion system here at NIU. Several areas were identified for improvement, which reside within the Faculty Senate Bylaws. First, there are currently no articles in the Faculty Senate Bylaws governing the process for clinical or research faculty promotion. Second, it was recognized that the tenure and promotion system was not aligned closely with NIU's mission, vision and values. And third, there is an identified need for the language and examples in Article 8 to be updated to be inclusive of various forms of scholarship, research and artistry, teaching and librarianship and service, as well as to be more equitable and inclusive for all faculty. And then fourth, there was a need for college tenure and promotion policies to be kept current and resources made available to support this work.

This proposal amends the current Faculty Senate Bylaws, which cover the tenure and promotion process at NIU, in order to modernize the tenure and promotion in step with recommendations of multiple NIU stakeholders, as well as in alignment with the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities, disciplinary associations and accreditation bodies. B, it ensures the alignment of our tenure and promotion system with NIU's mission, vision and values, as well as university goals; and C, it ensures an equitable and inclusive system that sees as valid, valued and valuable the broad range of work of our faculty members.

The proposal includes the following changes: It includes promotion criteria, guidelines and processes for clinical and research faculty, ensuring they have representation in the promotion process at the Faculty Senate level, and also ensures they have representation during the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee's deliberations. It includes and updates the Faculty Senate Bylaws, expanding what is named as valid and valued in promotion and tenure, including work that is transdisciplinary, interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary and/or community engaged. It also creates a requirement for colleges to review promotion and tenure guidelines to ensure college policies and systems are in alignment with the mission, vision and values of the university, as well.

What you'll notice in yellow – there are three instances of this in the document. This is based on conversation at the first reading, so these are the changes that were made from the first reading to this reading. The first is on page 15 where the word, “may,” was inserted at 8.2.1.7, to ensure that it is clear that it's not intended that all of these have to be done, but these are some that may be included in considerations related to personnel decisions. On page 18, noticing that 8.3.1.1 should be “teaching or librarianship effectiveness” rather than just “teaching effectiveness.” It was simply a clerical issue in pulling these multiple proposals together, so that was inserted back in. And then finally, based on the discussion of this body, 8.3.4 is no longer slated for removal, which is the article related to time in rank for promotion for the rank of associate professor and/or professor.

So, with that, I will open it up for discussion from the floor.

C. Campbell: Cynthia Campbell, College of Education, Department of Educational Technology, Research and Assessment. I have four points that I want to mention that are questions that my faculty had and also some concerns. So I'd like to just get some feedback and some clarity, and I'll just take it one point at a time and stay here by the microphone.

B. Creed: Sounds good.

C. Campbell: Going through it by scope and sequence, just a question on page 12 and really throughout everything in this document, the word, “equity” appears. And the word, “fairness” has been removed. And so, the question was: Because there can be some confusion about what equity means, what would equity look like in practice during personnel processes?

B. Creed: First, just to make sure it's clear, in 8.7 at the end, the word, “fair,” is still in there. It's still a system that is intended to be fair. I think all the work is, in fact, designed to make it more fair, more fair of a process, more inclusive of the work that's going on, pulling work that is otherwise being done but not rewarded or valued, into the consideration. So, I think fairness is a principle that's embedded throughout. And then as far as equity goes, I think the intention based on the work

of the various groups – and anybody that was involved in that work, please feel free to add on to what I say – but I think in the intro section under Article 8, what is described – and I think it’s the last three sentences. There’s a sentence, “The process is guided by Northern Illinois University’s values and centers equity and inclusion and ethics and integrity.” This is on page 12 of the packet. Then the following sentences where it says, “As such, it is recognized that what constitutes excellence can vary among faculty based on discipline, responsibilities, and commitments.” I think that’s where the idea of equity comes in, that we all are faculty, but we all serve different roles in our departments. We all serve different roles within our colleges. We all serve different roles within the university. And this is a system that allows for that variation to be a value-add as opposed to a hindrance. The personnel process to support faculty who do a variety of high-quality work that allows for differentiation by discipline, that allows for it by role served by that faculty member. So, that’s where I think equity is operationalized in the policies there. And then that’s kind of the guiding principle. And then if you follow through, there are multiple ways that excellence can be manifest for teaching and librarianship, for scholarship, research and artistry. So, that’s where the equity component comes in. It’s to say, a fair system is not one that treats everybody equally and exactly the same, but it applies a system and a process equally and fairly and transparently, that allows for that differentiation of roles, responsibilities and duties.

C. Campbell: Okay. I think some might say that equity would sometimes undermine fairness, because people are being treated differently. So, it’s just something to think about. I don’t know if it’s operationalized anywhere, but how we’re operationalizing equity in terms of practice – I don’t know if the university has it laid out somewhere if that could be referenced in these bylaws?

B. Creed: I think the idea that equity is an unfair thing, in my opinion, and manifest through the document here, I think it’s a fairness-enhancing approach to recognize that we all have various ways to show our excellent and responsibilities and duties. So, I think the application of a system that allows for that and operationalizes a system that supports that is, actually, a contributor to fairness. And I think stepping away from an equitable approach, a differentiated approach, as manifest in this document, that are based on things that are directly in alignment with the professional roles and responsibilities of faculty members, whether those are clinical, research, tenure-track, I think that’s equity for fairness. As far as equity statements university wide, I think there are various ones that are often focused not specifically on this process. And I think referencing a definition of equity that is used for other purposes maybe provides less clarity than one that is operationalized within here through these processes.

C. Campbell: Thank you. Okay, I’ll move on to my next point. It’s on page 17. The specific comment or question that I have is related to criteria for personnel decisions, which starts off on page 15. When you look at the personnel decisions for professional assignment, research and then service – and personnel decisions have to do with merit, as well as T&P – but when it gets down to the service, there’s a portion that’s scratched out. Even though it says this is for merit, it kind of leaves it open, because everything above that didn’t relate. I mean, this is different, because it relates to merit, as well as T&P. And so, at first reading, it looks like doing lots of service could get you tenure based on doing lots of service. And the question that was concerning was thinking about unintended consequences for that. Optimizing representation with regard to various service opportunities could put over-burden on certain individuals, because we’re looking for

representation, which then could take time away from more scholarly activities. So, I just wonder what the rationale for doing that is and getting some feedback.

