

TRANSCRIPT

**FACULTY SENATE
Wednesday, March 27, 2024, 3 p.m.
Altgeld Hall Auditorium
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois**

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Arado, Atkins, Books, Boswell, Brain, Campbell, Creed, Demir, Duffin, Ehsani (for Qin), Finch, Fotovat, Hartenhoff, Johnson, Jong, Kitner (for Guzman), Kupelian, Lampi, Larkin, Liberty, Luo, Marsh, McGowan, McKee, Mellon, Mills, Nesterov, Nyunt, Palese, Porter, Rossetti, Salimi, Sharp, Sirotkin, Staikidis, Vahabzadeh, Valentiner, Van Wienen, Whedbee, Zumanu

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Akst, Barrett, Bohanon, Chomentowski, English, Guzman, Harris, Ito, Kim, Kreitzer, Martinez, Naples, Qin, Rajabi, Ross, Ruetsche, Scanlon, Slotsve, Swedlow, Wang, Xie

OTHERS PRESENT: Barnhart, Bryan, González, Harris, Schumacher, Singh, Sumner

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

B. Creed: I'd like to call the meeting to order, the Faculty Senate, on Wednesday, March 27, 2024.

II. VERIFICATION OF QUORUM

B. Creed: Pat, do we have a quorum?

P. Erickson: We do have a quorum.

III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

B. Creed: Great, can I have a motion to adopt the agenda for today's meeting?

K. Staikidis: So moved.

B. Creed: Thank you. Second?

T. Arado: Second.

B. Creed: Thank you, Therese. All in favor of adopting the agenda, please signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

B. Creed: Opposed? All right, so, we have an agenda.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 21, 2024, MINUTES

B. Creed: That brings us to item IV, the approval of the February 21, 2024, minutes. Can I have a motion to approve the minutes? All right, first-David [Valentiner]; second-Therese [Arado]. Any discussion on the minutes, any corrections, additions, deletions? Seeing none, all in favor of approving the February 21, 2024, minutes, please signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

B. Creed: Opposed? Abstain? Great.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

B. Creed: That brings us to public comment. Pat, do we have any public comments today?

P. Erickson: No public comments.

VI. FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

B. Creed: Great, so that brings us to Faculty Senate President's Announcements. I want to spend just a few minutes to provide some updates on tenure and promotion implementation after the passage of those bylaws at our last meeting. First, I want to say thank you to those who took the time to fill out the survey, trying to help guide the implementation. The easy work, so to say, is getting the bylaws passed. Now, we have to do the work of implementing it and supporting that implementation. So, I appreciate those who took the time to fill out the survey. It will remain open if those, who haven't filled it out, would like to.

The main themes, as I've heard them so far through the survey, as well as through conversations, are really – I think I've got four that I pulled out so far. The first is that there is a request for more definitions and examples of the types of scholarship and research and artistry that are included within the new bylaws. Second is for ongoing support for the college and department personnel committees as they review those bylaw changes and through the cycles of review. Third is support for colleges and departments that have not, in the past, had clinical or research faculty bylaws for promotion, to learn from other departments or colleges about best or better practice on how to support the promotion of clinical or research faculty. And finally, there's a request for more public sharing of information about what the changes entail, creation of a series of FAQs and other opportunities to share the changes in concise ways so that everybody can be pointed toward them and have shared understandings.

So, these have been shaping the communications that I've been having and the plans that I've been engaged with. For instance, I've been working with the Web Design Team, and they have made live now [a web page underneath the faculty resources section of the Faculty Affairs website](#) that outlines

the overview of the changes, includes FAQs, based on ones that came up here during the conversation and as we had one-on-one. So, there will be communications coming out about where to find those more specifically with links. I also am developing a communication matrix to make sure that I'm talking directly with faculty across campus, with department chairs, department personnel committees, with college councils, with the deans, and doing this in collaboration with the Provost's Office, to make sure we go on the road and share what the changes are to identify supports that are needed to learn about those friction points so that we can continue steering resources to improving the tenure and promotion policies and systems here on campus for all faculty members. I'll continue to share more information in the coming weeks as I continue this effort of supporting the implementation of these policy changes.

One more thing related to promotion and tenure – not about the changes, specifically, but I just wanted to remind everyone and to take back to your departments or your academic units, that there is this requirement for all pre-tenured faculty to receive written evaluation of their progress toward tenure in an annual way. And with the changes, this also now extends to clinical and research faculty that are pre-promotion. This is something that's come up within the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee and in other conversations, that it's being done in uneven ways or maybe not at all in some departments. And so, this is a reminder to this group to go back and share that and ask, if you hear that that's not happening in your department, or you're part of the DPC, or in your different roles, if you can help remind folks that this is a support that we do require for all of our pre-tenured faculty and now for pre-promoted clinical and research faculty, as well. I'll share that in the summary email of this meeting, as well. I just wanted to make sure that that is a message that we continue pushing out to campus to support our faculty.

Finally, there will be an invitation coming sometime early April. You'll see it coming from Pat. It will be an invitation to share your interest in serving on the various Faculty Senate committees and other related opportunities that faculty senators help populate. It will be a list of all those openings on committees coming up for the new academic year. When you receive that, if you could please think through which ones you'd like to participate on, we'll be asking you to rank order some of those preferences so we can help ensure that the multitude of folks have an opportunity to serve on these various committees and that your preferences can be heard in that process.

That's what I have for my announcements.

VII. PROVOST'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

B. Creed: With that, we will move on to item VII, Provost's Announcements, which will be shared today by Bárbara González.

B. González: Hello, good afternoon. Provost Elish-Piper is, unfortunately, home sick, so she's working remotely, so she asked me to share her announcements today.

The HLC visit was completed yesterday, and we want to thank everyone for their input and participation during the visit. We want to acknowledge the great work of Amy Buhrow, Chris McCord, Celeste Latham and Mia Hannon, and others who helped to coordinate this event. We will receive feedback from the HLC on this visit in about four to six weeks, and we'll communicate that as we receive it.