B. Creed: Again, I think you flagged the component that was intentionally placed in there, that this part of annual merit evaluations should, in particular, recognize those who engage in heavier service loads, rather than a tenure and promotion component. The idea is to recognize folks who do have a heavier service load in a given year, that if there's annual merit increases associated with that or any other recognition around the annual merit process, that there are going to be times when folks maybe have to step up to serve in certain ways, whether that's as chair of a search committee or serve to redesign a program within their department, that that would not necessarily come at the cost of earning annual merit increases or at the cost of getting a positive review in a single year. However, the intention and the collective part here that you're flagging and the process, I don't think it would be interpreted as service being the only thing that somebody has to do in order to earn tenure and promotion. I think there's clearly alignments where it talks about teaching being fundamental to the role of the faculty member, as well as research and scholarship, as well, earlier on in this section. But the intention there is by including the clause, annual merit evaluations, in particular, should consider that, that that was the idea to, actually, incentivize folks, or remove disincentives from not stepping up to do service, because they're concerned about annual merit or because they're concerned about doing it in one year may take away from their likelihood of being promoted or tenured.

C. Campbell: Yes, sure. And so, it sort of distinguishes itself in that last sentence about, okay, now we're thinking about this in terms of annual merit. And the sentence that was struck out seems to be very clear: This doesn't apply to purposes of tenure and promotion or sabbatical leave. "It should be accorded significantly less importance than effectiveness in teaching and scholarly achievement." So, we were thinking distinguishing the two different applications of this might be clearer in this document.

B. Creed: Yes, Therese.

T. Arado: As I understood it when this was being created, this section was intended to acknowledge some folks who I see here, who I see everywhere around campus, kind of doing more. And as you mentioned, there are some people that take on the role of representing different entities across campus, and this was meant to provide that recognition. And within this section of service, this is a component. And so, I thought we took out the wordy "extraordinary nature" part because this is up to each individual tenure and promotion-granting entity how they apply it, rather than saying. Because somebody in some departments, service might have a greater impact on the promotion and tenure process in that area, than it would in another area. And this gave that flexibility. That's how I understood it and why that part was taken out and the rewording.

B. Creed: Thank you for that, Therese.

E. Nesterov: Evgueni Nesterov, Chemistry. I think I agree that the crossed-out phrase probably should be somehow retained, because I think here at the university, our primary mission is teaching and scholarly activity, not service. So, service for tenure and promotion should be [inaudible] department of lesser, should be offered less [inaudible] and less merit than our primary activities of

being a teacher and being a scholar. And I think that phrase clearly states this. Once it's crossed out, it creates pretty much uncertainty that some people can deserve tenure just doing a lot of service without doing enough teaching and scholar accomplishments. So, I think it should be somehow retained. I think I agree with that.

C. Campbell: Okay, thank you. The next question is on page 18, 8.3.1.2. The last sentence, the word, "and," was deleted and replaced with "or." The concern that we had was at least in our profession, we value all of it. Crossing off the "and," thinking again about unintended consequences, which could impact scholarship and so on. For example, someone could say, professional works, services doesn't count, so why should I bother to review articles? Why should I bother to get involved with conferences? Why should I bother to get involved with chairing sessions, running for office and so on, which then could impact their networking and staying current in their field. And so, we were just wondering what the rational was for striking "and" and replacing it with "or."

B. Creed: The rational is still that this is allowable within colleges and departments to operationalize underneath us. That's first of all. This provides a little flexibility in that set of language. But then I think more importantly, it's because to support [inaudible] programs. It's not saying to do service in these layers. It's saying that it's expected service to the university community and profession. It suggests broad service, broadly confined and valuing service that is done departmentally, at the college level, at the university level, as well as to the profession. But it's this idea "to work cooperatively with colleagues in efforts to support and improve the programs of..." So, if you are participating in journal review articles as a service; if you are working at the university college curriculum level; if you're working at the college curriculum level. And all of that manifests in changes and supports and improvements to your local program, that is service done at multiple scales, but the impact is at one of those four levels, rather than requiring folks to have an impact nationally or within their profession at the college level, at the university level and at the department. Again, that brings up the flexibility to operationalize and say, actually, we want all four of those, to be more rigorous than this. But the idea here is that the service can occur in alignment with your profession, with your discipline, with the local expectations of the discipline in the department, but that it's an improvement of the programs and supports of the programs at one of these levels at the minimum. So, that's the intention behind that.

C. Campbell: At a broader level.

B. Creed: Yea, it's not supposed to disincentivize service at any level, but it's supposed to say, here are the places that can be impacted.

C. Campbell: Okay, thank you. And the my last comment appears on page 19, section 8.3.1.3, titled Scholarly and Professional Achievement. The question is with B and C. Just asking for the rational for removing that someone can be promoted for public service and not research that was struck out. And just wondering why that was struck out.

B. Creed: I think it's to get at the earlier concern. I think this, in conjunction with earlier efforts is suggesting that somebody who does only public service would not be able to be eligible for promotion. By striking this out, it's trying to all be in alignment that it's not the only thing that

matters. I guess, as I re-read it, the idea here is that it's being consistent throughout where I guess we can think of the disciplines can decide what tenure and promotion looks like for their disciplines. It's not necessarily the university's job to put this line in here if that is what is valued and elevated within the local context, this allows for that if a discipline, in alignment with our accreditation, alignment with their field, suggests that. So, this is part of the modernizing that was recommended – I'm going to forget the acronym, forgive me as I look back to it – it's the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities' recommendation in modernizing. That's my understanding of what's happening here; it's allowing for the local authority to determine tenure and promotion locally, within the disciplines.

C. Campbell: This sentence that was struck out is very clear, and it spells out. And I'm just wondering, taking that out, are we opening ourselves up for this to be interpreted differently and say, well, it doesn't say that professional public service could get me promoted. And again, just sort of the rationale for taking away something that seems to be pretty clear.

B. Creed: I think again, it's that intention of alignment with essentialized system that is flexible to localized decision making around what is best for the department, for the discipline that is served by that department.

B. Swedlow: Brendon Swedlow, Political Science. I just want to follow up on what I'm understanding so far. There's a decentralization effort around this decision making where service for some departments, on their decision, could be a basis for tenure and promotion. And that is based on evidence somehow that you've acquired or feedback that you've gotten that this modernization is what's wanted by some disciplines. So, we could have units at the university that basically are tenuring and promoting folks based on service alone, if that's what they decide to do, right? I mean, that's what I'm hearing. Is that right?

B. Creed: I don't think that's the intended starkness of the conversation. If you read the sections the precede this, it is in my read, clear that teaching is listed first and defined as a core component of faculty identity, followed up by scholarship and research. And that those are fundamental aspects of it. I think what this is trying to do is the removal of these explicit languages, it could be interpreted the other way where you can do all the service in the world, but it doesn't count. So, it's trying to bring service back into counting, where as before, the read of it is that no matter what service you do, it doesn't matter at all. All that matters is the teaching and the scholarship components. And so, this is trying to remove that frame of mind where it's not just teaching and scholarship, or teaching, librarianship, scholarship, research and artistry, but it's also that service does play a role, but not the only role.

B. Swedlow: Okay, and I understand that. And that sounds more acceptable to me, personally. But it sounds like it also could be interpreted to go in the completely other direction from various comments that people have offered, so I don't see where it shows that it can't go completely the other direction and just service becomes a basis for tenure and promotion.

T. Arado: I think that would be caught or covered in a procedural aspect, because if a department suddenly changed their guidelines so that teaching and scholarship weren't necessary, doesn't that have to go through the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee for approval? And I think that review

process might pull up the red flag to say this is not in accordance with the spirit of this document as it was written and would go back to them? I think we have some fail-safes in place that would bring that into play. I mean, I don't read the document as allowing any one of those items to be the only thing; that all play a factor. This is just providing more recognition than has been in the past, not more recognition than other things, of on aspect of it. But I think we have fail-safes in place across the campus to stop a department from saying you volunteered, you're tenured.

B. Swedlow: Thank you. I guess it seems like the document is an important, or probably the important place for these fail-safes to be articulated. So, I'm just wondering where are they in the document?

Unidentified: I've been looking through to try to find this too and in 8.3 and then 8.3.1, it states, "Beyond the Board of Trustees' minimum requirements for the various academic ranks, individuals being recommended for promotion should meet the following criteria." And then that lists teaching and service and research. So, it suggests that they need to meet all those criteria, to me.

B. Creed: Thank you for that. And I think also if we are looking at 8.2.1.4, "Effectiveness in teaching is a significant aspect of a faculty member's professional performance." That's explicitly saying teaching is an integral component. And then the next section, 8.2.1.5, "Scholarly inquiry and research and artistic production are an integral component of the university and are indispensable...To align with the university's mission, a faculty member needs to engage in scholarly...activities designed to ensure continued currency and familiarity with the" discipline. And if we go to the service again, it talks about that being there. And this is a further operationalization of what was just flagged as part of the Board of Trustees' minimums. I do have one potential solution, but I want to hear from Evgueni.

E. Nesterov: I think if we retain that currently struck-out statement about service being of a lesser significance for tenure and promotion, and what was the survey [inaudible] tenure and promotion and merit or whatever, annual evaluations, no merit it was. So, if we retain that phrase there, I think that takes care about, it could not be interpreted over all the people can earn tenure based upon service or service would be considered a primary criterion for promotion or tenure and promotion. So, I think that retaining that phrase, which the service should have a lesser value, whatever, lesser impact, I think it takes care about the rest of the issues.

B. Creed: The suggestion is for in item (C) 5, whatever the whole thing is [8.2.1.7, (C) 5] where it was struck out, "However, for purposes of tenure, promotion or sabbatical leave, it should be accorded significantly less importance..." that statement being re-inserted?

E. Nesterov: Yea, I mean it should be a little bit edited, because the last phrase there is now not kind of correlating to that phrase. But I think overall, yea, that's what I would suggest.

B. Creed: We're seeing if we can do that.

Z. Wang: Hi, Ziteng Wang, Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering. It seems to me that all of these are more or less reorganization of the wording. If I look at section 8.3, University Criteria for Promotion, and then section 8.3.1, listing three categories of the criteria. And the second

category is talking about the service element. And the third category at 8.3.1.3, that's where I think the question was raised why the service element was removed? It was removed, but it's added back in 8.3.1.2 as the last phrase, "or academic/professional field(s)." And to me, it's clear that the service sentence or wording should be moved from scholarly and professional achievement to the service category. And then later, in 8.3.2, there is wording added to the paragraph. It says, "...a faculty member does not need to demonstrate...in all of the areas." However, that sentence emphasizes teaching and scholarship. Then the words are "and/or." Then it goes "practice and service." So, it seems to me that they prioritized a little bit teaching and scholarship over service, but it does recognize service. In the previous subsection, it's just rearranging the service language to the service category. So, I think we should read this all together instead of picking just one category to interpret.

B. Creed: Thank you for reading it comprehensively. In the moment, it's hard to remember all the pieces that are moved and where they live. And so, I appreciate that read and maybe that does address both concerns raised by Cynthia and Brendon, as well as Evgueni in 8.3.2 where it specifically says, "To be eligible...a faculty member does not need to demonstrate outstanding achievement in all," but the recommendation needs "demonstrated ability in teaching or...librarianship plus clear evidence of continued professional growth and activity in scholarship and/or clinical practice and service." So, it retains teaching as core and research, scholarship and artistry as core in that conversation, achieve excellence in teaching or the research, scholarship or artistry domain. But if it becomes clearer by including back in (C) on page 17, adding back in "However, for purposes of tenure, promotion, or sabbatical leave, it should be accorded significantly less importance than effectiveness in teaching and scholarly achievement," I feel like that's already manifest in the document that service is not supposed to be the thing you do to get tenure and promotion, but it can be part of your package and demonstration – you can't get it just by doing service; it's part of a whole package.

C. Campbell: That's all I have. Thank you for your comments and feedback.

D. Brain: Dennis Brain, World Languages and Cultures. I would recommend making two little changes. In the paragraph at the bottom of the screen, it says "Annual merit evaluations should, in particular,..." I think the point is you're saying annual merit evaluations, in particular, should consider... I would put the "in particular" together with the evaluations. I think the idea is that those things, in particular, among other things, should look at the particular year and the service of that year, etc. So, it would just be a matter of where the "in particular" is. And the other thing is, I think you could keep the paragraph that you've stricken about how service cannot be a replacement for scholarship and teaching effectiveness. I think you could keep that, but say it should not be a complete replacement for it. If you want to make this point absolutely clear that in no instance can it be a complete substitute, then you could keep those paragraphs and just say it cannot be a complete replacement. And then, there might be a degree of evaluating the weighting of all this. You could also have a statement earlier about saying the preponderance of the weighting and decision should be put on teaching effectiveness and scholarship. So, it's just two little suggestions.

W. Mills: William Mills, Engineering Technology. Can I raise another question, or are we still discussing the last question.

B. Creed: Discussion doesn't conclude until we make the decision.

W. Mills: All right, well it's 8.2.1.7. I wasn't able to come last time. At the bottom of page 16, top of page 17. I just want to make sure it's on the record. You talk about professional practice. In our field – I'm in Engineering Technology – College of Engineering professional standards of practice and guidance documents are really important. It doesn't use that; it does refer to professional practice, but I'm wondering if it would be helpful – it would be helpful to us – to say work on professional committees and standards such as ASTM, ASHRAE during COVID, all that sort of stuff. So, it doesn't actually say that other than I guess if the intent of the modification where it says, "professional practice." Is that the bridge that was being thought of or would it benefit from adding an example of professional standards and practice documents.