The [Faculty Awards Celebration](#) is happening on April 18 at 3 p.m. right here in the Altgeld Auditorium. Everybody is invited to attend and to celebrate the faculty, so please attend.

The Baccalaureate Council approved the designation of community engaged courses and sections at their March 7 meeting. We anticipate opening up proposals for section level designation for Spring 2025 sections and for course designations starting in Fall 2025 through the regular curriculum process. More information will be forthcoming about the process for section level designation.

A reminder to please submit your textbook adoptions to the NIU bookstore. This is critically important to student success, especially our students on financial aid, which is the majority, and who use our book charge program and must purchase their materials through the NIU bookstore, which is only available through the first ten days of the semester. Textbooks for summer courses need to be submitted by April 20, and for fall courses by May 24. Please try to submit all of your bookstore adoptions before you go on summer break. The book can really only source the latest editions of textbooks, and publishers are moving nearly 70 percent of all titles to digital only. So, delivery times for hard copies can cause delays as they are printing them on demand. Also, any non-text course materials should be adopted at the same time. Adoptions for all course materials can be made through the Follett in Blackboard or by emailing Follett directly. Kevin Sandstrom is our campus store manager if you have any follow-up questions.

The call for next year's Provost Faculty Fellow Program was sent out this week. Please consider applying to the provost fellow in Academic Affairs and Faculty Affairs for the 2024-25 academic year starting July 1. This year, we have two provost fellow positions, one in Academic Affairs and one in Faculty Affairs. So, that is a change from last year. Fellows receive one month's salary for the summer of 2024 and a one-course release in each of the fall and spring semesters. It is open to any tenured member of the faculty. To apply, you need to submit an abbreviated CV and a cover letter indicating your interest by April 19 to provost@niu.edu.

And those are my announcements. Thank you.

B. Creed: Thank you so much. And I'll do this later on, but I forgot to pick up a clicker; we will have votes today. So, at some point, if you could grab a clicker in the back of the room. I'll have to do that later and do that walk of shame.

VIII. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

- A. Presentation of the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award to
Professor Cindy S. York
Department of Educational Technology, Research and Assessment

B. Creed: That brings us to agenda item VIII, Items for Faculty Senate Consideration. The first one up is agenda item A, and that is the presentation of the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award. And I see Dr. Cindy York is here, and I'm please to present to you, if you want to come on up, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award. This is an award that recognizes faculty for service, which goes above and beyond. Dr. York was nominated by her colleague in ETRA. Dr. Hal Hinderliter from her department nominated her for her work within the College of Education and within NIU more broadly. You can see the letter of nomination in your packet, but it highlighted the work she's done within ETRA on the DPC and in other areas, as well as more broadly related to NIU's online presence and investigating the effects of AI in the classroom. So, thank you for your service, Dr. York, and congratulations. Your name, beyond this wonderful plaque

C. York: It will go on a wall.

B. Creed: And your name will go on a wall, so we look forward to seeing your name there in perpetuity. So, thank you.

C. York: Thanks, everyone.

- B. [Faculty Mentoring](#) Update
Janice Hamlet, Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Mentoring and Diversity

B. Creed: So, that brings us to item B, which is an update on faculty mentoring from Janice Hamlet, who is the associate vice provost for faculty mentoring and diversity.

J. Hamlet: Good afternoon. I want to thank Ben for this opportunity to provide you with an update, as well as the introduction of, hopefully, a new initiative as we move [inaudible]. Those who may not be aware, the university-wide faculty mentoring program was established in the fall of 2019 in the Office of the Provost. However, the idea to create this university-wide mentoring program came from President Freeman, and I was shocked – last fall I had the opportunity to go to the National Mentoring Conference at the University of New Mexico, and I was shocked by the number of people in the sessions that I went to, they were shocked that the president at this university had created the initiative. For many faculty at various universities, they had created smaller mentoring groups, peer mentoring groups and other types of groups to gain the attention of senior leadership in hopes that they would create a university-wide mentoring. So, they were just shocked that we didn't have to struggle, to my knowledge, to get a university-wide program.

The overall goal of the program has been basically to create a mentoring culture and network, and I think we have done this. Having come to NIU in the fall of 2000, I never heard the word, mentor, from anybody, and certainly did not have one. But, now, wherever I go, I'm hearing about mentors

and mentorship. In fact, last summer as I was working to prepare the new faculty orientation, I wanted to check to see if Mission III would be available to greet new faculty at the new faculty orientation. So, I went to the website and saw where there was a page about Mission II. There was a paragraph underneath his picture that said, “Mission II won’t be totally retired. He will be mentoring Mission III.” And I just fell out laughing; I know my colleagues across the hall were wondering, what is going on in her office. But it was too good to pass up. So, this poster, you may have seen this around campus. It says, “Even Mission has a mentor.” So, everybody, including the dogs, have the mentor fever. I’m going to leave some of these, the ones that I have left, I’m going to leave those if anybody would like one.

But our goal is, basically, to create a culture at the university where each member of the faculty feels valued, supported and respected so that they may instill these same values on to their students. So, our mentoring should have a ripple effect. We also want to give greater attention to our new faculty. But the whole goal here, in terms of faculty mentoring, is faculty supporting faculty. And I think that’s wonderful when we think in terms of how competitive we can be at times. And I’ve been very, very pleased. Since 2019, 95 new faculty have come in and have been assigned mentors. Additional associate faculty have requested mentors for very specialized reasons. We’ve established a formal consistent program in welcoming new faculty that communicates a sense of belongingness. When we hire new faculty, we are saying we are investing in your future. And mentoring is a part of the investment that we can yield the highest return on that investment, and that is for them to get promoted with tenure. Our mentoring program goal also to provide the opportunity to recruit and retain a diverse faculty.

You may not realize that there is a faculty mentor representative in your college, who is a member of my advisory committee. This was set up, because I wanted to make sure that anything that I did, I was being respectful to all of the colleges, because every college is different. And so, they have checked things that I’ve sent out. They have informed me, well, our college doesn’t do this, so let’s see if we can reword something to make sure that it is respectful to everyone. Reinaldo Moraga represents Engineering and Engineering Technology; Jennifer Gray represents Health and Human Sciences; Lisa Finkelstein represents the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences; Lei Zhou represents Business; Paul Wright, Education; Laurel Rigertas, College of Law; Gwen Gregory, University Libraries; and Reggie Thomas, Visual and Performing Arts. So, if you have questions or concerns or ideas, you may contact me or you may contact your college representative.

Generally speaking, the faculty mentoring has focused on two general areas: career-related and psychosocial support. And we have many faculty who have sought mentors in one or the other or both.

The foundation of the faculty mentoring program that I was asked to focus on, focuses on a one-to-one mentoring of new faculty, where a senior faculty member is matched with a junior faculty. Ideally, you pick your own mentors, those people that you see and respect something about them or what they’re doing, you like their style, you like their work ethic. But a new faculty coming in might not know anyone and so, it is important that they are matched with someone who can help them to navigate, not only the department, but the campus, in addition to the chair. Some colleges may assign more than one in various departments in the college.

In addition to a mentor, in terms of their department or their unit, there should be, and we're working to make sure that mentoring activities are going on in the college. The College of Education has been truly a leader in this regard, in having mentoring programs that are going on. Some are going on also in other colleges, and I'm working to try to make sure that this is being consistent across colleges. And certainly, new faculty I encourage to seek mentors in the national associations. Many faculty of color who are usually not assigned a faculty of color in their units, because there may not be a faculty of color in their unit. So, they know that they may contact me if they so desire a faculty member to mentor them, who is from their race or ethnic group, gender or sexuality group, or religion, disability, nationality or other group, and I will try to match them with an additional mentor. And then special interests as well. There may be a special interest that a faculty member has and wants to seek mentorship in that area. And we try to find a mentor in that area, as well.

This is the reason I'm here, basically, today, to talk about peer mentoring that involves everybody, or could involve everybody. Peer mentoring is non-hierarchical, so it doesn't matter the status of the person. That people can come together based on common interest, they have common concerns, it's to garner psychosocial support or even career-related supported, in terms of projects, in terms of just sharing or the need to share with other people that you have common concerns or interests.

One of my projects this year has been to encourage all of the deans to select a diversity point person for their college to help them in terms of issues related to diversity, equity and inclusion. I'm happy to report that, as of last week, I believe, every college has a diversity person in the form of a director, a coordinator – one college has two co-coordinators – or we have two associate deans in which diversity work is part of their responsibility. Their responsibilities are working with their dean and meeting the responsibilities that the dean has provided for them. But one of the things that I wanted to do – diversity work is difficult work. It's controversial work. You present things that may just get shot down, and it's something that you should not – anybody who is doing diversity work should not do it alone. And so, these directors will now form a peer mentoring group where they can support one another. They can share ideas. Well, I did this in my college, and it worked. Maybe you should try it in yours. Or, if something didn't work. So, that is a peer mentoring group that will begin. Another group is a smaller group of young – when I say young, I mean right out of grad school – faculty who would like to communicate with other faculty who just got out of grad school, and this is their first job. And so, that is another peer group that will be coming together. I'm going to meet with them a couple of times, and then I'm going to leave so they can have these private conversations among themselves.

There is a third group that is getting together to discuss books related to being a professor. And so, the ideas, the topics for peer mentoring groups, is endless. For example, some full professors may like to get together to discuss, okay, I'm full, I'm at the pinnacle, now what? Groups may be by race, by gender, by sexuality, faculty and staff working together in a peer mentoring group. You may invite graduate students to include in your group. If you have an idea that you would like to explore and have a group – usually peer mentoring groups are between five to seven, maybe ten at the most – please think about that. Let me know. I like to bring people together, and I have a peer mentoring toolkit that I like to be able to give you. I'm hoping that that will continue to expand our mentoring network at NIU.

Really quickly, I just want to go through some of the things that we've done. We don't do these things every, but these are the things that have taken place since 2019. We do have a Web presence. So, if you have not gone to the [Faculty Mentoring website](#), please take the time to do so. We have a newsletter that comes out once a semester. Every fall, there is the faculty mentor orientation. Usually, the members of the advisory committee are with me for this orientation. I call it orientation rather than training. I don't particularly like the word, training, as it relates to educators. And also, I have been told by people when I first started, well, I've been mentoring for over 25 years; I don't need anybody telling me how to mentor. So, this is not necessarily telling you how to mentor, but making sure that we are all on the same page as to what a mentor is and what a mentor isn't. Last year, I brought in a person who did a couple of sessions for us educating us about mentoring. But the advisory committee will return in the fall for a mentoring workshop. I am pleased to invite you to attend.

A couple years ago, we had a mentor-mentee luncheon that provided an opportunity for mentors to meet with their mentees if they hadn't already done so. So, we provided lunch in one of the rooms in the Holmes Student Center, just come and have lunch with your mentor. Also, a year ago, we had a mentor appreciation reception, and we just had refreshments in one of the conference rooms. People just came by and they received a key chain that talked about appreciating them for the work they had been doing.

We had a workshop for mid-career faculty, just in terms of various directions one can go after tenure and promotion. Not everybody wants to go through the process of going up for full. Some do, but not everybody. But there are other things that you can do. And so, we talk about this in this workshop. We've had a panel with the recipients of the Presidential Teaching Award share what they do that made them worthy of this award.