B. Creed: Which page is it on, I'm sorry.

W. Mills: Bottom of page 16 and top of page 17. It's 8.2.1.7(B) Scholarly Performance and Achievement, item 3, "...but also based on impact on practice and reach of intended audience." It says that, but then down below, in our field the biggest probable reach is as a standard, an ASTM standard, ASHRAE standard, that sort of thing. And that not there. I realize it says, "Examples include..." but it would be helpful for our deliberations as we are going through it in our department and the college, that it's explicitly as an example, saying work on professional standards practice. Or, could I just use the fact (because I'm going to be reporting back) that says "...the impact on practice and reach of intended audience."

B. Creed: That would be where I would suggest it's in there, is in that component, rather than having a stand-alone item. The idea here is to say that the professional standards or the practice standards and those kinds of impacts would be included in here. And that's one of those examples of where we wouldn't – there's no way we can create a comprehensive list of all the different types of impacts being resolved underneath that cover term. It would just be too long, and there's always be at least one missing. So, the intention was, again, going back to the college is the one that is probably more aligned than the Faculty Senate is. And then the department is even more aligned. And so, as long as we can keep that idea in place where we're saying this general type of activity ought to be covered, College of Engineering and Engineering Technology, the College of Visual and Performing Arts, can think about what that practice looks like locally within disciplines that are represented. And the departments, again, can further operationalize.

W. Mills: Yes, so the main reason I'm asking this question to get it on the record so, when we go back, because we have some people who are very rigid in their interpretation and we are trying to modernize, so I want to make sure that it's recognized that it's okay to include professional practice documents and that it was contemplated and that the bridge is in that sentence there where it talks about professional practice.

B. Creed: Correct.

W. Mills: So, my understanding on that is correct? Okay, thank you.

B. Creed: Thank you.

C. Campbell: Just one more thing. On that page 17 where there are some examples, I'm wondering, 4 is sort of separated out. Is it part of g?

B. Creed: No, it's 4. So, 1, 2, 3 with a list within it, and then 4 is the next.

C. Campbell: So, that would be a required thing to do then.

B. Creed: No, none of these, if we go back in, this is in response to a comment at the first reading at 8.2.1.7, the cover sentence, we included the word, "may," it "may" include these as examples. These are not supposed to be mandatory required or comprehensive. It's supposed to be that these are some of the types of things. So, you don't have to do engaged research and creative activities in collaboration with community partners, as well as have a patent. Both of those would not be required. People may do that.

C. Campbell: Isn't 4 actually – should be an h?

B. Creed: No, just like 1, 2 and 3 are stand-alone. I think it's the right level of heading.

S. Marsh: Sarah Marsh, Management. I appreciate the comments, because it's allowed me to go back and see the document. What I see related to the deletions that people suggest need to be in there, is it looks to me by having all of that verbose language in there, you don't see the most important point, which is the point was made that you have to show all of these things: teaching, research, service. And so, I'd encourage you not to just focus on the [inaudible] edits, but look at the document as a whole, because by saying public service, it's not enough, it's not enough, it's not enough, that sounds like it's not important, and it is in some disciplines, and that would be outlined in the procedures. But I think this document is much cleaner as presented. So, that's all I have to say.

B. Creed: Thank you. Any other comments or concerns or suggestions before we move to a vote? All right, so I will turn it over to Pat to lead us through the clicker vote on this.

P. Erickson: Okay, so you've got your clickers, and there's no need to erase your last vote. Those erase automatically. And when you're ready, you can press 1 or A for yes, you agree with the motion to approve the proposal; 2 or B for no, you do not agree; 3 or C for abstain.

Another few seconds. You can check my math, I think we need 29 yeses. You can disagree with me; now is the time to do that. And that passes.

YES – 31

NO – 9

ABSTAIN – 5

B. Creed: Thank you. And as a concluding remark on this, we've already flagged the Time in Rank will be one area that we will engage with to continue updating these bylaws and continue making them work best for campus. And if there are other areas to continue engaging in conversation, that

is the work of this body. So, please raise it to me, raise it to each other and bring it forward, and we will consider those.

- C. Bob Lane Award
Faculty Senate will vote on the recipient during the February 21 Faculty Senate meeting. The recipient will be honored at the March 27 Faculty Senate meeting.
 - 1. Nomination
Professor Cindy York
Department of Educational Technology, Research and Assessment

B. Creed: That bring us to item C, the Bob Lane Award, which you can see on page 31. The Faculty Senate will vote on the recipient during this meeting, and they will be honored at the March 27 Faculty Senate meeting. We have one nomination, which you can find on page 32, which is Professor Cindy York from the Department of Educational Technology, Research and Assessment. Again, you'll find the nomination letter on page 32. So, if I can have a motion to approve Professor Cindy York as the recipient of the Bob Lane Award.

B. McGowan: So moved.

B. Creed: Can I have a second?

T. Atkins: Second.

B. Creed: This will be a voice vote. All in favor of approving Professor Cindy York as our recipient of the 2024 Bob Lane Award, please signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

B. Creed: Opposed? Congratulations, Cindy.

IX. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

- A. Higher Learning Commission Report
Amy Buhrow, Assistant Vice Provost of Assessment and Accreditation

B. Creed: That brings us to Items for Faculty Senate Consideration. We have a presentation today about the Higher Learning Commission Report, updates on the process, from Assistant Vice Provost of Assessment and Accreditation Amy Buhrow.

A. Buhrow: Thanks, Ben. I appreciate the opportunity to update you on the work that's been happening in support of our Higher Learning Commission comprehensive evaluation visit that's going to be happening in just a month. I was last here in November to give you an update on the creation of our assurance argument, and a lot has happened since that visit. I'm also here to ask for your help with two things.

Before I dive in, I'm going to just bring us all back to the same page on why we are doing this and what it's all about. It'll be a refresher from our November meeting, but I think it's important leading up to the visit that I hope you'll all be a part of. The HLC has accredited NIU since 1915. It's one of seven regional accrediting agencies that's recognized by the U.S. Department of Education. It is required for us in order to receive federal funds, and those federal funds are to the tune of about \$97 million. So, it's really important to NIU and really important to our students. It also ensures the public of our legitimacy as an institution, that we're doing the right things and producing quality graduates. Most important, it's an opportunity to celebrate our accomplishments, and I think I ended with this statement last time I was with you; but I feel pretty lucky to have come into this role at the time I did. I always said when I was in the College of Business that I had the best job as the person managing accreditation, because I got to see all the wonderful things happening in Barsema Hall. And now I get to see all of the wonderful things happening in all of your buildings, all of your programs. We have a lot to be proud of here at NIU, and this is definitely an opportunity to celebrate that.