And we've had a panel of recipients of various grants. Going back to special interests, I had a new faculty, but he was at the associate level, who mentioned that he had a difficult time in trying to win a grant. And so, I sent out an email across campus asking for faculty, who had been successful with grants, if they would be willing to share their application. And I was overwhelmed with the number of people who responded, all different types of grants. And so, we had a panel with them sharing. And I was expecting this to be for the new faculty, but I was overwhelmed – this was online – the number of full professors who came to this, also had gotten frustrated about being able to successfully win a grant. So, hopefully, we'll be able to do that again.

The faculty mentoring poster campaign, not only with the dogs, but several mentors and mentees posed for these posters that have been around campus. The peer mentoring group that I just talked about and that is just launching this semester, and the Exemplary Faculty Mentor Award. This was launched in 2021, and I'm happy to announce that our third recipient, 2024 Exemplary Faculty Mentor Award will go to Dr. Holly Jones in Biology. The provost and I surprised her the week before last. The chair and her nominators faked a meeting to get her on campus, because she's been working at home, where we surprised her with that announcement. So, if you know Holly, you can go ahead and say congratulations to her, because she is informed. She will not be able to attend the presidential awards reception, because she'll be out of the country. But her award will be accepted by one or both of her nominators.

And now I just want to spend a couple of minutes. Ben shared with me some of the results of the faculty survey that was administered, and he presented the information to me in themes. And mentorship was one of the themes, so I just wanted to respond to those concerns and questions that you may have. The mentoring of clinical faculty – it's very disappointing that many clinical faculty have been informed that they're not faculty. I cannot understand that. Year after year, clinical faculty are invited to the new faculty orientation, and some don't come because they've been told they are not faculty. You are – if there are any clinical faculty here – you are faculty. You may not be on the tenure track, but you certainly are faculty. And if there is anyone who does not have a mentor and would like one, please drop me an email. Hopefully, we're going to be working in Faculty Affairs in trying to change this perspective. But we can certainly find you a mentor.

Mentoring library faculty – Gwen Gregory has been instrumental in trying to match faculty, professors, with mentors. One, maybe two, one definitely, said no, I don't need one, I don't want one. And I was kind of concerned this was a new faculty member. But, it's something that she's working on. So, if you are a faculty member who works in the library, please seek out Gwen, and she can match you with someone.

The mentoring and coaching opportunities for department chairs, deans, program coordinators. I sent out an email to all of the deans after getting this information, asking if they would make that a priority of matching their new chairs with senior chairs. And again, ideally, you pick your own mentor, but a chair may not know who is a good chair, a chair who has an impact, who is effective and one who's just in the position. But the dean knows. And so, even though new chairs and program directors do spend, is it a whole year, a whole year with the vice provost for faculty affairs being oriented to their new role, hopefully, the deans will make sure that they are matched with a mentor. So, I did send that information out in response to this information.

Mentoring for community engagement (ongoing work by the Engagement Roundtable. I also sent them an email requesting that maybe someone from that will give a presentation about mentorship to this body.

Mentoring for multidisciplinary/interdisciplinary/transdisciplinary work. There was a task force focusing on transdisciplinary work that I think worked for two years, and really dealt with some important issues. Mentorship was not one of them, but they released their report in 2021. The task force disband after they turned in their report. I'm going to turn this over to Ben, and I can send you the online copy. And so, from that, there was a committee and two co-chairs of that body, and they can speak better concerning mentorship and what came out of that report than I can.

Are there any questions about the mentoring program as it currently is, or anything that you would like to see as part of the mentoring?

B. Creed: I appreciate the responsiveness and, as you're talking about the different groups, such as peer mentorship opportunities, your willingness to work with faculty who self-identify in saying, I want to work on this topic and helping pull those things together, I think that's a really important thing to share, just your openness to that. If there was a group of faculty members that do transdisciplinary work are interested, they can reach out to yourself, and you can help build that peer mentorship. It doesn't have to just be a top-down approach. If we come to you with ideas, your openness to supporting faculty-led topics for those mentorship groups – I just want to say thank you for that and thank you for sharing.

J. Hamlet: You're welcome. If you have any ideas or things that you would like to see, please do not hesitate to send me an email. Thank you so much.

- C. Open Scholarship
Bárbara González, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
Fred Barnhart, Dean, University Libraries
Jaime Schumacher, Sr. Director Scholarly Communications, University Libraries

B. Creed: That brings us to item C, which is Open Scholarship, which Dean of the University Libraries Fred Barnhart will lead us through.

F. Barnhart: Thank you. I also just wanted to add on Janice's excellent presentation, how important mentoring is for early career faculty learning to publish and where to publish and scholarship, in general. So, thank you, Janice.

And thank you for letting us address the Faculty Senate this afternoon about the important topic of open scholarship and how recent OSTP guidelines are impacting open scholarship. I'm Fred Barnhart; I'm dean of libraries here at NIU, and I am joined by my colleagues, Jaime Schumacher, who is also from the library, senior director for scholarly communication; Yvonne Harris, vice president for research; Bárbara González, who is vice provost for faculty affairs.

We have been engaged in discussion around open scholarship and how the new federal requirements will impact NIU. So, we wanted to bring this to your attention, especially because there are some compliance issues that we, as a university need to become more familiar with. Many of you probably already know that the OSTP, the Office of Science, Technology and Policy, issued a memo in 2022, which expanded guidelines for federal agencies grant funding for research and scholarship that comes from that grant funding. This quote from the memo is especially important and summarizes very well the core rationale for expanding the guidelines. "Financial means and privileged access must never be the pre-requisites to realizing the benefits of federally funded research that the American public deserves." Again, just kind of saying, we shouldn't be paying very expensive prices for journals when the research is federally funded already. I think that's something that most of us can get behind.

Just to give you an overview, since we have limited time, I'll share a little bit about the value and importance of open scholarship, science and open data, and then how the OSTP guidelines have changed, how that's going to impact and the opportunities, as well, that it presents for us, and more information about NIU scholarship and what the library and RIPS have been doing to support open scholarship, and what our next steps should be.