For the past year, Chris McCord and Jason Rhode have led efforts to prepare for the comprehensive review that's happening next month. I joined the team in August. Our last comprehensive evaluation visit happened in 2014. At that point, we were reaccredited for another ten years, and that's the maximum period possible. We joined the Open Pathway at that time in 2014, and that really opened us up to less visits, but equal amount of reporting, I think. If you look at the screen, for years 1 through 3, we had to do some annual reports, reporting on what they found, what we were doing about it. In year 4, there was an assurance review; that was 2018. It was a comprehensive undertaking that involved hundreds of people on campus. You may have been part of that. In years 5 through 7, we had the quality initiative. We wrapped that up just last year, and that was the project where we looked at performance in our gateway courses and reducing equity gaps. So, the DWFs, looking at performance of different groups and how do we bring everyone up to more equal playing field. Then we come to where we are today, and that's preparing for our comprehensive evaluation visit.

There are four parts of this comprehensive evaluation. The assurance argument is what I spent a lot of time talking about last time. That's about a 35,000-word document. And, actually, I submitted it in draft form today; it's about 32,500. So, we're really happy that we're under. So, if you have anything to add, see me before Friday. That will be finalized on Monday. It's supported by about 700 pieces of evidence. And as I have been sitting here listening to the debate about the tenure and promotion policy, I'm really sad that you guys didn't push that up to fall, because that would have been a great piece of evidence for this document. The next piece is the federal compliance, then a student opinion survey, then our on-site visit.

I talked a little bit about the assurance argument. The peer review team will take a look at that starting on February 26 and will get back to us with requests for more information within a week. We are hopeful they will ask nothing. That document speaks to five things. Criterion 1 mission; Criterion 2 integrity: ethical and responsible conduct; 3 quality, resources and support for teaching and learning; 4 how we evaluate; and 5 institutional effectiveness – are we using our resources in the most appropriate way – and planning. Our evidence of those 700 [pieces of evidence] are supposed to substantiate our argument in hopes that the HLC will not ask anymore questions,

because it's all there. Those are minutes, those are memos. There's a ton of websites; I think I counted about 450 unique websites that we are offering. So, there's a lot that goes into validating what we wrote in that argument. We had a campus survey of our students that opened January 16 through the 25th, to which about 1700 of our students responded. I don't know about you, but I was pretty impressed with that. Trying to get students to answer a survey is hard work. And initial results show some pretty favorable responses to that. We need to dive into the results a little bit more and those qualitative comments. But I was pretty happy with skimming through and seeing those results. We also have to do a federal compliance review. That was submitted today, and that addresses how we meet a lot of the federal regulations – so, how are we addressing the credit hour definition. So, if you're a department chair or you were asked by your department chair about a syllabus audit that we did this fall and into January, that's what that was about. We're also looking at making sure that we are enforcing the faculty credentials policy and assigning and deploying faculty in the right places. And when they might not have the credentials, to meet, according to policy, that they have the tested experience to make sure that they are in the right seat.

And that brings me to my two asks. The peer review team will be here March 25 to 26. That agenda includes two days full of meetings. They're going to meet with students, administrators, faculty, community members, the Board of Trustees. A lot of that schedule is already set. When they read the review, they might say, gosh, we want to meet with the General Education Committee, the University Assessment Panel and Baccalaureate Council. So, we won't know that until March 11. So, one of my asks is, please, be flexible on those two days. If you are part of those committees, if you have faculty who are coming to you and saying what's this all about, why am I just finding out about it two weeks prior – we don't know. Most everybody who is on the schedule right now has already received an invitation.

There are two ways for you all to interact with the team. The first is going to be – and both are on Monday. The first is going to be a faculty open forum. And the second is going to be a meeting with the full senate. I know schedules are crazy, but we would really encourage you to attend one of those if you could. And then encourage your faculty to attend the open forum. Their review is not a what's happening in the management department. Their review is a broad look at the university, a broad look at how we are living out our policies and procedures as we operate. And they want to know from you, our leaders and our faculty, how are we doing at that. And they want to hear examples.

So, with that, I will open the floor to questions if you have any. Okay, nobody seems as excited as me about this. Please, again, encourage your faculty to attend. Please try to attend one of these meetings. It's really important - \$97 million worth of important – that this is a successful visit and successful findings. We want you to be honest and true and authentic to you experiences here, but we have no doubt that you just need to get involved and everything will be just great. If you have any questions, you can look me up and send me an email. I appreciate it.

B. Creed: Thank you so much, Amy.

- B. Budget Update
George Middlemist
Vice President for Administration and Finance and Chief Financial Officer

B. Creed: Item B is the budget update, but due to personal reasons, Vice President for Administration and Finance and CFO Middlemist will not be joining us today. He will be sharing a similar presentation at UC next week. So, if you are able, you can attend in person, or there is a livestream where you can see the presentation. The one piece that won't be presented there, but he will bring to Faculty Senate when he comes in April, is in response to Brendon Swedlow's question about the allocation of resources, administrators versus faculty. He has that ready for us, but he wants to be here when he shares it. So, he's moving forward with that stuff and, hopefully, that's useful for us to know.

X. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Proposed amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws
Article 3.1, Faculty Senate Steering Committee
Article 6, Operating Procedures of the Faculty Senate
Article 7, Duties and Responsibilities of the Faculty Senate
FIRST READING
Ben Creed, Faculty Senate President and FS Steering Committee Chair

B. Creed: That brings us to New Business, item X. We have two pieces of new business. The first is a proposed amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws, pages 33 to 37. This is related to the operating procedures for the Faculty Senate outside of the academic year. Issues which fall within the Faculty Senate's duties and responsibilities do not always occur within the academic year. However, Faculty Senate currently has no mechanism to operate outside of the academic year. Other public universities in Illinois have bylaws enabling their Faculty Senate or equivalent body to do so, to convene and make decisions outside the academic year. And they often will designate a standing committee to serve in that function over the summer so the whole body doesn't have to come back together. NIU's University Council currently has this mechanism, and that was in place before the reimagining of shared governance when that was the body that was at the academic core of the institution. So, this proposal seeks to enable Faculty Senate to conduct its business when urgent matters arise outside of the academic year by delegating its authority to Faculty Senate Steering Committee.

Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 3.1 would designate the Faculty Senate Steering Committee to serve in this way and extend the terms of those standing on the committee to ensure continuity over the summer. Article 6.5 describes when Faculty Senate Steering Committee would be authorized to act on behalf of the Faculty Senate, including guidelines for calling and holding meetings and the requirement to report back to this body at the first regular meeting.