So, what is the value of open scholarship, science and open data? Open scholarship is important in that it enhances transparency and reproducibility by openly sharing research data and methodologies. It accelerates scientific progress through the more rapid dissemination of findings and collaborative platforms, and increases collaboration and innovation by fostering a culture of sharing and interdisciplinary cooperation. As we've seen, it aligns with the funder's mission, which is usually to share information and to maximize social impact. It also aligns well with NIU's mission, which, as you see here, is to empower students through educational excellence and experiential learning as we pursue knowledge, share our research and artistry, and engage communities for the benefit of the region, state, nation and world. Very powerful words.

To summarize, open scholarship offers multi-faceted benefits, including transparency, collaboration and societal impact. Embracing these practices aligns with our mission here at NIU and contributes to advancing knowledge and dissemination of public engagement. Continued exploration and adoption of open scholarship practices are crucial for enhancing scholarly work.

Just a brief introduction to the OSTP guidelines. For those of you, who aren't familiar with what we're talking about, I'd like to share what those include. The Office of Science and Technology Policy is a federal agency that advises the White House on the impact of science and technology on domestic and international affairs. Many of you may already be familiar with that. The new OSTP guidelines, which came out in 2022 in a memo [inaudible] transparency, accountability and accessibility in scientific research funded by federal agencies. These guidelines mandate that universities and research institutions receiving federal funding must adhere to specific standards for open science and data sharing.

So, some of the key requirements that affect universities:

Data management and sharing plans – Universities must develop DMPs outlining how research data will be managed, preserved and shared throughout the project life cycle.

Public access to research outputs – Institutions are required to ensure public access to peer review publications, conference papers and associated research data resulting from federal funded projects.

Data repositories and infrastructure – Universities must establish or utilize data repositories and infrastructure to facilitate data sharing and preservation. For those of you familiar with the Huskie Commons, that's our institutional repository, which Jaime manages for us.

Compliance and reporting – Institutions are responsible for ensuring compliance with the guidelines and reporting progress on data management and sharing activities to federal agencies. So, there's a feedback mechanism, as well.

The implications for research and funding, really important. Adherence to the OSTP guidelines is crucial for maintaining eligibility for federal funding. Failure to comply with these guidelines may result in funding restrictions or loss of future funding opportunities. Embracing open science and data practices can enhance research impact, foster collaboration and promote public trust in science, something I think we all agree is important. And universities that proactively embrace these guidelines will be better positioned to drive scientific innovation and address complex societal challenges.

So, our current strategies, things that we're doing right now, actually, or things that are going on right now – Many of the trends that we've seen in recent years around open access publishing have actually laid the groundwork for compliance with the OSTP guidelines. Increasingly, established journals are moving toward open access publication models. Some of you might be familiar with these already, hybrid, gold, etc.

Some disciplines already have open access repositories, especially the physical sciences, for the research outputs, including data sets. Many of the physical sciences have had archives for data sets for many, many years, but others have not.

Some grants are also including open access publication costs in their budgets, but that can have its own complications, given the limited window of time to use that grant money for the publication. So, if you're outside that window, you may not be able to use that.

Universities like NIU have long hosted institutional repositories, like the Huskie Commons. Our Huskie Commons, by the way, is populated with voluntary submissions. So, we don't mandate that, but we ask faculty to submit their pre-print, post-print, whatever they're able to legally, conference papers, books, book chapters. And it's also been a data repository as needed. But, as I say, a lot of physical sciences also already have their own repositories.

We also have a robust program for funding open access publishing. Some of you might have already partaken of that, but has already struggled to keep up financially. The demand always outstrips the [inaudible]. It's a fund, which both RIPS and the University Libraries have contributed to and which is managed by the University Libraries. From 2013 to present, over ten years, about \$153,000 has been awarded to researchers for their author publishing fees, which usually average out around \$2,000 or \$3,000 per article. This has resulted in over 100 articles being published open access. As I noted, the demand always outpaces what we have available in the fund; and this year, in particular, we already ran out of money in the fall. About mid-fall, we ran out of the fund, what we had available. Some publishers are also trying what are called transformational agreements, in which universities pay a fee – or the library, I should say – pays a fee on top of the subscription fee, which allows more extensive open access to publishing. So, it's not by the authority, it's by the institution. That said, those charges still come back to the library and the university, which could be considered paying twice for the same content. So, not the perfect solution, by any means.

NIU scholarly outputs and impacts – Just to give an example of what NIU's scholarly outputs are, including those that will likely be impacted – 800 publications are, basically, what we've come up with from the last five years that had a funding agency identified in the metadata. So, the way we came up with this was over 6,000 publications were identified, or citations were identified in an

initial query of Scopus. So, over the last five years, these were ones with an NIU affiliate as the authors. Of those, around 2,000 were left after we eliminated duplicates, citations without an NIU affiliate in the first three authors – so, for those where the NIU affiliate might have appeared later, tenth author or something, would not have been included. And then also, these are only the ones that are identified as an article or a conference paper. So, not the reviews, things of that nature. Of those nearly 2,000 citations, 40 percent had a funding source actually listed. And of the 2,000, 23 percent, almost a quarter, listed a U.S. funding source, so us.gov, something like that. The actual number may be even larger because metadata is not perfect, it's whatever you put in and that's what you're able to find. So, I suspect that there's probably more than that.

Other funding sources, not U.S. gov, are implementing similar requirements. Wellcome Trust, Gates Foundation, etc., most funding agencies are looking at this now as a good thing, we want open access, open publishing. Again, this is because success for these organizations is based on positive impact for the public for all the reasons I already identified.

It's also worth noting that the EU and some other non-U.S. funding organizations have already had a much more rigorous process for years. EU classically is much more prone toward open access and really mandates that for their authors, for funded research.