The second set of proposed changes is, while precedence is that Faculty Senate sets the academic calendar, this has never been codified in the Faculty Senate Bylaws. In conversation with senior administration, including the current interim provost and university President Freeman, as well as

others, and talking with the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, it's proposed to codify this responsibility as one of Faculty Senate's responsibilities by adding it to Article 7.3.

As this is a first reading, I welcome any discussion or conversation either here in this forum, or please do reach out to me with any questions, concerns or thoughts.

E. Nesterov: Evgueni Nesterov, Chemistry. I feel this is very important, of course, to have such an option. But I also think that these questions which might arise when Faculty Senate is not in session may be very important for the university and significant. And so it would be really important that, not only is the small fraction of the Faculty Senate would be [inaudible], but the entire Faculty Senate would be given a chance to consider them later when the first session comes. So, I would suggest that, not only the Steering Committee would inform the Faculty Senate about the decisions they have made, but that the Faculty Senate would actually be able to consider as the whole Faculty Senate and either basically approve it or remove or basically cancel them. So, basically, the Faculty Senate should have a say in that, the entire Faculty Senate, not just a committee.

B. Creed: Agreed. And that process would still be in play whereas at the first Faculty Senate meeting, all the changes would be brought to Faculty Senate; and at that moment, we could engage in that conversation of what needs to be undone or redone or voted on as a body as part of that report. The idea is that these issues that would arise over the summer are unlikely things like bylaw changes. I would suggest that there's no such thing as an urgent bylaw change that I can think of. But there may be issues that need to be decided right then. One could be an academic closure, something that has to do with the academic calendar that needs to be decided over the summer, because of something like COVID, that we need to have Faculty Senate have a mechanism – faculty to have a mechanism in shared governance – to inform a conversation that, by the time Faculty Senate comes back together, whatever decision was made is now in the past and having a vote on it is kind of unnecessary or unproductive. But, if there is anything that comes up, is voted on, or decided by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, the Faculty Senate as a whole doesn't like, there would be the opportunity at the first meeting to raise that up, have the discussion around it, and then take corrective action. So, nothing in here prevents Faculty Senate to reopen any issue decided. That was part of the conversation that happened at Faculty Senate Steering Committee, of whether or not to include that language in these bylaw changes. And it was decided that the report would be enough, rather than voting on something that maybe was three months prior and no longer is necessary to vote.

E. Nesterov: I agree with what you said. I think it makes good sense. But I think still it would be probably important at least to have that statement that the Faculty Senate should be able to reconsider some of those. I'm not that good at making the phrases, sentences, but you can probably formulate to include that kind of statement that the Faculty Senate should be able to reconsider when they have their first meeting.

B. Creed: Thank you for the suggestion, Evgueni.

S. Marsh: Sarah Marsh, Management. I think that's why in there it requires notification of the full senate 48 hours in advance. And those are open meetings, so I think there's a mechanism in those circumstances, beyond what Ben was talking about, in the moment. That's why that notification is there, I believe.

E. McKee: Emily McKee, Anthropology. I also agree that I would be a little more comfortable if the wording were made clearer that this is truly an advisory council, except in extraordinary circumstances where there has to be a decision made over the summer. The idea that 48 hours notice is sufficient doesn't quite work for a lot of people who are off doing field work during the summer, etc., etc., and can't participate. So, simply notifying isn't enough when it's outside of contract months and also when people are often abroad doing things. So, I would appreciate some clear language explaining what the real purpose of the Steering Committee is and the limitations on what should be done during the summer.

B. Creed: Thank you. Seeing no other discussion on this; again, if you have comments or feedback, don't hesitate to share them.

- B. Proposed amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws
Article 3.5, Social Justice Committee
FIRST READING
Ben Creed, Faculty Senate President and FS Social Justice Committee Convener

B. Creed: And that brings us to item B, which is the proposed amendment to the Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 3.5, Social Justice Committee. It's a first reading. This is on pages 38 and 39. This is primarily housekeeping in some ways, but it has some substantive change. The first change in this proposal is focused on representation on the Social Justice Committee. To ensure this committee includes sufficient representation from all constituencies without also placing unfair burdens on particular faculty senators, this proposal allows the tenured and tenure-track faculty senators from the University Libraries and the College of Law, as well as the clinical faculty representative, to determine if they would like to serve on this committee. Currently, there's only one tenured or tenure-track faculty representative from the University Libraries and the College of Law, and one clinical faculty representative within Faculty Senate, which can lead to these members being overburdened as they are required to serve on this committee by the bylaws or it impacts the operation of this committee.

The second change is clarifying language in 3.5.2.1, which just replaces the word, "penultimate," with "summative" as that was the intention. It wasn't supposed to be a sunset committee, so penultimate suggests there's only one more report to come. And the other change within that is operating within appropriate shared governance procedures. Not all decisions or recommendations are going to come through the Faculty Senate Social Justice Committee, some are recommendations outside. So, it's through shared governance rather than this body only.

Any comments, concerns, discussion on this item?

E. Nesterov: It's just really a question. I honestly have not read this before so this is the first time I'm looking at this. But under 3.5.2, Duties, the first paragraph, 3.5.2.1, it lists a lot of items. I'm wondering why xenophobia was left out of this list, because I think this is a major issue often people get poorly treated; and so this is definitely related to an equity issue. It's not really the part, which was changed, or what is proposed to be changed, but I'm just curious why xenophobia was not listed among the others.

B. Creed: I don't know the answer to that. When this body was first established, I guess now two-and-a-half years ago, I don't remember what this list came from. But maybe that would be a future change to say: including -isms like these, phobias like these, and not make it be as definitive of a tight list. I don't know the rationale as to why xenophobia was left off in the original make-up of this. But maybe that is one of those things to reconsider.

XI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

- A. FS-UC Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – report
Emily McKee, FS/RGE Liaison/Spokesperson

B. Creed: That will take us to our next agenda item, which is Reports from Councils, Boards and Standing Committees. Item A is from the Faculty Senate-University Council Rules, Governance and Elections Committee. Emily McKee, as our spokesperson, will present this item.

1. President of Faculty Senate/Chair of University Council 2024-25
Call for nominations
 - Nominations for the office of Faculty Senate president will be taken from the Faculty Senate floor during the March 27 Faculty Senate meeting. Faculty Senate voting members are asked to review the list being provided at this time and use the coming weeks to prepare for making nominations during the March 27 meeting.
 - Letters of acceptance of nomination will be due in the Office of Faculty Senate by Friday, April 12.
 - Letters of acceptance of nomination will be provided to Faculty Senate voting members via email by Wednesday, April 17, and also will be included in the April 24 Faculty Senate agenda packets.
 - Election of the 2024-25 Faculty Senate president/University Council chair will be held during the April 24 Faculty Senate meeting.

E. McKee: It's time for us to elect our next Faculty Senate president for the 2024-2025 academic year. The list of those eligible is on the screen and on page 40 of your packet. Nominations for the office of Faculty Senate president will be taken from the senate floor during the March 27 meeting. Voting members of the Faculty Senate are asked to review the list being provided at this time and also to use the coming weeks to talk to your representative bodies and think about who you might

want to nominate during the March 27 meeting. Letters of acceptance of nomination would then be due in the Office of Faculty Senate by Friday, April 12. And those letters of acceptance of nomination will be provided to Faculty Senate members by email by Wednesday, April 17, and will also be included in our April 24 Faculty Senate agenda packet. Elections will be held on April 24 for the Faculty Senate president for 2024-2025 year.

2. 2024-25 [Student Grievance Panel](#)

By-lot drawing of three tenured faculty members and three instructors to serve on the 2024-25 grievance panel for student grievances. Members serving on the panel might be called upon to review a student grievance should one be filed during the 2024-25 academic year.

E. McKee: The second thing is an actual selection process. Can I ask you to select something out of an envelope for us? We're asked to select three tenured faculty members and three instructors to serve on the 2024-25 grievance panel for student grievances. Members selected to serve on the panel might be called upon to review a student grievance should one be filed during the 2024-25 academic year. And these panel members will be selected by lot from among the tenured faculty members of Faculty Senate and University Council first. And then we'll do instructors on the Faculty Senate and University Council. So, first the tenured faculty members.

Ziteng Wang, College of Engineering and Engineering Technology
Karen Whedbee, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Marc Falkoff, College of Law

And now three instructors.

Jason Akst, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Department of Communication
Jennifer Ross, College of Health and Human Sciences
Sandra Kupelian, College of Law

Thanks, everybody.

- B. Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE – report
Linda Saborío, NIU representative to FAC-IBHE
Ben Creed, NIU representative alternate to FAC-IBHE

B. Creed: Our next report is the Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE, Linda Saborío.

L. Saborío: Good afternoon. I have a brief report, thank goodness, right. I know you all are getting tired. The FAC February meeting was entirely on Zoom, so it was primarily a working meeting. During the morning reports, Jill from the IBHE mentioned that an AI Task Force was created at the state level, and she volunteered to serve as the FAC's liaison. She also discussed the numerous roll-out changes – I don't know if you heard about this – to the recently renovated FAFSA site. In a nutshell, it means we may see a delay in the roll-out of financial aid packages for our students – it's kind of a mess.

We had one guest speaker join us, Dr. Louis Newman. He is the former dean of academic advising and associate vice provost for undergraduate education at Stanford University. He presented on his book titled *Thinking Critically in College*. Dr. Newman discussed student assumptions about critical thinking, what it means to think critically, how evidence and experiences relate to critical thinking, metacognition and how we develop our curriculum to include critical thinking development skills. And you can find his book on Amazon, there's a quick plug for him.

The afternoon wrapped up with reports from the working and caucus groups. And then next month, we're going to be meeting here at NIU at the Barsema Alumni and Visitors Center. The meeting is scheduled from 9 in the morning until 2:30 on Friday, March 15. So, if you have nothing better to do on Friday of spring break week, feel free to join us. Thank you. Have a nice afternoon, everyone.

B. Creed: Thank you.

- C. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – report
Felicia Bohanon, Natasha Johnson, Ben Creed
Larissa Garcia, Karen Whedbee, Brad Cripe

B. Creed: Next up is the Board of Trustees report. They met on February 15 in their committees. They approved the sabbaticals for the upcoming academic year, as well as received presentations from Natalie Churyk and heard a report on the important work that is done during sabbaticals. There was a presentation about us becoming an HSI serving institution by Dr. Sumner and Dr. Reneau. There was a presentation about [Edible Campus](#) and all the awesome work that's going on on campus. I'll link these pieces of information in the summary I send out. But if you don't know about Edible Campus, it's really fascinating and great work that's going on. I suggest learning about it. It struck a chord with me for some reason. They received budget updates and also received recommendations for increases in room and board, undergraduate tuition and fees. There were five that were approved at the Board of Trustees meeting during a special meeting. And the remaining ones will be considered at the upcoming meeting on March 21. I don't know if there's anything else that folks would like to add that were in attendance?

- D. Baccalaureate Council – report
Amanda Ferguson, Chair
Alicia Schatteman, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

B. Creed: Hearing none, that brings us to the Baccalaureate Council report from Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Alicia Schatteman.

A. Schatteman: Thank you, everyone. I have two items, just some updates. Curriculog, which we talked about a little bit in the fall. The problems we were trying to solve were around seamless integration of curriculum updates to our online catalog. Acalog is our online system; it's the same system that owns Curriculog. We also want to improve some efficiencies, so, time spent on those demos and curriculum proposals, which is really sharing of Word documents currently, from departments to the college and then on to the BC [Baccalaureate Council] or GC [Graduate Council] and on from there. It's a very manual process, so we wanted to improve some efficiencies there. We

also want to increase transparency. If you've been on a proposal, you kind of don't know where it is in the system. You submitted it, but not sure who's looking at it when and where. And you don't know if it gets stuck or held up and for what kind of reasons. We also want to be transparent with increasing who's responding, what are the responses, how do I move the proposal forward. The new system will easily log all of those comments, and you'll be able to see those. So, we decided to move forward with this digital curriculum proposal platform in the fall, and we have been working with Curriculog over the fall semester to build out our platform for the spring. It's currently in build phase; we should have demo probably by the end of March. We do make updates that you can see on the website, so if you go to [Academic Affairs](#), there is page dedicated to [Curriculog](#). So, if you're not sure of where we are and who's been involved, I certainly recommend to go check out that site.

We have been visiting with the college curriculum committees, and we will do so in the spring. We're open to coming to departments, whatever you need. We're working on some training materials right now to be able to train faculty, staff, administrators, etc., and we're going to roll that out probably in April once we have the demo site to actually look at. So, we're sharing information through the provost's newsletter, and we have information on the website. But, if you want any more information in your specific unit, certainly just reach out to me and either me or the curriculum catalog editor will get back in touch with you.

The second one is around general education. We made some progress, and we also have a webpage on the Academic Affairs website kind of outlining what the [review](#) has been about [general education](#); and it seems like we have been taking very baby steps over the last five years or so around general education, so you can go and read that. Where the General Education Committee gets stuck is when we have to make decisions on new proposals in particular, because we don't seem to have a very shared understanding of the purpose of general education. It is required; IBHE says we have to have a minimum of 30 credit hours. But beyond that, we don't have clearly articulated things. When we were here in the fall, I mentioned that the GEC, and then approved by BC, will remove the pathways starting this fall that will, hopefully, simplify things. So, right now, we have the foundational studies and then the distributive model along these knowledge domains.