Okay, our next steps. So, what we'd like to do is make sure we gather feedback from all the disciplines at NIU. This is, hopefully, to achieve and exceed compliance. While this may affect most, if not all, disciplines, it is likely to have different impacts, depending on the unique cultures of publishing and data sharing within these disciplines.

Gathering feedback from all the disciplines at NIU is important to help us develop policies and procedures that can address current gaps and efficiently use current resources while adding new resources and procedures where needed. So, hopefully, by identifying the need, we'll be able to get the resources to address those. Ultimately, doing more than just the minimum is important to our mission, our identity as Northern Illinois University. We want to be at the forefront. We don't want to be just dragged behind by this mandate.

Our initial goal right now is to create an Open Scholarship Advisory Board, which will bring together disciplinary representatives. So, if you're interested, this group, of course, is invited. But please share with your colleagues as well, and we'll send out more of a call for this. But, if you're interested or you want to recommend somebody, please have them reach out to Bárbara González. It may not be possible for every department to have a representative, we're talking hundreds. But, there is likely to be some consolidation of needs around different disciplines, and we can work with that.

This group will also help to navigate concerns about open access journals and whether they are as rigorous, peer-reviewed, for the purpose of tenure and promotion. So, that is something also – kind of an elephant in the room – that is the value of open access journals versus the more traditional fee-based journals.

I will also note that we have a faculty survey coming out from the library this week, and that has questions about the typical collection and services that the library provides, but we also have questions in there about OER, open scholarship, and we really appreciate your feedback. This is how we know what our paths should be for the next three to five years.

With that, I can open it to questions or comments, did I miss anything? Sure, please.

B. González: One additional thing that, in particular, the Faculty Senate needs to think about open scholarship, is how do we incorporate this into the bylaws for tenure and promotion. I have shared with Ben a couple of things that different universities have done in terms of sometimes they are in the senate bylaws, sometimes they are in the departmental ones, sometimes it's just an affirmation of something. So, there are a variety of ways in which universities have addressed this for their faculty in their bylaws, so I would suggest that the Faculty Senate take a look at this and think about what you want to do.

W. Mills: William Mills, Engineering Technology. We have seen a dramatic shift in the last five years. I used to be able to find 10, 20 journals. My colleagues and I, we've got three publication routes, we have struggled to find a single one that was topical for it, and we tried to get the funding from the scholarship board, and it's gone. And what I'm also finding is \$3,000 is actually the minimum now. [inaudible] tenure? Do you want people to publish? If you think about even the salary advances and that that have gone, you're wiping out the salary advances and that almost if people don't have it built in. So, there's a real need to recognize that there is now a hidden cost associated with what we're doing. I think it's unreasonable to expect faculty to have to dig into their own pocket when it's not through their own fault.

F. Barnhart: Well said. I don't think we want that either.

E. Nesterov: Evgueni Nesterov of Chemistry and Biochemistry. Most the government funding agencies have their own tools and mechanisms for public access to publications. Let's say NSF has its public access repository, NIH has PubMed Central, and so on. And they do require the researchers who are funded by the central agencies to deposit their papers there independent on whether it's open access or not, because they have agreements with most publishers, which would allow, for example, access in one or two years, whatever after. But every paper, basically, becomes an open access paper. So, basically, these efforts of NIU is then just simply duplicating what the funding agencies already implemented and mandated. So, I don't know how much really there is connection.

F. Barnhart: Well, a couple of things, and thank you for pointing that out. It does vary from discipline to discipline. So, it's not all disciplines that have the same repository. But, also, the embargo

E. Nesterov: The funding agencies require it.

F. Barnhart: The funding agencies now require it, but it previously was embargoed for a year, and that's what really changed. And I think that's the dramatic change, is that the embargo is no longer there. The requirement is that it be published immediately. So, a lot of the fee-based journals are no longer able to have first-dibs or first access to these articles. But, you're absolutely right; a lot of the agencies do have requirements already to publish in their archive or their repository.

E. Nesterov: Yeah, I mean, as a part of annual report, you have to report what has been published. For example, NIH won't even accept your annual report unless you have deposited all those papers already to PubMed Central. NSF has the same policy now.

F. Barnhart: Suggesting a secondary or redundant procedure will – what we want to do is make sure that everybody's knowledgeable about it and is participating. So, thank you, though, that's great.

Any other questions, comments?

S. Vahabzedah: I'm Sahar Vahabzedah from Department of Mechanical Engineering. Thank you so much for the presentation. I have one particular question about the OSTP related to the open access. I was wondering if NIU has any plan to provide faculty and students with tools or software for plagiarism, because we are seeing that in the nation that there is some reports of plagiarism. And I was wondering if you are going to get access to such software as iThenticate or something like that for a smoother publication. Thank you.

F. Barnhart: Thanks, we don't have any plans at this time, but it's good to hear that that's something you're interested in. I think we could talk to CITL about that as well, and maybe see if we could collaborate. I'm not sure what the costs are of some of those packages, but yeah, that's something we could certainly talk about. And please put comments or requests like that in the survey, as well. I think that would be very helpful for us to hear. The more people that say it, too, the more we're able to make the argument for that funding.

B. González: This is a little bit unrelated, it's not about plagiarism, it's about training. NASA has come up with training for graduate students and faculty on open scholarship and data management. It's free, you can probably Google it. It's put up by NASA, and it's free. It's an online training that you and your Ph.D. students would benefit from.

B. Creed: I would just add also, going back to the comment from Professor Mills, I think it's not just about the NIHS, the NSFs, it's about the direction of a lot of the fields and a lot of the journals are going toward open access, as well. So, even if you're not receiving those large grants, those federal grants, there's still a push that is almost a tax on productivity, that if the university can help support faculty to navigate what are non-predatorial open access journals, how to offset some of those costs in publishing in the top journals in the field or discipline, [inaudible] various [inaudible] toward that, and it's welcome and thinking about how do we, as a university, have a stance toward open scholarship, open data repositories. I think it's welcome news to me.