We also know – IBHE and HLC the last time they were here – talked about that we don't really assess our general education program, and we probably need to do that. So, we have been trying to figure out how to do that. In the fall – well, actually, over the last couple of years – we've been identifying the learning outcomes attributed to our general education program. Now we have to figure out what kinds of updates do we actually need and how do we assess those things. There is also a general kind of overall lack in the student population of what is the purpose of general education anyway. And that kind of came through in some of the surveys that we've done with students. Why are they needed? How do they tie together? How can they expand their understanding of their own majors, as well as ideas outside their major?

So, we know that our graduates need to see the world from multiple perspectives to address these broader societal issues, and we think that's in general education, although we don't know. And we know that employers want our students – as someone was just saying about critical thinking – our employers want critical thinking skills and want good communication skills. So, we put a lot of weight on general education, but not a lot of purpose on general education. So, that's kind of what

this committee has been addressing. We did collect surveys from students. I wish I had, as Amy said, like 1700 responses. We had 81; I think that's okay – I mean it's a general education survey. We had 81, and so yay for those 81 students. We had 76 faculty members, so almost equal amounts. You can still participate, the survey is still open, if you want to.

A smaller task force met, and that task force is Rod Caughron faculty member from College of Education, and he's also chair of the General Education Committee; Chris Lowe, an advising director in the College of Education; Amy Buhrow, who you met earlier; Hasina Jefferson, an undergraduate student on the GEC and participating in this task force; Christina Abreau, the director for the Center for Latino and Latin American Studies; Mary Quinlan, faculty member in CVPA; Cody Schmitz, the registrar; Ben, your Faculty Senate president; Grace Sikapokoo, director of the COMMS 100 programs; and Amanda Durik, associate dean in academic affairs for CLAS.

That smaller task force has met once; we're meeting again this Friday. What we'd like to do is continue our discussions about what is our philosophy about general education here at NIU, specifically. And then the goal would be to come up with some guiding principles. Sometimes when general education courses are brought for proposals, we're looking for: Does this fit within our philosophy? Is this something that we want to approve kind of going forward? So, we'll be continuing that work and revising learning outcomes and figuring out an assessment plan for our general education program; we have not done that yet. Once that task force prepares a draft document, that will go to the GEC, and then review by the Baccalaureate Council, and then ultimately it could come before Faculty Senate for discussion and approval, as well.

So, planning: As we're coming up, you're going to get some nods to participate on BC or GEC coming forward, so please consider that in your plans for next year as we continue those two projects. I'm happy to take questions.

B. Creed: I think we got them to silence.

A. Schatteman: Exciting stuff.

B. Creed: Thank you so much.

E. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee – no report

F. Social Justice Committee – no report

B. Creed: There are no reports for E and F.

- G. Student Government Association – report
Chris English, Deputy Speaker of the Senate
Landon Larkin, SGA Treasurer

B. Creed: Is there an SGA report, Chris?

C. English: SGA elections are coming up, and candidate meetings for both legislative and executive branch end February 26. So, if you have students who are interested in that, please send them to those meetings. And if they can't make the meetings that are available, have them reach out to me, Chris English. You should be able to find that through that way if you need to direct people to a place.

SGA is also hosting SGA Connect March 6 at Fatty's from 6 to 8 p.m. If you're looking for a place to be to learn about student organizations and what we can do for you.

Annual funding is now open. So, if you're part of a student organization or you help lead one, it is open until March 31, so, make sure your students are filling out those forms as needed. In connection with that, we will be sending out departmental emails to make sure we know what category to put the various student orgs in. If you are on department office staff or you have connections to them, let them know that they might be getting an email from me today or tomorrow.

B. Creed: Great, thank you, Chris.

- H. Operating Staff Council – no report
Natasha Johnson, President
Mandy Kreitzer, OSC Representative

B. Creed: We have no report from Operating Staff Council.

- I. Supportive Professional Staff Council – report
Felicia Bohanon, President
John Boswell, SPSC Representative

B. Creed: I believe we have a report from Supportive Professional Staff Council from Felicia.

F. Bohanon: We have extended the [SPS awards](#) deadline to February 28. Those are nominations, and that information is available on our website. In addition to that, we've also returned to the [SPS Certificates \[of Recognition Program\]](#), and the deadline for that is March 4. Individuals can either be nominated or self-nominate, and those include items which for the certificates, in terms of publications of a book or article, presentation of a paper, leadership in a professional association or an advanced degree. That information is also available on our website and was sent out in Monday's NIU Announcements. On April 3, we will hold our awards luncheon and program. One of the things that we're doing will also be the [SPS Dependent Scholarship](#), and we will be awarding two scholarships. That deadline is February 28, as we mentioned previously. That is awarded to a child or grandchild of an SPS employee or a student who has been impacted or mentored by an SPS member. We're also launching our Huskie High Five Scholarship, and that will take place between

March 1 and March 29. We're asking individuals to give in support of our scholarship to commit to either \$5 per pay period, \$10 per pay period, \$15 per pay period or \$25 per pay period. And then we also have a giving level for retirees. Those will also be acknowledged at our awards luncheon.

Thank you.

B. Creed: Thank you, Felicia.

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

- A. [Policy Library](#) – Comment on Proposed Policies
- B. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council
- C. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board
- D. [Minutes](#), Baccalaureate Council
- E. [Minutes](#), Board of Trustees
- F. [Minutes](#), Comm. on the Improvement of the Undergraduate Academic Experience
- G. [Minutes](#), General Education Committee
- H. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council
- I. [Minutes](#), Honors Committee
- J. [Minutes](#), Operating Staff Council
- K. [Minutes](#), Supportive Professional Staff Council
- L. [Minutes](#), University Assessment Panel
- M. [Minutes](#), University Benefits Committee
- N. [Minutes](#), Univ. Comm. on Advanced and Nonteaching Educator License Programs
- O. [Minutes](#), University Committee on Initial Educator Licensure
- P. 2023-24 FS schedule: Sep 6, Oct 4, Nov 1, Nov 29, Jan 24, Feb 21, Mar 27, Apr 24

B. Creed: That brings us to informational items. All the standard ones are there. You'll note our next meeting is March 27. And before we move to adjourn, I just want to say thank you for sticking with us today, as well as the spirited conversation today. I do think it makes us better when we talk things through out loud and engage in conversation, so I appreciate that.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

B. Creed: Do I have a motion to adjourn? Valentiner first. Second? Johnson second. All in favor?

Members: Aye.

B. Creed: Thank you.

Meeting adjourned at 4:37 p.m.