F. Barnhart: Part of process with the open access grants for authors is reviewing the proposed journal and whether or not it would be considered predatory or would fall under those descriptions, such as not peer reviewed, perhaps not well accessed, things of that nature. The libraries can actually help determine if a journal is predatory – I hate to use that term – but journals that may just be more interested in profit than in actual good scholarship.

Are there any other questions or comments? Feel free to email if you have concerns. We're really more asking to inform yourselves and what can we do to help inform you about this.

E. Nesterov: Maybe a comment regarding this open access or predatory journals. There is an impact factor, and most of these predatory journals get pretty low impact factors. So, you [inaudible] can be done is just to establish a certain threshold. In that way, you would consider this as an application or just non-peer review publication [inaudible] predatory journal and [inaudible].

F. Barnhart: Sure, absolutely. And for newer journals, which may not have been around long enough to have developed an impact factor or developed their impact factor, this is also a useful mechanism to determine who are the reviewers. Who's on the editorial board? Things of that nature, we can help you find out, as well. So, thank you very much, that's a good comment.

Okay, without any further ado, just let us know if you have any questions, thank you.

B. Creed: Thank you very much.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

B. Creed: That brings us to agenda item IX, unfinished business. I'm going to walk back and get a clicker; and while I do that, I'm going to turn it over to Pat to walk us through the clicker protocol.

P. Erickson: First, I'm going to put this slide up here that shows all the people we have listed as voting members of Faculty Senate. If your name is on that list or you're here today as a sub for somebody who's on that list, we want you to have a clicker, so, now's the time to go back and pick one up. Just a reminder that you don't need to turn the clicker on or off. When the time comes, we'll direct you what to push on the clicker to vote. So, we'll just give a moment while people are getting that together.

We're going to be looking at two bylaw amendment proposals in this next section of the meeting. Just to review, also, how we vote on bylaw amendments. To become effective, an amendment must be approved by a vote of two-thirds of those voting, provided at least two-thirds of the voting members are present. So, let's take care of that second part of the sentence first. Let's make sure that we have two-thirds of the voting members present in the room before we even go any further. We have 59 members seated on Faculty Senate, so I think two-thirds means 40. I'm going to open the pool, and I'm going to ask everyone to – not do anything yet, because I see a response and I want to get rid of it. Now, I would like everybody who is a voting member to click, I don't care, 1 or 2, on your clickers right now. You're not voting for anything; you're just telling us that you're here. And we want to see that get to 40. And if anyone is having a little problem with their clicker,

just raise your hand, we'll help you out. Sometimes, that touch on that clicker is tricky. We need four more people to tell us they're here. Is there anybody in the room with a question about whether or not they are a voting member?

B. Creed: Give us one moment as we figure out what to do now. [pause] All right, we will be postponing both unfinished business items A and B as they require that two-thirds of seated members be present to hold that vote. With that in mind, I will also send a reminder requesting people come to that last meeting so we can finalize the business for this academic year related to our bylaw updates.

- 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
SECOND READING/VOTE
Ben Creed, Faculty Senate President and FS Steering Committee Chair
- B. Proposed amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws
Article 3.5, Social Justice Committee
SECOND READING/VOTE
Ben Creed, Faculty Senate President and FS Social Justice Committee Convener

X. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

B. Creed: That brings us to item C [X.A], which is Rules, Governance and Elections, and I will invite up Emily McKee. Thank you, Emily.

- A. FS-UC Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – report
Emily McKee, FS/RGE Liaison/Spokesperson
 - 1. 2024-25 President of Faculty Senate/Chair of University Council
Call for nominations
 - Nominations will be taken from the Faculty Senate floor during the March 27 Faculty Senate meeting.
 - Letters of acceptance of nomination are due in the Office of Faculty Senate by Friday, April 12, and can be emailed to Pat Erickson at pje@niu.edu.
 - 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: Hello, everybody. We are going to open the floor for nominations for the position of Faculty Senate president for 2024-2025. So up there now is the list of Faculty Senate members who are eligible to be nominated, and they're also in your packet. If you'd like to nominate someone, I'll ask you to please go to the microphone. First state your name, and then state the name of the person you'd like to nominate. And then I will ask for a second.

T. Arado: Hello, I'm Therese Arado from the College of Law, and I would like to nominate Ben Creed to once again run and fill the position of Faculty Senate president.

E. McKee: Do I have a second?

K. Staikidis: I second that nomination.

E. McKee: And could you state your name, too? I think we need your name for the record.

K. Staikidis: Kryssi Staikidis, School of Art and Design.

E. McKee: Thank you. Do we have any other nominations? Okay, hearing no more nominations, I will close the nominations. Letters of acceptance, including information on your qualification and desire to serve are due by Friday, April 12, and can be emailed to Pat Erickson. Those letters will then be provided to the Faculty Senate by email by April 17 and will also be included in the April 24 Faculty Senate packet. And the election will take place on that next April 24 meeting.

2. Election of 2024-25 Non-Union Faculty and Staff Grievance Pool – A Qualtrics ballot will be distributed to FS tenured/tenure-track voting members following the meeting.

E. McKee: Next, we are asked to identify three tenured non-union faculty members to serve on the 2024-25 pool for non-union faculty and staff grievances, from which a grievance committee could be created if one is needed, to review a non-union faculty or staff grievance. SPS Council and Operating Staff Council also are selecting their own three representatives each, to serve on this grievance pool through their own process. And just as a point of clarification – and I have to thank Pat Erickson for all this, because I don't know any of this unless I'm helped to know all these details. This is different from what we did at our last Faculty Senate meeting to select members for the Student Grievance Panel. The two bodies are distinct and they each have a different process for selection. So, for this election of three faculty members, a Qualtrics ballot is going to be used, and Pat will be emailing that out to you all following the meeting. The ballot will contain the names of ten randomly selected non-union faculty members, and you will be asked to vote for three of them.

3. Motion to approve Professor Tiffany Puckett, Department of Leadership, Educational Psychology and Foundations, to serve as Linda Saborío's alternate to the Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE during the 2024-25 academic year

E. McKee: We have one more item of business, that is a motion to approve Professor Tiffany Puckett, Department of Leadership, Educational Psychology and Foundations, to serve as Linda Saborío's alternate representative to the Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE during the next 2024-25 academic year. You can see Professor Puckett's statement in your packet on pages 18 to 21, also on the screen. And before we begin discussion, I'll start by making the motion to approve Professor Puckett to serve as Linda's alternate during 2024-25 academic year. Do I have a second for that motion?

B. Creed: Valentiner is the second.

E. McKee: Okay, great, thank you. Any discussion?

B. Creed: I think she'll be great.

E. McKee: Seeing nothing else, I'll turn it over to Pat to finish the vote. And approval of this motion requires a simple majority. Thanks, everybody.

P. Erickson: Okay, you have your clickers. We'll remind you to click 1, yes, to approve Professor Puckett; 2, no, to disapprove; 3 is abstain. [pause] We lost one person. Okay, that passes.

Yes – 34 votes

No – 1 vote

Abstain – 0 votes

B. Creed: All right, thank you.

- 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: That brings us to item B, which is the Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE. So, Linda Saborío will share the report.

L. Saborío: Good afternoon, count down for me, two more, this one and one more next month. The FAC met on March 15 here at NIU. We had a very productive meeting with several guest speakers. First, President Freeman provided us with some inspiring welcoming remarks. Next we had Simón Weffer, our very own Simón Weffer-Elizondo. He gave us an update on the higher education funding formula. This was followed by a very informative presentation by Bryan Flower on [NIU's Edible Campus](#). I would encourage you to Google that on NIU's website if you want to know more about it. David Tretter, the president of the [Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges and Universities](#), shared some insightful information with us on enrollment trends. And lastly, we were

joined by the newly appointed [IBHE](#) chair, Pranav Kothari. Our discussion with Mr. Kothari included topics such as the higher education funding formula, his ideas for changing the narrative on a liberal arts education and the importance of a liberal arts education, the IBHE's perspective on early college credit planning, a timeline for a faculty member to be appointed to serve on the IBHE to fill Jennifer Delaney's spot, IBHE's plan to create a task force on prior learning assessment and IBHE's accountability measures for the [Thriving Illinois Plan](#). More details regarding our discussions with each of these guests can be found in the minutes once they are approved by the FAC. And you can read any of the FAC-approved documents, including our meeting minutes, on our [website](#). Our next meeting is scheduled for April 19 at Waubensee Community College. Tiffany Puckett, please come and join us at Waubensee – wonderful! If there are any questions, let me know. Thank you.

B. Creed: Thank you, Linda.

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

B. Creed: That brings us to item C, University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees. I'll be giving the report; I'll keep it brief. One of the main items was the finalizing of the remaining tuition and fee increases that had been recommended to the board. Those were approved after some discussion. There was discussion and then an approval of changing the regulations of the Board of Trustees to raise the dollar amount in what needed to be reported consistently to the Board of Trustees, and that's to be in alignment with other universities in the state of Illinois and to ease the reporting requirements and staff time. And then, finally and importantly, the board unanimously approved and lauded the appointment of Laurie Elish-Piper to serve as the executive vice president and provost. So, that begins April 1. And that's my report from the Board of Trustees unless anybody who was there wants to add anything.

- D. Baccalaureate Council – no report
Amanda Ferguson, Chair
Alicia Schatteman, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

- E. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee – no report

B. Creed: Up next, we do not have a report from Faculty Rights and Responsibilities,

- F. Social Justice Committee – no report

B. Creed: Or from the Social Justice Committee.

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

B. Creed: Do we have a report from the Student Government Association?

L. Larkin: Good afternoon. I have a couple important announcements that pertain to mostly students, but if you could share these with your networks, that would be greatly appreciated. Student government elections end tonight at midnight. More information about the candidates can be found on the Northern Star website. We currently have over 1,800 votes, which is pretty crazy. It's one of the largest voter turnouts of students in the past decade. Submission forms for supplemental and annual funding for student orgs close March 31 at midnight. Please have any orgs reach out to myself, who is the treasurer, to apply for funding. I'll be able to hang around and give contact information after. Lastly, the First Gen Proud to be First event for supporting first generation college students is right here tomorrow at 4 p.m. Thank you.

B. Creed: Thank you, Landon.

- H. Operating Staff Council – report
Natasha Johnson, President
Mandy Kreitzer, OSC Representative

B. Creed: Natasha, is there a report? No report.

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

B. Creed: And do we have an SPS Council report? Didn't see Felicia.

J. Boswell: No report.

B. Creed: None, all right, thank you.

XI. 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
- Q. [Spring Commencement](#)
 Graduate School – Friday, May 10, 4 p.m.
 Undergraduate – CLAS, CEET, CVPA – Saturday, May 11, 10 a.m.
 Undergraduate – CEDU, CBUS, CHHS – Saturday, May 11, 2 p.m.

B. Creed: So that brings us to item XI, which is Information Items. A through P are the standard ones. Our last meeting of the academic year is on April 24. And for those here, thank you for coming today, but please also come then so we can finalize our business. So, that will be the last one of the academic year. And then you'll notice item Q is information about spring commencement. Similar to the call last semester, please do consider attending, as you're able, the graduate and/or the undergraduate commencements to celebrate the work that our students and their support networks have put in to their efforts along the way. So, please mark your calendar and try to be there and bring a friend.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

B. Creed: That brings us to adjournment. Do I have a motion to adjourn? Therese. Second, Valentin. All in favor, say aye.

Members: Aye.

B. Creed: Thank you.

Meeting adjourned at 4:13 p.m.